U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 87—PART 3

MARCH 19, 1941, TO MAY 1, 1941
(PAGES 2349 TO 3524)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1941

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OCT 21 '41

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Christ, who hast made known the secret of the Almighty One and humbled Thyself unto death, we pray that we may be deeply grateful for Thy merit and mercy. Enable us to stand before Thee, neither doubting nor fearing, but confirmed in the holy faith. Grant that our thoughts and endeavors may be enshrined in noble lives that cannot be reconciled to that which is subjected and opposed to the law of God. We are reminded, dear Lord, in these times which are trying men's souls, of the American home, with its altar, library, and blessed relationships which call forth the finest qualities of the human soul. May its reverence, simplicity, and purity be a royal fortress and its hearthstone a rampart against this garish world, building a hallowed citadel of martial resources against the beleaguering hosts of darkness. Let parents be willing to know the truth and admit the light wherever it reveals and follow it wherever it leads. We pray that all may listen to Thy message, however untuned the trumpet, and may obey its warning, and Thine shall be the praise and the glory forever. In the holy name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 19, 1941.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election, in due form of law, of Hon. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress from the Seventeenth Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Kenneth F. Simpson, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
By H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. BALDWIN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Admiral Stark.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. THOMAS M. BELL

Mr. WHELCHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHELCHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret and profound sorrow that I announce to the House of Representatives the passing of one of its former Members, Hon. Thomas M. Bell, of Gainesville, Ga., who died on yesterday at his home there. He entered the House of Representatives in 1904 and served until 1930, a period of 26 years. He served with distinction to himself and honor to himself and to his constituents. In his passing the Nation loses one of its illustrious citizens and Georgia one of its beloved sons.

ADMINISTRATION ACTS ON ORDERS AND POLICIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably (Rept. No. 279) House Resolution 111 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 111

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Digest of the State Laws Affecting the Hard of Hearing and the Deaf, With Supplementary Notes on Administration Acts on Orders and Policies," compiled by the State Law Index Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed as a document.

The resolution was agreed to.

"OUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably (Rept. No. 280) House Resolution 148 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 148

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Our National Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?", compiled by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, be printed as a public document, and that 9,000 additional copies be printed, with illustrations, for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

PUBLIC-WORKS CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3325) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3325) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
E. D. SMITH,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3325) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain Public Works, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the

accompanying conference report as amendment numbered 2: As proposed by the House, Section 8(a) of Public, No. 671, approved June 28, 1940, which provided that any statutory limitation with respect to the cost of any individual naval project of construction could be increased as necessary to expedite national defense, was made applicable to the naval public works projects authorized by this Act and all prior Acts.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state to the House that the Senate agrees to the position as set out in the amendment of the House. So the Senate receded on that amendment.

I ask for a vote on the conference report.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman briefly explain the amendment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is an amendment that the House put in, which carries into effect subsection 8 (a) of what is known as the speed-up bill. A limit was placed on the cost of vessels authorized by the act of July 1, 1937. The amendment provided that any statutory limitation with respect to the cost of any individual naval project of construction is hereby increased as may be necessary to expedite national defense or otherwise affect the purpose of this act.

It simply permits the Appropriations Committee, if the national-defense emergency requires it, to exceed any of the items named as the emergency of the occasion requires.

Mr. MAAS. It is quite necessary, is it not, for the speed-up program?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC-WORKS CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3155) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and ask that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3155) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the words "Recreation facilities and accessories," appearing on page 2, lines 3 and 4, of the House engrossed bill, insert "Acquisition of land, $350,000; but no part of such sum shall be used for the construction of a stadium"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ELLISON D. SMITH,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3155) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain Public Works, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to amendment numbered 2: Authorizes an appropriation of $350,000 for the acquisition of land at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, but provides that no part of such sum shall be used for the construction of a stadium, instead of authorizing an appropriation of $150,000 as proposed by the House and $650,000 as proposed by the Senate for recreational facilities and accessories at the Naval Academy.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Budget recommended an expenditure of $650,000. The House and the Naval Affairs Committee reduced it to $150,000. In conference we agreed to $350,000 for the sole purpose of the acquisition of land at the Naval Academy, with a provision in the amendment that no part of said sum shall be used for the construction of a stadium.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. There will be no stadium built out of Federal funds.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not one dollar will come out of Federal funds.

Mr. MAAS. The land itself, however, is very essential because of the expansion of the buildings at the Naval Academy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the conference report will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when holding hearings on the bill H. R. 3685, the freight forwarders' bill, may sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make that request for today?

Mr. LEA. No, Mr. Speaker, but when the committee holds hearings on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the completion of the legislative program for the day I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent editorial from the Norwich Sun.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution to the Congress by the seaway committee appointed by the mayor of Detroit on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway improvement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'BRIEN of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three particulars and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has come to this country a special envoy of Eamon de Valera, to see if he can purchase, for the Irish Government, tens of millions of bushels of wheat from us. The Irish people need bread. They are ready to pay for it. When a terrible famine came to Eire nearly a hundred years ago, charitable Americans tried valiantly to come to the rescue. But now, standing on its own feet, Eire does not ask charity.

This wheat will not go to a country dominated by Germany or by any other nation. It will go to feed Irish men, women, and children. "We are in grave danger of being cut off completely from bread supplies," De Valera said on Monday. May our Government cooperate

with the Government of Eire, so that needless suffering in the beautiful isle shall be averted. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a concurrent resolution from the General Assembly of Iowa on the subject of reapportionment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the contents from a few very brief letters in the remarks I expect to make this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances; first, relative to the passing of our colleague the late "Pi" Schwert of New York, and second, to include an address by a high school student in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF WAREHOUSING, STORING, AND RECONCENTRATION OF COTTON HELD BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (Rept. No. 281), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 149

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of S. 262, an act regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAINES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent on the A. A. A. contract.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter and resolution of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEAVY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a memorandum written by Mr. B. C. Johnson, of Seward, Alaska, relative to the proposed change of the terminus of The Alaska Railroad from Seward, Alaska, to a point at the head of Passage Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution by the Department of Public Service of the State of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Stamford Advocate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a petition from the Ford workers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the development of the waterpower and navigation project on the Savannah River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

READING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on April 13, the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, immediately after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and before the legislative program in order for the day is begun, a Member of the House designated by the Speaker may read Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article written by former Assistant Attorney General George R. Farnum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

Bloom	Jenks, N. H.	Rivers
Bolles	Jensen	Rogers, Okla.
Bradley, Pa.	Keefe	Satterfield
Buck	Kelly, Ill.	Schaefer, Ill.
Celler	Lea	Secrest
Collins	McArdle	Shannon
Culkin	McGranery	Smith, Wash.
Delaney	Mills, La.	Stevenson
Disney	O'Day	Sweeney
Domengeaux	Pace	Taylor
Gifford	Plauché	Thill
Healey	Ramsay	Thomas, N. J.
Heidinger	Rankin, Mont.	Wadsworth
Jacobsen	Reed, Ill.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

READING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my request that Jefferson's first inaugural address be read on April 13 so as to make it Monday, April 14. I find that the 13th is a Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I was seeking recognition from the Speaker before the Chaplain offered prayer, I felt that there would be a call of the House and I thought it would be a good thing for all the Members to be here for once to hear the Chaplain offer prayer. What does the Speaker think about that? Would it be proper procedure for a Member to make the point of order that a quorum is not present before the Chaplain offers prayer?

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, it has been held many times that the prayer is not such business of the House that a quorum is required.

DEFENSE AID SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4050) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4050, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the special order, the time for general debate has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Under the special order, it was agreed that this bill should be considered in the House as a general appropriation bill. Under that order, will amendments have to be offered at the end of each paragraph as it is read?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, under the special order that the bill be considered as a general appropriation bill, amendments would be in order at the end of each paragraph as read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, and for each and every purpose incident to or necessary therefor, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums for the following respective purposes, namely:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, when the lend-lease bill was before the House I voted against it. The lend-lease bill having been enacted into law after Nation-wide debate, I voted to report to the House the bill which is now before us to implement the foreign policy which the President and a majority of Congress have determined that the country is to follow, and I intend to support it on final passage.

I did not oppose the alleged objective of the lend-lease bill—namely, aid to England consistent with national defense and "short of war." I have favored that objective. I opposed the method proposed to assure proper aid to England.

I opposed it because of the enormous delegation of power to the President, including the power to participate from day to day, from week to week, from month to month, in the conduct of a war in which America is not a belligerent, including the power, without further recourse to Congress, to commit acts of war in behalf of, or against, any nation, or group of nations, anywhere in the world. I opposed it because of the belief that the delegation of power was unnecessary, dangerous to our form of government, and likely to plunge us, unprepared, into war. I opposed it because of the belief that full aid to England "short of war" could be easily provided on a credit basis in a manner preferable to England and without this tremendous delegation of power and assumption of responsibility and risk involved.

A decisive majority of Congress determined otherwise. When the bill returned to the House from the Senate it had received a commanding majority in both Houses. Its final passage was assured. Due to opposition in both Senate and House, however, amendments had been adopted in the Senate manifestly improving the legislation. The question presented to the House was the adoption or rejection of these amendments. I was glad to vote for them.

The lend-lease bill is today the law of the land. For better or worse America is committed to the foreign policy for which it provides. The question before us today, as I see it, is whether or not the pending bill is an appropriate measure to make that policy effective.

As the record indicates, witnesses before the committee in charge of this bill included Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Ingersoll, Mr. Knudsen, Budget Director Smith, and other representatives of the War and Navy Departments. Some of the testimony appears as a matter of record in the hearings which you have before you. Much of the testimony, including detailed break-downs of the several items of appropriation, is not a matter of record, but is included in the confidential files of the Appropriations Committee.

The testimony establishes the fact, in my judgment, that substantially all of the appropriation requested will be required for expenditure or obligation during the fiscal year 1942. I shall vote for certain amendments to the bill which will be offered. I shall support the bill on final pasage. The foreign policy to which we have been committed must either be made effective or sabotaged.

The total of $7,000,000,000 carried in the bill is not the largest appropriation in our history. It is, however, a tremendous appropriation. No one appreciates more fully than I the dangers of large appropriations at this time on top of the reckless expenditure, waste, and extravagance of the past 8 years.

It is fair to state, however, that the ultimate cost of this bill cannot be determined at this time. Under the terms of the lease-lend bill, the President is authorized to deliver articles of defense to Britain, or other nations, on such terms as he sees fit. The title remains in America until completion and delivery. Assurances have been given indicating that the President intends to make the best possible terms that he can make in each instance. Whatever he obtains by way of payment or collateral security may be deducted in the long run from the pending appropriation. The figures given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in reference to British holdings in this hemisphere, British orders and payments to date and British plans for payment in the future are of interest in this connection.

It should also be emphasized that 95 percent of the articles of defense to be manufactured under the pending appropriation will be of such character that they can be utilized immediately by our own Army and Navy in case of necessity. In this case the pending appropriation would be clearly for our own national-defense purposes.

The details of the appropriation appear in the general classifications set forth in the bill itself and the detailed off-the-record break-downs furnished for the confidential files of the committee.

The record indicates that every item covered by this appropriation has been specifically requested by the British Government; that every item in turn has been considered by the departments or agencies directly involved and by the Bureau of the Budget; that all expenditures will be made through the normal channels applicable to articles of defense for our own purposes; and that the entire program will be subject to accounting in the regular manner through the General Accounting Office. Whatever deliveries are made to foreign governments must, of course, be reported to the Congress at 90-day intervals, insofar as compatible with the public interest.

Included in the program are new facilities, assuring the necessary productive capacity to complete the program within the specified time. As a matter of fact, the record indicates a productive capacity of something like four times the present program, if necessary.

The record also indicates the possibility of immediate deliveries, at the discretion of the President, with reimbursement out of the pending appropriation if made available.

The President has requested the enormous and unprecedented powers provided in the lend-lease bill. Congress, by a majority vote in both Houses, has given him these powers. This appropriation bill will implement the foreign policy which he has initiated. The full responsibility for the execution of that policy is in his hands.

The people have been led to believe that the policy is a peace policy, that it

will contribute to our national defense. I am confident that the Congress and the Nation as a whole fervently hope that the lack of progress of national defense in the past is no measure of its progress in the future and that America may, in fact, remain at peace and not be plunged, lamentably unprepared, into the present conflict. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, today we are considering H. R. 4050, a bill which provides for the making of supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

The various sums set forth in this bill amount to $7,000,000,000, which is to remain available until June 30, 1943. The bill allocates certain sums, as follows:

(1) Articles of ordnance, $1,343,000,000.

(2) Aircraft and essential parts, $2,054,000,000.

(3) Tanks, automobiles, trucks, and so forth, $362,000,000.

(4) Vessels, watercraft, and equipage, $629,000,000.

(5) Miscellaneous military equipment, $260,000,000.

(6) Facilities and equipment for the manufacture or production of defense articles, $752,000,000.

(7) Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities and articles, $1,350,000,000.

(8) Miscellaneous, $200,000,000.

(9) For necessary services and expenses in carrying out the purposes of this act, $40,000,000.

(10) For administrative expenses, $10,000,000.

I voted against the passage of H. R. 1776, which, by virtue of becoming the law of the land, made necessary the appropriation bill we are considering today, H. R. 4050. I also voted against the motion to concur with the amendments to that bill which were adopted by the other body. I opposed this bill on principle and I opposed it because I sincerely believed that this country should not embark upon a program as contemplated by the provisions of the bill H. R. 1776.

I have always been a firm advocate of the supremacy of the United States and, throughout my entire legislative career, I have cooperated in every movement and supported every bill which had for its object the development of our country and the adequate military defense for our country. I am of the opinion that this Government has contributed greatly to the peace of the world by its fine example throughout the years of unselfishness and of devotion to the preservation of human rights. That example should be continued.

In July 1939, I went to Europe as a delegate of the United States to the Interparliamentary Union, which was held in Oslo, Norway. On the trip I visited Ireland, Scotland, England, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Holland and, as a result of my visit and of my conversations with the citizens of these countries and with the delegates from many other countries, I was convinced that it would be wise and necessary for the Government of the United States of America to remain aloof and apart from the European war which was then in the making.

Today, confronted with the necessity of making a decision as to whether I should vote for or against this appropriation bill, and having considered in the most painstaking and exhaustive manner all the factors involved, I have decided, difficult as it is for me, to vote for the bill. Undoubtedly the passage of this bill will require many readjustments in our social and economic order and will impose a serious tax burden upon an already overburdened people, but those problems can be met and will be solved. As a firm believer in the rule of the majority, I now bow to the will of the majority in casting my vote for this bill, and I propose to do everything within my power to cooperate with the President in making the legislation workable, effective, and instrumental in assuring the peace and security of our beloved country.

At this time I wish to compliment the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], both loyal sons of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Last week, on the final passage of H. R. 1776, they made eloquent pleas for the enactment of the legislation and they pledged their personal effort, as well as their political strength, to the success of the measure. The Pilgrims who fled from England to escape religious persecution, who landed at Plymouth Rock and who now occupy a place in the eternal scheme of things, must have been pleased when they heard the speeches delivered by their descendants, the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK and Mr. MARTIN], on the floor of this House. These leaders typified America in their speeches and the spirit of American charity by advocating all aid for Great Britain, to preserve the governmental structure of the British Empire.

At the last session of Congress, and again at this session, I introduced a resolution known as House Resolution 98, which provided for a committee to study the practicability of a plan for relief against starvation in Europe. The resolution also provided that, prior to the formation of such a commission, the Secretary of State procure from the present ruling governments in Europe commitments to the effect that food to be so distributed will not be given to any of the armies engaged in war, or to any of the peoples of a country actually engaged in war. I think that one of the greatest contributions this country could make to the peoples of the world would be the alleviation of suffering as a result of starvation. When you consider that there are more than 50,000,000 men, women, and children who are helpless and hungry, it seems our plain duty, motivated by humanitarian impulses, to do what we can to aid these unfortunate people. To me it seems futile to talk about saving the democracies while we permit the people of these democracies to starve while we have the means of feeding them.

I particularly direct the attention of the House to a statement that appears in today's newspapers in reference to the visit of Mr. Frank Aiken, Eire Minister for Defense Coordination, who arrived here yesterday aboard the Yankee Clipper. To the reporters, Mr. Aiken is quoted, as follows:

"As you know," he told reporters, "we are short of foodstuffs in Ireland, but principally I am here to get arms. I want to get all sorts of arms and supplies, but the chief thing is arms."

I respectfully suggest to this Congress and to the President of the United States that the plight of Ireland and the Irish people should receive consideration at our hands. Under the terms of bill H. R. 1776, the President has unlimited power and discretion and I make this public appeal to the President to do something to aid Ireland in her present dilemma. This small country, which has always been in the forefront of every campaign for the preservation of democratic ideals and of the democratic way of life, should not be permitted to suffer because of its unfortunate geographical position. On one hand, there are demands by Great Britain for bases in Ireland and on the other hand there is a warning from Germany of complete destruction if Ireland surrenders these bases to England. Ireland will be damned if she does not comply with the demands of Great Britain for bases and she will be damned by the Axis Powers if she does comply with England's demands. Regardless of the merits of the controversy, it is the plain duty of this country and of our President to aid in every possible way the people and the Government of Ireland. Their representative comes not with hat in hand asking for something for nothing, but he comes ready, willing, and able to pay for foodstuffs and the necessary military equipment for a proper defense of Ireland.

On several occasions, I addressed this House to emphasize the necessity of peaceful relations with the other countries of the world and I have also used every parliamentary means at my disposal to delay the passage of H. R. 1776 until such time as every hope for the establishment of world peace had been exhausted. Today, I wish to conclude those remarks with a fervent prayer that this Government will use its influence and prestige to bring about, at the earliest possible moment, a just and lasting peace among the warring nations. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent of the House, I am including, as part of my remarks, the following editorial which appeared in the Daily News of New York City on March 18:

THE PEOPLE ASKED FOR IT

We reread with great interest the speech which President Roosevelt delivered at Washington Saturday evening at the White House Correspondents' Association dinner and to a world-wide radio audience.

As we reread the speech, we kept reflecting that there are a lot of Americans around the country to whom this speech must have sounded extreme, idealistic, and too much like the early months of 1917 for comfort.

It was a speech heavily loaded with early 1917-style idealism. The President is calling the United States, seemingly, to an all-out crusade for democracy and against dictators. We think he sincerely hopes to avert an actual state of complete warfare, but we don't see how he can.

The British Government is building up a case for a request for some kind of convoy service to be performed by United States Navy ships. We can't foresee that request being refused, if the British make it urgent enough.

When and if United States Navy vessels go into convoy service, we look for the United States to find itself actively in the war not long thereafter.

This crusade may take a lot of our young men to far places to fight, and a lot of them may not come back unless in pine boxes. If the British ultimate war aim is to pulverize Germany this time, we think a bigger A. E. F. than last time will be necessary.

However, though a lot of Americans must have felt as above outlined about the President's speech, we're convinced that more Americans felt the opposite way about it. It was the kind of speech the majority of Americans have been asking for since shortly after this war began.

The President has said much the same thing several times, though never before last Saturday evening so vigorously or explicitly. And the majority of Americans have O. K.'d those Presidential remarks.

Mr. Roosevelt was nominated for a third term by almost the unanimous vote of his party's 1940 convention. He was reelected by a popular vote of about 27,000,000 to 22,000,000 for Mr. Willkie in a completely fair election. There was no funny business in it.

Soon after his third inauguration he submitted H. R. 1776 to Congress, a bill giving him virtually the powers of a wartime dictator. The bill was fully and fiercely debated from all angles in Congress, over cracker barrels, in the press, and on the radio. Having been so debated, it was enacted by 60 to 31 in the Senate and 317 to 71 in the House, practically as the President wanted it in the first place.

The President has these dictatorial powers now, and obviously intends to use them; and we can't see what Americans can do about it except to stand by the President, who now is the Government. Until the present expiration date of June 30, 1943, or in the now unlikely event of congressional repeal of the law before that date, the President is the big United States boss as regards the European and Asiatic wars. We can see no getting around that.

Whatever some Americans may feel in their hearts about this war dictatorship, though, there is one proposition on which we believe all Americans should agree.

That is the proposition that this country must arm to the teeth, and as fast as it can.

Whether you endorse or distrust Mr. Roosevelt's idealism about democracy around the world, there is no denying that the dictators will destroy our arsenal of democracy if they can. They'd be foolish not to try to destroy us by every means in their power, now that we've elected ourselves such arsenal and gone into all-out production for Britain, Greece, China, etc.

The time has gone by for fooling around. We can't build too soon an Army of about 1,500,000 highly trained and superbly equipped fighting men, an air force of some 50,000 planes, and a two-ocean navy. We've got to hang together and work together, or else.

And we think we'll soon have to restore to our editorial masthead Stephen Decatur's "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, there has already been so much debate on this resolution that nothing new remains to be said, and all that I say will be wet with the dew of other minds. The convictions of my people on this subject, however, and mine, are so strong that I do want to make them a matter of record. Seven billion dollars, by usual estimate, is a staggering sum of money, but when measured by results to be obtained, objectives to be reached, and ideals to be preserved it may be trifling almost in significance. Is $7,000,000,000 too much to expend to insure that democracy may survive in the world? Is it too much to offer that men everywhere may worship as their hearts and consciences dictate and demand? Is it too much to set apart that freedom may prevail on earth rather than abject and cowering slavery? Is it too much to set up to guarantee that war with all its attendant horrors shall be kept from our hemisphere and that our people be free from the fear of foreign invasion? As we speak here today, China, ill clad, starving, its government poor and impoverished in arms and munitions, is almost in its fourth year of heroic resistance to the cruelty and despotism of Japan, mighty in all the materials of war.

Greece, without preparation and with little material, is imposing the naked breasts and hearts of her soldiers to the modern war machines of Italy with a stoic bravery that is worthy of the traditions of Thermopylae.

Great Britain, the ancient seat of democracy and the mother of parliaments, stands firm, undaunted, and unafraid amidst hail of bombs and sheets of raging fires. As her people clean the debris of shattered homes and churches and hospitals, bury their dead women and children and helpless civilians, from the highest lord to the humblest menial, their only thought is to carry on to a day of victory and peace for the world, when dictatorships will be dead forever and their leaders brought to bar for their unspeakable crimes.

As we think of all these people and our comon stake with them, I say that seven billion, and twice seven billion, if necessary, is not too much to wager on their success.

These are some of the reasons that I am for this appropriation, to which may be added a strong additional reason—its approval by the Committee on Appropriations, composed of some of the ablest and most conservative Members of our body.

But frankly, all these reasons aside, I would be for it because it is the amount determined and asked for by the President. I do not mean to say that I am a "rubber stamp," for I think that every man should exercise the right to follow his own judgment. I believe the President has been right in all the great fundamental policies that he instituted, but in the 2 years that I have been here I have differed with him in some instances and voted accordingly. But this is a time of great emergency, and this sum is set by Franklin D. Roosevelt as necessary, not only as President but as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, after consulting with his military and naval experts. The job might be done with less, but again it might not, and this is the time, in hunting parlance, to close the eyes and shoot both barrels.

And may I impose a little further upon the time of the House to say just a word about this President and Commander in Chief of ours, against whom I heard considerable criticism levelled yesterday?

In 1933 as some one has aptly said, "distress and foreboding were in the hearts of men and their fondest hopes had turned to ashes in their hands. Banks without number had failed, bankruptcies had multiplied and among the wage earners of the country one in every seven had joined the ranks of the unemployed. Famine and hunger stalked in the market places and a brooding fear paralyzed thought and action in the industrial, financial, and political world."

It was in such a setting that he came into office. Just before he took the oath required, he repaired to a little nearby church to pray and ask God's guidance in the great task that confronted him. I am no mystic, perhaps not as religious and reverent always as I should be, but as he sat there, and as the gray light of that somber morning filtered through the naked branches outside, down through the stained-glass windows and played upon the altar itself, I think God spoke to him as truly as in other days men said he whispered to Joan of Arc beneath the giant trees in Domremy's forest and told her to set her country free.

And as he left his moment of prayer and moved on to formal ceremonies of inauguration, I can almost see him now, broad shoulders squared, a look of confidence on his face and the light of spiritual determination burning in his eyes.

And from the day he took the helm of our ship of state and put his strong hand to the rigging we learned the truth of that old adage:

One ship drives east and one drives west,
with the selfsame winds that blow,
Its the set of the sails and not the gales
that tell us the way we go.

And in the early years of his administration by the legislation and policies he proposed, he brought this Nation from desperation and dispair to prosperity and security and happiness.

I heard his speech of last Saturday urging passage of this measure criticized here on the floor yesterday. To my mind it was the sincerest and strongest argument I ever heard addressed to any proposition. As I heard his voice, strong, vibrant, and confident as always; as I saw his head, erect and unbowed by the tremendous burdens he has borne throughout these perilous years, I said to myself that on that inaugural morning last January when before entering upon this term, he went into that same little church to pray for guidance in times more fraught with peril and danger than ever before, as a bright sunlight poured through the church windows this time upon the holy altar, with its candles and cross, God spoke to him again and it is under His guidance that he plots a course this time to save civilization with all its ancient heritage, to save religion and all the sacred and holy things associated with it; yes, to save a world from ruin, destruction, and utter despair.

And I believe that every Member of this House and the American people as well, are thankful to have as President and Commander in Chief in these hours one whose leadership here is as inspired and inspiring as that of Winston Churchill in Britain. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and I ask

unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object, the gentleman will be able to conclude in 10 minutes?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, for almost 3 years, our committee has been calling the attention of this body and also the attention of the entire country to the insidious and treasonable nature of the numerous subversive organizations which operate on American soil. We have pointed out the aims and methods of scores of organizations and thousands of individuals who give their allegiance to the dictators of Russia and Germany. We have shown by indisputable proof that the agents of the totalitarian powers are busily engaged in a vast conspiracy against the security of the American people. We have named names without fear or favor. We propose to continue along that line until every agent of Moscow and Berlin is driven from the strategic position which he may occupy, whether that position be in government, in labor unions, or in our defense industries.

Today, I bring to the attention of this House a case which illustrates the peril that America faces, a peril created by the agents of Stalin who have been so tenderly coddled in days that are not remote. Today the mask is off. Even the most gullible of our citizens can no longer entertain the stupid illusion that Communists are progressive. They are exactly what our committee long ago declared them to be: Members of a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party.

At Inglewood, Calif., today, there is a strike in progress at the Harvill Aircraft Die Casting Corporation. This plant is an essential defense industry. On its products the aircraft factories of the entire Pacific coast depend. It is a real bottleneck for the whole aircraft industry. Aircraft concerns such as Douglas, North American, Lockheed, Consolidated, Vultee, Boeing, and Northrup are absolutely dependent upon the airplane parts which are produced at the Harvill plant. The Office of Production Management has announced that its schedule of aircraft production for our own national defense and for the aid-to-Britain program must be scaled down as a result of the strike now in progress at the Harvill plant. It is, therefore, impossible to exaggerate the importance of the situation which I shall describe for you.

The strike at the Harvill plant is being led by one Kenneth Eggert. Until recently Kenneth Eggert was the section organizer for the Communist Party in Toledo, Ohio. Our committee has his complete record of activity as a leader of the Communist Party in Ohio. I give you a part of that record:

On January 14, 1938, the newspaper of the Communist Party, the Daily Worker, announced that Ken Eggert, Toledo section organizer of the Communist Party, would be the main speaker at a Lenin memorial mass meeting in Canton, Ohio.

On March 17, 1938, the same Daily Worker announced that Kenneth Eggert appeared before the authorities of Toledo as a representative of the Communist Party, and that he was accompanied by a representative of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

In March of 1938 Ken Eggert wrote an article on how to organize the Communist Party in our factories. His article appeared in the Communist Party's official publication, the Party Organizer.

On June 21, 1938, the Daily Worker stated that Kenneth Eggert presided at a mass meeting in Toledo at which Earl Browder addressed an audience of 2,500.

The police records of Toledo show that Kenneth Eggert was arrested on November 18, 1939, for the unlawful distribution of Communist Party literature.

Having made clear that there is not the slightest doubt about Eggert's membership and prominent activity in the Communist Party, let us now turn our attention once more to the strike which Eggert is leading at the Harvill plant in Inglewood, Calif. A few weeks ago the Communist Party released Eggert from his duties in Toledo and sent him to California for the express purpose of sabotage of our national defense. It is a hard and fast rule of the Communist Party that its members, to say nothing of its leading functionaries, are not allowed to move from one part of the country to another without the express permission of the Communist Party. It is true that Eggert appeared in California as the representative of the C. I. O.'s National Association of Die Casting Workers, but every Communist's first loyalty is to his party. His labor union, if he belongs to one, is merely a cover for his Communist activity. We are therefore on absolutely solid ground in asserting that Eggert was sent to California as the representative of the Communist Party. The party realizes that its objectives are to be attained in this critical period not by the distribution of literature, lawful or otherwise, but by intensive work in labor unions, where they can sabotage the whole defense program of this country.

It is the Communist Party's position that the war in Europe is an imperialistic war and that Great Britain bears the major responsibility for this war. Eggert was arrested in Toledo for the unlawful distribution of a pamphlet written by Earl Browder. I hold in my hand a copy of that pamphlet. It is entitled "Stop the War." On page 14 of this pamphlet Browder declared that—

> The responsibility for continuing this war lies, before all, upon the British and French imperialists.

The pamphlet reeks with the stench of Browder's subservience to Stalin and the Soviet Union. In the course of 10 pages Browder referred not less than 34 times to the Soviet Union. The sum and substance of all these references is that the Soviet Union is the final paradise on earth.

Kenneth Eggert was engaged in distributing this pamphlet in Toledo. The effects of such propaganda may be held to be trivial. But in Inglewood, Calif., Kenneth Eggert is engaged in the sabotage of our whole defense program for which this House is appropriating billions of dollars. That is not a trivial matter. It raises an issue which has now become the most important which this country faces. Are we to flounder in the incredible folly which destroyed France—the folly of permitting the agents of Stalin and Hitler to occupy strategic positions in our defense industries?

Our country has determined upon a policy of all-out national defense and all-out aid to Britain. The policy of the Communist Party is diametrically opposed to our national policy. The issue is clearly drawn. For 3 years I have warned this House and the country. I can do no more. The time for determined action was here long ago. Further delay on the part of this administration in meeting the challenge which Stalin and his agents have laid down will spell disaster.

The Inglewood, Calif., strike is a mere foretaste of a vast program of sabotage which the Communist Party and Nazi groups are now carrying out.

And may I say, in conclusion, that I have again urged the Department of Justice to proceed against Communist, Nazi, and Fascist organizations for their failure to register as agents of foreign principals. Our committee has ample evidence to sustain a conviction of numerous of these organizations. We are anxious to appear before a grand jury to submit this evidence and to bring the issue to a conclusion; and through a fearless administration of our laws and through a courageous enforcement of those laws, I can say confidently to the House that many of these organizations, and literally hundreds of the officers of the organizations, can be convicted under existing laws. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply want to say that we wish to extend every courtesy to the membership and give them every opportunity to speak, but we are anxiously watching the time, and we must pass this bill early enough this afternoon for it to go over to the other end of the Capitol. So I hope the gentleman will cooperate with us to that extent.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could close debate on this paragraph at the end of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph end at the expiration of the gentleman's time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is there another paragraph on which someone may get 5 minutes?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are plenty of them, I may say to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The request applies only to this particular paragraph. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DECENTRALIZING DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the passage of this bill. It will probably carry by 2 to 1.

But I want to register my protest now against the concentration of these defense industries and these defense activities in certain areas of the United States to the exclusion of other sections.

I want to protest against concentrating these new industries into the already overcrowded industrial centers of the North and East to the exclusion of the agricultural States of the South and West.

This not only throws the entire defense program out of gear, but it throws the economic situation out of balance—to crowd these industries into one section of the country and to pay the wages all out of line with agricultural incomes and leave the agricultural States in the economic depression they are now experiencing as a result of crop failures and the low prices of agricultural commodities. These defense industries should be decentralized and distributed throughout the whole country. To centralize them in the already congested areas would not only be unfair, but it would probably be disastrous in the end, just as is the case in the congested centers overseas.

I especially want to protest against leaving the Gulf States unprotected. For more than 15 years I have advocated an adequate and an independent air force. This is an air war, and I agree with those men who contend that the airplane is the leading war weapon of today and of future wars. Yet we are seeing these industries crowded into the already overcrowded sections, and the most vulnerable part of the United States left unprotected or very poorly protected, and that is the South Central or the Gulf States.

We are legislating to protect the American people, to protect this Nation now and for all time to come, and I want to insist that if you will put these industries in the South where, as the Negro says, "We aint got no furrin relations," and just take off some of the Federal restrictions, the southern people will protect them, and you will not need any other defense against the Communists, the Nazis, and Fascists who are now trying to wreck the whole program.

Where is the vulnerable part of this country if we are to be invaded or threatened with invasion? It is the Gulf coast, where the last invasion occurred. Long before the airplane was invented, when Winchester had been defeated in the North, when this Capitol had been sacked and burned, where was the next point of attack? It was the invasion of the Gulf coast at or near New Orleans in 1814. Today that great coast line is practically undefended. It is within reach of a dozen foreign countries.

It is within easy reach by air of every island in the Caribbean Sea. Many of those islands are under foreign flags, and I am not revealing any secret when I say that many of their people are extremely hostile to the United States. It is but 1 hour or 1½ or 2 hours' flight at the outside from those islands to the Gulf coasts of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, and Florida. It is only a short distance across from Central America, and where we know that "fifth columnists" are teeming, and where air bases may be secured by foreign powers. Yet we have very few air bases in the South.

We are within easy flying distance from South America, one country of which has always been more or less hostile to us, and in which a dictator is now rising on his opposition to the Government of the United States.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Has the gentleman any suggestion to make as to what the War Department and the Navy Department are doing to meet this problem?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes. They are not doing what they should, and that is the reason that I am complaining.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My idea has been that there have been more new air bases established in the southern part of the country than in any other section of the country. All down through the Caribbean area and in Florida many new bases have been established, in Mississippi and Georgia.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, there are only two in the whole State of Mississippi.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And more than have been established in the northeastern section of the country.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, there are only two in the whole State of Mississippi, and if we should witness an attack from that source it would be a very serious thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I congratulate the gentleman on making this observation. Is it not also true that Chester Davis, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has carried on a fight for months to get these things decentralized, these plants placed in the agricultural areas, and has not the fight grown so hot that he is actually leaving the Board and taking the presidency of the St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; he made a speech the other day in which he pointed out these conditions and called attention to the dangers of leaving these defense agencies concentrated in the congested areas of the country and to the danger of leaving the Gulf coasts exposed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But does not the gentleman realize that the Thirty-seventh Division of Ohio is encamped in Mississippi, the best fighting men in the world? He does not need anything else.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that while I realize they are good soldiers, we need the strongest air force in the world to protect them. France had a great army, but her tank and air forces were inadequate. Hitler took less than 150,000 men with a supply of tanks and planes and defeated an army of more than 4,000,000 men.

If we should get into this war, and if Great Britain should go down, and if her commerce should be swept from the seas, and we were to be invaded along the Gulf coasts, what would those Ohio troops do without an adequate air force?

I remember when Gen. Billy Mitchell sank the *Ostfriesland*, the largest German battleship captured in the World War. He sank it with three shots. Yet we went on from year to year without building an adequate air force. It is the pressing need of the country today.

Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that the people of the South have no patience with communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. They are Americans; but they realize that if that great section is left exposed it might bring disaster.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And may I also remind the gentleman that we would have had no airplanes if an Ohio gentleman had not invented them.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. He had to go south to make it work.

But it is immaterial who invented the airplane. I recognize the airplane is a real fighting force, but there is serious doubt in the minds of many well-informed people whether or not this war will not reach a point where it will be impossible for our vessels to cross the Atlantic Ocean. Then, suppose England should go down and her navy should succumb to the air forces of Germany, and their "fifth columnists" should array some of these countries in South or Central America or some of the islands in the Caribbean against us, what condition would we be in then? It would be too late to rush airplanes from New England to Florida or even from Ohio to Louisiana. What we want is to decentralize these industries and to provide an adequate air force to protect every section of the country at all times. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this paragraph.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

(1) Ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, including armor and ammunition and components thereof, $1,343,000,000.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAMBERTSON: On page 2, line 12, strike out "$1,343,000,000" and insert "$959,285,814."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am making the motion here which, in substance, will be the motion to recommit. This is reducing this item two-sevenths. If this is successful I will make it to each of the succeeding paragraphs and on recommittal to reduce the total amount from $7,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000. I am not opposed to aid for England but this bill is too big and if it is not reduced I expect to vote against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, here are the hearings on this $7,000,000,000 bill. They equal $100,000,000 to each page. Here are the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, with which I had something to do. Those hearings lasted over a month. That calls for $1,000,000,000. One of these pages costs only about $500,000. We have had short hearings. There has not been a great deal of time given to this bill to date. Seven billion dollars. My point is that $5,000,000,000 will do to start this thing. I want to remind the House of the dozens of times you have all heard the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], chairman of the subcommittee, say to the House on other occasions, "This is enough now. We will be here. We will be here and you can come back again if it is necessary."

Now, we are going to be in session right straight through probably this whole calendar year. There is no question about that. If England needs more than $5,000,000,000 she can come back here just like our different departments of defense are coming back for more. So I say that $5,000,000,000 is enough to start this program. It is more than any Member of the House anticipated would be asked when the lease-lend bill left this chamber. There cannot be any objection to that. Then to carry the inference that this is all that we are going to appropriate for England in this war is false and misleading. Nobody believes it. What is the difference between $7,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000? Only a saving of $2,000,000,000 and showing our authority a little bit on this appropriation bill.

We are bringing in the fifth supplemental appropriation bill on Friday. We have had five supplementary appropriations since last June for ourselves. There is no reason why we should treat England, on a new proposition, any different from what we are treating our own, because we are not taking it for granted that our own are through. We will probably have some more of our own before long.

Then, as I pointed out yesterday, Congress holds the purse strings, as it was emphasized to us. I think it is important for us to show that we do hold the purse strings and that we will cut this a little bit on the general proposition that we are exercising our individuality and that it can stand a cut, because it is more than we anticipated.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Another argument in favor of the gentleman's amendment is this: It was brought out very strongly that there might be a fair chance of having England put up about $5,000,000,000. If she puts up $5,000,000,000, then we can say to the world that we have only advanced to Great Britain what she can reasonably pay for and which is enough at this time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is a well-known fact that after the lease-lend came into existence, Britain did not spend any of her own money buying the stuff we had provided for her to buy but waited because she knew we were going to give her this. She has not acted in good faith with us even on what she has in this country to offer as collateral, or in South America.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Do you think the membership of the House knows what $7,000,000,000 really amounts to?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. They may know. I do not know. What I would like to emphasize again is, I cannot get it straight in my system, following these same leaders on this proposition, who have told us that the national credit was about to break, when we were considering some hundred thousand dollars for grasshoppers or something of a similar degree in other years. And I believed it, and I followed them, and I felt that our national credit was in danger. But now these same men do not cross a "t" or dot an "i" on $7,000,000,000 to England, as if our national credit was not involved.

They talk as if our national credit were boundless. Why is it not involved just the same with our own defense, this thing of giving England $7,000,000,000? That is what it is going to be. That is another one of the misleading arguments used on the lease-lend bill, for we do not intend ever in victory or defeat to collect a dollar of it back.

Another thing in this country that is costing us a lot of money but that is being winked at, is the millions of dollars lost every day through labor racketeering in defense. We heard today how strikes in this country had increased the unemployed four times since January; in other words, the number of men striking in national defense today is four times what it was in January. Yet the same guiding force that is so enthusiastic to give England $7,000,000,000 at once is not turning the hand to correct this thing that is loose in this land costing millions of dollars every day through this unregulated labor racket in our national-defense effort. We ought to have as much courage on that. It will take more courage on the part of the leaders to take hold of that and save that waste than it does to give $7,000,000,000 in one lump to England.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Is it not true that we are more threatened from within today than we are from without?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Absolutely. I have thought so all the time, that we are in greater danger from within from the things talked about by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] a few minutes ago—the subversive influences and their auxiliaries, than we are from Hitler; and in my opinion it will be that way for awhile.

If we could save $2,000,000,000 on this bill right now we have a lot of places to put it. There are many future obligations that will have to be met, there are many hungry people all over the world who would like to be fed, and we have people in this country who would like to feed them. That would take a great amount of money, and under our way of living, feeding those starving peoples is a sort of obligation upon us. There are a great many places we could put the $2,000,000,000 if we cut it off this bill today.

We have not started yet in the matter of paying the cost of the present situation. As a matter of fact we have not yet reached the peak of expense of hospitalization growing out of the last World War. I say we have many places where we could put $2,000,000,000, and I do plead for this amendment and for support of the motion to recommit which will come later, so that we can break down this psychology that we are in this war and that we have to go along, that we cannot stand up and articulate as we used to. Let us assert ourselves to try to get away from the psychology that we are in the war. Let us not accept that fatalistic attitude. I hope you will vote for this amendment whether or not you vote for the bill.

We are even voting to cut down our own national defense needs. Over the protest of our military leaders we cut one item in the bill that will be reported Friday to the extent of $1,300,000 for our own defense. If we dared do that to our own defense why do we not dare cut England's bill a little? Whether you vote for this bill, vote for this amendment and reduce the amount. England would have a pretty good start if she got $5,000,000,000. Such a vote would be to our credit. The Congress should stand up and articulate a little as they said we could when the lease-lend bill was passed. If you believe we should act independently then give us your vote to reduce this two-sevenths with the idea that we have many needy places to put this money in our own country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments do now close.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, seldom am I in disagreement with my genial and able colleague from Kansas, but I am now very much in disagreement with him on this particular proposition of cutting this aid-to-Britain bill.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to sit with the members of the deficiency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee during these hearings. They were gracious enough to invite me as the ranking minority member of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee to sit with them. I heard the entire testimony on the bill. I questioned witnesses at considerable length. Most of my questioning and most of the answers

are not on the record because the questions and the answers were of such a confidential nature that it is probably better they are not on the record; but, Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly and absolutely convinced that this $7,000,000,000 appropriation should pass. It should not be reduced. We have definitely adopted a policy of aid to Britain. Neutral or unneutral, whether you like it or not, that is now our policy. The $7,000,000,000 was arrived at by a careful analysis of figures presented to the committee by the Director of the Budget and others. The various items were broken down into categories so that we were all convinced that everything being purchased is necessary for a British victory.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is not passed for the total amount, it will mean that shortly another bill will be brought in here for passage in order to make up the difference. If the bill should be defeated, and I know it will not be, it will only be a matter of time until our appropriations will probably be quadrupled because of our lack of timely financial aid to Britain.

The deficiency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has done a magnificent job and I congratulate the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], on their fine work. I sincerely hope and I honestly believe that this bill will pass for the full amount of money recommended by the Appropriations Committee. Time is of the essence.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is a very, very important bill and the membership of the House should have the right to say a little something in reference to the bill as we proceed. For the life of me I cannot see why we have to shove this bill down the throats of those who do not want it. We ought to have a chance to say something.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in view of the eloquent appeal to the gentleman, I amend my request and unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, the Chair will say that the time will be divided among the following Members: Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RICH, Mr. JOHNS, Mr. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That will be 4 minutes apiece for the gentlemen who have asked for time.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], a member of the committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we are mighty glad to get even 4 minutes, if we cannot get 5, in opposition to this bill, or at least to amend it.

This is not a partisan bill, Mr. Chairman, and may I say right here that I will fight a Republican just as soon as I will fight a Democrat when I know a bill is not the kind of a bill that ought to be brought before the House of Representatives. It makes no difference to me. We have a conscientious duty to perform here and each Member has to perform that duty as he sees it. He is held accountable for his actions and his vote.

As stated by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] this bill was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and certainly the Bureau of the Budget recommended $7,000,000,000 after the President of the United States told him he wanted $7,000,000,000 when he knew he would have trouble to get $10,000,000,000, which he wanted. A lot of Army officers were called in to justify this $7,000,000,000 before the Budget office. They were asked how this money ought to be spent. Now, do you know of an Army officer in the service of the United States, when the President of the United States is commander in chief of the Army, would say one word that the President of the United States did not want him to say? If that Army officer did, his head would be cut off immediately. It is preposterous to think that any Army officer would in any way criticize a recommendation of the President of the United States. If he did he would be demoted in rank or even fired from the service. That is the first thing in reference to this bill. You know the President's ability to purge.

Now, Mr. Chairman, who is the chief Budget officer? Mr. Harold D. Smith, who is an appointee of the President of the United States. The President now has complete power, because you passed the lend-lease bill giving him complete power. He is really a dictator in peacetime. Do you think he is not going to exercise the power granted to him? He has you fellows right by the neck and you must come and talk turkey and vote like he wants you to or else he will go out in the next campaign and purge you in your own district. You know it. You yourselves are in a pretty bad fix. Let him come to my district and say whatever he wants to say. If the people of my district do not want me down here I do not want to be here.

The amendment which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] has offered cutting $2,000,000,000 from this $7,000,000,000 bill is just as sensible as anything can possibly be, and may I ask you, what is a billion dollars? I do not believe anyone here knows. Here is a little statement that I saw in the paper which starts out with the question, How much is a billion dollars? and I will like to read it to you. It will enlighten you a little, I hope. It has me. I quote:

> How much is a billion dollars?
>
> Let's take a boy of 15, suggesting that he count a billion $1 bills, working 8 hours a day, 5 days a week. If he hustles he can count 100 bills a minute.
>
> That's $6,000 an hour, or $48,000 a day, or $240,000 a week.
>
> At the end of the year, with 5 holidays off and no vacation, our lad has counted $12,240,000.
>
> When he is 21 he has counted $73,440,000; 6 years on this grind.
>
> Still there is a big pile of dollar bills in front of him. On his fifty-fifth birthday he is just half way through the pile, still counting at the clip of 100 bills a minute.
>
> But our boy—now past middle age—is a persevering cuss. He'll finish the task or know why.
>
> And he does.
>
> But when he's counted the billion, he is 96 years old. He's beaten the insurance tables and has stooped shoulders, but he has counted his billion.
>
> It's easier to spend someone else's billion than it is to count your own. If you don't believe it, try it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], a member of the committee, and the Chair may say for the information of the committee that the members will be recognized in the following order after the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] has concluded: Mr. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota; Mr. O'CONNOR, of Montana; Mr. CRAWFORD, of Michigan; Mr. JOHNS, of Wisconsin; and Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there are some things I want to call to your attention.

In the first place, this bill is labeled and publicized throughout the length and breadth of the land as a $7,000,000,000 aid-to-Britain bill. Then I turn to page 3 and I find that, under the provisions of the lease-lend bill, the President of the United States may reimburse the Army and the Navy for the amounts that are furnished by them. The present bill leaves the President to decide whether this is a seven billion or eight billion three hundred million aid program.

Where are the champions that graced these Halls on February 9? When the lease-lend bill was being considered you told us, "Congress will not lose control of the amount of British aid." You said, "This constitutional body has control of the purse strings of the country." Where are the champions that came down here and told us as we passed the lease-lend bill, "You will stand by us and you will help to control the President of the United States by controlling the amount of money you give him"?

If you object to this little amendment that would reduce by a certain percentage the amount of this particular item and of other items that follow, you are saying that a Member of Congress cannot change this appropriation one iota, but the President can change from $7,000,000,000 to $8,300,000,000 the amount of aid to be given. Instead of having a $7,000,000,000 bill, if he chooses to take out the $1,300,000,000, you have only a $5,700,000,000 appropriation bill.

Where is the integrity of Congress if we do not have the courage to provide the amounts that the majority of the people's Representatives approve? Seven billion dollars covers the entire amount of the estimate that was submitted by the British Government for their own defense. Why should we pass a bill for $8,300,000,000, when all they have asked us for is $7,000,000,000? I have never yet seen an Army officer who has ever asked for a less amount than he needed, and I assume the British Government knows more than we do what they need to win the war. Why should we whoop it up $1,300,000,000?

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JONES. Do not try to draw a red herring over the trail. I am trying to tell you that the integrity of Congress and the courage of Congress are the important things we must preserve.

Mr. HOUSTON. In other words, the gentleman refuses to answer?

Mr. JONES. In other words, nothing; do not try to confuse the issue.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is the gentleman for or against it?

Mr. JONES. If we are going to stand upon our constitutional duty, that Congress shall provide the amounts that shall be spent, if you mean what you say and what you said on February 9, that Congress was going to control the purse-strings and the operation of this bill, let us vote for these amendments. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the lend-lease bill, and I voted for every amendment to restrict the authority of the President offered here in the House and presented to us from the Senate. I have not changed my position with reference to that legislation, but I believe that when we stop to consider legislation appropriating money to carry out the purposes of the bill which is now law we should act with deliberation and judgment. If the leaders in our administration do not have any business sense, then certainly the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Members of the House should exhibit some intelligence in that respect.

A day or two ago the British Government presented our Government certain information relating to war orders by the British placed in this country. We find they have now on order $2,700,000,000 worth of war material and that they have paid on these orders $1,682,000,000. These orders include 14,000 fighting planes of all kinds, and cover all kinds of other material now in production in this country, for which Great Britain stands ready and willing to pay $2,700,000,000.

It seems to me it should be the first business of Congress and of the administration to see that delivery is made of the war materials Great Britain has already ordered before we proceed with an appropriation of $7,000,000,000, when we are not now in a position to make delivery on the materials they have paid for. They have purchased 14,000 fighting airplanes. The bill now before the committee, in which we are asked to appropriate $7,000,000,000, calls for additional hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of airplanes. Why should not the administration start our factories going, stop the strikes all over the country, and get our men working 24 hours a day and 7 days a week to produce the material for which Great Britain is ready to pay, rather than go on with this additional program when we cannot now make deliveries on what they have ordered? We should not appropriate any money until we furnish the material for which Great Britain has paid. Therefore, I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas to reduce the amount, for we should not spend money unnecessarily and take it away from our own national defense.

Great Britain has a great deal of dollar exchange in this country. It has assets all over the world. Some of the most valuable assets they are now holding are in the Far East, the rubber and tin monopolies, which they have not offered to turn over as security to this country. All we are supposed to get is some securities they have representing properties in South America and some in this country. I say that we should write into the bill an amendment which will require them to put up security for every dollar of whatever amount is appropriated by the Congress, either now or in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in spite of my protest against the provisions of the lend-lease bill, that measure has now become the law of the land. A large majority of the membership of both Houses of Congress voted for the measure. The President and his leaders in Congress repeatedly stated that the bill was a measure designed to keep our country at peace with the world and out of the European war. I will hold the President and his administration to this promise, and I am therefore voting for the appropriation before us today, as I do not want it to be said that I placed an obstruction in the path of the President in his effort to administer existing law and secure peace for America. I hope that he will achieve this objective as all America wants to remain at peace.

As a part of these remarks, I am including a recent Associated Press dispatch on British war orders placed in this country and on England's financial holdings in the United States and South America. I am willing to help the democracies of Europe, but I stress the fact that the President should act with sound and business-like judgment before saddling the future cost of the European war upon the backs of the American people. Great Britain has an abundance of world-wide assets which can be acquired as security for the war supplies about to be loaned or leased from the United States. The President should insist that these assets be turned over to the United States as collateral for the debts due us. If he does not do so he will be breaking faith with the American people.

We are living in a critical time. No one can predict the future. As Members of Congress we have two immediate duties to perform—first, to rapidly complete a full defense for our country; and, second, to keep out of the European war. I renew my pledge to these objectives and call upon all Americans to join with me.

The Associated Press dispatch above referred to follows:

CONGRESS RECEIVES SUMMARY OF BRITISH WARTIME FINANCES—$1,682,000,000 PAID ON 2.7-BILLION ORDERS; HOLDINGS TO MEET BALANCE

Congress received this statistical summary of Great Britain's wartime finances and operations today from Budget Director Harold D. Smith:

Existing British orders here total $2,700,000,000, of which about $1,682,000,000 has been paid. The policy of the United Kingdom has been to pay cash, and all goods delivered have been paid for. Usually 25 percent has been paid in cash when the orders were placed.

Remaining liabilities will be met from existing dollar resources, such as sale of British holdings of United States securities, acquisition of gold and proceeds of British exports to this country.

The British Government does not have funds adequate to meet additional commitments.

BRITISH HOLDINGS

None of the proposed $7,000,000,000 British-aid appropriation, however, is to be used to pay for orders placed by Britain in this country prior to the lease-lend bill.

On January 1, British holdings included $616,000,000 of marketable securities and $900,000,000 of less readily marketable investments.

The "nominal" value of United Kingdom investments in Canada is the equivalent of 2,000,000,000 United States dollars, while the Kingdom's investments in South America are $3,500,000,000. Mr. Smith said the "market" value would be "much less."

GOLD AND DOLLAR HOLDINGS

As of the first of the year, Britain held $292,000,000 of gold, $54,000,000 of official dollar balances, and $305,000,000 of private dollar balances.

Britain has given capital assistance totaling $171,000,000 to United States defense plants in connection with her orders.

The monthly rate of war expenditures for the United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and India, taken together, is, according to Federal Government information, $1,750,000,000, of which $1,500,000,000 is the expenditure of the United Kingdom alone. During the fiscal year 1941–42 Canada is expected to spend $1,400,000,000 on her direct war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the few remarks I propose to make in an appeal to the leadership of this House on certain matters.

I opposed the passage of the lease-lend bill. The voice of the opposition was futile. A storm, wherever it started, swept it through. It is now the law. The bill that is now before us will soon become law as it is written. It will pass as it has been presented to this House. The President in both bills has been given plenary power. He can do with this

money as he sees fit. The responsibility is his; he asked for it. It has been suggested that in the neighborhood of one-half billion dollars of this money will be expended for agricultural products and foodstuffs for Great Britain. Cotton is included, tobacco is included, canned pork is included, and I understand, tentatively, other foodstuffs. Now, here is the point I want to get over to you. We have a surplus of wheat in the United States today approaching 500,000,000 bushels and no place to go with it—and wheat is not contemplated in this bill. Canada has a surplus of wheat likewise and Great Britain is securing her wheat supply from Canada and paying for it. That is her privilege. It was brought out upon the floor here yesterday that Canada and her subjects have liquid assets in the United States totaling a high figure. I want to appeal to the leadership of the House to go to the President of the United States, because, as I said, he has a free hand, and upon his shoulders rests the responsibility of spending $7,000,000,000—and appeal to him to include wheat in this program. I want to call your attention to the further fact that the taxpayers of this country who are raising wheat, as well as the little home owner, will be called upon to pay their share of this indebtedness, and remember this: They are the taxpayers who have the property that the tax collector can lay his heavy hand on at the time, and this includes the farmer, the home owner, and the man who has real estate or personal property of a tangible nature.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I refuse to yield.

I am going to ask the great statesman who heads this committee, the Speaker of the House, and the gentleman whom the majority side of this House elected as its leader, of whom we are all proud, to get the sympathetic ear of the President of the United States when it comes to expending this money so as not to extend credit to Great Britain until Canada's and Great Britain's liquid assets in this country are exhausted, to the end, if you please, that the Canadian taxpayer will not be preferred over the American taxpayer.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will give me a minute, I will yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman asked me a question, and I want to answer it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; I did not ask the gentleman a question. I am just asking him with others to appear before the President and try and have him give consideration to the two points I have pointed out.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is the gentleman going to vote for this bill and help us get the money?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope that they will also appeal to the President in trying to put into this picture the wheat grower of this country who ultimately is going to have a lot of these taxes to pay, and, in the final analysis, and in one word, not prefer the British taxpayer over the American taxpayer. I do not want to see us use emotion entirely in place of judgment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to add my support to the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. In my opinion, we are making a great error by not decentralizing more the location of these new industries and putting them out in the agricultural areas of the United States. To me it is a tragedy, and, of course, we have the evidence that has developed in the case of Governor Davis, who was one of the Governors of the Federal Reserve banks. He is now being transferred to St. Louis as the head of the Federal Reserve bank there. I wish more attention would be paid to what the gentleman from Mississippi had to say about locating new industrial plants in the agricultural areas.

Earlier in the day the Speaker gave me permission to insert as a part of my remarks certain correspondence and one of the letters, which I will insert, written by the head of one of our very important business institutions, in the middle paragraph states this:

> It strikes me that the importance of industry and the importance of increasing the production of industry has been more clearly seen as a war measure than it has as a peace measure. And, since we are now at war, much of the misunderstanding of the peacetime situation no longer holds

I note from the War Department that this gentleman's concern has been given $467,000 worth of war orders. To me his language is amazing, and I am not one to admit that industry is more important as a war measure than as a peace measure. I think we should stick to it as a peace proposition, more valuable than in time of war. The absence of industry leads to war, resulting from social upheavals.

One other point. There is published in the city of London what is known as the South American Journal, and these sheets I hold in my hand are photostatic copies taken from the January 25, 1941, issue. This data deals strictly with British investments in Latin America. On page 57 of that issue is shown Great Britain's holdings in Latin America are the equivalent of £1,093,000,000. Calculate that on the basis of the dollar exchange today, and at $4.02 per pound sterling and you will have the investment. This sheet shows the amount invested in Government bonds, banks, shipping, miscellaneous investment, railways, and it shows the amount invested for each year from 1923 to 1940, dividends and interest paid thereon, and I say to you that this information is taken primarily from the official London Stock Exchange records and other authentic sources, and it shows that the investments are current, extremely valuable. If we can obtain them as collateral to these advances to be made to England we will be doing a good day's job. I hope the amendment which will be offered will prevail and, if the Speaker will give me permission to do so, I shall insert these statistics in the RECORD for the information of the House.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that in the decentralization program the Army and the Navy not only are not decentralizing plants, but they are figuring on expanding existing plants in all congested areas?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly what is taking place, and you will have a social revolution at the end, when demobilization comes, unless something is done about it in advance.

Mr. PITTENGER. And they are paying no attention to Congress or the suggestions of Members of Congress in connection with that matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The case of Governor Davis is evidence that the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I now present the data on the British investments in Latin America, which would appear to be about $4,394,181,600, on the basis of $4.02 per pound sterling.

[From the South American Journal of January 25, 1941]

BRITISH INVESTMENTS IN LATIN-AMERICA

A reduction of £34,824,206 to £1,093,080,099 in the amount of British capital interested in Latin America at the end of 1940 compared with the previous year, which our compilations show must be regarded as more apparent than real for so many securities which have for long been without interest payments and seldom dealt in, have this year been removed from the official lists, and although in our endeavor to give our readers reliable statistics, we have included many which this year are not quoted, there have still been a number which it was reasonable to ignore. The average return, it will be noticed, shows a fractional improvement from 1.68 percent in 1939 to 1.70 percent in 1940, and there is a substantial reduction from 61.9 percent to 50.2 percent in the amount receiving no interest. In the following table we show the total amount of British capital invested in the Latin American countries and normally quoted on the London Stock Exchange at the end of each of the last 18 years, with the total interest paid, its percentage, and the amounts not receiving interest, figures for 1913 being given for comparison:

Total

	Amount, pounds	Interest		No interest, pounds
		Pounds	Percent	
1940	1,093,080,099	18,684,377	1.7	549,180,024
1939	1,127,904,305	19,010,329	1.6	698,077,803
1938	1,149,363,463	19,681,020	1.7	655,986,229
1937	1,154,785,293	26,104,093	2.2	496,507,685
1936	1,161,006,075	22,529,238	1.9	521,613,353
1935	1,189,804,359	20,811,282	1.8	657,195,153
1934	1,205,617,085	20,443,044	1.6	708,288,480
1933	1,201,685,595	21,023,911	1.7	791,402,615
1932	1,185,122,391	23,840,073	2.0	720,407,651
1931	1,221,039,882	40,096,336	3.2	414,777,230
1930	1,205,306,213	52,743,749	4.3	280,614,959
1929	1,214,211,368	55,541,775	4.5	288,580,014
1928	1,211,038,544	53,673,892	4.4	290,324,366
1927	1,173,944,363	49,835,846	4.2	284,613,539
1926	1,156,534,777	52,405,213	4.5	269,597,994
1925	1,139,659,470	47,178,101	4.1	287,102,344
1924	1,140,653,247	45,291,860	3.9	321,153,727
1923	1,151,705,083	43,551,457	3.8	333,296,318
1913	999,236,565	47,714,168	4.7	82,229,183

Our method of calculating the return on the invested money is to take the amount actually paid during the year, whether on account of dividends, arrears of interest, or bonus, so that when a 50-percent bonus, for example, is paid in addition to, say, a 5-percent dividend, that amount of capital on which these payments have been made would be considered to have received 55 percent. In the same way 2 years of preference dividend in arrears at 6 percent per annum, if paid in 1 year, would be regarded as 12 percent. This method, while the fairest we can imagine, often has the effect of making the return as regards some of the smaller countries appear to vary unduly, and that fact should not be overlooked in considering the final result. The following table gives the statistics relating to Government bonds:

Government bonds

	Amount, pounds	Interest		No interest, pounds
		Pounds	Percent	
1940	316,697,941	4,929,340	1.5	67,955,687
1939	324,149,858	4,030,466	1.2	210,891,798
1938	327,379,182	3,946,324	1.2	204,267,718
1937	330,407,756	8,266,740	2.5	62,723,585
1936	328,389,486	7,427,357	2.3	61,084,305
1935	330,912,538	7,204,124	2.1	88,604,918
1934	345,466,421	7,072,527	2.0	122,659,610
1933	314,887,920	6,275,068	1.9	184,644,661
1932	317,504,013	6,275,079	1.9	187,905,022
1931	328,876,574	12,315,420	3.7	58,089,265
1930	336,965,978	14,637,895	4.3	49,027,890
1929	338,466,263	14,349,949	4.2	50,347,950
1928	343,787,427	14,594,912	4.2	49,205,988
1927	340,529,604	14,107,631	4.1	51,586,983
1926	331,920,190	13,799,029	4.1	45,138,656
1925	326,591,231	13,152,912	4.0	43,783,258
1924	344,002,443	13,426,073	3.9	58,458,581
1923	346,963,043	13,569,717	3.9	58,023,899
1913	316,404,207	14,027,003	4.4	4,588,420

In order to keep our statistics uniform we have to follow the practice, unfortunately adopted many years ago, of regarding all the capital of the Antofagasta (Chili) and Bolivia Railway as appertaining to Chile, although, of course, much of the line is actually in Bolivia. The following table gives the railway statistics:

Railways

	Amount, pounds	Interest		No interest, pounds
		Pounds	Percent	
1940	471,949,558	5,002,657	1.0	337,202,452
1939	477,765,391	5,773,648	1.2	336,032,299
1938	493,906,115	5,934,746	1.2	339,073,077
1937	494,313,510	8,126,510	1.6	320,216,884
1936	498,830,472	6,238,246	1.2	331,624,207
1935	495,184,431	6,484,275	1.3	334,158,554
1934	490,000,099	6,231,205	1.3	344,540,662
1933	492,633,144	6,467,774	1.3	345,920,724
1932	489,670,030	7,580,418	1.5	321,682,877
1931	508,363,044	11,791,912	2.3	295,298,991
1930	508,997,193	17,778,736	3.5	158,323,420
1929	495,906,911	19,970,570	4.0	135,329,099
1928	490,990,928	19,389,341	3.9	135,479,723
1927	492,420,738	19,081,406	3.9	137,097,476
1926	490,797,841	20,915,112	4.2	135,785,474
1925	483,376,359	17,644,499	3.6	146,372,535
1924	481,421,357	17,313,677	3.6	160,109,031
1923	482,874,311	16,578,841	3.4	164,472,783
1913	457,822,726	19,600,738	4.2	60,649,269

The amount of British capital invested in Latin-American miscellaneous stocks at the end of 1940 was £288,613,696, a decrease of over £16,000,000 as compared with 1939. The amount going without remuneration was £141,388,585, and the average return 2.7 percent. The following table is self-explanatory:

Miscellaneous

	Amount, pounds	Interest		No interest, pounds
		Pounds	Percent	
1940	288,613,696	8,027,519	2.7	141,388,585
1939	304,258,078	8,410,974	2.9	144,799,022
1938	306,207,988	8,979,835	2.9	106,290,750
1937	308,080,178	8,968,792	2.9	105,339,940
1936	317,574,619	8,302,911	2.6	120,677,595
1935	327,510,334	6,588,922	2.0	209,271,126
1934	330,059,665	6,586,237	1.9	213,232,909
1933	347,302,859	7,689,110	2.0	226,312,184
1932	331,282,715	9,476,271	2.8	175,507,606
1931	338,942,336	14,547,232	4.2	134,025,062
1930	315,845,838	18,012,680	5.7	72,463,649
1929	336,395,390	18,201,869	5.4	101,770,765
1928	334,407,855	17,112,148	5.1	102,906,455
1927	302,160,507	13,774,288	4.5	92,185,380
1926	294,805,107	15,300,605	5.1	85,673,864
1925	288,434,706	13,902,103	4.8	90,899,012
1924	266,729,938	12,064,004	4.5	90,062,641
1923	270,168,630	10,414,562	3.8	103,757,106
1913	191,132,865	10,645,637	5.5	16,791,494

Banks and shipping companies cannot, as a rule, be allocated to any one republic, so a separate group has been made for these. The total amount shows a substantial reduction on the year, and the percentage return indicates improvement, with a reduction in the amount receiving no dividend. This is, however, due to the elimination of some shipping securities from the official stock-exchange lists. The following table combines the bank and shipping groups:

Banks and shipping

	Amount, pounds	Interest		No interest, pounds
		Pounds	Percent	
1940	15,818,904	724,861	4.5	2,633,300
1939	21,730,978	795,241	3.6	6,354,684
1938	21,870,178	820,115	3.7	6,354,684
1937	21,983,849	742,051	3.3	8,227,276
1936	21,211,498	560,724	2.6	8,227,246
1935	36,197,056	533,961	1.5	25,160,555
1934	40,090,900	553,075	1.4	27,855,299
1933	46,861,672	591,959	1.2	34,525,046
1932	46,665,633	508,305	1.1	35,312,146
1931	45,457,928	1,441,772	3.1	17,363,912
1930	43,497,204	2,314,438	5.3	9,800,000
1929	43,442,804	2,919,387	6.7	1,132,200
1928	41,852,334	2,577,491	6.1	2,732,200
1927	38,833,514	2,872,523	7.4	3,743,700
1926	39,011,639	2,390,467	6.0	3,000,000
1925	41,257,174	2,478,587	5.0	6,047,539
1924	48,499,509	2,488,106	5.1	12,523,474
1923	51,699,099	2,988,337	5.7	7,042,530
1913	33,876,767	3,440,700	10.1	200,000

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, my time is limited and I decline to yield. I spoke here last night from the well of this House and saw about 15 to 20 Members sitting in front of me listening to what I had to say. Congress was still in session, and we were talking about giving away $7,000,000,000 to foreign countries. Fifteen to twenty were all of the Members who were interested in what was going to happen. When I say "giving away $7,000,000,000," that is exactly what the lend-lease bill provides for, if the President of the United States sees fit to do it. I have heard economy preached here by my colleague from New York and also by my colleague from Virginia ever since I have been in Congress. I followed that leadership, and I have voted for every dollar the President of the United States said was necessary for national defense of this country, and I shall continue to do so, but I do not believe that any red-blooded American is going to vote to saddle on the taxpayers of the United States $7,000,000,000 to be given away to foreign governments. Do you realize that when we get through with this program for the year we will have something like $76,000,000,000 of debts for this country? There will be a tax bill come in here soon that will make the people of this country conscious of what this means. We are asked to appropriate $7,000,000,000, and what for? Has any country declared war upon us? Has any country threatened a war on the United States? If you want to be honest about this thing, we have talked ourselves into this war. Nobody is to blame but America if we get into the war. I do not believe in sending $7,000,000,000 3,000 miles away to get into any war, and that is what it means if we follow up the dictates here of what is expected of this Congress. I am going to support this amendment because it is for a less amount, but I am thinking about the 130,000,000 taxpayers of the country who will have to pay for this sooner or later. They are the people for whom I am speaking today. You people here can take care of yourselves; so can Mr. Knudsen and these other men who testified about this bill. I am thinking about the taxpayers in this country, in my State, and in my district—the people who are laboring in the sweat of their brow to meet the heavy taxes they already have to pay today, without adding $7,000,000,000 more on top of that. I am opposed to it, and that is the only reason I take up the time today, to bring these views to you. I know what the people throughout the Nation are thinking, and it would be well for us to stand up here and say what we think, because later on you will have to do it, if you are going to run for Congress again. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a story is told that on one occasion a great evangelistic effort was going on in a certain part of the country, and the Prince of Hades was very much concerned about it. Therefore, he summoned into a round-table discussion all of his little imps.

He said, "What can we do about this thing? It looks like this preacher down there is sweeping the country, and our cause is being very much hurt."

One little imp got up and said, "Satan, I suggest we go down and argue about it." Various others got up and made their suggestions as to what they should do, but none of the suggestions seemed to appeal very much to the Prince of Darkness. Finally he said, "Go on and do the best you can, but if it finally comes to the point where you cannot do anything else, then just tell them not to go forward, not to accept religion, but to put it off a little while; just delay it a little while."

Now, the lease-lend bill has become law. It has become the fixed policy of

this Government. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and many others who were not for that bill have said in the well of this House, "We have set our hand to this task." So are we going to sit here today and listen to speeches arguing all over again against the policy of the lease-lend bill? If we have decided to help Great Britain and other countries, if we have decided to render aid, shall we do it all the way or halfway or part of it?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Always to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I wonder if the gentleman would make it clear whether the devil is for or against this legislation? [Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the devil would be for this amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Always to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is anybody who opposes this $7,000,000,000 supposed to be an imp? [Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, I do not say that, but if my friend feels like the shoe fits him I would not argue with him about it. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask the indulgence of the Committee. I only have 2 or 3 minutes. This particular paragraph to which this amendment is offered provides funds for acquiring ammunition, guns, ordnance, and other matériel of that type. Are we going to say to these countries, by adopting the amendment, "Yes; we will give you two guns now, but we think we will not give you three guns at this time. We will give you so many tanks now, but we think that is enough for you," in spite of the fact that Great Britain and our Army and Navy experts say they are needed now. My friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] says, "Just put up half the money and we will put up the rest of it later, because you are not getting delivery on it." Well, that is one way. Many years ago Winston Churchill thundered at his people, "You ought to be getting ready." They said, "Put if off until the time comes when we need it."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I said we should help Great Britain get their matériel for which they had paid, which amounts to over $2,000,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. They are getting delivery on that every day and we are told that in a few months those orders will be out and the factories which Great Britain has built in this country to manufacture those commodities will be idle unless they have further orders to go on. They will not have any further orders unless this money is available to get these defense articles. Not only that, but we know very well we have to build factories and facilities to manufacture some of the matériel to be furnished in this bill. If we put it off time after time, put it off, we will never get ready to deliver the planes and the tanks and the guns which they need and we will not do what we said we would do by Public Law 11.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not right now.

I want to appeal to the House on this first amendment not in any way to cripple or hamstring or impede this legislation. I want to appeal to you to pass this bill today as this committee has brought it to you, a nonpartisan committee, if you please, supported by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and other gentlemen on that committee. We have labored over it. We have fashioned it. We have brought it here and we are anxious to see it go to the other end of the Capitol, so that it may have their consideration and approval and the President's signature.

I do not wish to stop any of you from making any statement or taking any position, but I ask you to help us expedite this. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAMBERTSON) there were ayes 63 and noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(4) Vessels, ships, boats, and other watercraft, and equipage, supplies, materials, spare parts, and accessories, $629,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the lend-lease bill. I felt that measure delegated extraordinary and unnecessary powers to the executive branch of the Government. I regard it as a radical departure from our democratic way of government. But the majority has ruled and that issue is decided. That die is cast. Our Government has even made commitments under it.

We now join in the hope that it will work in the interests of our people. We cannot even begin, at this time, to visualize how far commitments made under that measure may extend. We do hope that whatever steps that may be taken, that they will not get our country too far into a foreign war.

I believe that the great majority of our people are anxious to help the democracies, and certainly want Hitlerism defeated at the earliest possible date. There is practically no debate on that point. I just don't think, however, that the great rank and file of our people are ready to sacrifice our men and boys on foreign battlefields.

The bill before us provides for an outlay of $7,000,000,000, the biggest single peacetime appropriation in our history. The proponents of the measure believe most of it will be secured. Almost all of it represents implements and munitions of war for use in foreign countries. One and a half billion dollars' worth is already on the way.

We are informed that this is only a part of what we may be expected to do later on.

Mr. Chairman, we have already spent or agreed to spend, twenty-seven and a half billions for our own defense. We will spend billions more. By way of comparison, that $27,000,000,000 just about represents the value of all farm land in this country. Our national debt at the end of the year will amount to about the taxable value of all property west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. Chairman, here is the point I want to make. I just do not think it is right that with the expenditure of the billions of the people's money, that it should be used for the enrichment of any person or group of persons. It is not right that we should permit money expended to make death-dealing weapons of war to be used for profitable purposes. It just is not right.

We talk a lot about where munition factories should be located, and so forth. And right here let me say that I think certain industrial centers have taken advantage of that situation.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Sorry; I do not have time. The gentleman can probably explain in his own time.

Mr. Chairman, if these funds are to be used to save democracy and humankind; if all these efforts are to save a world gone mad; if we are going to call our men and boys, either as volunteers or by the draft method, and pay them about $30 per month and train them in the art of the use of deadly weapons; if we are going to ask them to sacrifice their lives, if need be, on the battlefield, or on the sea, or in the air; if we are going to do that, Mr. Chairman, and we are doing it, then we have no right to permit any of these funds to be used for profitable purposes.

Mr. Chairman, let us not make the mistake that was made in the World War. While men were suffering and dying on the battlefields of Europe we permitted a lot of selfish individuals to become rich over here. We increased our millionaire population by more than 2,000 during that period. We must not do that again. We are not yet thinking in terms of sacrifice. It seems to be more of a question of financial gain so far as these funds are concerned. Let us get down to business and make this defense program work just as efficiently and as fast as possible.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress and this House must see to it that proper and effective legislation is enacted, to the end that these funds, and all other defense funds, shall not go to the enrichment of anyone.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

One reason some of us here have voted consistently against tending toward involvement in the European war is because we did not wish people in European countries to rely upon our coming into the war.

For the same reason I have always refrained from saying that I would ever vote aid for England. But from the beginning of the war I had always thought that if and when the British Isles should

be attacked, since England is a kind of buffer state between America and nations on the Continent now on the march, a vote to aid them financially would be justified. I would not consider that seven billions or even double that amount would be too great a price to pay, and I intended to vote for that much aid.

But this appropriation under the lend-lease bill is not a mere simple proposition to aid Britain, much as I wish that it were. It has a sinister background. The increasingly belligerent statements of the President, obviously intended to stir the American people to a total-war fervor; the arguments of the proponents here and in the newspapers that "the die is cast," that we are now in the war and must carry it on to victory; the many incidents indicating that it is intended to carry through the war until either we or Hitler capitulate, leave a long trail of circumstantial evidence. That evidence leads to the inevitable conclusion that this appropriation is another artfully cut piece in a carefully planned pattern. It is a program the purpose of which is to condition American psychology so that we shall be willing actively to engaged in the European war and fight it until the finish.

So it seems to me that those of us who believe that America will never stand the strain of a great war, that it would unquestionably end in a depression so much worse than 1932 that there will be revolution and chaos, ought to lift our voices against this appropriation, even though we want to see England receive the material.

I recognize that it seems opinionated and presumptuous for an humble Congressman like myself to express opinions like that which are contrary to the judgment of the many able American financiers who are promoting the war effort, joining hands with the President in this one policy. But wisdom, we have seen, sometimes flits away from bank vaults and even from the White House. Sometimes it rises from log cabins. Although the President has many brilliant qualities which make him a superior person, his apperception of economic questions, we now realize, is not one of them. We do not know, on the other hand, the extent of the great financial and personal interests abroad held by some of the financiers now participating in the war effort which would tend to color their judgment of what is best for the ordinary men and women who constitute the vast majority of people in this country.

The argument that this appropriation would aid Britain and strengthen British morale has been the argument used on every one of the issues which has been forced upon us since the war began which involved surrendering f u n d a m e n t a l American policies and rights. It was used on the two debates to lift the embargo, in which we abandoned our neutrality; on the issue of conscription, in which we conscripted men who had the constitutional right not to be drafted if as good an army could be found by enlistment; it was the argument for abolishing the third term, our one sure check against absolute monarchy; it was also used to secure passage of the lease-lend bill in which, for a time, if not forever, the Congress has been reduced to ministerial functions.

Every one of those sacrifices of American principles has served to encourage Great Britain to go more deeply into a war which, as many British now believe, would otherwise have gone east toward Asia instead of west toward London.

It becomes apparent now that war proponents have used our sympathies for Britain as a club to overcome our intelligence. We can now see that their objective was to lead a reluctant American people, determined never to participate in another European war, to the point where it could be said that America was so deeply into the war that there would be nothing left for us to do but win the war. They never point out in their speeches that it is equally possible that we might lose the war; or, winning it, lose all for which we were fighting.

Already both the President and his new friends are urging that we have reached that point where there is nothing left to do but give all the aid that is needed to win the war. Already newspapers are hinting that the President should soon tell the people frankly that the British need convoys, pilots, and soldiers to be poured into the Dardanelles. Until now nobody much denied that for us to try to send sufficient men and supplies to win the war in Europe would be impossibly expensive in blood and money, just as it would be too utterly expensive for Hitler to overcome America in a war fought in this country.

I wish that I could believe that either increased Christianity or increased democracy or increased prosperity or increased civilization will come to the world out of the sacrifice which America is gradually being seduced and blackmailed into making. The very basis of the privileges of freedom we enjoy is not merely our form of government, because we have lazily permitted it to become increasingly corrupt and incompetent. No; the security of our liberties has until now been the vast natural wealth and resources which have enabled Americans to progress under a government which was too often mismanaged.

Surely those of us who believe this, who believe that we ought not to sacrifice all that we have in what is certainly going to be a life-and-death struggle on the part of the Germans, ought not to acquiesce in this program. We ought to call a halt now before it is too late. Because it is never too late while we are still being treated by the enemy as if we still were a neutral nation.

To proceed with this program, knowing it for what it is and still to tell the American people that it will keep us out of war is surely a fraud upon them. It is also a fraud upon the English people, who are making sacrifices they might not otherwise make, relying upon the belief that if and when they lay down their arms Americans proceeding with this program will still be in the war fighting until either we or the enemy or both are exhausted. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virgina [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman from Virginia would permit me to speak for 10 minutes on an amendment I have.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are some additional paragraphs.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am going to offer an amendment to this paragraph. I have not had any time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request to 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are no amendments pending.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I tried to get the floor and the Chair has agreed to recognize me.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Page 2, line 20, strike out "$629,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to use 10 minutes of the 15 minutes allotted to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have submitted an amendment to section 4 of the bill before us striking out the sum of $629,000,000 and inserting $300,000,000 to provide ships, vessels, boats, watercraft, supplies, materials, spare parts, and accessories to Britain. Section 4 places all of these supplies in the hands of the President, and he can lend, lease, or give them away to Britain or any other country under the so-called lend-lease bill, H. R. 1776. As the administration has cracked the whip, I can entertain very little hope that my amendment will be agreed to. My main purpose is to discuss this section and the other sections of this $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill.

In January 1935 the administration urged the passage of an appropriation bill providing that the President be given a blank check for $4,880,000,000. The membership of the House generally, as well as the country, were astonished at this demand. We were told that huge sum was to be used to construct highways, provide employment and food for tens of millions of American people, aid the farmers, provide jobs, and it was supposed to be used entirely for the benefit of the American people. I was unwilling to vote for that bill, because I could not get the consent of my mind or conscience to give any man a blank

check for $4,880,000,000. Much of this huge sum was used, as was definitely proved later on, to corrupt, browbeat, and intimidate needy citizens, and to manipulate and win elections. Today we are called upon, in effect, to give to the President a blank check for $7,000,000,000, not to build ships or manufacture guns, planes, tanks, shells, and other defense equipment for the defense of our own country, nor to take care of the aged, or to feed or clothe the hungry and needy people of our own country. This huge blank check sum is to be turned over to the President to provide munitions of war for the British Empire, and to feed and clothe the people of that nation and such other country or countries as the President may wish.

We do not have this great sum of money in our Treasury and will not have it. Our Nation must borrow the money and place $7,000,000,000 more debt upon the bowed backs of the taxpayers of the United States. This means $250 of debt or taxes on an average for each one of the millions of American families, or in other words $50 each for every man, woman, child, and new-born babe in America.

Section 4 to which my amendment is directed authorizes the expenditure of $629,000,000 to buy or build ships and boats out of our taxpayers' money and turn these over for the most part to the British Empire. Does she need these boats and ships to carry on her part of the war? She does not. Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador to the United States, and others, as has been done every time one of these important bills has come up to rush us into that European-Asiatic-African war, put out alarming reports. We read in the press yesterday that a German cruiser and a submarine were a few hundred miles off our coast in the Atlantic. Time will prove that there is not a word of truth in that report. It is pure propaganda to alarm the American people, and help to push through this monstrous measure.

When the bill was before Congress to repeal the Neutrality Act and to pass a conscription bill rumors were circulated that German submarines were lurking along the coast of the Western Hemisphere. Of course, after these bills were pushed through nothing more was heard of these submarines until this $7,000,000,000 blank-check bill came in.

BRITISH TONNAGE HAS INCREASED

I have before me the Associated Press report dated London, March 17, 1941, giving a report as to the present amount of merchant ship tonnage owned and held by Great Britain. This report is made by the world's authority on shipping, Lloyds of London. This is a great shipping concern. They insure merchant ships and cargoes. They keep an accurate record of every ton of merchant shipping owned by Great Britain. I am now reading from that report and it shows that Great Britain and her shipowners owned and controlled at the beginning of her entrance into the present world war 8,977 ships and boats with a tonnage of 21,001,925 tons. When Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France were overrun Great Britain secured from those countries additional tonnage of 12,320,685 tons. Counting what she had at the beginning of the war and what she acquired from these conquered countries, according to Lloyds report she had 33,320,610 tons.

Great Britain has always been a great ship-building country and they have been working overtime in building ships since the war started. Lloyds do not state in their report how many millions of tonnage Great Britain has built, but there is no doubt that represents several million tons. Great Britain has acquired from this country more than a hundred ships that represent approximately a million tons, and therefore it is safe to say that Great Britain and her ship owners from the time the war began up until now have owned and controlled more than 35,000,000 tons of merchant ships. Lloyds in this same report that I have read from, states that Great Britain herself has lost 757 ships up until March 17, 1941, with a tonnage of 3,171,273 tons. Her allies have lost 193 ships, totaling 875,202 tons. Therefore, since the war began Great Britain and her allies have lost 950 ships, with a total tonnage of 4,046,273 tons, but as Lloyds point out she got 12,320,685 tons from Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and France. She received from these other countries four times as many tons of merchant ships as she has lost, and she has received more than three times as many tons of merchant ships as she and her allies have lost.

In other words, she has a net gain of more than 8,000,000 tons over what she had before the war began, and add that to the 21,000,000 that she had when the war did begin she now has nearly 30,000,000 tons of merchant ships, not counting a single ship that she has built since the war began, nor the 100 or more ships she acquired from the United States. Therefore, according to Lloyds she has thirty-million-and-odd tons of merchant ships. Yet we are putting a debt upon ourselves and our children under section 4 of $629,000,000 to provide more ships for Great Britain. But there is another angle to it. Great Britain is not using these thirty or more million tons of merchant ships to carry supplies, food, and war materials to her and her allies to carry on the war. There are hundreds and hundreds of British ships, with more than eight millions of tonnage, that are continuing in their regular business and carrying on strictly commercial and money-making shipping. For instance, Great Britain has a great many ships and a monopoly that are busy day by day carrying commodities from New York and other United States ports to various countries and ports in South America. These enterprises have no relation to the war. They are busy making money and operating in direct competition with American shipowners and taking the jobs of American sailors. Furthermore, Great Britain and British shipowners are busy operating shipping lines on our Pacific coast, not in connection with the war in Europe, Asia, and Africa, but they are engaging in strictly commercial, money-making shipping business, carrying commodities from the western ports of the United States to Alaska and other possessions of ours in competition with American shipowners, operators, and sailors.

The Navy is our first line of defense on the seas; the second line of defense, it is admitted, is the merchant marine of any country—our merchant ships. With this situation confronting us this administration is stripping our own country of its merchant ships, turning them over to Great Britain, and this bill soaks the American taxpayers for $629,000,000 to build or buy hundreds and perhaps thousands of merchant ships and boats and under the lend-lease-give-away bill to turn them over to Great Britain.

We talk about trade after the war. What a nation needs to carry on successfully trade throughout the world is a large merchant marine. The British boast of the fact that Great Britain rules the waves—the seven seas, and the commerce of the world. She does it with her great merchant marine. Great Britain far surpasses the United States with her merchant marine. If we keep on giving away our merchant ships and building up Great Britain's merchant marine after the war is over, we will not have the ships to carry our products to the various parts of the world and Great Britain will continue to have the great advantage that she has always enjoyed. Great Britain has billions of dollars of collateral, gilt-edge stocks and bonds. We should at least demand that they put up sufficient stocks and bonds or other collateral to secure this seven billions and to pay the $629,000,000 for these ships. Why should the American taxpayers be substituted for the British taxpayers? Great Britain now owes us about $6,000,000,000 of principal and interest that we let her have in the other World War, and on which she has defaulted and refused to pay. The money we loaned to Great Britain was taken from the taxpayers of the United States. Now, must the taxpayers of the United States be called upon with a tremendous debt hanging over their heads to finance this war, and Great Britain still holding her bonds and securities and her many great manufacturing plants in the United States and every other country in the world, and still hold one-fourth of the world's landed surface and 500,000,000 of the 2,000,000,000 population of the world?

If Great Britain could not put up the collateral to secure a loan that would be a different question, but inasmuch as she can do so we insist that it is only just and right to the overburdened taxpayers of the United States. If she needs more merchant ships to carry products to her shores why not take these hundreds and hundreds of merchant ships on the lines between New York, Central, and South America, and on the western coast between the United States and Alaska which are now operating in competition with the ship owners of the United States and use these ships for the purpose of carrying on the war if they need more ships.

I know some say they are fighting our war, but when did Great Britain ever fight our war? We had to fight her to

gain our independence. We had to fight her again in 1812–15 to keep from being run off the high seas to carry on our commerce, and she took sides with the South in 1861–65 to help destroy this Nation. With all of that, we went over there in 1917–18 and helped her win the war. We have never yet received back what we let her have, and so far as I have been able to observe we have never got a real expression of gratitude. What brought about the present World War? Mr. Bullitt, our Ambassador to France, in testifying for the lend-lease bill, said that this war was caused by the Versailles Treaty in the last World War and especially the selfishness of Great Britain and France. We helped them to disarm Germany. England and France stood by and permitted her to rearm; in fact, the evidence is indisputable that Great Britain encouraged Hitler. We did not bring on this war, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that my amendment will be adopted and save a few hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money of our own country. [Applause.]

THE LAST STEP TO WAR

I spoke and voted against the so-called lend-lease-give-away bill, H. R. 1776, because it took away from Congress its constitutional powers to declare war and to raise and support armies and provide and maintain a navy. It gave to the President unlimited powers with unlimited resources to carry on undeclared wars for and against any nation on the face of the earth. That bill, by repealing many other acts of Congress, gave to the President power to sell, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of our Navy or any part of it, all or any part of the equipment of our Army or air forces, and to disclose and give away our most vital military and naval secrets to any country or countries in the world and on such terms as he might think proper. He could sell it for any price, lease it, lend it, or give it away.

Now he comes to us in this bill and asks for $7,000,000,000 in money to dispose of it for the benefit of any country or countries of the world. He can furnish any country military or naval equipment and provide the citizens of any country with food, clothing, and shelter to the amount of $7,000,000,000. There is not a dollar of it to provide relief for our own citizens or build ships or manufacture guns, planes, tanks, or other defense articles for our own country, and everybody knows that our defenses are very, very inadequate.

We have countless numbers of old people and still have millions of unemployed who need food, clothing, and shelter, and when I vote to turn over $7,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money and increase our national debt $7,000,000,000, I must know that it is for the defense of this Nation and to provide for the needy aged, other needy, and needy unemployed in the United States.

The administration, in my opinion, has been leading us into war for the last 18 months. I cannot help but believe that there was an understanding between the President and King George and Queen Elizabeth on their visit here that we would take a hand in that bloody European-Asiatic-African quarrel and war if and when it came up. The President said almost as much when he dedicated a bridge between the United States and Canada about 2 years ago. English statesmen have always counted on our joining with them in this war.

The repeal of the Neutrality Act was a step toward war. The Conscription Act, which sought to have 45,000,000 boys and men registered for military service (but to which amendments were forced through Congress limiting the number to about 17,000,000) was another long step toward war. The lend-lease bill, H. R. 1776, in my opinion, was drawn with the definite purpose to empower the President to use our Navy, our Army, and air forces, and all the equipment belonging thereto in this war.

The bill before us today, the $7,000,000,000 bill, with the recent speeches made by the President point unerringly toward our active participation in the European-Asiatic-African war.

In the beginning they said they were not going to convoy merchant ships. Now they are talking about convoying ships with our Navy. The threats of the President and his administration have invited war. The President has butted into the war. All of us have a feeling of dislike toward Hitler, but the President and Hitler have had a personal quarrel. He has a personal grievance against Hitler and, in my opinion, he will go to almost any length to involve this country in that war.

They said that our boys would not be called on to fight in any foreign land or on foreign seas, but it will not be many months, in my opinion, until some of our ships will be sunk, some of our soldiers and sailors killed, and perhaps then there will be a formal declaration of war brought before the Congress, but the President, I am satisfied, will carry on as long as he can the undeclared wars. That is the way the leaders in many of those European and Asiatic countries in recent years have been carrying on their wars.

I said on the floor of the House more than 12 months ago that Germany could not subdue Great Britain—that she could not conquer the British Isles. I have never changed my opinion on that subject. On the other hand, it will require millions of men and untold billions of dollars to go into continental Europe and take physical possession of the German people and the German nation and win a total victory there. If such an attempt is made, there can be no doubt but what this will be the longest, costliest, and bloodiest war in which this Nation has ever engaged.

There is every indication that actual warfare is imminent. The administration sometime ago bought 4,500,000 casualty tags to put on the necks of our soldiers, sailors, and marines so they could be identified when they are killed or injured. We learn now that our naval vessels are being repainted and they are painting them the same color as the paint used on the naval vessels of Great Britain. I think our Nation has assured Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and other countries that we would enter this war.

Press reports state that a number of United States cruisers and destroyers are off the coast of Australia, claiming that they are paying a courtesy call. They have been there for sometime and will continue there for sometime. They are there to help protect the East Indies islands, much of which is owned and controlled by Great Britain. The press also reports that some of our very best bombers and fighting planes have winged their way across the Pacific to far-away Singapore, that great British military and naval base on the Malay Peninsula in Asia. The United States has taken positions with its Navy and its air force at various points around the world, and one of these days unless I am badly fooled American boys and American men will be fighting in many parts of the world—in the islands of the seas, in Asia, Africa, Europe, and other places.

It seems that the President and this administration have made up their minds to defend the British Empire in every part of the globe, and the seven billions that will be voted today by the supporters of the administration is likely to be only the first installment.

Is it not amazing—if this bill passes, and another coming up tomorrow—Congress, at the behest and command of the President, will have voted $31,000,000,000 for war in the last 14 months. This is $6,000,000,000 more than was voted by the Congresses in 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920 in the World War. This gives all of us some idea what tremendous strides we have taken and are taking today, and all within 14 months. And yet we are told we have not entered the war yet. What will it be when we get in, and before we get through?

I said on the lease-lend bill, and I now say, that I would be willing to help Great Britain in a reasonable way provided it would not involve our country in war, but I would want Great Britain, if we made her a loan, to secure it to the extent that she could reasonably do so. No British Parliament has been called on in this war or has voted at any one time such a tremendous sum as we are called on here to vote today, and the British Parliament has not appropriated $31,000,000,000 within the last 14 months.

The American people have been deceived again. They have been filled with fear and have accepted from time to time the promises of the President and his administration that they would keep us out of this war. They have already broken those promises—they are now in the war, and as the months come and go we shall be drawn farther and farther into this terrible bloody world holocaust.

A motion will be made to recommit this bill in order that it may be amended so as to provide if this large sum of money is to be expended that it be spent for war supplies, food, clothing, and so forth, in the United States—spend the money here, buy from our own farmers, factories, mines, shops, and mills; and also to provide that Great Britain provide security for the $7,000,000,000 of commodities and supplies that this Nation will turn over to her. I am satisfied that this motion to recommit will be defeated by the administration forces.

I have voted for every dollar asked for by the administration to strengthen our Navy and provide equipment and supplies for our Army and air forces. Our country must be thoroughly prepared to defend itself successfully against any attack on land, sea, and in the air. Such defense has not yet been provided for. Would it not be well for us to look first to the defense of our own country and to the needs of our own people?

The clouds hang heavier over our beloved country today than at any time in many decades. I am thinking of the future. With the policies being pursued, how can this Nation escape war, bankruptcy, and ruin and the loss of our own freedom and liberties? How different would have been our condition today had we observed the wise counsel and patriotic advice of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, McKinley, and other great Americans to avoid entangling alliances with foreign nations.

Believing that this measure means active war and is against the best interests of our own country, and our people I shall vote against it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the time allotted to me and ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky) there were—ayes 42, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(6) Facilities and equipment, for the manufacture or production of defense articles, by construction or acquisition, including the acquisition of land, and the maintenance and operation of such facilities and equipment, $752,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, on the day when this House raised the national debit limit to $65,000,000,000, I offered an amendment to freeze it, temporarily, at least, to that figure, because I felt that any gesture at this time toward attempting to curtail expenditures in some degree would be a step in the right direction. Since then conditions have rapidly changed until now we see before us the demand for expenditures far and above any figure we had conceived of before. It is not my purpose, therefore, to rise in opposition to any attempt to secure the national defenses of our country and to make our country invulnerable to attack. Neither is it my purpose to rise today to oppose in any way, shape, or manner any force which seeks to preserve our form of government or those forces which are interested in the preservation of our form of government.

May I take this opportunity to embellish and elaborate to a certain extent upon some of the remarks which have been made by several Members before me when they have mentioned the decentralization of plants and of the national-defense program. I am particularly reminded of the statement which the gentleman from Mississippi made somewhat earlier in the debate when he stated that he felt that industries and occupations which are engaged in the national-defense program have been concentrated too much in and about some of the great urban areas of our country, and that in the case of an invasion our industrial set-up would be seriously threatened.

I wish to reiterate that statement and also to point out to you that, as is being daily illustrated in the case of the British Isles, at least from information I have been able to glean, just such a condition of concentration of various industrial plants in Great Britain exists. I say to you that the bombings and the air raids, which are now taking place upon the great cities of London, Birmingham, Liverpool, and many other industrial centers and sections of Great Britain, would not be so effective if it were not for the fact that the industries and plants have been largely centered in these great areas of population. Therefore, at this time I call upon the National Defense Commission to make a concentrated study of every nook and cranny and corner in our broad land to the end that many of the vacant and idle plants and factories throughout the country may be brought to some sort of activity and be utilized for defense industry. I ask this Commission to consider all sections which are universally interested—and they all are—in forwarding our defense program. In conclusion, I want to take this occasion to tell the members of the National Defense Commission of the desire of numerous persons and firms within my congressional district who are patriotic and public-spirited to participate more actively in this great defense effort. These patriotic firms and individuals who have available extensive plants, resources, and materials are located in strategic places within my district and in the great State of New York. They deserve the utmost of consideration by the Defense Commission and should be given every chance to play their part in this most gigantic of all preparedness attempts. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, just as I considered a vote for the lease-lend bill a vote for dictatorship, war, and national bankruptcy, so I consider a vote for the sanctioning of the $7,000,000,000 blank check to the President a vote for the same things.

The Congress having adopted a policy to aid Britain, it does not follow that we are committed to giving the President at one time this gigantic sum of money to be used by him as he pleases.

Since this money can be spent only over a period of several years, I think a smaller sum, certainly not more than half that amount, should be provided, and Congress should retain complete control over it and determine where and how it is to be spent.

It is definitely recognized by all who understand the true condition of the Federal Treasury that national bankruptcy is staring us in the face. The Federal debt, existing and contracted for, is now well past the $100,000,000,000 mark and rising at an unconscionable rate.

Bankruptcy will mean to America the complete loss of our Constitution and whole way of life. It will mean permanent dictatorship and the enslavement of all, as we see it under Hitler and Stalin.

The effect of giving over this $7,000,000,000 will do more to bring bankruptcy than it will to give us defense or to aid Britain.

In view of our own desperate financial condition, and in view of the fact that Britain has between fifteen and twenty billion dollars in overseas assets which she could use to pay for war supplies, I think it is wrong for Congress not to require those assets as security for the aid we are giving her. The facts relating to these British assets have been published by the National Industrial Conference Board.

Surely the aid to Britain would be just as effective if our loans to her were protected by those assets as if they were not so protected.

Why should Britain not be willing to give us this security?

I believe my first duty is to protect the interests of the people I represent. Under the circumstances I feel I would be doing them a grave wrong if I did not do all I can to protect them here.

The giving to the President this blank check of $7,000,000,000, to scatter over the whole face of the earth in any manner he chooses to induce other countries to join him is, in my opinion, the most fantastic and irrational thing any parliamentary body ever did. There is nothing in all history that I know of that even remotely resembles this act.

And this seven billions is just a starter.

This scheme can end only in ruin and disaster for America.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

(7) Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities and articles, $1,350,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 3, line 4, after the figures, insert "*Provided*, That Great Britain lift the blockade against food for the starving women and children of European countries."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon this amendment, and I ask the gentleman from Virginia to reserve the point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, of course, I like always to accommodate the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, from whom we

occasionally hear. I know that he is a great economist, and I plead with the gentleman as an economist of time. I reserve the point of order for 2 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia. If economy of time on the part of Members of Congress could in any way affect the $7,000,000,000 bill now before us, I would like someone to point it out to me. Why should we be in such a great rush? I am from Missouri when it comes to being shown. The object of this amendment is this: In this bill we have about $350,000,000 appropriated for foodstuffs for Great Britain. If we are going to pass a $7,000,000,000 bill here to buy foodstuffs, to buy ships, to buy airplanes, to buy TNT, and powder and submarines to go to Europe to kill, kill, kill, it seems to me that we ought to be Christian enough to ask Great Britain to lift the blockade so that we could appropriate out of this $7,000,000,000 at least two or three or four hundred million dollars to buy wheat and flour and vegetables and other things that would sustain life in the women and children who are dying in France from starvation, the women and children who are dying in Spain, the women and children who are starving to death in Austria, the women and children who are starving to death in Poland, and in Norway, and in Holland, and in other countries. Why is it that we are going to appropriate—a great, big nation like the United States—to furnish seven billions of dollars' worth of war supplies to bomb, destroy, and kill when we are not going to say to Great Britain, "We will not give you a damn ship or a piece of powder or dynamite to kill until you give permission for America to save the lives of some of these women and children who are starving to death?" We should insist on it; it is right; it is just; it is honorable; it is the right thing to do—the Christian act. Where is our good-nation policy?

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. What does the gentleman say of Hitler, who brought this condition about?

Mr. RICH. I would say to Hitler, "We will go for you ourselves eventually, if and when it occurs that we are not going to be permitted to ship things to starving people." And I will tell you how to get Hitler. That seems to be the whole thing now—how to get Hitler. If you will give $5,000,000, I will wager that we can get 10 red-blooded Americans who will go over there and get Hitler; and it would only cost you $5,000,000 instead of $32,000,000,000. We have men who would go over there and get him, and it would not take an army nor a war, and you would not have to buy coffins, either, for a million men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Of course every one of us like and admire the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] who has just spoken. We all understand that he is a very kind-hearted gentleman whose statements are sometimes emotionally expressed, but the world outside does not realize that fact. We cannot permit a statement to stand unanswered that might give the gentleman from Pennsylvania a lot of publicity, but the Congress itself a lot of adverse publicity. He says that if he were given $5,000,000 he could get Hitler. That statement is interesting to hear, but hard to believe. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has shown a very belated love for the unfortunate people of Europe who are suffering as a result of the conquest by Hitler and his allies, and it entered my mind as to whether or not the gentleman from Pennsylvania had them in mind when he voted against the bill which enables this appropriation bill to be before us today. He should have thought of them then. It is very easy to come on the floor and make a lot of wild statements, but we are considering a bill on a serious occasion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has no monopoly on kind feelings for those who are suffering. It is a very complicated international question. We noticed in the papers yesterday where the President has recently acted and, as a result of that, vessels with food will go to France in the near future. We remember not so long ago that when five vessels went into France, supposed to carry food for the suffering people of unoccupied France, that one carried rubber, which was then shipped to Italy.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman think for a moment that the Germans are going to see that that food gets to the French?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very serious question. That is involved. Five vessels were supposed to go to France. Four of them carried food and one, afterwards, was founds to carry rubber. That rubber landed in one of the unoccupied ports of France, so I am reliably informed, and was shipped immediately into Italy. Now, there is one of the questions.

The gentlewoman from Ohio has just raised the question as to whether or not I think Hitler will permit the French people to get that food. I hope so. I cannot say, but all I can say is that our Government will continue to do everything within its power to help the unfortunate people of unoccupied France and all the other countries. I think we should help the people of Poland, the people of Czechoslovakia, the people of Norway, the people of Belgium, the people of the Netherlands, and all other countries that have been conquered, if it can be done in a manner where those intended to be benefited shall receive the benefits; but certainly none of us would want to see food sent over there and find out later on that, directly or indirectly, it was being used to benefit the powerful military machine of Hitler and his allies.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I presume the gentleman will agree with me that if food is permitted to be shipped to France at the present time, occupied or unoccupied, to Poland, or to the Low Countries, that Hitler and the Nazis will confiscate an equal amount—take it way from those unfortunate people whom we have in mind to relieve, and the net result will be that we will be aiding nazi-ism. I want to say here and now that I believe the people of Poland will sacrifice and starve just a little longer in order to finally and certainly cut the throat of Hitlerism.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman's statement is one we can all agree to. On one hand, I see innocent suffering people. On the other hand, I see a powerful war machine. I can understand the practical problem and I hope that machinery will be devised as a result of which our Government, under the supervision of an American commission, or any other neutral commission, will be able to render assistance to the unfortunate victims of conquest, without the powerful and vicious and destructive war machines being benefited.

I also join with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia in urging that this bill pass the House without amendment and by as nearly unanimous vote as possible, sending to the country and the world the fact that with the authorization bill passed, all of America rallies behind our President and our leaders in the enforcement of the lease-lend bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) For testing, inspecting, proving, repairing, outfitting, reconditioning, or otherwise placing in good working order any defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, including services and expenses in connection therewith, $200,000,000.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Page 3, line 10, add to section 1 (b), before the period in line 10, "*Provided*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be expended in violation of article V, section 3, of the final act, agreed upon by the Consultative Meeting of Ministers of the American Republics at Panama on October 3, 1939."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment until I can look at the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order against the amendment. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment and in no sense a political speech, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to object to any extension of time and I will not do it at this time, but because we must pass this bill today, after this I shall be compelled to object to any extension of time.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is tremendously important for at least two groups of people in this House and two groups in America. In the first place, I think it is of vital significance to that group which wants to keep this country out of war and wants to be sure that the allegations made of H. R. 1776, that it is a peace measure, are faithfully fulfilled.

In the second place, I think the amendment is of vital significance to those people in America who wish to maintain the solidarity of friendship between this country and the South American republics. I believe those two groups of people in America represent a vast majority of American opinion.

Let me say a word or two about the aspect of keeping this country out of war. In the first place, if this $200,000,000 remains in the bill, it tends to encourage the bringing of war to America to the extent that we bring to our harbors belligerent ships of fighting powers, thereby running the risks of encouraging sabotage, bombing, and submarine attacks, and all of the other types of attacks which one enemy power makes on another in time of war.

In the second place this helps to interfere with the thing most Americans want, that is, to build our own American defense system, because every time we take ships off our shipways in order to repair some belligerent ships we retard and slow down the defense program of America.

More important than that I call attention to the fact that there is a danger of provoking war by engaging in this kind of program at this time. I have in my hand a newspaper clipping taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of today; and I understand the Philadelphia Inquirer is not only the leading newspaper in the city of Philadelphia, but the most widely read newspaper in the State of Pennsylvania. The heading reads: "Norfolk to Repair First British Warship."

Let me read this to you. The article is under a Norfolk, Va., date line, dated March 18.

> The first British warship to take advantage of the provision in the lease-lend law opening United States ports to British naval craft for repair and reconditioning is expected at the Navy Yard here next week. She is a cruiser. Her bottom is to be scraped of barnacles and she is to receive a coat of paint.

Before you vote against this amendment hear what this article has to say further:

> Meanwhile it was learned that the United States Navy is changing its color to aid the British and confuse the Germans. American warships are to be painted a dark gray—almost a black gray—the color prevailing in the British Fleet.
>
> This, Navy men said, not only will make it difficult for U-boat crews to distinguish between United States and British ships, but will aid the latter in slipping into United States ports unobserved.
>
> Five over-age destroyers—

Very similar in profile and type to those which we have already given to the British and thus almost indistinguishable from our own destroyers.

> Five over-age destroyers and the minesweepers *Osprey* and *Raven* have already received their new colors. Ships in the Atlantic Fleet will be painted first, with the *Wyoming*, *Texas*, and *New York* being first among the battleships.

I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to this diabolical distortion of the art of camouflage and submit that it is the first time in the history of the American Navy or the first time in the history of any Navy of any country that camouflage has been used to increase danger to one's own ships. Camouflage is intended ordinarily to reduce the danger, not increase it. This ghastly, war-promoting, danger-increasing distortion of the art of camouflage should be discontinued in the name of common sense and public sanity.

Until such activities as this, warlike in kind, warlike in nature, are checked and corrected I submit you have an obligation, a duty, to vote with me in support of this amendment which simply stops for the time being the use of this $200,000,000 for purposes such as have been described in the article I have read and such as repairing belligerent ships in our harbors. If you meant what you said when you said this was a peace measure, certainly you should support this type of amendment.

Mr. Chairman, despite the determined opposition of a large minority, H. R. 1776 has become the law of the land, and has been ratified as our national policy. I voted against the passage of this act. I was afraid then and I am afraid now that it commits us to a very dangerous and unwise course of action in both foreign affairs and domestic policy. I greatly fear that America will be many years recovering from the impact of the lend-lease bill and all its implications. It has given the President powers which he has long coveted and imposed upon him responsibilities too great to be safely entrusted to any one man. I am frankly worried about what the President will do under the terms of the lend-lease bill which I have consistently opposed, but the operation of which is now solely the responsibility of the President and of the Democratic Party which worked hand in glove to force through this Congress a policy which I am afraid will be used to place American interest second and which willful, reckless men can utilize to plunge this country into war if they are willing to deliberately violate the solemn pledges they gave us that this bill was strictly and only a measure to protect and preserve peace for America.

I hope to God that my worries and fears are not well-founded but for the permanent record I must voice them. The President through his political control over Congress has embarked us upon an uncharted course which may quite unnecessarily involve us in a foreign war and in foreign ways of life which could have been avoided. The decision to exercise his vast political control to secure this coveted power was his; his control was great enough to drive the bill through Congress; his now, therefore, is the sole responsibility for redeeming his pledge to use it only to preserve our peace and to make good his promises not to send a soldier or a sailor into wars overseas.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, in all consistency I must vote for this appropriation bill, vast as it is, to provide the defense materials necessary to prevent this new legislation from becoming simply an invitation to dictators to attack us while leaving us defenseless against their attacks. I was and am against taking action which would invite attacks upon our peaceful Republic and which would serve to goad potential enemies into involving us into a shooting war.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am against the bill which extended such an invitation, but I most positively am not against securing the defense material to protect us against a threat to our national security, even though that threat be of our own making and be one which we could have well avoided by extending aid to Britain through more legitimate means, and at the same time build and protect our own defenses by placing American interests first. I am not ashamed to place America first, Mr. Chairman, because I love America most.

Since what I believe to be a safer, saner course of self-protection has been denied to us through the exercise of the vast Presidential control ove· this Congress and over my protesting voice and vote, I shall vote to spend the $7,000,000,000 requested in this bill so that the President may have full opportunity, unimpeded by a reduction of the money he demands, to make good his pledge to use this measure to preserve our peace. If he should now fail to redeem that pledge; if he should now decline to keep the good faith with the American public; if he should, now that the power is his, thwart the public will by pushing us into war instead of protecting us against it, the responsibility and the stigma will be solely his. He has the bill he wanted—he will soon have the money he requested. If he now fails to make good his covenant with the citizens of America and takes on the slimy garb of a war-maker instead of a peace-protector, it will be because of his own bungling, his own bad judgment, his own lack of candor and sincerity. I shall not be a party to making carping criticisms of his use of the power which I opposed his getting; I shall not try to shave down his demand for funds to provide him an easy alibi by saying, "if you had given me a billion or two dollars more, my program would have succeeded." No, Mr. Chairman, much as I distrust the policy which has been adopted, I wish the President God speed and full success in using it in conformity with his public pronouncements to keep America out of war.

I shall not with my voice or vote hinder his success in that direction. I shall sup-

port his every move if he progresses toward peace and only when I am convinced that we have been deceived will I oppose him. But should it appear, soon or late, that President Roosevelt has duped the majority which blindly followed him and that he has taken steps, or is about to take them, which will move us from our present peace to the bloody ordeal of another foreign war, I shall oppose him with all the strength and vitality of my being. And so will America oppose him then. Now that he has the power and the policy he demanded and now that he is about to get the $7,000,000,000 he has told us is needed to implement his program and to guard our peace, the job is his and the laurels if he wins or the lurid devastation if he loses will also be his.

Mr. Chairman, there is another reason I shall vote these $7,000,000,000 if my amendment loses or the major portion which will remain in the bill if my peace-promoting amendment carries. Over 420 of us who sit as Members in this House must, perforce, make our decision on these appropriations without the benefit of anything like adequate information on its merits. Fewer than 15 Members of this House were permitted to sit in at the secret hearings when practically all of the significant evidence brought in about this bill by military and naval experts, as well as Cabinet officers, was made available. These 15 men have heard all the facts; they have weighed all the evidence; they were told the complete story. The other 420 of us know little more than do the readers of the daily press or do ardent listeners to the radio about the merits of this vast appropriation. The vital facts are sealed in secrecy.

While only five or six Republicans were included in the committee which weighed these secret hearings and sifted as best they could the propaganda and the hysteria from the factual findings, it is significant that all of those who heard the secret testimony, whether Republican or Democratic, are in support of this appropriation bill of $7,000,000,000. I cannot bring myself to vote my uninformed opinion in opposition to these gentlemen whom we must trust and who have had access to all the facts. Their unanimous approval of these appropriations give me added reason to vote for them today, since we are illy equipped with evidence to oppose the testimony which they heard in secret session.

We Members of this Congress must have some degree of confidence at least in the good faith of one another. When all the Members of both parties who were privileged to hear the secret testimony tell me we should vote for these $7,000,000,000 to give the President full and unimpaired opportunity to make good his promise to preserve our peace, I, for one, shall not set my judgment with its inadequacy of evidence against the united opinion of this committee of my colleagues. I only hope and pray with them that the President will use the funds as he has so frequently promised us he would. It is with a heavy heart that I realize that as a legislator I must rely so much on the good faith and the good judgment of a single individual in a country which has so long been dedicated to the principles of representative government. I wish devoutly that it were otherwise today.

Mr. Chairman, again reverting to my amendment let me state that my proposal to eliminate the $200,000,000 scheduled for use to repair belligerent foreign ships in American ports is not inconsistent with my resolve to abide by the verdict of those who heard these secret witnesses. It does not fail to harmonize with my willingness to give the President a fair and complete chance to have the funds he demands to pursue the policy which he has dictated. My amendment fits in well with my position.

I offer it here in the House as a helpful suggestion to implement the President's alleged desire for peace. I propose to keep the war away from America by this amendment by not opening our ports to warring ships at this particular juncture. I seek further information as to why the Navy, under the President's direction, always paints our ships to make them indistinguishable in color from British men of war. I ask the question, Just how does this conform with the President's pledge to protect our peace and to save our sailors from danger? The country and this Congress is entitled to the information. If there is some reason obscure to us at present why we should send our ships to sea in such a shade that underwater predators cannot tell them from those of its active foe, let those who have the reason make it clear. If the fortunes of war run so even, now that opening our ports to belligerent ships may mean the difference between disaster and success for the British cause, let us be given further evidence as it might affect our action on other matters of vital concern to the protection of our own defenses. What advantages might accrue to us from such a policy? How do they correspond with the accompanying disadvantages of offering just another possibility of war-provoking incidents?

Sir, my amendment does not close the door forever, but it would give us time to find the facts and it would help protect our peace while we are searching for the truth. Surely the delay or defeat of a program which threatens to bring war to our very ports can do no great harm and a more careful, thorough analysis of all this policy implys might do great good.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the extension of time because there is another angle of this problem I want to touch upon. Let me first say, in concluding the foregoing thought, that we in no sense tie our hands in Congress if we accept this amendment. The committee can come back in 3 weeks or 6 weeks from now if the necessity be thought to require it, and consider an appropriation of $200,000,000, or whatever sum may be necessary, to make certain harbors available for certain purposes; but in the first place we should be sure that the fine art of camouflage is not being used to encourage the sending of mothers' sons down to Davy Jones' locker under a system like this described in the Philadelphia Inquirer this morning. Now I shall speak on the other aspect of this amendment.

On October 3, 1939, at the Panama Conference we entered into certain solemn obligations and moral commitments with the South American republics, and I read to you verbatim the language of article V, section 3, of the final act of the Panama meeting, to wit:

> It is resolved to declare that with regard to their status as neutrals, there exists certain standards recognized by the American republics applicable in these circumstances and that in accordance with them they:
>
> (a) Shall prevent their respective terrestrial, maritime, and aerial territories from being utilized as bases of belligerent operations.

This item in the bill is in direct circumvention of that solemn agreement entered into in the good faith of the United States with the South American republics. To those of you who with me wish to retain the solidarity and friendship of our South American neighbors I urge that we act in good faith. Let us at least postpone the enactment of this $200,000,000 provision in direct circumvention of these pledges until we have had an opportunity to consult and advise with the ministers of the South American republics to be sure that this innovation in established policy, this negation of our obligation is an agreeable and acceptable one to them.

I do not believe the United States in the Western Hemisphere should begin the Hitlerian application of international law, that anything that suits the biggest power must suit the lesser powers. Surely we do not want to assume a policy in the Western Hemisphere that our national honor is not to be respected when we enter an agreement with our neighbors to the south. Surely we do not want to force feed our decisions on what is wise and what is prudent to the South American republics with the same disregard for their national interests and opinions that Hitler is now using in his diplomatic relations with the Balkan states.

We have an obligation to the South American republics to make good on that Panama Conference which we entered as a voluntary agreement, and if we hope to retain their respect and confidence, if we hope to have their cooperation, as I think we should, in stamping out subversivism in the South American republics, first of all we surely must substantiate our own good faith by maintaining our printed word and our solemn obligation with those South American republics.

I urge you to agree with me in this amendment, which would simply delete $200,000,000 from the bill, permitting the rest of the $7,000,000,000 to become available as soon as the bill is passed, in order that we may additionally safeguard the

peace of America and in order that we may maintain the good word and the good name of America as it is related to South American republics. If we would be good neighbors we must first of all be faithful promisers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would object to my having 5 minutes? I have not spoken on this bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, saving 2 minutes for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like some time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. On this amendment?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, in rising in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, I do so in order to say a word discouraging Congressmen from reading some little matter on the floor and in doing so get to thoroughly feeling grounded and qualified to present something for action by the body. The gentleman from South Dakota who just closed his argument has read an article here from the Philadelphia Inquirer and seriously offered an amendment to a proposed law of the land. He has not had time, of course, to find out what may have led the military affairs branch of this Government and all of its consultants to take this action, if it is true. He does not know what the ramifications may have been which justified this and, it may not have been done at all. All he has to go upon is the report apparently of one reporter to one paper in the entire United States. I think we sometimes have a habit of going off half-cocked and that a one-man statement of an unguarded moment frequently goes out as a voice from the floor of the Congress of the United States. That is all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that anyone else approaches this bill in quite the same position as I do, although I feel perhaps some do who have not expressed themselves so far. As far as the United States is concerned, it is my feeling that we are traveling a pretty narrow road at the present time. I am afraid that we have passed the fork in the road which marked involvement, and the bridges are either washed out or are burned behind us. As far as I am concerned, I thought I saw many places along the road before where there were danger signs and I did my best to call attention to those danger signs. I opposed traveling this road, I opposed taking this fork in the road, but the President of the United States and the Congress have said we are going to try to make guns, and ships, and planes for one side in this war, and hope that Hitler will not be able to do anything about it, or will deem it prudent not to try. We cannot now turn back; we can only try to stay on the road. There is only one consideration that can be brought before the Congress at this time and that is, how can we give this aid and keep the war away from our shores? What is best for the security of the United States when we have taken the position that we have already taken?

Mr. Chairman, throughout the entire debate upon the lease-lend bill, and in the debate that the country has been hearing, we have been assured that we were going to try to walk this narrow road from here on out without falling off into the abyss of a shooting war. The reason I want to support the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota, is that it seems to me he has put his finger upon one of those very touchy points where we may bring the war to our shores and into our harbors.

During the last Presidential campaign, the President of the United States, speaking at Philadelphia in October, said:

> To every man, woman, and child in the United States, I say this: Your President and your Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves, not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves nor for any purpose of conquest—

And get this:

> not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes.

What is intervention in foreign disputes? I quote again. The President further said:

> I stand on the platform of our party. We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Navy, or air force to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas except in case of attack.

The reason I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] should be adopted is that this section before us invites that attack. The repair of vessels in our harbors, the use of our shipyards, invites attack, and when that attack comes, you and I know what the danger will be for the United States.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman believe it is any more dangerous to repair a ship than it is to build a ship for Great Britain? Under the bill we are going to build ships for them. Is it any worse to repair one than to build one?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We will still have the title to those ships we are building until they are turned over. We have a perfect right to build as many ships in our own name as we desire, and while they are in our name it is nobody's business but our own. This proposal, however, in the bill as it is written is to appropriate funds for the repair and conditioning of ships to which foreign belligerents have title, and that is in violation of every precedent of international law. It is a direct invitation to attack. It makes a potential base for Britain out of every harbor we own. It brings the war inside the 600-mile neutrality zone created by the Inter-American Congress; yes, it brings the war inside the old 12-mile zone, inside the old 3-mile limits. It brings the war to our docks and shipyards.

I realize that when you hit a man you cannot afford to hit him softly. For that reason, I have not voted for the amendments to cut down the total of this bill. Over my protest, against my judgment, the Congress adopted the policy of providing guns and planes and ships, on the plea that by passing the lend-lease bill we could keep the war away from our shores. The step was taken. I am in favor of trying to go through with it on that basis. Therefore I am not voting to cut down the amounts in this bill, but I do believe we ought to try our very best to walk the narrow road we have outlined for ourselves and not invite the attacks that will bring the war to our shores and create the incidents that will lead this country into a shooting war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak for the Mundt amendment to the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease appropriation bill. This amendment bars the use of any part of this $7,000,000,000 for the repair of belligerent vessels in our harbors. I support the amendment for two reasons:

I hold the reputation and honor of my country very high. It seems to me this bill puts us into grave danger of breaking faith with the whole Western Hemisphere. Our agreement with the Southern Republics should prevent our permitting the repair of belligerent ships in our harbors. Without this amendment shall we not be breaking this agreement, or has the State Department clarified the matter with our neighbors on the south?

I know quite well from my experience on the Committee on Foreign Affairs during the consideration of H. R. 1776 how impossible it is to make any impression upon the minds of the majority. I recognize that the passage of this measure is inevitable and that it will probably be passed, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has said, "without amendment." But I want to speak in behalf of this amendment which would help us keep faith with the New World.

When a measure becomes law in our Republic, we have considered ourselves obligated to uphold the law. The passage of H. R. 1776 goes very hard with some of us who feel in all sincerity that the country is being led rapidly away from peace. I say to you members of the majority, that we will hold you responsible if there is war. You have said all along that this is all for peace. Then keep us at peace. The mothers of the United States, yes, all the women of this country, expect that of you and will hold you, and the Chief Executive you represent, wholly responsible. Those of us who are on the minority side, who have fought as hard as we know how to keep this country out of war, expect you to keep your word. All the people who voted for you have the right to expect that of you. So if you do not keep faith it will be a sorry world. If we have gone so far along the way of war behind a smoke screen of your promises that there is no return possible, then it is indeed tragedy.

We who vote with you in this will do so because H. R. 1776, called by your leader this afternoon the "lend-spend" bill, has become a law. But the responsibility lies with you! We have done all it is humanly possible to do to put limitations that would not obstruct the main issue but which would have protected our people from the unrestrained actions of those to whom power has been given. You have refused to acquiesce in any of these protective amendments. The full burden of the future rests upon you.

I ask you again, What are you going to do with it? I ask you also, What is America to you? What are you making of America in its relation to the world? What kind of a world are you building? You of the majority party, you who are responsible . . . is it to be war or peace? You have promised peace. Do you keep your word?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the question before us now is not what end do we seek, but what means shall we seek to arrive at that end. At least I sincerely hope that each and every Member of Congress is looking forward to a free and solvent United States of America.

I stand for, and have voted for, and will continue to vote for, appropriations to build up and maintain a defense in this country second to that of no other country or combination of countries. I believe if we are to remain a free people we must, above all things, be able to stand on our own feet. That has always been my policy and, personally, I have never felt very safe while dependent on the good faith of someone else.

I do not believe the democratic way of life can exist in a country that is insolvent. Further, I do not believe this country can remain solvent and at the same time underwrite a victory for all the democracies of the earth and continue to guarantee their boundaries. I do not believe we can, or would want to, establish a world capitol in Washington. We have not solved the domestic problems of our own people here at home in the greatest country on earth; therefore I do not believe we can solve them for the rest of the world.

A man in a feeble-minded institution was seen hitting himself on the head with a hammer. When asked why he was doing that, he replied, "It feels so good when I quit." I suppose, since the President hates war so much, he is going into it because it will feel so good when it is over. I suppose you are going to vote the $202.02 tax on every family in the United States because they will feel so good when it is paid. Oh, yes; but when that is paid they will not feel so good when they are told that there is $997.98 yet to pay which has been heaped upon their heads by this administration. If this bill passes it will cost the people in my district $55,000,000, not counting interest. Their total debt will be $505,000,000, or $1,875.90 per family.

With this tremendous debt heaped upon our heads, how are we going to maintain free institutions in an insolvent country? I maintained that by following this very war philosophy, we are automatically destroying free institutions and the democratic way.

On April 5, 1917, 373 Members voted to enter the World War. Each Member voting for that resolution voted away the lifeblood of 322 boys, not counting the injured, to say nothing of the suffering. That war did not make the world safe for democracy. Neither can this war or any war make the world safe for democracy. However, we can continue to edge into this war until you too, can spill your share of American blood on foreign soil. Yes, it is your privilege, but I hope and trust that it is not your pleasure.

It took 1,600 pages of hearings to get the farmers $712,000,000. It has taken only 74 pages to get foreign countries $7,000,000,000, or 10 times as much. Wake up, farmers!

Our country will never be invaded from without. Its grave danger is from within. We have paid only lip service to home people, while we are paying billions to others. How can our suffering aged, whom we promised relief; our farmers whom we promised parity, our own veterans at whose expense we economized; feel that we stand for America and Americans first? They will pay this bill if it is paid, by the sweat of their brows, and many will find themselves deprived of the very things they are asked to fight for.

I have only one face, and I wear it at all times. I cannot look in one direction (peace) and travel in another direction (war). I cannot speak one thing, and mean another. I believe in America first, last, and always. God help us to save her and her people from war from without, and destruction from within.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], to whom the gentleman from Virginia has yielded the remaining time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be defeated for two reasons. First, this is not the time or the place to amend H. R. 1776. That bill was considered for 3 weeks in our committee. It was debated for 1 week on the floor of this House. It was considered for weeks in the Senate. Every possible amendment that could be thought of or suggested was made, analyzed, and voted upon. Now, when we are here to carry into effect that law and to make appropriations to provide funds with which to make it effective, is not the time to seek to change that law, which is what this amendment seeks to do. This bill we are now considering is an appropriation bill only, and it should not be encumbered with legislation.

Second, this very amendment or a similar one was rejected when H. R. 1776, the so-called lend-lease bill was under consideration by the House.

This amendment was thought of and considered when we had that bill before our committee. Secretary Hull was questioned with reference to this very matter when he appeared before our committee in the hearings on that bill. The effect of this amendment would be to hamstring the President on this important subsection (b), providing for testing, inspecting, proving, repairing, outfitting, reconditioning, or otherwise placing in good working order any defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of our country, and that is what this amendment is designed to do, and it should be rejected now, and I believe that it will be.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the charge by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] that if war comes the responsibility for it will be laid upon those of us who voted for H. R. 1776, let me say that we assume all responsibility for our vote, and we have no apology therefor.

We love peace as much as do the opponents of that bill, but when we passed H. R. 1776 some weeks ago, and as we pass this bill now appropriating the money to carry it into effect, we were and are now in a crisis, the gravest in our history—the very safety of our Nation is threatened as everyone familiar with the facts knows to be true, and we voted for it with the deep and profound conviction that it was necessary for the defense and preservation of the United States of America.

No one knows whether or not our country will become involved in war, but if it comes the supporters of that bill will not be responsible. Not we, but a certain individual in Berlin, Germany, will decide when this country goes to war. You cannot point your finger at those who supported this bill, if war comes, and say, "You are responsible," because it is those who created this condition, those who are carrying out this condition, it is the dictator nations of the world that will determine when war comes. They will not consult us, but will attack us whenever they think it is to their best interest to do so.

That bill was voted upon to keep war away from this hemisphere, and we believe that it will. I am glad to see that some of those who opposed the other bill are now in favor of this bill. I am glad to see that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who said he is hard-boiled and he is when it comes

to figures, after studying this bill says it ought to be passed and is supporting it.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully and earnestly urge that this amendment be defeated. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 62, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(c) Not to exceed 20 percent of any of the foregoing eight appropriations may be transferred by the President to any other such appropriation, but no appropriation shall be increased by more than 30 percent.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I owe allegiance to only one country. I intend to discharge my duties in this Congress at this time on that basis. I am not concerned in regard to the war abroad except to deplore it, but I am more concerned in regard to my own country, the land of my birth, the land of the birth of my forbears. The highest duty I can perform in good faith to the people who have honored me by sending me here, and my duty under my oath is to preserve, protect, and defend my own country from enemies within or from without.

I shall vote with enthusiasm and with all my heart and soul for every appropriation that will build up our own national defense on land, in the air, and on the sea. I will do that for my country, and gladly. I will vote and I will act in every way to make our arms invincible from any invading enemy. I have pledged myself to my people that not with my vote will their American sons be required to follow down the same bloody path of sacrifice that they did in the last war.

I challenge no man's patriotism on this floor. This is a grave hour. For days every man and every woman on this floor has gone to bed with prayers and with their conscience, and, I assume, asking for Divine guidance that they may act as patriots when called upon to vote at this crucial time. There are a few facts, however, that, perhaps, color my reasons and my conclusions, and you also may possess facts that I do not possess.

I admit that my whole attitude toward these questions pending now is colored by what happened 22 years ago. Not once, so far as I know, on this floor, has any attention been called to veterans' hospitals scattered over this country in which are incarcerated the blind, the legless, the insane; their lives destroyed and their bodies committed to a life of suffering. These boys are the pitiful wrecks of the last war in Europe in 1917–18. You had better think that over as you go down this path to war, and let me tell you something else, and I challenge any man to refute the accuracy of my statement. I was told by a British official before war was declared overseas, "Yes; there is going to be a war, but it is going to be a phony war." I said, "Phony, in what respect?" "Oh, not so much killing," he said. "The industrialists of England and of France and of Germany and of Russia have agreed among themselves to carry on a war to destroy the economic barriers of the small countries and wipe out their boundaries in the interest of trade, and when that has been done areas of control will be assigned to each country." I said, "What about Hitler?" He said, "He is window-dressing for the big boys." Have you looked over the situation? It sounded preposterous to me in this day of civilization that any such intrigues could be engaged in by any nations on the face of the earth. I am talking about the foreign industrialists involved in such a conspiracy against inoffensive, peaceful nations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Now, I ask, have you observed the scene abroad? I have watched it from that angle. I hardly dared to mention it to a soul, because the scheme seemed preposterous, but I have watched it. Look back over the record and see how many countries were taken over with practically no resistance. What about Czechoslovakia? They did not want to surrender; they were told to surrender to Hitler by the powers that be in Great Britain, and one by one other small countries were taken over. Finally, something happened, and what was it? Oh, somebody, like all bandits and thieves, sitting around the table to divide up the spoils, was dissatisfied and then the war broke forth in all its fury. I say to you here and now, and the fact may be denied here and now, but our State Department knows that that situation is gospel truth and it will not tell it to the people now any more than many of the disclosures that came to light only at the conclusion of the last war.

I want to tell you that I am not criticizing any Member for the vote he may cast today, but with these facts within my knowledge I am going to resist every step toward war (applause), as I did on the lend-lease bill and as I shall by my vote against this $7,000,000,000. [Applause.]

Washington, gazing down upon you from the painting at my right, warned you that you could not afford to trust your freedom to the intrigues of foreign nations, and he laid down a foreign policy from which we departed in the year 1917.

So I say to you I shall never criticize any man who votes on this, and I shall give him credit for being patriotic, but I say to you, speaking for myself, if I had cast a vote for the lend-lease bill or if I were to vote for this bill today I would consider myself a traitor to my country.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order and ask the gentleman from Virginia to make that 6 minutes, as I have a short statement I wish to make.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I modify that to 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of my rights under the remarks just made to assert that I am going to vote for this bill to prevent the establishment of any more hospitals, insane asylums, and to keep the Americans out of this war. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I read a newspaper article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, pointing out that our American battleships are being repainted in British colors in order to confuse submarines and bombing planes. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] questioned the authenticity of these remarks and said that perhaps I had not adequately considered their accuracy. He is an alert gentleman, and I hereby publicly challenge him in this House and before the public press to call up the Navy Department and inquire about it and then come back to the House and refute the authenticity of the article.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. My time is exhausted.

The Clerk read as follows:

(f) In all, $7,000,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in lines 19 and 20, page 3:

In all, $7,000,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

I desire to be heard upon the point of order. I say at the outset that this is not made as a dilatory motion nor is it the purpose to hamstring or modify any feature of the bill. This appropriation, of course, derives its entire authority from the act of March 11, 1941, and in section 3 (c) of that act there is a provision that the powers under the act of March 11 can be exercised until the 30th of June 1943, unless sooner terminated by a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses. It is conceivable that if a concurrent resolution were adopted by Congress, you would have available here $7,000,000,000 for which there was no authority—$7,000,000,000 just fairly floating around. It occurs to me that the language in lines 19 and 20, which makes the entire amount available until June 1943, in that sense, particularly contravenes the authority of the organic act, and for that purpose I make the point of order. Mr. Chairman, if the point of order should prevail, I am prepared to offer an amendment reinserting the language now carried in the bill, together with the proviso that brings it in line with section 3 of the act of March 11.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be heard upon the

point of order. It occurs to me that the language on its face is patently subject to the point of order, because it constitutes legislation making the appropriation available beyond the period of the fiscal year in which the bill is proposed to be passed. Almost all authorizing legislation that is adopted by Congress authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of the act, but without provision in the appropriation act itself, the appropriation never carries beyond the fiscal year. The last section of this bill, section 5, reads—

This act may be cited as the "Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941."

During the debate upon the lease-lend bill we were repeatedly told by those in charge of the bill that it was not an appropriation bill, that it did not carry an appropriation. Now either it did create appropriations for more than a fiscal year or this language in section 1 (7) (f) which would make the appropriation available for more than 2 fiscal years is legislation.

In addition to that, the legislation proposed here is a contravention of the Constitution, and that of itself should make it subject to the point of order, because it seeks to amend existing law, namely, the basic law, the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution specifically provides that Congress shall have power—

to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer time than 2 years.

Obviously, if this bill should be passed at this time carrying language to make the appropriation available for 2 years following the next 30th of June, it exceeds the period of 2 years.

It may be that on the face of the bill it is thought that this appropriation bill does not provide support for armies, but I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that under sections of the bill not yet read, section 2 and section 3, it is specifically provided that the President may transfer parts of these appropriations to our own defense agencies, including the Army.

I also call attention to the fact that in the definition of "defense articles" in the basic legislation, defense articles are defined to be any commodity or article for defense. Certainly that includes commodities for the support of armies.

In references to "agricultural commodities" the suggestion has been made repeatedly that funds herein will purchase food and supplies which will be for the support of armies. Consequently, with the authority proposed to be given to the President here to transfer these appropriations, he would be given authority to transfer appropriations for the support of armies for a period beyond 2 years.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, we must bear in mind that this is not a fiscal year appropriation bill. It is not in the usual form of the general appropriation bills appropriating money for a specific fiscal year. This bill appropriates money to carry out Public Law No. 11 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, known as the lease-lend bill.

The powers under that act conferred by section (3) (a) may be exercised until June 30, 1943, or until terminated prior thereto, by a concurrent resolution pursuant to section (3) (c). The appropriations made in the bill before the House are made—

to enable the President, through such departments and agencies of the Government as he may designate to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941.

And so forth. The act referred to is Public Law 11.

The point made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is not tenable. The gentleman makes the point that inasmuch as the powers of the President under Public, No. 11 of the Seventy-seventh Congress might be terminated at a certain time before June 30, 1943, the language in line 20 of this bill making the money available until June 30, 1943, might give him the right to exercise his powers and spend money beyond the time when the powers under Public Law 11 had terminated.

The appropriations in this bill being made in specific terms to carry out the powers conferred by Public Law 11, the termination of the powers under that act would be reflected immediately upon the appropriations made to carry that act into effect. The two go together. He could not exercise any powers under this bill which he had ceased to have under Public Law 11, because the purpose of this bill is to implement that law.

On the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Constitution provides, of course, that no appropriation to raise and support armies shall be for a longer term than 2 years. There is nothing whatsoever in this bill about raising or supporting armies. This bill is for the specific purpose of providing defense articles for governments whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States. There is nothing in here whatsoever about pay, sustenance, clothing, or personal equipment of soldiers of armies of the United States. The word is not mentioned in this entire bill or in Public Law 11, and by no stretch of the imagination could this bill be construed as a bill to make an appropriation to raise or support armies of the United States.

Therefore I think the point of order is not good, and I ask that it be overruled.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard especially on the part of the point of order that relates to the appropriation for a longer period than 2 years. This bill is an act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense.

In section 2 it reads:

If any defense article procured from an appropriation made before March 11, 1941, is disposed of, under such act of March 11, 1941, by any department or agency to the government of any country whose defense the President deemed vital to the defense of the United States, the President may transfer, from the appropriations made by this act to the appropriate appropriation of such department or agency, an amount equivalent to the value (as computed for the purposes of the $1,300,000,000 limitation contained in section 3 (a) (2) of such act of March 11, 1941) of the defense article so disposed of, but not to exceed in the aggregate $1,300,000,000.

Section 3 provides that any defens article procured with the money unde this bill can be, if the President deems it in the interest of the United States, transferred to the proper defense unit of the United States.

This language in the Constitution is very broad. To "raise and support armies" means not only to authorize the raising of an army, but supporting it; to provide them with ammunition, to provide them with guns, to provide them with all those things, such as airplanes, forts, and all that sort of thing, that are required for that purpose. It is not narrow and restricted language. It is the authority upon which we make all of those appropriations from year to year. It seems to me that with that situation it is absolutely impossible that we, under the Constitution, have the power to make an appropriation for that purpose available for more than 2 years.

I hope the Constitution can be observed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair has listened with interest to the arguments pro and con with reference to this point of order.

The Chair knows of no authority by which it is the function of the Chair to pass upon a constitutional question. The Chair therefore directs attention to other features of the argument with reference to the point of order and calls attention to the fact that this is not a fiscal year appropriation bill but that it is an appropriation bill made in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 11, 1941.

The Chair would quote from that act, section 3, subsection (c), this provision:

(c) After June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses before June 30, 1943, which declares that the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a) are no longer necessary to promote the defense of the United States, neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall exercise any of the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a); except that until July 1, 1946, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1943, or before the passage of such concurrent resolution, whichever is the earlier.

In the opinion of the Chair, in view of the fact that Public, No. 11, the act of March 11, 1941, by its terms stipulates and provides that neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall exercise any of the powers conferred by or pursuant to that act, after the expiration of certain dates, or after the concurrent resolution has been passed by the House of Representatives and Senate, the appropriations would thereby become ineffective were such action taken.

In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order should not be sustained, and the Chair so rules.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me with respect to the ruling, or is it too late?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has passed upon the point of order from the standpoint of everything except the constitutional question. That is not the obligation of the Chair.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That is the very question, if the Chair please, to which I should like to address myself if I am in order. If I am not in order, I will not press my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of the constitutionality of a measure, the Chair will state, is one for the House itself and not for the Chair to pass upon.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 3, line 20, strike out "June 30, 1943," and insert "2 years from the effective date of this act."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself directly to the amendment, in order that the record on the point of order on which the Chair has ruled may be made clear, I should like to call attention to the fact that the lease-lend bill specifically provided in section 6 (b) that the money which may be received from any government—

shall, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, revert to the respective appropriation or approriations out of which funds were expended—

And then it goes on to say that—

they shall be available for expenditure for the purpose for which such expended funds were appropriated by law during the fiscal year in which such funds are received and the ensuing fiscal year.

In other words, there was an apparent attempt on the part of the writer of the bill to hold the appropriation of repaid funds to 2 fiscal years, attempting in that way to observe the spirit of the Constitution.

Now, then, it is perfectly within the power of the House, sitting as a Committee of the Whole this afternoon, to keep within the spirit of the Constitution without in any way endangering a single objective of the bill before us. The amendment is very simple. Instead of using the words "June 30, 1943," it provides that these funds shall remain available for—

2 years from the effective date of this act.

This certainly is in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution.

The reason this amendment does not injure the bill in any respect is to be found in the testimony before the deficiency committee, and which is summed up in a statement in the report on the bill, which report is before you. I quote from page 7:

The committee was advised that substantially the entire amount of the funds provided would be required prior to July 1, 1942.

That means it is needed within 15½ months. Yet the language of the bill would give them an additional year, even at the risk of needlessly violating the Constitution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. TABER. There is not any question but what all of this money was brought in to us as something that would be used within 1942. The Constitution clearly requires it, and I believe we ought to accept the gentleman's amendment and comply with the Constitution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from New York, and I appeal to the Members who have said we are going to do this thing in a regular way, that we are going to retain control of the purse strings, that we are going to retain the power of Congress—I appeal to them in all sincerity that here is an instance where we should exhibit the power of a democracy to work as it should, not to fly in the face of the Constitution. Three months at the other end does not make any difference so far as the effect of spending the money is concerned; but if we can violate the Constitution today and create a period of 27½ months for appropriations for the support of the Army, when the Constitution says the period shall not be longer than 24 months, that difference will widen and the constitutional limitation will be successively ruined by circumvention and direct violation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes allotted to me.

The statement was made this afternoon by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the effect that our battleships, by orders of the Navy Department, were to be painted in such a way as to confuse the Germans so that British ships could slip into our harbors. Following that he said he would defy anyone to call the Navy Department, and that it could not be denied by them. Upon hearing that statement, I became very much concerned and did call the Navy Department and talked to none other than the Secretary of the Navy himself. Mr. Knox informed me that I could quote him as saying "that there was not a scintilla of truth in that statement."

The Secretary of the Navy, I repeat, himself stated there was not a scintilla of truth in that statement. He did say, however, that about 4 months ago the Navy changed a little of their painting methods and made their color a little more muddy, but there was nothing at all done by the Navy in any way to confuse any other nation or in any way to aid anyone along the lines reported by the Philadelphia Inquirer. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. In the first place, the Constitution does not attempt to stop what the gentleman states it does. The Constitution is meant to provide for regular appropriations to various governmental departments for 2 years, and it states:

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money for that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

The Constitution does not attempt to say that you cannot use anything else that you may have or provide for the Army beyond 2 years. That is a stretch of the imagination, in my opinion, in interpreting the Constitution.

The committee considering the lend-lease bill wrote this provision into the law with a definite purpose in mind. It wanted the time limit to be what it is. It puts those dates in there so as to give sufficient time. It is not correct to state, as the gentleman from South Dakota did, that this provision in the bill is designed to spend all the money in the short time of 2 years. It is not. There are authorizations and expenditures running beyond the 2 years. Therefore, if you attempt to do what he is attempting to do here, and if you now go along with his attempt to do by amendment what failed on a point of order, you will be defeating part of the main purpose of the lend-lease bill and this appropriation bill. Undoubtedly a time limit in here is a necessary part of the proposition, and if you are interested in carrying out the provisions of this bill and working for the defense of this country by aiding England, you will certainly be opposed to the amendment. I trust it will be voted down.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was not the gentleman present in the deficiency hearings when this question came up on three different occasions, and the testimony was that it was expected the money would be spent during the fiscal year of 1942? My amendment gives them 2 full years.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman left out the word "substantially." When the gentleman stated it would be spent, in his statement, he used the word "substantially," which is highly important. When $7,000,000,000 are to be spent a substantial part to be spent in 2 years might mean five or six billion, while the balance of one or two billion might be spent after 2 years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman recognizes that if the sum should not be spent within the time set forth in the Constitution it would be a simple matter then to continue the availability of the unexpended balance.

Mr. O'NEAL. Why hamper it by trying to do something that will require further legislation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If you have 24 months in which to spend this money, how do you hamper the program?

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the gentleman in his opinion feel that under the present speed of our defense program this money will not be spent within 2 years—this $7,000,000,000?

Mr. O'NEAL. I am not in any way criticizing the speed of the program, but I do believe that part of this money will not be spent in the first 2 years.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I rise for the purpose of answering the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] with reference to a statement made by the gentleman from South Dakota to the effect that the United States Navy is repainting its ships. As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee when that statement was made by the gentleman from South Dakota, I checked with the Navy Department, through the Bureau of Ships, and I was informed that the ships of the United States Fleet are being repainted in dark gray, a color similar to the ships of the British Fleet, and that they will probably resemble the *King George*. [Applause.]

Mr. HOOK. I happened to have talked to the Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 83, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 3, after line 20, insert "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the emplacement of facilities, the extension of plants, the acquisition of sites, the manufacture of defense articles, or compensation for the procurement or manufacture thereof, outside the boundaries of continental United States."

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] made the following statement:

Now I want to talk about this appropriation bill. At the outset I desire to pay a very sincere and a very earnest tribute to the minority members of the subcommittee. They have worked diligently, splendidly, with great interest, in assisting and expediting the consideration of this bill; and particularly do I want to pay my respects to the able and distinguished gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER. [Applause.] Many times in the committee room, or around the committee table, and even on the floor of this House, I find myself in rather sharp disagreement with my distinguished and able friend, but I say today that he realizes, as most of us do, that the time for partisan debate is gone, the time for discussing and speaking about questions of policy has passed, and that America has made a great decision, and that it remains now for the people of America to breathe strength into that arm it has avowed it will uphold. So the great gentleman from New York, diligent, earnest, sincere Member of the minority that he is, today is an American first, and is here supporting the committee, as he has supported us from the beginning, in bringing this appropriation here for your consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard and respect for the gentleman from Virginia. I admire his ability, his intelligence, and his industry, and I have implicit faith in his sincerity and integrity. I know that he did not say it and did not mean to say it, but the innuendo and the implication is here for those who read the statement that until the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] rose to the height of supporting this committee he had been bound by narrow partisanship, and that not until today had he risen above that to Americanism.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman is laboring a great deal to try to read something into my remarks. I do not believe any other Member of the House would think I had the slightest idea of it. [Applause.]

Mr. JONKMAN. I have already exonerated the gentleman from that idea and my objective is to prevent such a construction by those who read it. As a yearling Congressman, I am not here to defend the gentleman from New York. He can do that himself much better than I could do it. But I have not yet risen to the occasion that I am going to do everything the committee says, that the majority says, or that the administration says must be done. I believe it is about time we put something into this bill that will spell America first, and that is my amendment. [Applause.]

You can read this bill as you like, but there is nothing in the bill which sounds like America first. We have heard it said time and time again on the floor of the House that if this is our war we should be in it, and if it is not our war we should be circumspect about what we do about getting into it. I have so far failed to hear anyone say it is our war. If it is not our war and if we are going to give away $7,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money without security we at least should make sure that the jobs go to Americans. I am partisan to America first. For that reason, I propose this amendment. I propose it with greater freedom because it has been freely said on this floor that the intention is to spend the entire amount of this $7,000,000,000 in America. If that is the intention, there is no reason why it should not be in the bill, and then we would at least begin to have something in the bill that spells America first.

I repeat, if this is not our war, then this bill is anything but America first, when we are taking $7,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money and throwing it into what we know is a hole from whence we will never get it back. We have found repeatedly in the measures that have been before this House that instead of looking after the interests of America first we are looking after the interests of somebody or anybody else except America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in one-half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONKMAN) there were—ayes 88, noes 122.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONKMAN and Mr. O'NEAL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 103, noes 145.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. If any defense article procured from an appropriation made before March 11, 1941, is disposed of, under such act of March 11, 1941, by any department or agency to the government of any country whose defense the President deemed vital to the defense of the United States, the President may transfer, from the appropriations made by this act to the appropriate appropriation of such department or agency, an amount equivalent to the value (as computed for the purposes of the $1,300,000,000 limitation contained in section 3 (a) (2) of such act of March 11, 1941) of the defense article so disposed of, but not to exceed in the aggregate $1,300,000,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 4, line 2, strike out "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this is the effect of my amendment. Heretofore we have appropriated for the Army and the Navy. In the lease-lend bill we provided that $1,300,000,000 worth of the equipment of the Army and Navy for whose acquisition we appropriated may be transferred by the President to Great Britain. This new bill provides $7,000,000,000. Adding the amount that was provided for in the lease-lend bill to the $7,000,000,000 in this appropriation makes a total aid to Britain of $8,300,000,000. If the President decides that he will not in accordance with section 2 reimburse the Army and the Navy for the $1,300,000,000 worth of equipment which he can give to Great Britain, it means that a vote for this bill will possibly be a vote for the expenditure of $8,300,000,000. If my amendment is adopted, the President will be required

out of the $7,000,000,000 to reimburse the Army and the Navy for the $1,300,000,000 of material they furnish to Great Britain.

I cannot understand why the committee or this House would disapprove of this amendment, which confines the amount of aid to Britain to the amount that has been publicized throughout the length and breadth of the land, $7,000,000,000. I sincerely hope the Members of the House, regardless of the fact that I am on the wrong side of the aisle today to offer amendments, will accept this amendment in fairness to the American people, and will not by defeating it give Britain $1,300,000,000 more than she asked for at this time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, under Public Law 11 the President was given the right to dispose of material to the value of $1,300,000,000 procured out of funds heretofore appropriated for our Army and Navy. The language, as the committee has put it in this bill, gives the President the right to reimburse the Navy Department or the War Department for any matériel he takes from those Departments and uses under the authority given him under the $1,300,000,000. If you put the word "shall" in here instead of "may," it would have the effect of reducing the total amount of aid we could give under this bill to $5,700,000,000. Leaving the language as the committee has drawn it, the President is given discretion to reimburse, but he is not required to reimburse. He should not be required to do so. For instance, if we transfer to Great Britain or any other nation matériel which the American Army and Navy are not using and would not need, there is no point in reimbursing.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. The effect of this amendment is to confine the total amount to $7,000,000,000, which the American people think the total amount of the bill will be.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The effect of it is to reduce the amount of aid which we can give by $1,300,000,000. That is the practical effect of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 75, noes 186.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Any defense article procured from an appropriation made by this act shall be retained by or transferred to and for the use of such department or agency of the United States as the President may determine, in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign government, whenever in the judgment of the President the defense of the United States will be best served thereby.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: On page 4, between lines 15 and 16, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. In order to protect the economic and financial interests of the United States, every foreign government receiving defense articles procured from funds appropriated herein shall reimburse the United States for the cost of such defense articles, or guarantee such reimbursement by transferring, or causing to be transferred, to the United States property deemed by the President to be satisfactory collateral security for such reimbursement, insofar as the President shall find that such government has property available for such purpose."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in that it changes the lease-lend act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No; I have another amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: On page 4, between lines 15 and 16, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation made by this act shall be used to procure defense articles for any foreign government which has not made arrangements, prior to receiving such articles, in order to protect the economic and financial interests of the United States, to reimburse the United States for the cost of such defense articles, or to guarantee such reimbursement by transferring, or causing to be transferred, to the United States property deemed by the President to be satisfactory collateral security for such reimbursement, insofar as the President shall find that such government has property available for such purpose."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not a limitation. It is phrased, generally speaking, as a limitation, but on careful analysis the Chair will see it is not a limitation in that it is not a complete negative, and to be a limitation it must be a complete negative.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is in precisely the same form as the following section, just as the other amendment which I offered was in the form of the two sections which had preceded it. This is clearly a limitation on an appropriation and it cannot be stated any more definitely than to read the language of the amendment itself which says "no part of any appropriation made by this act shall be used to procure defense" articles except under certain conditions. This is exactly the same language as section 4 in this bill, which starts out exactly the same way, that "no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used" under certain conditions. It seems to me the amendment is clearly a limitation upon an appropriation bill; in fact, it is hard to conceive of how you can state a limitation upon an appropriation bill in any other words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment as a new section to the bill. The amendment is in the form of a limitation, but in the opinion of the Chair, in essence, it clearly is legislative in its character. It is not sufficient for an amendment to be in the form of a limitation. In view of the fact that the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Ohio very clearly imposes an additional duty on the President of the United States, the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is a limitation only in form and that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: Page 4, after line 15, and before line 16, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"SEC. 4. No defense article procured from an appropriation made by this act shall be convoyed out of the waters of the Western Hemisphere by any vessel of the Navy of the United States, except possessions of the United States and the Philippine Islands."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have an opportunity to be heard upon the amendment. I have offered the amendment for the very specific reasons that the successive steps——

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think we should first dispose of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order rather than on the merits of the amendment. The point of order has been made and not reserved.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am making the introduction, laying the ground work for the argument on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Surely.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Perhaps the gentleman will reserve the point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I have not reserved the point of order.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I do not want to take up much time, because I know this is a futile procedure.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, to accommodate my friend, I shall reserve the point of order for a few minutes.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I want to make the record. We tried to make a record back in the Seventy-fourth Congress to keep this country out of war by passing the Neutrality Act. We have seen that repealed. We passed the Johnson Act to

keep us out of war, and we have seen that repealed; and the next step is going to be the convoying of supplies and matériels to any place in the world under the Lease-Lend Act in order to aid the democracies. Of course, as soon as we do that every one of us knows that the shooting begins. May I repeat here, as I have done on former occasions, that it takes neither physical nor moral courage to vote for a war that somebody else will have to fight, and I want to add to that that those who have been in favor of repealing the Neutrality Act and the Johnson Act, and who are in favor of convoying supplies, should have the courage to come out squarely in the open and bring in a declaration of war, and let us go on record in regard to it. This effort that we endure is merely a piecemeal effort to take us into war, which no one has the courage to come out openly and declare in a resolution, so that we may vote for or against it. The people are being led into it with the specious argument for peace.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. Is not that in keeping with the way this administration has done everything?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I do not want to say that, because I have supported the administration in three different elections, but I do appreciate the fact that the next step is going to be the convoying of supplies and I want to make a record now that I am against it, just as I was against the lease-lend bill which to my mind is simply an undeclared declaration of war, because no one had the courage to bring in a simple declaration of war. This will make $39,000,000,000 we have authorized or appropriated for 1941 and 1942 for aiding outsiders without even asking for security for our money. Our own people cannot get similar treatment. The other day we had the agricultural appropriation bill up for consideration. An amendment was offered to give our farmers parity but it was voted down. We have been trying to get a hearing on the old-age pension bills now lying in committee. So far nothing has come of our efforts in that respect although we have promises. Billions for foreigners but not a dime for our aged people. Why this all-out aid for foreigners and nothing for the folks at home? I will tell you what I think. It is because in 60 or 90 days we will be in war. Everything points that way; even our battleships are being painted to resemble Britain's. Why? Is it to hasten the day when the Axis Powers will sink one of our ships so that there will be a real excuse to get into the fray?

In the meantime Japan gets ready to strike. I have felt for some years that our gravest danger is on the Pacific and not on the Atlantic. Hitler is slipping. He now has a war on his hands on two fronts and he cannot win. Of course he will try and no doubt inflict great damage, but he cannot conquer Britain, I am convinced. Therefore I feel that the blow which we should guard against is on the Pacific and not on the Atlantic. It is to our interest to strengthen our own defenses and not deprive ourselves of essential materials which are going to be sorely needed. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I trust the point of order will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia insist upon the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is clearly legislation upon an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: On page 4, after line 15, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and, in order to protect the economic and financial interests of the United States, every foreign government receiving defense articles procured from funds appropriated herein shall reimburse the United States for the cost of such defense articles, or guarantee such reimbursement by transferring, or causing to be transferred, to the United States property deemed by the President to be satisfactory collateral security for such reimbursement, insofar as the President shall find that such government has property available for such purpose."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and further that it is not germane to the paragraph to which it is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard upon the question of germaneness. It is no more legislation than the rest of the paragraph. On the question of germaneness section 3 provides limitations, adds additional duties, and gives additional powers to the President in dealing with those articles, to wit, that articles that are prepared for disposal under the lend-lease bill may be retained or transferred to and for the use of various governments whenever in the judgment of the President the defense of the United States will be best served thereby. Under my amendment whenever, in the judgment of the President of the United States, articles are transferred, security is required. It certainly is germane to the paragraph. The very purpose of the paragraph is telling what shall be done with articles after we have them; telling what the President can do with them. The subject of my amendment is to tell what the President can do with defense articles. So it is certainly germane. It is not legislation any more than the rest of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair would not contend that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph to which it is offered; but in the opinion of the Chair it clearly adds legislation to a paragraph of an appropriation bill. It therefore would not be in order.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the lease-lend bill having become law, my first reaction was that nothing should be spared to give that law full effect. On yesterday I stated that if certain amendments were adopted I would support this bill. At this hour it is very evident that the backers of this bill will permit no amendments. That is the request of the majority leader. We who would defend the American taxpayer find ourselves in the path of a juggernaut. For one, I do not propose to countenance such tactics. An effort has been made to prevent full debate. "Free and fair discussion is ever the firmest friend of truth." Neither this bill nor the arguments in its favor are in keeping with promises made at the time the lease-lend bill was passed. At that time it was intimated that $1,300,000,000 would meet requirements of the lease-lend bill. The administration now refuses an amendment to this bill providing $5,000,000,000. It is admitted that even this is only a beginning. I am stopping here. I shall not support passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, $7,000,000,000 would build 1,000,000 fine homes at an average cost of $7,000 each.

Seven billion dollars would put 7,000,000 men to work for 1 year at an average annual wage of $1,000 each. And that, by the way, is more than the national average income from wages.

Seven billion dollars, Mr. Chairman, is more than the cash income of all the farms of the Nation for 1940. Seven billion dollars spent for the benefit of agriculture would lift every farm mortgage held by the Government, and leave a handsome balance to invest in the future betterment of rural society.

Seven billion dollars would build 1,000,000 miles of highway at a cost of $7,000 per mile.

Seven billion dollars spent for the benefit of America would represent a gain for everyone. But, sir, $7,000,000,000 spent by us for the benefit of the British Empire represents a loss for us and a betrayal of the sacred heritage handed down from the days of the founding fathers.

I have voted for every appropriation bill for our own defense. I am prepared to vote additional billions for the same purpose. But, Mr. Chairman, my conscience will not allow me to betray my countrymen. I cannot vote for this bill. It is not a bill for defense of America. It is a bill putting both hands of John Bull in the pockets of the poor American taxpayer. Let John Bull first search deeper his own pockets. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there has been some question in our minds as to whether this is a peace bill or a war bill. We have been told by the majority that this measure is to promote peace. Some of us wonder whether we

are at war and have been at war ever since the adoption of the lease-lend bill and ever since the speech of the President on last Saturday night.

I would like to read to you for the information of the House a few words from the declaration of war against Germany in 1917—

is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

On Saturday night the President said:

There is no longer the slightest question or doubt that the American people recognize the extreme seriousness of the present situation. That is why they have demanded, and got, a policy of unqualified, immediate, all-out aid for Britain, Greece, China, and for all the governments in exile whose homelands are temporarily occupied by the aggressors.

From now on that aid will be increased—and yet again increased—until total victory has been won.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is a deadly parallel between these two statements that I believe all of us here can grasp—a parallel that I hope will not end in war. Do the words of the President mean that today we are in war? Do they sound as if we are to remain at peace? The full responsibility as to whether the future shall bring peace or war to our country now rests with the President of these United States.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I simply want to explain to the committee what the proposed amendment was which was stricken out three times on points of order made by the distinguished white-haired chairman of the subcommittee.

This amendment simply would have written into law the assurances that the President gave indirectly to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that insofar as available, collateral would be required to secure our advances. The amendment was permissive only, and gave large discretion. It would have written in the exact words used on this floor yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] in describing what the President said he was going to do; also the exact words Mr. TABER used in stating what the President was going to do, and would have made a declaration by this Congress that as we start to be the arsenal of the democracies, we are going to require security for reimbursing us for our advances, if that security is available; that we furnish arms, not at cost plus, but at cost to us, to those who have assets to pay for them.

Now, you may wonder why, after legislation has been written in this bill by the committee—and this bill is full of legislation—after many amendments of a legislative character have come in without objection, that these points of order are raised on such an amendment and rulings are made which, I consider, strain the rules beyond their bounds—why that was done. I think I can tell you why; because this well-disciplined army on my right was in danger of remembering those sweet words about freedom quoted yesterday by the white-haired chairman of the subcommittee:

O Freedom, thou are not, as poets dream,
A fair young girl, with light and delicate limbs—

And so on. Some of the Members on my right were reading those words about freedom and were going to shake off the partisan yoke that has been clamped on them, forcing them to vote blindly against every amendment. They would have voted to protect America to make sure that we did not get stuck in this war as we did last time; to make sure that some of the seven billions that Britain has in this hemisphere should be put up as collateral. The white-haired chairman was afraid to permit those men their freedom even for a moment, and therefore invoked this technicality.

I am going to vote for this bill, reluctantly, with a heavy heart, but feeling it is the only thing to do. We are in the war now. I opposed every step down the road to war, but now we are in it. The day the lease-lend bill was introduced I called it a modern, streamlined declaration of war. The President's war speech last Saturday, the repainting of our battleships, the coming of the German submarines—all confirm my estimate of the result of passage of the lease-lend bill. The protestations of the majority that this is a peace bill bring hollow comfort to me, for they have either failed to foresee or refused to foretell the next step all the way.

I opposed this policy, but it has been adopted by the processes of representative government; and if it is to be the policy of my country, I want it to succeed. I cannot take the responsibility of withholding the means to carry out this policy merely because I disagreed with its adoption. This is such a perilous course that I do not want it to fail in order to prove I was right.

If we can get out of the war again, before we are forced to fight, I want to try to do it. If Britain conquers Hitler without the aid of our manpower, as we have been promised today, I shall be as delighted as I am surprised. If Britain falls before this aid reaches her—and none of the arms produced by this bill will be ready soon—then we may need these arms for a struggle we have brought on ourselves. I hope we succeed in war.

I still hold to another hope, although that hope is faint. I hope that before all the men and treasure of Europe and America are destroyed, the world powers can get together at the place where they will surely meet after the destruction has taken place—around the peace table. Remember that whether we do this now or in the distant future, we will be rebuilding a new kind of world out of the remnants of a system that has gone forever; and remember that peace is inevitable, for after every war peace has come.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who voted against the lease-lend bill. But this is a democracy. We had our full day in court, the case was submitted in the democratic way, and in the democratic way a decision was made. I would personally rather lose a fight under democracy than win that same fight under any other form of government. This Nation has, by the choice and will of the people, been launched upon a policy which, it seems to me, we must implement if we are to remain a democracy. Having once determined upon our course, we can do no less as Americans than to pursue that course with the fullest vigor. We adopted the lease-lend bill, and we ought now to support it in any and every way which is necessary to carry it out. To do less than this would mean worse than mere failure for us—it would mean stark tragedy. Once on the road we must not falter or all is lost.

The sponsors of the lease-lend bill contend that it will give us the best chance of avoiding military participation for us in the war. If that is the case, then, for heaven's sake, let us give it every possible support so that it may be successful in that objective.

If, on the other hand, we are, as some say, already in the war, or if war cannot be avoided, then let us put forth such a mighty effort that we assure our winning that war.

In either case we must do what must be done.

We once held the balance of power in the world, in 1917 and 1918, and we voluntarily surrendered that through mistaken idealism. I do not mean that we should have gone into the League of Nations, but I think we never should have surrendered our power for good in the world, which we did when we surrendered the most powerful Navy in the world. I hope we may remain out of this war; but whether we go in or stay out, we are today again the balance of power in the world. We shall emerge from this war, whether we participate actively or not, as the balance of power in the world, as we did in 1918, and I hope we shall never again surrender that great force for good in the world which we can be, which we have been in the past, but only when we were strong.

If we are to get to that powerful position of world influence again, then there is only one thing for this Nation to do now, and that is, having embarked upon a course, to go unfalteringly and unwaveringly down the road of that course. And as far as the amounts involved in this bill are concerned, they have been determined by the military experts as being the amounts necessary to carry out the national policy adopted by this Congress. We, as laymen, are in no position to question or quibble over the amounts. Much more may be required in the future; but if we are going to maintain our integrity, having adopted a policy, let us as Americans before the world carry out that policy. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government

of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill H. R. 4050 back to the House with the recommendation that teh enacting clause be stricken from the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time because of the very, very significant remark made by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] when he replied to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. It was a very significant remark in that it carried the indication as to what the reasoning is going to be to justify the situation in which we shall soon find ourselves unless the American people prevent it, namely, a situation where American boys will actually be fighting in this imperialistic war, not for democracy but a war to establish world dominion and world empire for one axis, the Wall Street-Downing Street axis as against the Rome-Tokyo-Berlin Axis. That remark was that it does not rest with us as to whether or not we are in war or going to war, but that it rests with Mr. Hitler. If we were faced with a situation of attempted invasion, that remark would be entirely justified, but certainly not a person in this House honestly believes that today we are dealing with a situation involving invasion or attempted invasion. We are dealing with the carrying out of a policy which will mean our actual participation in this conflict, not only with matériel, cannon, airplanes, and munitions but with the blood of our people. So that when we reach that point, the people will be told, as revealed here today, the alibi and the excuse to justify the spending of the blood of Americans on foreign battlefields, namely, that our present policy, ourselves, and the President are not responsible, but that the responsibility rests with Hitler. Thus we begin to see the rationale of the rulers of the Nation which will be used to justify the spilling of American blood.

Do not blame us but blame Hitler for going into a war not of defense but into a war for imperialistic gains, profits, and world dominion. If we reach the stage of spending the blood of Americans, that responsibility cannot be placed on Hitler. Hitler, the rulers of France, Britain, Italy, and Wall Street are responsible for the present imperialist conflict. Hitler, however, is not making the policies for the Government of the United States. Hitler is not making the policies for America today. Our being in this war—and we are in this war, as far as the President and Congress are concerned, from the standpoint of war economy and munitions—the responsibility rests with the President of the United States and with the majority of the Congress of the United States [applause], aided by some of the minority as well. [Applause.] That responsibility does not rest with Hitler; it does not rest with Churchill; it rests with us; it rests with the leaders of the Nation; it rests with the Representatives of the people assembled in Congress.

Certainly we are in war, but not with the consent of the people. The President, in his speech last Saturday, said, "We must win this war." Whose war did he mention it to be? Not the American people's war. England's war? He did not say that; he did not even misuse the word "democracy" in this connection as he did throughout his speech—he did not say it was a war for democracy that we must win; he said "this war." I agree with him that we are in this war by his actions and the actions of those who support this policy. We are not in this undeclared imperialist war either by consent of the people or by a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States.

It is a war of the rulers of this Nation, of the President, and of those in Congress who support this policy. The American people have never ratified this policy. Therefore the responsibility for war and the spilling of our Nation's blood rests on the President and those who support his pro-war program. Every war step that has been sold to the people of America has been dressed up in the dress of peace. They have been told it is a peace measure, and today in the cloakrooms and on the floor of the House Member after Member stands up and says, "We are in this war. It is the policy of the country, and therefore, even though we voted against the lease-lend bill, we must vote for this appropriation."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, we are told in one breath by some of the spokesmen here that this measure is a measure for peace, yet we are told to vote for it in another breath, because it is a measure sustaining a position. What position? A war position. Yes; we know that it is a war policy. However, we are not obliged to support it. It is a war program, a war never declared by Congress nor approved by the people. Therefore it is our duty to repudiate it and not support it; to get America out of war and not to go into it deeper.

In regard to the nature of these funds, may I quote the President of the United States himself as to what these appropriations are going to do to America, and I quote from his address made at Chautauqua, N. Y., August 14, 1936, in which he said:

> Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.
>
> It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.
>
> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.
>
> They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.
>
> It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.
>
> If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

The President was right then. I agreed with that speech then. I agree with it now. He has changed, not I. I have opposed his war program from the very beginning, because I knew that it was not in furtherance of the peace or defense of the United States. I knew that it was a policy to create in this country a military reservoir for one side as against the other. Now he and you call it an arsenal policy. I knew that such a policy meant an inexorable march into an imperialist war. Time and events have justified that position of mine, and today in this Congress we are very glibly told that we must do this to defeat Hitler. Yet you know that as a result of this policy you have pulled us into war without the consent of the people, not for democracy but for empire and profits. The only alternative you give us it to go to war with Hitler.

I say there is another alternative. Defeat the Hitler Rome-Tokyo-Berlin Axis, defeat the Wall Street-Downing Street axis, not by plunging America further into war but by getting America out of the war by keeping the peace of America, by extending democracy to more and more Americans, and by giving life to the liberties of Americans. Feed the 52,000,000 shrunken bellies, and no Hitler, no Mussolini, no Churchill, no Japan can ever touch these United States of America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote for this bill simply because the responsibility is upon the President by the passage of the lend-lease bill, which I opposed at the time it was considered here and was sorry to see passed. The reason I take these few minutes is to reply to the gentleman who has just spoken and to refer to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio who stated that we are in the war now. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, we are the greatest cowards and cravens in the United States.

The sole responsibility for war, under the Constitution, rests squarely with the Congress of the United States. That is our prerogative, and not that of the President. Someone found fault with the speech made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], although I did not hear it, in which he said the responsibility for war rests with Hitler. Of course, ever since we repealed the Neutrality Act and changed from a neutral power to a nonbelligerent power, Hitler, Mussolini, or any of the dictators could have found a reason to declare war on us at any time in a legal and proper way, and can do so more today after the passage of the lend-lease bill. Now there is no use hiding behind that. Everybody knows that Mussolini and Hitler are not going to look for trouble with the United States. They are not going to declare war on the United States unless the President of the United States assumes authority which is not given in the lend-lease bill to convoy our ships into belligerent zones. If he does that, then the President of the United States is taking us directly into the war. There is not a man in Congress, no matter to what party he belongs, who does not know that if we convoy our ships they will be sunk and we will be in the war within 30 days.

I have previously stated that I believe what the President has said. He has repeatedly said, "I hate war. I love peace. I am going to keep this country out of war." But if the President repudiates those words by convoying ships or by sending our ships or our troops to Singapore, it is the same thing as declaring war, and that means usurping the constitutional power to declare war of the Congress. In voting for this bill I do so believing the responsibility is now up to the President. If the President assumes the additional responsibility of taking us into war, then that responsibility must rest with the President. But let us, for heaven's sake, face facts and be realists and hush up this talk about being at war.

There is only one issue before the American people, and that issue is peace or war. Ninety percent of the American people still want peace. The responsibility will be on one man if we are taken into war; not upon Hitler or upon Mussolini, but upon the President of the United States if he abuses the power given him under the lend-lease bill by convoying ships or by sending our warships to Singapore.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 4, at the end of line 17, insert the following: "whose post of duty is in the continental United States, unless such person is a citizen of the United States or a person who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen before the date of approval of this act, or who owes allegiance to the United States, or of any person."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer at this time to section 4 is similar in many respects to amendments offered to the various appropriation bills in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses. These amendments referred to have been adopted and provide that no part of any appropriation may be expended to pay the salary or wages for any person other than American citizens or those who have filed a declaration of intention to become an American citizen, or those who owe allegiance to the United States of America.

This amendment is designed to limit the expenditure of funds under the lend-lease bill to American citizens whose position of duty is in the continental United States and to those persons who have filed a declaration of intention to become citizens before the date of approval of this act or who owe allegiance to the United States.

You will note that the present language in section 4 prohibits the payment of funds in the form of salary or wages to those persons, citizens, or aliens who advocate or as a member of an organization joins in advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. This language utterly fails to provide proper safeguards in carrying out the intent of the lend-lease act. We are preparing to spend as the first step 7 billions of dollars in translating the lend-lease law into action.

As a result, we are told that should our country become involved in war, much of the equipment being manufactured for our friends across the sea, will immediately be placed at the disposal of our own Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Since section 4 is aimed at excluding those known to advocate the overthrow of this Government, my amendment will go the whole way in removing the alien from the pay roll of any manufacturer engaged in filling a Government contract under the lend-lease act.

Gentlemen, we must not forget that we have 4,741,971 registered aliens in this country according to figures released by the Department of Justice.

We are not condemning aliens—but gentlemen, as a Nation we are at the crossroads of our destiny. We cannot afford to take a chance on alien enemies being planted in the defense industries of our country for the purpose of sabotaging our efforts to build an adequate national defense.

This amendment is in line with the policy of industry, who has for months required that every employee either produce a birth certificate or evidence of his naturalization. Some of our industries may be lax or sympathetic in applying such a policy but the risk involved is too great to deal lightly with the question.

If this amendment is adopted industry will be called upon to conduct a thorough house cleaning and to scrutinize the background of every employee.

Gentlemen, in conclusion may I remind you that my amendment applies only to expenditures within the continental limits of the United States and has no bearing on any expenditures the President deems necessary to make abroad under the provisions of the lend-lease act.

Gentlemen, I ask your approval of this amendment as a guaranty against the possibility of destructive acts by alien influences. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. May I point out to the Committee that section 4, as the committee has inserted it in this bill, is the language we have put into a number of recent appropriation bills? It has for its purpose the reaching of subversive influences in our defense establishments.

The amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks to engraft on that language would have the effect of preventing any funds under this bill from being paid to any person who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not declared his intention of becoming a citizen. In many of our defense industries we have refugee experts from the democratic countries that have been overthrown. They have come to America and are occupying important posts in our defense industries. It is impossible to know how far reaching such an amendment would be. We have had no opportunity to see just how far it would reach out into our various industries, but we know that we have Canadians and we have citizens of Great Britain who have been brought here and are working in our industries and our plants. I do not want to see any amendment engrafted onto this bill that has not been considered and that may have for its ultimate effect the slowing up of the effort that is going to be made under this bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman mentioned having refugee experts in the United States. Does the gentleman realize that we have experts in their own lines of endeavor on W. P. A. today? Let us take care of the American citizen.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I believe we do not. I believe you cannot find on the W. P. A. any men who are experts along the lines of these men who have been brought here. We have men who have been brought here from Great Britain who are in our defense establishment for the purpose of assisting in this program—assisting in the manufacture of the defense articles that are to go to Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 5, line 9, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: *"And provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person, firm, or corporation that requires, as a condition of employment of any employee, that he either join or not join a labor union; except where prior to the effective date of this act, an employer is under a contract with his regular employees which contains such a condition."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the sole and simple purpose of this amendment is to put a stop now to the unconscionable practice that has aroused the righteous anger and indignation of the American people and which has tended to slow down and sabotage our defense industries. It is the practice, which prevails in every congressional district in the United States, of requiring American citizens to pay tribute to a labor union for the privilege of working for their country. That is the simple proposition which I now present to you.

When I offered this amendment some time ago to a bill, my distinguished colleague from Virginia spoke against the amendment and based his opposition on the proposition that there were many industries now working on defense which had existing closed-shop contracts with their employees. In order to meet that objection, I have changed the amendment so that it will not apply to any firm that now has an existing closed-shop contract, but the amendment will tend to stop these organization drives which are paying more attention to union dues than they are to the defense of our country.

I will give you two brief examples. You have today a strike, about which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] spoke this morning, in the Harvill plant, which is making vital parts for airplanes. This is an organizational strike, a strike for a closed shop. When that particular supply of parts for airplanes, already manufactured, has become exhausted, as the Committee on the Judiciary was told the day before yesterday by an official of the United States Government, airplane production will have to stop until production of those parts is resumed.

You all know about the Allis-Chalmers strike, which has been going on for nearly 2 months in Wisconsin. In that plant they are making vital parts for battle cruisers. Until those parts are made, the cruisers cannot come off the ways.

It is going to be said that this amendment should not be adopted for some psychological reason that I have never been able to understand in that we ought not to put any amendment on this bill. I want to say to you gentlemen that it is equally important that we get this work done as it is to commit the idle gesture of sitting here and appropriating $7,000,000,000, because appropriating $7,000,000,000 is not going to do a nickel's worth of good unless you get it into production.

I want to tell you in conclusion some of the things that are being done under this practice which I am seeking to prevent.

Competent men seeking employment even on direct Government work are required to pay unconscionable fees to union representatives under the guise of initiation fees. Instances of these fees in individual cases run from $23 to $1,500. I have evidence of many instances where inability to pay the required amount has foreclosed the worker from obtaining employment.

The payment of such fees, in many instances, does not admit the employee to membership in the union or to the rights and privileges of union members, but merely gives him a temporary license or permit to work on a single job.

In some instances, in lieu of the so-called initiation fee, he is charged a flat sum per day or per week for a permit to work, for which he likewise receives no union privileges or right of participation in union affairs.

In some instances of so-called jurisdictional controversies, one union, through arbitrary action, will prevent members of other equally legitimate unions from working on Government jobs.

Farm boys, from your district and mine, seeking temporary work as common laborers, are refused employment on Government projects in their own vicinities unless they pay the demanded tribute to a union representative.

Competent unemployed men, who are able to pay the required initiation fee, are refused work until all union men have first been employed.

Contractors, through voluntary agreements with unions, encourage these practices.

Closed-shop demands are at this moment preventing delivery to the Government of finished materials urgently needed, because labor unions have refused to permit the Government to enter and take them out of the factories.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman where the information comes regarding the fee of $1,500.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It came, if I recall correctly, from Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives pertaining to a glaziers union where the Government was seeking at that moment to put glass in the barracks during the month of February for the boys that you put into the Army at $30 a month.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman saying that the labor union required all prospective workers to pay or arrange for the payment of $1,500 in dues?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am saying that was the testimony before the Judiciary Committee, and there are members of the committee here who can verify that.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKEOUGH. As I understand the gentleman's position, he is opposed to the philosophy of the closed shop in relation to union operations.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. During this emergency. And what this amendment seeks to do is exactly what was done by President Wilson in the first war, to fix the status quo of labor unions during this emergency and not permit any organization, labor union, or anything else, to use this emergency in an effort to organize to make money. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my brethren just one word in behalf of the pending amendment. My colleagues, this amendment presents not only a challenge to your courage, but a challenge to your patriotism. This racketeering must be stopped unless we are to be swept into a labor despotism. I am wondering just what the country thinks of us. Are we miserable, cowardly politicians whose first interest is our job, or are we simple, plain, patriotic Americans whose first interest is our country.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents an opportunity, an invitation, and an urge to every member of this Committee to uncover and show to the country just what he is, who he is, and where he stands. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SEVEN BILLION APPROPRIATED BUT A MONKEY WRENCH STOPS THE MACHINERY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, before the day is over Congress will have appropriated $7,000,000,000 to aid Britain, but it lacks either the ability or the courage to prevent Communists and labor racketeers throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery, upon the efficient and continuous operation of which our own national defense depends.

The press tells us this morning that the Army is contemplating some move to end the strike at Wright Field, which has been delaying the War Department's operations for some 3 weeks.

An editorial in one of the Washington morning papers complains of the strike

at Allis-Chalmers, which is in its fifty-sixth day, and assigns as one reason for its complaint the fact that some officials of the company object to a closed shop. Does the writer of the Post editorial take the position that no American citizen is to work on the defense program until he has paid tribute to the C. I. O. union? That is the issue at the Chalmers plant.

Is it true that this Congress has arrived at the decision that no one shall be permitted to work for national defense until he meets the demands of a particular union, which assumes to have authority in a designated city, to determine who shall and who shall not work?

As has been pointed out time and again on the floor here, in one city one group of union men and nonunion men cannot work because of the demands of a rival union. In another city, the situation is reversed. Meanwhile, as a House committee was told and as we learn from the public press, in plants the operation of which is absolutely essential if we are to have the production of aircraft, strikes are tying up and delaying both the Army and the Navy.

And do not try to, because you cannot, ignore the fact that these strikes are not tying up the production of automobiles, of radios, of anything that is not essential to national defense. These strikes, you will note, are in strategic plants. They are called and carried on in plants supplying, it may be, but a very small portion of the parts necessary for the building of implements of war or for the operation of munitions plants, but they are called where their success is disastrous to the whole program.

Oh, the President talks loudly when he defies Hitler, but right here at home he lets union officials and Communists ride roughshod over our people. He may be a Samson when he talks and acts against the Axis Powers, but he is a shorn Samson after his union Delilah gets through with him; and, if he continues his present course, he will have the whole temple of disunion down about his ears.

Why defy Hitler, when we know, as we do know now, that right here at home fulfillment of the effort to send aid to Britain, of the effort to strengthen our own Nation, is being undermined by those who defy our own Government?

Appropriate $7,000,000,000, send convoys, a fleet, and finally an army, to insure freedom and equality of opportunity to the people of the Old World, while here at home those who must pay the cost are denied freedom of action, the right to go to their jobs; denied equal opportunity to work in our factories.

Thirteen affiliates of the A. F. of L. have announced a policy of no strikes in defense industries, and my understanding is that that is the recommendation of the national organization.

As long as Sidney Hillman remains on the Defense Council as the representative of labor there is no prospect that strikes in key plants will be lessened.

He has persistently supported the policy of the closed shop, which denies to millions of patriotic Americans the right to work in defense of their homeland. He is on the pay roll of a union which believes in the closed shop.

If he has not actually acted as the foreman of wrecking crews, he has advocated, fought for, the result which they seek to accomplish—the denial of work to other than members of their own organization. Neither the foreman of a wrecking crew nor one who believes in the policy of an organization which uses a wrecking crew can successfully function as chief of a construction gang.

Hillman has lost much of the influence he might have had with nonunion employees or with employees of rival unions. It has recently been demonstrated that he has lost influence with members of his own organization.

Appearing recently before the Judiciary Committee, he testified, in substance, that when he, as a member of the Defense Council, called upon the C. I. O. to end a strike, to go back to work, he would be obeyed.

Recently he called upon the strikers at the Vanadium Corporation at Bridgeville, Pa., to load two carloads of ferrovanadium and vanadium oxide. The strikers were members of a C. I. O. union. Hillman is vice president of the national organization. The strikers' answer was an emphatic no. Governor James was forced to, and did, send State motor police to protect the men who actually loaded the cars.

That material belonged to the United States Government. The request for the loading was a request from an official of the Government, who was also an official of the labor union to which the strikers owe allegiance. Nevertheless, Hillman, a Government official, vice president of the national C. I. O., was unable to obtain the delivery of that much-needed material, and it required the use of force by the State of Pennsylvania to secure delivery.

The passage by this Congress of either one of the two bills I have offered and the enforcement of the law would lessen, if it did not end, these acts which tend to destroy the effect of any appropriation which we may make.

If this House cannot act until it receives word from the Executive, and if he means what he said last Saturday night, let him, before he goes on his vacation, send word down to the House leadership to act without further delay.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Having voted for the lease-lend bill, I, of course, expect to vote for this bill to implement the policy adopted in that act. I want to see our people make an all-out effort in this policy to defeat the Axis Powers. I do not want to see any monkey wrenches thrown into the machinery, and that is all that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] would accomplish if his amendment were adopted. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] both talk about strikes. I defy anybody to find anything in the language of this amendment that in any way makes it unlawful to strike or that provides any machinery for preventing strikes. It is just not here. This amendment does only one thing. It undertakes to outlaw the labor unions in this country and to prevent them from collecting dues and initiation fees. I do not stand here for the purpose of defending any $1,500 initiation fee. If any such fee has been charged, I would condemn it just as would the gentleman from Virginia. I am not here to defend charges regarding initiation fees collected on construction projects in our national-defense program where there has been abuse, and I think there has been abuse in some cases; but we have orderly processes by which we legislate here on fundamental questions, and the gentleman from Virginia has a bill now being heard before the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, and he ought to wait his opportunity there and not throw monkey wrenches into the machinery in this bill to implement the program our people have adopted.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As the gentleman knows, many American citizens are disturbed and apprehensive about the greatly increasing number of strikes in defense industries; but, as I understand from the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], as just pointed out by the gentleman from Virginia, the amendment in no way whatever seeks to reach that situation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not attempt to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But merely deals with the situation where trade-unions have been charged with the practice of charging exorbitant fees and requiring people to join a union before they could work.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my interpretation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I cannot yield.

The amendment does not deal with the question of strikes. May I point out to the House that only today I was informed by a member of the press that the President of the United States has issued an Executive order setting up a mediation board to deal with the strike situation. Nobody deplores the strikes that have happened any more than I do. I go further than that, and say I think it is the worst kind of judgment in the world for any union to call a strike in a national-defense industry, and I condemn that action. But we should not throw monkey wrenches into this national-defense machinery by ill-considered amendments such as this, and I hope it will be voted down. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has been offered, I think, on three previous appropriation bills, substantially in the form that it is offered as an amendment to this bill. Each time the Committee of the Whole House has defeated the

amendment. As I recollect, the last time the amendment was offered it was defeated by a vote of 80 to 11 on a standing vote.

It is dangerous to incorporate an amendment of this kind in any appropriation bill on the floor. We all have respect for the legislative committees, the committees of which we are members. We know that the Committee on the Judiciary is now, and has been for some time, conducting hearings on this very question. We know that that committee is going into the matter very exhaustively. What the recommendations of the committee will be no one knows now, but the fact is that, in the regular way that Congress functions, in the normal and sound way, the Committee on the Judiciary is now giving consideration to the very questions in all of their aspects that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] tries to have decided on the floor of the House.

The gentleman from Virginia condemns—properly so—certain practices. So do I. But we do not want to indict all of organized labor for what a few have done. Let us get at the wrongdoers. Let us not overlook the fact that organized labor in England is patriotic. Organized labor in England has responded to the call and organized labor in the United States, looking at organized labor as a whole, is just as patriotic as any Member of this Congress. [Applause.]

We do not want to put ourselves in the position of indicting labor as a whole for some of the contemptible tactics of a few, and we do not want to put ourselves in the position of affronting all of labor when we know that labor, looking over the entire picture, are loyal, constant, and fine American citizens.

I challenge the position taken by my distinguished and learned friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] when he says that this is an issue as to whether or not we are cowards. Certainly the issue is not one of whether or not we are cowards on this question but one of common sense; whether we are to put an amendment of this kind into a bill on the floor, and whether we ought to do it at a time when one of the great committees of our House is giving profound consideration to the question. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were ayes 70 and noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 5, line 9, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: "*And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used directly or indirectly to pay the salary or wages of any employee who shall, after the effective date of this act, engage or participate in any so-called jurisdictional strike or strike to protest against or prevent the employment of any person who belongs or does not belong to a labor union, provided that, for the purpose hereof, an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not engaged or participated in such a strike."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that time was limited on the paragraph and all amendments thereto, and that time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4050) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAMBERTSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendments: At the end of section 1 add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the emplacement of facilities, the extension of plants, the acquisition of sites, the manufacture of defense articles, or compensation for the procurement or manufacture thereof outside the boundaries of the United States or the Canal Zone."

On page 4 between lines 15 and 16 insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. *Provided*, That no part of the defense articles procured from funds appropriated herein shall be disposed of to any foreign government unless such government, or some other foreign government on its behalf, shall guarantee the reimbursement of the cost thereof by transferring to the United States, if available, property as collateral security."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAMBERTSON) there were—ayes 103, noes 182.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 132, nays 258, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—132

Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Paddock
Andersen, H. Carl	Gilchrist	Pheiffer, William T.
Anderson, Calif.	Gillie	Ploeser
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Reece, Tenn.
Angell	Grant, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Arends	Guyer, Kans.	Rees, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne	Rich
Baumhart	Halleck	Rizley
Bender	Harness	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bennett	Hartley	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Hess	Rockefeller
Blackney	Hill, Colo.	Rodgers, Pa.
Bolton	Hinshaw	Rogers, Mass.
Bradley, Mich.	Hoffman	Rolph
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Rutherford
Burdick	Howell	Sauthoff
Carlson	Hull	Scott
Carter	Jarrett	Shafer, Mich.
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Ohio	Short
Chenoweth	Johns	Simpson
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Johnson, Ill.	Springer
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Stefan
Coffee, Nebr.	Jones	Stratton
Cole, N. Y.	Jonkman	Sumner, Ill.
Copeland	Kean	Sweeney
Crawford	Kinzer	Taber
Crowther	Knutson	Talle
Culkin	Kunkel	Tibbott
Cunningham	Lambertson	Tinkham
Day	Landis	Treadway
Dewey	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Dirksen	McGregor	Vorys, Ohio
Ditter	Maas	Welch
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Wheat
Dworshak	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Elston	Mason	Wilson
Engel	Michener	Winter
Englebright	Mott	Wolcott
Fellows	Mundt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fenton	Murray	Woodruff, Mich.
Gale	O'Connor	Youngdahl
Gearhart	O'Hara	
Gehrmann	Oliver	
	Osmers	

NAYS—258

Allen, La.	Casey, Mass.	Edelstein
Anderson, N. Mex.	Chapman	Edmiston
Andrews	Clark	Elliot, Mass.
Arnold	Claypool	Elliott, Calif.
Baldwin	Cluett	Ellis
Barden	Cochran	Faddis
Barnes	Coffee, Wash.	Fitzgerald
Barry	Cole, Md.	Fitzpatrick
Bates, Ky.	Colmer	Flaherty
Beam	Connery	Flannagan
Beckworth	Cooley	Flannery
Beiter	Cooper	Fogarty
Bell	Costello	Folger
Bland	Courtney	Forand
Boehne	Cox	Ford, Leland M.
Boggs	Cravens	Ford, Miss.
Boland	Creal	Ford, Thomas F.
Bonner	Crosser	Fulmer
Boykin	Cullen	Gamble
Brooks	D'Alesandro	Gathings
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ohio	Gavagan
Bryson	Davis, Tenn.	Geyer, Calif.
Buckler, Minn.	Dickstein	Gibson
Buckley, N. Y.	Dies	Gore
Bulwinkle	Dingell	Gossett
Burch	Disney	Granger
Burgin	Doughton	Grant, Ala.
Byrne	Douglas	Gregory
Camp	Downs	Haines
Canfield	Doxey	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Cannon, Fla.	Drewry	Hall, Leonard W.
Cannon, Mo.	Duncan	Hancock
Capozzoli	Durham	Hare
Cartwright	Eaton	
	Eberharter	

Harrington	Maciora	Schuetz
Harris	Magnuson	Schulte
Harter	Mahon	Scrugham
Hébert	Mansfield	Shanley
Heffernan	Marcantonio	Sheppard
Hendricks	May	Sheridan
Hill, Wash.	Merritt	Sikes
Hobbs	Meyer, Md.	Smith, Conn.
Holbrock	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Maine
Holmes	Mitchell	Smith, Pa.
Hook	Monroney	Smith, Va.
Houston	Moser	Smith, Wash.
Hunter	Murdock	Smith, W. Va.
Imhoff	Myers, Pa.	Snyder
Izac	Nelson	Somers, N. Y.
Jackson	Nichols	South
Jarman	Norrell	Sparkman
Johnson, Luther A.	Norton	Spence
	O'Brien, Mich.	Starnes, Ala.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Steagall
	O'Leary	Stearns, N. H.
Johnson, Okla.	O'Neal	Sullivan
Johnson, W. Va.	O'Toole	Sumners, Tex.
Kee	Pace	Sutphin
Kefauver	Patman	Tarver
Kelley, Pa.	Patrick	Tenerowicz
Kennedy, Martin J.	Patton	Terry
	Pearson	Thom
Kennedy, Michael J.	Peterson, Fla.	Thomas, N. J.
	Peterson, Ga.	Thomas, Tex.
Keogh	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Tolan
Kerr		Traynor
Kilburn	Pierce	Vincent, Ky.
Kilday	Pittenger	Vinson, Ga.
Kirwan	Plumley	Voorhis, Calif.
Kleberg	Poage	Vreeland
Kocialkowski	Powers	Walter
Kopplemann	Priest	Ward
Kramer	Rabaut	Wasielewski
Lanham	Ramspeck	Weaver
Larrabee	Randolph	Weiss
Lea	Rankin, Miss.	Wene
Leavy	Richards	West
Lesinski	Robertson, Va.	Whelchel
Lewis	Robinson, Utah	White
Lynch	Rogers, Okla.	Whittington
McCormack	Romjue	Williams
McGehee	Russell	Wolverton, N. J.
McGranery	Sabath	Woodrum, Va.
McIntyre	Sacks	Worley
McKeough	Sanders	Wright
McLaughlin	Sasscer	Young
McLean	Satterfield	Zimmerman
McMillan	Scanlon	

NOT VOTING—39

Bloom	Hart	Plauché
Bolles	Healey	Ramsay
Boren	Heidinger	Rankin, Mont.
Bradley, Pa.	Jacobsen	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Jenks, N. H.	Rivers
Celler	Jensen	Schaefer, Ill.
Collins	Keefe	Secrest
Curtis	Kelly, Ill.	Shannon
Delaney	Ludlow	Stevenson
Domengeaux	McArdle	Taylor
Fish	Maciejewski	Thill
Gifford	Mills, La.	Thomason
Green	O'Day	Wadsworth

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thill for, with Mr. Healey against.
Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Stevenson for, with Mr. Secrest against.
Mr. Jensen for, with Mr. Ludlow against.
Mr. Heidinger for, with Mr. Kelly of Illinois against.
Mr. Keefe for, with Mr. Hart against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Green with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Plauché.
Mr. Domengeaux with Miss Rankin of Montana.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Mills of Louisiana with Mr. Fish.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Shannon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 336, nays 55, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—336

Allen, La.	Drewry	Kennedy, Martin J.
Anderson, Calif.	Duncan	
Anderson, N. Mex.	Durham	Kennedy, Michael J.
	Eaton	
Andresen, August H.	Eberharter	Keogh
	Edelstein	Kerr
Andrews	Edmiston	Kilburn
Angell	Eliot, Mass.	Kilday
Arends	Elliott, Calif.	Kinzer
Arnold	Ellis	Kirwan
Baldwin	Elston	Kleberg
Barden	Englebright	Kocialkowski
Barnes	Faddis	Kopplemann
Barry	Fellows	Kramer
Bates, Ky.	Fenton	Kunkel
Bates, Mass.	Fitzgerald	Lanham
Baumhart	Fitzpatrick	Larrabee
Beam	Flaherty	Lea
Beckworth	Flannagan	Leavy
Beiter	Flannery	LeCompte
Bell	Fogarty	Lesinski
Bender	Folger	Lewis
Blackney	Forand	Lynch
Bland	Ford, Leland M.	McCormack
Boehne	Ford, Miss.	McGehee
Boggs	Ford, Thomas F.	McGranery
Boland	Fulmer	McGregor
Bolton	Gamble	McIntyre
Bonner	Gathings	McKeough
Boykin	Gavagan	McLaughlin
Brooks	Gearhart	McLean
Brown, Ga.	Gerlach	McMillan
Brown, Ohio	Geyer, Calif.	Maas
Bryson	Gibson	Maciejewski
Buckler, Minn.	Gilchrist	Maciora
Buckley, N. Y.	Gore	Magnuson
Bulwinkle	Gossett	Mahon
Burch	Graham	Mansfield
Burdick	Granger	Martin, Iowa
Burgin	Grant, Ala.	Martin, Mass.
Byrne	Gregory	Mason
Camp	Guyer, Kans.	May
Canfield	Gwynne	Merritt
Cannon, Fla.	Haines	Meyer, Md.
Cannon, Mo.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Michener
Capozzoli		Mills, Ark.
Carlson	Hall, Leonard W.	Mitchell
Carter		Monroney
Cartwright	Halleck	Moser
Case, S. Dak.	Hancock	Mott
Casey, Mass.	Hare	Mundt
Chapman	Harness	Murdock
Clark	Harris	Myers, Pa.
Clason	Harter	Nelson
Claypool	Hartley	Nichols
Cluett	Hébert	Norrell
Cochran	Heffernan	Norton
Coffee, Wash.	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.
Cole, Md.	Hess	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Hill, Wash.	O'Leary
Colmer	Hinshaw	O'Neal
Connery	Hobbs	Osmers
Cooley	Holbrock	O'Toole
Cooper	Holmes	Pace
Costello	Hook	Paddock
Courtney	Hope	Patman
Cox	Houston	Patrick
Cravens	Howell	Patton
Creal	Hunter	Pearson
Crosser	Imhoff	Peterson, Fla.
Culkin	Izac	Peterson, Ga.
Cullen	Jackson	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Cunningham	Jarman	
D'Alesandro	Jarrett	Pheiffer, William T.
Davis, Ohio	Jenkins, Ohio	
Davis, Tenn.	Jennings	Pierce
Dewey	Johnson, Ind.	Pittenger
Dickstein	Johnson, Luther A.	Plumley
Dies		Poage
Dingell	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Powers
Dirksen		Priest
Disney	Johnson, Okla.	Rabaut
Ditter	Johnson, W. Va.	Ramspeck
Doughton	Kean	Randolph
Douglas	Kee	Rankin, Miss.
Downs	Kefauver	Reece, Tenn.
Doxey	Kelley, Pa.	Rees, Kans.
Richards	Smith, Maine	Van Zandt
Rizley	Smith, Pa.	Vincent, Ky.
Robertson, N. Dak.	Smith, Va.	Vinson, Ga.
	Smith, Wash.	Voorhis, Calif.
Robertson, Va.	Smith, W. Va.	Vorys, Ohio
Robinson, Utah	Snyder	Vreeland
Rockefeller	Somers, N. Y.	Walter
Rodgers, Pa.	South	Ward
Rogers, Mass.	Sparkman	Wasielewski
Rogers, Okla.	Spence	Weaver
Rolph	Springer	Weiss
Romjue	Starnes, Ala.	Welch
Russell	Steagall	Wene
Rutherford	Stearns, N. H.	West
Sabath	Sullivan	Wheat
Sacks	Sumners, Tex.	Whelchel
Sanders	Sutphin	Whittington
Sasscer	Taber	Wigglesworth
Satterfield	Talle	Williams
Scanlon	Tarver	Winter
Schuetz	Tenerowicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Schulte	Terry	Wolverton, N. J.
Scott	Thom	Woodrum, Va.
Scrugham	Thomas, N. J.	Worley
Sheppard	Thomas, Tex.	Wright
Sheridan	Tibbott	Young
Sikes	Tolan	Youngdahl
Simpson	Traynor	Zimmerman
Smith, Conn.	Treadway	

NAYS—55

Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Ploeser
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
	Harrington	Rich
Bennett	Hill, Colo.	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Hoffman	Sauthoff
Bradley, Mich.	Hull	Shafer, Mich.
Chenoweth	Johns	Shanley
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Short
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Coffee, Nebr.	Jones	Stefan
Copeland	Jonkman	Stratton
Crawford	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Crowther	Lambertson	Sweeney
Day	Landis	Tinkham
Dondero	Marcantonio	White
Dworshak	Murray	Wilson
Engel	O'Connor	Wolcott
Gale	O'Hara	Woodruff, Mich.
Gehrmann	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—38

Bloom	Hart	Ramsay
Bolles	Healey	Rankin, Mont.
Boren	Heidinger	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Jacobsen	Rivers
Buck	Jenks, N. H.	Schaefer, Ill.
Celler	Jensen	Secrest
Collins	Keefe	Shannon
Curtis	Kelly, Ill.	Stevenson
Delaney	Ludlow	Taylor
Domengeaux	McArdle	Thill
Fish	Mills, La.	Thomason
Gifford	O'Day	Wadsworth
Green	Plauché	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jensen for, with Mr. Thill against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Curtis against.
Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Keefe against.
Mr. Healey for, with Mr. Ludlow against.
Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. Stevenson against.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois for, with Mr. Heidinger against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Green with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Miss Rankin of Montana.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Plauché.
Mr. Collins with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Mills of Louisiana with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Ramsay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIRPLANE CONTRACTS

Mr. FADDIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted an adverse report on House Resolution 140, which is as follows:

House Resolution 140

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives all such information as he may possess or which may be available in the War Department to answer the following questions:

1. Did the War Department on or about the 11th day of March 1939 call for bids contemplating a quantity procurement of new and improved designs of training (primary) airplanes in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (t) of section 10 of the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 788) (in conjunction with and), based upon procedure set forth in paragraphs (a) 2 (i) of said act known as Circular Proposal 39-635?

2. Did this bid call for the purchase of an airplane already in production?

3. How many bids were received by virtue of said call?

4. What were the names and addreses of those who submitted bids at that time?

5. When and where were the bids opened?

6. At the time of the opening of the bids, did the records show, according to the bids submitted, the Lenert Aircraft Corporation, of Pontiac, Mich., to be the lowest bidder?

7. Was a contract ever awarded to the lowest bidder in this competition?

8. What was the price submitted by the Lenert Aircraft Corporation according to the above bid?

9. Was a contract of purchase ever awarded within the provisions of law upon which the calling of bids was based and, if so, was a new and modern design purchased or was a contract awarded for an airplane already in production that was not of new and modern design?

10. If a contract was awarded, give the terms of the contract and the description of the airplane so purchased together with the price paid thereon and all subsequent additional awards based on their original contract.

11. Did the Army accept an airplane model which had been in production for approximately 10 years as a new and modern design?

12. Did the Lenert Aircraft Corporation of Pontiac, Mich., post a $60,000 bid bond conditioned on the performance of any contract awarded to the Lenert Aircraft Corporation in accordance with their bid?

13. What was the bid price submitted by the Stearman Aircraft Corporation?

14. Did the Lenert Aircraft Corporation file a protest with the War Department within 10 days after the decision of the War Department on said bids or the awarding of a contract thereof?

15. Was the proposed airplane according to the design submitted by the Lenert Aircraft Corporation based on the provisions contained in the Army Handbook?

16. Did the Army ever evaluate the design submitted by the Lenert Aircraft Corporation and, if so, by whom and when was the report made? What was the rating earned by the evaluation?

17. What was the rating earned by the next higher rated design (for design only) entered in this competition?

18. Was a contract ever awarded to the Stearman Corporation for the first 100 airplanes, "and later 400 additional," for a biplane design contrary to the advertisement?

19. Was a hearing denied the Lenert Aircraft Corporation after it requested same?

20. Did the evaluation board change the requirements of the designs after bids were accepted or opened?

21. At what date was the official decision made to require a flying model to comply with Circular Proposal 39-635?

22. Did the Army refuse to consider the offer made to Major Lyons by officials of the Lenert Aircraft Corporation that they would allow their $60,000 bond to cover the performance of one airplane if an order was given according to the bid for one airplane at $10,000?

23. Did the Army make a survey or evaluate the production facilities of the Lenert Aircraft Corporation at Pontiac, Mich., before awarding the contract from bids received on Circular Proposal 39-635?

24. By whom and on what date was the first inspection of the Lenert Aircraft Corporation at Pontiac, Mich., made?

25. Was there any correspondence between Mr. Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, and Mr. Wiley Lenert, president of the Lenert Aircraft Corporation, concerning this controversy?

26. Is there any record of the Army showing any conferences or conversations between Mr. Lenert and the Assistant Secretary of War or any other War Department official?

27. After the award on Circular Proposal 39-635 of approximately 500 airplanes, what was final delivery date of the last airplane on this original 500 order?

28. To date how many airplanes have been ordered from and how many airplanes have been delivered by the Stearman Corporation resulting from awards from Circular Proposal 39-635?

29. From July 6, 1939, to date, how many and at what price were primary trainer type airplanes purchased from Fairchild Engine and Airplane Corporation?

30. From July 6, 1939, to date, how many and at what price were primary trainer type airplanes purchased from Ryan Aeronautical Co.?

31. State on what date a full and complete schedule was made out by the War Department of airplanes, by types, listing contracts to be awarded to various manufacturers for the entire 50,000 airplanes scheduled for the first year as proposed by President Roosevelt in his defense-program speech of May 16, 1940.

32. Did the Army refuse to let the Lenert Aircraft Corporation or the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation participate in this 50,000-airplane program?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, who introduced this resolution?

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House this afternoon. In view of the lateness of the hour I shall not take this time now, but I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, March 25, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MARKETING QUOTAS—PEANUTS

Mr. PACE submited a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the New York Times of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the bill H. R. 4050.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in Committee of the Whole on H. R. 4050 and include therein an editorial from the Daily News of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MCMILLAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. One is to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution of the executive council of the International Association of Machinists, and the other is to include a radio speech on the work of the Farm Security Administration, by John B. Hughes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague, the able and distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address he delivered last night on the subject of superhighways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 4050.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today by including a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the bill this afternoon and to include a statement of British investments in Latin America as published in the South American Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] was here during the debate, but had to leave just a few minutes before the roll call. He has prepared a statement which he left with me and I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I am 100 percent for this bill. I have actively supported all national-defense measures and am for all reasonable and proper aid to Britain and other democracies fighting for freedom and justice.

I must leave the city in a few minutes on important business, and it may be impossible for me to be present when the record vote is taken. If I were here I would vote against the motion to recommit the bill, and on final passage would vote for it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I also add the request that I be permitted to insert certain excerpts from the President's speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief editorial from the El Progresso, an Italian newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and my reason for making this request is that there is a bill coming up tomorrow relating to the warehousing of cotton, and the rule, of course, will probably take 1 hour, and there will probably be 3 hours of general debate. I also assume there will be considerable debate under the 5-minute rule, and I am anxious to dispose of the bill tomorrow because on Friday it is the intention to bring up the fifth supplemental appropriation bill and pass it that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I am constrained to object. I have talked to some members of the Banking and Currency Committee. They do not think it advisable to come in at 11 o'clock. The reason given to me is that they have not had time, because of the debate on the bill that we have just voted on, to refresh their memory of the testimony given before the committee. Although this is an important bill, from the standpoint of some of the warehousemen, it is not important enough to make it necessary for us to come in early and work late to get it out of the way. The only argument used that we would have to bring this bill on tomorrow anyway is because of the announcement by the Commodity Credit Corporation that, unless the bill is passed by the 23d of the month, a certain policy will be adopted in respect to warehousing cotton. Therefore we have almost a week before it is necessary to pass the bill, and I have reasonable assurance from the Commodity Credit Corporation that it will not change its policy while this legislation is pending. Because of the objection of the committee, because of that situation, if the gentleman presses it, I will be forced to object, although I appreciate what he is up against in respect to the deficiency bill on the day following.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are circumstances that would not permit the bill to go over until Monday, and it is not because of the consideration, but because of other circumstances, that I assure the gentleman I would give recognition to, and did, in forming the program for the House. Thursday is the day that the bill could come up to accommodate Members who have very important engagements over the week-end and on Monday.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I can assure the gentleman that there will be an attempt made to defeat the rule, and if we can get any reasonable support on the gentleman's side we might be able to dispose of the bill in an hour's time tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is now making an argument that I cannot take cognizance of. Of course, if the gentleman is going to insist on his objection, I shall withdraw my request. On the other hand, I hope the gentleman will not maintain his position.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I feel I must object to keep faith with other members of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would never ask the gentleman to take a position which constituted a breach of faith.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, I do not think it goes quite so far as a breach of faith.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RAMSAY, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. THOMASON, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. LESINSKI, for the week of March 24, on account of business.

To Mr. WARD, for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 326. An act to amend section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, relating to the definition of agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 657. An act for the relief of certain United States Commissioners; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 681. An act for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 931. An act for the relief of Robert B. Ayers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1022. An act for the relief of Richard Gammon; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1075. An act for the relief of George S. Geer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1076. An act for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke; to the Committee on Claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 20, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 20, 1941, to resume hearings on H. R. 3684, freight forwarders.

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 27, 1941, to begin hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Thursday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock, on H. R. 10 and H. R. 3514.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet to hold hearings on river and harbor improvement projects, as follows: Thursday, March 20, 1941, Connecticut River, Hartford, Conn., to Holyoke, Mass.; Tuesday, March 25, 1941, Alafia River, Tampa Harbor, Fla.; and Tuesday, March 25, 1941, waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers. All meetings to start at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, March 20, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 76, H. R. 1102, H. R. 1103, H. R. 1598, H. R. 1727, H. R. 3937, and other bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

362. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

363. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to repeal sections 512, 513, 514, 515 as amended, 3744 as amended, 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., secs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 18, and 19), and of the act of February 4, 1929 (ch. 146 of 45 Statutes at Large, 1147; 41 U. S. C. 4a); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

364. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of January 1941 (H. Doc. No. 148); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

365. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide home care for dependent children in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

366. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on reexamination of Guilford Harbor, Conn., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 9, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 149); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

367. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Board of Investigation and Research provided by part I, title III, of the Transportation Act of 1940 (H. Doc. No. 150); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

368. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Sixth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 111. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Digest of the State Laws Affecting the Hard of Hearing and the Deaf" as a document; without amendment (Rept. No. 279). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 148. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Our National Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" as a public document, with illustrations; without amendment (Rept. No. 280). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 149. Resolution for the consideration of S. 262, an act regulating the warehousing, storage, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 281). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3869. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3752. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises, or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended November 30, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3. A bill to invest the circuit courts of appeals of the United States with original and exclusive jurisdiction to review the order of detention of any alien ordered deported from the United States whose deportation or departure from the United States otherwise is not effectuated within 90 days after the date the warrant of deportation shall have become final; to authorize such detention orders in certain cases; to provide places for such detention; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4036. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act, approved May 3, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 285). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FULMER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3546. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 287). Ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Resolution 140. Resolution requesting the Secretary of War to furnish information which may answer certain questions relating to airplane contracts (Rept. No. 286). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 4078. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDELSTEIN:

H. R. 4079. A bill to subordinate the lien of the United States in cases of voluntary assignment to claims due wage earners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4080. A bill to give certain warrant officers and enlisted men who are retired with wartime rank the retired pay and allowances of such rank; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOUGH:

H. R. 4081. A bill to exempt insurance policies from tax liens and distraint and sale under the tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4082. A bill to repeal the provision relating to compulsory removal from the rolls of Work Projects Administration workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4083. A bill to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to dispose of property coming into his possession; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4084. A bill to create a board to be known as the Accident Prevention Board, composed of three members, whose duties shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the District of Columbia in relation to their working conditions; enforce such safety laws as exist, and others that may be from time to time enacted; make such inspections and investigations as are necessary; collect and compile statistical information; to require employers to keep their places of employment safe; to require employers to keep records and to furnish Accident Prevention Board with complete, detailed reports relative to all accidents; to bring necessary suits and institute such prosecutions as may be necessary to enforce the safety laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 4085. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of bridges across the Monongahela River in Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 4086. A bill to make unlawful interstate commerce in convict-made and convict-produced agricultural commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 4087. A bill to authorize research and experiments to find new uses for anthracite coal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 4088. A bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to charter and purchase available vessels of domestic and foreign registry and to provide necessary insurance and reinsurance for such vessels and their operations; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland:

H. R. 4102. A bill to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793) as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 4103. A bill to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4104. A bill to require certain persons to supply information with respect to certain addresses and writings by them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to amend section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse the various measures taken by the President and the Congress of the United States in regard to national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass upon proposed legislation relative to the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Detroit Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the State of North Dakota, requesting consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the State of Iowa, requesting consideration of their resolution with reference to amendments to the Constitution to consider amending the first sentence of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment so that the same shall read: "Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of citizens in each State"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 4089. A bill granting a pension to Claud Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 4090. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Hipp; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 4091. A bill granting a pension to Mary O. Lyman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4092. A bill for the relief of E. P. Corley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4093. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Frazee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4094. A bill for the relief of Rear Admiral William L. Calhoun, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IMHOFF:

H. R. 4095. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elmer E. Wilson; to the Committee in Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4096. A bill for the relief of James L. Kackley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4097. A bill granting a pension to Harry C. B. Frets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 4098. A bill for the relief of Wallace B. Bogart; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Louise Holcomb, George Holcomb, and Cliff Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM:

H. R. 4101. A bill granting a pension to Grace Case; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

506. By Mr. BURDICK: Senate Concurrent Resolution O, Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Public Roads.

507. Also, Senate Concurrent Resolution Y, Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

508. Also, Senate Concurrent Resolution P, Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

509. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of South Dakota, as embodied in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11, urging Congress to give careful consideration to the need for emergency appropriations for construction of strategic military roads; to the Committee on Appropriations.

510. By Mr. GILCHRIST: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, asking the Congress to call a convention to consider and adopt an amendment to the first sentence of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution so that the same shall read: "Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of citizens in each State"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

511. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of the postal employees of Hearne, Tex., favoring House bill 1057; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

512. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Allied Dental Council of Greater New York, concerning the Murray bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

513. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., concerning Senate bill 279 and House bill 1585, to establish a construction reserve fund; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

514. By Mr. LEWIS: Memorial of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact into law Senate bill 860, a bill to prohibit the sale and possession of alcoholic liquors upon the premises of any camp or cantonment used for military purposes and to prohibit such sale or possession within such distances of any military camp or cantonment as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may determine is necessary for the efficiency, health, and welfare of the members of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

515. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Finnish American Relief Committee, Inc., New York City, urging a loan to Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

516. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23, adopted by Michigan State Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact legislation relative to the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

517. Also, resolution of the Detroit Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Committee, urging legislation for completion of Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

518. Also, resolution of the Detroit Housing Commission, relative to amendments to Lanham Act; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

519. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa, petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and that said convention, when so called, shall consider amending the first sentence of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment so that the same shall read: "Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of citizens in each State"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

520. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Racine, Wis., requesting consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of legislation for General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary

521. Also, petition of the board of directors of Southern Illinois Coals, Inc., favoring passage of joint resolution in regard to the continuation of the National Bituminous Coal Act of 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

522. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Uniontown, Pa., concerning House bill 3789, providing for daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

523. Also, petition of the Association of Highway Officials of North Atlantic States, endorsing defense-highway appropriations now pending in Congress, and urging immediate action by the Federal Government to construct a superhighway between Boston and Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of the living God, who dost kindle in the thoughts and hearts and wills of men the zeal whereby alone great tasks are brought unto fruition: We bless Thee for this undying motion within us, the longing to attain, which is the pledge of a nobler selfhood that is yet to be, and grant that in these darksome days we may keep our faith in the greatness of man and in the unseen things which are eternal.

Help us in the midst of the noisy clamor of the world today ever to cherish those sacred instincts of the heart that constrain to prayer and worship, that speak of a hidden world, a light beyond, and avouch a Father's boundless love. Strengthen us that we may endure whatever may befall, as the sadness and severity of life shall make us conscious of our utter need of Thee, for Thou alone art the hope of our country and of all the nations of the world. When at last the labors of the day are ended and the night cometh

when no man can work, may Thy light illumine our way and may the rod and the staff of Thy divine shepherding be our comfort still. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 17, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him;

H. R. 1060. An act to vest absolute in the city of Dearborn the title to lot 19 of the Detroit Arsenal grounds subdivision, Wayne County, Mich.;

H. R. 1771. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2302. An act to adjust the boundaries of the Cedar Breaks National Monument and the Dixie National Forest, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2611. An act to release all the interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the right-of-way granted to the Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of July 1, 1862, as amended and supplemented;

H. R. 2765. An act to repeal an obsolete section of the District of Columbia Code;

H. R. 3252. An act to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3362. An act to amend the act of May 24, 1940 (Public, No. 520, 76th Cong.);

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; and

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the Commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes.

RECEIPT AND REFERENCE OF A HOUSE BILL DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 17th instant,

On Wednesday, March 19, 1941, the Secretary of the Senate received from the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 4050) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Nye
Aiken	Ellender	O'Mahoney
Andrews	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Glass	Reynolds
Barbour	Green	Russell
Barkley	Guffey	Schwartz
Bilbo	Gurney	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Smathers
Brewster	Herring	Smith
Bridges	Hill	Stewart
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Brown	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Truman
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Byrnes	Lodge	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chavez	McKellar	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	White
Connally	Murdock	Wiley
Danaher	Murray	Willis
Davis	Norris	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER and Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

Mr. MCNARY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

METAL FOR MINOR COINS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

W. R. LARKIN AND DORA LARKIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall irrigation project, Idaho (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PLAZA AND PAN AMERICAN UNION BUILDING

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a Pan American Plaza and a site for an office building for the Pan American Union (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement and development of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF CONSUMERS' COUNSEL DIVISION, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Consumers' Counsel Division in the office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, covering the period from July 1, 1939, to October 31, 1940 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

LANDS OF COPPER RIVER AND NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY CO., ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Copper River and Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska for use as a public highway, tramroad or tramway, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

GIFTS FOR THE FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the Freedmen's Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the International Woodworkers of America, of Westwood, Calif., favoring the enactment of the so-called Pierce bill, House bill 615, to conserve the forests of Oregon, Washington, and California, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the City Council of New Bedford, Mass., protesting against the law which provides for a 30-day lay-off period after 18 months of employment under the W. P. A.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the Council of the City of Hazleton, Pa., protesting against the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the City Council of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to enact a just and adequately financed old-age pension law; to the Committee on Finance. (See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on the 17th instant.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial No. 4

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America requesting the cancelation of all seed-wheat loan contracts now existing between certain farmers of the State of Montana and the United States of America

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"Whereas certain farmers of the State of Montana did, during the several years last past, enter into contracts with the United States of America respecting loans for the purchase of seed wheat; and

"Whereas the farming industry of the State of Montana, during the last several years, has been harassed by drought, insects, and hail, and has derived small profit from its labor and investment; and

"Whereas these unfortunate conditions have caused many to leave the farming industry for more lucrative callings in this State and elsewhere; and

"Whereas many of those who have deserted the farming industry do not contemplate meeting, or cannot meet, their obligations under those seed-wheat loan contracts aforesaid; and

"Whereas it is unjust that one should be compelled to meet the loans under said seed-wheat loan contracts when one has derived no appreciable return therefrom; and

"Whereas it would be financially ruinous in many cases if payment of said loans were compelled: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the prayer of your memorialists, the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, that the Congress of the United States should by proper legislation make possible the cancelation of seed-wheat loan contracts where the forced collection of the same would prevent such farmer from continuing his usual and regular farming operations, or the collection of which would render such farmer unable to properly protect his family under a decent and humane standard of living."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 10

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation authorizing the continuance of the purchase of silver

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"Whereas under the Monetary Act of July 6, 1939, the Congress of the United States has fixed the price of domestic silver at 71.11 cents per fine ounce; and

"Whereas this price is necessary to insure the continuance of the operation of the silver mines of Montana, as well as those mines of the States in which silver is an important byproduct; and

"Whereas without the continuance of this price many properties will be compelled to close down, with resulting unemployment of miners and loss of markets to farmers and merchants: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully urged and petitioned to oppose any propcsals which may be made for the reduction of the now established price of 71.11 cents per fine ounce of silver produced within the United States and Alaska."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial No. 9

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, S. 860, a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and Naval Establishments; and

"Whereas S. 860 would prohibit the sale and possession of alcoholic liquors upon the premises of any camp or cantonment used for military purposes and would prohibit such sale or possession within such distances of any military camp or cantonment as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may determine is necessary for the efficiency, health, and welfare of the members of the Army and Navy;

"Whereas said S. 860 is necessary for the protection of the people of the United States and the conduct of the National Emergency Training Program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and requested to enact into law said S. 860; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the legislature of Montana; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"House Joint Memorial No. 8

"Memorial to Congress requesting the enactment of a bill introduced by the Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER in the United States Senate seeking the establishment of the United States assay office at Helena

"*To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"Whereas Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, on January 10, 1941, introduced a bill into the United States Senate seeking the establishment of a United States assay office at Helena for the purchase of gold and silver bullion, gold dust, and similar gold and silver products; and

"Whereas the Mining Association of Montana feels that the establishment of such an assay office in Helena is an economic necessity, as the Montana production of gold and silver is nearly 500 percent greater now than when the former Helena United States assay office was discontinued in 1932: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of Montana urge the Congress of the United States to pass the Wheeler bill, as outlined in the first paragraph of this memorial."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 6

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Government in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas a highway 14 miles in length between Atlanta and Alpine Creek, connecting with Highway No. 93 below Alturus Lake, would shorten the distance from Boise, Idaho, to Stanley, Idaho, to 130 miles, the distance from Boise to Sun Valley would be shortened 30 miles, and the distance from Boise, Idaho, to Challis, Idaho, would be shortened 70 miles; and

"Whereas the construction of said road is feasible and would open up for development strategic mineral deposits and resources in the vicinity thereof; and

"Whereas said highway would shorten the distance from Highway No. 93 to the Idaho-Nevada-Oregon cut-off and would be beneficial to the citizens of the State at large, and to the Nation, providing a possible military highway from Montana through this section to southeastern Oregon and northern California: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that it pass proper legislation to require Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees to construct said highway; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward a certified copy of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

By Mr. NYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Concurrent Resolution G

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):*

"Whereas approximately 85 percent of the citizens of North Dakota must derive all of their living from the production and sale of grain and other farm products; and

"Whereas the costs of all agricultural implements and all supplies necessary for the purpose of maintaining and continuing farm operations have greatly increased with the result that the present Government loan values allowed for grains and other farm products are not sufficient to cover the actual expense of farming operations and necessary living requirement: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we memorialize Congress to pass such legislation as may be necessary to enable the Federal Government to increase the loan value on grains and farm products at least 25 percent, and especially upon the grains most universally raised in North Dakota; namely, wheat, rye, barley, and corn; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Gerald P. Nye, senior Senator from North Dakota; the Honorable William Langer, junior Senator from North Dakota; and to the Honorable Usher L. Burdick and the Honorable Charles R. Robertson, Representatives in Congress from North Dakota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution O

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):*

"Whereas the national-defense agencies of the Federal Government have designated 985 miles of the North Dakota State highway system as being highways of major importance in the defense emergency now facing this Nation; and

"Whereas surveys of this strategic military mileage have been made by the Public Roads Administration cooperating with the North Dakota Highway Department through the State-Federal highway planning survey, said surveys disclosing that an important part of this mileage is still a dry-gravel road without a dustless surface, and other portions of the mileage are obsolete so that a substantial part of the designated mileage must be built to present-day standards to provide for the movement of vast quantities of munitions and supplies and large numbers of men necessary for the effective operation of the defense forces of the National Government; and

"Whereas it is estimated that to bring the strategic military network of highways in North Dakota to the minimum standards required to meet the defense program of the United States will cost approximately $20,000,000; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Highway Department has available during the coming biennium an estimated amount of less than $1,000,000 of State funds that may be available for matching regular Federal-aid funds for expenditure on the strategic network of highways, the State funds thus available being collected from road-use taxes on the motor-vehicle owners of the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Highway Department is confronted with a serious shortage of available revenue to meet the normal demands of highway construction and maintenance on the State highways system, it being estimated that in addition to the cost of standardizing the 985 miles of the strategic network it would require an additional expenditure of approximately $21,000,000 to bring other portions of the State highway system to modern minimum standards; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is now collecting in North Dakota through Federal gasoline taxes, lubricating-oil taxes, and other excise taxes on the operation of motor vehicles a sum substantially greater than the amount returned to North Dakota as Federal highway aid; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Highway Department contemplates cooperating with the Federal Government in improvement of the strategic military network so far as available funds will permit and the improvement of other sections of the State highway system may be deferred, and intends to cooperate with the Federal Government in every way possible by using its engineering facilities in preparing surveys, plans, and specifications for a strategic network of military highways; and

"Whereas the State of North Dakota is unable to provide any material increase in the amount of State funds available for matching regular Federal-aid funds on highway construction and it is not feasible to accomplish the improvement of the strategic military network of highways on the present basis of matching Federal-aid funds with State funds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the twenty-seventh legislative assembly (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to give early and deliberate consideration to the need for emergency appropriations to expedite the construction of roads on the strategic military network, said funds to be appropriated for expenditure through the same agencies as regular Federal aid and to be allocated among the several States on the same basis as regular Federal aid at the present time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress be respectfully requested to make such appropriations as may be necessary for improvements of the strategic military network available for expenditure on a basis that will reduce to a minimum the funds required by the States to carry out such defense program; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Y

"Whereas sections 9 and 10 of the River and Harbor Act of 1899 make it unlawful for any State to construct any bridge, dike, or causeway over or in any navigable river or other navigable water of the United States without the consent of Congress and without the approval of the plans by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War; and

"Whereas by the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, no State may construct or permit the construction of a water-power development in any such navigable river except pursuant to a license from, and under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in a recent decision with respect to the navigability of a stream in the State of Virginia, under which decision, as stated in a dissenting opinion, 'every creek which has enough water when conserved by control works to float a boat drawing 2 feet of water,' is rendered navigable if such condition can be brought about by the expenditure of enormous sums of money; and

"Whereas the effect of said decision is to obstruct the State and other governmental subdivisions in the building of bridges over rivers and streams which no one has ever considered navigable; and

"Whereas the situation resulting from the newly prescribed test of navigability will operate to demoralize the activities of the State of North Dakota in the construction of highways, irrigation systems, and other works of internal development in a manner never intended by Congress in passing the laws affecting the navigability of streams and the development of water power; and

"Whereas on the Yellowstone River and on that portion of the Missouri River above the south line of North Dakota, waterway transportation has been found to be impractical and has long ago been abandoned and an urgent demand now exists that all of the waters of these two streams be used for purposes other than navigation; and

"Whereas in view of the said Court decision, it is important that all rivers and streams in the State of North Dakota which are not navigable in their natural condition and which are not now considered navigable be declared by the Congress of the United States to be non navigable: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House concurring therein), That the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be, and they are respectfully, urged to use their best efforts to secure the enactment of legislation by the Congress designating as nonnavigable all of the Yellowstone River and that portion of the Missouri River above the south line of the State of North Dakota, and all rivers in North Dakota which are not navigable in their natural condition and which are not now considered navigable; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen of North Dakota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution P

"Resolution requesting Congress to amend the Social Security Act to provide Federal grants to States for public assistance on an equalization basis, taking into consideration the ability of the State to finance public assistance, to permit the States to develop medical-care programs for recipients of public assistance, the cost of such medical care to be matched with Federal funds on a 50-percent basis; to provide 100-percent Federal grants to States for assistance for certain Indians; to increase maximum grants-in-aid for dependent children; to provide for Federal participation in costs incurred by States in referring persons to federally financed welfare programs; and to provide for the enactment of a new title to the Social Security Act providing for grants-in-aid to the States for general assistance to needy residents and migrants

"Whereas geographical location and the location of industries and other factors result in wide differences in the tax-paying ability of citizens of the various States as evidenced by differences in the per capita income of the States; and

"Whereas the problem of providing medical care for public assistance recipients under the social-security programs and of providing general assistance to needy residents and migrants has become a burden which exceeds the tax-paying ability of many States and local communities; and

"Whereas the cost to the States and the local subdivisions of providing public assistance to Indians living on public reservations in those States having a large Indian population is a burden which those States and local subdivisions cannot and should not be expected to carry; and

"Whereas the cost to the States and local subdivisions of taking applications, making investigations, and referring persons to welfare programs such as the Work Projects Administration, Farm Security Administration, and Civilian Conservation Corps, financed with Federal funds, is becoming an increasingly heavy burden on the States because of the requirements of those Federal agencies in connection with such referrals; and

"Whereas the maximum amount which the Federal Government will match for aid to dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act is $9 for any month with respect to one dependent child, and $6 with respect to each other dependent child in a family, which maximum amount is entirely inadequate to provide for the needs of a mother and one or two children: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby memorialize Congress to amend the Social Security Act to:

"1. Authorize equalization grants to the States under each public-assistance title on the basis of the relationship of the average per capita income in the State to the national average per capita income, with respect to costs of assistance.

"2. Add a new title to the Social Security Act providing for grants-in-aid to the States for general assistance to needy residents and migrants on a matching basis equalized in accordance with the relationship of the average per capita income in the State to the national average per capita income.

"3. Amend each public-assistance title in the Social Security Act to permit the States to develop medical-care programs for recipients of public assistance on a matching basis.

"4. Amend each public-assistance title to authorize 100-percent Federal grants to the States for costs of assistance and administration with respect to Indians living on public reservations.

"5. Provide for Federal participation in costs incurred by State agencies in referring persons to welfare programs financed with Federal funds as Work Projects Administration, Farm Security Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, etc.

"6. Amend title IV of the Social Security Act, increasing the grants which the Federal Government will match to $20 for the first

child in each family, and $6 for each additional child in the family; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the President and the Congress of the United States and the congressional delegation from North Dakota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution U

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to maintain a military post at Fort Lincoln

"Whereas Fort Lincoln is situated in approximately the center of an individual area comprising 150,000 square miles with a population of 1,250,000, and is supported by an excellent rail and highway network, and is adjacent to a proposed international air line joining the United States, Canada, and Alaska; and

"Whereas Fort Lincoln is situated in the geographical center of the State and is the only military post in North Dakota and the only one between Fort Snelling in Minnesota and Missoula, Mont., and is the only military post between the Canadian border on the north and Fort Meade in the Black Hills section of South Dakota on the south; and

"Whereas the buildings and grounds comprising the military post of Fort Lincoln are in excellent condition and are capable of caring for many hundreds of citizens called to the service of their country during the present national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to take such steps as are necessary to maintain Fort Lincoln as a military post."

By Mr. GURNEY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10

"Concurrent resolution urging the Congress and Social Security Board of the United States to give consideration to the following proposals with respect to relief and public assistance

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring)*:

"Be it resolved that the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota do hereby urge the Congress and Social Security Board of the United States to give serious consideration to the following proposals with respect to the administration of relief, to wit:

"1. Direct relief should be added as a category to the Federal security program to be administered by the States as a part of their general shared relief program.

"2. All work relief should be operated by the States as a part of the general shared-relief programs. This means a transfer of administrative responsibility for work relief from the Federal Government to the States.

"3. The relief of migratory workers or persons should be handled by the States as a part of their general relief program, and should be reimbursable by the Federal Government.

"4. All administrative costs of State and local welfare agencies operating the shared programs should be reimbursed by the Federal Government at the same rate as applies to other reimbursements.

"5. The distribution of surplus commodities in any State should be in accordance with plans developed and mutually agreed upon by the Federal Government and the State agency charged with public assistance in that State.

"6. Occupational training of potentially employable persons should be intensified.

"7. Rehabilitation through medical care and treatment of physical defects should be intensified and should be a part of the reimbursable program of general relief.

"8. There should be a continuing joint congressional committee working with State legislative and administrative groups in planning for new or modified legislation, and for the purpose of providing for research in public assistance.

"9. It is urged that all public officials recognize the crushing force of the soaring burden of all public relief on the taxpayer, and we recommend vigorous effort on their part for a more efficient and economical administration.

"It is believed that these proposals, if adopted, would lead to:

"(a) Better service to the needy person.

"(b) More efficient administration.

"(c) Substantial savings to both the States and the Federal Government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate to each of the United States Senators and Members of Congress from the State of South Dakota and to the Social Security Board at Washington, D. C.

"Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 27th day of February 1941."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States of America at Washington, in the District of Columbia, to cause to be issued a United States postage stamp commemorating the two-hundredth anniversary of the planting of the lead plate by the Verendrye brothers near the confluence of the Bad and Missouri Rivers, at the Fort Pierre site in the State of South Dakota

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring)*:

"Whereas the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-three will mark the two-hundredth anniversary of the planting by the Verendrye brothers of a lead tablet near the confluence of the Bad and Missouri Rivers at the Fort Pierre site, laying claim to the region for King Louis XV of France and embracing that vast territory later acquired by the United States of America under the Louisiana Purchase; and

"Whereas their journey, recording the planting of the lead tablet, is the first written record of the visit of white man to that region, and

"Whereas it is customary for the Postmaster General of the United States of America to cause to be issued postage stamps in commemoration of significant historic events: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the consensus of opinion of the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), that it is fit and proper that the anniversary of this great historic event be thus recognized; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General of the United States of America be urged to cooperate with the twenty-seventh legislative assembly of the State of South Dakota in recognizing this event by the issuance of an appropriate stamp with pertinent insignia thereon; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of State to each Senate and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States of America and to the Vice President of the United States of America and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress.

"Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 25th day of February 1941."

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution N

"Resolution requesting Congress to Investigate conditions on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, and relieve needs existing there

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring)*:

"Whereas upon petition of the Sioux Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation, who testified at a joint hearing of the Senate Indian Affairs and House Federal Relations Committees that the general situation on the reservation is bad, and that the ration system as used on their reservation has failed, and recommended that moneys appropriated by the United States Congress for rations be disbursed through State relief channels, as for white people, who take their grocery orders to the merchants, selecting from staple foods authorized, the Legislature by resolution, House Concurrent Resolution G, authorized an investigation of the conditions existing in that area of the reservation lying within the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas a special joint committee visited Fort Yates, Cannonball, and Porcupine Sub-Agency, examined witnesses, and personally saw the deplorable, wretched conditions under which these Indians are existing, and as shown by report and testimony on pages 235-248, of the Senate Journal for February 8 1941, which report is incorporated herewith by reference thereto and hereto attached, and also by photographs of a few of the cases referred to in the committee report attached hereto and made a part of this resolution; and

"Whereas the report of this committee indicates that many of these unfortunate people live on food allowances of the value of $3.45 per month, and families of four on a double ration, amounting to $6.90 per month, with perhaps occasional surplus commodities, inequitably distributed; green coffee, and no fruit, dairy products, nor milk for children; with only a very limited amount of dead cotton wood and willow timber and driftwood for fuel, burned in stoves not worthy of the name, wholly inadequate medical facilities; inability to contact the superintendent; school children with no other garments than one dress, a coat, stockings and shoes; old women gathering their own wood; and many entire families huddled in poor, leaky tents, with no furniture and inadequate bedding, nearly freezing in subzero weather; and that many other intolerable conditions were found to be the rule and not the exception; and many of the most miserable tents and huts were within a stone's throw of the beautiful brick office and residential buildings of the agency at Fort Yates and the subagencies at Cannonball and Porcupine; and

"Whereas such living conditions are demoralizing to both the younger and older Indians, and it appears that this situation is not known to Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully request Congress to authorize an immediate and thorough investigation of the conditions that exist on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; and that adequate food, clothing, shelter, fuel, medicine, and other urgent needs be supplied at the earliest possible moment to these destitute, hungry, and homeless Indians and American citizens; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate; the Speaker

of the House of Representatives; to Senator Elmer Thomas and Representative Will Rogers, chairmen of the Senate and House Indian Affairs Committees; to Senators NYE and LANGER and Representatives BUDDICK and ROBERTSON, and to the press."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to enact the Capper bill establishing a Division of Cooperatives in the United States Department of Agriculture

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas cooperation has proven beneficial to both producer and consumer and through years of successful operation in all democracies has established itself as a useful economic unit of well-ordered society; and

"Whereas Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, has introduced a bill (S. 650) to establish a Division of Cooperatives in the United States Department of Agriculture, the purposes of which are to serve as a source of information and cooperation to producers and consumers in cooperative buying and selling; to conduct research and assemble statistical data; prepare publications on cooperative subjects, which will be placed on the distribution lists of Members of Congress; and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish cooperative relationships between this Division and those other branches of the Department that carry on services in the cooperative field; and

"Whereas Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, as Secretary of Agriculture, and many officials of outstanding farm and cooperative organizations have endorsed the provisions of the Capper bill as beneficial to agriculture and cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, That we petition and urge Congress to take early and favorable action on the Capper bill, S. 650, and that it be enacted into law during the present congressional session; and be it further

"Resolved, That attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress."

(The Vice President laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of members of Townsend Club, No. 1, of Sabetha, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation embodying the provisions of the Townsend recovery plan; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens of Traer, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near military training camps, and to suppress vice in the vicinity of such camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Home Builders Class, Grace Methodist Church, of Winfield, Kans., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near military training camps and to suppress vice in the vicinity of such camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROTECTION OF MILITARY CAMPS FROM VICE AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I present a petition from Mrs. Martin Reinholdt and sundry other citizens of Sawyer, N. Dak., and vicinity, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the names attached thereto, as follows:

Hon. GERALD P. NYE AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS:

We, the citizens of Sawyer community, petition you to use your influence for the passage of Senate bill 860, for the protection of our Army boys from alcoholic beverages and venereal disease.

Mrs. MARTIN REINHOLDT,
RALPH D. LEHMAN,
(And sundry other citizens of the Sawyer community, North Dakota.)

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland, Ohio, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland, March 3, 1941:

"An emergency resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the resolution now pending in Congress relating to General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas various States of the Union have already designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1940, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America; and

"Whereas this resolution constitutes an emergency in that the same provides for the usual daily operation of a municipal department: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Council of the City of Cleveland, State of Ohio:

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Ohio.

"SEC. 3. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure, and, provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law."

Adopted March 3, 1941.

A. L. DEMAIORIBUS,
President of Council.
CHRISTIAN J. BANNICK,
Clerk of Council.

Effective March 3, 1941.

Approved by Edward Blythin, mayor, March 3, 1941.

RESOLUTION OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY, DELAWARE

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the New Castle County (Del.) Medical Society, signed by its secretary, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CASTLE COUNTY
MEDICAL SOCIETY, DELAWARE,
March 19, 1941.

United States Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TUNNELL: At a meeting of the New Castle County Medical Society last night the following resolution was passed and I have been instructed to notify you of our desires concerning this matter. We trust that you will be able to give it due consideration:

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the society that certain provisions of the National Selective Service Act have proved unjust and unreasonable in their effect on members of the medical and dental professions—namely, that physicians and dentists have been inducted into military service as privates rather than as members of their respective professional groups and that no provision has been made for medical students, hospital internes, and residents to complete their professional training: Be it

"Resolved, That the following recommendations express the opinion of this society:

"(1) That physicians and dentists called into service under the Selective Service Act be permitted to apply for commissions in the Medical or Dental Corps.

"(2) That in the event such commissions are not available because the personnel of either corps is adequate, such selectees be permitted to enlist in the Reserve Corps, Medical or Dental, respectively.

"(3) That medical and dental students' military service, if selected, be deferred until the completion of their professional training (or until professional degree is granted).

"(4) That internes be permitted to complete their terms of interneship as provided in their contracts, being deferred if selected prior to the completion of interneship.

"(5) That residents engaged in advanced training in an approved hospital for qualification in a specialty be permitted to complete their training, being deferred if selected prior to the completion of their residency. Such advanced training and approved hospitals are to be understood as those meeting the requirements of the examining boards of the particular specialty.

"(6) That none of the foregoing recommendations is to be understood as suggesting that medical and dental students, physicians, and dentists be exempted from military service, or that internes and residents be deferred beyond the usual term of their hospital contracts, or that internes and residents be permitted to complete new hospital contracts for additional training made after they have been selected for military service, or that internes and residents be refused permission to make such new contracts before

they have been selected for military service; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting and that the endorsement of the Medical Society of Delaware and the Delaware State Dental Society be requested, and that copies of the resolution be sent to the Senators and Representative of Delaware in the Congress of the United States, and to the American Medical Association."

Yours truly,

C. L. HUDIBURG, M. D.,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point a joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact a just and adequately financed old-age pension law

Whereas 53,310 persons received old-age assistance grants in Wisconsin in the month of December 1940, with the average payments of $22.80 per recipient; and

Whereas such payments are wholly inadequate to maintain the American standard of living because of the mounting food prices and increase in rent costs; and

Whereas it is now an accepted duty of our Government to provide security for the aged, even inadequate and complex as it is, by reason of an advanced age qualification of 65 years and a faulty system of taxation to raise sufficient revenues to carry on the program in decency; and

Whereas most northern Wisconsin counties cannot raise sufficient moneys to pay the 20 percent charged back to them for old-age assistance because of delinquent tax rolls caused by cut-over lands, thereby causing the State to lose much revenue because of inability to match the Federal allotment to which it would be otherwise entitled, and which, if received and matched by the State, would enable payments to old-age pension recipients of $40 per month as provided by law; and

Whereas many authorities, including President Roosevelt, are in full accord with a Federal old-age pension system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider the passage of a just and adequately financed national old-age pension law; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislature urges the consideration of legislation as proposed in bill H. R. 1036, introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress and known as the Townsend General Welfare Act, which provides for liberal pension payments for all over 60 years of age and carries with it a just tax measure, based upon the ability to pay; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—RESOLUTION OF SIOUX CITY LIVESTOCK SANITARY COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter to the Senator from Georgia, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which I have just received from the Livestock Sanitary Committee of Sioux City, Iowa, urging that no action be taken by the Senate to weaken the present sanitary livestock protection against importation of livestock, meat, and meat products from countries subject to foot-and-mouth disease.

I wish heartily to indorse the position taken against any weakening of this necessary and wholesome protection against foot-and-mouth disease. The livestock industry of the United States, and the people of the United States, are entitled to this protection. I hope that no attempt will be made to weaken this protection, and that if the attempt is made, it will not succeed.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVE STOCK SANITARY COMMITTEE,
Sioux City, Iowa, March 14, 1941.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEORGE: Members of the Sioux City Live Stock Sanitary Committee are seriously concerned about any changes in the sanitary regulations for importing cattle and fresh-meat products from countries harboring foot-and-mouth disease or other dangerous animal diseases. At a recent meeting of the committee the following resolutions were passed:

"Whereas cattle production in the United States is now in the healthiest condition that it has been for several years; bovine tuberculosis has been practically eradicated, with the whole Nation officially modified accredited; foot-and-mouth disease has not been present since the outbreak of 1932; the southern fever tick has been almost exterminated from the herds where great damage was done; cattle scabies is well under control after many years of persistent work; effective methods are being followed to control Bang's disease; these great campaigns to eliminate present and future cattle losses have cost great sums of money and required untiring efforts of farmers and sanitary officials; and

"Whereas cattle production is now near the peak of numbers, market prices are good, and it is possible to increase production if export trade can be developed; and

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease is known to be one of the most highly contagious, infectious virus diseases affecting livestock and constitutes a menace to public health, in that the human family is also susceptible to this devastating scourge. It incurs huge economic losses to the livestock industry because it materially restricts the movement of livestock; and livestock feeds in areas adjacent to infected centers. In infected territories movement of livestock, feeds of all kinds, and many agricultural products are completely immobilized as a result of quarantine measures necessary to control and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease. Ten outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred in the United States, viz, 1870, 1880, 1884, 1902, 1908, 1914, 1924 (two), 1929, and 1932, and the United States has spent $200,000,000 since 1900 to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease brought into this country; and

"Whereas our cattle would be highly susceptible to exposure to foot-and-mouth disease if it were introduced, because our cattle have not built up any resistance by coming in contact with foot-and-mouth disease; as a result undoubtedly losses would be extremely heavy and disastrous to the whole livestock industry; and

"Whereas the United States is committed to a definite program of controlling animal diseases: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate not to endanger our livestock industry through weakening our present sanitary regulations and tariffs so that livestock and fresh-meat products can be imported from countries and areas harboring foot-and-mouth disease and other dangerous animal contagions.

"Sioux City Live Stock Sanitary Committee; George F. Silknitter, president, Stock Yards Co.; George M. Vickers, Live Stock Exchange; C. L. Fredricksen, president, Live Stock National Bank; W. J. Downey, Live Stock Exchange; O. P. Garrison, Live Stock Exchange; C. H. Lennon, Live Stock Exchange; A. A. Heldridge, president, Live Stock Exchange; D. H. Cunningham, secretary, Live Stock Exchange; W. D. Vail, Traders Exchange; L. C. Hudson, Traders Exchange; Tom Fife, Producers Commission Association; Paul Bechtol, Cudahy Packing Co.; John T. Glen, Swift & Co.; F. P. Capera, Armour & Co.; Dr. T. W. Munce, Allied Laboratories, Inc.; J. E. Vogel, Frank Pilley & Sons, Inc.; J. M Foster, John Morrell & Co., Sioux Falls; G. W. England, Sioux Falls Stock Yards Co.; Peter Vest, Sioux Falls Stockmen's Exchange; Harry J. Boyts, Live Stock Commission."

We would be pleased to have your acknowledgement of this letter.

Yours very sincerely,

HARRY J. BOYTS,
Livestock Commissioner.

REPORTS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 17th instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on the 19th instant:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 115).

By Mr. BYRNES:

H. R. 3981. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 116).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 941. A bill for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, R. J. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock; with amendments (Rept. No. 117).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 529. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 118); and

H. R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Helen Louise Giles; without amendment (Rept. No. 119).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 120); and

S. 1064. A bill for the relief of Caroline Janes; with amendments (Rept. No. 121).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1104. A bill for the relief of William A. Wheeler; without amendment (Rept. No. 122);

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 123);

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of James P. Melican; without amendment (Rept. No. 124).

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; with amendment (Rept. No. 125);

H. R. 2998. A bill for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell; without amendment (Rept. 126); and

H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Henry L. Munt; without amendment (Rept. No. 127).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger; with an amendment (Rept. No. 128); and

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Monroe Short; with an amendment (Rept. No. 129).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 218. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 130).

By Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. BROWN), from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 3575. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 131).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 210. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders; with amendments (Rept. No. 132).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1140. A bill for the relief of the Barlow Grain and Stock Exchange, and the Farmers Union Oil Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1141. A bill to amend section 531 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of J. Mae Chambers and Retta E. Hultgren; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Dayee Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1144. A bill for the relief of Matthias P. Monson; to the Committee on Claims.

S 1145. A bill for the exchange of lands adjacent to the Kaniksu, Coeur d'Alene, St. Joe, Clearwater, and Nezperce National Forests in Idaho, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1146. A bill authorizing the presentation of a distinguished flying cross to Maj. Roy William Ammel, Air Corps Reserve, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 1147. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa," approved August 7, 1939; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1148. A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Bollenbeck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1149. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1150. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Pan-American center at Miami, Fla., for the coordination of commercial and cultural relations between the American republics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr GREEN:

S. 1151. A bill for the relief of Harold Winthrop McElroy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1152. A bill for the relief of Antonio Armijo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1153. A bill for expenditures of funds for cooperation with public-school board at Wolf Point, Mont., for completing the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1154. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Maynard Goss; and

S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Jess W. Harmon; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1157. A bill amending the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended, and providing for payment of compensation for permanent and total disability ratings of tubercular World War veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BULOW:

S. 1158. A bill to authorize the construction of a permanent resting place for the remains of Gutzon and Mary Borglum; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1159. A bill to make George D. Kahn eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1160. A bill for the relief of Joseph Just; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1161. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Pitt; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1162. A bill to provide for the construction of a Coast Guard vessel designed for ice breaking and assistance work on Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1163. A bill for the relief of Katherine Caulley;

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Donald Archibald Jones;

S. 1165. A bill for the relief of Julius Porath;

S. 1166. A bill for the relief of Daniel Steele; and

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of Herbert Therrien; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1168. A bill for the relief of Elsie D. Frayer; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1169. A bill to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Minas Kirillidis;

S. 1170. A bill for the relief of Dionis Moldowan;

S. 1171. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Ilhan New;

S. 1172. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917; and

S. 1173. A bill to amend the act of June 24, 1935, so as to include certain alien veterans of the World War who left the United States, prior to their being called in the draft, to serve in the military or naval forces of any of the countries allied or associated with the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1174. A bill to amend the Wisconsin Chippewa Jurisdictional Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. L. 1049); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1175. A bill granting a pension to Ruth Iola Goulette Pridham; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Jacob Betzer; and

S. 1177. A bill granting an annuity to William F. Pack; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1178. A bill to be known as the General Welfare Act, to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend coverage thereunder to all groups and all classes, to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide a pay-as-you-go basis for pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1179. A bill to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1180. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the better protection and highest public use of lands of the United States and adjacent lands and waters in northern Minnesota for the production of forest products, and for other purposes," approved July 10, 1930; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1181. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1182. A bill for the benefit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1183. A bill for the relief of the A. E. Conrad Co.;

S. 1184. A bill for the relief of Irene Dial;

S. 1185. A bill for the relief of William H. Evens;

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of Harold W. Goozee;

S. 1187. A bill for the relief of Victor E. Johnson;

S. 1188. A bill for the relief of Georgia Jeanne May (with accompanying papers);

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lane;

S. 1190. A bill for the relief of Julia Neville; and

S. 1191. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Parsons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1192. A bill to amend section 209 (b) (10) (C), title II, of the Social Security Act, as amended, and sections 1426 (b) (10) (C) and 1607 (c) (10) (C) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended;

S. 1193. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of old-age insurance benefits to individuals who are 75 years of age and have had three quarters of coverage; and

S. 1194. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish free dental care to honorably discharged veterans having service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1195. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 3 years (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 1196. A bill granting an increase in retired pay to George Occhionero, first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1197. A bill granting a pension to Susie V. Heiele; and

S. 1198. A bill granting a pension to Mary C. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. RADCLIFFE):

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution authorizing the restoration and preservation of the frigate *Constellation*, and making Baltimore, Md., her home port; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and placed on the calendar or referred, as indicated:

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him; to the calendar.

H. R. 1060. An act to vest absolute in the city of Dearborn the title to lot 19 of the Detroit Arsenal grounds subdivision, Wayne County, Mich.;

H. R. 1771. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2302. An act to adjust the boundaries of the Cedar Breaks National Monument and the Dixie National Forest, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, the Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573); and

H. R. 2611. An act to release all the interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the right-of-way granted to the Central Pacific Railway Co., under the act of July 1, 1862, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2765. An act to repeal an obsolete section of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3362. An act to amend the act of May 24, 1940 (Public, No. 520, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3252. An act to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the Commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF FAILURE TO GIVE WARNING OF NORTH DAKOTA BLIZZARD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate the recent storm in North Dakota which resulted in the death of 60 of our citizens. Someone is to blame for the tragedy that resulted in the loss of the lives of 60 men, women, and children in North Dakota and Minnesota. I am submitting a resolution providing for an investigation to find out why proper notices were not given by the weather bureaus in those two States. This failure is all the more serious when one realizes the tremendous improvement in the facilities for broadcasting news because of the radio.

One can forgive the Fergus Falls tornado in 1919, in which 52 persons died; but there was something wrong already, in my judgment, with the method of giving warning when, in the Armistice Day blizzard of 1940, 54 more persons lost their lives; and we now come to 1941, when 60 persons perished, and, according to the newspaper dispatches from North Dakota, the victims had little storm warning in the weather forecast. The only notice North Dakota had, according to the newspapers, was as follows:

North Dakota: Light local snows tonight and Sunday with cold wave and strong northerly winds.

This was the only warning North Dakotans had of the terrific storm that entered the State from Canada about 6 p. m. Saturday and took a toll of lives before it passed on southeastward Sunday. A maximum wind velocity of 74 miles per hour was reached at the Fargo airport at 10:08 p. m.

The forecast was issued by the weather bureau in Chicago, as is the custom in the case of State forecasts.

Forecast for Fargo-Moorhead and vicinity is based on the State forecasts, and is issued by the weather bureau at Hector airport in Fargo, with such variations as are felt necessary to meet local conditions.

ISSUED AT 9:45 A. M.

Issued at 9:45 a. m. Saturday, published in newspapers and broadcasts from radio stations like the State forecasts, it read:

"Occasional light snow with a cold wave and strong northwesterly winds tonight and Sunday."

At the only weather flag site in Fargo-Moorhead atop the Moorhead city hall, a "cold wave" flag was flown all day Saturday.

E. J. Fox, Federal meteorologist at the airport, also made a series of calls to Fargo-Moorhead business firms who ship perishable goods, bringing them "cold wave" warnings—a procedure followed here for years.

JUMPED FAST

With the wind readings customarily taken but every hour at the airport, it is quite possible the velocity may have exceeded 74 miles in between readings, observers said.

When it became apparent that a record breaker was in sight, a number of extra readings were taken.

During the early evening the wind was light and from south-southwest, veering to the west as it attained velocity about 9 p. m., then straight from the northwest as the gale hit its peak.

The time, velocity, and wind direction of the readings made before and during the storm period follow:

Time	*Velocity*
8:35 p. m.	15
9:35 p. m.	46
9:55 p. m.	72
10:08 p. m.	74
10:20 p. m.	70
10:35 p. m.	56
10:50 p. m.	60
11:05 p. m.	65
11:35 p. m.	55
12:30 a. m.	55
1:30 a. m.	48
2:35 a. m.	45
3:30 a. m.	44
4:35 a. m.	42
5:35 a. m.	41

ONLY 41 IN MOORHEAD

While the wind velocity broke records at the airport station, Moorhead bureau reading reached a maximum of only 41 miles per hour, Fox reported. This was for a 5-minute period beginning at 10:38 p. m. Saturday.

The change came suddenly at about 9:25 p. m. The wind then was about 12 miles per hour from the southwest. Quickly it shifted to northwest and rose to a velocity of 26 miles per hour. After reaching its peak at 10:38 p. m., the wind dropped slightly and recorded about 35 miles per hour between 11 p. m. and 1 a. m.

Between 1 and 2 a. m. it dropped to a point slightly less than 35 miles per hour, and thereafter gradually diminished.

At Grand Forks, a top velocity of 85 miles per hour was recorded on instruments maintained at the airport by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Fox said the first indication the Weather Bureau had that a sharp change was in prospect was in weather signals from northern Canadian points, which told of high winds and snow on a weather map assembled at 1 a. m. Saturday.

This situation, however, was not conclusive enough to warrant drawing up of forecasts for North Dakota and Minnesota, but 6 hours later, the morning map showed continued strong winds in Canada, and from this compilation the Saturday forecasts were drawn.

HALF INCH OF SNOW

During the storm it was not possible to measure precipitation here accurately, but it was estimated that a half inch or less of snow fell.

A Moorhead station summary prepared in 1938 shows that the highest velocity recorded in Moorhead was July 7, 1890.

This was the day that Fargo-Moorhead was ravaged by a tornado, with seven killed, scores hurt, a moving train tossed from the tracks at the western outskirts of Fargo, and scores of homes, churches, and business buildings wrecked. Newspaper accounts reported the wind came from the southwest, but on Weather Bureau records it is shown to have been a northwest wind.

EXPLAIN VARIATION

Variation in the Fargo airport and Moorhead bureau wind-velocity records results not only from the fact that the Moorhead station is in a comparatively sheltered spot, but because the Moorhead velocity is computed on a 5-minute average basis, while the airport data is on a 1-minute checking basis, Fox said.

While it is customary for the weather bureau to receive criticism when a sudden storm develops and takes a toll of human and animal life, the Fargo bureau has not yet been subject to any calls.

RECALL ARMISTICE DAY

During the Mississippi Valley storm last Armistice Day when a heavy toll of lives of duck hunters was taken in southern Minnesota, there were scores of complaints against

the weather bureau, some critics contending that the Chicago weather bureau, comparatively far away from Minnesota and North Dakota, cannot satisfactorily arrive at accurate forecasts for these two States.

Incidentally, the Mississippi Valley storm varied from Saturday night's blast in the fact that it originated in Kansas and farther south, and moved north into Minnesota.

WHAT CAUSED IT?

What caused the storm? While the answer is comparatively technical, Fox explained it as simply as he could:

"It was a combination of the circulation of high- and low-pressure areas.

"Here are the circumstances. A low-pressure area moves eastward and the winds around a low-pressure area turn in a counterclockwise circulation.

"In this case there was a lower pressure area that moved across the country quite rapidly from west to east across the Dakotas and Minnesota.

"As it passed, an area of high pressure moved down from the north along the eastern slope of the northern Rockies from Canada, also moving at a rapid speed."

MOVEMENT CLOCKWISE

"The movement of air in high-pressure areas is clockwise, or opposite to that in low-pressure areas.

"Where these two areas join, or the space in between, the northerly winds are on the west side of the low-pressure area and on the east side of the high-pressure area, and tend to strengthen one another.

"The deeper the low pressure and the higher the high pressure, the stronger the wind.

"The force is increased still more if the two areas are moving rapidly.

"One, the low-pressure area, was moving rapidly eastward, and the other, high-pressure area, was moving rapidly southeastward.

"The area in between those centers was the area of the strong northerly winds."

Following is the explanation of the storm coming to the Forum by telegraph from Winnipeg:

"The wind started from a high-pressure area in Alaska, swept down to a low-pressure area in the Rocky Mountains, between the mountains and Lake Superior, and then continued throughout the West. The wind gained in volume as it swept across the western provinces, and then, at Manitoba, swung down into the States."

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point portions of pages 1, 6, 7, and 8 of the Fargo Forum of March 17, 1941, dealing with the tragedy in North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum of March 17, 1941]

SIXTY PERISH IN STORM—TRAGIC PATTERN WRITTEN OVER LENGTH OF VALLEY—DEADLY GALE TEARS CHILDREN FROM PARENTS' GRASP—WIND-PACKED WALL OF SNOW RIPS DOWN FROM NORTH IN FRIGID FURY—VICTIMS HAD LITTLE STORM WARNING IN WEATHER FORECAST

THE STORM'S DEATH TOLL

North Dakota

Albert Jacobson, 73, and his son, Albert, Jr., 11, Fort Ransom, N. Dak.

Miss Bernice Larson, 20, Gardner, N. Dak.

Leo, Donald, and Dickie Taylor, 17, 15, and 10 years old, Dazey, N. Dak.

Raymond (Whitey) Johnson, Valley City, N. Dak.

J. E. Bunday, 75, Oakes, N. Dak.

Miss Frances Waters, Kelso, N. Dak.

Mrs. John Kallestad, 40, and Sever Reep, Michigan, N. Dak.

Andrew Hentjium, 55, Dahlen (Nelson County), N. Dak.

Mrs. Olaf Christianson, 60, Pekin, N. Dak.

Gust Carlson, 70, Lakota, N. Dak.

Carl D. Hillesland, 74, Aneta, N. Dak.

Florence and Katie Howry, 15 and 21, Pembina, N. Dak.

Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Heuchert, 68 and 64, St. Thomas, N. Dak.

Kenneth Nickerson, 11, and Louise McLeod, 12, cousins, Hannah, N. Dak.

Mrs. Jacob Hoffman, 25, her daughter, Ervone, 4, and Henry Friesen, 26, Munich, N. Dak.

Mr. and Mrs. Paul J. Nordberg, Mohall, N. Dak., and son, Ralph, Minot, killed near Bottineau.

Mrs. Nancy Charon, 73, Park River, N. Dak.

Mrs. William Baumgartner, 50, Cando, N. Dak.

Frank Meyers, Grand Forks.

David Sterling, 14, Glasston (Pembina County), N. Dak.

Peter Smiley, farm laborer, Michigan, N. Dak.

Minnesota

Mr. and Mrs. John Lennox, 534 Twenty-first Street N., Fargo, near Detroit Lakes.

Mrs. Oscar Sandy, 38, and her son, Harlan Duane, 9 months, 105 Fourth Street N., Moorhead, near Ada, Minn.

Willard Treichel, 6, Ada, Minn.

Mrs. Jacob Bjerken and son, Palmer, 8, Mahnomen, Minn.

Mrs. Elmer Greene, 26, Crookston, Minn.

Mrs. Palmer Peterson and son, 5, Crookston, Minn.

Ervin Ingebretson, 40, Fosston, Minn.

Francis Weckwerth, 21, Hazel (near Thief River Falls), Minn.

Mrs. Alphonse LaRochelle, Crookston, Minn.

Berg Moren, 56, Wylie (near Red Lake Falls), Minn.

Mr. and Mrs. Ludwig Foss and daughter, Roselyn, 18, of Beltrami, Minn., near Lockheart (Norman County), Minn.

Mr. and Mrs. E. T. Ellington and Miss Harriet Coger, all of Grand Forks, near Crookston, Minn.

Sid Bonaime, Tilden Junction (20 miles east of Crookston), Minn.

Ali Luzaich, 62, farmer near Chisholm, froze to death near home.

Manitoba

Mrs. John Janzen, 43, and her daughter, Marie, 6, Winkler, Manitoba (about 25 miles north of Neche, N. Dak.).

Isaac I. Fast, Niverville, Manitoba (25 miles south of Winnipeg).

An unidentified Indian, Letellier, Manitoba (10 miles north of Emerson, N. Dak.).

MISSING AND PROBABLY DEAD

Bernice Smaage, 14, and Rosalie Anderson, 14, Michigan, N. Dak.

Mrs. Orland Bailey, Grand Rapids, Minn., lost near Fisher, Minn.

Andrew Bjork, 50, farm laborer, lost on prairie near Bottineau, N. Dak.

Lawrence Melland, lost on prairie near Edmore, N. Dak.

At 1:30 p. m. today, the tabulation of deaths compiled by the Fargo Forum showed 32 dead in North Dakota; 24 dead in Minnesota; and 4 dead in Manitoba, with at least 5 others definitely missing and feared dead as they were last reported walking out into the storm Saturday night and remain unaccounted for.

This afternoon the bodies of Mr. and Mrs. Erick Soltveit, of Oslo, Minn., were found. They had been in Alverado, Minn., Saturday night, tried to drive home, then walk. They became separated. Her body was found a mile and a half from her home, his 4 miles north.

This afternoon, too, searchers found the body of Sid Bonaime, Great Northern station agent at Tilden Junction, near Crookston.

Just before noon today four more bodies were found. Mr. and Mrs. E. T. Ellington, of Grand Forks, and Miss Harriet Coger, principal of the Winship School in Grand Forks, were frozen to death on the roadside near the Northwest School of Agriculture near Crookston.

Peter Smiley, farm laborer of Michigan, N. Dak., was found frozen to death a mile from his home, bringing the death total to 55.

The list of missing is larger, but hopes are held for the safety of many not yet reported.

A snowstorm driven by tornadic winds of unparalleled ferocity ripped through the length of the Red River Valley Saturday night, leaving a toll of more than 50 dead and a score missing or seriously injured.

With the tragedy which struck into countless homes in North Dakota and Minnesota counties adjacent to the Red River there was written many an epic tale of heroism in this major catastrophe which takes its place in Northwest history along with the Armistice Day blizzard of 1940, in which 54 lost their lives, and the Fergus Falls tornado of 1919, in which 52 died.

A wind-packed wall of snow and dust traveling from 60 to 80 miles an hour actually suffocated many of the victims.

Dominating the pattern of death were the instances of country folks making a Saturday visit to their nearby towns, driving home as the storm hit without warning, cars stalled by drifts, lack of visibility, or other causes, abandonment of the cars, and a futile struggle to reach shelter.

Families were broken, children blown from their parents' grasp in the mighty flood of pressure which poured its way from Alaska through Canada, reached its crescendo of fury as it struck the northeastern North Dakota border counties, and swung its scythe of destruction through a tier a hundred miles wide on each side of the Red River, and reached over into the Lake Superior region, where a score of fishermen are believed to have perished.

Heaviest loss of life was in northeastern North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota where side roads and farmyard drives have been blocked through much of the winter, where the practice was to leave cars parked alongside the main highway and walk the distance to the farmhouse. In that short space, blinded by snow and pounded by the almost irresistible wind, many died.

But no two incidents were alike, and tales of the fantastic and heroic, gathered via long distance telephone by a staff of the Fargo Forum which worked through Sunday and the night, are almost beyond belief.

For example:

A wrecked train relief engine, pulling into Pembina, the train crew in ignorance that it was bearing on its pilot the frozen body of a girl. A search along the track to find the body of her sister, who had also frozen on the railway track before the two were struck by the engine.

A Crookston man, his wife, and their 5-year-old son breasting the gale, hand in hand. A terrific gust separates him from his wife and child. He hears them calling—calling—faintly calling.

Death in a swamp to a Fargo couple visiting near Detroit Lakes.

Mute tracks in the snow near Fort Ransom that paint a picture of the kind of men of which the Northwest is bred. An 11-year-old boy stumbles along with his 73-year-old father. The old man falls. The boy drags his father's sagging body a hundred feet. Both perish.

Near Gardner a young man pleads with his sister, "Don't give up." He carries her a ways, finally must go by himself.

The arm of a 10-year-old Dazey, N. Dak., boy in a dying gesture flurries the snow, attracts nearby searchers. They find three dead, one alive, twin brother of the one who had just passed on.

Upright against a telephone pole in the residence district of Lakota, N. Dak., the frozen body of a 76-year-old laborer.

A boy of 11 and girl of 12, cousins, on their way home in a horsedrawn sled from a 4-H Club meeting near Hannah, in Cavalier County. They die. Twenty other children remain at the meeting place without meeting harm.

Huddled together 50 feet from home the bodies of a young farm woman, her 4-year-old daughter, and a neighbor young man, near Munich, Cavalier County. The husband has staggered to the house, his face and arms frozen, summoned aid by phone, ventured forth again on frantic and fruitless searches.

A Moorhead woman, bearing in her arms her infant boy as they are driven from her sister's and mother's home near Ada by a chimney fire. They start across Highway 75 to a neighbor home. Se.rchers find their bodies in the highway ditch next day.

An 8-year-old boy dies in his father's arms near Mahnomen, Minn. The mother, too, is suffocated by the wind. The father, and another son reach safety.

"Stay near this tree," a Crookston farmer tells his wife, when she can go no further. He returns with aid a short time later. They find her body.

"We'll get through," think a Mohall couple and their son, stalled in a car, their engine running and heater flooding comfort. But snow chokes the exhaust, deadly monoxide gas creeps in. All die.

Worried about the storm, a Crookston farm woman who has left five children alone at home, desperately seeks her husband in town, starts off without him. The truck stalls. She climbs into an abandoned car and never leaves it.

A Grand Forks farmer worries about his stock, starts out to the barn a few rods away with a lantern. His body is found on the prairie, a half mile away.

A husband who is seriously ill and on the way to visit a doctor, his wife, their three children sit in a stalled car near Fisher, Minn. She starts out on foot for help, and is missing.

A 14-year-old farm girl visits another girl a mile away. "I'll walk half way home with you," says the 14-year-old hostess, as children have done for time immemorial. The storm strikes.

What hope for the many missing in such circumstances?

There are the tales of the many who did not die—of sitting in hopelessly stalled cars through the night, smothered in a solid wall of darkness, the car wrenched by furious blasts; the gasoline gage dropping down, and down. But rescue comes in time.

The town and country folks make a common cause against the enemy. Snowplows are out, searching parties are organized for the missing, hospitality is extended to the thousands who are blockaded in every city and hamlet through the area.

But the last word on the death toll may not be written until warm breezes erase the heavy snow covering from the prairies.

NEWSMEN GO INTO ACTION

As the story of the storm began to unfold Sunday morning, hard-bitten newspapermen at first could hardly sense its magnitude. A skeleton news crew was hastily assembled by the Fargo Forum, long-distance calls went out to key points to determine the area covered. Similar activity went on at the Grand Forks Herald plant, the area it serves having been most hard hit by the storm. Facilities of the Associated Press bureau at Minneapolis were thrown into play; Winnipeg newspapermen went to work.

Calls came to the office from New York, Chicago, and other news agency headquarters, pleadings for stories, pictures. But a word picture is the only one that can tell the story of the storm to go down in history as the great storm of 1941.

At certain periods news of five or six fatal incidents was flowing into the Fargo Forum office simultaneously over long-distance wires.

At 2:30 a. m. Monday the Fargo Forum, through direct contact, had assembled the individual stories involving every 1 of the 44 bodies recovered and 5 hopelessly missing at that time.

HITS WINNIPEG AT 4

The storm struck Winnipeg shortly after 4 p. m., entered northeastern North Dakota about 6, and hit Fargo about 10 p. m.

Had it struck on any other day of the week the likelihood of so many fatalities would have been greatly reduced, as Saturday is the universal one for country folks to go to town. The hour of the day, too, was one which caught most of the rural residents after they were in town, and its very terror fired their desires to battle their way home and guard the security of their family members and their property.

Noticeable in the list of deaths is a considerable number of bachelor farmers, and in the new death reports which continued to pour in Monday of families in isolated sections. Too, there were many reports of abandoned cars whose occupants were unknown and unaccounted for.

Time only will unravel the circumstances of empty cars on side roads, farm homes with no smoke coming from the chimneys, and it is inevitable that the death list will increase.

DYING BOY'S WAVE OF ARM SAVES LIFE FOR TWIN BROTHER—THREE BROTHERS OF DAZEY FAMILY ARE DEAD

The feeble wave of an arm, a dying gesture, by his twin brother is the reason today Robert Taylor, 10, of Dazey, Barnes County, is alive—but his three brothers are dead.

Vernon Jacobson, a neighbor, saw the arm after the searching party had located the bodies of Leo Taylor, 17, and Donald Taylor, 15. Digging into the bank the party found Dickie Taylor wrapped around the body of his twin. Dickie died a few minutes later.

Robert is in a Valley City hospital, his condition serious.

The four boys had been to Dazey Saturday night roller skating. They left shortly before the storm broke for their home 4 miles southeast of town.

Their car stalled and they began to walk. A searching party found the two bodies at 7:45 a. m. and the twins.

They were children of Mr. and Mrs. Warren Taylor. An older brother, Clinton, is a student at N. D. A. C.

FATHER MAKES THREE HALF-MILE TRIPS TO SAVE FAMILY—ONE BOY OF 6 DIES AFTER REACHING HOME

Fighting every instant to keep breathing, Herman Treichel, of Ada, Minn., made three trips between his stalled automobile and his farm home a half mile away to lead his wife and four sons to safety from Saturday night's blinding storm.

Today he is in an Ada hospital in serious condition from exposure and exhaustion.

Tragedy enters the story, however, as one of the sons, Willard, 6, died Sunday from exposure.

Mr. and Mrs. Treichel and their four children—Orville, 16; Howard, 3; Stanley, 3 months; and Willard—had been in Ada and started home about 10 p. m. Saturday.

The storm broke shortly after 10 and their car stalled a half mile from home.

Mr. Treichel and Orville carried Howard and Stanley to the farm home, leaving Mrs. Treichel and Willard in the car.

After getting the two youngest boys to safety, Mr. Treichel returned alone to the automobile for his wife and Willard. The three started walking to their home and got lost, wandering around in the storm about an hour before reaching the house.

Mrs. Treichel is at home but suffering from exhaustion and exposure.

DEADLY GALE ROLLS CHILD ACROSS FIELD—FAMILY, UNABLE TO REACH HOUSE YARDS AWAY, SPENDS NIGHT IN SHEEP SHED

Fury of the storm was exemplified in striking manner in the story of the experiences of a farm family near Langdon, N. Dak., two members of which are in critical condition.

They are Mr. and Mrs. Harold Weiner, an 8-year-old daughter, and a 9-months-old son. Mrs. Weiner and the baby are under a physician's care, in such condition it is not thought advisable to move them from their home.

The Weiner family arrived at a point on the highway 200 yards south of their home just as the storm broke and parked the machine in its customary spot, since their driveway is usually blocked in the winter.

As they stepped out of the machine the daughter was swept away by the wind and rolled along a field much like a small barrel, with her parents, the mother clutching the baby to her bosom, in pursuit.

By the time they had retrieved the daughter they were lost, but after a time they bumped into a fence, which Weiner recognized as his own.

He left his wife and the children there and followed the fence looking for the nearest shelter.

After awhile he found his sheep shed and returned and brought his children there. At that time Mrs. Weiner was unable to move.

He hurried back for his wife and half dragged, half carried her to the sheep shed.

There they spent the night.

In the morning Weiner hitched up a team of horses to a "stone boat" and took Mrs. Weiner to the house.

Her hands and her body from the waist down were partly frozen. The baby also was frostbitten.

After getting his family in the house, Weiner walked to the home of a neighbor, Albert Sperling.

Sperling hitched up horses and drove to Langdon for a physician, returning with him after 6 hours, having been delayed by the storm and road conditions.

Mr. Weiner was frozen about the forehead and eyes.

TRACKS IN SNOW TELL HOW BOY, 11, FOUGHT IN VAIN TO SAVE HIS FATHER

Heroic 11-year-old Albert Jacobson, Jr., did his best but it was not enough, and he and his father, 73-year-old Albert Jacobson, Fort Ransom (Ransom County) farmer, died in the storm 80 rods from a farm home.

The snow about the two bodies found Sunday 3½ miles west of Fort Ransom told a tragic story. Tracks revealed that the older Jacobson collapsed and that the boy tried to drag him.

The two had gone to Fort Ransom to shop and had left for home about 7:30 p. m. Meantime Mrs. Jacobson, alarmed by the storm, had called Henry Martinson at Fort Ransom asking him to contact Mr. Jacobson, and for him to remain in town. The two had left, however.

Apparently they attempted to turn back, and their 1928 model car stalled. They walked about 1½ miles before the elder Jacobson collapsed.

The bodies were found at 6 a. m. by Arthur Anderson and Ole Olson, who had been searching for them.

Mr. Jacobson was a custodian at the last legislative session and had only recently returned from Bismarck.

Survivors are Mrs. Jacobson and Arnold at home, and other children, Dagny, Ingrid, and Mary Jacobson, 1202 Second Avenue

South, and Mrs. W. F. Knudson, 622 Tenth Avenue North, Fargo; Gunda Jacobson, Seattle, Wash.; Reuben, in the Navy and stationed on the U. S. S. *Honolulu;* and Andrew, with the United States Army at Fort Ord, Calif. A sister of Mr. Jacobson, Mrs. L. J. Berg, lives at Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. Jacobson was a pioneer resident of the Fort Ransom vicinity, coming from his native Norway in 1886.

Auto Is Blown Off Highway

At least 25 cars were ditched in the Moorhead vicinity and one automobile was blown off the road during the storm, highway patrolmen reported.

One man, whose name was not obtained, walked about a mile into town off U S 10 after his car was literally picked up by the wind and deposited in the ditch. He was unhurt.

Two highway patrolmen at Crookston, T. K. Knutson and Arthur Lofgren, spent the night in a snowbank about 3 miles north of Crookston, but suffered no ill effects. Equipped with blankets and other emergency aids, they kept their car running and were comfortable. Two others at Detroit Lakes, Cal Cummings and Orland Ott, were forced to spend the night at Callaway, Minn.

Moorhead highway patrolmen reported they towed about 10 cars into town off the highways and turned back a number of cars that were starting into the country. Wreckers also brought a number of cars into town, but were forced to leave the machines on the streets. The garages were filled.

H. A. Warner, superintendent of the Moorhead municipal power plant, reported several private circuits were blown down, at least two poles broken, and lights on the south side were out for a minute or so when wires blew together, causing a short circuit. The electric traffic signal at Eighth Street and Center Avenue was burned out by a short circuit. All damage was repaired Sunday, however.

Four big advertising signs between Moorhead and Dilworth were blown down by the wind.

Rail Agent Is Among Missing

Sid Bonaime, Great Northern station agent at Tilden Junction, near Crookston, is missing. Mr. and Mrs. Bonaime and their 2½-year-old son became stalled on Highway 32 about 1½ miles from Marcoux Corner, 16 miles east of Crookston on U S 2, before the storm began. A truck driver attempted to assist, but the storm had struck and the car become lodged in snow. The trucker went to a nearby farm home and the farmer took a team of horses to the stalled car, but failed to get it out of the drifted snow.

Against advice, Bonaime started across a field to his home nearby. His whereabouts had been determined. Mrs. Bonaime and the child were taken to safety.

Tilden Junction is about 20 miles east of Crookston.

Cousins Die Near Hannah; Had Been At 4-H Meeting

The frozen bodies of Kenneth Nickerson, 11, and Louise McLeod, 12, cousins, were found about 3:30 a. m. Sunday on a road about 2 miles from their home near Hannah, N. Dak., northwestern Cavalier County.

The youngsters had been at a 4-H Club meeting in the Byron township school, 6½ miles southwest of Hannah, along with some 20 other children.

Kenneth and Louise had started home about 6 p. m. Saturday on a light horse-drawn sled. The storm struck in all its fury about 6:15.

The children apparently unhitched the horse. Bodies of the two were found about a quarter mile east of the school by relatives who had started a search. The horse was found about 80 rods away, still alive.

Kenneth was the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. I. Nickerson, and Louise was the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Murdock McLeod, both families residing in the same farm home. The children were cousins of Allen J. McLeod, 310 Oakland Avenue, a member of the Fargo police department.

The other children at the meeting remained in the schoolhouse overnight.

Mother Loses in Attempt To Reach Children at Home

Attempting to join her five young children alone at home, Mrs. Alphonse LaRochelle, of near Crookston, Minn., was found frozen to death in a car which had been abandoned by someone else. Mrs. LaRochelle was in her early thirties.

Mr. and Mrs. LaRochelle were in Crookston Saturday. She heard a storm warning over the radio but she couldn't immediately find her husband, so she started out for home in their pick-up truck.

En route the truck stalled and she started to walk, climbing into the abandoned automobile apparently to rest—and there, Sunday, they found the body of the young mother who had braved the storm to be with her children.

Kelso Girl Storm Victim; Companion Badly Frozen

Frances Waters met death in the storm on the highway about 3½ miles south of Hillsboro, and her escort, Lowell Melsby, 25, of Hillsboro, was seriously frozen.

Their car became stalled, and they undertook to walk to safety, only to find themselves unable to cope with the storm as they started north. They turned about in the hope of reaching Kelso, but Miss Waters was overcome, and Melsby made an attempt to carry her. Himself finally exhausted, he had to leave Miss Waters and made his way into Kelso, which he reached about 12:30 a. m. A searching party was organized from Hillsboro, men going out afoot, and ultimately found Miss Waters' body lying across the railroad tracks which she and Melsby had attempted to follow in their battle for safety.

Melsby, the son of Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Melsby, of Hillsboro, is recovering at his home. The father is a rural mail carrier.

Miss Waters, a student at Mayville College, had been spending the week end at Kelso with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Waters, and she and Melsby were en route to Hillsboro when the storm overtook them.

It Was a "Long" Basketball Game; Marooned Folks Stayed All Night

(By Stanley Cowan)

More than 400 persons, many of them children, left the Moorhead Junior High School Building between 9 and 10 a. m. Sunday, weary, hungry, and worried, after spending the entire night marooned by the raging storm.

There were more than 2,000 persons, many of them standing, who had frenziedly watched final contests in the Minnesota district 23 basketball tournament Saturday night, unaware that the storm had developed until this announcement came over the public-address system:

"Police have been stationed at all doors and no one will be allowed to leave because of the storm."

Many in the audience thought it a joke and they laughed. Others looked shocked and stunned. But Supt. S. G. Reinertsen, of the Moorhead schools, assured the crowd it was no joke.

"A man has just come into the building. He lives only a block away. Yet he was nearly exhausted," Reinertsen said.

The formality of presenting awards over, the crowd milled down onto the gymnasium floor. Schoolrooms were opened and preparations were made to spend the night—or at least wait until the storm abated.

SOME WENT HOME

Soon several of those who lived nearby summoned enough courage to make a dash for home. Police allowed them to leave only after being assured that they could make it. Later the fury of the storm lessened somewhat and others battled the roaring wind and snow to their cars and crept homeward, unable to see but a foot or so ahead.

I was there with my son. We live less than a block from the building. Telling Jimmy to keep a tight hold on the belt of my coat, we pulled our caps down over our ears and went out into the storm. We could barely see, but the going wasn't bad while we were heading with the wind. But when we turned the corner and faced the storm it literally took our breath away.

HARD TO BREATHE

We had to turn our heads into our coats to breathe. Blindly trudging down the middle of the street, we cut across back lots and reached our back door, out of breath, nearly frozen, and a mass of snow. We knew then that it was no joke.

Back at junior high, Thomas Kloster, principal, told me later, the crowd was in high spirits and fully cooperative. There was no anger at being detained, but they set about finding amusements. Coaches who had come to participate in or to watch the tournament games, started a basketball game among themselves for the amusement of the shut-ins. That game developed into what may be a record breaker.

LOTS OF BASKETBALL

Other boys joined in. Soon there were four teams on the floor, each pair of teams shooting at one basket. That game continued until 5 a. m. There was at no time less than 20 boys on the floor, some of them players who had taken part in the games. They played until they were too exhausted to continue.

Meanwhile, on all three floors of the building others were attempting to find some place to sleep. Tables, floors, the hallways, were occupied by men, women, and children trying to get some rest. One group obtained a long plank, put clothing under it and coats on top of it, to make one long pillow.

Kloster and other school faculty members were too busy to rest directing the crowd, answering innumerable questions, and attempting to keep order. The school's radio was turned into KVOX and WDAY, and bulletins on the weather and other information were transmitted throughout the building through the public-address system.

CLEARED AT 4 A. M.

By 4 a. m. the storm again cleared somewhat, and some 30 children who lived within a few blocks of the school were permitted to go. Then the storm renewed its fury, and the remaining crowd settled down for the night.

T. J. Bolger, an official of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., was among those marooned. He put his knowledge to work, and soon there were three outside telephone lines in operation. Lines of anxious shut-ins continued at those telephones until 3 a. m. They were calling their homes or relatives or friends telling them that they were safe.

PARENTS WERE ANXIOUS

Other calls were from anxious parents who had hired girls to take care of their children for the evening while they went to the games. One man, from Detroit Lakes, broadcast an appeal to Detroit Lakes asking if someone wouldn't please go to his home and see that his little children were safe. He had left a young girl in charge.

Members of the school traffic patrol, with their white Sam Browne belts, helped bring order out of confusion, and 25 Boy Scouts from Fergus Falls, brought to the tournament

by 2 men, did their good turn for that day by assisting.

There was a doctor from Barnesville in the crowd, and Kloster kept him always in sight—just in case. But there was no illness and not an accident.

FOOD BROUGHT IN

During a lull in the storm a few of the braver men battled their way downtown to get something to eat. They came back with pockets loaded with candy bars, peanuts, and popcorn for the children.

That was the one big problem, Kloster said. There was no food in the building.

When morning came cars were sent out to survey the highways. No information as to road conditions could be obtained. The car drivers came back to report everything blocked. By 11 a. m., however, highway snowplows had been through and most of the out-of-towners started for home.

Frank Roof, junior-high instructor, Wayne Winjum, senior-high teacher, and A. C. Christopherson, football coach, stayed with Kloster throughout the night to assist. Christopherson operated a free taxi service in the morning, taking townspeople home.

---

500 BASKETBALL FANS SPEND NIGHT IN BUFFALO SCHOOL

About 500 basketball players and fans spent Saturday night storm-bound in the schoolhouse at Buffalo, N. Dak., where the North Dakota consolidated high school girls basketball tournament was played.

Several hundred others left the building during the evening, and apparently all are safe.

One couple, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Lackey, left for their farm home shortly after 10 p. m. Their car stalled a half mile out, and they were forced to walk back into Buffalo—and they made it.

Children were put to bed on desks and benches in the building, while their elders played bridge and whist. Some "just visited" the night through. Some of the younger crowd spent most of the night on the basketball court in the gymnasium.

The home economics department of the high school joined with 4-H boys and girls, who had been selling candy at the tournament, to prepare a lunch. Donations from the "patrons" brought in $40.

At one point in the evening an 8-year-old youngster was reported missing, and a chill went through the crowd as his name was called again and again on the school's loudspeaker system. He was finally located in the building.

MANY SPEND NIGHT IN FINLEY AUDITORIUM

Fifty children and many adults were forced to spend most of Saturday night in the city auditorium at Finley, in Steele County.

Junior basketball teams from the Finley territory were participating in an invitational tournament. They included groups from McVille, Hope, Kloten, Mayville, and consolidated schools of Lindaas and Logan Center in Steele County.

Many of the children stayed in private homes, while others remained in the auditorium, Sheriff D. E. Porter of Steele County said.

HEARS CRIES OF WIFE AND CHILD FADE IN STORM

Mr. and Mrs. Palmer Peterson left their stalled auto north of Crookston, placing their 5-year-old son between them, hand-in-hand, attempted to walk a quarter of a mile to a farm house.

The wind tore Mr. Peterson from his wife and son. He could hear them calling, and called back though the storm. The calls became fainter, then faded out.

Searchers found the frozen bodies of Mrs. Peterson and the little boy. Mr. Peterson was found alive but is in serious condition in a Crookston hospital with severe shock and frost-bitten hands and face.

Mrs. Peterson had removed her own petticoat, wrapped it around the body of her son. That circumstance had led the search party which found the bodies to believe at first that the child was a girl.

The tragedy occurred about 6 miles north of Crookston. The three apparently had left the city about 9:30 p. m. It is believed they left the auto about 10 p. m. The bodies were found late Sunday.

DARES STORM; IS FOUND DEAD

Mrs. William Baumgartner, 50, who refused to remain in a schoolhouse with her two companions, was found frozen to death about 300 yards from the Herman Engstrand farm, where she was employed, 5 miles north of Cando, in Towner County.

Mrs. Baumgartner, Edith Engstrand, and Curtis Carlson had left Cando Saturday night for the Engstrand farm. Overtaken by the storm, they stopped at a schoolhouse a mile from their destination.

She refused to take the advice of the other two and started walking toward the farm. Evidence indicates that at one time she was but a few feet from the farmhouse but had turned.

Miss Engstrand and Carlson stayed in the school all night and were unharmed.

GWINNER WOMAN, SONS SAFE; SEARCH WAS MADE

Searching crews from Forman and Gwinner, Sargent County, spent 7 hours Saturday night and Sunday morning before they learned that Mrs. William Jentz and her two small sons, of Gwinner, were safe. The trio had taken refuge during the storm at the home of George Cartier. The party worked from 2 a. m. until 9:30 a. m.

DECISION TO TAKE CAR COSTS LIFE OF NELSON FARM WIFE

Mrs. John Kallestad, 40, died and a searching party later found the body of Sever Reep, neighboring farmer, in the area 5 miles southwest of Michigan in Nelson County.

Mr. and Mrs. Kallestad had driven into town by team and when the storm arose started back in a car with their neighbor, Reep. The Kallestads got out at their corner, and started down the side road, but Mrs. Kallestad became exhausted and he hurried ahead hitched up a team, and returned to carry her back. She died a short time after she was brought into their home, which was only a half mile from the highway.

Meanwhile, Reep drove on toward his home, a few miles away. Sunday morning his car was found abandoned on the road midway between the two places. Late Sunday searchers found his body alongside a fence, which he apparently was using as a guide to his home. Reep was 35 and was the son of Thomas Reep.

Ironically, Kallestad's brother, Charlie, and Charles McKinnon drove back safely through the storm with the team the Kallestads had left in Michigan.

BOY, 8, DIES IN FATHER'S ARMS

Eight-year-old Palmer Bjerken died in the arms of his father, and a few minutes later his mother, Mrs. Jacob Bjerken, of Mahnomen, died.

Mr. and Mrs. Bjerken and their sons, Palmer and Arnold, 13, farm residents, had been visiting at the home of a neighbor, a short distance from their home.

En route home, the Bjerken car stalled and the four started to walk the few remaining rods to their home. They were huddled together, the father carrying Palmer. The wind and blinding snow apparently choked Palmer and his mother to death, within minutes of each other.

The father and the other boy then started out to reach the farmhouse. Exhausted, Mr. Bjerken fell unconscious. Arnold slapped and shook his father into consciousness, and the pair staggered through the storm and reached the house.

Violet Bjerken, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bjerken, had stayed at the neighbor's home.

WOMAN DIES AS SHE WAITS HELP

Mrs. Elmer Greene, 26, was frozen to death within a mile of her home, which is 5 miles northeast of Crookston, Minn.

Mr. and Mrs. Greene had gone into Crookston Saturday to purchase a birthday present for one of their sons, William Henry, who was 5 Friday.

Riding in a pick-up truck, the machine stalled within a mile from home. Windows of the truck were broken out, and the couple apparently decided to walk to their home.

They attempted to follow a fence along the road. Mrs. Greene became exhausted, and Mr. Greene told her to stay near a large tree while he went to the home of a neighbor, Harry Herberg, about a quarter mile away, for help.

Herberg accompanied Greene back to where Mrs. Greene was, but the two men were unable to carry her. They returned to the Herberg home to get two of the Herberg boys. The four men again went to where Mrs. Greene was located, but she was dead by the time they had carried her to the Herberg home.

Besides William Henry, there are two other children, Elmer Euguen, 4, and Marlene Margaret, 2½.

THREE DIE 50 FEET FROM SAFETY

Huddled together but 50 feet from safety, the bodies of Mrs. Jacob Hoffman, 25, her daughter, Ervone, 4, and Henry Friesen, 26, were found by searchers in the Hoffman farmyard, near Munich, N. D., after the frantic husband had summoned aid by telephone. They had driven home from Devils Lake and left their car on the highway as the farmyard road, about 40 rods long, was blocked. Mr. Hoffman was the only one who managed to stagger to the house. He is seriously frozen about the face and arms and was to be removed to a hospital from his home. He called several neighbors on the phone, then went out himself to search for his wife and daughter and Friesen, who was a neighbor. The bodies were found about 1:30 a. m. Sunday within a few feet of each other.

CAVALIER BROTHERS SPEND 10 HOURS IN AUTOMOBILE

LaVerne and Henry Dick, brothers, residing at Clyde, N. Dak., Cavalier County, spent 10 hours in a stalled car on highway 5 between Langdon and Calvin. They had plenty of gas, and the heater kept the young men comfortable. There were a number of similar experiences in this area, where the snow is heavy.

ANENT IGLOO DWELLERS—TWO MEN BURROW INTO SNOW—SUFFER ONLY FROST BITE

Burrowing rabbit-like into snow in a drainage ditch, Waldemar Johnson of Warren, Minn., spent Saturday night in an improvised igloo and came out of his retreat at 10 a. m. Sunday suffering only from frost bite. He was driving to his farm when the storm struck and his motor stalled. He struggled into the ditch and settled down for the night. Johnson had been reported missing in the early hours Sunday and searching parties had gone out.

Surprised man was Gene Fender, West Fargo, who watched his driving companion, Stanley Wachal, 1023 Broadway, disappear in the storm along U. S. 75 near Wahpeton early Sunday, when a farmer passing by 2½ hours later picked up Wachal, unharmed except for frost-bitten hands and ears.

Fender had expected it would be Wachal's body that would be found in the morning, but Wachal had burrowed into a snowbank in the ditch and had nestled down, afraid to move about.

The two men were returning to Fargo from Wahpeton, where they had bowled. As they came to a fork in the road, the wind suddenly swung their car around.

Wachal stepped out to try and get bearings for the car, when another gust of wind suddenly swept him into the ditch.

There he bedded down after failing to find the car, while Fender sat in the machine certain he had seen the last of his companion.

Wachal felt ill Sunday night and planned to go to a hospital for a check-up.

Gardner Youth's Effort To Save His Sister Fails

Bernice Larson, 20, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Larson, residing a mile south and 2 miles east of Gardner, met death within a half mile of her home when she and her brother, Kenneth, tried to walk to their home after their car stalled.

They had been in Gardner during the evening and left about 9 p. m. They were about halfway home when their car became stalled, and they left it to make their way across a field to their home.

As the fury of the storm beat about them, Bernice became exhausted, and Kenneth tried to carry her, but found himself unable to make progress. His pleas to his sister to "Don't give up," to keep up the fight, were unavailing, and the brother finally had to go on by himself. It was after 11 p. m. when he reach home, exhausted, frostbitten, and in a state of almost complete collapse.

The search for Miss Larson began at dawn, and about 7 a. m. her body was found.

Miss Bernice and Kenneth were the Larsons' only children.

Man, Wife Die at St. Thomas

Less than a quarter mile from their farm home 5½ miles northwest of St. Thomas, were found the bodies of a prominent farmer and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Heuchert, who abandoned their automobile, attempted to make safety on foot. They were slightly off a rural road, the bodies about 20 feet apart, Mrs. Heuchert lying on her side, Mr. Heuchert on his face. He was 68, she 64.

The Heucherts had been in Hensel visiting their three daughters there and left for home about 15 minutes before the storm struck. A searching party of neighbors and their sons found them at 9:30 a. m. Sunday.

Heuchert is the brother of Rev. Carl Heuchert, Lutheran minister at Henning, Minn. There are 10 children surviving, Johnny, Alfred, Walter, George, and Raymond, and Mrs. Kenneth Volker at home; Mrs. N. C. Wilker, Mrs. John Bennewies, and Mrs. George Selheim, Hensel, and Carl, Grand Forks.

Heuchert farmed 1,600 acres. He came here from Germany when 19. Mrs. Heuchert also was from Germany, coming to this country with her parents, when she was 3.

Bunday, Oakes Leader, Dead

Overcome as he tried to make his way through the storm, J. E. Bunday, 75-year-old Oakes civic leader, dropped dead in front of the First National Bank at Oakes, of which he was vice president.

Overexertion brought on a heart attack which caused death, Mr. Bunday's physician said.

Mr. Bunday had been a resident of North Dakota since 1897 and before joining the Oakes bank had been with a bank at Gwinner.

He was city treasurer of Oakes for 30 years.

Born in Northfield, Minn., February 22, 1866, he farmed at Brookings, S. Dak., before coming to North Dakota.

Mrs. Bunday survives him.

Tom Falconer, Grandin, Suffers Frozen Hands

Tom Falconer, of Grandin (Cass County), had a 2-hour battle trying to make his way into town from a distance of only a half mile, and arrived with his hands badly frozen.

Lakota Man's Body Is Located Resting Against Phone Pole

Resting against a telephone pole, the frozen body of Gust Carlson, about 70, was found in the residence district of Lakota, snow drifted up to his shoulders. He was but a half block from his home when overcome. A laborer, he leaves Mrs. Carlson and four sons and daughters.

Gardner Teacher Stays in Car During Storm

Rosewald Hull, a member of the Gardner School faculty, escaped with his life because he remained in his stalled car. He had gone out during the evening for a drive when the storm hit and his car stalled. Realizing that his best chance for safety lay in remaining in his car, he did so. Sunday morning he was able to get into Gardner, arriving with severe frost bites but otherwise sound.

Misses Road Leading to Farm and Perishes

Apparently missing the road leading from the highway in to his farm, Berg Moren, 56, bachelor who resided a half mile south of Wylie, Minn., was found frozen to death on the highway. Wylie is northwest of Red Lake Falls. Moren had been in Wylie Saturday night and left about 11 p. m. to walk home.

Son Goes for Help; Mother Dies in Car

A son who left his 73-year-old mother in the car in which they were riding to get help returned to find her dead of exposure near Park River. Their car had gone into a ditch.

Mrs. Nancy Charon, Park River, was found by her son, William, when he returned with assistance.

Duluth Area's Damage Heavy

DULUTH, MINN.—Heavy damage occurred in the Duluth area as a result of the Saturday night storm.

Wind damage in Duluth included ripping off half the roof of the Consolidated Elevator Co., exposing more than a million bushels of wheat. At the Bryant School a metal desk, 30 feet wide and 90 feet long, was torn from the building.

Residence windows, doors, roofs, and chimneys were loosened by the wind and telephone lines were put out of commission. Firemen were kept busy with a series of chimney and roof fires. Similar conditions prevailed in Superior. Snowfall measured 1.2 inches.

WAREHOUSE COLLAPSES

Damage also was caused by the wind at Crookston. The rear end of the Elsholtz Co. warehouse collapsed under the force of the blow. No one was in the building at the time.

At Warroad the storm was reported as the worst of the winter, with the temperature skidding to 14 below zero, but no reports of death were received there. Many persons were stranded at friends' homes overnight, however.

TWO HUNDRED ARE MAROONED

More than 200 persons were forced to seek temporary shelter at Park Rapids. About 125 took refuge in a theater while one private home had between 40 and 50 unexpected guests and 25 persons stayed in a garage. The storm there drove the temperature to 11 below zero.

At least 50 cars were reported stalled between Paynesville and Roscoe, Minn. High winds prevailed around Pipestone, although there was little drifting snow.

Week-End Visit to Detroit Lakes Ends in Death for Fargo Couple

A week-end visit ended in death for Mr. and Mrs. John Lennox, 534 Twenty-first Street N., Fargo.

Their bodies were discovered in a swamp 5 miles northeast of Detroit Lakes, Minn., at 4:30 p. m., Sunday, after an all-day search.

Mr. and Mrs. Lennox—she was 28 and he was 37—and their 7-year-old son, Charles Raymond, had gone to Detroit Lakes to visit Frank Vanderwarka, Mr. Lennox's stepfather. Lennox was an employee of the Northern Pacific.

GONE TO NEIGHBORS

Saturday night the couple had gone to spend the evening with another neighbor, Clyde Stull, about a half mile distant.

They left Stull's home to walk to the Vanderwarkas'.

They had made about half the distance, when, as Sheriff Mox Olson, of Becker County, reconstructs the story, they turned to walk with the wind. They wandered into a swamp where the snow was several feet deep. They exhausted themselves threshing about in the snow. Apparently Mrs. Lennox collapsed first. Lennox had made a path about 100 feet long where he apparently had walked in an effort to stave off freezing, Olson said.

Wayne Shepard and Fred Eidenschinck, of Detroit Lakes, found the bodies.

BORN IN IOWA

Mrs. Lennox, the former Denna Ramona Dix, was born at Alexander, Iowa, on November 4, 1912. She had been a Fargo resident most of her life. The couple were married in Fargo on March 22, 1930.

Besides her son, she leaves her mother, Mrs. Denna Dix, 1433 Twelfth Avenue S., and the following brothers and sister: Kent and Orion Dix, 1433 Twelfth Avenue S., Meraioth Dix, 113 Thirteenth Street S.; and Mrs. O. J. Donnelly, Hollywood, Calif.

A native North Dakotan, Mr. Lennox was born December 17, 1903. He leaves a half-brother, Harry Higgens, 1505 Tenth Avenue S., and two sisters, Mrs. Walter O. O'Marro, 347 Twenty-third Street N., and Mrs. James Recco, of Chicago

The bodies are at the O. J. Hanson funeral home in Fargo.

Fire In Chimney Sends Moorhead Mother, Baby, Out to Their Deaths

A chimney fire in the home of Mrs. John Bergman, 2 miles west of Ada, Minn., led to the freezing death of Mrs. Bergman's sister, Mrs. Oscar Sandy, 38, 105 Fourth Street N., Moorhead, and her 9-month-old son, Harlan Duane.

Mrs. Sandy had been visiting her sister and her mother, Mrs. Caroline Sand, who makes her home with Mrs. Bergman. Saturday night, during the height of the storm, the fire broke out and Mrs. Sandy took the child and started for the home of Lloyd Ness, across U. S. 75 from the Bergman residence.

She apparently became lost and wandered in the storm. Bodies of the two were found in the highway ditch Sunday.

Mr. Sandy, who was at home in Moorhead, unable to reach Ada because of blocked roads, said Sunday that his wife and baby had gone to Ada last Monday. He still was unaware of

what had actually happened, although he had been informed of the deaths by an Ada undertaker.

Besides her husband, three other children survive, Mildred, 16; Curtis, 13; and Herman, 11. Mrs. Sandy was born on a farm near Ada, July 6, 1903, and attended a rural school near there. She married Mr. Sandy July 24, 1925, at Ada and came to Moorhead, where she had resided since.

Mr. Sandy planned to go to Ada today to make arrangements for the funeral.

MANY AUTOS ABANDONED

Many abandoned automobiles in ditches, in fields, and along the highway was the sight greeting Mr. and Mrs. Merril Morre and their two children, Richard and Marilyn, on their return Sunday from Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Mr. Moore said a high wind hit Sioux Falls about midnight Saturday, the air being filled with dirt but little snow.

He said they were unaware of the storm which hit throughout this section until he was on his way back.

The abandoned automobiles were mostly between Wheaton, Minn., and Moorhead.

And when they arrived home they found three large screens on the porch of the Merril Moore mortuary, 202 Eighth Street S., had been ripped off by the wind.

They had been visiting Mr. Moore's parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. H. Moore, of Sioux Falls.

FOUR PERISH IN MANITOBA

(Special to the Fargo Forum)

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.—A driving, snow-laden wind swept through Manitoba late Saturday night and left in its wake four persons frozen to death. At one time during the blizzard the wind velocity reached 51 miles per hour.

The dead are Mrs. John Janzen, 43, and her 6-year-old daughter, Marie, Winkler, Manitoba; Isaac I. Fast, of Niverville, Manitoba; and an Indian of Letellier, Manitoba.

(Winkler is about 25 miles north of Neche, N. Dak.; Niverville, 25 miles south of Winnipeg; and Letellier, 10 miles north of Emerson, N. Dak.)

HUNDREDS STALLED

Hundreds of motorists were forced to stop at farmhouses as the swirling snow made visibility on highways nil.

The storm struck Winnipeg about 4 p. m. Saturday, following steadily dropping temperatures throughout the day. By 7 p. m. it had reached top fury, and it continued throughout the night.

Roads were blocked, city streetcar service disrupted, and power plants shut off power. Many rural roads remain impassable. H. Schillingberg, a school teacher of Altona, Manitoba, could not return to teach his school after visiting at Morris, Manitoba, for the week end.

HOCKEY TEAMS HELD UP

Two busloads of hockey players, traveling to play-off games, were snow-bound. One, the St. James Midgets, spent the night in a schoolhouse at Oakbluff, Manitoba. The other, the Dauphin Midgets, had to stay at Neepawa. They returned safety to their home towns Sunday.

The fatalities occurred in all cases when the victims tried to make home from their respective towns. Becoming tired, they stopped to rest, and death overtook them.

Train and airplane services were disrupted, but all arrived at their stations and airports late but without mishap.

ROADS IN MANY AREAS BLOCKED

Roads in central, eastern, and northeastern North Dakota were generally heavy or blocked Monday as result of the storm.

The Minot, Bismarck, Williston, and Dickinson territories failed to get the brunt of the storm and highways were generally clear although somewhat icy in the Minot region, the State highway department reported.

Jamestown said roads north of there were generally impassable and Devils Lake reported everything choked except for short distances and U. S. 2, U. S. 10 was open across the State and U. S. 81 from Wahpeton to Hamilton, N. Dak.

North Dakota No. 1, north and south out of Valley City was blocked.

Bus lines had schedules interrupted Saturday night and Sunday.

Saturday night both a west-bound and an east-bound bus left the Union Bus Depot here but minutes before the storm struck. A west-bound bus turned back at West Fargo. More than an hour was required to return to Fargo—a distance of 5 miles. The east-bound bus turned back shortly out of Moorhead and returned without incident.

The lines to Oakes and Cooperstown were not running today because of blocked roads. The Grand Forks-bound bus was to leave late in the day. Schedules to the Twin Cities and west of here were operating.

Commercial truckers were in the main home Saturday night, at least not on the highway, they explained, so were saved much of the grief other vehicular traffic experienced.

Main-line railroad trains were operating about on time.

The Great Northern sent all its branch trains out of Fargo Monday. The Northern Pacific Cooperstown branch, and the Casselton branch (the Marion) line were held here. Northern Pacific officials said there were snowdrifts from 8 to 15 feet deep in the Hastings and Nome territory in southern Barnes County. A rotary plow will be sent to clear that line out Tuesday, provided the wind does not freshen. A Russell plow was to go over the Cooperstown line Tuesday.

Northwest air lines canceled out but one trip due to poor visibility. Otherwise the schedules were maintained.

COURAGEOUS MOTHER LOST SEEKING TO HELP FAMILY

A courageous Grand Rapids, Minn., woman who set out for help for her three children and her ill husband as they sat stormbound on the Crookston-Grand Forks highway (U. S. 2) near Fisher, Minn., apparently sacrificed her life for their sake.

She is Mrs. Orland Bailey, whose whereabouts still was unknown after an all day search Sunday and today. Bailey, the son of John Bailey, Grand Forks, and the children, aged 5, 4, and 2, were rescued by a passing motorist after a long wait and brought to the Bailey home in Grand Forks.

The family was en route from Grand Rapids to Grand Forks, with Bailey planning to enter a hospital for treatment. When the car stalled, Mrs. Bailey set out along the road for help.

As the search for Mrs. Bailey went on without success, it was feared that she probably had perished on the highway, and that snowplows that traversed the section early Sunday had buried her body.

LEAVES SLEIGH, DIES IN FIELD

Only 20 rods from his farm home, Carl D. Hillesland, 74, perished in a field after a broken sleigh pole caused him to abandon the sleigh and horses as he was en route to his farm home, 8 miles northeast of Aneta, Saturday night. His frozen body was nearly completely covered with snow when found by searching parties.

Apparently none the worse for their night in the storm, the horses were standing calmly beside the abandoned sleigh.

Hillesland had been a resident of the Aneta vicinity for many years. He leaves Mrs. Hillesland; seven sons and daughters: Andrew, Manfred; Anton, Taylor Falls, Minn.; Thomas, San Francisco, Calif.; Mrs. Henning Carlson, residing in an unidentified Minnesota city; Mrs. Julius Gehrke, Aneta; Gunda, St. Paul; and Mrs. Chester Overby, Kenyon, Minn.; and three brothers: L. D. Hillesland and E. B. Hillesland, Aneta; and Elias, in Norway.

Three Aneta school teachers and their driver companion spent a terrifying night on Highway 2 between Grand Forks and Aneta before a nearby farmer came to their rescue at 8 a. m. Sunday, 5 miles west of Niagara. In the party were Amy Snyder, home-economics teacher; Evelyn Piltingsrud, primary teacher; and Lucille Amdahl, high-school English teacher; and Earl Landgren, Underwood, N. Dak., the driver.

The group left Grand Forks, where the teachers had been shopping, at 8 p. m. When the engine sputtered and stopped, they had only a small blanket for extra cover. The car was without a heater.

Members of the party suffered from frostbite.

FEAR LOSSES OF LIVESTOCK

Some fears are expressed by local livestock men that livestock losses may have resulted from the storm, although there had been no definite information regarding losses in this area early Monday.

"Where bands of sheep were being fed, with only trees as a shelter, they may have bunched up and smothered or drifted away and piled up," said L. W. Kube, manager of the Union Stock Yards Co.

"Where there was a shed for them to get under, there would be little danger. Most of the feeders in this section are provided with shelter."

B. E. Groom, secretary of the Greater North Dakota Association, said there might have been some loss of horses.

"I have noticed in trips through the State that there are quite a few horses out on the prairies," he said. "They winter well in the open if they have access to grass or a straw stack, except under such unusual storm conditions as that 75-mile gale. Under such conditions they might flounder into a heavy drift and smother or freeze."

RECALL MARCH '88 BLIZZARD AS FIERCE EARLY DAY STORM

Saturday night's disastrous storm has recalled to two North Dakota pioneer residents in Fargo, L. B. Hanna, former Governor, and F. W. McLean, United States marshal, that March 1888 brought a somewhat similar fury out of the northwest which carried death to many on the prairies.

Mr. Hanna was living at Page at that time and recalls that the storm lasted 3 days and nights with much more snow than in Saturday's storm.

"The death list was not as large as in this disaster," said Mr. Hanna, "for one reason because the State was much more sparsely settled. But, many perished in that big blizzard."

Mr. McLean was living at Langdon. He says the storm was similar to the one Saturday night in that it followed a period of mild weather.

"The morning opened clear and bright," he said. "Then it clouded up and began to rain, which soon turned to snow. Then the wind struck with fury out of the northwest and it raged for 3 days.

"Those, of course, were the days before the automobile and the only means of transportation was by train or team. Many who had started on journeys across the prairies were caught poorly prepared to meet the storm. They had gone out with light clothing because of the mild weather."

Many of the victims were not found until days after the storm subsided.

Farewell Party Turns Into an All-Night Event

What started out to be an evening farewell party in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Schroeder, of Moorhead, who left Sunday to make their home in South St. Paul, turned into an all-night affair at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Carlson, 618 Eighth Street S, Moorhead.

And the overflow crowd—25 of them—stayed in the 7-room home of Brooks Brown, 703 Sixth Street S, Moorhead. The 25 were in addition to the 7 students who room there and who were home, and the 4 in the Brown family, making a grand total of 35. Mrs. Brown is a daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Carlson.

Between 50 and 60 persons were attending the party at the Carlson home when the storm broke out. All but 18 of them managed to get to their homes in Moorhead or with relatives by 2 or 3 a. m., but the 18 stayed overnight, sleeping on davenports, floors after beds were filled.

At the Brooks Brown home, some of those from out of town, who were at the Schroeder party, were accommodated, and the house was packed. Most of the out-of-towners were from Barnesville and Fergus Falls. They had attended the basketball tournament at the junior-high school and battled the storm to get to the Carlson and Brown homes. All left for their homes Sunday.

The Schroeders, with their children, left by car Sunday. The Carlsons received a wire stating they arrived safely in St. Paul at 8 p. m.

Two Northern Pacific Branch Lines Blocked

The Northern Pacific branch lines from Fargo to Marion and from Valley City to McHenry were blocked, and there was no attempt to run trains over them this morning. Plows are being sent over the lines today.

A train started over the southwestern branch to Streeter at 7:05 a. m.

Other Northern Pacific trains were nearly on schedule.

Woman of 60 Dies at Pekin

A 60-year-old widow was frozen to death, and a young couple are under care of a nurse after suffering from exposure as the aftermath of the storm in the Pekin vicinity.

Mrs. Olaf Christianson, 60, who had been shopping in Pekin, southern Nelson County, started at 7:30 p. m. to walk the three-quarters mile distance from the village to the farm home, where she resided with her sister, Mrs. Gusta Brude.

At 7 a. m. Sunday searching parties found her, her bag of groceries beside her, in a field a slight distance north of the highway. She leaves only her sister.

Three Persons Missing In Devils Lake Region

Devils Lake, N. Dak.—Saturday night's storm resulted in a traffic tie-up in the lake region, hundreds o' motorists were marooned, and at least three were still missing today.

Every means was being used to find Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Reep, who had left Devils Lake about 6 p. m. Saturday for the Noonan School, where Mrs. Reep is a teacher.

With wires down, the school could not be reached by telephone, but an airplane was being used in an attempt to sight the marooned car while a snow plow was leading a searching party. Authorities and Reep's family were particularly anxious to reach him, as a brother, Sever Reep, died in the storm near Michigan.

One Edmore man was missing this morning and another suffered frozen feet when their car stalled northeast of Edmore after they had taken a farmer home. Searching parties were combing an area about 7 miles northeast of Edmore for Lawrence Melland and believe he may be frozen to death.

Melland left Edmore Saturday evening with Art Fjelstad and Svale Egeland to take a farmer home. On their return trip the car stalled about a mile from the farm. Fjelstad and Egeland stayed in the car, but Melland started walking and has not been heard from since.

Egeland suffered from exposure while Fjelstad's feet were frozen.

Heavy Damage to Plate Glass

Seventeen plate-glass windows in Fargo and Moorhead business establishments were blown in by the storm, with a loss of more than $1,500 in glass, plus an unestimated larger amount in damage to goods in display windows, a check disclosed.

In addition, a number of signs and doors were torn loose, and the wind ripped down a large flower box from a second-story window ledge at the New York Hairdressing Academy, 109 Broadway, the box falling into the street but not injuring anyone.

At the Coca Cola Bottling Works, 92 Front Street, two large doors were ripped from their hinges. Employees, summoned by police, made their way to the establishment and labored until 3 a. m. to repair the damage.

The heaviest plate-glass damage was at the O. J. deLendrecie store and men's shop, where four windows were smashed in. Cost of replacing the glass will be approximately $400. Besides, considerable merchandise was damaged.

Other plate-glass losses:

J. J. Newberry store, 110 Broadway, one window, $175.

Wimmer's Jewelry, 610 Front Street, two windows, $150.

Romkey Vegetable Market, 506 Front Street, three windows, $200.

W W. Wallwork Garage, Moorhead, one window, $150.

Graver Hotel, one window, $85.

Red Owl Super Market, Lower Broadway, one window, $100.

S & S. Food Market, 817 Broadway, one window, $50.

Jeff's Market, 315 First Avenue South, Moorhead, one window, $75.

Little Red Grocery, 210 Front Street, two windows, $100.

Houglum & Olson Furniture Store, 18 Eighth Street South, Moorhead, one window, $100. Last fall fire destroyed the Houglum & Olson building at Center Avenue and Fourth Street, Moorhead, and the Eighth Street site is the firm's present location.

This tabulation was gathered from glass companies and firms which suffered losses.

Find Bodies of Beltrami Trio

Leaving their car which had stalled 3½ miles west of Lockhart, Minn., Mr. and Mrs. Ludwig Foss and daughter, Roselyn, about 18, of near Beltrami, Minn., were found frozen to death early Monday on the highway a short distance from their auto. Lockhart, in Norman County, is about 10 miles north of Ada, Minn.

They had been at Ada Saturday and were en route to the Theodore Stromstead farm, 7 miles southwest of Beltrami, where they work, when they were overtaken by the storm.

They had walked along a county road south with the wind. Their bodies were found by Mr. Stromstead and his son about 10 rods from the Driscoll and Sullivan farm.

Mr. and Mrs. Foss, who were in their later 50's or early 60's, were the parents of five other children.

Sisters Freeze to Death—Bodies Struck by Train

Frozen to death, and their bodies then struck by a railway engine was the fate of two sisters residing near Pembina, N. Dak., Florence Howry 15, and Katie Howry 21.

The family resides a half mile south of Pembina and about 100 yards away from the Northern Pacific track. The girls had been in town, had started home along the track Saturday night, and apparently were overcome by the storm.

Meanwhile a boxcar had blown onto the main track and a passenger train bound for Emerson to the north was wrecked. A replacement engine, en route from East Grand Forks, pulled into Pembina and on the pilot was the body of one of the sisters. Townfolks recalled the two had left together and searchers found the other body on the track at 7 a. m. Sunday.

Katie Howry had been doing domestic work in the Pembina area and had come to town to be taken out to the farm of Mr. Helm Saturday night. Their father, Mike Howry, is a track laborer.

Three From Grand Forks Found Dead on Roadside

Shortly before noon Monday, the bodies of three persons were found on the roadside near the Northwest School of Agriculture about a mile out of Crookston.

They were Mr. and Mrs. Elmer T. Ellington, of Grand Forks, and Miss Harriet Coger, principal of the Winship School in Grand Forks.

They had left Grand Forks for Crookston but had not notified anyone of their destination. Reported missing Sunday, searchers did not know where to seek them and their whereabouts was not learned until their bodies were found.

It is believed they left their stalled car to find shelter.

Mr. Ellington was a salesman for the Paramount-Publix Film Co. and had visited Fargo frequently.

A native of Crookston, his father, deceased, was cashier of the former Scandia-American Bank of Crookston. Elmer Ellington was educated in the Crookston public schools, and after his marriage to Miss Grace Willie, a Crookston girl, sister of Mrs. Florence Slocum, of Crookston, he went to Rolla, N. Dak., where he operated a hardware store for several years. His first wife died at Rolla and later he married Miss Lulu Byrne, a former Grand Forks school teacher.

Previous to his employment with the Paramount-Publix Co. he had resided at Jamestown and later was engaged with an automobile concern at Grand Forks.

Visits Parents, Perishes on Way Back to His Job

His day off proved the last day in the life of Raymond (Whitey) Johnson, of Valley City, who perished near Cooperstown.

Mr. Johnson was employed as a baker at Valley City by the Miller Bakery. Saturday was his day off, and he elected to go to Cooperstown to visit his parents, riding with Bob Miller in the bakery truck.

En route home to Valley City, Miller and Johnson attempted to turn back when 1½ miles out of Cooperstown. The truck went into the ditch.

They set out on foot. Johnson collapsed. Miller attempted to carry him. Miller then went on alone in the hope he could bring help to his companion.

He reached Cooperstown, and a searching party went in search of Johnson. His frozen body was discovered about 7 a. m. Sunday.

Besides his parents, there are a brother, Gordon, and Mrs. Johnson, both of Valley City.

Miller was severely frozen about the face, his arms, and legs. Barring possibility of pneumonia, he is expected to recover.

Sharpe, Legislator, Is Found Safe at Neighbor's

A. I. Sharpe, representative from the Foster-Eddy District and a Glenfield, N. Dak.,

merchant, was located Sunday morning safely at the home of a neighbor. He had been unaccounted for since Saturday night, and concern was felt for his safety. Broken communication lines in the Glenfield area made getting of details of Mr. Sharpe's experience impossible.

Loses His Way Going to Barn

The intense ferocity of the storm may be better understood in the facts developed in connection with the death of Frank Meyers, a bachelor farmer residing about 6 miles northwest of Grand Forks.

Meyers' body was found Sunday afternoon in a field about a half mile from his home, a lantern clutched in his hand.

As officials reconstructed the story, they believe that Meyers had undertaken to go from his home to his barn—just a few rods apart—and that he was blown from his path and became lost on the prairie.

Wadena Woman Badly Frozen; Will Recover

At Wadena, Minn., Wesley hospital physicians said the condition of Mrs. Maynard Castle, 35, was favorable in spite of frozen hands, feet, and legs. She walked to shelter Saturday night after her automobile stalled. The storm was so intense near Wadena that 75 automobiles plunged into roadside ditches when the drivers were blinded by the snow and dust. None was injured seriously.

Hillsboro Opens Hall to Storm Visitors

Hillsboro provided facilities for a lot of Saturday night visitors who were held in town. The Knights of Pythias hall was opened to farm families, and other facilities were provided. At Taft, just north of Hillsboro, the Alfred Overmore farm home was crowded with motorists—about 30 people being cared for overnight.

Two Girls of 14 Are Lost

Searching parties are battling drifts near Michigan, N. Dak., in Nelson County, to determine the fate of two 14-year-old farm girls who had been visiting with each other, and one had started walking part way home with the other when the storm arose. They are Rosalie Anderson and Bernice Smaage.

The farms of the parents are but a mile distant from each other, 7 miles south of Michigan. Bernice had been visiting at the Anderson home.

There are eight children in the Martineus Anderson family, seven in the Severan Smaage family.

It was regarded as virtually certain that the two girls had lost their lives in the storm that broke shortly after they started out.

Couple Badly Frozen As They Leave Auto

Hands, feet, faces, and ears of Ione Thorson, 17, of Tolna, and Vernon Haas, 20, Hammar, were partly frozen after they abandoned their car 2 miles west of Pekin on Highway 15 and started to walk into the Nelson County village.

They stumbled into the Ed Loe home and collapsed. Loe went to the home of Mrs. Jack Jondahl, who is a nurse, near-by, and on Sunday they were moved to her home for better care.

Mrs. Jondahl expressed the belief both will make satisfactory recovery.

Man, 55, Becomes Separated From Party, Perishes

Separated in the storm from companions on the prairie near Dahlen, in northeastern Nelson County, Andrew Hentjium, 55, bachelor farm laborer, died in a field only a short distance from the Lars Brudahl farm, 5½ miles southwest of Dahlen, where he was employed. The body was found Sunday morning. A young son of Brudahl, Leonard, 11, suffered frozen feet.

Brudahl and three of his sons were with Hentjium when the storm struck. They had left Dahlen at 5:45 p. m. en route to the Brudahl farm in a sleigh drawn by two horses. When the storm frightened the horses and snow impeded progress, the party got out to walk.

Brudahl and his sons held hands. Hentjium walked alone.

Survivors are unknown, Hentjium was a native of Norway.

Amenia Community Club Spends Night in Hall

When the storm broke about 200 members of the Amenia Community Club, consisting of both men and women of that community, were holding their regular monthly get-together in the Amenia town hall. They decided to make a night of it and remained in the hall until after the storm cleared early Sunday.

Minnesota Boy Trapped Searching for Brother

Francis James Weckworth, 21, of Hazel, Minn., who started out at 11 p. m. Saturday to get a younger brother, who was at a neighbor's home, was found frozen to death a few rods from his farm home Sunday morning. Hazel is 10 miles southeast of Thief River Falls, Minn., in Pennington County.

Weckworth, son of Mr. and Mrs. Owen Weckworth, left his home on horseback for the Andrew Arne home. He either fell off or was thrown from the horse, which returned to the Weckworth farm during the night.

Fosston Man Perishes Walking From Highway

The body of Ervin Ingebretson, about 40, Fosston, Minn., farmer, was found about a quarter mile from his home, which is 4½ miles south of Fosston, east of Crookston. Ingebretson had been in Fosston Saturday night, leaving for home between 10 and 11 p. m. The road from the highway to his home was blocked so Ingebretson left his car on the highway and attempted to walk the three-quarters of a mile. Mrs. Ingebretson and two children survive.

New Rockford Men Take Long Hike After Storm

Two New Rockford men were located safely at a farm home east of the Eddy County city Sunday after concern had been felt for their safety.

August Hass and Walter Christie spent the night at the Jul Farr farm, going there after their car stalled in a drift a half mile from the home Saturday night.

Sunday they walked more than 10 miles to reach their New Rockford homes.

Walks 3½ Miles and Lives To Tell of It

Mahlon Ronzheimer, about 35, a farmer living east of Rogers, N. Dak., in Barnes County, walked 3½ miles during Saturday night's storm and lived to tell about it. His car stalled during the height of the blizzard. He remained in it until there was a lift in the storm, and he then abandoned his car and returned to Rogers. He apparently suffered no ill effects.

Two Dead in Cities as Result of Storm

MINNEAPOLIS.—In the Twin City area two were dead as a result of the storm.

Mrs. Amita Petruchek was found by her St. Paul neighbors frozen to death. She evidently had been overcome by the gale, swept from her feet, and unable to reach safety.

Burton Bjork, a railroad worker called out for special storm duty, was killed when run down by an engine which he supposedly failed to hear because of the wind.

Students Given Break, Many Schools Closed

Eighteen Minnesota and nine North Dakota schools called upon radio station WDAY Sunday to notify pupils that there will be no classes today, and in some cases Tuesday or longer because of weather and road conditions.

They included rural as well as city schools as far east as Park Rapids, Minn., and covered a wide area, including some eastern Cass County points.

The station also was called upon in many instances to notify distant residents of the safety of relatives.

Roseau Players Trapped on Road on Way to Game

MINNEAPOLIS.—The telephone in the Associated Press offices here rang late Sunday, as it had been doing for hours on end, in the unfolding of the story of one of the Northwest's worst storms.

"Hello," said a voice. "This is Coach O. T. Lindberg, of Roseau. I guess you missed our basketball score last night. I'm sorry I couldn't send it in, but you see—we didn't play. We had some trouble."

That, it developed, was putting it mildly; but let the coach tell his story:

Roseau was scheduled to play Baudette at 9:15 p. m. Saturday night at Stephen, Minn., for the Thirty-second District High School basketball title. At 8 p. m. the coach, his 11 players, and Superintendent of Schools C. D. Hollister left Warren, 20 miles from Stephen, and where they had been staying, for the tournament.

"Just about 4 miles from Stephen we were hit by this terrible storm," said the coach. "It must have been going all of 75 miles an hour. We couldn't see a thing. It came at us like a bullet. We couldn't see a foot, so we just had to stop on the highway."

The squad was in two cars. There they sat until midnight, when gasoline ran out and the heaters grew cold. Outside the storm roared as terribly as ever. In desperation, all 13 piled into one car. That way they kept each other warm.

There, jammed together, they stayed until 8 a. m., when frantic searching parties found them on a snow-blocked road. One boy's foot was frostbitten. Lindberg guessed they could have held out another 2 hours.

Tuesday night Roseau and Baudette will play their game, and Lindberg thinks that if his team could last "through what we did Saturday night," it could win anything.

Find Truckers Safe at Farm

Missing since Saturday night and object of a 2-day search in which upward of 75 men from Glenfield, N. Dak., Carrington, and Cooperstown participated, A. N. "Bud" Graves and Lester Engberg, Carrington truckers, were found safe at a farm home near Sutton, N. Dak., Monday. They had gone off highway 7 when the storm broke and reached a farm where there was no phone.

Monday morning they went by sleigh to Sutton and took the Great Northern train, leaving it at Glenfield, where the searching crews from Carrington had headquartered, and the whole party returned to Carrington.

Neither suffered any ill effects.

Two snow plows were battering away at the 7-mile stretch of blocked roads and made little headway against the 15-foot drifts. This morning the searchers walked over the snow, driving into it with long rods, probing for the truck. The truck was discovered in the farmyard.

Graves is a former Fargoan. He worked here for several years for the International

Harvester Co. before returning to Carrington to engage in the potato business. He is unmarried, but has a widowed mother, Mrs. N. A. Graves, Sr., and a brother, Lester.

Engberg is married and has three children.

CLIMAX MAN IS SAFE, ALARM WAS BROADCAST

Jason Granstad, of Climax, Minn., for whom broadcasts were made Sunday when he failed to show up at his home, was located about 4 p. m. Sunday at a farm home 7 miles east of Buxton, where he had taken refuge.

THOUSANDS MAROONED IN THEATERS—HOTELS PROVIDE HAVEN FROM STORM

One woman was seized by hysteria but was quieted before she spread panic to others in a Fargo theater during the storm, when thousands of persons were marooned in Fargo-Moorhead amusement places until Sunday morning.

The incident occurred at the Fargo theater, where the feature film on display was Gone With the Wind.

Of the capacity audience of some 1,200 at the Fargo, fully half were from smaller communities near Fargo, and most of these remained in the show house until 7 a. m. Sunday.

TELEPHONES BUSY

As soon as the storm struck, telephone lines leading into all eight Fargo-Moorhead theaters became busy and kept ringing throughout the night as worried relatives called to inquire.

Theater managers called radio stations and sent our reassurances to relatives, telling them that patrons were remaining in the show houses over night, that they were warm and comfortable.

When regular shows ended, some theaters placed radio sets on the stages, so that the stranded audiences might hear latest news reports.

At the Moorhead Theater, "shorts" films for Sunday performances had arrived and these were run off as special free entertainment.

At the Fargo, N. D. A. C. youths climbed to the stage and put on comedy sketches and led community singing in which the audience joined heartily.

CAFES RUSHED

Throughout the night, cafes near the theaters did a thriving business, bringing coffee, doughnuts, and hot dogs into the aisles and finding a ready sale. One cafe was completely sold out of food and coffee.

Various games were organized among the audiences and many were kept amused. Others dozed in their seats.

HOTELS KEPT BUSY

Hotel managers and employees played humanitarian roles in the storm. Available rooms were taken, a good share by Fargo residents unable to get home, and many were provided with rooms gratis. Employees worked late seeing that stranded folks were made as comfortable as possible.

Mr. and Mrs. R. D. Carroll, managers of the Cole Hotel, broadcast an offer when the storm broke that out-of-town people could have rooms gratis. Sixteen were provided quarters before available space was taken.

Visiting in St. Luke's Hospital, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Powers, 629 Ninth Street S, got as far as the Powers Hotel, which Mr. Powers manages. He went right to work, helping place guests, keeping the cafe force on the job, and rounding up blankets for those in the lobby.

STAYED IN LOBBIES

Many of those stranded preferred to remain in the lobbies, rather than take offered rooms. Most of these were local people who took the first opportunities to return to their families.

The wind blew out a window in the Graver hotel, adding to the problems of a harassed management. The hotel carpenter was on hand, and those in the lobby were made as comfortable as possible in the far end of the room until the window was boarded up. Precaution was taken at the Bison Hotel to prevent a similar occurrence. An attendant was kept busy opening an inside door when the outside door was in use, maintaining a balanced air pressure.

STANDING ROOM ONLY

The lobby of the Metropole Hotel is large, and there are two side waiting rooms, but there was standing room only as crowds sought haven there.

Every chair and parlors were jam-packed in two Moorhead hotels.

Mr. and Mrs. George Moritz, proprietors of the Comstock, said the 60 available rooms were filled early, and some of the regular hotel patrons spent the night in the lobby so women and children would be comfortable. The upstairs parlor was open, and many wrapped in blankets furnished by the hotel slept on the floor. Still the people came, and with permission of the police, the barroom provided additional space for weary visitors. The coffee shop was crowded until 3 a. m. An estimated 200 persons occupied the hotel.

The New Columbia, Moorhead, was filled by midnight, the crowd filling 62 rooms and overflowing into the lobby. Mr. and Mrs. A. W. Nelson, proprietors, provided free lodging for many, as did the management of the Comstock.

Thomas L. Powers, manager of the Gardner, and F. Urban Powers, general manager of Powers Bros., were not on the job. Mrs. Thomas Powers gave birth to a daughter Saturday night and, visiting her, the brothers were stranded.

POLICE AID MAN

Police quartered large numbers of people at the station and took many children home in squad cars. For a time visibility was so bad one officer was forced to walk ahead of the car to guide it.

While no extra policemen were on duty, all were called and told to be in readiness for an emergency.

GAS KILLS TRIO SITTING IN CAR

MINOT, N. DAK.—Three persons were dead and one was still missing today in Bottineau County in the wake of Saturday night's blizzard, which spared northwest North Dakota of its worst fury.

The northwest dead were Mr. and Mrs. Paul J. Nordberg, Mohall, and their son, Ralph, 25, of Minot, victims of carbon monoxide in their stalled car on State Highway 5, about 8 miles west of Bottineau.

MAN IS MISSING

The missing man is Andrew Bjork, about 50, farm laborer at the Andrew Haugerud farm, near Bottineau, who ventured into the storm late Saturday to look for cattle. He had not been located today, and farmers in cars and on horseback were searching for him.

Hundreds of motorists, east and west of Minot, were caught in the blizzard, but appeared to have found havens in farmhouses or roadside gasoline stations Saturday night and Sunday.

Minot highway division snowplows battled blocked roads throughout the week end, and offices here today said all roads were open.

West of Minot the storm was less severe than to the east and northeast, but a number of travelers were marooned for a time in a schoolhouse west of Berthold on a blocked section of U S 2 Saturday night.

Roads quickly drifted shut in parts of Bottineau County, and in areas in Rolette, McHenry, and Pierce Counties.

A survey of northwest counties showed the sector was relatively free of casualties except for the Nordberg deaths.

GETS INJURED LEG

Edwin Berentson, Newburg, suffered a compound fracture of one leg in an accident west of Bottineau, when the car on whose front fender he was riding, guiding the driver, was struck by another car.

Mr. Nordberg, who died with his wife and son in their storm-bound car near Bottineau, was Farm Security Administration supervisor in Renville County. He was a former Newburg banker. He had been transferred about January 1 of this year by the Farm Security Administration from Steele, where he had been Kidder County supervisor, to Mohall.

PARTY OF SEVEN HUDDLES 5 HOURS IN CAR—MAN BRAVES DEATH TO BRING RESCUE

Literally hanging on the brink of death, seven persons, including a woman and a girl, spent 5 hours at the height of Saturday night's storm in a stalled automobile on a country side road 8 miles south of Moorhead.

The motor of the car, unable to get oil because of the precarious angle at which the machine was hanging over a high ditch embankment, stopped after it had run 2 hours and the remainder of the time occupants of the machine battled almost vainly against fatal sleep induced by cold.

The driver, G. N. Nelson, salesman for the Postage Meter Co., Minneapolis, and his wife, had rescued the others from stalled cars in the ditch along U S 75.

Driving toward Mocrhead from Breckenridge, the storm overtook them, but they crept along. They came upon another car in the ditch. In it were D. J. Sigdestad, his daughter, Joyce, 14, and son, Duane, 16, all of Webster, S. Dak., and a cousin, Stewart Sigdestad, of Pierpont, S. Dak.

They got into the Nelson machine and the car crawled along the highway. Soon another machine was encountered in the ditch and Leonard Brakke, a farmer who resides a mile off the highway, was rescued.

Brakke directed Nelson to the side road which led to his farm. Then he got out of the car and walked ahead of the machine, Nelson following. Several times Nelson lost him in the swirling storm and honked his horn to call Brakke back.

Then two wheels of the machine slipped over the edge of the bank on the left side of the road and the bottom of the car caught on the shoulder.

They left the motor running and the heater on. Meanwhile Nelson dug out newspapers, correspondence sheets, clothing, towels, and gunny sacks, stuffing them around windows and door cracks to keep out the snow that was being driven in by the terrific wind.

That was about 10:15 p. m.

CHOPS AWAY SEAT

Nelson took out a hatchet and chopped away the back cushion of the front seat, laying it down to make a bed with the rear seat.

There the seven huddled close together to keep warm. But when the motor stalled about midnight, Nelson said, they all began to feel the effects of the cold. Nelson and Brakke nearly fell asleep several times and the others dozed—all except Mrs. Nelson. She was wide awake, but numb with cold, and kept hitting and pushing the others to keep them from going to sleep.

Feet began to freeze and some took off their shoes, then put their feet under another's coat to get them warm against the heat of a body.

MAKES DECISION

About 2:30 a. m. Brakke said he was going to attempt to get to his farm, which they later learned was only a quarter of a mile away. The others insisted he would be lost and freeze to death.

"I'll freeze here anyway, so it won't make much difference. Maybe I can make it."

He did.

About 40 minutes later he returned with his hired man, carrying blankets, coats, and overalls for the women.

The party got ready for the dangerous hike to the farmhouse. Donning all the clothing they could carry, they got out of the machine. Forming two groups and keeping their arms locked, they set out, Brakke leading the way.

They reached the Brakke home, but all were near exhaustion. Mrs. Brakke was ready with coffee and food.

LANTERN IN WINDOW

She had paced the floor all night long and had hung a lantern first in one window, then another, in hopes her husband could see the light.

Sunday the group made its way into Moorhead. The Sigdestads were en route to Moorhead to visit D. J. Sigdestad's brother, Joel Sigdestad, 704 Fourth Street South, and his sister, Mrs. R. E. Fuglestad, 611 Sixth Street South.

The Nelsons were en route to Halstad, Minn., to visit Mr. and Mrs. Anton Orvik.

SPENT NIGHT ON THEIR CARS

At least five Mayville persons were forced to spend their night Saturday in stalled cars but escaped any serious injuries.

K. M. Hill and Eldred Dormacker, and a transient whom they had given a ride were marooned between Dinley and Cooperstown. Hill suffered frozen hands.

L. O. Swanson was trapped 10 miles east of Mayville, remaining in his car until the snow plow sent out from Hillsboro rescued him in the early hours of Sunday.

Dorothy Safford, physical education instructor at the Mayville Teachers College, and Jo Ann Condit, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. B. W. Condit, did not return to Mayville until 9 a. m. Sunday, when a snow plow broke through to rescue them.

Describing their experiences, Miss Condit said they were traveling down the highway about 50 miles an hour when a "wall of dirt and snow driven by a fierce wind swept us off the highway into a ditch." The car stalled.

Seventy youngsters at Mayville for a Future Farmers basketball tournament were kept at the school auditorium. They were from Casselton, Cooperstown, Hunter, and Mayville. The Mayville home economics girls served lunch, but rations were skimpy. There was but a half loaf of bread for the 70 children. The youngsters slept on tumbling mats draped over tables.

NINE MISSING ON ICE FLOE; SEVEN MEN, WOMAN REACH SHORE

SKANEE, MICH.—Seven men and one woman, suffering from exposure and frostbite after nearly 24 hours on an ice floe that carried an estimated 22 persons into storm-tossed Lake Superior, were swept ashore today.

At least nine others, including one woman, were reported still missing aboard the huge floe which broke from near Skanee before noon Sunday, and Coast Guard men said eight other men were unreported near Munising, Mich., approximately 80 miles east along the Lake Superior coast.

Five men who were swept out on the Skanee floe drifted ashore last night on a separate ice cake which broke off the main floe.

Five of those rescued landed at the Huron River point, at least 15 miles to the east of where the floe broke away, and three others landed near a lumber camp a few miles distant.

Coast Guard men patrolling the shore line while waiting for waves to subside sufficiently to permit launching of boats, found the two groups suffering severely from nearly 24 hours of drifting on the lake in subzero temperatures without food, fuel, or shelter from galelike winds and swirling snow.

John Osterman, Jr., one of the group of three, said they landed during the night and fashioned a windbreak with pieces of ice.

FIVE HOSPITALIZED AT VALLEY CITY

Hospitalized at Valley City are five Barnes County residents, suffering from exposure.

Delphine Stangler, 14, and Albina Stangler, 28, sisters from Pingal, N. Dak., were severely frozen when their car stalled as they were en route home Saturday night after attending church. Their condition is satisfactory.

Mrs. Albin Aune and daughter, Joyce, 4, rural Valley City, suffered from exposure when their car stalled. They are in good condition.

Most seriously frozen was 10-year-old Robert Taylor, of Dazey, whose three brothers perished.

STASSEN WILL SEND AGENTS TO VALLEY AREA

ST. PAUL.—Gov. Harold Stassen today asked Walter Finke, director of social welfare, and R. A. Trovatten, commissioner of agriculture, to send one man each to the Red River Valley storm area to determine whether any State help was needed.

WOMAN SUFFERS INJURY FROM BROKEN WINDOW

Only two persons were injured in Fargo during the storm and none was hurt in automobile accidents despite the low visibility during the storm.

Mrs. George Morford, 457 Fifteenth Avenue South, was taken to St. John's hospital for surgical treatment to a foot after she stepped into a pile of broken plateglass beside the J. J. Newberry store, 110 Broadway. Four stitches were required to close a deep instep wound. An unidentified man received facial cuts from a swinging storm door.

Mr. and Mrs. Morford had left a theater, were walking with their faces buried in coat collars and did not see the glass. They sought first aid at a drug store and were brought to the hospital by a police car. Mrs. Morford spent the night at St. John's but was home today, recovering.

The man injured was about to enter a drug store when the wind swung the doors and struck him, was the report. He was given treatment in another adjacent drugstore.

HOPE BASKETBALL TEAM SPENDS NIGHT IN AUTO

Hope, N. Dak., high-school basketball players were forced to sit in their car a mile south of Finley all Saturday night. They had been at Finley for a tournament. Superintendent Easton of Hope, in charge of the party, walked to Finley Sunday morning to get aid. None of the party was frozen.

WOMAN FREEZES AS SHE WAITS HELP

Mrs. Elmer Greene, 26, was frozen to death within a mile of her home, which is 5 miles northeast of Crookston, Minn.

Mr. and Mrs. Greene had gone into Crookston Saturday to purchase a birthday present for one of their sons, William Henry, who was 5 Friday.

Riding in a pick-up truck, the machine stalled within a mile from home. Windows of the truck were broken out and the couple apparently decided to walk to their home.

They attempted to follow a fence along the road. Mrs. Greene became exhausted and Mr. Greene told her to stay near a large tree while he went to the home of a neighbor, Harry Herberg, about a quarter mile away, for help.

Herberg accompanied Greene back to where Mrs. Greene was but the two men were unable to carry her. They returned to the Herberg home to get two of the Herberg boys. The four men again went to where Mrs. Greene was located but she was dead by the time they had carried her to the Herberg home.

Besides William Henry, there are two other children, Elmer Eugune, 4, and Marlene Margaret, 2½.

Mr. LANGER. My resolution provides that the Committee on Commerce, or a subcommittee thereof, shall thoroughly investigate why notices were not given by the weather bureaus in North Dakota and Minnesota.

The resolution (S. Res. 89) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas on the early afternoon of March 15, 1941, and the early morning of March 16, 1941, 60 persons were frozen to death in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota because of the lack of notice of the storm on the part of the Weather Bureau; and

Whereas it is imperative that every reasonable safeguard shall be employed to afford the greatest possible degree of safety to the public, and that proper notice of the approach of a storm shall be given; and

Whereas an investigation of the cause of the lack of such notice being given is essential for the purpose of obtaining adequate information to enable the people, especially the farmers, to adopt such safeguards as may be necessary to prevent the occasion of a similar disaster: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the chairman of such committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the lack of notice being given by the Weather Bureau of the United States whose duty it is to so notify the people; any inefficiency in the administration by any department or agency of the Government of any of its functions relating to the safety of persons because of improper notice, or any other matters which such committee or subcommittee may deem it necessary to investigate for the purpose of obtaining adequate information to enable it to recommend action designed to prevent the loss of lives of persons and property. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the result of its investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL PUBLIC WORKS—CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3325) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
E. D. SMITH,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3155) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the words "Recreation facilities and accessories," appearing on page 2, lines 3 and 4, of the House engrossed bill, insert "Acquisition of land, $350,000; but no part of such sum shall be used for the construction of a stadium"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ELLISON D. SMITH,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS AT THE WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the introductory remarks on Hon. Eugene L. Connelly, chairman of the executive committee of the Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind, and an address delivered by Senator DAVIS at the annual meeting on June 10, 1940, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN BY SENATOR HERRING

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on William Jennings Bryan, delivered by Senator HERRING at Lincoln, Nebr., in 1936, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF IDAHO ON WOOL IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on March 15, 1941, on the subject of wool in national defense, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS ON PROPOSED ARKANSAS VALLEY AUTHORITY

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority, delivered by Hon. CLYDE T. ELLIS, a Representative in Congress from the Third District of Arkansas, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL ON VERMONT AND THE UNION

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Vermont and the Union," delivered by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill before the Vermont Society of the District of Columbia on March 15, 1941, and before the Governor and the General Assembly of the State of Vermont at Montpelier on March 20, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CHESTER C. DAVIS ON THE SOUTHERN ECONOMY IN THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

[Mr HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the southern economy in the defense program, delivered by Chester C. Davis, member of the National Defense Advisory Commission, before the Southern Governors' Conference held at New Orleans, La., March 15, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS ON LEND-LEASE BILL BY MRS. DWIGHT W. MORROW

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the lend-lease bill, delivered by Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow on March 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY W. C. PICKETT ON EFFICIENCY AND DEMOCRACY

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of Efficiency and Democracy, by W. C. Pickett, Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE—ADDRESS BY THEODORE S. WATSON

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Theodore S. Watson on the subject, the Role of the New York Stock Exchange as the Capital Market Place in Our National Economy and Its Relation to Democratic Traditions, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, ON FORTIFICATION OF GUAM

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired, on the fortification of Guam, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION IN WAR—EDITORIAL FROM CARBON COUNTY NEWS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials from the Carbon County News, of Red Lodge, Mont., the issue of March 14, 1941, relating to the possible participation of the United States in the war in Europe, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES ON ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SEAWAY

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of today entitled "St. Lawrence—New Style," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON EVENING TRANSCRIPT ON THE WEAPON OF FOOD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Weapon of Food," published in the Boston Evening Transcript of March 13, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST ENTITLED "THE BITTER QUESTION"

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 8, 1941, entitled "The Bitter Question."]

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITIES IN FRESNO COUNTY, CALIF.

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "National Youth Administration Sums 1940 Activities in Fresno City and County," published in the Fresno (Calif.) Clarion for February 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON ON BRITISH BLOCKADE OF FOODSTUFFS FOR FRANCE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hugh S. Johnson relative to the British blockade of foodstuffs for France, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE FROM CHARLOTTE DAILY OBSERVER ON BERNARD BARUCH

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on Bernard M. Baruch, published in the Charlotte Daily Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEDICATION OF NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in these turbulent days it was restful to the entire Nation to listen to the radio address of the President on March 17 dedicating the National Gallery of Art. For a brief period of time the attention of our people was turned from the task of defense production to the quiet beauty of this palace of art, which has been made possible for the Nation through the generosity of the late Andrew W. Mellon. In this shrine are to be found the priceless art treasures of Mr. Mellon, Mr. Kress, Mr. Widener, Miss Ellen Bullard, and various anonymous donors. It was inevitable that these private collections should finally come to public use, for great art belongs to all the people.

It is significant that Mr. Mellon, who developed aluminum, now so necessary in our national-defense program because of its lightness and tensile strength, should also have made possible, free of admission to the people, an art gallery where beauty reigns supreme.

I knew Andrew Mellon as a member of the Cabinets of three Presidents. The Nation had great respect for this modest, thoughtful, even-tempered man, who early in life had inherited from his father not only the genius of finance but a high sense of public stewardship. He followed in the traditions of Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, Henry Folger, and other men of great wealth, who had a vision of public usefulness through the investment of wealth in far-reaching social benefits. We speak of their generosity, but they more truly have understood their work as opportunity for an age-long perpetuation of good will and good deeds. Andrew Mellon will continue to live in the hearts of his fellow countrymen as the organizer of confidence and the friend of peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as

part of my remarks the text of the President's radio address delivered on March 17 in the dedication of the National Gallery of Art.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

It is with a very real sense of satisfaction that I accept for the people of the United States and on their behalf this National Gallery and the collections it contains. The giver of the building has matched the richness of his gift with the modesty of his spirit, stipulating that the gallery shall be known not by his name but by the Nation's. And those other collectors of paintings and of sculpture who have already joined, or who propose to join, their works of art to Mr. Mellon's—Mr. Kress and Mr. Widener—have felt the same desire to establish, not a memorial to themselves, but a monument to the art they love and the country to which they belong.

OTHER COLLECTIONS ADDED

To these collections we now gratefully add the gift from Miss Ellen Bullard and three anonymous donors, which marks the beginning of the Gallery's collection of prints; and also the loan collection of early American paintings from Mr. Chester Dale.

There have been, in the past, many gifts of great paintings and of famous works of art to the American people. Most of the wealthy men of the last century who bought, for their own satisfaction, the masterpieces of European collections, ended by presenting their purchases to their cities or their towns.

Great works of art have a way of breaking out of private ownership into public use. They belong so obviously to all who love them—they are so clearly the property not of their single owners, but of all men everywhere—that the private rooms and houses where they are hung become in time too narrow for their presence. The true collectors are the collectors who understand this—the collectors of great paintings who feel that they can never truly own, but only gather and preserve for all who love them, the treasures they have found.

But though there have been many public gifts of art in the past, the gift of this National Gallery, dedicated to the entire Nation, and containing a considerable part of the most important work brought to this country from the Continent of Europe, has necessarily a new significance.

It signifies a relation—a new relation here made visible in paint and in stone—between the whole people of this country, and the old inherited tradition of the arts. And we shall remember that these halls of beauty, the creation of a great American architect, combine the classicism of the past with the convenience of today.

In accepting this building and the paintings it contains, the people of the United States accept a part in that inheritance for themselves. They accept it not for themselves because this gallery is given to them—though they are thankful for the gift. They accept it for themselves because, in the past few years, they have come to understand that the inheritance is theirs, and that, like other inheritors of other things of value, they have a duty toward it.

NEWLY DISCOVERED PART

There was a time when the people of this country would not have thought that the inheritance of art belonged to them or that they had responsibilities to guard it.

A few generations ago the people of this country were taught by their writers and by their critics and by their teachers to believe that art was something foreign to America and to themselves—something imported from another continent and from an age which was not theirs—something they had no part in, save to go to see it in a guarded room on holidays or Sundays.

But recently, within the last few years, they have discovered that they have a part. They have seen in their own towns, in their own villages, in schoolhouses, in post offices, in the back rooms of shops and stores, pictures painted by their sons, their neighbors—people they have known and lived beside and talked to.

They have seen, across these last few years, rooms full of painting by Americans, walls covered with the painting of Americans—some of it good, some of it not good, but all of it native, human, eager, and alive—all of it painted by their own kind in their own country, and painted about things they know and look at often and have touched and loved.

ART PART OF PRESENT

The people of this country know now, whatever they were taught or thought they knew before, that art is not something just to be owned, but something to be made: That it is the act of making and not the act of owning which is art.

And knowing this they know also that art is not a treasure in the past or an importation from another country, but part of the present life of all the living and creating peoples—all who make and build; and, most of all, the young and vigorous peoples who have made and built our present wide country.

It is for this reason that the people of America accept the inheritance of these ancient arts. Whatever these paintings may have been to men who looked at them a generation back—today they are not only works of art. Today they are the symbols of the human spirit, and of the world the freedom of the human spirit made—a world against which armies now are raised and countries overrun and men imprisoned and their work destroyed.

AMERICA'S PURPOSE VOICED

To accept, today, the work of German painters such as Holbein and Durer and of Italian painters like Botticelli and Raphael, and of painters of the Low Countries like Van Dyck and Rembrandt, and of famous Frenchmen, famous Spaniards—to accept this work today on behalf of the people of this democratic Nation is to assert the belief of the people of this Nation in a human spirit which now is everywhere endangered and which, in many countries where it first found form and meaning, has been rooted out and broken and destroyed.

To accept this work today is to assert the purpose of the people of America that the freedom of the human spirit and human mind which has produced the world's great art and all its science shall not be utterly destroyed.

Seventy-eight years ago, in the third year of the War between the States, men and women gathered here in Washington to see the dome above the Capitol completed and the bronze Goddess of Freedom set upon the top It had been an expensive and laborious business, diverting money and labor from the prosecution of the war, and certain citizens found much to criticize.

There were new marble pillars in the Senate wing and a bronze door for the central portal and other such expenditures and embellishments. But Lincoln, when he heard the criticisms, answered: "If people see the Capitol going on, it is a sign we intend the Union shall go on."

We may borrow the words for our own. We, too, intend the Union shall go on. We intend it shall go on, carrying with it the great tradition of the human spirit which created it.

The dedication of this gallery to a living past, and to a greater and more richly living future, is the measure of the earnestness of our intention that the freedom of the human spirit shall go on.

RELATION OF AGRICULTURE TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I have heard over the radio, from leaders in this country, appeals made to the farmers, telling them that they are the first line of defense.

The farmers are the only merchants, businessmen, producers in America who produce and sell their products, but let the other fellows fix the prices they get for them. Government has looked after labor. Nearly every State has a minimum wage. Big business has to get a profit on its goods in order to pay taxes and labor and material costs; but the farmer, in the scheme of things, finds himself producing and selling, producing and selling below the cost of production.

Now we have under way a great program of national preparedness. Everything the farmer buys is rising away out of proportion to his ability to pay. However, within the A. A. A. the Consumers' Division exerts an influence on the price trends of agricultural products, restricting price advances.

The directors of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture last Thursday adopted a resolution concerning the position of agriculture in national and Western Hemisphere defense. It is very short, Mr. President, and I shall read it into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE POSITION OF AGRICULTURE IN NATIONAL AND WESTERN HEMISPHERE DEFENSE AS ADOPTED BY THE WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE AT MADISON, MARCH 6, 1941

Hemisphere defense involves economic as well as military considerations, and we urge that especial care be exercised during this period of emotional stress in order that agriculture in this country not be asked to carry an undue share of the economic burdens of such Western Hemisphere defense. Latin America is suffering from decreased agricultural exports, as is this country. They are accumulating agricultural surpluses, as are we. Some of their surpluses are identical in kind with our own.

The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture urgently requests that our Government proceed slowly and cautiously in assuming responsibility for these foreign surpluses, at least until we have formulated methods for the efficient handling of our own agricultural surplus problems.

In relation to other major economic groups and classes in America, the farmers stand ready and are willing to assume their full share of the burdens and responsibilities of national defense. This is just as true now as during the last World War. Our production of food and fiber goes into the channels of trade largely in the form of consumer goods. Hence, the prices of our farm products are most directly affected and influenced by the efforts and propaganda of the consumer groups for stabilization of prices as voiced by the Consumer Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and as expressed in the National Defense magazine.

We protest that this program, designed to restrict price advances affecting agricultural commodities, apparently does not attempt at the same time to curtail the rising cost of capital goods, industrial products, and defense materials. The effect of this is to

increase cost of production on the farm while curtailing the prices farmers receive. This results in lower net farm income.

We urge that efforts be made by our State and National Governments to assist more aggressively in moving our surplus agricultural commodities into world markets when and where at all possible.

Here we have the considered opinion of many Wisconsin farm leaders.

Many times in the Senate of the United States I have used the rather crude figure of speech that the farmers constitute the backbone of the Nation. When the backbone of an individual is weakened or dislocated, the individual is in a serious condition. The same thing applies to a nation.

There are too many swivel-chair farmers looking after the farmer's interests. We do not need our present great Agricultural Department here in Washington. Why centralize everything here? If the army employed in that building were put back in the sections where it could operate effectively, where the cotton division could get close to the cotton farmer, where the wheat division could get close to the wheat farmer, where the dairy division could get close to the dairy farmer, we might get results.

STRIKE AT PLANT OF VANADIUM CORPORATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at the present time there is in progress an unauthorized uncalled-for, unwarranted strike at the Bridgeville, Pa., plant of the Vanadium Corporation of America. Because it is of particular interest to the country, because the strike has been repudiated by the responsible officials of the C. I. O., and because I believe attention should be called to the strike, which is seriously interfering with national defense, in which the country is concerned, and which is vital to the Nation, I ask that a statement I have prepared be incorporated in the body of the RECORD, together with an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

For more than 1 month—since February 10, to be exact—the Bridgeville, Pa., plant of the Vanadium Corporation of America has been closed down tight by a strike. It is a small, unspectacular strike as strikes go in defense industries. But it illustrates perfectly our utter defenselessness in such a situation, whether the motive be irresponsible greed for power, reckless malice, or actual subversion.

First, I would like to tell you something about vanadium—what it is, what it does, what it means to the national defense. As a member both of the Military Affairs and the Education and Labor Committees of the Senate, I have a particularly deep interest in these matters and a particularly deep responsibility for them.

Vanadium is a metal, a relatively rare metal. It is used to alloy steel to improve its toughness, its hardness, its resistance in use to heat. It is indispensable in modern arms, armor, and in the industrial components of war. Vanadium is produced or processed by two important companies in this country. The largest producer is the Vanadium Corporation of America.

Let us start with the machine-tool industry. All of us know the terrific pressure this industry has been under to retool and to expand our productive facilities since our defense program got under way. It has been looked upon as a bottleneck from the beginning. Now, machine tools are made to cut metals. Whether it is a lathe, a saw, a drill, a planer, a hobber, a boring machine, a gear cutter, or any other one of dozens of specialized machine tools, its purpose is to cut metals. Every one of them must have one or more cutting tools. And it is the little cutting tool that does the business. It is made from a highly specialized, carefully controlled, and processed steel alloy. It is called tool steel. Let me repeat: It is the tool steel that does the business. The machine tool guides and directs and controls the work. The tool steel does the work. Without it there would be no modern arms, no modern weapons, no modern industry. This is literally true, not a figure of speech. There would not even be any machine tools. Machine tools are made by machine tools.

Now, consider this: Regardless of whether the major element in the alloy is tungsten or molybdenum, vanadium must be included to produce a modern high-speed tool steel. In the absence of vanadium, the cutting capacity of the tool is only a fraction of that possible with the proper quantity of vanadium included in the alloy. This affects every metal-working industry where metal is cut and many processes involving pressing, drawing, and rolling.

It is a fact that it is not possible to use modern machine tools to their full capacity, or anywhere near their full capacity, without high-speed tool steels containing vanadium. Such is the importance of this element, this metal, to our machines which produce defense equipment.

But its vital position does not stop here. It would be serious enough if it did. But it goes further, much further, as a necessary component of defense materials.

Manganese-vanadium steel plates and shapes have been adopted for regular use by the Navy for structural purposes in cruisers, aircraft carriers, and destroyers. It is the best the Navy can get for high useful strength and weldability. The Navy uses it also for gun mounts, especially for antiaircraft guns.

Then there is armor plate, both light and heavy. Belt armor, deck armor, armor for gun turrets. Armor plate containing vanadium will sustain an impact of 15 percent higher velocity than other plate. The same steel without vanadium has shown occasional failures on impact and ballistic tests. One failure may be fatal in battle. We do not build national defense for failures.

Vanadium is used in the tubes—that is, the outer part of the barrels—and the hoops and bands of the large-caliber guns. Its use has been found to result in fewer flaws in manufacture, fewer rejects, less waste, prompter deliveries to our armed forces.

In heavy cast armor vanadium is an element necessary to give the best performance in ballistic tests.

In the form of an alloy known as grainal No. 1, containing 25 percent vanadium, it is used in the manufacture of the cast armor for tanks being made for us and for Great Britain. This is heavy armor of 1½ to 3 inches.

Vanadium pentoxide is the preferred catalyst in the manufacture of sulfuric acid for use in the nitrating operating in the making of gunpowder. Likewise, it is used in the production of synthetic ammonia, which also is important in the production of explosives.

Vanadium is an essential constituent in the making of light rolled armor for light tanks and for airplane armor to protect the pilots and the most vulnerable parts of our fighting planes.

Vanadium is used also in the propeller hubs, in the gears of the airplane motors, and in the welded type of propeller blades which are made from sheets of chromium-vanadium steel.

I could continue much longer the recital of the direct and the indirect uses of this peculiarly vital element in our national defense. However, I shall not burden you. I have wanted to do no more than impress you, as I am impressed, with the extreme importance of this single metal, of which the public probably knows little and to whom it represents an undramatic and insignificant part of the huge work the Nation has undertaken.

Now, I want to tell you something about the strike that has closed and has kept closed for more than a month the one processing plant of the principal producer of vanadium in this country.

The Vanadium Corporation of America has a collective-bargaining contract with Vanadium Workers' Local Industrial Union No. 953, a C. I. O. union chartered directly by the parent body. This union has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board and is recognized by the company as the exclusive representative of all the employees in the appropriate unit. The appropriate unit was agreed upon and certified to by the Labor Board as the production and maintenance employees of the Bridgeville plant, but excluding foremen, superintendents, timekeepers, clerks, stenographers, office workers, salaried employees in supervisory or technical positions and confidential salaried employees.

The agreement with this union was executed on June 15, 1939. It was renewed June 17, 1940, to be effective until June 15, 1941.

Among other things, the agreement provided machinery for the settlement of grievances and of differences of interpretation of the agreement, with various steps defined, ending finally with arbitration, all without suspension of work. I quote from the agreement: "Should differences arise between the company and the union as to the meaning and application of the provisions of this agreement, or should any local trouble of any kind arise in said plant, there shall be no suspension of work on account of such differences, but an earnest effort made to settle them immediately in the following manner." The document then goes on to describe the procedure to be followed which is, first, consultation between the employee or member of the union shop committee and the employee's foreman; second, between the shop committee and the superintendent; between the representatives of the national organization and the representatives of the executives of the company; and finally, by arbitration, one representative being chosen by the company and one by the union, and these two jointly selecting an impartial third person.

In September 1940 the company hired six men to act as armed guards for protection of the plant property. These guards were carefully selected from the reserve guard list of the Pittsburgh branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. There was no question of espionage present. The guards were known to the men. They were thoroughly qualified, proper, and well-behaved men.

They were salaried employees, and since their interest was identified with management, they were considered confidential employees. The union disagreed.

When in January 1941 the company temporarily laid off 41 employees in order that a piece of continuous-process equipment which had to be overhauled might be worked on, the local union demanded that the six guards be replaced by union members thus temporarily idle. The union, treating the matter as a grievance, wired the president of the company for a meeting. The president of the company, although considering the guards as proper confidential salaried employees, nevertheless replied by wire stating his willingness to discuss the matter, suggesting a certain day in Washington, D. C., or the following day in New York. I should add at this point that

the president of the company, E. D. Bransome, is in the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management, working with Sidney Hillman and his associates on defense labor problems. Hence his suggestion of Washington, D. C., as a possible meeting place.

The union committee did not make any further reference to discussing the matter with the president of the company. Instead it notified the company by telegram that a strike would take place February 10, 1941. This threat to strike was in violation of an existing union agreement. On February 6, 1941, the C. I. O. regional director in Pittsburgh, the officer of the national organization in authority over the local, wired the president of Local 953 as follows, in an attempt to avert the strike and persuade the local officers to live up to their agreement: "The National Defense Advisory Committee informs me that the Vanadium Corporation of America is threatened by you with a strike unless special guards employed by the company are released. You have been repeatedly informed that the C. I. O. regional office will not interfere with the company's prerogative of employing police to conform with regulations set forth by the national-defense authorities. Such a strike will not be authorized or sanctioned by the Congress of Industrial Organizations. My instructions to the officers and members of L. I. U. No. 953 are to continue at work or those responsible shall suffer the consequences of any such suspension of work which is in direct violation of our agreement."

Despite this effort the local struck in violation of its agreement. It was a wildcat strike, repudiated by the responsible officials of the C. I. O. But the effect is just as serious as if it was a duly authorized and perfectly legitimate strike. It has continued since February 10, 1941, with all production and maintenance employees (except for a skeleton maintenance crew) and all clerical, research, and engineering staffs excluded from the plant.

Apparently as an afterthought the union committee called upon the superintendent and demanded a 10-percent increase in wages just before the strike started. There was no wage issue. The wage question was settled by the agreement until June 15, 1941.

The sole real issue, then, was the matter of the guards. In this matter the management was upheld by the C. I. O. regional officer. The strike then is a wildcat strike in violation of an agreement, in violation of the procedures set up in the agreement for the settlement of all questions arising under the agreement, and in defiance of their own national officers.

What the real issue is no one seems to know. The local union has had an erratic career. It was unaffiliated at one time. Then it was affiliated with the A. F. of L. The more conservative men who were then officers of the union were displaced by restless and less-experienced men. This reckless strike is the result. The real reason may be no more than a reckless demonstration of power. There is no report of any subversive ideological or political angle to it. And there has been a hint that it was for the purpose of embarrassing the president of the company in his work with the Labor Division of the O. P. M. There is no real evidence to sustain any of these latter suggestions. So far as is known it is just what it appears to be, a reckless demonstration of strength over the pretext of the guards.

But the effect is exactly the same as if the officers of the local were acting for our enemies and determined to strike at our national defense and cripple it at a critical point. There has been no vanadium produced in that plant.

Now, I want to ask you: What defense do we have against such things? You responsible gentlemen of the majority who have the power, the necessary votes, to legislate, what are we going to do to protect the Nation? Is national defense a serious question or is it not? When I supported the lend-lease bill, the selective-service bill, the two-ocean Navy, all national-defense appropriations, and other measures to promote the national defense, I did it in the sincere belief that we faced an emergency. It cannot be an emergency one day and not an emergency the next. It cannot be an emergency on one issue and not an emergency on another. It cannot be an emergency for some people and not an emergency for others.

The announcement by the President yesterday of the formation of the National Defense Mediation Board was an acknowledgment of the seriousness of the strike situation in defense industries in general. But this Board has absolutely no power to meet the situation I have just described and many others which are similar. We need constructive legislation which will meet the issue squarely. The Congress cannot shirk its heavy responsibility to do what should be done by progressive legislation in the feeble hope that executive action will be an adequate substitute. We cannot discharge our obligation to the Nation at this time by hopeful wishing. And let me add that it is not, and I do not see why it would ever be, necessary to deprive labor of any of its rights. The great majority of labor is patriotic and sincere and wants to do its share in the defense program, and so are the majority of the responsible leaders in the labor movement. They realize what is happening and regret it, but it is necessary, however, to deprive some reckless, unpatriotic, or subversive labor leaders of some of their extraordinary privileges and immunities if we are to have no serious break-down in our defense program.

I am informed that the shortage of vanadium is becoming critical in some defense-industry plants, that some may have to suspend production. Are we going to stand for this? We can produce defense materials without vanadium. But what kind of defense materials? Do we want to use our machine tools at a fraction of their efficiency at this time? Do we? Do we want to provide inferior ship plates, inferior armor for ships, for tanks, for airplanes? Do we want to produce powder, gun tubes, gun mounts, airplane parts by methods that are less than efficient or of impaired quality? Of course we do not.

Then what are we going to do? This strike which closed down such a vital defense industry was against a company with a valid union agreement with several months to run, with a union certified by the National Labor Relations Board. The strikers violated the agreement, defied the national union. Are we going to admit that in this emergency a narrow private interest of this character, whatever it is, transcends the public interest in national defense?

Testifying before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. Sidney Hillman, of the Office of Production Management and the C. I. O., deprecated and minimized the effect of strikes in the national-defense industries and the need for corrective legislation. He preferred to leave the questions to settlement by responsible union officers as they arose. And he said the time lost by strikes represented only one-quarter of 1 percent of the total national-defense labor. Well, here is a critical strike where the responsible union officials have been unable to do anything. And they have tried. They have done their best. They should be given full credit for their efforts. But their best efforts have not been effective. This is not the only one where the same thing is true. It happens to be just a particularly critical one.

As for the complacent attitude toward defense-industry strikes and the statistics to deprecate their importance, I invite your attention again to the Vanadium strike. Without challenging the basis of the figures quoted, and I believe the basis of the statistics is vulnerable to challenge, let me point out that the number of men at the Vanadium plant is but one one-hundred-thousandth—one one-thousandth of 1 percent—of the number of employed people in the Nation. Statistics can be very confusing.

This strike may be settled any time. I earnestly hope that it will be. The Nation cannot and will not forever stand for such reckless action. But the settlement of this strike will not settle the question, by any means. We are still defenseless against another equally as serious, or more serious, in the same place or in another which may be even more critical. The threat is always present until we take effective measures to meet situations of this kind.

So I repeat my question to the administration: What do you propose to do to meet this and similar recurring issues squarely and honestly and effectively? And with substance, not shadow. And when are you going to do it?

[Editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of March 18, 1941]

STRIKE—OR SABOTAGE?

Only 24 hours after President Roosevelt warned that defense production "must not be obstructed by unnecessary strikes of workers"—a warning which drew more applause from his audience than any other portion of his speech—his words were put to practical test at the Bridgeville plant of the Vanadium Corporation of America.

The results of that test constitute one of the most shameful chapters in the history of organized labor.

Sidney Hillman, Associate Director of the Office of Production Management, telegraphed officers of the striking union asking that they permit the loading and removal of two carloads of finished materials, because it was "of the utmost importance to the national-defense program that certain vanadium products be shipped at once."

Mr. Hillman is not only coadministrator of defense, but is a power in the C. I. O., and the strikers are C. I. O. members.

Mr. Hillman's request was followed by a similar appeal from the regional C. I. O. office, which told the strikers it was a "patriotic duty" to facilitate shipment of the materials.

But the strikers defied both the Government and their own union officials. Therefore it was necessary for Governor James to send 35 motor police to protect 17 foremen and office workers who went through the picket line and loaded the materials.

The Vanadium strike, now entering its sixth week, is an outlaw strike, called in violation of a contract and in defiance of the regional director of the C. I. O., who warned the strikers that they had forfeited their rights to C. I. O. protection and were the victims of "irresponsible leadership."

The Vanadium Co. is the Nation's largest producer of ferrovanadium, a vital alloy in producing many types of armaments. At the direction of defense officials the company employed five watchmen to guard against sabotage, picking them from a list of applications on file with the Federal Reserve bank. The union claimed its members should have been employed, although the regional C. I. O. director warned that his office "will not interfere with the company prerogative of employing police to conform with regulations set forth by national-defense authorities."

Thus the plant is struck for doing what the Government told it to do.

The strikers broke their contract.

They defied their own C. I. O. officials.

They boycotted a meeting called by the regional C. I. O. director for the purpose of asking them to return to work.

They defied the United States Government.

They forced the sheriff to appeal to the Governor of Pennsylvania for police so that finished materials could be shipped to other companies faced with a shut-down of armaments production because of a shortage of ferrovanadium and vanadium oxide.

Yet, 1 week hence, Pennsylvania will start paying unemployment compensation to the strikers, under a law providing such payments 6 weeks after the start of an industrial dispute. Fortunately, relief officials have ruled that outlaw strikers cannot receive direct relief unless they furnish positive proof that they are "unwilling" sufferers and are not active supporters of the strike.

Shortly after the strike started, Sidney Hillman told the House Judiciary Committee that he has authority to tell a labor group: "You are not cooperating with national defense."

And then he added, "Believe me, that's plenty."

That's exactly what he told the Vanadium strikers on the same day that President Roosevelt said defense "must not be obstructed by unnecessary strikes of workers."

The strikers paid no attention to Mr. Hillman or Mr. Roosevelt. They paid no attention to the directing heads of their union.

Which is conclusive proof that it takes more than words to handle a situation like this one.

This strike smacks of sabotage against the Government. It is a blow to defense and to the cause of organized labor. It's time it was recognized in its true light and dealt with accordingly.

Also, it's time for C. I. O. President Philip Murray to show whether or not he can enforce his announced policy of upholding the sanctity of the organization's contracts with employers.

WAIVING OF OVERTIME COMPENSATION ON BANGOR ARMY AIR BASE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the Bangor Daily News of March 18, 1941. It is a short item dealing with a fine illustration of patriotism. At this time, when we are hearing so much about strikes and other obstructions, this is the reverse. Sixty-two War Department engineers have voluntarily waived their compensation for overtime, and are working 18 and 20 hours a day on a defense project in the winter, in the State of Maine. I think their action is very commendable, and should be widely noted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

62 WAR DEPARTMENT MEN WAIVE COMPENSATORY TIME—GOVERNMENT WORKERS AT BANGOR AIR BASE DISPLAY PATRIOTISM IN UNPRECEDENTED MOVE; CONTRAST TO STRIKERS

As their contribution to national-defense efforts 62 War Department engineers working on the Bangor Army air base yesterday agreed to waive compensatory time for overtime work.

Unprecedented here and believed a unique display of patriotism for all parts of the Nation, the move stands as a vivid contrast to other defense-project workers who are striking or threatening to strike for more pay.

Some of the engineers are now working 18 to 20 hours a day to facilitate the early completion of this key-defense development and by their action are giving their services to the Government after their 8-hour work day has been completed.

Lynn V. Spink, resident engineer in charge who announced the decision of his men said, "Its just the boys' own idea of doing their bit."

Yesterday's storm considerably slowed down work on the cantonment and confined it to inside jobs such as plumbing and electrical work. It was the second day in a week that progress has been slowed down on account of the weather.

To compensate for the lost time Contractor T. W. Cunningham said last night that an extra crew of 144 carpenters would be put to work today and Wednesday.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1941

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 3836, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Mimosa Gates Pittman, widow of Key Pittman, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive independent establishments—Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Co.", on page 4, line 14, after the word "Corporation", to strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person affiliated with the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, or any other organization seeking to undermine the national defense of the United States and to overthrow our republican form of government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Security Agency—Civilian Conservation Corps," on page 5, line 1, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$165,880,000" and insert "$164,880,000: *Provided*, That the $2,000,000 transferred hereby from the amount available for 'Pay, subsistence, clothing (and repair thereof), transportation, and hospitalization of enrollees' and thereby made available for expenditure for other expenses of the Civilian Conservation Corps shall continue available until June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That of the funds hereby transferred not more than $150,000 shall be used for new repair shops, including equipment therefor."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Colorado explain the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this item does not change the aggregate existing appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps. It does authorize an increased diversion of the existing appropriation from the purposes mentioned in the act so that the money may be used for the repair of equipment. A large amount—I think a rather inexcusable amount—of equipment of the Conservation Corps is in bad repair. In the normal course of the conduct of the operations a certain number of the trucks and tractors need repair each year. I think there is an accumulation of cases in which repairs are needed, covering possibly 3 years, and the limitations in the appropriation are such, we are told, that the officials cannot make the needed repairs, and we are informed that they would lose the use of the equipment if no relief were afforded. We are providing by the amendment that an additional million dollars of the existing appropriation may be used for making repairs. Because of an apprehension we entertained that there might be an undue disposition to build new repair shops rather than to make repairs, we have limited the amount which could be expended for the building of repair shops to $150,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 5, line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Youth Administration," on page 6, line 24, after the word "act", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the proviso in paragraph 4 of such act on the distribution of funds shall be amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That the National Youth Administrator shall so distribute funds among the several States for the operation of projects specified in paragraph 1 (b) of this title that the ratio of the amount made available during the fiscal year for the operation of such projects for the benefit of the young people of each individual State to the total funds made available for this purpose in all States shall not be less than 90 percent of the ratio that the youth population of each State bears to the total youth population of the United States.'"

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, perhaps there should be a short explanation of this amendment.

The existing law requires appropriations for the National Youth Administration to be divided among the States in proportion to the youth population, regardless of relative needs. This amendment relaxes that rigid formula, so that 10 percent of the amount may be shifted from a center where there is not the same need for consideration of the youth problem to other neighborhoods, where the need is greater.

There was a difference of opinion in the committee. One of the Senators

thought the leeway should be 5 percent; some of us thought it should be more than that. The conclusion was that we should try the 10-percent flexibility and see how it worked during the remainder of the present fiscal year, and then we will be in a better position to judge what flexibility should be applied in the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 6, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia," on page 10, after line 7, to insert:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Buildings and grounds: For the construction of an eight-room extensible elementary school building on a site to be acquired in the vicinity of Minnesota Avenue and Ely Place SE., $180,000, to remain available until expended.

For the purchase of school building and playground sites as follows:

For the purchase of a site in the vicinity of Minnesota Avenue and Ely Place SE., for the construction of an elementary school;

For the purchase of a site in the vicinity of Pennsylvania and Alabama Avenues SE., for the construction of an elementary school;

In all, $65,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture, Forest Service," page 13, after line 8, to insert:

National forest protection and management: For an additional amount for national forest protection and management, fiscal year 1941, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 4, after the number "1941," to strike out "$2,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942," and to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1942, $2,500,000, of which $500,000 shall be available for grasshopper control only: *Provided*, That no part of this sum allocated for expenditure in connection with the control and prevention of spread of the white-fringed beetle shall be used in any State without the request of the Governor of such State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, under the heading "Department of the Interior," after line 12, to insert:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville transmission system: For an additional amount for construction, operation, and maintenance, including the same objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, to remain available until expended, $1,000,000, of which amount $300,000 shall be available for advance, survey, design, and investigation, and $700,000 for construction tools, equipment, and stock inventories.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories," on page 18, line 21, after the word "thereon", to insert a semicolon and "municipality of Saint Croix, $28,500, to be paid to the treasury of said municipality in monthly installments; in all, $58,433.78."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division," page 20, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$29,000" and to insert "$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department, Office of the Secretary," page 21, line 11, after the words "set forth in", to insert "Senate Document No. 24, and", and on line 13 to strike out "$75.87" and insert "$1,133.57."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department, Office of First Assistant Postmaster General," page 22, after line 3, to strike out:

Domestic air mail: For an additional amount for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, fiscal year 1940, including the same objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1940, $285,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 13, to insert:

Domestic air mail: For an additional amount for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, fiscal year 1940, including the same objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1940, $285,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State," page 22, after line 23, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Contingent expenses (departmental): For an additional amount for contingent expenses (departmental), fiscal year 1941, including the same objects specified under this head in the State Department Appropriation Act, 1941, $37,500, of which amount there may be expended not to exceed $10,000 for the purchase of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including rental, exchange, and repair thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Coast Guard," page 28, line 24, to strike out "$89,800," and insert "$457,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, after the words "Coast Guard," to insert "and, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury may enter into contracts for an amount not in excess of $500,000 for this purpose."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Military activities, Office of the Secretary," page 30, line 3, before the word "House," to insert "Senate Document No. 23, and" and on line 4, to strike out "$8,151.75" and insert "$9,151.75."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 5, to insert:

Relief of Howard R. M. Browne: For payment of Howard R. M. Browne, for baggage and property lost at La Nue, France, as authorized by the act of October 14, 1940 (Private, No. 626, 76th Cong.), $137.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the remaining portion of the bill consists of appropriations to satisfy judgments and audited claims, and I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are, as follows:

Under the heading "Judgments and authorized claims," page 33, after line 11, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 25, Seventy-seventh Congress, as follows:

Federal Communications Commission, $11.50;
Department of Agriculture, $828.69;
Department of Commerce, $22.09;
Department of the Interior, $1,448.02;
Navy Department, $686.31;
War Department, $1,331.13;
In all, $4,327.74.

On page 35, after line 8, to strike out:

(c) For payment of the judgment rendered by the United States District Court, Eastern District of Arkansas, Western Division, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles W. Benton," approved June 29, 1937 (Private Act No. 195, 75th Cong.), as certified in House Document No. 108, Seventy-seventh Congress, under the Work Projects Administration, $1,500, together with such amount as may be necessary to pay costs and interest as specified in such judgment.

And to insert:

(c) For the payment of final judgments and decree in special cases rendered against the Government of the United States pursuant to authority contained in the act approved August 26, 1937 (Private Act No. 390, 75th Cong., 1st sess., 50 Stat. 1097), and act approved June 29, 1937 (Private Act No. 195, 75th Cong., 1st sess., 50 Stat. 1012), as certified to the Seventy-seventh Congress in Senate Document No. 27, under the War Department, $5,400, and House Document No. 108, under the Work Projects Administration, $1,500;

In all, $6,900, together with such additional amounts as may be necessary to pay costs and interest as specified in such judgments or as provided by law.

Under the heading "Judgments, Court of Claims," page 36, line 21, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 26, and".

On page 37, after line 1, to insert:

Navy Department, $16,698.62.
Treasury Department, $1,892.05.

On page 37, line 4, to strike out "$335,965.96" and insert "$336,205.96."

In line 5 to strike out "$348,608.45" and insert "$367,439.12."

On page 56, after line 14, to insert:

(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the

surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1938 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 30, Seventy-seventh Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

Independent offices: For Federal Civil Works Administration, $1.11.

For Securities and Exchange Commission, $19.40.

For Interstate Commerce Commission, $16.56.

For operations under Mineral Act of October 5, 1918, $35,146.90.

For salaries and expenses, Federal Housing Administration, $1.80.

For National Industrial Recovery, Labor, United States Employment Service, $1.11.

For National Industrial Recovery, Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, $185.86.

For administrative expenses, Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, $37.72.

For general administrative expenses, Public Works Branch, Procurement Division, $3.91.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Bureau, $1.80.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $93.15.

Department of Agriculture: For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $592.80.

For administration of Sugar Act of 1937, Department of Agriculture, $52.69.

For submarginal land program, Farm Tenant Act, Department of Agriculture, $435.

For acquisition of lands for protection of watersheds of navigable streams, $1,373.05.

For elimination of diseased cattle, Department of Agriculture, $43.64.

For National Industrial Recovery, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, $3.14.

For retirement of cotton-pool participation trust certificates, Department of Agriculture, $11.70.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, $7.68.

For salaries and expenses, Forest Service, $1.07.

For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, $1.82.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture, $6.50.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, act June 28, 1937), $621.

Department of Commerce: For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $4,712.

For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce, 75 cents.

For traveling expenses, Department of Commerce, $4.50.

For maintenance of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $61.04.

For Civil Aeronautics Authority fund, $4.41.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census, 49 cents.

For salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, $14.57.

Department of the Interior: For salaries and expenses, National Bituminous Coal Commission, Department of the Interior, $27.

For miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Fisheries, $23.97.

For power distribution system, Bonneville project, Oregon, Department of the Interior, $319.57.

For National Industrial Recovery, Interior, National Park Service, recreational demonstration projects, $124.67.

For support of Indians and administration of Indian property, $270.82.

For conservation of health among Indians, $3.40.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to Interior, Indians, act February 9, 1937), $7.18.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to Interior, Indians, act June 22, 1936), $7.34.

Department of Justice: For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $560.12.

For detection and prosecution of crimes, $1.50.

For fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, $44.

For salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service, $12.23.

For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $1.

For salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation, $3.33.

For salaries and expenses, United States Court for China, $145.06.

For traveling expenses, Department of Justice and Judiciary, $6.69.

Navy Department: For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $84,421.03.

For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $55,835.97.

For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $264.13.

For aviation, Navy, $92,161.08.

For pay of the Navy, $175.56.

Department of State: For contingent expenses, Foreign Service, $68,53.

Treasury department: For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, $87.75.

For collecting the revenue from customs, $297.30.

For increase of compensation, Treasury Department, $2.66.

For collecting the internal revenue, $6.19.

For stationery, Treasury Department, 87 cents.

War Department: For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $1,254.64.

For pay, etc., of the Army, $843.09.

For pay of the Army, $297.34.

For Army transportation, $86.70.

For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $81.48.

For increase of compensation, War Department, $46.68.

For increase of compensation, Military Establishment, $1.94.

For Organized Reserves, $46.40.

For barracks and quarters, Army, $345.65.

For travel of the Army, $70.30.

For Air Corps, Army, $3.57.

For subsistence of the Army, $1.01.

For citizens' military training camps, $2.28.

For expenses, camps of instruction, etc., National Guard, $10.30.

For National Guard, $279.15.

For clothing and equipage, Army, $24.78.

For mileage of the Army, 7 cents.

For pay of the National Guard for armory drills, $4.

For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), $445.75.

For cemeterial expenses, War Department, $1.28.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, act June 22, 1936), $228.85.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, act February 9, 1937), $78.63.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act March 31, 1933), $499.34.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act June 19, 1934), $20.55.

For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer from emergency conservation work to War, act June 19, 1934), $1.84.

Emergency relief: For emergency relief, Resettlement Administration, rural rehabilitation (transfer to Agriculture), $603.29.

For emergency relief, Agriculture, administrative expenses, $2.25.

For emergency relief, Office of Coordinator for Industrial Cooperation, administrative expenses, $45.20.

For emergency relief, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, expenses of liquidation, $148.46.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons, $297.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, grants to States, etc., $956.31.

For emergency relief, Resettlement Administration, sanitation, prevention of soil erosion, etc. (transfer to Agriculture), $244.82.

For emergency relief, emergency conservation work, War, Civilian Conservation Corps, $385.12.

For emergency relief, Office of Coordinator for Industrial Cooperation, administrative expenses, $19.90.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration (non-Federal projects approved prior to June 22, 1936), $3,365.95.

For emergency relief, Resettlement Administration, rural rehabilitation, loans and relief to farmers, etc. (transfer to Agriculture), $1.50.

For emergency relief, Treasury, Office of the Secretary, assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons, $42.24.

For emergency relief, Interior, National Park Service, parks and recreational facilities, $2.32.

For emergency relief, War, administrative expenses, $29.20.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons, $370.30.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, administrative expenses, $1.

For emergency relief, Interior, National Park Service, public buildings, parks, utilities, flood control, etc., $9.12.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, highways, roads, and streets, $11.11.

For emergency relief, Interior, National Park Service, public buildings, parks, utilities, flood control, etc., non-Federal projects, $8.55.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons, etc., $467.10.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, non-Federal projects approved prior to June 30, 1937, $1,520.42.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, administrative expenses, general, $54.34.

For emergency relief, Treasury, Procurement Division, work relief supply fund, $14.62.

For emergency relief, Agriculture, agricultural economics, public buildings, parks, utilities, flood control, etc., $405.81.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, public buildings, parks, utilities, flood control, etc., $12.38.

Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For clerks, contract stations, $18.67.

For indemnities, domestic mail, $11.28.

For rent, light, and fuel, $10.18.

For rent, light, fuel, and water, $20.72.

For Rural Delivery Service, $62.74.

Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), $292,153.74, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

On page 65, line 25, before the words "in House", to insert "in Senate Document No. 29, and."

On page 66, line 2, to strike out "$2,347,769.01" and insert "$2,675,646.16."

On page 66, line 14, after the word "Department" to insert "in Senate Document

No. 28, and", and on line 16 to strike out "$48.76" and insert "$115.66."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, regarding the appropriation of $75,000,000 for housing, is that under the former authorizations and not under the authorization now being considered?

Mr. ADAMS. The item referred to is to meet the contract authorizations heretofore made.

Mr. TAFT. Within the limitation of $150,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; within the limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to add the following:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH

Board of Investigation and Research: For all necessary expenses to enable the Board of Investigation and Research during the fiscal year 1941 to perform the duties authorized under part 1 of title 3 of the Transportation Act of 1940, such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, printing and binding, and all other necessary administrative expenses, $50,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this amendment, making an appropriation of $50,000 for the Board of Investigation and Research, as set up in the Transportation Act, which the Senate passed on September 18 last, has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and has been sent to the Senate in due form by the President. It was only sent here on yesterday and, therefore, there was not time to present the amendment to the committee.

As the Senate will recall, title III of the Transportation Act, which was passed last September, created the Board of Investigation and Research, to be composed of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The duties of the Board are set out in the act and, briefly, they require study and investigation by the Board of the service which each type of carrier is best fitted to render to the country, and study of the best methods to be used in the development of the different types of carriers, and the services which they are to render.

As we know, in the Transportation Act we placed water carriers under the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that we now have under the Interstate Commerce Commission the three different types of carriers—the rail carriers, the water carriers, and the bus carriers. The Board is to make these studies and investigations so as to obtain information for the Interstate Commerce Commission and for the Congress which will enable the Commission and the Congress better to determine what services the different types of carriers can render, and how the different types can best be developed.

The Board will also go into the question of what the different types of carriers are receiving from the Government in the form of rights-of-way and in the form of different transportation facilities and special services.

The Board will also make a study of the taxes imposed by the Federal Government, the States, and the subdivisions thereof, on the different types of carriers, and will make a general study of the whole system of transportation as that system is affected by the different types of carriers.

The President has sent to the Senate the names of the three persons appointed to the Board. Of course, when the three nominations are confirmed, the Board will be established, and will be anxious to go to work. In order to do so, it must have this $50,000. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the amount provided in the amendment is for a fiscal year?

Mr. HILL. For the fiscal year 1941; yes.

Mr. ADAMS. That is, simply for the remainder of the fiscal year?

Mr. HILL. For 1941, and the amendment so provides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3836) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3981, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading, Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous Expenses, on page 3, line 22, after "$3,450,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 shall be available after March 13, 1941, for any additional positions in the District of Columbia or elsewhere at rates of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, except in pursuance of specific authorization herein or hereafter granted: *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 shall be available for the employment of a greater number than seven thousand five hundred civilian officers and employees in the Navy Department proper at Washington, except in pursuance of specific appropriations as to numbers hereafter provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading, Bureau of Navigation, Training, Education, and Welfare, Navy, on page 8, line 9, in the item for the training station at Newport, R. I., to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$390,000":

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the bill. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the measure if it met with the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the bill met with the unanimous approval of the committee. In explanation of the bill I should like to say to the Senate that it provides for carrying out only the existing programs for the Navy. It does not provide for new construction of ships or of planes. The supplemental appropriation bill which Congress passed recently authorized the beginning of a building program. This bill does not provide for new construction.

The estimates for the bill were prepared in the Department during July of last year, sent to the Bureau of the Budget in September, to the President about the first of December, and to the Congress on January 1. Since the investigation for this bill was begun in the Department, we have passed about three appropriation bills.

When we take into consideration the regular appropriation plus the supplemental appropriation we find that the amount carried in this bill for the fiscal year 1942 is approximately the same as the amount provided for the fiscal year 1941.

The report of the committee indicates exactly what is included in the very large sum carried by the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator divide for me the $3,400,000,000 into maintenance, on the one hand, and new construction, or construction, on the other?

Mr. BYRNES. No new construction of ships or planes is authorized. Any new construction authorized is confined to the shore activities under the head of

"Bureau of Yards and Docks." The bill provides appropriations to continue the construction of ships and planes for the Navy. There are 725 ships the construction of which is to be carried on by reason of the appropriations carried in this bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I am trying to find out, if the information is available, is the maintenance-of-the-Navy costs as differentiated from construction costs.

Mr. BYRNES. The maintenance and operation of the fleet, including incidental shore expenses, is one classification. For that $433,000,000 is provided. Personnel amounts to $475,000,000; $1,515,000,000 is provided for ships under construction. Then $142,000,000 is provided for alteration of vessels which are now a part of the fleet. For aviation—that is, for carrying on all existing programs—$434,000,000 is provided. The only other large item is the Public Works item, which is approximately $300,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will not the Senator indicate where in the bill is included the item for the acquisition of 8.8 acres of land at Annapolis to be used for a new athletic field?

Mr. BYRNES. It is a Senate committee amendment, which will be reached under "Bureau of Yards and Docks."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are engaged in a general explanation of the measure, and since the Senator from South Carolina, according to the hearings which I hold in my hand, went into the matter at some length, I wonder if he could tell us what is the present assessed valuation of the 8.8 acres of land which are to be acquired under this bill.

Mr. BYRNES. I could not. However, I shall be glad to give the information as to what happened with reference to the item.

The estimate was about $650,000 for the extension of the grounds. The purpose was not as indicated in the House hearings. The House hearings misled me, because it appears from the House hearings that the purpose was to construct a stadium. That was not the purpose. The purpose was to extend the grounds, which seemed essential by reason of the fact that the increased number of midshipmen has resulted in increasing the number of buildings. As a result there is not a sufficient area for drill ground, or upon which the midshipmen may exercise.

In the matter of the extension of the grounds the 8.8 acres was discussed in the committee. Upon the map that was shown it appeared to have quite a number of buildings upon it. Most of the buildings were not very costly, but some very good buildings were on the land.

After the hearing in the committee, to which the Senator has alluded, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House and the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate met in conference upon a bill authorizing the extension, and they placed a limit of $350,000 on the item. After the conferees ageed upon that amount the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who is a member of the subcommittee, presented to us the action of the conference authorizing the extension of the grounds, at a cost limited to $350,000. That is the explanation of the figure in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. My attention was drawn to the matter by an item which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of this morning, pointing out that the cost of the land will average approximately $55,000 an acre, and yet the area includes two blocks of one- and two-story wooden shacks at present mainly inhabited by Negroes. The property apparently is definitely of the slum type. The extraordinary valuation of $55,000 an acre, or thereabouts, without any substantiation so far as I can find in the hearings as to the value which has been set by the Appropriations Committee, leads me to these inquiries.

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator will read the hearings, he will find that I, too, figured out the valuation.

Mr. DANAHER. I noticed that.

Mr. BYRNES. The Baltimore Sun is basing its figures, as mine were based, on the original estimate of the Department for $650,000. The amount carried in the bill is $350,000, and not $650,000. So it is practically cut in half. As to whether or not the land can be purchased for that amount I do not know. The Department does not know; but the committees of Congress have placed that limitation upon the cost. It is approximately one-half the amount referred to in the newspaper story.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The very same item in the House bill provided for $650,000, and the House struck it all out. Now the item appears in the bill as reported from the Senate committee, providing for $350,000; and I am wondering how an item which called for $650,000 when the bill was in the House became $350,000 by the time it reached the Senate. So far as I can find from the hearings before us, there is no evidence as to what basis was established for the valuation on which the Senate committee makes its recommendation. The Senator from South Carolina questioned Admiral Moreell, who appeared before the committee. I read from page 35 of the hearings:

> Senator BYRNES. Admiral, the President has been urging, and everybody else, that there should be a reduction of expenditures for all purposes that are not absolutely essential to defense, and that meets with general approval. Everyone knows that for the enlisted men—places such as you refer to—there must be facilities for recreation.
>
> When you come to a place where we have a field that we are all familiar with, where we go—it might not be as good as some of the fields throughout the country, but I must say that when I read the testimony before the House, I wondered if that $650,000 right now should not be put into ships or torpedoes or some other place, and that I could knock along, going over to the Naval Academy and to the stadium that they now have, until something more important is provided.

I should like to have the Senator from South Carolina, who thus questioned the Admiral, tell us what changed his mind.

Mr. BYRNES. I was attempting to tell the Senator what changed my mind. As the Senator has stated, I referred to the hearings before the House committee. I am still of the same opinion which I expressed to Admiral Moreell with reference to the expenditure of funds for purposes of this character. I told the Senator that after the hearing it was called to our attention that Admiral Moreell was not correctly informed as to the purpose of the appropriation. He presented it to the House as a request for a stadium, and I was basing my statement upon that request. In my opinion, the stadium over there is adequate at this time and we should not invest the money in a stadium. It seems that Admiral Moreell was not correctly informed as to the purpose of the appropriations. The stadium is being built by the Naval Athletic Association at another place, and does not affect this particular item.

After the hearing the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is a member of the committee, called the attention of the subcommittee to the fact that Admiral Moreell was not correctly informed as to the purpose of the appropriation. It is not for a stadium. It is for the extension of the grounds; not even for an athletic field. It is to provide a drill ground and a place at which the young men at the academy, when they are out of classes, may exercise. It is for an entirely different purpose than that which was presented to the House.

I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that, based upon the House hearing and before the matter was accurately presented to the committee, the committee was opposed to including anything in the bill. After that the conferees on the part of the House and Senate Naval Affairs Committees, charged with the duty of looking into this item, and Members of the Senate and House who are familiar with the grounds and the needs, arrived at the agreement to provide not exceeding the amount stated in the bill for an extension of the grounds not for a stadium but for drill purposes. That is the reason the committee changed its view and included the appropriation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his explanation. I can understand that there may be need for additional land for drill fields, or even for athletic fields, and that the new stadium will be built out of the athletic association funds, and thus not represent a cost to the Government. On page 70 of the bill I read that we are providing for commissions of not to exceed 3 percent for acquiring the land. The item was $650,000 when the bill was in the House, and it is now $350,000 when it is in the Senate. I am wondering what basis can be established for the figure, so that we may act intelligently on the request.

Mr. BYRNES. I hope I have explained the matter. In the House an entirely different purpose was stated. It was considered as a stadium project. The authorization is all that we can act upon. The authorization is not for a stadium, but merely for an extension of the academy grounds for drill purposes.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator think that we might be able to condemn the land for something near its assessed valuation, and perhaps obtain it more cheaply?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not know. I must say that sometimes I am not encouraged by that thought. I find that in some cases when land is condemned for Government purposes and jurors from the locality pass upon the question, the cost is even higher than if the land were secured by negotiation. I am not in a position to answer definitely. I have seen that method work both ways.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further in order that my colleague [Mr. MALONEY] may address the Senate?

Mr. BYRNES. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say in this connection, because I am a member of the subcommittee, that my colleague may take comfort in the fact that I voted against this proposal and that I offered in the committee the proposal that the land be condemned. It was my understanding, however, and I desire to be sure I am correct, that this appropriation of $350,000 was not necessarily based upon the acquisition of any particular plot of land.

Mr. BYRNES. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. It was my understanding that several parcels of land were under consideration. We were advised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that there were several pieces of land which might be acquired; and, while apparently there was originally a desire to get this tract of 8½ acres, the Senator from Maryland did not know how much any of the land would cost, and said several pieces were available. I share the view of my colleague that this is a tremendous amount of money even to think of paying for land; but I desire to have the record show that so far as the committee was advised other parcels of land were under consideration.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me give the Senator from Connecticut, whose inquiry is a very proper one, a little information as to the reason why the Naval Affairs Committees of the two Houses of Congress finally adopted the amendment and why I believe the Appropriations Committee finally recommended the appropriation.

In 1902 there were 750 midshipmen in the Naval Academy. Today there are 2,600 midshipmen there. In 1902 there was in the grounds of the academy seven times as much land per midshipman as there is today. As the academy has grown, as the Navy has been developed along more scientific lines, it has been necessary to construct many buildings that in the old days were not necessary in connection with a naval officer's training. The new buildings, many of which are dormitories, classrooms, laboratories, and so forth, have gradually encroached on the available land within the Naval Academy boundaries, so that today there is only 1 acre of ground for every 100 midshipmen in the academy; and that includes roads and walks, and not merely ground available for drills. Think of that. The Naval Academy has less ground per student than any university or college of which I know in the United States.

When we consider that the naval student, the midshipman, works longer hours than the student in any comparable college, and that athletics is a compulsory part of his training, that he must have some form of physical exercise, and that in addition, he must drill, as a necessary part of his training, the question of having sufficient land on which to do those things becomes imperative. Therefore the Naval Academy, through its Board of Visitors, has recommended for 15 consecutive years, in the face of this need, that additional land be acquired; and finally, with the tremendous swelling of the personnel of the Naval Academy, both student and officer, it became a matter that could no longer be delayed.

The Naval Academy, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, would prefer to have the 9 acres to which the Senator has addressed himself. That land is contiguous to the present grounds, and is on the waterfront, but unfortunately is occupied by houses of varying degrees of value and by businesses of varying degrees of worth, so that if it can be acquired for $40,000 an acre, I am advised—I know the land only in a general way—that that would not be an excessive price as compared with the property's assessment. However, there is nothing in the bill that fixes that particular piece of land as the land which this money will purchase. As a matter of fact, there are two or three alternatives. This would be the best piece if price did not enter into consideration.

In reducing the sum from $500,000 to $350,000, the House and Senate Committees on Naval Affairs did so deliberately because they wanted to acquire whatever land might be acquired at the lowest possible dollar price. Therefore, if it would cost more than $350,000, we said we could not afford to buy that high-priced land for this purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in a moment.

If we can get the land for that sum of money, and if that amount of land will be sufficient, all well and good; but if the price runs over $350,000, that is absolutely the maximum point to which we will go in appropriating money for this purpose.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I did not desire to interrupt the Senator from Maryland. Of course, the Government could condemn the property, could it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Government could condemn the property; and I understand that course may finally be resorted to. However, I say frankly that takes time. The 2,600 midshipmen are now in the Academy; and if we can get some more land, it will make just twice the acreage that now is available for the same number of men.

I reiterate that there is nothing in the bill which says this money shall be spent for the 9 acres in question. That is what the naval authorities would rather have than any other land there, but there are several other available tracts, and I am not at all certain that the land to which the Senator refers is the land that will be purchased.

Furthermore, I will say that when Admiral Brown, the predecessor of the present commandant, was the commandant of the Naval Academy, he wrote me and called attention to the fact that the time was coming when more land would have to be available for the midshipmen; and I took up the matter with Admiral Moreell and with others. Then when Admiral Wilson, the new commandant of the academy, entered upon his duties, he reiterated the position taken by Admiral Brown. In all the correspondence, however, there was never any time when any particular parcel of land was selected as the area to be acquired. The picture presented to the Appropriations Committee was only one air view of a possible solution of the congestion.

The $350,000 recommended by the committee was felt by the Naval Affairs Committee and by the Appropriations Committee to be the lowest sum that we possibly could appropriate in this emergency to relieve the congestion. When the House struck out the original appropriation that action was taken upon the assumption that the money would be used to build a stadium, as the testimony will show. To prove that the House is now in accord with this action, only yesterday the House passed without discussion the naval authorization bill, after those who originally had objected were apprised—as now we are apprising the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]—what the real facts are.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me say, please, that I am perfectly satisfied that the need exists. I am glad the Naval Academy is to get the additional land. My only question had to do with the price which apparently was to be paid for what looked like slum-area acreage. When I found that the Senator from South Carolina, with his perspicacity, had already questioned the admiral in the hearings, and had pointed out that the price seemed very high, I shared his belief; and especially did I feel that we ought to inquire into the matter in view of the fact that the House had stricken the entire item from the bill.

I thank the Senators who have assisted us in reaching an understanding of the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment on page 8, line 9, will be agreed to. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in the item for the training station at Norfolk, Va., on

page 8, line 11, to strike out "$425,000" and insert "$449,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 4, to increase the total for training, education, and welfare from "$3,123,400" to "$3,187,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ships," subhead "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," on page 17, line 8, after the word "appurtenance", to insert "and not to exceed $5,000 for necessary travel expenses of civilian employees incident to such maintenance and operation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," subhead "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel," on page 21, line 16, after the words "Nurse Corps", to strike out "$3,035,174" and insert "$1,785,174."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "$269,129,231" and insert "$287,879,231."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 18, after the words "in all, $41,399,256", to strike cut:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed, and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is a contested item.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. At this time I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to raise a question relative to the committee amendment to this bill which would strike lines 19 to 25 on page 23 and lines 1 to 2 on page 24. I raise this question on behalf of the midwestern beef growers who, I am afraid, will be left stranded by the purchasers of beef for the Navy if this bill as passed shall contain the amendment referred to. With the proviso on page 23 stricken from the bill, cheap Argentine beef may be purchased at the discretion of the Navy Department. Not only can small amounts be so purchased but also any amount up to 100 percent of the amount needed. Of course, they will not necessarily purchase that extreme amount, but it is possible and where they may stop no man on this floor knows.

There has been talk of a gentleman's agreement between the National Livestock Association and the Office of Production Management, but we all know what is liable to happen under the stress and strain which may and undoubtedly will ensue in the rush of defense organization and purchasing. Speaking of the American National Livestock Association with which this so-called gentleman's agreement has been made governing the purchase of South American beef, just what organization is it? The American National Livestock Association represents the sum total of only 35 percent of the tonnage of beef produced in the United States and only States west of the Rocky Mountains. The greater majority of beef tonnage produced, or 65 percent, is raised in the Middle West, east of the Rocky Mountains. The stock raised by members of the American National Livestock Association are feeder cattle which, before they are ready for market, must be fed on the corn produced in the midwestern area. What power or right has the minority of the stock raisers and beef marketers in this country to make an agreement for the majority in regard to marketing procedure, or to recommend the removal of a vitally important provision of a bill, the elimination of which would probably ruin the domestic beef growers market?

One other point along this line: I call attention to the fact that the members of the National Livestock Association are feeding their cattle in great part on public domain lands. They do not have to pay taxes on this land or worry about its continued production of feed. I am not condemning them for this opportunity which they have; I am only bringing up this point to show that they do not have to realize the same amount of profit on their cattle in order to cover the midwestern farmer's expense of raising his cattle, or have the same attitude toward the productivity and care of their lands as do the western farmers. The only price they have to pay is the small feeding charge made each year by the Federal Government. This is illustrated in wheat production by the leasing at a very nominal price per acre of Montana land, as an example, to those who are producing wheat, to be added to the surplus, and then for not producing wheat on the land so leased being paid so many dollars per acre. That is an illustration of what is happening in connection with this feed program.

The committee in its report states that the Navy under this appropriation should have the same equality as other departments so far as appropriations are concerned and that they are governed by the Buy American Act, which appears in the Code of Laws of the United States of America under title 41, section 10a, and reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States and only such manufactured articles, material, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, etc. * * * shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply to articles, etc. * * * for use outside the United States.

It is very easy to see that this particular law does not and will not prevent the unbridled purchase of South American beef under the appropriation now being considered. The Secretary of the Navy could very easily determine that domestic beef was too high priced, which is likely to follow in the footsteps of large purchases, or that it might be inconsistent with the policy of "neighborliness," which the administration has a tendency to overpromote. My conclusion in regard to the aforementioned law now on the books is that it can in no way protect our domestic beef producer. Thus it becomes necessary that we include in a bill embodying such a potential beef-purchasing power a protection to the American growers market.

In the Middle West farm income in the past several years has come to depend in large part upon the feeding and raising of beef and other livestock. I submit for the RECORD a quotation from an article released from the Department of Agriculture and appearing in the Des Moines, Iowa, Register for March 7, 1941, which sets forth the percentage of farm income which has resulted from livestock production. This report has largely to do with the percentage of income to Iowa farmers from livestock production, but which I believe reflects in great part the situation in most of the Midwestern States. The quotation from the report is as follows:

But almost as important are the figures showing our income from livestock and livestock products. Last year livestock represented $513,960,000 of our total ($728,506,000), while crops of all kinds came to only $165,311,000.

In other words, over 70 percent of the farm income in the last year came from the raising of livestock. Do Senators, who are ardent supporters of an increased income for farmers, wish to see one of their main sources of income threatened or destroyed?

It has been necessary for our farmers to resort to the marketing of their agricultural products along the feed line because of the increasingly low prices for such products caused in great part by the increasingly large surpluses of corn, wheat, and other feeds which are being built up by the administration's farm program.

Now, we have before us a bill which would tend to increase the sale of this important agricultural product, livestock, but which will have the opposite effect if we allow the committee amendment to prevail. It seems to me that we are working in an entirely opposite direction than I am sure the truly agriculturally minded Members of this body would wish. The proponents of the pending amendment may argue that if we draw upon our own supply of beef alone, a shortage may occur, causing prices to go above their proper level. I call to the attention of the Senate two points which would directly contradict this argument. First I should like to quote from an article appearing in the Southern Planter under the date of March 1941:

The number of cattle and calves on farms and ranches on January 1, 1941, has been estimated (U. S. Department of Agriculture) at close to 71,000,000 head. Numbers have been increasing steadily since 1938, until they are now some 5,000,000 head above the 1938

level. With the present immediate outlook for prices relatively favorable the cycle suggets that numbers will continue to rise for 2 or 3 years more.

As is usual in periods of increasing numbers, farmers are withholding breeding stock from the market; hence total marketings of slaughter cattle are not what they might be. Unless the trend is reversed, an all-time high record of cattle numbers may be reached and then increased slaughterings unavoidably will take place within the next 3 to 5 years. A sharp decline in cattle prices cannot be avoided then if this heavily increased veal and beef production comes at a time of weakening consumer buying power and lessening demand for meat.

Putting it briefly, the supply of cattle in this country ready for marketing is increasing each month. Thus there is not much chance of our market becoming tight because of the lack of supply.

But let us look at the picture from another angle. If there is a danger of the supply of domestic beef becoming short, why then should not the great supplies of corn, stored on the farms of the Nation and making up the ever-normal granary, be released to growers of livestock to feed and increase their herds to meet this so-called potential meat shortage? Loan it to the feeders so that they in turn can produce more beef for our increased consumption and with the money so received pay off the loans given by the Government on corn. Great quantities of this corn are growing older month by month and losing more and more of feeding value. I do not believe that the purpose of the administration in setting up the corn loan and storage plan was to let the surplus go to waste. Why not put it to a productive use, and realize something from our great investment in it? By the proposed method above suggested we would be not only paying off the debt incurred to the Government by making these loans, but would also be increasing the income of the beef-growing farmers. In turn we would be setting up a supply of beef which I am confident would supply the needs of this country to a great extent without relying upon the imports of foreign beef.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that in 1934 we started a national farm program aimed and designed to assist the farmer in diversifying his crops in order to assist in raising his income from each of them. I am a subscriber to this program as an owner and operator of midwestern farms. The Department of Agriculture, as one of its major points in the farm program, has urged that the farmer turn some of his land back to grass and raise livestock to which to feed his corn, thus alleviating the surplus of that crop. This naturally means an increase in livestock and particularly beef production. Are we going to put these farmers, who are religiously following out the farm program, out on a limb by threatening the main cash market which they have? I do not see how the administration can stand idly by and see such a serious blow dealt to its farm program.

In conclusion, I urge the defeat of the committee amendment as proposed for the following specific reasons:

First. It will allow the South American beef producer an almost unlimited market under this specific appropriation, and will seriously threaten the American producer's market at present and for the future as well.

Second. If there is a shortage of beef, as the advocates of this amendment might wish us to believe, it can be taken care of in two ways:

(a) Under the original bill, the Navy could purchase South American beef to any amount necessary if it was absolutely necessary, but they must give priority to the American-grown product.

(b) We can release our stored grain, which is increasing in ever-increasing amounts from year to year, and this in turn would turn the ever-normal granary into a self-liquidating organization.

Third. The majority of the beef growers in the United States, consisting of 65 percent of the total beef tonnage produced, are represented by the United States Livestock Association, are opposed to this amendment 100 percent. No other attitude has ever been taken by the real beef producers of the United States.

Again I remind the Senate that we are selling our farmers' livestock market down the river every time we pass a bill which opens the doors farther to the importation of foreign competitive products. Once they are open, it is twice as hard to close them. There must be a starting point in stopping this adverse trend, and I believe that this is the place to begin doing it.

We can never have a return of prosperity to the Farm Belt through a plan that simply redistributes money or values already created, changing our money from one pocket to the other. Of course, it is of temporary value, perhaps; but any permanent relief must come through a profitable sale of the products of the farm. The control of foreign markets is beyond us; but we should and must retain control of our own domestic markets, especially for the crops we produce on the farms of America.

Every dollar of new value created on the American farm grows into $7 of national income. Let us protect this, our greatest industry, the small farms of America.

One word more, please. The farm income of the United States represents one-seventh of the total national income; or, stated the other way, the national income is seven times the agricultural income of the United States. I believe it is not good policy to adopt a program which limits and restricts the products of the American farm. We must, I believe, protect the American farmer in his own market.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is unnecessary to take the time of the Senate to explain my objections to this amendment. We are all well acquainted with the provision relating to the purchase of food which the committee now seeks to eliminate from the naval appropriation bill. A similar provision was put in the naval bill last year through the sponsorship of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. We had a field day at that time, or two or three field days, on this particular subject.

At this time we can add to some extent to the information then available, because since then the livestock situation has changed somewhat, in that prices have gone up; but the cattle-raising farmers of the Middle West now confront a situation that is at least as bad as, if not worse than, that of a year ago. Because of the increased prices in the United States, many Mexican cattle are coming in to compete with cattle raised in this country. About 400,000 head have come over the border during the past year.

Another point which should be mentioned is the fact that the defense appropriations are going to territories outside the Middle West. Defense money is not being spent in the cattle-raising sections of the United States. Therefore, even though the farmers' products have increased in price to some extent, the prices of articles which the farmers buy and have to have on their farms have increased out of proportion to the prices they get for what they produce.

We of the Middle West feel that we gained quite a good deal by having a similar provision put in the appropriation bill last year. We greatly dislike to see it taken out this year. We should like to have the opportunity of giving the men of the Navy good beef, not imported beef, and we should like to maintain the right to supply that market. We in the Middle West feel that we are being penalized in not getting any of the defense money at this time, and that this is a step that will take away our one opportunity to serve in the defense effort. Therefore, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to join my distinguished brother who has just spoken in relation to the committee amendment striking out of the bill the provision on pages 23 and 24 giving a preference to the purchase of foodstuffs grown or produced in the United States and its possessions.

I have often spoken in the Senate in relation to the problems of the farmer, and particularly in relation to the products for which Wisconsin is famous—butter and cheese. Here we have a situation which means that if the action of the committee should stand, the Navy would not have to use American cheese or American butter or American beef or other American products.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has just mentioned the fact that we in the Middle West have not been getting our proportion of the defense moneys.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me point out that, while we are not getting our proportion of the defense money, we are furnishing our proportion of the boys who go into the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WILEY. I am very glad the distinguished Senator has brought that idea into the picture. We in the Middle West, in State after State, have not had $1 from the Government for the purpose of building up producing plants that are in

the defense picture. For a long time I have been trying to persuade certain officials in the Government service who have the say that it is common sense that they should move into the Middle West, into the hinterland, plants that would produce articles for defense. They have not done so. They have come into my State and given us about $90,000,000 worth of orders in certain plants that build machinery, and so forth, but they have taken out of the State thousands of men and moved them into the East, into this centralized area; and those thousands are not consuming the products that they would have consumed had they remained in the Middle West.

Here, again, we have another shot at the Middle West, a shot at the granary, the food basket of the Nation. When we have an opportunity to help them, we say, "The Government is going to appropriate money for defense; but instead of buying American products to feed the boys in the Navy who come from the Middle West, they may be fed with products which are not raised in America."

Mr. President, I believe this amendment should be rejected on its merits. I believe the people of the Middle West are entitled to that consideration; and when we come to vote I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The demand being sufficiently seconded——

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I am asking for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not think the Chair should say that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were requested.

Mr. BYRNES. The yeas and nays were requested, but not ordered, and even as the Senator from Wisconsin asked for the yeas and nays, I was seeking recognition from the Chair. I know the Senator will withdraw the request, since I, being in charge of the bill, desired to have an opportunity to explain the action of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the order will be rescinded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there should be a quorum present while the explanation is being made.

Mr. BYRNES. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bridges	Clark, Idaho
Aiken	Brooks	Clark, Mo.
Andrews	Brown	Connally
Bailey	Bulow	Danaher
Ball	Burton	Davis
Bankhead	Butler	Downey
Barbour	Byrd	Ellender
Barkley	Byrnes	George
Bilbo	Capper	Gerry
Bone	Caraway	Gillette
Brewster	Chavez	Glass
Green	McNary	Taft
Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Gurney	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Herring	Norris	Truman
Hill	Nye	Tunnell
Holman	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Hughes	Overton	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Van Nuys
Kilgore	Reed	Wallgren
La Follette	Reynolds	Wheeler
Langer	Schwartz	White
Lodge	Shipstead	Wiley
Lucas	Smathers	Willis
McFarland	Smith	
McKellar	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, line 18.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I wish to make only a short statement with reference to the action of the committee adopting the amendment eliminating from the bill the language preventing the Navy from buying canned beef for the personnel of the Navy. This provision was adopted not last year, but two years ago, as I recall.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I underststand the amendment has come to be known as the Canned Corn Beef amendment, but does it not include all kinds of American-produced foods?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. There is no question about the language applying to all foods.

The amendment was adopted about 2 years ago. At that time the question was raised, when the price of the Argentine beef was 9 cents a pound and the price of the domestic product was 25 cents a pound. There was a 6-cent duty on canned beef. The Navy proposed to buy some canned corned beef, and the language now in the bill was added as the result of that desire on the part of the Navy. My recollection is that at that time I voted for the adoption of the amendment on the floor of the Senate. I said, however, what I believed to be true, that if it were to be our policy, it should be applied to all departments of the Government, and not alone to the Navy and to the marines.

Mr. President, 2 years have passed. Now the domestic canned corned beef, instead of being 25 cents a pound has increased 33½ percent, and now is 33 cents a pound, as indicated by the last bid furnished to the Army and the Navy. That increase of 33½ percent has taken place at a time when the price of the Argentine beef should necessarily be affected by reason of the increase in ocean freight rates and insurance which the Argentine product has to pay. But after the payment of increased freight rates and increased insurance, and after the payment of 6 cents duty to the United States Government, the price of the Argentine canned corned beef to the Navy would be 25 cents a pound as against 33 cents a pound for the domestic product.

Mr. President, domestic canned corned beef is not so good a product as Argentine canned corned beef. Senators from the Western States know the reason why. It is because in the Argentine there is not as great a demand for T-bone steaks as there is in the United States; so in the Argentine choicer cuts are used for canned beef, and as a result we find in this country a domestic product which, though sold to the Navy at a price 33⅓ percent higher than the Argentine product is inferior. If any Senator doubts that, let him go home and ask his wife what kind of corned beef she buys for him, and he will find that she does not buy domestic corned beef. He will find that she buys the Argentine product.

Mr. President, I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I admit I have been interested in one phase of the question. If Congress does not place this restriction on the Army, if we permit the Army enlisted man to eat the better beef at the lower price, if Senators will not place a similar restriction on themselves, either at home or in the Senate Restaurant, why place it on the Navy?

I refer to the Senate restaurant, because some Senators who are now downstairs at lunch, if they are eating corned beef, are eating Argentine corned beef, for there is no other kind used in the United States Senate restaurant. The domestic product is good enough for the Navy, but when it comes to a Senator, he wants to eat the better beef. When it comes to the Army, we let the Army buy 10,000,000 pounds of Argentine beef under an agreement. Is anything said about that? Appropriation bill after appropriation bill is acted upon. Not a word is said about that particular matter, but the blue jacket and the marine must eat an inferior product.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The argument which the Senator has made may well be made in South Carolina, but the Senator could not come out to my State of Montana and tell the cattlemen there that the corned beef of Montana is inferior to the Argentine product.

Mr. BYRNES. They know it, though they get more money for their beef.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from South Carolina is not making the argument which ought to be made on this matter.

Mr. BYRNES. I do not expect the Senator from Wyoming to agree with me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it were a question of inferior beef and good beef, I should not have stood upon the floor of the Senate a year ago to make the fight which was then made for the inclusion of a similar provision in the bill then pending. It should not be forgotten that the canned meat which the Navy bought under that provision met the specifications which the Navy laid down. So there is no question of good beef or bad beef involved in this matter. The only issue involved is whether or not in the present emergency it is desirable to refuse to take canned beef from Argentina.

I understand that during my absence today the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] made some reference to the position which I took upon this matter a year ago, and pointed out what he alleged to be an inconsistency upon my part, because I am not now objecting to the removal of the language in question by the Senate committee.

Mr. President, there is no inconsistency, and I am very proud of the fact that the cattlemen of the West, represented by their American National Livestock Association, came here to Washington and sat down with the officers of the Office of Production Management, the officers of the Navy, and the officers of the Army, and went all over this matter, and declined to allow their selfish interests to interfere with what they regarded to be a momentous question of national interest.

It should be borne in mind that these gentlemen representing the American National Livestock Association, the entire board of directors, from the entire Rocky Mountain West, participated in the discussions, during the course of which it was clearly demonstrated that, with the enlarged Army and the enlarged Navy, it is necessary to have increased supplies of canned-meat products, because when the Army is engaged in field maneuvers it needs meat products which can be transported more readily than can fresh beef. Likewise, when the Navy is out upon the sea it also requires its foodstuffs to be in such a form that they can be easily transported. So the Office of Production Management indicated to the officers of the American National Livestock Association that it would be desirable for the next fiscal year to purchase about 20,000,000 pounds of canned beef from South America.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator from Wyoming will bear with me a moment, is it not a fact that about 80 or 90 percent of the armed forces of the United States are in the Army, and that this 80 or 90 percent can be fed on food purchased anywhere? Therefore, is it not entirely proper for the livestock producers of this country to hold their lines as they have them at the moment, and be ready to keep their market, which is the Navy at the present time? What does the Senator have to say to that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not agree with the point of view expressed by the Senator. The Navy is increasing in personnel, and there are some indications that it may have to travel abroad upon the high seas, at least to a greater extent than at present. It is my understanding that, as a matter of actual enrollment, there are about 500,000 men in the Navy, as against only a little more than 1,000,000 in the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. I question those figures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has interrupted me. Let me finish.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask one further question, if the Senator will permit me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BYRNES. I have yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator desires to ask a question, I shall be very glad to try to answer it.

Mr. GURNEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Wyoming to state that the canned beef produced in the United States meets the Navy specifications?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; of course.

Mr. GURNEY. Therefore, it could be supplied domestically at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At a largely increased price. But the point which the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators who want to make a political argument out of this question are overlooking is the fact that under this arrangement more fresh beef is being produced for the Navy and the Army than was ever produced before. The Senator is overlooking—deliberately, I believe—the fact that the Office of Production Management has agreed to reduce the weights of beef carcasses from a minimum of 500 pounds to a minimum of 450 pounds and is now considering a reduction to 400 pounds. That will enable the cattlemen of the Senator's State, of Nebraska, of Wisconsin, and of all the West, to sell to the Army fresh beef that they could not sell under the arrangements which previously existed; and the Office of Production Management has agreed to the new arrangement.

With respect to the sale of lamb, the Office of Production Management has increased the carcass weight from 45 to 60 pounds. Concessions of the most important and valuable character have been granted, and because of that fact the officers of the American National Livestock Association gave their consent.

The Senator from South Dakota was in the committee yesterday when I presented a telegram, which I do not happen to have with me at the moment, from Mr. F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American National Livestock Association, urging that the provision in question be eliminated from the bill because of an arrangement which he and his associates of the American National Livestock Association had negotiated for the protection of the cattle and sheep producers of America. If the Senator from South Carolina will permit me, I shall be glad to have inserted in the RECORD the announcement which was made by the Office of Production Management on February 26, together with a news dispatch from Denver, Colo., dated February 28, setting forth in full all the details of the agreement. I ask that the announcement and the news item to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
DIVISION OF PURCHASES,
February 26, 1941.

A wider range of meat products, particularly fresh meats, will be bought by the Army as a result of agreements reached in a recent conference of leaders in the livestock industry with officials of the Army Quartermaster Corps and the Division of Purchases, Office of Production Management.

This conference, held in the office of Donald M. Nelson, Director of the Division of Purchases, brought about extension of weight ranges and a liberalization of the grades of meat which can be bought for the Army ration.

Agreements reached included the following:

1. The Army will buy spiced pork products, commonly known to the trade as spiced ham, in 12-ounce cans.

2. Heifer meat of proper quality will hereafter be included in all tenders of army-style boneless frozen beef, which will be used in large quantities in maneuvers.

3. Subject to further study and perfection of a grading system, the Army will consider the inclusion of heifers of proper grade in all beef purchases.

4. Federal specifications are being revised in conformance with A. M. S. standards and as production conditions warrant full consideration will be given to the use of other grades whose quality is satisfactory to the Army and which are in surplus.

5. The Army has ordered that lambs up to 60 pounds in weight may be purchased until April 30. This is an increase from the previous limit of 45 pounds.

6. Beef weights have been lowered in Army specifications to 450 pounds. Further lowering of this weight limit to 400 pounds will be given consideration.

7. The Army will buy large quantities of (reserve) C ration, each can of which contains about 6 ounces of domestic meat.

In this connection, it is pointed out that the American soldier is getting in his regular ration substantially more fresh meat than the per capita average of consumption by the entire country.

As a general rule, the soldier gets meat or protein foods at 18 of his 21 weekly meals.

His breakfast, for example, includes bacon or eggs, or the two together, or meat in some other form—ground beef, for instance, creamed and served on toast.

Five days in every week find meat—roast, steak, chops, or what not—on the noonday menu. On an average, each man is allowed one-half pound of meat at this meal, the exact allowance varying with different kinds of meat. If steak is served, for instance, the allowance is 50 to 55 pounds for 100 men. Ground steak for meat loaf is figured at 35 pounds for 100 men, chuck meat for pot roast at 65 pounds for 100 men, and so on. On Friday noon, fresh fish is served.

Every Saturday noon, by Army tradition of long standing, the soldier gets baked beans in place of his meat ration—the beans being flavored with salt pork or bacon.

The soldier usually gets two meatless suppers per week, the meat ration being replaced at those two meals by some such dish as spaghetti and cheese.

The soldier gets a carefully balanced meal and fruits, vegetables, and starches are served, of course, in proper proportion to balance the meat which is consumed.

At the conference were Lt. Col. Paul P. Logan, chief of subsistence of the Quartermaster Corps; Mr. Douglas C. MacKeachie, Deputy Director, Division of Purchases, Office of Production Management; Mr. J. Elmer Brock, president of American National Livestock Association, Kaycee, Wyo.; Mr. F. E. Mollin, secretary of American National Livestock Association, Denver, Colo.; Mr. Frank S. Boice, chairman, legislative committee of American National Livestock Association, Soncita, Ariz.; and the following members of the legislative committee of the American National Livestock Association: Mr. A. D. Brownfield, Deming, N. Mex.; Mr. J. H. Mason, Spearfish, S. Dak.; Mr. William M

Wright, Deeth, Nev.; Mr. George Jones, Marfa, Tex.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Tribune of February 28, 1941]

STOCKMEN APPROVE IMPORTS

DENVER.—The American National Livestock Association, which has vigorously opposed importation of canned beef from Argentina, announced Thursday it had approved limited imports of South American canned beef to supply immediate United States Army field-ration needs.

The approval was given, explained F. E. Mollin, association secretary, after important concessions were obtained on grades and specifications for national-defense purchases of domestic meat.

The domestic-grade concessions and the South American import approval, Mollin reported, were agreed upon at a conference of association officers in Washington with Douglas MacKeachie, assistant to the coordinator of national-defense purchases, and Col. Paul Logan, of the Army quartermaster's division.

"Because of the difficulty already experienced in filling domestic orders for canned beef, and, in order to cooperate fully with the defense program, it was conceded," Mollin said, "that imported canned beef in the present emergency might be purchased for defense purposes, but that such purchases were not to exceed 20,000,000 pounds for the fiscal year 1941.

"It was stressed," Mollin continued, "that at the conclusion of the emergency the domestic industry would again expect the support in the domestic market of these contracts for the Army and the Navy."

He pointed out also that canned-beef imports in 1940 had declined 25,000,000 pounds below 1939.

Among Army concessions on domestic purchases, Mollin reported, were:

The Army will purchase heifer beef "in all tenders of Army style boneless, frozen beef, which will be used in large quantities in maneuvers." Previously only steer beef was bought.

The beef weight limit will be reduced to 450 pounds, and consideration will be given to a further lowering to 400 pounds.

Lambs weighing up to 60 pounds will be purchased until April 30. The previous lamb weight limit was 45 pounds.

Spiced-pork products will be added to the canned-meat field ration, previously limited to canned beef.

"By spreading defense purchases over a wide range of meat products, instead of centering them on a comparatively narrow range of the higher grades alone, we should avoid unwarranted peaks that might do our industry a tremendous amount of damage," Mollin observed.

"The last thing the industry wants under present conditions is a run-away market."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BYRNES. I have yielded to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At the conferences to which I have referred there were present: Lt. Col. Paul P. Logan, chief of subsistence of the Quartermaster Corps; Mr. Douglas C. MacKeachie, Deputy Director, Division of Purchases, Office of Production Management; Mr. J. Elmer Brock, president of the American National Livestock Association, Kaycee, Wyo.; Mr. F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American National Livestock Association, Denver, Colo.; Mr. Frank S. Boice, chairman of the legislative committee of the American National Livestock Association, Sonoita, Ariz.; and the following members of the legislative committee of the American National Livestock Association: Mr. A. D. Brownfield, Deming, N. Mex.; Mr. J. H. Mason, Spearfish, S. Dak.; Mr. William M. Wright, Deeth, Nev.; and Mr. George Jones, Marfa, Tex.

Mr. President, all these gentlemen are intimately acquainted with the needs of the American livestock industry. No person anywhere can claim greater loyalty to the interests of the meat producers of the West than these gentlemen, who have been elected by the meat producers to be the executive board of their association. They have covered the situation. They have conducted the negotiations. They came to the conclusion that it was desirable to make this arrangement, and they are defending it in the announcements which they make.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska to ask a question.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Wyoming has just read the names of certain members of the American National Livestock Association. I have before me the letterhead of the United States Livestock Association, representing a territory which produces 65 percent of the beef of the United States, as compared to the 35 percent represented by the organization for which the Senator speaks. There is no rivalry that I know of between the members of the two organizations. I simply wish to state for the RECORD that the United States Livestock Association, whose sentiments I am speaking, produces 65 percent of the beef produced in the United States, as compared to the 35 percent produced by members of the American National Livestock Association.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It has been said that the amount of beef which could be brought in would be 20,000,000 pounds. That is one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount of beef produced in the United States. Our production last year was 18,802,000,000 pounds; and imports of 20,000,000 pounds would represent one-tenth of 1 percent of our production. At the same time we have been producing and selling in the American market more American beef each year since 1933.

Mr. BYRNES. I am not familiar with the figures; I know the Senator from Wyoming is. I know, too, that beef is one of the products which at this time we are very happy to say is above parity. In the Appropriations Committee we are advised that all other farm products are below parity. Beef is the only commodity I know of that is above parity.

Mr. President, the amendment does not involve any discussion of the relative merits of domestic and imported beef, other than corned beef. The statement I made as to the canned product was based upon the statement of Admiral Spear in his testimony at page 49 of the hearings, as to the superiority of the Argentine product, not because they have better beef there, but because they use the choicer cuts for canned beef, whereas in this country there is a great demand for steaks and "hot dogs," for which there is practically no demand in Argentina. As a result, in this country, with very few exceptions, we do not can beef except for the Army and Navy. I am afraid cattlemen do not receive much of the increased price that is being paid, anyway.

Boiled down, the question is simply this: The Navy finds itself confronted with a subsistence allowance, and when it buys canned corned beef, which is particularly desirable to take to sea, it has to pay 33⅓ percent more than it paid 2 years ago. The Army can buy 10,000,000 pounds of corned beef, and apparently there is no complaint about it on the part of the Congress.

If anything of the kind should be done, it should be done by general legislation affecting all Government departments; and it should not apply, as the provision in the bill does, to the Navy alone. If it is desirable and if it is wise, it should be applied to all departments of the Government. That is the only interest I have in it. The motion to strike from the bill the restriction upon the Navy did not originate with me. It came from the section of the country which those interested in cattle are representing, and because of the agreement which had been entered into between the Office of Production Management, the Defense Commission, and the Association of Livestock Growers in the West. Because I am interested in the Navy, I think that in this matter the Navy is entitled to be placed on the same footing with the Army.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who proposed the original amendment, states there is no question relative to quality, so we may leave that entirely out of consideration. This is a matter of principle, a question whether it is worth more to the members of the United States Navy to eat beef that can be purchased for a few cents less from a foreigner, or whether they would rather patronize their home market. It is a big question. It does not cover only Argentine beef; it covers everything.

The farmers of the United States, constituting about one-fourth of the population, are getting a smaller and smaller percentage of the income of the Nation. Wages are continually going up and the situation will reach such a point that those who are not now advocating the retention of this provision in the bill will propose, tomorrow or the next day or sometime soon, to increase the amount of money that is to be distributed among the farmers of America in order to reach parity. We will never reach parity by taking the money from one pocket and dividing it among the people of the Nation. The only way to get prosperity is to create new wealth. We cannot create new wealth in America by buying the products of other countries when we already have in our own country sufficient to supply the demand, and when there is no question of the quality of the products we are supplying.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming more or less

charged that I was making a partisan issue out of this question. I rise for the purpose of answering his statement, because I do not want to be partisan in this matter, any more than I have been partisan in the consideration of a recent big question on which some of my colleagues cast votes different from mine.

However, I plead guilty to being partisan for the farmers and livestock raisers of our country. I feel that the provision should remain in the bill mainly for the reason that it is a step in the right direction, and that certainly the chaotic condition existing in world affairs at present will not continue. I feel that when times of peace come again I shall certainly be in favor of our doing what the Senator from South Carolina suggests, that is, prohibiting the purchase of foreign foods, outside of the United States, for any of the departments of Government which will be buying food, or which will have the right to buy food.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 18, after the figures "$41,399,256", to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed, and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto.

Mr. WILEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If permitted to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER and Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE and Mr. THOMAS], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who is necessarily absent.

Mr. STEWART. My colleague the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I am advised that he is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 32, nays 32—as follows:

YEAS—32

Andrews	Gerry	Murray
Bankhead	Glass	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Green	Overton
Bilbo	Guffey	Reynolds
Brown	Hayden	Schwartz
Byrnes	Hill	Smathers
Caraway	Hughes	Stewart
Chavez	Kilgore	Truman
Connally	Lucas	Tydings
Downey	McFarland	Wallgren
Ellender	Maloney	

NAYS—32

Adams	Capper	Norris
Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Nye
Ball	Danaher	Shipstead
Barbour	Gillette	Smith
Bone	Gurney	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Bulow	La Follette	Wheeler
Burton	Langer	Wiley
Butler	Lodge	Willis
Byrd	McNary	

NOT VOTING—31

Austin	Johnson, Calif.	Sheppard
Bailey	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Bunker	McKellar	Tobey
Chandler	Mead	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Miller	Van Nuys
Davis	Murdock	Wagner
George	Pepper	Walsh
Harrison	Radcliffe	White
Hatch	Reed	
Herring	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 32 and the nays are 32; so the amendment is rejected.

(For correction of this vote as recorded in the RECORD and Journal of this date, see RECORD of Senate proceedings, p. 2490.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 26, line 23, after the words "Naval Academy", to strike out:

Provided further, That the commissioned officer assigned on March 13, 1941, to the supervision of budgetary work in the Bureau of Ships, if he so elects, may be continued in such assignment until retirement for age or other cause, subject to the approval of the Chief of such Bureau, and, subject to physical fitness, such officer shall be advanced to the grade of captain at such time as any officer of his class is regularly advanced to such grade.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks", in the item for the Naval Station, Tutuila, Samoa, on page 36, line 1, to strike out "recreation building and accessories, $70,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 15, to insert:

Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Purchase of land, $51,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., on page 39, line 14, after "$30,000", to insert "acquisition of land for extension of Naval Academy grounds, $350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., page 40, line 11, after "$172,000", to insert "post school building and accessories, $100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in the item for the Marine Barracks, San Diego, Calif., line 14, after "$400,000", to insert "improvements at rifle range at La Jolla, $220,000, including $20,000 for target area and ranges; theater and recreation hall for enlisted men, $300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla., page 41, line 7, after "$350,000", to strike out "recreation facilities for officers, $250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 13, to strike out:

Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif.: Additional aviation facilities at outlying auxiliary base, Boulder City, Nev., including buildings and accessories and equipment, $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading, "Pay, Marine Corps", on page 49, line 23, after the word "including", to strike out "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. No part of any money appropriated herein or included under any contract authority herein granted shall be expended for the payment of any commission on any land purchase contract in excess of 3 percent of the purchase price.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to strike out "years 1941 and" insert "year."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the only purpose of that is to make plain that it applies to 1942 and is not retroactive, applying to the fiscal year 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 3981) was passed.

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRNES, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees of the Senate be authorized to submit reports during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I usually consent to such a request, and I shall not do otherwise now; but let me inquire, what bills the Senator has in mind, in order that we may anticipate what work will be on the calendar for Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am hoping that the Appropriations Committee will report the $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill under the Lend-Lease Act during the week. It is my purpose to move an adjournment until Monday, and I should like to be in a position to have that bill taken up on Monday if the committee shall finish its work on the bill and report it to the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I wanted to know from the Senator. So, if the committee reports between now and Saturday, then, it is the purpose of the Senator to have taken up the $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill on Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MARKETING QUOTAS FOR PEANUTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following report, which was ordered to lie on the table:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 3, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "90" and insert the figures "95"; on page 4, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the word "of" and insert the word "on"; on page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 and insert "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota with respect to the crop of peanuts produced in the calendar year 1941 equal to the minimum quota provided for said year in subsection (a) hereof and shall provide for the holding of a referendum on such quota within thirty days after the date upon which this Act becomes effective, and the State and farm acreage allotments established under the 1941 agricultural conservation program shall be the State and farm acreage allotments for the 1941 crop of peanuts"; on page 5, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "90" and insert the figures "95"; on page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the period after the word "year", insert a semicolon and strike out the following sentence "In the distribution of such increase of 2 per centum, preference shall be given to the claims of new producers" and insert "Provided, in the distribution of such increases based on such excess acreage the total allotments established for new farms shall not be less than fifty per centum of such increases"; on page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendment after the word "basis" in line 10, insert "of the formula used in determining the parity price of peanuts as"; and on page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendment strike out all of lines 17, 18, 19, and 20; on page 10, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "52" and insert the figures "50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HATTIE W. CARAWAY,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. P. FULMER,
WALL DOXEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, 7 years ago the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, submitted to the United States Senate for ratification a treaty covering the St. Lawrence seaway power project. The document then before us was a treaty. The Senate acted, and the treaty failed of ratification.

Yesterday it was announced that a treaty had been signed between Canada and the United States on a similar project, to be known as the St. Lawrence River seaway and power project. The President, in a public statement, has indicated that at this time a similar treaty does not need the ratification of the Senate, as a treaty between this country and some other country.

I do not know by what stretch of the imagination, or by what queer process of reasoning, the President arrived at that conclusion. Nevertheless, it seems rather peculiar that such a treaty 7 years ago should require Senate ratification, while today it does not.

The President states this project is in the interest of national defense. He allotted about a million dollars of national-defense funds to make a survey without authorization of Congress. The survey has been made, and he now recommends the project under the guise of national defense. I cannot see how it can be considered a national-defense project. It will take about 6 years to complete. By that time, most of us hope and believe that the present emergency will be over.

In my judgment, this is exactly the reverse of a vital national-defense project. At a time when we need all the resources of the country to build planes and tanks, plants, and other materials which are urgently needed, it is proposed to divert men and materials to the purposes of this project. It will open up to a hostile power a broad highway for the invasion of the heart of America. It will eventually throw out of employment tens of thousands of railroad labor. It will injure and hurt our port cities, on both the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, and it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars when money is needed so urgently for vital defense needs.

There appeared in the New York Times of today an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence: New Style"; and in the March issue of the Locomotive Engineers' Journal there appeared an editorial on the St. Lawrence Waterway. I ask that these two editorials be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 20, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE: NEW STYLE

Seven years ago President Roosevelt submitted the St. Lawrence River seaway-and-power project to the Senate in the form of a treaty that required a two-thirds vote of approval to make it effective. The Senate failed to approve it. Now, 7 years later, the President returns to the same subject, this time with an "agreement"—signed yesterday at Ottawa—which will not require a two-thirds vote of approval, but merely a majority vote to provide the necessary money.

For this method of whipping the devil around the stump some justification might perhaps be found if the St. Lawrence project could be described as an imperatively needed defense measure. But how can this be said of a project which, by Mr. Roosevelt's own definition, cannot be completed until 1945? The President offers the explanation that we are today appropriating money for the construction of warships, which also will not be completed until 1945. But this comparison is less an argument for supporting the St. Lawrence project than it is a reason for doubting the wisdom of clogging our shipways by laying down battleships that cannot be completed for 5 years when our shipbuilding facilities are so urgently needed for merchant ships and destroyers that can be turned out quickly to meet the threat of Hitler's all-out attack at sea.

The plain facts are (1) that the St. Lawrence project cannot possibly be of the slightest use either to Canada or the United

States in any crisis this year or next year or the year after that or the year after that; (2) that if Canada and the United States need more power for defense work they can get it much more quickly either at Niagara Falls or by building steam-electric plants; (3) that instead of promoting defense, the St. Lawrence project promises to get squarely in the way of it by diverting an army of men, colossal amounts of material, and whole trains of railway cars to the St. Lawrence at a time when there is crying need for planes, tanks, guns, and ships.

The President has chosen an unfortunate method of reviving a favorite project. On grounds of defense efficiency his request for appropriations to support it ought to be rejected.

[From the Locomotive Engineers Journal of March 1941]

A MESSAGE

To the Membership:

Baited with glittering misconceptions, the farmers of the great agricultural areas of North America are being led to believe that the St. Lawrence waterway and power scheme will help them get more money for their products. They are told that such a project would make the area a mighty "gateway to world trade."

Skillful instigators of the scheme have neglected to mention that this so-called gate to world trade, which is so generously offered this great area—at the expense of the already overburdened taxpayers—is a swinging gate. One that will swing back and smack the face (and security) of the very same farmer and businessman, small and large, who would have to struggle to pay this enormous tax bill. The great farm areas should become alert to the fact that America's agricultural markets are jeopardized by this scheme which is being proven unsound economically and politically.

A quick survey of world trade conditions reveals the backswing that could be expected from the St. Lawrence scheme. Most of America's trade, except for war and defense transactions with Great Britain, is with South America and probably will remain so balanced for years to come. Our good-neighbor policy will see to that.

In return for our goods Latin America offers principally agricultural products, cattle and hides. Through lower living standards and peon labor their cost of production is much cheaper than in the United States and Canada. Thus the St. Lawrence scheme would enable them to dump these products into the very center of America's own agricultural area and would do much to demoralize the markets.

Not so long ago, you may recall, a number of small ocean-going boats from South America came through the circuitous St. Lawrence route and unloaded their cargoes of grain in the Midwest. This raised havoc with grain markets in the area.

With the good-neighbor policy enforced, politicians would find it most discomforting and embarrassing to endeavor to raise protective tariffs to guard our agricultural markets in the Midwest. Thus, through the St. Lawrence scheme, America's great army of farmers would toil in their fields to raise the taxes for a project that would severely cripple their own markets.

Increased opposition to the St. Lawrence project is becoming more evident throughout Canada and the United States, as people become more familiar with its economic and political effect. As a defense measure it cannot be completed in time to be of any use in the present conflict, and when completed it could be used only about 7 months of each year because it would be icebound and unnavigable 5 months of the year. As a power project steam plants have been conceded to be far more desirable because they can be erected where the power is needed, more quickly and at less cost.

A channel 27 feet deep is specified in the project, which eliminates the possibility of building warships of capital size—battleships or cruisers—in the Great Lakes shipyards as many of the project's proponents would have us believe. Lake shipbuilding facilities are already congested with their share of the construction of boats which can go through the existing water route.

As we consider the St. Lawrence scheme in the solid light of day we must not neglect the fact that it will do much to harm the farmers of Canada and the United States. Neither can we forget that the scheme will serve to drain millions of dollars from overburdened taxpayers in every part of the country now (and for many years to come) when every effort and dollar is urgently needed for advancement of a vital rearmament program.

Yours fraternally,

PAUL M. SMITH, *Editor.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jerome N. Frank to be Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ben Moore to be United States District Judge for the southern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be confirmed en bloc.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. E. L. Compere to be State director of selective service for the State of Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations will be confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the calendar.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, several nominations have been confirmed, of which the President has not been notified because of the fact that a regular executive session has not been held since the 6th day of March. I ask unanimous consent that, including today's nominations, all nominations heretofore confirmed may be immediately transmitted to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. GREEN. From the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report the nomination of Cecil M. P. Cross, of Rhode Island, to be a consul general of the United States of America, with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed; and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Cecil M. P. Cross, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign enrolled bills that are ready for his signature, notwithstanding the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20, 1941:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Claud N. Sapp, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 30, 1941.

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Investigation and Research for the period of the existence of the Board, as provided in title III, part I, of the Transportation Act of 1940, approved September 18, 1940:

Wayne Coy, of Indiana.

Charles West, of Ohio.
Nelson Lee Smith, of New Hampshire.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Ward L. Mould, April 1, 1941.
Terrence E. Billings, April 1, 1941.
James R. Shaw, April 7, 1941.
James Watt, May 17, 1941.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Edward Macauley, of California, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1938, vice Max O'Rell Truitt, resigned.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers in the Coast Guard of the United States to be chief gunners, to rank as such from April 1, 1941:

Gunner Wilfred Mitchell.
Gunner William O. Dwyer.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Norris E. Lineweaver, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of March 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Karah J. White to be postmaster at Ashland, Ala., in place of K. J. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

ARKANSAS

Fred H. Bond to be postmaster at Stephens, Ark., in place of Fred Smith, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

George S. Lawson to be postmaster at Boonville, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Thomas F. Gladwill to be postmaster at Harbor City, Calif., in place of L. M. Preston, resigned.

Elizabeth C. Bavier to be postmaster at Truckee, Calif., in place of E. C. Bavier. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1940.

COLORADO

Michael C. Huber to be postmaster at Palisade, Colo., in place of E. R. Mulvihill, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

James J. Slattery to be postmaster at Norwalk, Conn., in place of W. J. Devine, deceased.

FLORIDA

Louis Goldstein to be postmaster at Fernandina, Fla., in place of T. G. Ozmer, deceased.

Ethel L. Hadsock to be postmaster at Newberry, Fla., in place of E. L. Hadsock. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1940.

Thelma M. Houghton to be postmaster at Port Orange, Fla., in place of B. E. Jones, resigned.

GEORGIA

Nancy A. W. Griffis to be postmaster at Screven, Ga., in place of N. A. W. Griffis. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1940.

ILLINOIS

Julianna Crippin Uphoff to be postmaster at Cisne, Ill., in place of R. E. Kern, resigned.

Cecile S. Ballein to be postmaster at Hanover, Ill., in place of H. E. Ballein, deceased.

Richard Joseph Kreuser to be postmaster at Prairie View, Ill., in place of F. E. Stoerp, resigned.

Banks Lambdin to be postmaster at St. Joseph, Ill., in place of Pauline White, removed.

INDIANA

William Wert to be postmaster at Marion, Ind., in place of A. J. Green. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1938.

Udell Smith to be postmaster at New Palestine, Ind., in place of M. A. Schreiber, resigned.

Ivan Dale Watson to be postmaster at Russiaville, Ind., in place of I. D. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1940.

IOWA

Martin O'Connell to be postmaster at Vail, Iowa, in place of L. L. Powers, deceased.

Jeanette L. Lee to be postmaster at Ventura, Iowa, in place of J. L. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1941.

MAINE

James G. O'Connor to be postmaster at Bangor, Maine, in place of J. G. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1940.

MASSACHUSETTS

Gerald J. Casey to be postmaster at Charles River, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

MICHIGAN

Wayne C. Uckele to be postmaster at Erie, Mich., in place of B. J. La Pointe. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Earl Hudson to be postmaster at Gobles, Mich., in place of Earl Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

William Bonek to be postmaster at Suttons Bay, Mich., in place of W. A. Beuerle, transferred.

William H. Stickel to be postmaster at White Pigeon, Mich., in place of W. H. Stickel. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1940.

MINNESOTA

Leo L. Drey to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Minn., in place of D. J. McMahon, removed.

John S. Stensrud to be postmaster at Canby, Minn., in place of J. S. Stensrud. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1940.

Jarl I. Sundseth to be postmaster at Halstad, Minn., in place of C. A. Smaby, deceased.

LeRoy S. Burnett to be postmaster at Hewitt, Minn., in place of L. S. Burnett. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1940.

Arthur G. Johnson to be postmaster at Litchfield, Minn., in place of Roy Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Hjalmer H. Moe to be postmaster at Milan, Minn., in place of H. H. Moe. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1939.

Edward J. Mendick to be postmaster at Oslo, Minn., in place of J. A. Hilden. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1940.

Dolpha E. Johnson to be postmaster at Strandquist, Minn., in place of E. O. Stennes. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1939.

Roy H. Ireland to be postmaster at Wadena, Minn., in place of J. P. Mettel. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1939.

Jennie M. Wurst to be postmaster at Watkins, Minn., in place of J. M. Wurst. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1940.

Edwin H. Mielke to be postmaster at Wheaton, Minn., in place of R. L. Bard. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

MONTANA

Odin H. Blockhus to be postmaster at Big Sandy, Mont., in place of F. B. Lee, removed.

Edwin E. Sykes to be postmaster at Ekalaka, Mont., in place of P. M. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Ethel H. Burchak to be postmaster at Stanford, Mont., in place of E. H. Burchak. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1940.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Wallace D. Jones to be postmaster at Meriden, N. M. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

NEW JERSEY

Harry Marvin Riddle, Jr. to be postmaster at Asbury, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Kathleen M. McKenna to be postmaster at Fairview, N. J. in place of J. A. O'Connor, removed.

J. Philip Ryan to be postmaster at Warren Point, N. J. in place of J. P. Ryan, retired.

Edmund H. Carpenter to be postmaster at Woodbury, N. J., in place of E. H. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1940.

NEW MEXICO

Enid D. McCargish to be postmaster at Reserve, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Mary Y. Ray to be postmaster at Roy, N. Mex., in place of Canuto Gonzales, resigned.

NEW YORK

William O. Wiley to be postmaster at Cape Vincent, N. Y., in place of L. A. Wiley, deceased.

Edward L. Coon to be postmaster at Chittenango, N. Y., in place of P. J. Dwyer, removed.

Blanche C. Randall to be postmaster at Hilton, N. Y., in place of W. A. Downes, transferred.

William T. Storm to be postmaster at Hopewell Junction, N. Y., in place of H. R. Stevens, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary S. Tiedeman to be postmaster at Douglas, N. Dak., in place of M. M. Lystad, resigned.

Earl T. Atha to be postmaster at Linton, N. Dak., in place of J. M. Lipp, removed.

Pauline A. Wetzel to be postmaster at Saint Michael, N. Dak., in place of E. H. Berheide, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

W. Blanche Lucas to be postmaster at Ponca City, Okla., in place of Blanche Lucas. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1939.

Woodrow Rhoton to be postmaster at Shidler, Okla., in place of L. H. Tolbert, removed.

OREGON

Ruth I. Lyons to be postmaster at Lyons, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Raymond D. Hewitt to be postmaster at Troutdale, Oreg., in place of C. A. Purcell, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Peter L. Tressler to be postmaster at Dalmatia, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Joseph Pugh to be postmaster at Jerome, Pa., in place of R. P. Smith, resigned.

Eugene P. McCarthy to be postmaster at Johnsonburg, Pa., in place of Leo McAlee. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1939.

John H. Nix to be postmaster at Polk, Pa., in place of E. L. Ely. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1940.

Howard M. Reynolds to be postmaster at Sayre, Pa., in place of A. L. Laws, deceased.

J. Erooke Althouse to be postmaster at Temple, Pa., in place of W. S. Becker. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1940.

Edna S. Rankin to be postmaster at Vestaburg, Pa., in place of M. L. Carl. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

PUERTO RICO

Antonio Esteves to be postmaster at Aguadilla, P. R., in place of C. F. Torregrossa, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Henry E. Hudson to be postmaster at Whitwell, Tenn., in place of H. E. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

TEXAS

Albert L. Logan to be postmaster at Marfa, Tex., in place of E. I. Pruett, resigned.

David C. Harris to be postmaster at Mineral Wells, Tex., in place of D. C. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1940.

UTAH

David S. Betts to be postmaster at North Salt Lake, Utah, in place of H. C. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1936.

VERMONT

Roscoe E. Olmstead to be postmaster at Saxtons River, Vt., in place of H. L. Simonds, removed.

VIRGINIA

Rachel E. Dance to be postmaster at Ettrick, Va., in place of K. J. Brockwell, deceased.

WASHINGTON

John H. Thompson to be postmaster at Midway, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

WISCONSIN

Arthur J. Brill to be postmaster at Kiel, Wis., in place of R. H. Lauson, removed.

WYOMING

Ivan R. Daugherty to be postmaster at Baggs, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20, 1941:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Jerome N. Frank to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Ben Moore to be United States district judge for the southern district of West Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Albert Daniel Liedel, Maybee.

MISSOURI

Robley H. Hogue, Jr., Bragg City.

OKLAHOMA

Lola Knotts, Langley.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. E. L. Compere to be State director of Selective Service for the State of Arkansas.

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Cecil M. P. Cross to be a consul general of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Second Lt. Robert Royce Gideon, Jr., to the Air Corps.

NOTE.—For a list of the names of the remaining persons whose nominations for promotion, transfer, or appointment in the Army were confirmed today, see Senate proceedings of March 10, 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 2184.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou, O God, with eternal love in Thine heart, help us to seek that fountain of life out of which flow those enduring affections which inspire grace, charity, and vision in the midst of a world of doubt. Give us power to look backward to our limitations of yesterday and an outlook to discern the possibilities of tomorrow. Breathe upon us Thy spirit, revealing that human life is but in its morning, and finally the old and the new shall be joined in one everlasting fellowship. Enlighten the eyes of our hearts, Heavenly Father, reflecting that light which springs up in the depths of the soul, unveiling more fully a large measure of the spirit of our Master. We pray for those who are in sorrow and for those who are in joy, for those who are cast down, for those who are exalted, and for those who are in a barren land, weary and lonely. Grant that the divine presence may rest abundantly with those who are walking in darkness; may they see the light in the daytime and its gleam in the night season. Spread abroad Thy truth as it is in Christ Jesus, our Lord, and may the whole world learn to love and follow peace and understanding. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the Mediation Board and the work of the Dies committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short letter and telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GUYER of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Alfred E. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MINE INSPECTION

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining reported out the mine-inspection bill with one simple amendment, which, however, completely destroys the effectiveness of that bill as a safety measure. They have stricken out the qualification that the inspectors must be mining engineers or the equivalent, and make as the only qualification for an inspector the fact that a man has had 5 years' experience in mining. I believe that that change was brought about due to the pressure of the United Mine Workers of America, who are thereby proving that that organization is not interested in that bill as a safety measure, but rather as a regulatory measure to control and possibly hamstring the coal-mining industry.

Mr. Speaker, safety inspection is literally as well as figuratively deadly serious business, and it requires the highest possible type of individual as an inspector, thoroughly competent, completely efficient, and adequately trained. A capable mine inspector must be a technician and he should be a mining engineer by training either in an accredited college or through practical experience. In any event, to be thoroughly capable, he must have had years of practical experience in mining as well as in mine safety work. The simple qualification, now stated in the Senate version of the mine-inspection bill, "that he shall be a person with the basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal," is absolutely meaningless as far as the capabilities of the proposed inspector are concerned. I will grant you for the sake of argument, that a man with 5 years of practical experience might be a thoroughly capable inspector after he had received the exacting training required. I will grant further that this does not limit or prohibit the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, from employing thoroughly capable men, who must, however, have had this 5 years' practical experience. But it does permit him, Mr. Speaker, to employ men who are not trained engineers for this inspection service, and this was not the sense of the House of Representatives when it passed this bill, nor was it the sense of either the sponsor of the bill or the Mines and Mining Committee of the House, when it reported this bill to our body.

Competent mine inspection is very complicated and technical training is imperative. A competent mine inspector must have a knowledge of engineering and mathematics in order to figure stresses and strains required in properly supporting the roof of a mine against the hazard of falling, and this hazard has become increased greatly with the increased in mechanized mining. In the old hand-mining days, a face might move back 5 or 6 feet a day, with 1 or 2 men engaged at the face. A falling roof created a hazard to those two men only. With the advent of the mechanized mine, the operating force is more closely grouped and frequently 10 to 20 men are employed in one part of the mine on one working face; and this

working face may be pushed back 20 to 40 to 60 or 70 feet in a day, and where falling-roof conditions are encountered, the difficulty of shoring up these roofs is tremendously increased, not only in quantity of materials required, but must likewise be increased in strength in order to provide working room for the machinery. The danger from falls is increased and, of course, in a serious fall, the entire crew might be wiped out.

Likewise, in this rapid pushing back of the face, the danger from gas is tremendously increased. This means that competent inspectors must be able to do much more than judge the danger from gas explosion by the mere operation of the popular safety lamp. They must be technically trained to be able to go into the mine and analyze the gas and to analyze the air, both as to oxygen content and as to the presence of impurities, such as carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide. They must be able to measure the flow of air and all these various tests must be computed accurately. These inspectors must be able to analyze the coal-dust content of the air in the mine and be able to determine when a hazardous condition is prevalent. They must be blasting experts. They must be capable machinery—and especially electrical machinery—experts.

As I have previously pointed out to this House, the Bureau of Mines has done splendid work in the past, and they now are possessed of a splendid staff of fieldmen. All of these men, and all of these future inspectors, must be carefully trained in the Bureau of Mines' laboratory, and they are not competent to make these inspections, required under this bill, until they are so trained. And when they are so trained they are of inestimable value not only to the safety of the miners themselves but to the operators and the entire industry. There have been numerous occasions when on request of the operators these Bureau of Mine experts have gone into the mine, have spent the week or more required to adequately inspect these mines, and have come out with very definite recommendations, which when acted upon by the operators, oftentimes at the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars, have immeasurably increased the safety of the miners and increased the profits to the operators and increased the wages to the miners.

Mr. Speaker, these inspectors at present are experts in rescue work. They are especially trained for this work and are at all times capable of immediately diagnosing the post-explosion hazards in a mine and safely leading the rescue operations. Again this calls for the highest-type technical men and not simply those whose only qualification, under the Senate version, must be that "they have had 5 years practical experience in mining." After the rescue work has been completed these technicians must be able to diagnose the probable cause of the explosion and then be able to write a comprehensive and highly intelligent report, which under this bill can be made public.

Indeed, following all inspections, these men must be technically trained so that they can write a comprehensive and intelligent report on the inspection not with the idea of making an interesting report for the public, but one which is technically correct and hence of value to the Bureau of Mines itself and to every other inspector in the Bureau, and likewise of value to the operator and the miner. These men must be students because obviously by their required reading these hundreds of reports which come in from the field each year covering accidents which occurred and inspections which were made all over the country, they in turn may be fully informed on the science of mining and be on guard lest explosions occur in mines which they have inspected and where they may perhaps have overlooked a possible source of explosion.

Mr. Speaker, these inspectors must be technicians trained in mining conditions all over the United States and capable of analyzing hazards and the source of hazards in any mine in the country to which their duty may call them. Because obviously, if safety is the watchword in this legislation, these men must be constantly shifted from one part of the country to another. They must be continually rotated around the country because of the possibility that succeeding inspectors may find something a preceding inspector overlooked. This, I am sure, is desired and in fact insisted upon by the United Mine Workers themselves, because before our subcommittee last year, the charge was constantly made by representatives of the miners that the underlying fault with the State inspection service today is that many of the inspectors are appointed by political patronage; are employed only locally; are subject to undue pressure on occasion from the operators and, consequently, are not adequately trained and sometimes are not efficient because of the fact that they may be overlooking certain hazards, either wittingly or unwittingly. Obviously, therefore, if we are sincere in trying to eliminate any such possibly existing abuses, these inspectors must not be kept in any one district as a permanent thing, but must be rotated all over the country in order that through experience their knowledge and their technique may be broadened.

Surely because of these reasons, and many others which I might cite to you, Mr. Speaker, you must agree that mine-safety inspection does require technically trained men of the highest type; and this bill must properly specify, as it did, that these men under civil service must be capable mining engineers or the equivalent.

This Senate committee amendment, by which they have stricken out the House provision that these inspectors must be mining engineers or the equivalent, opens this bill up to the worst kind of abuse, and opens it up to the question of political appointment. You may say that these men are, and they will be, subject to civil service, but you do not say what civil-service rating they must have, and thereby you permit incompetency in the inspection force. That is not the sense of this Congress. This Congress seeks in this bill to promote safety in mining. This Congress is interested in saving human life, and is not interested in politcal appointment, nor is it interested, in this bill, in the regulation or supervision of the mining industry. Safety, not politics, must be the watchword of this bill. Let us not play politics with safety.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when this bill reaches the floor of the Senate the House provision will be restored; and if not, then I certainly hope that it will be when the bill is sent to conference.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a report from the North Dakota Mill and Elevator on the wheat situation in regard to Government contracts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON] at a St. Patrick's Society dinner in New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MEDIATION BOARD

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the President has appointed a Mediation Board to prevent stoppages in defense production. In my judgment, this is a very constructive move on the part of the President. I am glad it was taken, and I wish it had been taken earlier.

I have asked for this minute to say that under these circumstances it seems to me it is the duty of every person and every group in America to cooperate fully with this Board; that there should not be the imposition of conditions by employers upon workers which are likely to cause trouble, nor should there be strikes in defense industries until all of the good offices of the Mediation Board have been exhausted.

It appears to me that if that rule is followed carefully by all groups, you are going to be able to find a cure to the situation that many of us have been worrying about, including the constructive leaders of labor.

I believe and hope that is going to be the result of this constructive act. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXPLANATION

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent at the time of the roll call yesterday on the $7,000,000,000 bill. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the bill, and likewise I would

have voted in favor of the motion to recommit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Times-Herald of this date.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Baton Rouge State Times of March 14, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by Mr. Theodore S. Watson, of New York, dealing with the role of the stock exchange in our national economy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRY

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as the President put it last Saturday night, our defense program should not be impeded by unnecessary strikes. The question naturally arises whether Congress should act in this respect. Whenever a difficult situation presents itself, many people seem to think it can be solved by legislation, saying, "There ought to be a law."

Experience in other countries gives us overwhelming evidence that if we want to speed up the defense program, the passage of a bill to outlaw strikes is a good way not to do it. In Australia, with compulsory arbitration, there have been many more strikes than here. In England in the last war they outlawed strikes. When three men were convicted of illegally striking, 97,000 shipyard workers promptly went out on strike. In France, as Ambassador Bullitt told the Judiciary Committee, strikes were outlawed, but production was not thereby increased, for dissatisfied workers simply did not produce.

A strike is a social calamity; in a major defense industry it can be a national calamity. But we must not make the mistake of thinking that every strike is an unwarranted attempt by labor to force the acceptance of exorbitant demands. After all, the people making the immediate sacrifice are the strikers and their families. They lose their regular pay, and they risk their jobs—and wage earners with an income of, say, $1,500 a year seldom have savings to fall back on. Often strikes seem to workingmen to be their only resort against unbearable oppression—their only chance to win a decent and healthy life..

There are other strikes which, in a national emergency, anger the American people. Those are jurisdictional disputes, between two craft unions within the A. F. of L. or between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. Such stoppages never enlist public sympathy. But the solution does not lie in legislation doomed to be ineffective. It lies in more expeditious action by the National Labor Relations Board, where an election can settle the issue, and in other cases it lies in the voluntary self-discipline of the organizations concerned, aided by the good offices of Government officials who are experienced in mediation and have the public interest at heart.

The President yesterday created a new representative mediation board to deal with labor disputes of major difficulty and importance. Simply as a practical matter, we cannot achieve results by passing a law here, no matter how much that might relieve the feelings of some of the Members. We can help by giving every support, and calling upon our constituents to give every support, to the efforts of the new Board to promote a just and voluntary industrial peace. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

HOUSE HEARINGS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back House Concurrent Resolution 21 (Rept. No. 288) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from a constituent in my district in connection with the fact that her name appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, 1940, and was placed there by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], together with a list of other people who were supposed to be affiliated with anti-Semitic groups.

This particular lady has lived in my district all her life, is a very active worker in the Democratic Party—as a matter of fact she is a captain; and this is the first time her name has appeared in the RECORD. She never appeared before any committee of the Congress nor had an opportunity to be heard. In this letter she sets forth her position. I believe in view of this unfair appearance of her name it would be proper to permit her letter to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on this coming Saturday, March 22, Grand Coulee Dam will produce its first power. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a release by the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTER-AMERICAN COOPERATION WEEK

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Inter-American Cooperation of New York City, of which I am a member, is sponsoring an inter-American cooperation week to be held between March 23 and March 29. The week will be featured by a number of meetings, forums, and radio programs on the theme of closer hemisphere solidarity; a "Buy South American" campaign; the exhibition of travelogues and shorts on Latin America; literature displays dealing with Latin America; and art exhibits on Central and South American subjects.

On the issue of defending the Western Hemisphere against any and all aggressors we are a united people. To organize and foster a closer bond of friendship with all our southern sister republics is both wise and necessary to our mutual defense. The policy of a really good-neighbor attitude which recognizes not only our common interests but also our status of equality as states in the Western Hemisphere will be of inestimable value in the coming post-war days when the solution of our economic problems will still demand our attention. By an intensive and extensive friendly policy on the part of our Government and our people we can build up an economic barrier which no Hitler can penetrate or destroy.

May I urge all my colleagues to listen in on these programs and realize the importance of this angle of our defense program. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a release by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, following up what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] just said, I hope you will read that record he offered, and, if it is complete, you will find the name of Harold Christoffel, the man who is responsible for the strike at the Allis-Chalmers Co., which is holding up the machinery necessary for the operation of the Radford Powder Plant down here in Virginia. Yet yesterday when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] offered an amendment which would break the Allis-Chalmers strike in 24 hours the House voted it down. We could have broken that strike by giving to every American citizen the right to work for his Government on national defense. Knowing that strike, which is now in its fifty-seventh day, is holding up the Navy and the production of powder, the House refused to end it by providing that men may work when they have jobs.

What is the use of talking about strikes—condemning them—if you will not enact legislation which will break strikes of this kind when you have the opportunity? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

AGREEMENT BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we all welcome every effort on the part of government, on the part of management, and on the part of labor to settle disputes between and among themselves. I think I should call to the attention of the House the fact that, on yesterday, in the city of Washington, there was executed between a national organization of employers, the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, and a similar national organization of employees, the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, in a vital defense industry, a voluntary agreement whereby all disputes with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions, are to be submitted to a national joint board for arbitration and to the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor for mediation, and in connection with any defense projects in which this particular industry may be engaged, all strikes and lock-outs are prohibited and banned.

In my opinion that is the American way to settle this very momentous problem with neither side seeking to take any advantage of the other, but rather the two of them working hand in hand for the good of the Government, for national defense, and for security. [Applause.]

The agreement which they executed follows:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT ON NATIONAL DEFENSE WORK

Realizing the need of ccoperation with the Federal Government on national-defense projects, the following memorandum of agreement has been adopted between the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, Inc., with headquarters in the Brown Building, Philadelphia, Pa., on behalf of the members employing union labor, hereinafter referred to as the association, and the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Inc., with headquarters at Lafayette, Ind., herein referred to as the brotherhood:

Whereas the people and Government of the United States are now engaged in a tremendous program of preparedness in order that war and its sufferings may not come to the people of the United States, and under this program a huge schedule of construction work of all kinds is now under way or contemplated, of which painting and decorating is a necessary part; and

Whereas the association and brotherhood, representing as they do thousands of experienced painting and decorating contractors and hundreds of thousands of skilled journeymen painters in all sections of the country who are anxious to cooperate with the Government to the fullest extent, now, therefore, it is mutually agreed and covenanted by the parties hereto as follows:

1. That the association and the brotherhood, on behalf of their respective members, place their services at the disposal of the Government to the end that they will cooperate in executing all painting and decorating work in connection with the defense program in a speedy, efficient, and economic manner, as requested by the President of the United States and the National Defense Council.

2. That the association and the brotherhood jointly agree that there shall not be any strikes or lock-outs on defense work until after a full investigation and effort has been made toward an amicable adjustment by the joint national trade board.

3. That all disputes, controversies, or differences that may arise on any defense job that cannot be settled locally or by the joint national trade board shall be referred to the United States Conciliation Division of the Labor Department.

4. That where a predetermination of wages has been established at the time of the awarding of any particular painting and decorating job, such wages shall be continued until completion of said project, except as provided for in the Davis-Bacon Act.

5. That on any jobs in any section of the country where a shortage of skilled mechanics exist the brotherhood agrees to man the jobs and furnish the men from other sections or localities.

In witness whereof the respective parties have hereto set their hands and seal this 19th day of March 1941.

Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, Inc.: Michael W. McCarthy, president; George S. Stuart, secretary; George T. Brown; Philip H. Gladstone; C Albert Kuehnle; Charles B. Hart. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Inc.: L. P. Lindelof, president; George F. Tuckbreiter; James J. Knoud; Edward Ackerley; Wm. J. Gallagher.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short lecture by Dr. John Barr, of Urbana, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on Why Continually Cater to Cotton? together with tables from various Government agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GEN. NEAL DOW

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this 20th day of March marks the one hundred and thirty-seventh anniversary of the birthday of a distinguished American, Gen. Neal Dow, founder of the Neal Dow Association for World Peace and Prohibition. General Dow was born in Maine, March 20, 1804.

I believe that it is timely, in view of world conditions, and in view of the situation within our own country, that we pause for a moment and pay tribute to this distinguished American.

General Dow gave his energies, his talents, and his very life in an effort to make this country a cleaner and a better place in which to live. It was General Dow who insisted that the liquor traffic is the greatest "abominations of desolation," and that if not destroyed will destroy mankind.

General Dow has left an imprint of influence upon this Nation that will live after other generations have long since been forgotten.

I am glad to have this opportunity of paying tribute to his memory.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to the gentleman from New York who just spoke about industry and labor getting together and arranging for time to settle their differences before a strike is called. The gentleman failed to mention the name of the parties to the agreement which he described. It seems to me that in these days when we so vitally need the production of every man and every woman in America to aid in our national defense, every industry and every labor group, regardless of who they are or where they come from, who make agreements to allow 30 to 40 days' time in which to settle their disputes before calling a strike, ought to be given publicity, because making such an agreement is one of the finest things capital and labor can do at a time like this, when the world is aflame with war. I think the gentleman ought to give them credit openly here so that the country may know of it and others may follow their example.

Mr. KEOGH. I am going to take the liberty of including in my remarks the short agreement to which I referred. The agreement is between the Master Painting Contractors and the American Federation of Labor Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers. Both of these are national organizations.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate those organizations on their action to arbitrate their disputes, and I hope that more labor organizations will follow their example. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope the Members of the House will join with me in asking the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of all our national defense and who has the power and the money that no other President in all history has ever had, to call in the heads of labor and industry and talk over the situation and then act in all fairness in order to secure immediate national-defense production. Yesterday we appropriated the enormous sum of $7,000,000,000. Of what avail will that money be if production does not progress immediately? Boards are all right, but they take time and they have no authority, but I believe action should be immediate, and the President can act at once. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made earlier today may appear in the Appendix rather than in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Connecticut River development.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 30]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Healey	Rankin, Mont.
Arends	Heidinger	Reed, Ill.
Bland	Hess	Rivers
Bloom	Hope	Robinson, Utah
Bolles	Howell	Sacks
Bradley, Pa.	Jacobsen	Schaefer, Ill.
Buck	Jenks, N. H.	Scott
Burch	Jensen	Scrugham
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Calif.	Secrest
Case, S. Dak.	Keefe	Shanley
Casey, Mass.	Kelly, Ill.	Shannon
Celler	McArdle	Sheridan
Chapman	McGranery	Smith, Wash.
Clason	McLaughlin	Stearns, N. H.
Collins	McLean	Stevenson
Curtis	Maciejewski	Stratton
Delaney	Mills, La.	Taylor
Englebright	Norton	Thill
Gale	O'Day	Thomason
Gavagan	Osmers	Traynor
Geyer, Calif.	Pfeifer,	Wadsworth
Gifford	Joseph L.	White
Green	Plauché	Wigglesworth
Hart	Ramsay	Woodruff, Mich.

The SPEAKER. On this roll 358 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

COTTON WAREHOUSING BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 149 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 149

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of S. 262, an act regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as its name indicates, makes in order Senate 262, which is a bill dealing with the storage of cotton and other commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate, after which the bill would be up for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], a member of the Rules Committee in charge of the pending rule, this resolution makes in order the consideration of Senate bill 262, which deals with the warehousing and storage of cotton. This Senate bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate and passed the Senate unanimously. The bill has been favorably reported by the committee having jurisdiction of it, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. Certainly, in all fairness, there could not be any doubt that this rule should be adopted and the House given the opportunity to consider the pending legislation. As also indicated by the gentleman from North Carolina, it is an open rule. It affords ample opportunity for general debate of 3 hours.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to preserve the present status that has been in existence for a long time for the warehousing of cotton in the sections of the country where the cotton was produced. This program has worked very successfully under the administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation and under the negotiated contracts that have been entered into for the storage and warehousing of cotton, the rates have gradually and steadily declined until today the farmers of the country and the Government enjoy the lowest rates for this service in all the history of the Nation. As one who was born and reared and has lived a lifetime in a cotton-producing county in this country, I want to give it to you as my assurance that the main purpose of this bill is to protect the interests of the cotton farmer.

The situation is this: The local warehouse affords the local market for cotton. A local market is not generally provided unless there are local warehouses to provide the necessary facilities for the storage and handling of the cotton.

Today, the Government enjoys a rate of 12½ cents per bale per month for Government-owned cotton and the farmers receive the benefit of a rate of 15 cents per month for the storage of their cotton, including insurance.

The only excuse given for not passing this bill is that the Commodity Credit Corporation, by taking competitive bids, might save something like $1,800,000 in storage of Government-owned cotton, but at the same time it will cost the Government about $5,000,000 in transportation charges and will mean that the cotton farmer will sustain a loss of about $6,000,000 a year. In all common sense

what kind of economy, what kind of business judgment, is any such arrangement as that?

The situation is that a local warehouse is necessary for the cotton producer to have a place to store his cotton and especially since the adoption of the present agricultural program, with loans on cotton, which is the very foundation upon which the cotton industry rests. Therefore I appeal to you to adopt this rule and make the consideration of this bill in order and to pass the bill in the interest of the cotton farmers of the country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell:]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is an extremely important measure, and I hope it may have the consideration which I think it deserves. First of all, I would like to say that I dislike very much finding myself in disagreement with some of my very good friends, who are sincerely and honestly for this bill, but I am likewise in sincere and honest disagreement with them. I do not think this rule should be adopted by the House, and I do not think the bill should be passed.

In the first place, it came from the legislative committee with a very close vote that cut across party lines. When the matter was presented to the Rules Committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] made what I thought was a most devastating attack on the bill. Likewise was such an attack made on the bill by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

I do know there are many, many Members on both sides of the aisle who are against this bill. Beyond that, this bill is vigorously opposed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and by the Department of Agriculture—not that that should absolutely or necessarily control our judgment, but it certainly is indicative of the position of the people who are charged with administering the law and should be fairly considered.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] said that this bill will effect a saving of something upward of $1,000,000. To be exact, it will effect a saving to the Government, as stated in the hearings, of $1,800,000 per year. Perhaps, in contemplation of the appropriation which was made yesterday, that is not a lot of money, but there are broad fundamental principles involved in this legislation to which we should pay attention.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not yield. I want to continue with my statement. One of those principles is this: We set up an administrative agency to administer a law which we pass. In a measure, as far as this situation is concerned, it involves the Government going into business. We say to that agency, "You conduct that business on a fair, square, economical, businesslike basis. If you do not do that, we call you up here and put you on the pan because you do not so conduct it." Here is a case where an agency of the Government is apparently being accused of doing too good a job and effecting too great a saving.

Another fundamental issue is this: Are we going to take out of the operations of our Government that fundamental proposition that competition should control prices for services to be bought? Are savings to be sacrificed and monopolistic tendencies to be encouraged?

What about this bill? The Commodity Credit Corporation was set up in 1933. The stock is owned by the Government. Its fundamental purpose is to lend money on agriculture products. It has functioned on that basis as an independent agency and did so until July 1, 1939, when under the Reorganization Act it became a part of the Department of Agriculture.

The Corporation has loaned money on cotton. When the reconcentration in warehouses was threatening cotton that still belonged to the farmers, or in which they had an equity, Congress prohibited the moving of certain of that cotton from areas where it was produced to other areas where it might be stored. That applied only to cotton not owned by the Government. Then in August 1939, the Government having prior to that time effected a barter with England for some rubber—trading cotton for rubber—the Department of Agriculture announced that it would take title to approximately 7,000,000 bales of cotton of the 1934 and the 1937 crops. Loans were past due and charges against the cotton were more than the market price, and it never would be redeemed. The Government, therefore, in effect owned it, and therefore took title to it. That removed the restriction about storing this cotton wherever the Corporation could find an economical storage place. Thereupon the Commodity Credit Corporation, using the bargaining power which that gave it, undertook to bring about a reduction in the storage rates. The thing to bear in mind in connection with this legislation is that this cotton is Government cotton; it belongs to the Government. The equities of the producers have been taken away.

What happened? When the Government came into possession of this cotton it was relieved of the restriction that has been applied on producer-owned cotton. The rates had been from 25 to 40 cents per bale per month. In 1939 the rates were 25 to 18 cents per bale per month. Remember, those rates were paid by the Government or by the farmer—the farmer if he redeemed the cotton, the Government if the cotton is not redeemed. In 1939 the Commodity Credit Corporation, having this bargaining power, undertook to bring the rates down, and did bring them down to 12½ cents per bale per month, and in connection with that I read the statement of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, found on page 327 of the hearings:

> A study of these storage rates indicated that they were somewhat excessive against farmers and the Government. In addition, the fact that the Government had acquired title to nearly 7,000,000 bales of cotton, which could be moved among warehouses without legal restriction, meant that the Government had become in a position to utilize competitive forces and bring about a reduction of storage rates to a more nearly reasonable level.

A Member of the other body who appeared in support of this legislation, a champion of the legislation, stated to the committee, as set out on page 6 of the hearings:

> Now, as I stated before, the old rates, from 25 to 40 cents a bale per month, that was the private rate, and then it was brought down under the Commodity Credit Corporation to 25 cents for the first year and 18 cents thereafter, and that existed for awhile and now it was brought down a couple of years ago to 15 cents for the first year and 12½ cents thereafter. So there has been a steady reduction in the rates.

Now, how were those rates brought down for the benefit of the Government and the farmer? They were brought down because the restrictions imposed in respect to storing the cotton were removed when this cotton came into the possession of the Government. They followed that 12½-cent rate through 1939.

Then, further in extension of good business principles, for a time subsequent to that they advertised for bids for the storage of Government cotton. Those bids, as I remember it, ran from 7 to 10 cents per bale per month, and I think it is important to recognize that out of 1,700 warehousemen in this country, 237 in the interior bid less than 12½ cents; 37 port warehousemen bid less than 12½ cents, and over 1,000 warehousemen generally submitted bids.

You may say, "If the Government can save this money and if these rates can be brought down, what is the matter? What is this all about?"

Well, here is what it is all about. I referred to a member of another body who came before the committee and testified. You will find it on page 3 of the hearings. He made this statement:

> Well, now, this movement was started again, and I will say now that it is generally known to everybody familiar with it that fundamentally it has been a fight between the port warehouses and the interior warehouses, generally speaking, with the Commodity Credit Corporation apparently on the side, and I do not think—I think they are actuated by motives purely of saving money; but on the side by their actions with the port warehouses.

Now, that is not my statement as to the issue that is involved here. That is the statement of one of the champions of the legislation.

I have heard only two arguments for this bill that I think are at all worthy of consideration. One is that you should keep this cotton in the producing areas to the end that the producers will see the big stock piled up and will tend to cut down their production. I can see some sense in that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The only other argument that I think is worthy of any consideration in favor of this bill is whether or not the Government wants to establish precedents herein contained and wants unnecessarily to spend $1,800,000 a year for the sole and only purpose of continuing at possibly maximum operation certain of the interior warehouses of the country.

There are other arguments that are absolutely untenable. This bill would permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to advertise for bids to store cotton.

If the port warehouses submitted a lower bid, if the cotton can be moved to that port warehouse, following the channel of ordinary marketing arrangements, then the Commodity Credit Corporation is free to send it there. Under this bill the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be free to do so.

Now, it is contended that you have to keep all cotton in the interior warehouses to keep them operating at this price. Let us see about that. We have piled up fourteen and one-half million bales of surplus cotton. So there is that tremendous amount to be taken care of somewhere. During the time this operation has been carried on these rates have come down to 12½ cents presently and, under the bids, down to 7 and 10 cents. Is it not fair to assume that if this condition which has brought that about is permitted to continue those rates will continue to stay down? But if you write into this bill restrictions on Government cotton that this bill would put in there and take the Government out of competitive bargaining, the situation that it now occupies, is it not fair to say that the rates will start back up?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot yield now. I do not have time.

It is said in the report that this legislation will maintain the situation as it has existed and compliments the Commodity Credit Corporation for the job it has done. The exact opposite of that is true as to the effect of this bill. If the bill is adopted, the competitive principle that has heretofore existed will be taken away. They say, "If you have more space in the interior the prices will go up, but if you have more space in the ports, the prices will go down." You cannot blow hot and cold on that. The law of supply and demand would hold, that if there is more space in the interior warehouses the price of the storage would tend to remain at a reasonable level.

They say that you have to pay the freight rate if you move it to the port warehouses. The freight rate is recoverable. It is not an expenditure that you are not going to get back. It is recoverable, because cotton at the port is worth more than cotton at the interior.

Someone says that that cotton after you move it to the port and put that expense on it will have to be moved back to the interior to be manufactured. I am not willing to concede that the export market for cotton is forever gone. We heard a suggestion just the other day on this last appropriation bill that part of that money would be used to bring about export of cotton, and I say cotton will again move into export, and it will move from these ports, and will not have to move back to the interior.

Beyond that, you would not move it back into the interior except you are ready to admit that the domestic production of cotton will be cut down below domestic consumption, and that is not going to happen

There are other things that were suggested; that the cotton would lose weight in shipment; that its identity would be lost. Those things are set forth in the report. The hearings absolutely disclose that loss of weight by transportation is inconsequential; that the identity of the cotton is not lost. If it is from a good area, it is still known as being from a good area. It loses none of its value.

Finally, I say again we set up an administration and charge it with doing an efficient job for us. We should not overrule its efforts for efficient and economical management.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

If my position about this is correct—and it is borne out by any number of people who have testified—this bill will bring an additional expense. The best way to provide storage for Government cotton is the way the Corporation wants to do it. If this be so, why should we be setting our judgment up against theirs? The Secretary of Agriculture made a report on this bill in which he said that whereas competition had been brought into the storage of cotton, the passage of this bill would result in the restoration of monopolistic practices, would eliminate competition, and would result in the raising of rates of storage. The Secretary's letter appears in the hearings at pages 333 and 334. I quote a paragraph thereof:

> The excess profits that many warehousemen made at the expense of farmers and the Government when restrictions were effective on the movement of cotton now owned by the Government have demonstrated the conditions that could be expected under the restrictive provisions of S. 262. Competition in the storage of cotton is destroyed and monopolistic conditions substituted whenever the possible movement of cotton is legally prohibited. There seems to be no reason to doubt that increased and excessive charges to farmers and the Government would result unavoidably under the provisions of this bill, because it would deny those localities which normally store more cotton than they produce the right to enter into competition and to utilize their established facilities. For instance, one of the first effects of the bill would be to prohibit the acceptance of the bids now in hand for the storage of some old-crop cotton at rates that would reduce the carrying charges to the Government and farmers by approximately 15 percent, or $5,000 per day.
>
> In view of the fact that the apparent effects of S. 262 would unfortunately be to create special monopolistic conditions in the storage of cotton and to burden farmers and the Government with increased and excessive storage costs, it is the opinion of the Department that this bill should not be enacted.
>
> As required by Budget Bureau Circular No. 344, a copy of our proposed report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance, and on January 22 the Assistant Director thereof advised that the enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

I do not owe anybody anything on one side or the other of this controversy. I do not know any owners of port warehouses or interior warehouses. This matter came to me new. I have tried to listen to the arguments and to form a fair opinion about it.

In final analysis the Government owns this cotton. We charged the Commodity Credit Corporation as our agents with seeing to it that this cotton was handled economically and in the interests of the country. I think they have done that. I appreciate the interests of those in local warehouses, but I should like to say that if we did not have a Commodity Credit Corporation, if we did not have any cotton program, this issue would not be here. All of these warehouses are going to have some of this cotton. There is not any question in my mind but what the Commodity Credit Corporation should be permitted to handle the storage in the businesslike way they have adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FARMERS TO LOSE $17,500 A DAY ON PRETENDED CLAIMS THAT GOVERNMENT WILL SAVE $5,000 A DAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana stated that the passage of this bill would cause the Government to lose $5,000 a day in storage charges. I will state in reply to him that failure to pass this bill will cost the farmers of this country $17,500 a day. The farm program was intended to help the cotton farmer as well as the others, and I hope the gentleman remembers that when it comes to competitive bidding it can be made to apply to wheat and corn the same as to cotton. I wonder if the gentleman would be up here advocating a bill to make competitive bidding apply to wheat and corn. I doubt if he would sing exactly the same song.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The gentleman did not have time to yield to me, and I really do not have time to yield to him.

Mr. HALLECK. But the gentleman asked me a question.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not ask the gentleman a question, I am just wondering in my own mind in regard to this business of competitive bidding; and I ask this question of the membership, not to be replied to in my own time but in the time of any Member who wants to reply to it: If you owned 1,000 bales of cotton in the interior and some port man came to you and said, "Ship it to the port and I will save you 4 cents per bale per month on storage"; and the average cost of shipping from the interior is $2.18 per bale; in other words, you would put out $2,180 to send that 1,000 bales to the port, and when you got it there you would save 48 cents a bale for the first year only. These contracts are for 1 year, Mr. Speaker, only 1 year. At the end of that time the warehouse people can say, "Put up 50 cents a month, or $1 a month, or $2 a month; and if you do not want to pay it they will tell you to ship your old cotton back and you will pay $2.18 a bale to send it back from whence it came if you are fortunate in getting a rate of $2.18 on the return shipment. Would you as an individual do that? Of course, you would not. If you as an individual would not do it, why force the Government to do it?

Suppose competitive bids were made on cement; that the Commodity Credit Corporation wanted 1,000 tons of cement

and a local concern here in Washington bid $20 a ton, $20,000; and a San Francisco concern bid $10 a ton, $10,000. Under this reasoning you would get the cement in San Francisco. The Commodity Credit Corporation would claim a saving of $10,000; but when you point out that it costs $20,000 freight rates to get it here, they would say, "No; do not count that; do not count the freight."

How are you going to have competitive bidding unless you have comparable situations and delivery at a certain point?

Do you think the railroad companies and the port facilities would dare pay this freight and expect to get it out of savings? Of course, they would not.

We have an example of what this will do in one shipment of 300,000 bales in order to save 4 cents a bale per month. That cotton was shipped. Do you know how long it will take to get that saving back? It will take 9 long years, and then if they have to ship it back to the interior they will lose $3.50 a bale. I ask you if this makes common sense? In my own district cotton has been shipped from Marshall, Tex., to the port, 400 miles away; and freight was paid on it amounting to $2.50 or $3 per bale. As soon as that cotton got there, they needed some of the same kind of cotton to make mattresses up there in the same county, and they shipped some from Louisiana to Marshall and paid $2.50 a bale. Does that makes sense? Of course it does not make sense.

We are trying to enlarge our market for cotton. We have a mattress-making program, we have a comfort-making program, we have a proposal to make bomb-proof shelters out of cotton, and, in addition to that, there is a proposal to use several million bales of this cotton in the making of paper. There is the further fact that the bill passed yesterday carries approximately $100,000,000, although it is not specifically written in there, for finished cotton. So this cotton, wherever it is, will have to go to the mills and be finished. Certainly it is not good sense to pay $2 or $3 a bale to send that cotton to the port, then when you get it there it is only good for 1 year. That is all the contract is good for. Then bring it back for any reason. You do not know what the rate will be, and I challenge any Member who speaks on this bill in reply to me to state whether or not there is a freight rate that has been fixed to bring this cotton back. The answer is, there is none.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, no rate has been fixed. So I ask, in all seriousness, would you as an individual ship this cotton to the port if when you get it there you have no assurance of any saving except for 12 months? That is all. Only 4 cents a month. And then if they want to increase the rate you will have to pay it or bring it back. The cost of shipping in steamships increased from 85 cents to $9 a ton just recently. If storage space increased that way it will compare with 21 cents per bale on cotton now up to an increase to $2.25, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this rule should be adopted and this bill passed in the interest of the cotton farmer. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WOLCOTT.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it might seem unusual for me to be going along with the President and the Department of Agriculture on this bill, but there have been rare occasions, and this is one, when I find myself completely in accord with the President of the United States and the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture is very strongly opposing this bill for the reason that it is about to undertake a program, if this bill is not passed, that will save the taxpayers of this Nation a good many millions of dollars.

You have heard some figures here with reference to the number of bales which are in storage at the expense of the Government. Altogether there are in the warehouses about 14,636,000 bales of cotton. The Government owns or controls 11,169,000 of those bales. In other words, there is Government-owned, and what we call Government-loan cotton in these warehouses, over which the Government has control, to the extent of 11,169,000 bales. There are about 7,000,000 bales of this that the farmer has absolutely no interest in whatsoever. When the farmer gets his loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation, it being a loan without recourse, without any possibility of the Government getting a deficiency judgment against that farmer, he, for all practical purposes, sells the cotton to the Government.

There are two or three beautiful stump speeches in this bill, stating that it is for the benefit of the farmer. The farmer has no interest whatsoever in the 7,000,000 bales of Government-owned cotton and has a doubtful interest in the 4,000,000 bales of Government-loan cotton, because there is more loaned and charges against the cotton than it could ever sell for in the open market.

At the present time the cotton which the farmer has an equity in cannot be transferred, reconcentrated they call it, from the interior to the ports, or from one interior warehouse to another interior warehouse without getting the consent of the farmer. You attempt in this bill to tie the hands of the Department of Agriculture by stating that the farmer who has lost all interest in this cotton must from now on tell the Department of Agriculture whether it can or cannot concentrate this cotton. That to me is perfectly silly. The farmer has sold this cotton to the Government. The Government has acquired the fee in it and owns it outright. You, I, and all the other taxpayers own it.

So this bill resolves itself into just this situation: We subsidize the interior warehouses to the possible amount of $5,230,000 a year. The very minimum saving to the Government, as expressed in the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Vice President, and you will find it in the hearings on page 333, is $5,000 a day, or $1,825,000 a year.

The Department of Agriculture is against this bill because the Department, the Executive branch of this Government, wants to save the taxpayers of this Nation $5,000 a day. Who is there in this House who is so foolish, so uneconomical, as to say that if the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, Mr. Robbins, and his board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, want to save the taxpayers of this Nation $5,000,000 a year they should not be allowed to do it? That is the reason the majority of the Republicans are going along with the President and the Secretary of Agriculture on this bill, and we hope to get a sizable support from the Democratic side.

What is there wrong in competition? The only thing wrong about it is that it saves the Government some money. Does the farmer benefit by this bill? I was astounded at the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that it was going to cost the farmer $17,500 a day. Every time we decrease the storage charges for this cotton we save the farmer that much money, because we establish a new yardstick, a new standard; so when the Commodity Credit Corporation reduced the warehousing charges from 25 cents per month per bale to 12½ cents per month per bale, that 12½ cents per month per bale was not charged against the farmer's equity. When the Commodity Credit Corporation, in opposing this bill, seeks further to reduce the warehousing charges, it establishes this new standard, this new yardstick, whereby, if they are successful, and they hope to be, they can beat down these charges to 8½ cents per bale per month. There is a 4-cents-per-bale-per-month saving to the farmer, if he has any interest in the cotton. It is 4 cents per month less per bale that he has to pay for the storage of his cotton. If the reduction is credited to Government-owned cotton, then the taxpayer saves it.

I believe the statement made by the gentleman from Texas that the cost to the farmer is $17,500 is not borne out by the facts, by the testimony, or by any statement that was ever made before the Senate or the House legislative committees.

The Bureau of the Budget says that this bill would not be in accord with the program of the President.

One of the most significant statements made in behalf of the farmer was made by a farmer himself, Mr. Williamson, head of the American Cotton Cooperative Association. He says he is a cotton farmer, and he is the head of this farm cooperative. He has this to say about this bill, and let this settle the attitude of the cotton farmer in respect to this bill:

> The next observation I shall make is that there is a conflict of financial interests between farmers and warehousemen. Why is the warehousemen in business? To make money handling the farmers' product. How can he make money? By charging for his services a rate sufficient for cost of operations and a profit. How can he make more profit? By raising his rates to the farmer for storing his cotton.

That is just what the Commodity Credit Corporation does not want him to do. They want the opposite of that. They want to decrease these charges against the farmer so that the farmer's equity in this cotton shall be maintained and not dissipated by warehouse charges.

He says again:

I have sat here in this room and heard these warehousemen present their demands through learned counsel and in the farmers' interest. I would like to say a few words about this kind of interest and friendship. First, I would like to point out to you that it has been these very warehousemen, whose Washington hearts bleed so profusely for the farmer, that have used the law passed by the Congress to charge farmers excessive rates for storing their cotton. You know how great that excess must have been when the Government could reduce the rates to farmers 40 percent; and I happen to know that some warehouses have made handsome profits and paid liberal dividends to stockholders on last year's operations at the reduced rate.

Again, this cotton farmer, the head of this cooperative, has this to say:

I am telling you, gentlemen, that this appears to be a warehouseman's law and not a farmer's law, and that in our humble opinion it is not necessary for Congress to pass laws to protect farmers against the Department of Agriculture.

That goes to the meat of this situation. The Department of Agriculture, we all know, is doing everything it possibly can for the farmer, and in this bill we are telling the Department of Agriculture that it cannot help the farmer by reducing his warehousing charges. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard the eloquent plea of the gentleman from Michigan in behalf of the cotton farmer. Could it be that perhaps the most eloquent speeches that are made in behalf of the cotton farmer are made by those who probably would not know a cotton boll from a pepper pod?

Representing a cotton district in Texas which produces more cotton than almost any congressional district in America, I believe I am prepared to say that this bill is in the public interest. To be sure, it is in favor of the interior warehouseman, where the cotton is produced. In the larger sense, it is also in the interest of the interior communities including the farmers and business people.

If you go into a little town and deplete the warehouse of its cotton and send it down to the port, of course, this hurts the warehouseman. The small amount of cotton he has left has to pay a higher rate, and when the new cotton comes on, there will have to be a higher rate charged if the warehouseman is to survive. That is common sense.

I would be the last man to advocate excessive storage rates. Rates ought to be fair both to the Government and to the farmer, and I am much pleased that warehouse rates have been greatly reduced during the last few years. For this reduction much credit must be given to the interior warehouses.

Now, both the warehouseman and the farmer are entitled to consideration, but I make my plea in behalf of the public interest. I believe there are implications in this bill that are superior even to the interests of the farmer and the warehouseman. If you could export this cotton, I would say send it to the port and export it. But there is no export market and the port has no claim on this cotton. It was produced in the interior by the sweat of the people in the interior, and if any money is to be made on it, it ought to be made by the people in the interior who produced it, or who are associated with those who produced it. Unfortunately, the farmer made all too little. Let us not deprive both him and his community of the benefits, if any, from the cotton. After all, the ports do not grow cotton.

The ports in this country are now greatly congested. Money, wealth, industry, and population are being concentrated in the port cities. The interior is sharing in but a meager way. On the Gulf coast of Texas alone more than $100,000,000 is being spent in national-defense projects. The ports are growing and expanding. At the ports prosperity abounds. Housing facilities are at a premium. There is every reason in the world why we do not want to increase the congestion of wealth and industry at the ports. And then, why send this cotton down to the ports to make more money for the people that live in the ports? I do not think it makes sense.

Why send it down there and concentrate it and make it an object for the saboteur? Cotton is essential in national defense. The battle of the Atlantic is on. Why send the cotton down there when now it is in a thousand warehouses over this Nation, in interior communities, protected from the saboteur? Therefore, I say, why not keep it where it is? I say to you in all earnestness that in my opinion it would be unwise, rash, and against the public interest at this time to concentrate our vast cotton resources in a few vulnerable ports. No man knows what catastrophe may befall us, what attack may be made upon us within the next few weeks and months. We know one thing for certain: We will not need additional cotton at ports within the coming months of spring and summer.

If we manufacture powder and guncotton out of this cotton, we are going to manufacture the powder in the interior. If you draw a map of the continent and draw a line about 200 miles in the interior from the coast line, you would call that area within the interior the strategic area for powder production. Why move this cotton out of the strategic area, where it may be needed for national defense?

It seems to me that there is no reason at all why we should bow to those at the ports who are hungry and greedy for more from the Federal Treasury and let them concentrate all these millions of bales of cotton down at the ports. I do not see it. I do not believe the Congress will see it. I have every confidence that the House will adopt this rule and will pass this bill.

Further, why at this time utilize our freight cars in moving millions of bales of cotton down to the ports? Every man who knows anything about conditions knows about the scarcity of ships and how very essential they are at this particular moment. Nothing in a material way could be much more important now than ships.

It is possible that the Nation will have to call upon the railroads to aid as far as possible in connection with the ship scarcity situation. Some of our coastwise ships could be freed for other purposes by substituting transcontinental railroad transportation from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast. Products carried by ship from our Atlantic seaports through the Panama Canal to California or vice versa could be carried by the railroads, if it became necessary. So why not keep the railroads free from this useless traffic in millions of bales of cotton at this particular time and why not keep this cotton where it is, and why not, as I know you will, pass this rule and pass this bill? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, it has just been said that this is a fight between the warehousemen of the interior and the owners of warehouses at the ports. This may be true, I do not know, but I do know that the farmer is the man who pays the charges and I am interested in securing storage rates for him as cheap as possible and rates that he will not be required to pay by submitting to a reduction in the price for his cotton.

Under the present program, as I understand, the port warehouses, on account of their monopolistic ownership, are able to underbid the interior warehousemen. I understand further that the port warehouses are owned largely by the large cotton factors of the country and that these factors can afford to underbid the interior warehousemen for the reason they can determine the price paid the producer for this cotton, and it is at this point where the interest of the farmer comes in and commands my attention. It is a known fact that the cotton factors own and maintain extra large warehouses at the ports and it has been alleged that these factors by reason of their ability to fix the price of cotton can underbid the interior warehousemen at an actual loss in storage charges and then reduce the price paid to the producer sufficient to recoup their losses in such charges, whereas the interior warehousemen are not able to do this. It has been suggested by some that one or more of the large cotton factors can afford to store cotton practically for nothing because of their ability to fix the price to the producer in such a way that the difference in the cost to the factor or warehouseman and the price he receives from the importer or manufacturer is sufficient to pay him a profit in the way of storage and eliminate the small warehouseman in the interior altogether, all at the expense of the producer.

Of course, the farmer is interested in securing warehouse facilities as cheaply as possible, but he is also interested in the price to be obtained for his cotton. It has been said that Anderson-Clayton & Co., the largest cotton factors of the world, are the owners of nearly one-half of the warehouse facilities at the ports.

This company can well afford to store cotton at a very low rate and eliminate the small warehouseman in the interior, and then, as I have already said, reduce the price they pay the producer a sufficient amount to reimburse the company for the losses sustained in storing such cotton. This is my first argument in behalf of the farmer.

My second point is that if the port warehouses are permitted to obtain a monopoly on the storage of cotton and require practically all cotton to be sent to the ports for storage and then shipped back into the interior to be manufactured, we know the spinner is going to pay the freight to and from the port warehouse, and we know also that the spinner is then going to pass the cost of paying this freight back to the producer, or the cotton farmer, in the reduction of price as much as possible, and pass the remainder of this extra transportation cost to the consumer. The process is an elementary one, and the farmer is the loser in the first instance and the consumer in the second, because he must pay more for the goods purchased.

A great majority of the people in my district are engaged in and are dependent upon the production of cotton; the remainder are engaged primarily in the manufacture of cotton, there being about 40 cotton-manufacturing enterprises in my district. Now, if the cotton from my district must be shipped to New Orleans, Galveston, or some other port warehouse for storage and then shipped back in a few months to the cotton mills in my district to be manufactured, you can easily see where the farmer is going to be gypped for at least part of this extra cost, and the consumer will pay the balance in higher prices for cotton goods consumed. My understanding of this bill is it would protect both the farmer and small warehouseman. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 4 minutes allotted to me I cannot, of course, discuss the merits of this bill, but I do want to avail myself of the time allotted to say to the House that I am deeply interested in the granting of this rule and that I am also interested in the passage of this bill. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because the cotton people in the district which I have the honor to represent believe that the passage of this legislation is necessary for the welfare of the cotton farmers in southeast Missouri where I reside. We are the cotton-producing section of Missouri. Seven counties in the district which I have the honor to represent produce about 400,000 bales of cotton per year, and cotton is the largest cash-money crop in the State of Missouri. So, when I urge you today to adopt this rule, I am doing so because it makes possible the passage of a bill which will, we believe, greatly help and benefit the cotton farmers of our section.

Now, it is just a little surprising to hear Members come here today and plead the cause of the cotton farmer in their opposition to this bill, when many of them never saw a stalk of cotton grow and know nothing of the cotton industry and its problems. I want to say to you people that I represent the little warehouseman, the local warehouseman who takes care of the needs of the cotton farmer in his locality, and it seems to me that the Members in opposition to this bill are thinking more of somebody in our port cities, as my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] pointed out, than they are in the cotton farmer and the small interior cotton warehouse that serves him and his community.

Do not be deceived. We, in the interior cotton-producing sections know that Anderson-Clayton represents the cotton-exporting interests of this country; know that they are the ones who own the empty warehouses in out port cities, and that they are the ones who are vitally and financially interested in having these warehouses filled with this cotton that the Commodity Credit Corporation has to move from the interior warehouses of our country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Yes, I am glad to yield to my able and distinguished colleague from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that he has described the condition existing in my State and I am heartily in agreement with him on the rule as well as on the bill which is to follow.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Let me say to you would-be champions of the farmer and you champions of this cotton-moving program of the Commodity Credit Corporation like my distinguished friend and colleague from Indiana who has always had so many kind things to say about the farm program and its administration; and also like my distinguished friend from Michigan who has also supported the farm program so vigorously at all times, that I am glad to see you still defending the program of the Department of Agriculture here today. Let me say to you, gentlemen, that if you are true friends of the farmer that you ought to get on the side of the little warehouses that really take care of the needs of the farmer instead of Anderson-Clayton, the group that has opposed the farm program at every stage since its inception and is now, as I am informed, down in Brazil growing cotton to compete with your American cotton farmers. I am really surprised at you men. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SUMNERS.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little to the "jimson-weed farmers." [Laughter.] You know, as a matter of fact, in the South we have but one-fourth of the vote in this House. It is utterly impossible for any legislation peculiarly affecting our interests to pass unless we get across the line and get some votes from the other sections. Let me give you a few important facts in respect to this situation that I think nobody will controvert. I ask the attention of Members on the Republican side as well as on the Democratic side, because the observations I am going to make ought to be considered in determining attitude toward this rule. There are now some 1,700 interior warehouses for cotton.

It is highly important that cotton get under shelter as quickly as possible after it is baled. Nobody will question that. Only interior warehouses can make that possible. In order for them to remain in business they must store cotton. There is but one place where you can have a warehouse which can give to cotton the maximum of protection against weather damage, and that is in the interior at the point of first concentration. In addition, there is another important point. It is important that cotton move gradually from the points of first concentration in order to avoid a heavy strain on the transportation facilities. The cotton producers in the cotton-producing areas of the country are convinced—and I know they are convinced—that if you do what is proposed by those who are opposed to this legislation you will so remove revenue from the interior warehouses that they will fall into decay. They must receive enough net profit to keep in operation. They can keep in operation only by keeping cotton in these warehouses. Do not let anybody overlook that fact.

If those warehouses do go into decay, this cotton would have to be held exposed to weather in the interior until it could be compressed and gotten to the port. That is the first proposition. The second proposition is this: You know and we all know that cotton is not, under present conditions, going to move abroad from the ports. A big part of this cotton under existing conditions must go back into the interior, if it is to be used soon, in order to find its use, because, unfortunately for us, we are pretty nearly shut out from the world market of cotton. What is the common sense, then, from the standpoint of the Government, the farmer, or the purchaser for use of taking this cotton from the interior and stripping the interior warehouses, which are the only warehouses that can fully protect the cotton against storm damages, and turning the warehousing over to a few big concerns at the ports? It is just plain horse sense to hold this cotton at the point of first concentration in the interior, where it can get its protection against storm damage, and move it from that point to the point of use, instead of having to double back possibly from the ports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill (S. 262) for the following reasons: First, the bill is so drawn as to absolutely conceal its real intent, in that it loudly proclaims an intent to prevent monopolistic practices, but its provisions are such as to actually create an absolute monopoly.

Second, it is so drawn as to render all Government-owned cotton subject to the provisions of the Bankhead Act, which

act was designed primarily to apply to Government-loan cotton.

Third, in applying the provisions of the Bankhead Act to Government-owned cotton it deprives the Commodity Credit Corporation of all control over this cotton and thus takes from the Corporation the one effective weapon it possesses to protect both itself and the farmer against high storage rates.

Fourth, if the Corporation is stripped of its power to bargain for its own protection, it naturally follows that it loses its power to bargain to protect the farmer.

Fifth, it is a vicious measure in that while the Government has been able through its loan program to put a floor under the price of cotton paid to the farmer, this bill, by abolishing competitive bidding on storage, denies the Government the means of establishing a ceiling on storage rates.

Thus while the Government is, through its cotton-loan program, supporting the price of cotton, this bill forces it to relinquish its control of storage rates and thus leaves both farmer and Government at the mercy of the warehouses.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina the remaining 15 seconds on this side. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes and 15 seconds. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I think my reputation for brevity in the House is such that the gentleman has put those 15 seconds into perfectly safe hands.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield for the 15 seconds. [Laughter.]

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. So many things have been said that were not true. Three hundred and sixty-five days times $5,000 is only $1,825,000.

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry I cannot yield further.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly apparent to everybody that there is a very genuine controversy here, and it is an important controversy. It not only deals with one of the greatest of our agricultural commodities, but it is natural that it may involve the great question of national defense and the storage and use of our natural resources. My only plea to you is to adopt this rule and consider for 3 hours, under the guidance of the legislative committee, this very important question. The Senate committee has unanimously reported this legislation. The Senate has passed it. One of the great committees of this House has held hearings and favorably reported the legislation. The Rules Committee was appealed to to report a rule in order that the House might consider this legislation.

It seems to me that under those conditions it would be summary judgment to come here and consider this momentous question in 1 hour, without the legislative committee in charge of the debate, and say, "We will knock it down right here and let it go no further."

I am not speaking on the merits of the bill. I do think it is reasonable and fair and right that we should adopt this rule and turn this matter over to our great Committee on Banking and Currency and consider this very vital question for the next 2 or 3 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. [Applause.]

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were ayes 109 and noes 73.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 262) regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 262, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to consume 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is so much to be said in support of this bill that it is difficult to be brief. I hope Members will permit me to make a brief statement without interruption. Before the debate shall have been concluded some of us on the committee favoring the bill will undertake to answer any questions that may be propounded and supply such information as may be desired.

The cotton-control program in the United States was intended to benefit and improve the condition of the farmers of the Nation and the people who produce cotton. That fundamental purpose should be borne in mind in the consideration of this bill—the purpose to improve conditions, to lift the standard of living, if possible, among those people who share such an inequitable part of the Nation's income, but whose toil produces so much of the things essential for the maintenance of human life. This question of warehousing and reconcentration of cotton should therefore be viewed in the light of the Government's program and the purposes for which it has been inaugurated.

There have been grown since the beginning of the cotton program approximately 100,000,000 bales of cotton. Something like 90,000,000 bales have been marketed independently of the Government-loan programs by the farmers. When the program was inaugurated the price of cotton was running around 5 cents a pound. The cotton that has been marketed averaged something like 10 cents a pound, which means that this programs has probably resulted in an additional income for the cotton farmers during this period amounting to something like a half billion dollars.

As contrasted with this result for the producers of the Nation it is shown in the record before the committee that the losses of the Corporation on cotton do not exceed $25,000,000. As a matter of fact there have been only two appropriations setting up the capital of the corporation which totaled $200,000,000 and they have made a profit of $43,000,000. The book value of the cotton owned by the Corporation is $364,000,000, and there is outstanding $238,000,000 in producer loans, making a total book value of the Government-loan cotton and the Government-owned cotton of approximately $600,000,000.

When cotton is marketed by the farmer he takes it to town to the local warehouse. In many instances such warehouses are farmer owned. The local warehouseman is the friend, the neighbor, the counselor of the farmer. He lives in the same community with the farmer with whom he deals. There is a relationship there that should not be disturbed unless there exists some impelling reasons for such action. What happened? Cotton was being stored at rates sometimes as high as 50 cents a bale per month. When the cotton program was inaugurated warehousemen found themselves having storage of large amounts of surplus cotton. The loan program enabled the farmers to hold their cotton instead of dumping it on the market in certain seasonal periods at whatever price might be offered, as had been the custom theretofore. So the warehouses with large stocks of storage cotton not immediately marketable were able to make larger profits on their business and it naturally followed that storage charges could be and they were reduced more than 50 percent. As to the interior, these reductions were made on Government-owned, Government-loan, and the producers' cotton marketed independently of the loan. As to the ports, the principal advocates of competitive bids, the charges were reduced only on the Government-owned and Government-loan cotton; the producers still being required to bear the higher handling and storage charges. The Government had nothing to do and no power or jurisdiction over the charges made for the handling of the producers' cotton marketed independently of the loan; that reduction was the natural result of competitive influence throughout the interior of the country.

As storage stocks went up at interior points handling and storage charges came down from 50 cents to 25 cents and to an all-time low today of 15 cents, including insurance. If you will read the hearings, which I wish every Member of the House would, you will find that the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation themselves told the Committee on Banking and Currency that the accumulation of Government-loan cotton, termed "dead cotton" by them, enabled the warehouseman serving the farmers to reduce the rates on cotton stored by the farmers, whether owned by the farmers or in which the farmers had an equity; if you read the hearings you will find where Dr. Robbins made that statement. This would have happened in the absence of the loan pro-

gram if these surpluses had been accumulated under the normal development of business, under our competitive system, and there is not any business in the United States that has been more competitive than the cotton-storage business. When a warehouse was charging 25 cents or 50 cents a bale and found itself with enough dead cotton to carry on its business at reduced charges, competitive influences served to bring down the cost to the farmer. There has never been a more competitive business. When this cotton accumulated in these amounts the result was a great reduction in the charge for storage. The Commodity Credit Corporation took part in the negotiations that helped to bring about these reductions. Nobody finds fault with that, but these reductions would have come about at least in large part under normal business developments under the law of competition.

If it is true—and nobody disputes it—that the storage of dead cotton such as is involved in this bill, Government-owned cotton which cannot be sold immediately, if it is true that the storage of that kind of cotton enables the warehousemen to reduce charges to the farmer, it follows inevitably and indisputably that when you remove that dead cotton elsewhere and take its storage from the warehouses that serve the farmers, those warehouses must of necessity increase their earnings on the other current moving cotton in order to survive. This record shows that their earnings today on the present rates and the present volume of business is at the very bottom of possible handling charges if the industry is to survive.

Since the increased handling charges on cotton marketed independently of the loan has more direct bearing upon the producers' earnings than the charges on the loan cotton, it occurs to me that the Government would have more concern over such charges than they have shown here with respect to the Government-owned cotton. This is a program to increase the income of the cotton farmer. The Government is on record admitting that the dead stocks now in interior warehouses has influenced the reductions which have taken place in the interior charges. The producers put 10,000,000 bales in the Government loan and marketed 90,000,000 independently of the loan. If you were going to choose which of the two should have reduced interior charges in order to increase the income of the farmers, which would you select—6,000,000 owned by the Government or the 90,000,000 bales marketed by the producers?

What happened? After the interior warehouses had reduced their charges to the present level based on this stock of dead cotton the Commodity Credit Corporation set about to remove this cotton to the port warehouses. The port warehouses were established to store and handle cotton to be exported to the outside world. That is their function in handling of the cotton of the country. They found themselves with large idle storage space, with our export trade vanishing, and accordingly set about to secure this dead stock from its interior locations. They offer reduced rates, not to the farmer but only for the purpose of attracting this long-term dead storage. The record will show that throughout the present cotton season only a little more than half a million bales of cotton were exported to foreign markets. But these port warehouses now have stored and on hand more cotton than they did have on hand in 1938, when we exported more than 5,000,000 bales. There are only 43 port warehouse companies in the United States, and there are some 1,600 warehouses scattered throughout the interior of the Nation, yet this bill contains specific provisions providing for the reconcentration of cotton to port locations. First, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under section 4 of this act, may reconcentrate any cotton now at any interior location to any place they see fit in order to relieve congestion. The present port stocks have been principally reconcentrated under that provision as now contained in the present law. Under section 4 the Corporation may reconcentrate cotton because of excessive charges at interior points. Under that provision large volumes of cotton have been reconcentrated from interior locations to other locations. Reconcentration may be had if the cotton is uninsured, improperly warehoused. These provisions of the bill before you are carried forward from the present act, under which the Commodity Credit Corporation reconcentrated cotton under competitive bids, according to their own testimony. Whatever may have been the conditions in the past that produced the necessity for reconcentration of cotton to relieve congestion—excessive charges—all such conditions are being carried forward into this act to provide for all future necessities. As a matter of fact, the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation took the position that the only way you could determine under the present law what was the average rates in order to measure and determine whether or not the rates were excessive was to obtain competitive bids under the existing law with reference to Government-loan cotton. Since that is the fact, the transition of those terms of the present law into the bill before you to govern the cotton to which the Government has title necessarily means that the same competitive bids may be obtained in the future and the same quantities of cotton may be reconcentrated.

Now, that is not the only thing in section 4: In addition to all the reasons outlined above for the reconcentration of cotton, section 4 specifically authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to reconcentrate Government-owned cotton so that one-third of the total volume will be located in port communities. I emphasize that that authority is in addition to the other authority conveyed on the Commodity Credit Corporation by section 4. Assuming there will be no reconcentration other than the one-third provision of section 4, even that would add 750,000 bales to the already excessive port stocks.

Compare these 43 port warehouses with the 1,700 warehousemen in the interior sections of the country who serve their local communities, pay wages to employees, pay taxes, support schools, support churches, support community life, and who help preserve the little remnants left of community life in the United States. Why anybody should want to disturb that situation passes my understanding. To me there is nothing more unthinkable, under existing economic conditions resulting from our great national-defense program, than the suggestion that we should strike such a blow to the small interior communities as would result from the reconcentration of stocks of Government cotton.

These communities which by comparison are being left out of the picture have but little that is left for the support of their community life.

The bids under consideration have only about 1 year to run; do not forget that. Suppose you move 3,000,000 bales of cotton to the port warehouses, and you get a big reduction for 1 year. Suppose they gave you storage for 1 year for nothing. What would happen at the end of the year? What is to keep them from saying, "We will raise this rate. We cannot do this business at this figure." What would the Commodity Credit Corporation say? "All right, we will move it back to the interior." That is the only remedy that would be left. There never was a scheme invented to accomplish the formation of a trust more suited to the purpose than to permit the port warehouses to take contracts for the storage of cotton for 1 year. When the matter of rates would be left entirely in their hands at the expiration of that time. They could do it for nothing and raise the price at the end of the year, forcing you to take the cotton and move it back, or pay an exorbitant price. That would overcome whatever benefit was received in the first instance.

These people back yonder in the interior warehouses serve the farmers. They have to have these interior warehouses, and cannot get along without them. The cotton farmers have to have the storage facilities. They have to have a place to take their cotton. As a matter of fact, they are not going to save any money by this plan. The records show that the freight, plus the other handling costs on this cotton to the port warehouses is $2.18 a bale on the average. Based on the 2,000,000 bales which the Department asserts will be moved to port locations, this amounts to $4,360,000—as an initial outlay in order to save 50 cents per bale. On that basis the cotton would have to be stored at the ports 4 years before the saving in storage charges would equal the cost of freight and other handling charges. This, however, assumes that the cotton will be exported, a probability that is contrary to the now known existing facts. Present conditions indicate that the cotton will probably be consumed in the interior of this Nation, which would, of course, mean additional freight to ship it back from the ports to interior-consuming centers. No one can foretell the amount of that cost.

That testimony is in the record practically without dispute, and it is a matter of common knowledge among all men who know anything about the cotton business that you cannot ship cotton without a loss in weight. In the transportation of cotton, the reconcentration

contemplated in this bill involves a loss of from 2 to 5 pounds to the bale, which adds as much as a year's storage or 2 years' storage under the plan contemplated for the reconcentration of this cotton.

At this time there is no need to incur the expense of moving cotton to the port warehouses because nobody knows where it is going to be consumed. At least, we have no assurances that much cotton will at any time soon be consumed by the outside world. The proof shows without dispute that our foreign market has dwindled to the point of little over a half million bales a year, and that our cotton is now being consumed in the States that do a spinning business. These are the communities to which this cotton will have to be shipped, if it is to be consumed at any time soon.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to make this observation: The statement was made by the gentleman from Indiana to the effect that cotton was more valuable and worth more in port warehouses than at interior points. That is not correct, is it?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, no; on the contrary, the record shows that the producers' cotton stored at port locations has less value than at interior locations. The only actual dirt farmer appearing before the committee had had that actual experience.

Let me call your attention to a further matter. It is proposed to ship this cotton to port warehouses where it is said they can store it for less than would be imposed by the local warehousemen if limited, as they are, to the bids submitted, but the port warehouses today are charging 35 cents a bale on all free cotton they store, all the cotton not owned by the Government and not involved in this bill. They are charging 35 cents a bale for that, whereas the local warehouseman is charging only 15 cents a bale.

Take the dead cotton out of the interior that enables them to carry on their business at present and ship it to the port warehouses and you will force the interior warehouses to increase their charges to the level now being collected by the ports, namely, 35 cents per bale for the first month and 21 cents per bale thereafter. This would add more than $5,000,000 per annum to the cost to the farmer for marketing his cotton. Yet the Commodity Credit Corporation talks about a savings to the Government when this loan program is only a part of a complete program to increase the farmer's income. It is a narrow and restricted view of this problem that would seek to reduce charges on the Government-owned cotton at the expense of the farmers' cotton marketed independently of the loan.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Following up the question propounded by the gentleman from North Carolina, may I ask the gentleman if it is not true, as I understand he has already stated, that the port warehouses have been used for the concentration of cotton to be exported, and if the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina that cotton in port warehouses is higher in fact than that stored in interior warehouses is not true, because the interior warehouses are nearer to our mills that take all of the cotton they use?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. COX. I know the gentleman feels very deeply about this proposal because it involves the safety and the security of the small man in his district.

Mr. STEAGALL. It involves, the further destruction of what is left of local community life and it ought not to be done.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is undertaking by this proposal to protect the small man against the large corporation and the powers of the big fellow?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes. May I say this, and it should not be forgotten: This is not a genuine competitive plan for the storage of cotton. If you will take the bids submitted by these warehouses, you will find that the port warehouses were given advantages that were not given to the interior warehouses. Let me say, too, the statement has been made that they had received over a thousand bids after they sent out invitations.

That statement was misleading. In order to understand why it was misleading we must think of what we have under consideration in this bill. What are we talking about? What are we seeking to regulate—the reconcentration of cotton from present locations to port and other locations? Dealing with that question, the testimony of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation shows that they had bids on only 3,300,000 bales out of a total quantity of 8,231,000 bales. Of the 3,300,000 bales on which they received bids, 2,740,000 were included in bids calling for the movement from interior locations to port locations. The remaining amount of 635,000 bales called for the movement from present locations in the interior to other locations in the interior. Of the total quantity on which they had such bids, 1,500,000 bales were included in the bids of the Anderson Clayton Co., the biggest cotton operators in the country. Of the 635,000 bales for reconcentration at interior points, 365,000 bales were included in the bids of the Anderson Clayton Co. Therefore, eliminating Anderson Clayton Co., they received, as to interior points, bids for the reconcentration of only 270,000 bales out of 8,231,000 bales. Could you call that competitive? These thousands of bids to which they refer have no connection with this bill. This bill deals with reconcentration of cotton, and they had only 25 bids from the 43 port warehouses and 62 bids from all the 1,600 interior warehouses. The only port warehouseman appearing before this committee testified he could not bid competitively under the forms sent out for the reconcentration of cotton. They were, in fact, not competitive, and cannot be so called.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

It was testified that the interior warehouses could not bid on this cotton because of conditions laid down in the bids requiring the compress of the cotton and delivering it at shipside, which, of course, the interior warehousemen could not meet.

I want to talk about another phase of this matter. I cannot cover it all if I am to quit within the time I desire. I submit this particularly to the Members of the House on my left. I wish you would read the record and trace the history of these transactions and of this legislation and see what this Bureau of the Government has undertaken to do in connection with this matter, and see whether you want to support a bureau of this Government in the face of the record they have made for openly ignoring the repeated enactments of the Congress.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have an open mind, and I want information.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will try to give it, if I can.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to help the little fellow who is being crowded out by a monopoly, if I can. The gentleman says for us to read the record and see what this Bureau has done.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am going to tell you about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish the gentleman would tell us what they have done.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am going to tell you, and you Members on the minority side ought to know it. How you can fail to consider it is beyond my understanding. I am talking to the minority Members who, it does seem to me, would pay some attention to things of this kind even if we over here get so blind that we do not.

The loan programs really started in 1934. There was a loan for 1933 which was later transferred into the 1934 stock. The beginning, however, of the present loan program really dates with August 1934. There was no loan during 1936. In 1937 the Corporation announced the purpose to move the producers' loan cotton from interior locations to port locations. The Congress received a storm of protests from interior warehousemen and farmers. As a result it included in the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act the following provision:

> Cotton held as security for any loan heretofore or hereafter made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not hereafter be reconcentrated without the written consent of the producer or borrower. (Section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.)

Thereafter and notwithstanding this announced policy of the Congress, we found the Commodity Credit Corporation proceeding with its plans to move the cotton from interior locations to port locations, and again we received a storm of protests from the producer-owners and from the interior warehousemen. On investigation it developed that the producers' loan note—copy of which I am exhibiting to you—contained a finely printed agreement, that could be read

only by an ordinary man with a magnifying glass, authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to reconcentrate the producers' cotton. This agreement was made a condition precedent to the producers obtaining a Government loan. It was actually printed in the loan forms prior to the passage of section 383 (b) but was nevertheless used to continue the reconcentration program contrary to the declared will and purpose of the Congress.

Thereafter the Congress passed what we now refer to as the Bankhead Act (Public, No. 660, 75th Cong.), which provided as follows:

That in the administration of section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the written consent of the producer or borrower to the reconcentration of any cotton held as security for any loan heretofore or hereafter made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be deemed to have been given unless such consent shall have been given in an instrument made solely for that purpose. Notwithstanding any provision of any loan agreement heretofore made, no cotton held under any such agreement as security for any such loan shall be moved from one warehouse to another unless the written consent of the producer or borrower shall have been obtained in a separate instrument given solely for that purpose, as required by this act. The giving of written consent for the reconcentration of cotton shall not be made a condition upon the making of any loan hereafter made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided, however,* That in cases where there is congestion and lack of storage facilities, and the local warehouse certifies such fact and requests the Commodity Credit Corporation to move the cotton for reconcentration to some other point, or when the Commodity Credit Corporation determines such loan cotton is improperly warehoused and subject to damage, or if uninsured, or if any of the terms of the loan agreement are violated, or if carrying charges are substantially in excess of the average of carrying charges available elsewhere, and the local warehouse, after notice, declines to reduce such charges, such written consent as provided in this amendment need not be obtained; and consent to movement under any of the conditions of this proviso may be required in further loan agreements.

This second pronouncement of the positive will of the Congress against the reconcentration of cotton from interior locations to port locations should have ended this controversy, but it did not.

Apparently being thwarted in their efforts to carry out their purpose to move the cotton from interior warehouses to port warehouses the Department undertook one of the most gigantic schemes to override the will of Congress that has ever come to my attention in my long service in the Congress. I refer to the fact that they took title to the 1934 and 1937 cotton without definite knowledge of the grades and staples demanded by Great Britain and without definite knowledge of the grades and staples actually available in the 6,900,000 bales involved in the 1934 and 1937 loan cotton.

I made every effort to have the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation tell the Committee on Banking and Currency just when the Corporation decided to take title to the 1934 and 1937 cotton in order to effectuate the obligation of the barter agreement. I did not succeed in obtaining anything other than the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture confirming the act of taking title. From the records of the Banking and Currency Committee I have refreshed my memory and find that under date of July 25, 1939, Mr. John D. Goodloe, then vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, advised me on that date that it was the purpose of the corporation to take title to both the 1934 and 1937 cotton. He pointed out that not more than 100,000 to 150,000 bales of the desired grades could be found in the 1934 cotton and stated—

Thus to complete the delivery of the required amount of cotton and of the grades and staples tentatively indicated to be desired by the British Government, it will be necessary for the corporation to acquire title to the 9-cent-loan cotton under the 1937–38 program, and complete delivery out of this stock.

The date of July 25, 1939, becomes a very important date in the light of the record before the Committee on Banking and Currency because the president of the Corporation told the committee that only tentative specifications of grades and staples had been received by this Government on July 1, 1939, and that final specifications were not received until August 9, 1939. Therefore, without final and complete information concerning the grades and staples, the Department had proceeded with its program to take title to the 6,900,000 bales and move it to the ports. I quote from the statement of the Department of Agriculture, dated July 21, 1939:

It will be necessary for the corporation to reconcentrate a substantial amount of the cotton to port locations in order to have the desired grades available.

The record of the committee on this bill shows from the testimony of the Department that they had to grade and class 6,000,000 bales in order to obtain 600,000 bales of the desired grade and staple.

If any further confirmation of the design and purpose of the corporation, prior to the knowledge as to what should be moved to the ports, is desired it is found in the fact that they employed Monget Brothers to class and grade the 1934 and 1937 cotton in order to determine what bales could be selected from it to meet the specifications of Great Britain. That employment was not made until after the barter agreement and the treaty with Great Britain were ratified. Two things should be observed—the announced purpose to take title to the cotton and to move it to the ports prior to the knowledge of the definite specifications of Great Britain, and second, prior to the knowledge as to what cotton was actually in the 1934 and 1937 loan cotton that could be delivered to meet the specifications of Great Britain. These two acts clearly indicating that the purpose to move the cotton to the ports was the primary factor and not the barter agreement. The Congress had to pass an act requiring the Department to proceed, as any intelligent cotton merchant would have proceeded, to determine the grade and staple of the cotton prior to incurring handling, rehandling, and transportation costs.

Technically the passing of title from the producers to the Government removed the restrictions of the Bankhead Act, but it did not change in any way the declared intent, purpose, and policy of Congress to prevent reconcentration from interior to port locations and to retain the cotton at interior locations.

To summarize: This controversy has arisen almost every year since 1937, and each time the Congress has expressed disapproval of the purpose and policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but just as often as we have expressed our disapproval that Corporation has sought ways and means to evade the act of Congress.

If you did not have any other reason to pass this bill, you ought to pass it out of respect for the dignity of Congress, and require this Bureau to respect the will of Congress and to obey the law in the distribution of this cotton. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think my constituents, the cotton growers in the Ninth Congressional District of the city of Chicago, Ill., or I, are completely convinced that this bill is entirely in favor of the cotton grower, and as for those cotton growers who come from that more salubrious section of the country where cotton does grow, they have lost all equity in the cotton which is under consideration. It is all Government-owned cotton, but there is one class that have an equity—they are the taxpayers of the United States.

I listened to the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, not knowing anything about the raising of cotton, but interested at all times in saving the taxpayers' money. As I have said, the cotton under consideration in this bill is all Government-owned, and, as I understand, there are already charges against it at the rate of 17 cents a pound, while I believe the current price of cotton is only 10 cents a pound. So, naturally, this cotton is likely to be a rather constant boarder wherever it is for sometime to come; but what may be the future of this cotton?

As the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has just stated, the only recent export of cotton that I know of is 600,000 bales in connection with a barter deal made with Great Britain for a quantity of rubber. I was very much interested in the testimony regarding that deal and particularly so when I heard that that 6,000,000 bales of cotton had to be classified—this 6,000,000 bales belonging to the American Government—in order to find 600,000 bales that were of sufficient staple and grade to be accepted by the British in this barter specification.

Mr. Rathell, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in his testimony, stated the following:

Their specification was higher than the normal run of cotton. They included, for instance, 90,000 bales of Good Middling cotton running in staple up to 1 1/16 inches; and a substantial quantity of Strict Middling

with staples running up to an inch and a sixteenth.

As a matter of fact, we not only had to class all of the 6,500,000 bales to complete their assortments, but we had to substitute some grades we were unable to find in sufficient quantity in the 6,500,000 bales of stock.

I asked at that point, being rather ignorant of these things, if one of these bales were classified whether that classification would be good for the future, and may I again read from the record:

Mr. DEWEY. I believe you stated, Mr. Robbins, all of the 6,000,000 bales had been classified. Now, would it require any reclassification at any time in the future to establish the definite types of cotton that are removed in the Government-owned cotton, or is that one classification sufficient for all time?

Mr. ROBBINS. The classification that has been made to date covers more than 98 percent of the total Government-owned stocks, and it should be reliable and useful for a long time in the future.

Mr. DEWEY. Changing from one warehouse to another would not cause or necessitate any reclassification, and the classification record on each bale would go along with the bale, I presume?

Mr. ROBBINS. That is correct, sir; resampling and reclassifying would not be necessary.

As I understand it, there has been very little export demand for cotton. I understand there is some talk of $100,000,000 in the lease-lend bill being set aside for another export of cotton. We have already proved by the classification of these 6,000,000 bales that there was only 10 percent of it that suited the British specification, so that if Great Britain at the present moment is our only market for this Government-owned cotton outside of very special markets that are being considered, such as mattresses and other things of that nature already mentioned, it does not seem to me that there would be any particular good in moving this interior cotton to the ports for export, as it has already been shown that our sole customer does not want it, and we had to go outside of the Government-owned stock to fill his requirements.

It has been stated that freight rates can always be recaptured in the price of cotton, but if our present customer does not expect to buy our Government cotton there is little chance of recapturing the freight rate, and while I am very ignorant of the growing of cotton, I do know that it always costs money to move any kind of commodity anywhere, and for that reason I see no cause to add to the 17 cents that the taxpayers of the United States have already got in this cotton, the cost of moving it to the port or any other point that is not known, to be near the definite point of consumption of the cotton.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Is the gentleman so despondent as to the future of our cotton producers, after the war, as to fear the future export of any more cotton?

Mr. DEWEY. I am very despondent about the 6,000,000 bales of Government-owned cotton that already has charges of 17 cents a pound against it, when the correct market price is 10 cents, and the only person with whom we have any dealing in export will not take most of it or could only find a portion of the 600,000 bales required out of the 6,000,000 bales our taxpayers own.

Mr. HALLECK. We have already lost $25,000,000 in cotton already disposed of and, as the gentleman suggests, we do not know what the ultimate losses are going to be, but as against the proposition that we will not be able to export this cotton I suggest that that is a position that I for one would not want to take.

Mr. DEWEY. I urge that speed be given to discovering some ultimate use of this cotton, and then that it be moved to that point where it is ultimately going to be used.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman is assuming, of course, that in any other barter deal, the same carefully prepared specifications would be demanded? One of the reasons for those high specifications which came into the barter deal was because we had specified for our rubber a type of rubber very rare and hard to get, and the British countered by doing the other thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield the gentleman more time if he desires.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the chairman, but there is nothing I think to add to my statement except a hope that some use will be made of this cotton in new facilities, so that the taxpayer may gain something out of the loss he will most probably have to bear and until such a time comes, and we know where that cotton is to be consumed, it be left where it is and do not add to the 17-cent-per-pound cost by additional freight rates, all of which will have to be paid by the taxpayer. [Applause.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in my view this is a very bad bill, and should not become a law. It has in it in my opinion a very fundamental principle. It is not a question of a contest between the warehouses at the ports and in the interior. I am sure that I can consider this bill from a purely impersonal standpoint. Some of us who are opposed to it have been accused of not knowing anything about raising cotton. That is true, so far as I am concerned, but I do not believe that a person in Congress has to be a cotton raiser to understand a plain, simply economic problem, and to understand a sound public policy. This bill will prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from accepting competitive bids from warehouses in order to secure reasonable rates to store Government-owned and Government loan cotton.

In addition to that, even if these competitive bids are not accepted this bill will absolutely tie the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its negotiations with the warehouses for a fair and reasonable rate for the storage of cotton. If that is what this Congress wants to do, then you can pass this bill and you will accomplish that purpose. There is not any question about that.

We have a statute, section 3709, with which you are all familiar, which provides that contracts to secure supplies and services for the departments of the Government must be made by advertising for competitive bids.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not now. That has been the law for a number of years. Agencies of the Government have followed that policy and as a result have saved this Government many, many millions of dollars. It is unthinkable to me for Congress to pass a law which will prohibit an agency of the Government from accepting competitive bids in their normal peacetime activities. It is true in a great national emergency we have departed from that principle in securing the supplies and the construction of armament and equipment and establishments for the Army and the Navy, and as a result of it when we abandoned that principle it has cost this Government many millions of dollars. That policy has caused severe criticism from one end of this country to the other and there is now a strong demand for investigations by congressional committees.

The temporary National Economics Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member—and I am a little surprised to find the vice chairman of that committee here making a speech for this bill, as he evidently has not read it—for over 2 years has been carefully studying the question of the concentration of wealth and economic power in the hands of a few individuals and corporations. Many volumes of testimony have been taken. Many other volumes of monographs have been written, all of them tending to show that there is increasing concentration of wealth, influence, and power in the hands of a few individuals and corporations in this country, and tending further to show that the healthful and beneficial forces of open and free competitive conditions in our economic life are fast disappearing. It is the hope of that committee to make some recommendations which if adopted by the Congress will tend to check that tendency and to restore to our economic forces and our economic life free and open competition.

This bill is exactly in the opposite direction. It is a step against that move and cannot be justified on any sound economic grounds. This bill prohibits free competition and is a legislative declaration in favor of monopolistic controls. If that is what you want, vote for it.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was created, as you all know, not for the purpose of sustaining what may be an unsound and an uneconomic warehouse situation in this country. The Commodity Credit Corporation was established by this Congress to stabilize the price of farm commodities and to help the producers of farm commodities of this Nation.

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not now. I will be glad to answer any questions when I finish my statement.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, in its operations, has obtained title to a total of about 6,200,000 bales of cotton and has loans on some 4,800,000 more, making a total of about 11,000,000 bales. Last November, in order to carry out its activities, and provide for the storage of Government-loan and Government-owned cotton, the Commodity Credit Corporation submitted bids in accordance with the statute which provides that it must be done, and it is the duty of the Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, in which it operates, to submit competitive bids under section 3709.

I want to ask you Members of Congress if you are going to repeal that section of the statute and prohibit the Department of Agriculture from accepting competitive bids in accordance with it? If that is what you want, that is what this bill does. When those competitive bids were sent out to the country, 1,000 warehouses, interior and at the ports, bid on that cotton, and if the Commodity Credit Corporation is permitted to receive and accept those bids under the law they will save this Government $5,000 daily, or an annual saving of $1,800,000. If you want to prohibit them from doing that, then you should pass this bill. That is what it will do. That will be the result of it.

Now, they talk about moving this cotton. I want you to keep that in your minds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present, a quorum. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In accordance with these bids which have been received there will be 3,000,000 bales of this cotton that will not be touched and will not be moved an inch, and the Government, by reason of leaving that cotton where it is, under those competitive bids at a lower rate, will save $720,000 a year. I want to ask you if you are in favor of a bill which will prohibit them from accepting bids by which they can save that amount of money and not move a single pound of this cotton? That is what you will do when you pass this bill.

In addition to that, 2,000,000 bales that will be moved will save the Government over a million dollars by reason of the fact that these warehouses that have bid—and they are not all at the ports and I do not care if they are, as far as I am concerned—have offered to store the cotton at an average rate of 4½ cents per bale per month lower than the present rate, which will save the Government a million dollars in the storage of this cotton that belongs to the Government and not to the farmers and in which, as a matter of fact, the farmers have absolutely no interest, as far as that is concerned. If you want to prohibit the Corporation from making this saving to the Government, that is what this bill does.

They have raised the cry here of Anderson and Clayton. I do not know anything about them, but I do know what the record in this case shows, and that is that of this cotton thus to be moved, if you please, 50 percent will come out of the warehouses—not the little independent local warehouses they talk so much about—50 percent of it will come out of the warehouses of the Federal Compress Warehouse Co. and its affiliates which is far above and beyond the largest concern in the warehouse business in this entire country which operates 88 warehouses from southeast Missouri south and that has now stored in its warehouses one-fifth of all the cotton. They have refused to bid for this cotton at a lower rate because they hope on account of their commanding position in the warehouse business in this country to maintain the rates where they are now and to increase them in the future. Talk about a competitive proposition. They are able to meet all competition but would rather avoid it and secure excessive rates from the Government and the farmers. It looks very much like they are the ones who are sponsoring this bill. They do not want this cotton moved from their warehouses. They want this cotton frozen in their warehouses and levy a perpetual tribute upon the Government and the farmers. If that is what you want, vote for this bill.

By the way, whose bill is this? Did you ever think about that? Whose is it? I should like to have somebody answer that in their time. Whose bill is this? The only representatives of the farmers' organizations that we had before our committee were unqualifiedly against it. The Commodity Credit Corporation that has to administer it was against it. The Secretary of Agriculture wrote a report on this bill which I wish everybody would read. It is the most logical and devastating argument that was ever made against any bill; and the Department of Agriculture is the Department charged with the administration of this program. When the matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance it advised that the proposed legislation was not in accordance with the President's program. Now you, my Democratic friends over on this side of the House, whose bill is this? Are you supporting it in the belief that it is an administration measure? Heretofore when our committee contemplated changing the law affecting any agency or department of the Government, it called upon a representative of that department for his views on the bill. If it was a matter concerning R. F. C., Mr. Jesse Jones was invited to appear. If it concerned F. H. A., Mr. Macdonald or Mr. Ferguson. If it was a matter affecting the Home Loan Bank System, Mr. Fahy or Frank Hancock were consulted. In this case what was done? An able representative of some of the big warehouses was called upon in an effort to make a case for this bill. Whose bill is it? It ought to be defeated? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman has referred frequently in his argument to section 3709 covering competitive bidding. Is the gentleman not aware that that policy has been almost completely discarded by this administration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I do not say that. I did say, and I say now, that under this great national emergency, under the stress and strain of these unusual circumstances and urgent necessities it has been largely abandoned; and whenever it has been it brought down upon those who did it severe criticism and condemnation, and we do not want to abandon the principle of competitive bidding as applied to an agency that is operating under normal peacetime conditions. I say it should not be done.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget had both recommended adversely to this legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I said.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Am I correct in understanding the gentleman to say that all the farm organizations that appeared or reported on this matter expressed opposition?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; all that appeared.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One other thought if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not saying by that that all the farmers of the country are for or against this legislation, but so far as this record shows, the representatives of the big cooperative cotton associations claiming to represent large groups of cotton producers appeared and were against it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I got the impression that it was being contended seriously that we had a monopoly by reason of the present law and that this measure would break down this monopoly. If I understand the gentleman he said that at the present time we have competitive bidding but that if we pass this bill we shall create monopoly, not destroy it; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; yes. No one ever heard of a competitive system building up a monopoly if the competition was really free, open, and honest. The Commodity Credit Corporation is striving to put into effect free and open competition. This bill will prevent it from doing so. If you want to kill competition vote for this bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does all the cotton involved belong to the Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not all of it belongs absolutely to the Government. I should

like to explain that and I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then I wish the gentleman would speak a little further on this matter of Federal warehousing for the benefit of those of us who do not know about cotton warehousing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are 6,200,000 bales of cotton owned by the Government. I am using round numbers and speaking from memory, but this is substantially correct. There are some 2,500,000 or 3,000,000 bales in the 1938 loan which is already covered by expenses, interest, warehouse charges, and so on, which are far in excess of the market value of that cotton. It will never be redeemed by the farmers, and in practical effect the farmers have no more interest in it. So the 1938 and 1939 cotton on which the Government has a loan has become dead, so to speak, and is moving in the market no longer and for the purpose of warehousing may be considered just the same as the Government-owned cotton.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Were competitive bids asked for on the storage of cotton in the 6 years preceding the time they were requested, in November 1940?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is a matter I would like to go into.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Have there ever been competitive bids?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I wish, for the sake of the RECORD, the gentleman would clear that up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right. When the Congress called on the Commodity Credit Corporation to store 300,000 bales of this cotton in New England, that Corporation submitted bids for that purpose and got bids resulting in a storage price of 7 and 8 cents a bale, as compared with 12½ cents which it had been paying.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, not only that, but when they came to take care of some of the 1939 cotton they submitted competitive bids which resulted in securing storage at the rate of 10.4 cents instead of 12½ cents, and every time this free, open, competitive bidding has been put into operation, it has resulted in an enormous saving in expense to the Government. Since this Bureau became a Division in the Department of Agriculture, the law makes it mandatory, in my opinion, for them to submit competitive bids, and in each case where that has been done it has resulted in great saving. The Government did not have title to this cotton before 1939.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that for the 6 years the Commodity Credit Corporation has been making loans and storing cotton the only occasion on which competitive bids were secured was the New England case last year, and that was made necessary by the provisions of an act adopted by the Congress stating that that cotton may not be stored in any other way?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is misinformed on that because I have pointed out some of it in addition to that was let under competitive bidding in 1939. He is not entirely right about that and besides, under the reorganization bill this bureau or this agency was put in the Department of Agriculture in 1939 and since that time the competitive bidding has been in effect, not altogether but practically so, and where it has not been open to competitive bidding it has been open to negotiated contracts with these warehouses. If you pass this bill you will tie the hands and feet of those who are trying to administer the Commodity Credit Corporation. They will no longer have a free hand in negotiating contracts with warehousemen for the storage of cotton.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, some very unkind things have been said about the Commodity Credit Corporation. I make this prediction here and now to you gentlemen who are so intently interested in this bill and who have been rather bitter and severe in your condemnation and criticism of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Before this year is over, you gentlemen will be before this Congress asking for additional funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation to use in order to make additional loans to the cotton producers of the South. When that time comes, and you mark my prediction now, you will be here lauding and praising to the skies the activities, the conduct, and the record of the very agency that you are now seeking to crucify in order to pass this bill. That is exactly what I predict, and I am not a prophet. I imagine, however, that very thing will come to pass.

I was a friend of the Commodity Credit Corporation when it was created, and I helped create it. I am the friend of it now, because I think it has done a great work. I will be the friend of that agency when it comes before this Congress asking for additional money to carry on its great program.

The question has been asked, What has it done for the farmers? I ask, What has it done? I think it has done a great work. It has helped double the price of cotton. It has reduced the warehouse charges from 50 cents to 12½ cents per bale for the farmers. Is there anything in the record to show that the corporation is not the friend of the farmer? It is true we can dissolve it; we can liquidate its assets by an act of Congress and put an end to its activities. If it is as bad as contended by some who sponsor this bill, if the Corporation is acting in disregard of the interests of the cotton producers whom it was designed to help, then it should be abolished. We can say to it, "You shall not accept competitive bids"; we can say to it, "You shall not move a bale of cotton from where it is now stored"; we can say to it, "You shall not take into consideration the low rate of these warehouses that bid in certain localities"; we can say, "You shall not move any of this cotton from certain warehouses to certain other places"; we can say, "You shall freeze warehouse charges at their present level regardless of future economic conditions and regardless of lower rates which may be offered"; we can do all that if we want to destroy every bit of its initiative, every bit of judgment and discretion that it may have in the matter. If you want to tie it hand and foot, if you want to put it in a strait jacket, you can do that by passing this bill. I do not believe it ought to be done. It is not a question of power. It is a question of sound public policy and efficient administration. I for one do not believe that the Government of the United States and the cotton farmers of the South should be called upon to pay tribute and excessive and unreasonable storage rates to what may be an unsound and uneconomic warehouse condition.

I wish you would all read the report of the Secretary of Agriculture on this bill. In conclusion, may I say that the bill should be defeated. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, when two distinguished gentleman, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] differ on a question so violently as they appear to do on this one, the rest of us will just have to muddle along and do the best we can to figure it out for ourselves. There is no cotton grown in my district. There are no warehouses in my district. But I am located sufficiently close to the situation to know a little something about it.

I feel that the enactment of this bill is in the interest of the taxpayer, as the gentleman from Illinois so well said a few minutes ago; in the interest of the cotton growers, and in the interest of the warehouse business. And do not forget the fact that the warehouse business is an essential part of the cotton industry.

This bill does not break down the principle of competitive bidding.

With the greatest respect to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] may I say that this bill provides for competitive bidding. It provides that if the corporation is unable to enter into satisfactory contracts at a reasonable rate without advertising and competitive bidding, such contracts may be made pursuant to advertising and competitive bidding.

It does not, in my opinion, result in building up a monopoly. There are 1,700 warehouses located in the interior and 43 located at port towns or cities, about one-third of which are owned by one concern. If this bill is not passed, under the policy that is being pursued by the corporation, there will be a tendency to disorganize, undermine, and break down

this large group of 1,700 warehouses in the interior which are essential to the cotton industry, because it is these warehouses that the cotton growers must rely upon to render the service that is necessary to the sale of the product [applause], and instead will result in building up these few large warehouses in the port cities which are not in a position to render service to all the farmers which must inherently be located in the interior where the cotton is grown. So I cannot help but feel that the raising of these two questions, the breaking down of competitive bidding and the building up of monopoly, is entirely aside from the issue involved in this question.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not a fact that the port warehouses, to a large extent, are general warehouses and house other commodities than cotton, whereas the little warehouse in the interior is for one purpose alone in a large number of cases, perhaps in all cases; that is, the storage of cotton, so that cotton has to pay the entire cost of operation in such cases?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. That is true. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the low rates made possible, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], were made possible by negotiating contracts, exactly the same kind of contracts that will continue if this bill becomes a law.

May I suggest to you that in every Member's district where cotton is produced there are at least 1,000 actual cotton farmers to every 1 warehouseman; therefore, if this bill were against the interests of the actual farmer, Members of Congress from cotton districts would be voting against this bill. I suggest to you that outside of the Members representing the port districts I do not believe you will find a single Representative in Congress from a district where cotton is grown that is opposed to this bill and some Members who have ports in their district are supporting it. What better proof do you need that this bill is in the interest of the actual cotton farmer?

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] says that 1,000 interior warehouses bid for this reconcentrated cotton. That is his statement; I wrote it down. With all due respect to my good friend from Missouri, that statement is not in accordance with the facts. There were only 62 interior warehouses that bid for this reconcentrated cotton, and Anderson, Clayton Co., one of them the biggest cotton monopolist in all the world, bid for three-fifths of the cotton that was bid for by the 62 warehouses.

The gentleman from Missouri is on that great committee, the Temporary National Economic Committee. If he has not yet discovered that the group he is defending here is the biggest monopoly in the world on cotton, I say he should give more attention to his committee, or that committee should do a great deal more work.

In connection with the monopoly part of this bill, may I say that Anderson-Clayton is a $150,000,000 concern. They go into all the countries of the world. They have gone to South America and helped to develop the cotton industry there in competition with our own. That is the concern that will be favored if this bill does not pass, that great monopoly.

The gentleman from Missouri said the Federal Compress Co. is a big monopoly. They represent only about 7 percent in value and in assets of what the Anderson-Clayton company represents. Further, for the enlightenment and information of the gentleman from Missouri, Anderson-Clayton is one of the largest stockholders in the Federal Compress Co., the concern that he condemns the most. So on either side you can point your finger at monopoly, I concede that, but they represent only 30 percent of the cotton.

What happens to the 70 percent? They are the people about whom we are concerned, these little warehouse people representing 70 percent of the cotton. They are the ones who will be harmed and destroyed if this bill fails to become a law. In the interior we have 1,600 warehouses. It is inconceivable that there could be a trust with 1,600 warehouses. At the ports, however, there are only 33 warehouse concerns, so when you get this cotton out and send it to the ports you are taking it out of the hands of 1,600 and placing it in the hands of 33. Which is more likely to cause monopoly? Just ask yourself that question.

Mr. STEAGALL. Fourteen of the port warehouses are owned by one concern.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; 14 of the port warehouses are owned by one concern.

So I say the argument of the gentleman from Missouri is the case of a great big black pot calling a very small kettle black. That is what his argument is, because Anderson, Clayton Co. represents the biggest cotton business in all the world. If competitive bids are so good and should be put into effect, I wonder why the Commodity Credit Corporation has not put them into effect as to wheat and corn. The Government has the title to the corn that is pledged and it has the title to the wheat that is pledged. I submit that if the statute the gentleman from Missouri reads here with a great deal of enthusiasm applies to cotton it applies equally well to wheat and corn, so why does he not apply the same statute to wheat and corn? It is true that Anderson, Clayton is not interested in wheat and corn, it is interested only in cotton.

So ask yourself this question: If you have 1,000 bales of cotton in the interior—I asked this question of Dr. Robbins, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and he never did answer it; he refused to answer it because it would be against his interest to answer it—and you are asked to send this cotton to the ports, it will cost you $2.18 freight. You will have to go down in your pocket and dig up that much and pay it to the railroad company, cash on the barrel head first, to ship that cotton to the ports. That is the average rate. Some rates are much higher.

You ask the port man, "What will I get in return?" He says, "Oh, I will give you a 4-cent-a-bale cheaper rate per month on that cotton, 48 cents a year." You say, "How long will that rate last? Will it last long enough for me to get that freight back, that $2.18?" "Oh, no; I offer it for only 1 year, just 1 year, that is all." After you save 48 cents you still have your $2.18 invested.

How can you, exercising good judgment as an individual or as a representative of the Government, actually cause a condition like that? You cannot answer it. You would not dare answer it.

Suppose you have to ship this cotton back, and we know lots of it that will have to be shipped back. Do you know the rate you will have to pay? You ask the railroad man. "Suppose I ship my cotton down there and at the end of a year the Anderson Clayton Co., in whose warehouse my cotton is stored, want to double the rates on my cotton, or do like the steamship companies, raise the rate from 21 cents for 500 pounds to $2.25, or from 21 cents a bale to $2.25 a bale per month." That has already been done by the steamship companies whose space is getting scarce and will doubtless be done by the warehouses when space gets scarce. Suppose you ask the railroad company agent, "Suppose I get down there and they want to raise my rates as they have on the steamships and the storage facilities, how will I get my cotton back? What freight rate will I pay?" The railroad agent will tell you truthfully, and I challenge anyone to deny it on this floor, "That freight rate has not been fixed yet. We will have to wait until you want to ship it back and then we will fix the rate for you."

So you have two contingencies there, neither of which would justify you in entering into this contract. One is that the warehouse rate you are getting is good for 1 year only and the other is that after you get your cotton there and the rate goes up, you do not know what the freight rate will be if you want to return it to the interior.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman wants to deny what I have said, I will yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I want to ask just this question——

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have time to yield unless the gentleman wants to deny what I have just said. The gentleman is one of the best members of the committee and is well informed and he does not deny what I say and he cannot deny it.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I certainly do deny it in the way you put it. No farmer is going to be fool enough to ship 1,000 bales of cotton to a port if he knew he was not going to get a contract for over 1 year.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what the Commodity Credit Corporation is doing and I challenge you to deny it. The bids are for 1 more year.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It says nothing of the kind.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it does.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. You say the farmer would be a fool. What about the Commodity Credit Corporation—they must be fools too, according to your views.

Mr. PATMAN. And I say it is foolish for the farmers to do it and I say it would be foolish for the Commodity Credit Corporation to do it too.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairmen, will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. PATMAN. If you will ask a question on that point.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. What assurance have we that after this cotton is frozen in the interior they will not raise the rate?

Mr. PATMAN. They cannot do it.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Why not?

Mr. PATMAN. They have the right to fix the rates.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Who has?

Mr. PATMAN. The Commodity Credit Corporation, and the rate must be fair.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. They have nothing of the kind.

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely, it must be fair. In other words, if they cannot get a fair rate they can ship this cotton to the ports or any other place.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. They say that one-third of the cotton can go to the port anyway, and suppose you have a warehouse and your rate is not a good rate, Dr. Robbins can say, "Mr. FORD, I have the right to move one-third of the cotton down to the port and I am going to take part of that one-third out of your warehouse if you do not give me the right kind of a rate." He would have a club over your head and you could not do anything else.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. But you cannot store cotton without moving it and you are prohibited from moving it right here.

Mr. PATMAN. You know what I am saying is the truth and you stated the case when you said that a farmer would be a fool to move his cotton down there under those conditions. That is it exactly and I say the Commodity Credit Corporation would be just as foolish.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Would you say on your own authority that the word "move" here does not prohibit——

Mr. PATMAN. You are getting technical.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Does not prohibit the movement of that cotton under this bill? You cannot state that on your own authority and say it truthfully, and you know it.

Mr. PATMAN. You want to get off on a technicality because you cannot answer a reasonable argument. The reasonable argument is that you would not think about moving your own cotton down there under those circumstances. You would not think of moving, perhaps, a thousand bales of cotton to the port and pay $2.18 a bale, when, after you get it down there, you are going to save 48 cents the first year only, and at the end of the year they can charge you $2.25 a bale per month, and then they can tell you that if you do not like it, go back home with it. Instead of that, you will go to the railroad office and you will say, "How much freight do I have to pay?" The agent would say, "You will have to leave that to me; you may have to pay four or five dollars, because we do not have any rate going back"; you would not think of doing that. So I suggest to you that these interior warehouses are needed.

Then, in addition to that, this storage rate has been made possible only because of this large surplus of cotton. It used to be, when I was on the farm and worked in gins and warehouses in a cotton district, we had to pay 50 cents a month for storage and pay for insurance too, and that was cheap. Why? Because they only operated 2 or 3 months and they had to pay taxes for 12 months and running expenses and everything else, while they only got cotton for storage 2 or 3 months. It then went to the ports and was exported; but now when we have cotton 12 months in the year, we can reduce the rates from 50 cents down to 15 cents and even pay the insurance, notwithstanding the fact that this Congress passed a wage-and-hour law that forces them in some cases to double the wages they pay to their employees, and yet you are offering to give them no protection whatever. I cannot conceive of this Congress doing that after passing a law that forces all these extra charges upon the warehouseman. When we passed that law we did not say anything about competitive bids then. No; we said, "You have got to pay it"—and they are willing to pay it—and to reduce their charges from 50 cents to 15 cents. Can you say that after they pay that labor charge they have got to enter into competition with the biggest monopoly on earth or give up that cotton and restore those rates to 50 cents to the farmers when they bring it in this fall?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. In addition to the splendid argument the gentleman has made, does it not appeal to his reason that at this time of world crises, when we do not know what is going to happen in the next month or next six months, it would be unwise to move all the cotton from hundreds of interior warehouses and concentrate it at port warehouses, where it would occupy a very dangerous and precarious position if the worst should come to the worst?

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Suppose we should get this cotton there, the fifth columnists would commence their operations. What better place would they like to have the cotton concentrated than at these ports, so that they could destroy the cotton and prevent it from being made into gunpowder. It is easier to destroy it there than in the interior. Down here in Virginia they dedicated a powder plant the other day that uses 300 bales of cotton a day. Plants like that are going to be installed all over this Nation. They are going to use lots of cotton. Do you want that cotton at the ports where the enemy can easily destroy it?

Mr. STEAGALL. There was included in the appropriation bill yesterday a $100,000,000 appropriation for cotton.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is that for Government-owned cotton or current cotton?

Mr. PATMAN. It makes no difference.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. PATMAN. Does it make any difference out of which cotton gunpowder is made? Is it any better if it is made out of a farmer's cotton than if it is made out of Government-owned cotton? That is just as logical as some of the other arguments that the gentleman has made. The gentleman asks, Whose bill is this? I will tell you whose bill it is. It is in the interest of the smallest farmer of the Nation, the farmer who makes one or two bales of cotton, eking out a bare existence with the hardest kind of labor. This bill is in his interest. He is not making $1,400 a year or $1,000 a year. He is making $200 a year, supporting a large family on that. Are you going to penalize him more? This bill is in the interest of the smallest farmer in the country, and they are actual dirt farmers that appeared before our committee in support of this bill. There was one farmer from the district that I have the honor to represent. He shipped part of his cotton to Houston and put it into a port warehouse and kept the rest of it at home, and he has been receiving $2.50 for that at the home warehouse, while he gets only half that much at the port. Yet you say that it is worth as much to him at the port. That is absolutely not true, and those cases before the committee proved that it is not true. I ask the gentlemen in all sincerity to vote for this bill and pass it by an overwhelming vote in the interest of the cotton farmers of the South. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says that every representative of the small farmer who appeared was in favor of this bill. A dirt farmer who appeared before the committee and showed much intelligence in respect to facts and figures was Mr. Williamson, who is a cotton grower of Lake Providence, La. This is what Mr. Williamson had to say:

> The income of cotton farmers is already inadequate, as you know. Please register these figures in your minds: The cash per capita income of farmers in Alabama in 1939 was $81; with Government payments added and all grants included, about $105. To put it another way, the average income per farm, including Government payments, was less than $500 in the cotton-growing State of Alabama. The other cotton-growing States are comparable to Alabama, but slightly better in sections where other crops are grown along with cotton. Every nickel you take out of that meager income makes it just a little harder for the family to live.

Every penny you take away from this farmer and pay for warehousing is a

penny less to live on. Mr. Williamson goes on to say:

No one can protect these low-income farmers from excessive storage charges on loan cotton except the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and we should have a quorum present to listen to the enlightening arguments which are to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MAY. And on that, Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. STEAGALL and Mr. WOLCOTT to act as tellers.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 8 and noes 54.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count to ascertain whether a quorum is present.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that 14 Members have left the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count to ascertain if a quorum is present. [After counting.] Eighty-six Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Allen, Ill.	Hart	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Andrews	Healey	Plauché
Baldwin	Heidinger	Ramsay
Barnes	Hendricks	Rankin, Mont.
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bloom	Hope	Rivers
Bolles	Howell	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Jacobsen	Sacks
Buck	Jenks, N. H.	Scanlon
Burch	Jensen	Schaefer, Ill.
Byrne	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Keefe	Secrest
Casey, Mass.	Kelly, Ill.	Shafer, Mich.
Celler	Kilburn	Shanley
Connery	Kirwan	Shannon
Crosser	Knutson	Sheridan
Curtis	Lambertson	Simpson
Delaney	Lea	Stearns, N. H.
Domengeaux	McArdle	Stevenson
Fitzpatrick	McLean	Stratton
Flaherty	Maciejewski	Taylor
Flannagan	Mills, La.	Thill
Gavagan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Geyer, Calif.	O'Connor	Wadsworth
Gifford	O'Day	Ward
Gossett	Osmers	Weiss
Green	Paddock	White
Guyer, Kans.	Peterson, Ga.	
Hall, Leonard W.		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 262, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 345 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, S. 262, the bill under consideration, passed the committee of the Senate and the Senate unanimously. There are six members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House who are from cotton-growing States. Every one of those six members voted for this bill.

I think the Commodity Credit Corporation has done a good job, especially in loans to the farmers—the cotton growers, the wheat growers, and the corn growers. They have done a good job in the warehouse business. They admitted that the reduction for carrying cotton was because of the dead stock that was not moved within a year or so.

We do not expect, nor are we trying, to change the manner in which they have operated. In spite of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] said, last fall was the first time they asked for bids, and in the call they said that the lowest bidder would receive the cotton. That means that the little warehouses in my district and in other districts similarly situated will lose all of their cotton.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who is against this bill, stated that he thought 12½ cents was low enough for the little cotton warehouseman in my district, and others similarly located, and that they should have their cotton. If it is submitted to bids, the Commodity Credit Corporation is compelled to deliver the cotton to the man who bids lowest.

Not only that, but the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation in New Orleans less than a year ago stated that 12½ cents was a very reasonable rate for carrying this cotton. He was asked that question before our committee. He neither admitted it nor denied it, but said that perhaps he said it. The expert who represents the farmers of the country, Mr. Williams, when I asked him the question if 12½ cents was an exorbitant rate for carrying cotton in my district said "no," and when asked the question if he wanted to see the cotton moved from the warehouses in my district and other districts similarly situated, he said "no."

Why should the little fellow, who has nothing to do with the fight between Anderson Clayton and the Federal Warehouse Co., suffer from this fight? I am informed that the Federal Warehouse and Anderson Clayton only have 30 percent of the cotton. These two great cotton powers in the country should not control to the disadvantage of the small interior warehouses.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. How many large concerns are there and how many small concerns?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am coming to that. There are something over 1,650 interior warehouses in this country. There are 45 port warehouses in this country, and I am reliably informed that 6 or 7 concerns control the entire 45 warehouses at the ports.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. The small interior warehouses are owned by a number of individuals, are they not?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. In my district, within 15 miles of my residence, 75 or 80 cotton farmers own that warehouse, and I am here speaking for the farmers of my district, who are not 75 percent but 100 percent of the cotton growers. [Applause.] They are in favor of this bill because they realize they will not have any cotton otherwise. Then my good friend, who has never seen a cotton field and very few bales of cotton, if any, tries to convince the Members of this House that all producers of cotton are for this bill. I understand, of course, that in Louisiana the members from the rural sections are for this bill. The two Members who live in New Orleans are against the bill. They do not grow cotton in New Orleans. Even Huey Long was not smart enough to grow cotton in New Orleans. [Laughter.]

No one can refute this. The bill passed unanimously in the other body. Every man who represents a cotton rural section in Congress today is for this bill, because he knows the little fellow and the little cotton warehouseman will not have any cotton unless this bill is passed.

We are not doing anything except what the Commodity Credit Corporation did until last November; and I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] they never did call for bids before November 1940—they did it by negotiation. But now I want to get down to a discussion of the bill:

First, it provides that contracts may be made annually between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the warehouse companies within the period from July 15 to September 15 of each year.

Second, the act provides that the Corporation may enter into such contracts without competitive bids provided it is able to obtain through negotiations with the warehouse companies, satisfactory reasonable rates; otherwise the Corporation may advertise for competitive bids from any territory where it might be able to obtain such competitive bids.

How can anybody object to that? More than that, while I am on this point, I asked the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation why he objected to this bill. He said he objected to it because they might raise the price from 12½ to 18 cents. I said: "Suppose we put a provision in this bill fixing the rate at 12½ cents?" He said they would still fight the bill, still be against the bill. We did not, therefore, offer the amendment, if they were going to fight it anyway.

The law leaves it to the Corporation to determine what may be reasonable and satisfactory rates. It sets a standard in section 3 by providing that consideration shall be given to the rates in effect in 1940. This, however, does not mean that the Corporation shall fix the 1940 rates as the only rates acceptable to them. It merely means that the Corporation shall consider in arriving at its conclusion as to what

are reasonable and satisfactory rates, the rates in effect in 1940. If the Corporation is unable to obtain satisfactory and reasonable rates and satisfactory warehousing facilities in that manner, it may advertise for bids and contract accordingly.

Third, the law provides that cotton shall be stored at or near its source of production, or at the place where it is commonly or ordinarily stored prior to manufacture or export. This provision would make available to the Corporation all warehouse facilities in the producing area and the ports.

Right here let me state that if you move this cotton from the little warehouses in the areas where the cotton is produced, if you destroy their warehouses, how can the farmers in those communities obtain a loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation? If you force them to carry their cotton 50 or 75 miles they would naturally sell it at a lower price. It is not fair and it is not right. This is a long-range program through which we are trying to help the helpless man, the little cotton grower; and it helps in this way, that the dead-stock cotton owned by the Government helps keep down the expenses for the cotton grower in each year, because the Government-owned cotton will not be handled perhaps in some time and the expense will not be as great as it is with those growers who perhaps will handle their cotton in many instances within a few months after the cotton is warehoused.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Fourth, the purpose of the law is to continue in effect the system heretofore utilized by the Corporation in negotiating rates with the industry. That system is shown of record to have produced highly satisfactory results, both for the producer and the Government. In fact, it has brought down the handling and storage charges on the Government cotton and the producers' cotton by more than 50 percent. Prior to the loan program the producers were charged as much as 50 cents per bale for receiving and handling during the first month and 25 cents per bale thereafter. Today he is obtaining that service for 15 cents per bale, including insurance, whereas his prior rate did not include insurance. It would seem to be almost criminal to discard a system that has produced results of that character, both for the Government and the producers. The Government rates have come down from 25 to 18, to 15, and to 12½ cents per bale per month. Those of us in the cotton-producing States recognize these benefits as of great value to the producer and desire to preserve the system which has produced such satisfactory results.

The bill provides that in determining what constitutes reasonable rates the Commodity Credit Corporation must consider, but need not prescribe as reasonable, the general level of prevailing rates at the time it enters into its contract. It may also, under the act, take into consideration whether or not the cotton is compressed or uncompressed, and the type of compression, and fix rates accordingly.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, in asking for bids on cotton, should have submitted calls for separate bids for compressed cotton and flat bale cotton. You probably can store three bales of compressed cotton in the same space that it would take for a flat bale. So, the warehouse charge should be considerably lower on a round bale, and the freight rate, of course, would be much lower on a round bale. This certainly was a very strange procedure to the cotton growers in my section of the country. The cotton mills prefer and will give more for flat bales. In the southeast 85 percent to 90 percent of the cotton is of the flat-bale type. It is admitted by the Commodity Credit Corporation that the mills want the flat-bale type. One or two of the large warehousemen who own interior warehouses as well as port warehouses have suggested to me the fair thing to the interior warehouses would be to submit separate bids for the round bale and the flat bale. If this were done a great deal of the injustice would be corrected. Certainly the interior warehouses in my section would suffer much less. Now, why should the Commodity Credit Corporation pay as much for storage for round bales when the mills want flat bales and also the carrying charges and warehouse rates are much cheaper for the compressed cotton.

Probably the most controversial section of the act is section 4. It has been charged that this section creates a monopoly and would prevent the Government from moving cotton from interior to port locations in order to take advantage of lower rates available at such port locations. I cannot agree with this contention, and in order to make it perfectly clear, I have rewritten section 4 and have incorporated into it the provisions which have been borrowed from the Bankhead Act. What section 4 really says, and what the language means, is as follows:

The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving cotton acquired by it from the warehouse in which it was located when title was acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or from the warehouse in which it is now located, unless the cotton would be subject to removal because of congestion and lack of storage facilities, and the local warehouse certifies such fact and requests the Commodity Credit Corporation to move the cotton for reconcentration to some other point, or when the Commodity Credit Corporation determines such loan cotton is improperly warehoused and subject to damage, or, if uninsured, or if any of the terms of the loan agreement are violated, or if carrying charges are substantially in excess of the average of carrying charges available elsewhere, and the local warehouse, after notice, declines to reduce such charges: *Provided, however,* That if prices satisfactory to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the storage of compressed cotton are submitted by port reconcentration warehouses, not more than one-third of all Government-owned cotton may be stored in such reconcentration warehouses: *Provided further,* That in the reconcentration of such Government-held cotton the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, wherever practicable, refrain from moving cotton from smaller warehouses, storing 7,500 bales or less of Government cotton.

That section effectively preserves the present method of handling the Government-owned and Government-loan cotton.

First. The Government may undertake to negotiate contracts at reasonable rates and, if reasonable rates are not obtained, may advertise for bids. Under the bids received the Government could calculate whether or not the rates were higher than the available rates elsewhere. If so, section 4 would effectively provide a remedy whereby the Corporation could move its cotton in order to obtain reasonable rates. The only condition precedent to such removal would be the refusal of the warehouse to accept what the Commodity Credit Corporation determined to be a reasonable rate.

Second. Under the provisions of section 4, as it actually reads, as I have quoted it, cotton may be moved from its present location by reason of congestion, improperly warehoused cotton, uninsured cotton, violation of the terms of the loan agreement, and if carrying charges are excessive.

Under the terms of this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation could move Government-owned cotton in order to provide adequate facilities for the producers' loan cotton. Under the competitive bidding system, a warehouse could bid to hold the dead Government stock and thus deprive the producers of needed facilities at origin.

Third. The Government, under this section, may move a sufficient quantity of the Government-owned cotton so that one-third of that stock will be located at ports and two-thirds at interior locations. This provision is in addition to the provisions relating to congestion, and so forth.

The amount of cotton that could be moved under that provision has been calculated as follows: Total Government-owned stocks—all locations—6,199,915 bales, one-third of which equals 2,070,000 bales. The present stocks at ports of Government-owned cotton, 1,552,000 bales. Additional movement under the provisions of section 4, 522,000 bales, increasing the port stocks to more than 2,000,000 bales of Government-owned cotton and to more than 2,400,000 bales of Government-owned and Government-loan stocks.

Certainly, in view of the present condition of our export market, and the probable uses to be made of this cotton, no more should be moved than that authorized by the bill. Indeed, I am of the opinion that none of the Government-owned cotton should be moved from its present location, because I am of the opinion that we should begin now to distribute much of that cotton to the needy poor of the country in connection with our mattress and comfort program.

The bill, instead of creating a monopoly, gives to the Government agency power and authority to protect small industry and to see that the small communities receive a fair share of the business growing out of the storage of Gov-

ernment-owned and Government-loan cotton.

Competitive bidding is itself the avenue to monopoly and centralization of wealth. Only the large and powerful can possibly survive under such a system. Obviously the small interior communities, with their higher insurance rates and their small volume of business cannot survive in competition with port locations having volume that runs into the millions of bales and storage capacity equal to the volume. In addition, such facilities have low insurance costs and are thereby in position to underbid almost any of the small interior communities seeking to participate in the distribution of wealth growing out of the production and distribution of cotton.

Under the present system which this act seeks to preserve, more than 50 percent of the cotton is in the possession of small interior warehouse companies and located in small interior communities. The purpose of the competitive bids, called for by the Department, was to move at least 2,000,000 more bales to the ports. It therefore occurs to me that it is the purpose of the Government to further foster centralization of the business and to create monopoly.

The matter of storing cotton at interior warehouse points has an important bearing upon the life of small interior communities. The cotton-warehouse industry is sometimes the only industry in the small communities. The record shows that the warehouse industry in 1940 paid an average tax of 21 cents per bale for every bale of cotton handled and that the taxes paid for a 9-year average equaled 16 cents per bale. It shows that the wages for 1940 were 72 cents per bale for each bale handled and on the 9-year average, 57 cents per bale.

An important thing shown by the record is the effect of the wage-hour law. Wages jumped nearly 100 percent following the effective date of that act. Combining the 1940 taxes and wages we find that the storage of cotton in interior communities means an average of 90 cents per bale taxes and wages. On the basis of an average year of 30,000 bales, which is approximately the average for the small interior communities, this means $27,000 in wages and taxes. This is small when compared with the large industrial centers, but it is a big item to the small community in the way of taxes and wages.

Of the 8,231,000 bales of cotton involved in the call for competitive bids, the Department actually received bids on only 3,377,000 bales to be moved from one location to another, and 2,741,000 of these bales were included in bids to move the cotton from interior locations to port locations, the principal bidder being one company in the Southeast. Already the ports have the lion's share of the business. The 8,231,000 bales are distributed 76 percent interior, 24 percent at the ports. The interior stock is located in 907 communities. The port stocks are located in 17 port communities.

The bill before you has as its major purpose the retention of the cotton at interior locations and to prevent the further enhancement of port stocks to the detriment of the interior.

The evidence in the hearings will disclose that there is 96 percent of the population in the communities where cotton is grown, compared to 4 percent of population in the port warehouse communities.

Without a warehouse near the scene of production the producers would be unable to obtain Government loans, and these warehouses must be preserved. Many farmers would sell their cotton at reduced prices if the cotton had to be taken a long distance for storage.

The location of Government-owned cotton in interior warehouses is now serving as a basis to bring down the cost of handling and storage on cotton not owned by the Government but with title in the producer. If the dead stock is carried away, naturally the cost of carrying the other cotton will be more. Therefore, in the end the producer will be materially injured by being forced to pay large warehouse charges.

The President of the Commodity Credit Corporation admitted that the Government stocks at interior locations had enabled the warehouses serving the farmers to reduce their charges on current cotton, and thus this is splendid argument for supporting S. 262.

If the 6,000,000 bales of cotton had been moved to port warehouses for the purpose of sampling and grading, in order to deliver 600,000 bales to the British Government, the cost would have been $2 per bale, and this exorbitant sum was saved by classifying the cotton in the interior warehouses and other warehouses storing same. The Government claims that a saving by competitive bids would amount to not more than $1,800,000. Therefore you can see that it probably would have taken 3 years or more for this saving to pay transportation and other incidental cost.

It is my understanding the Commodity Credit Corporation thought that under their proposed system of bids about 2,000,000 bales, and probably not more than 1,500,000 bales, would be moved from the interior warehouses. Under the bids submitted, one company in the Southeast placed a bid for about 1,500,000 bales.

Only 270,450 bales were included in the bids of interior warehouses other than one large interior warehouse in the Southeast.

Now you can readily see this cotton would be carried from small warehouses. The Commodity Credit Corporation would be forced under their offer of bids to deliver same to the lowest bidder. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, in speaking against the bill which is now being considered by the Committee, I do not wish to give the impression that I am not entirely sympathetic to the problems of the cotton farmers of the South. In the short time that I have been a Member of this body I have voted for every measure intended to aid the farmers of this country. The economy of the entire South is still largely dependent upon the profitable growing and marketing of cotton, and I would be one of the last Members to oppose any measure that might contribute to such profitable growing of cotton.

A close reading of the hearing in the Senate and the House committees, however, I believe will convince any Member of this House that this bill cannot help the cotton farmers, but may have just the opposite effect and cause increased warehousing costs, which must be borne by the farmers.

In effect, this bill will remove the control of warehousing of cotton from the Commodity Credit Corporation, the agency which under the law now holds title to more than 6,000,000 bales of cotton, and we must determine whether or not such a policy should be adopted by the Congress. In making that decision, it seems to me that it is in order to review some of the evidence that was heard by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

To begin with, Dr. Carl B. Robbins, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, asserted that it was only a few years ago, August 17, 1939, that the Government was able to secure title to approximately 7,000,000 bales of cotton on which loans were past due. It was then pointed out that because the Government was able, after acquiring title, to move the cotton freely without restriction, that a reduction of approximately 40 percent was achieved in storage rates for farmers. This reduction has resulted in the savings of about $10,000,000 to the Government and the farmers in a little more than a year. In late 1940 the Government thought that additional savings could be effected and called for competitive bids for the storage of cotton. These bids, if accepted, will result in the savings of about $2,000,000 per year. In order to prevent the movement of about a million and a half bales of cotton under the bids, Senate bill 262 was introduced.

Now it must be assumed that the Department of Agriculture, which, through the Commodity Credit Corporation owns and manages this cotton, will be given some consideration when discussing a bill of this nature.

Secretary Wickard has this to say about the bill. I quote the last three paragraphs of his report:

> The excess profits that many warehousemen made at the expense of farmers and the Government, when restrictions were effective on the movement of cotton now owned by the Government, have demonstrated the conditions that could be expected under the restrictive provisions of S. 262. Competition in the storage of cotton is destroyed and monopolistic conditions substituted whenever the possible movement of cotton is legally prohibited. There seems to be no reason to doubt that increased and excessive charges to farmers and the Government would result unavoidably under the provisions of this bill, because it would deny those localities, which normally store more cotton than they produce, the right to enter into competition and to utilize their established facilities. For instance, one of the first effects of the bill would be to prohibit the acceptance of the bids now in hand for the storage of some old crop cotton at rates that would reduce the carrying charges to the Government and farmers by approximately 15 percent, or $5,000 per day.
>
> In view of the fact that the apparent effects of S. 262 would unfortunately be to create special monopolistic conditions in the storage

of cotton and to burden farmers and the Government with increased and excessive storage costs, it is the opinion of the Department that this bill should be not enacted.

Many of the proponents of this bill have referred to the shipping and storing facilities at the Gulf ports as if they were the stepchildren of the cotton industry. They seem to forget that these facilities have been as important as any other branch of the industry to the marketing and selling of cotton. The important thing to bear in mind is that this bill, in effect, grants a subsidy to the interior warehouses. The ports are not asking for a subsidy or for favorable consideration. They simply ask the privilege to bid on this cotton. The Commodity Credit Corporation has no interest in port or interior warehouses. It simply maintains that it has the right, as does every Government department, to ask for bids and to award to the lowest bidders in order to avoid excessive charges to the Government and to the farmers.

The proponents further assert that the reasons that the ports are able to offer low bids is because many warehouses are now empty because of the curtailment of foreign trade. This may be true, but if so, that should be the basis for allowing the ports more favorable consideration during times of stress, so that these facilities will be available when the war is over and foreign trade is resumed. But there is no basis in fact for this contention. In the first place, this is the first time that the Commodity Credit Corporation has asked for bids. It may well be, because there are no figures to contradict it, that the port facilities could have bid as cheaply several years ago. In addition to this, the proponents maintain that the interior warehouses will have to raise their rates if some cotton is moved out, thereby leaving vacant space, but in the same breath maintain that the ports are able to bid lower because of the same type of vacant space. On the same argument, vacant space should result in lower rates in the interior.

I read with interest the testimony of N. C. Williamson, president of the American Cotton Cooperative Association, a group composed of more than a quarter of a million cotton farmers. He said in part, page 448 of the hearing:

> Now, I would like to say a few words about the unfairness of the results of this bill, if passed. I ask you whether it is fair to farmers to pave the way for bringing back the excess storage charges with which they were burdened before the Government got some of the cotton free of legal restrictions, and had authority to move the cotton? I ask you whether it is fair to enable these warehousemen to make excess profits at the expense of the taxpayers? I ask you whether it is fair to freeze, as the bill would, the present distribution of cotton storage among individual warehouses and communities on whatever basis happens to prevail at the present time, with some warehouses in some communities overcrowded and congested with Government stocks of cotton and with other warehouses having little or none? * * * This bill is like a one-way street. All the protection is for the warehousemen and none for the farmers.
>
> We farmers do not want to see competitive bidding destroyed, as it might be done under this bill, in buying services and supplies for our Government. Under the competitive bidding rule, we as citizens and taxpayes, have some assurance that Government buying will not be done at excessive prices and that everybody will have a fair chance to participate in the business.

To the same effect is the statement of D. W. Brooks, manager of the Georgia Cotton Corporation, composed of both farmers and warehousemen. He said in part, page 459 of the hearings:

> I would like to state here that if this bill is defeated it will lower the income of the warehouses which are operated by farmers in Georgia, several thousand dollars per year, because I happen to know that they placed bids which are lower than the present rates, and if we were solely warehousemen we would, naturally, be in favor of the bill; however, we believe that the passage of the bill will cost our members, as a whole, in the State of Georgia, many times this amount of money in years to come, and therefore it is not for the best interest of our members, as a whole, that the bill pass.
>
> We believe that the passage of this bill will take away from the Commodity Credit Corporation the bargaining power which it has had in the past, and that soon thereafter storage rates will be advanced to a point where farmers will again be paying exorbitant rates, and it is for this reason that we are opposed to it. We feel that the Commodity Credit Corporation must be given discretion in the movement of the cotton and then be held responsible by the Congress to see that their actions benefit the farmers and do not injure them.

As a matter of fact, it was shown that the greater portion of this cotton would remain in the warehouses that it is now housed in at reduced rates, and not more than 10 percent of the total cotton, including that owned other than by the Government, would be moved to other locations.

It does not appear that this bill, to subsidize interior warehouses, because, in effect, that is what it does, can be justified. To the contrary, it has been shown that the enactment of the bill may result in greater costs to the farmer, in creating monopolistic control of the entire industry. The savings which have been effected have come through the Commodity Credit Corporation, yet this bill would now deprive that agency of the right to select the storage facilities for its own cotton. And more important, the bill would admittedly prevent a savings to the taxpayers of approximately $5,000 per day, by the simple denial of the well-established and time-honored fair plan of competitive bidding. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. If this bill is passed, will it not freeze all of the Government-owned and Government-loaned cotton in the interior, giving them an absolute monopoly on the storing of that cotton and enabling them to charge anything they want?

Mr. BOGGS. That is my impression of what would happen under the bill, and in addition to that the Commodity Credit Corporation, Dr. Robbins, and the Secretary of Agriculture in their report stated just exactly that.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. In what respect is this operation different from that of the Commodity Credit Corporation of last fall?

Mr. BOGGS. I do not know whether this changes it or not. I believe we have approximately the same system. There has been some talk about that on the floor. I read the hearings with a great deal of interest. Dr. Robbins pointed out that the reason the system used last fall was adopted was because the Commodity Credit Corporation was not ready to begin the system of competitive bids; and in connection with that, the reason we have not had competitive bids before—and that point was raised this afternoon—is because the Government did not acquire title to this cotton until 1939. This is only the second year that they have had the privilege of warehousing and storing this cotton as they see fit.

I think it is unfair for the House to pick out any one group of facilities and say that this group is bad and the other group is good. The ports are as important to the cotton industry of the South as any other feature of that industry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yiled 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT.]

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, after listening all day to the arguments pro and con on this measure, I am firmly convinced that it is an ill wind which blows no good to anybody, and in spite of all the efforts of the proponents to dress this bill up in a party and seductive dress, it is nothing more than a crazy quilt which will not cover all the tassels it is intended to protect.

A great deal has been said about cotton stored in interior warehouses. After hearing the gentlemen who sponsor this bill speak, I am almost moved to tears as I see the emptiness of those little interior warehouses, where there will not be a single bale of cotton stored, according to their story. But let us look at the facts as they really are. I am interested, not in the loan cotton, nor am I interested in the current crop, but I am interested in the Government-owned cotton, the cotton that the gentleman from Maine owns, the cotton that the gentleman from Oregon owns, and the cotton that the gentleman from Louisiana owns. It is owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and as such it is your cotton, it is my cotton, and I am interested in seeing that cotton stored at the most economical price that can be made available to the taxpayers.

I want to point to this chart so that you may get a clear picture of what is in my mind. The only cotton in which I am interested is the cotton involved in the 1934 to 1937 loans, totaling 6,183,000 bales. That is the cotton we are discussing. The other cotton is of a later date. It is the loan cotton in which the farmer has an equity.

Let us break this down and see exactly what we intend to do. In round figures there are 6,200,000 bales of this Govern-

ment-owned cotton. Of this amount, approximately 1,500,000 bales are now stored in the port warehouses, which leaves approximately 4,700,000 bales. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not intend to wipe out all the cotton stored in the interior. Nobody is so foolish as to even think of such a thing. All they want to do is to remove out of that lot approximately 1,700,000 bales of long-term storage cotton into the port warehouses and allow all the rest of that cotton under the other loans to remain in the interior, allowing the interior warehouses to get their share. The port warehouses do not set up any sort of monopoly; they do not set up any sort of "taking everything and bringing it down to the ports," leaving the interior warehouses vacant. That is the farthest from their mind. When all is said and done; when all the cotton is moved that should be moved, there will still be a total of some 2,650,000 bales of cotton in the interior, in addition to the current crop and in addition to the loan cotton.

I have heard gentlemen on the floor today praise and exalt to the highest the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation for the splendid work which they have done in the interest of the farmer and the little man. They have told you how the price of cotton has soared; they have told you how the price of storage has been beaten down; and they have justly given credit to the Commodity Credit Corporation for doing all that. They dress the Commodity Credit Corporation in the raiment of a Good Samaritan, but in the next instance they come around and tell you that that great benefactor, that has so assisted the cotton man, the cotton farmer, the producer, and the little warehouseman, has now suddenly turned out to be a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, and they tell you that it is attempting to do something now which will damage the little farmer and the little warehouseman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am frank to say there has not been a pound of cotton grown in my district since the day of Peter Stuyvesant, neither are there any storage facilities there, consequently this bill does not directly affect my people. However, I am looking at the bill from the standpoint of possible economic dislocation. Are not the warehousemen about whom we are talking in fact a substantial part of the small cotton communities? Your merchants, your bankers, your cotton growers, your horse traders, all of them have kicked in and contributed to the building of these small warehouses on the strength of the promise of the Commodity Credit Corporation, either actual or implied, that this cotton would be stored there and that that arrangement would be continued. Consequently, would it not dislocate the economic picture in many of the small rural communities where these warehouses have been built?

Mr. HÉBERT. No; definitely not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that one of these small warehouse companies of which the gentleman speaks was paid $8,500,000 for storage up to July 31, 1939, and that it has 60 big branches. It is one of the largest combinations, I might go so far as to say combinations in restraint of trade, in the United States. The gentleman need have no fear whatever about that great combination's being thrown out of business by the shipping of 1,500,000 bales of cotton out of a total of 11,000,000 bales. They will survive. This bill does not destroy the little warehouses in the interior. It is not here in their interest. It is here in the interest of these combination warehouses.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is just the observation I wanted to make.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. With regard to the observation of the gentleman from New York, may I say that the facilities of the interior have tripled in the last 6 years. In 1934 they had stocks of about 5,000,000 bales. They have increased their facilities in the last 5 years from 5,000,000 bales to 15,000,000 bales. They have built up their stocks to 11,000,000 bales. This bill is just for the purpose of allowing them another perhaps 4,000,000 bales to fill up these warehouses which were built by the industry in anticipation of these stocks, and it has nothing whatever to do with the warehousing of the farmer's cotton.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman makes a proper observation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. In answer to the gentleman's statement that these interior warehouses have been built since 1934, may I ask the gentleman if that was not the time that the port warehouses refused to go in with the Government program and the warehousemen of the interior were forced by necessity to construct these interior warehouses to comply with the Government program.

Mr. HÉBERT. No; the gentleman from Texas is in error there, and particularly with reference to New Orleans. The city of New Orleans has always cooperated and has always offered its facilities at a reasonable rate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Legislation was first enacted guaranteeing these warehouses protection, and based on that special and specific subsidy legislation they went ahead and expanded into the interior. That was the basis of their capital structure, as the record clearly shows.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the port warehouses did not refuse to comply with the Government program in the storage of cotton in 1934?

Mr. HÉBERT. As far as I am familiar with the situation, the city of New Orleans did not refuse to comply and did not refuse to cooperate.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Why is it that the only opposition to this bill comes from people who probably never have seen a stalk of cotton and from people who have big Anderson-Clayton port warehouses in their districts?

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not believe the gentleman has made a proper observation, with all due respect to him.

Mr. PACE. Can the gentleman point out anybody else who is opposed to the bill?

Mr. HÉBERT. Why is it the only support for the bill comes from gentlemen who have one or two warehouses in their districts? We are all interested in our own districts, in trying to protect our people and at the same time save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But do not overlook the fact that the people of the United States, the people of my district and of all the northern and southern States, own 6,183,000 bales of cotton today, and soon they are going to own another 4,800,000 bales, so we of the North and the South and the East and the West are in the cotton business, whether the cotton farmer of the South knows it or not.

Mr. HÉBERT. I made that observation at the beginning of my remarks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman realizes that one of the main witnesses against this bill testified that if a person wanted to go into the warehouse business now, at the present labor rate, at the present insurance rate, and at the present tax rate, he could not construct a warehouse and carry the cotton for 12½ cents and make any money.

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not know the witness to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will ask the gentleman that question.

Mr. HÉBERT. No; I do not know that that to be a fact.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the gentleman believe that is so?

Mr. HÉBERT. Not being a warehouseman, I cannot answer.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am not talking about the fellow who already has a warehouse, I am talking about it from

a business standpoint. Is this Government of ours going to say, "We are not going to allow you to make a profit"?

Mr. HÉBERT. In answer to the gentleman may I say that I do not know the warehouse business from the foundation and its cost of operation, but I do know that I will take the word of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture, who have done so much for the farmer, who are doing so much for the farmer, and who want to continue to do so much for the farmer, and when they tell me it is a bad bill I am willing to take their word for it and go along with them. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have to go over to the other side to get my time upon this important measure. I rank third on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I asked the chairman today to yield me a little time. Because my views do not coincide with his, he refused to do so, and, therefore, I had to go over and ask the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to yield me a few minutes in order that I might discuss this measure, not with any heat, because I have no feeling about it, but in order that I might explain to the committee why I cast my vote against this bill when it was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee.

At the outset I may say that I have never raised any cotton; that there is no cotton raised in my district; that there is no port warehouse or interior warehouse in my district; and I know very little about the cotton industry, and I know very little about the storing of cotton, but because I know very little about the cotton industry and the storing of cotton, that certainly does not prevent me from advocating plain principles and policies of government that I think should be pursued.

The purpose of this bill, of course—and it does it—is to freeze the cotton in the interior warehouses. I am not interested in that. I do not care whether it is frozen there or whether it goes to the port warehouses. That means nothing to me or my people. I am but an observer of what is going on, but the principle that is involved, I think, is a very vital governmental principle, and I do not think we are justified in adopting that principle contained in this bill, even if it were to attain some of the splendid results the gentlemen claim it will accomplish.

Now, what do they say? What does the majority of the committee say in this committee report?—

> We believe the inauguration of competitive bidding would bring disaster, confusion, and losses both to the farmers and to the Government; that such bids, whether so intended or not, are in the interest of the large port storage facilities and equally hurtful to the interior warehouses.

In other words, if this beneficent principle of competitive bidding will be hurtful to the interior warehouses we are justified in repealing a policy of government that has been established and its wisdom proven by time.

I want to place that in parallel columns with the policy that has been adopted by the Government of the United States in Revised Statutes, section 3709. Someone may say that we have not followed it, but how does that affect the wisdom of a principle, simply because we have not followed it? It is a wise principle, it is a just principle, and it is a principle that the Government should follow—the principle of competitive bidding in all purchases of goods for the Government, and this is what section 3709 provides:

> All purchases and contracts for supplies or services, in any of the departments of the Government, except for personal services, shall be made by advertising a sufficient time previously for proposals respecting the same, when the public exigencies do not require the immediate delivery of the articles, or performance of the service. When immediate delivery or performance is required by the public exigency, the articles or service required may be procured by open purchase or contract, at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold, or such services engaged, between individuals.

I think this is a wise principle of government and I think the Government should follow that principle, but suppose in some instances the Government does not follow that principle, does that weaken the principle? Does that destroy the efficacy of this procedure? Of course, it does not.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. No; I am not going to yield now.

Now, what is the history of this legislation? This bill provides, and this is the gist of the whole thing:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving cotton acquired by it from the warehouse in which it was located when title was acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or from the warehouse in which it is now located unless the cotton would be subject to removal under the act entitled "An act relating to the manner of securing written consent for the reconcentration of cotton under section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

Now, what is that section 383 (b)? It reads as follows:

> Cotton held as security for any loan heretofore or hereafter made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not hereafter be reconcentrated without the written consent of the producer or borrower.

This states a principle that is fundamental in the law, that the owner of personal property has control and direction over it. He can place it where he pleases. He can withdraw it when he pleases and the Government, although it had made a loan upon it, could not withdraw this cotton without the consent of the owner or the borrower, but then the law was amended in order to protect the interests of the mortgagee or the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it was provided—

> That in cases where there is congestion and lack of storage facilities and the local warehouse certifies such fact and requests the Commodity Credit Corporation to move the cotton for reconcentration to some other point or when the Commodity Credit Corporation determines such loan cotton is improperly warehoused and subject to damage, or if uninsured, or if any of the terms of the loan agreement are violated, or if carrying charges are substantially in excess of the average of carrying charges available elsewhere, and the local warehouse, after notice, declines to reduce such charges, such written consent as provided in this amendment need not be obtained; and consent to movement under any of the conditions of this proviso may be required in future loan agreements.

That was put in there to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation, the mortgagee of the cotton. It was to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation in giving them the opportunity to store the cotton in a safe place, to remove it, if it was not properly stored, to preserve the mortgaged property. That equitable title of the Commodity Credit Corporation has ripened into a legal title. The Commodity Credit Corporation is now the owner of that property, and that condition which was put there to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation as the mortgagee of that cotton is now written into the bill, to tie the hands of the Corporation that owns it, the Corporation being the representative of the National Government. What was in the first instance an enlargement of the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation has become an unreasonable restriction.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Not now. In law, ownership of personal property, either in the individual or in the Government, presupposes the right of control and direction over that property, and yet they have put into this bill by reference a provision that has no other purpose in there but to put the Commodity Credit Corporation in a strait jacket. That should have no application, when the mortgage title has ripened into the legal title, and only ties the hands of the legal title owner to do with his own as he pleases.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman knows that the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to carry out a contract with Great Britain took 600,000 bales——

Mr. SPENCE. Oh, I am not going into the matter of the 600,000 bales. I do not care anything about policy, or who was benefited. I am only telling you why I voted for it. It may not be appealing to anybody else. Once I practiced law, many years ago, and I thought I learned a little law, which I have mostly forgotten, but some of the fundamental principles still cling in my memory, and I am not going to follow any such crazy proposition as this. If the warehouses need some money, if the cotton growers cannot get along without the help of the warehouses, let us make an appropriation to the warehouses but do not camouflage the thing with such a bill as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I want to say this. When this bill came before the committee I was favorably impressed with it because of the fine fellows that are behind it. They were my friends, and I wanted to go along with them. I think I could have served as a juror. I had not formed or expressed an opinion. My opinion comes from the hearings before that committee, and that prejudiced me against this bill. I would like to be able to go along with the gentlemen, but I cannot do it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; I yield, although the gentleman has charge of the time and I could not obtain 5 minutes in which to explain my position. I do not hold him responsible, and therefore I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want the gentleman to explain to the Members of this House just the difference between this bill, if enacted into law, and what the Commodity Credit Corporation has been doing up to November last.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman wants me to explain it?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do.

Mr. SPENCE. I am not going to explain that, but I state this. There is no regulation of rates in this bill. Somebody said that they would propose such an amendment, but when the forces in the committee developed so that they could put it through without that amendment, that amendment was never introduced. I do not know how much you gentlemen want these things, and I have no criticism to make of some man who votes for what he thinks is in the interest of his people, but I am sorry that you have to vote for such a bill to help the cotton growers.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the bill provide on page 1, line 10:

> If the Corporation is unable to enter into satisfactory contracts at reasonable rates without advertising and competitive bidding, such contracts may be made pursuant to advertisement and competitive bidding.

Mr. SPENCE. I know that a majority of this committee, which I concede knows more about the bill than I do, said in their report which I read that competitive bidding is banned under the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. But it is a provision of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. I think you have done a good job. I think if this bill passes you will freeze the cotton in the interior warehouses so tight that not one bale will ever come out.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it may surprise anybody who happens to be in the gallery to find the Congress straining at what seems to be a gnat of a million dollars after having often swallowed billions by unanimous consent. [Laughter.]

Of course, there are oratorical gladiators here who have been reared in the cotton country and understand it very well. I would not presume to offer my humble opinion on this bill, had I not, as a member of the committee, been requested to do so by some of the Members from my side, to whom I shall be glad to yield for questions at any time, to the extent of the time I can get from the Chairman. [Laughter.]

My main interest in this bill is that I think even if the bill were a very bad bill—and I cannot see that it has more faults than most of the legislation we encounter here—I should be willing to stretch a point on account of the principle involved. It is more important today, to my way of looking at things, than ever before. That is the principle that we should have a national policy that wherever possible we should try to prevent money from being siphoned out of the rural communities, and that we ought to do it whenever we can do it without stretching too many points and costing too much money by affirmative legislation. [Applause.]

You have already heard and will hear a great many more statistics on this bill. I have annotated references to pages in the hearings here, and will be glad to answer any question that anybody cares to ask me. Does anybody want me to yield? [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I would like to have the lady answer this question: Does this bill cost the taxpayers money, or does it save them money?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. According to the figures given by the Secretary of Agriculture there would be a saving to the Commodity Credit Corporation of $1,825,000, which is what this bill involves, according to him. It might be, to that extent, an economy to the Commodity Credit Corporation; but from my point of view it would be bad economy from the point of view of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. MURRAY. Will you answer another question?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MURRAY. Are you familiar with the fact that this so-called King Cotton that represents a $595,000,000 crop has some of the greatest schemes ever devised to extract money from the United States Treasury, which represents 45 to 47 percent of the parity that was voted here, and at least a half dozen direct subsidies to this one crop?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman knows that, like Mr. Willkie, I have only been active in the Republican Party long enough to take off my hat and toss it into the ring, and I do not know all the political answers, but I will say that I have learned quite a bit from both sides today.

All of you, I think, have had personal experiences which would lead you to believe it is sound Government policy——

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the lady yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Do not the hearings show it would cost three and a half million dollars in freight rates and incidentals to take this cotton from the interior to the port warehouses?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Oh, the opponents call this bill an economy bill. That makes me laugh. I become suspicious when I hear a Government department come in and talk about economy. [Laughter.] We had hardly gotten into the evidence when it was brought out that a bill like this came in from New England, and the Congress compelled the agency to store 300,000 bales up there in New England. The Commodity Credit Corporation did not favor that legislation. There was no showing of what it would cost, but it resulted in economy in storage rates and if the Commodity Credit Corporation only wanted to economize and nothing else, they would move this cotton out of the South, even out of port warehouses, and stack it up in places like that all through the United States, where cheaper storage rates, the evidence indicated, are available. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Could I have a little more time?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Perhaps the gentlewoman can get a little time from the other side. My time is all promised.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the lady 3 additional minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I should like to discuss the economic principle which I advocate. From my own personal experience, I happened to be in New York in 1928, working on Wall Street. We saw the money pouring in from the rural communities, the savings of doctors, lawyers, merchants, bankers, and small people coming into the cities, lured by the glamour of the markets there; money that had better been invested at home. I remember how at that time some of us who worked in the day and in the evenings were downtown at night schools studying toward degrees in commerce, used to criticize what we thought was the stupidity of Congress which did not seem to see in 1928 that the inflation was booming so large that a crash was bound to come any day. The crash did come 1 year later. The Congress did not perceive in 1928 that a little affirmative legislation would keep that money down in the country communities so that when the impact of the crash came the country would be healthy enough to survive it; yet today we are engaged in a defense program and again occurs the siphoning of money out of rural communities. As this defense program proceeds, inflation is bound to be much greater than it was in 1928, but what are we doing about it?

The reason I preferred not to talk about the bill in detail unless I was asked questions was that I think every minute of an occasion like this, when legislation of this type gives us an excuse to do so, one should be urging the necessity of a national policy of adopting any kind of legislation which would keep money from rushing into the concentrated areas.

[Applause.] So this bill, while it may have some faults, like every piece of legislation, is to my mind intrinsically, however embryonic, a piece of legislative therapy to take care of that diseased condition in our economy to which the United States Government never has paid enough attention.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it true that the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture are against this bill?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understand so, but I will tell the gentleman something.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is what I want, information.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. They have been against a great many bills on which I did not vote with them—and so has the gentleman, too.

Mr. PITTENGER. I never did believe they were infallible, but I wondered how the gentlewoman explained that attitude.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes. As a matter of fact it is quite often that I do not vote with the bureaus because often what they seek is increased power.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentlewoman from Illinois has made a very interesting summation of this bill. In practical effect does not the gentlewoman say it is rather false economy to spend more than $3,500,000 to effect a saving which the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture by all stretches of the imagination say will be only $1,800,000?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes; and has the gentleman stopped to realize that when the $1,825,000 goes into each interior community in the South some of it will immediately, as if by a magnet, be attracted to the cities? The rest of it will be multiplied by the number of times it changes hands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Illinois 1 additional minute.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It will be multiplied by the number of times it passes from hand to hand, so that when the warehouseman passes it on to the laborer it becomes $2 of national income; when it is passed by the laborer to the dentist, let us say, it will become $3 of national income. When the dentist passes it to the grocer it will be $4 of national income, and so on. In national income that $1 is multiplied by the number of times it spins around, the number of times it passes from person to person. So it is not impossible that this expenditure would mean millions of dollars in rural communities which have no other way at the present time of getting income except through W. P. A., perhaps, or parity payments or through sale or pledge of agricultural commodities in those occasional years when the market is high enough to justify sale by the farmers. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, first I want to make this observation, we have talked here about the estimate on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation that they can save $5,000 a day under the program of competitive bidding they have laid out, but I want to call to your attention another proposition. If, under the terms of this bill, the cotton is concentrated in the interior, the $10,000,000 a year that the Commodity Credit Corporation has saved the farmers and the Government by reason of being able to force the rates down from 40 cents to 12½ cents will probably be added again when this monopolistic bill places the total control of Government cotton in the hands of inland warehouse owners. How is this going to come about? This bill does the exact opposite of what it is intended to do, in every particular. Bret Harte once wrote:

> That for ways that are dark
> And for tricks that are vain,
> The heathen Chinee is peculiar.

But let me tell you that the guy who wrote this bill had Bret Harte's Chinaman backed off the map. Let me show you a point. The bill states that all cotton which is warehoused or stored under any contract or arrangement made by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be warehoused or stored in the locality where it is produced. Further on in the bill the provision is made that not more than one-third of all Government-owned cotton may be stored at such reconcentration warehouses, meaning the ports. I ask you how you are going to store any cotton anywhere except in the vicinity where it is produced under the terms of this act?

When that act applied to Government-loan cotton it was all right, but this cotton is Government-owned, and in this bill you deprive the Commodity Credit Corporation of the only weapon it has to keep storage prices down. When you consider that it is the Commodity Credit Corporation that put a floor under the price of cotton and by so doing saved the cotton farmers, they should be supported, yet after they have done that you rob them of the further privilege of saving that cotton farmer from being robbed by overcharges in the form of storage. When you vote for this bill that is exactly what you are doing. The bill is a peculiar bill. It does not mean what it says. It means just exactly the opposite. Oh, it is drawn to deceive, to hide its true meaning.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the bill not be enforced according to what it says rather than according to what the gentleman thinks it means?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. No; it cannot be enforced according to what it says, because it does not mean what it says.

Mr. Chairman, there have been one or two statements to the general effect that certain people who talk about this bill do not grow cotton. There is no cotton grown in my district, there are no cotton warehouses in my district, but may I say for the benefit of the gentleman who made that observation that in 1920 I spent almost a year studying not only the way cotton was produced but the way it was processed, shipped, and all the rest of it, in order to have a distinct, definite understanding of it for the purpose of putting a chapter in a book which I wrote called The Foreign Trade of the United States.

The bill before us is first of all so drawn as to deceive the House as to its true intent.

It denounces monopoly—but sets up provisions designed to create complete local and regional monopolies.

It denounces any movement of loan cotton owned by farmers away from the local warehouse—and then proceeds to prohibit any movement of Government-owned cotton in which the farmer has no interest.

It denounces uneconomical handling of loan cotton—and then makes uneconomical handling and storage mandatory—not just optional.

It seems to authorize competitive bidding—yet the underlying purpose of the whole bill is to prevent the acceptance of competitive bids.

It talks about preserving the system of warehousing in effect in 1940—about preserving the status quo—and yet it takes away from the Department the right to move Government-owned cotton—the only reason it was able to effect a $10,000,000 reduction in storage costs in 1939.

In short, the bill does everything it denounces, and prohibits everything it recommends.

Equally deceptive are the arguments presented in support of the bill.

It is said the bill must be enacted to prevent movement of the farmer's cotton. The truth is that no one is proposing to move the farmer's cotton. This bill affects only Government-owned cotton.

It is said the bill is necessary to protect small warehousemen. The truth is that its chief effect is to prevent movement of cotton out of the large interior chain warehouses, who are trying to hold the Government to a 12½-cent rate, whereas 8 cents is available elsewhere. More cotton will be moved out of the largest interior chain warehouse than the largest port chain will receive.

It is said the bill is necessary to prevent the Department from deliberately incurring huge unrecoverable freight expenses. The truth is that everyone except the vested warehouse interests knows that this cotton must go export ultimately, in which case the freight must be paid; and even if it does not go export, the Department states that transit privileges will permit continued movement without loss of freight to important domestic cotton-consuming centers.

This bill is drafted to deceive you, and the arguments presented for it are all refuted by the evidence in the record from the Department and farmer organizations.

It is a noteworthy fact that the proponents of this bill did not dare to write

in directly the limitations they are placing on Government-owned cotton. Instead, they achieve this result by reference to an act prescribing the method by which written consent of the producer to move his cotton shall be obtained. The effect of this method, however, is to take away from the Government, as to the cotton it owns, the very right that act was attempting to preserve for the farmer. The farmer could give his consent to the movement for any reason he saw fit, but this act deprives the Government, which now owns the cotton, of all discretion. The warehouseman will now decide whether the Government can move its cotton.

It is also a bill which, if enacted into law, will not only put a premium on inefficiency but will make inefficiency mandatory.

This is the first time in my legislative experience that Congress has been asked to pass a law to prevent a Bureau from saving money. Yet the Department states that if it proceeds with acceptance of bids it has on hand it can save the United States $5,000 per day, after taking into account all unrecoverable freight and other expenses of movement. Is this body willing to distribute $5,000 per day largess to a warehouse industry which has already cleaned up millions at the expense of the farmer and taxpayer? How long can we expect a bureau chief to try to save money when we instruct him to pour it out like water—not to the needy, not to the poor farmers, but to large interior warehousing chains. Yet that is exactly what this bill is proposing we do.

Section 4 specifically prohibits the C. C. C. from moving the cotton from the warehouse in which it is now stored unless the warehouse requests it or unless the warehouse insists on rates substantially in excess of average rates available elsewhere. It makes no difference whether the cost of storage can be reduced 30 percent by moving some of the cotton to port warehouses with space available at cheap prices. The cotton cannot be moved. It makes no difference if the local warehouse is full to the rooftree with Government-owned cotton and the farmer has no place to put his new production—the cotton we own can only be moved with the consent of the warehouse. Just contemplate for a moment what this bill does when it prohibits the movement of cotton from present storage if rates are not substantially in excess of the average rates available elsewhere. It means that the Government can never take advantage of rates below the average. With this provision in the law you may as well eliminate any reference to competitive bidding, for you have effectively eliminated any competition.

If you pass this bill, you are not only telling the Department, "Don't try to store this Government-owned cotton cheaply," but you are making it impossible for them to do so. Indeed you are giving the large interior warehousing organizations a vested right to raise their rates provided they act in reasonable concert, and their action on this legislation proves to me pretty conclusively they will do that.

You can reasonably ask why, if this bill is as bad as I say it is, it was not amended by the Banking and Currency Committee.

A careful reading of the bill will disclose the fact that it is so drawn as to render it practically impossible to effectively amend it without eliminating everything after the enacting clause.

Elimination of a clause here and there, and substitution of some other language would still not cure the basic defect of the bill which is the absolute elimination of competition in the storage of Government-owned cotton. For instance, I originally proposed to eliminate line 8 on page 3 prohibiting any consideration of "unusually low rates at which facilities are available by reason of abnormal dislocations in foreign commerce," but suppose this language were eliminated? The action would be meaningless, for section 4 by reference to another law would prevent any movement of cotton to the warehouse offering the rate, and thus assure that no such unusually low rates would be offered. My conclusion was that there was not any use of amending the camouflage, and that a slight majority of the committee would not agree to an amendment curing the basic defects of the bill.

The bill loudly proclaims that it is intended to prohibit monopolistic practices, while as a matter of cold fact it is designed to create a monopoly that will work in the end to the farmers' disadvantage by enabling the interior warehouses to monopolize the storage of all Government-owned cotton and Government-loan cotton.

The heart of this bill is the provision of section 4 prohibiting any movement of Government-owned cotton unless the warehouseman consents or unless he refuses after notice that his rates are "substantially in excess" of the average available elsewhere, to reduce his rates. No close analysis is necessary to see that the warehouse now storing the cotton, having received a statutory right to keep the cotton at any rate not substantially in excess of the average available elsewhere, will be sitting pretty in any negotiations. No port warehouse can hope to get Government-owned cotton regardless of the rate at which he is willing to store it.

The same philosophy and cooperative action which is back of this bill, moreover, will make it possible to push the rates back on up to the 1939 level, and the competition of port warehouses for Government-owned cotton, which has been the Commodity Credit Corporation's only weapon of regulation thus far, will be gone if this bill is enacted.

It is obvious that the purpose and effect of the bill is to keep costs up to the Government and the taxpayer; but the large interior warehousing organizations say that high rates to the Government will enable them to keep rates to the farmer down. The best answer to that is that when rates charged the Government were much higher, so were the rates charged the farmers. Only the threat of moving Government cotton caused any reduction in rates to the farmers in spite of the fact that some warehouses were earning 100 percent on their investment, and all of them were at least exceedingly prosperous.

As the only real representative of the farmers who testified before our committee stated:

> The charges to farmers will be no lower than those paid by the Government; and, will enable them to keep rates to theoY8cmfw if you give warehouseman the legal right, I'll guess odds that we farmers will pay higher rates to them for storing our cotton (record, 447).

Like that same gentleman, all the palaver by the attorney for the large interior warehousing organizations about this bill being necessary to protect the farmer filled me with apprehension for him.

> Yes, gentlemen; these warehousemen always desire to befriend us. They have done a lot of befriending in the past, and if the Congress of the United States gives them the legal right to befriend us much more, we stand a mighty good chance of being befriended to death (record 451).

Like him, too, I say:

> If you approve this bill you protect a few warehousemen against lower rates, thus putting money in their pockets by taking it away from the taxpayers or cotton farmers or both. But you do not protect the cotton farmer against high rates, while you grant these privileges to the men who store the farm products (record, 452).

While by its clever language it purports to grant to warehouses situated at the ports one-third of the Government-owned cotton, it contains cleverly hidden restrictions that prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from moving the cotton in order to secure advantageous storage rates.

Some friends of the bill have tried to tell me that at least one-third of the Government-owned cotton can be moved to the ports under the first proviso to section 4, which reads as follows:

> *Provided, however,* That if prices satisfactory to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the storage of compressed cotton are submitted by port reconcentration warehouses, not more than one-third of all Government-owned cotton may be stored in such reconcentration warehouses.

About one-quarter of the 6,200,000 bales of Government-owned cotton is now stored at port warehouses, and this proviso would seem to permit up to one-third to be stored there. This would apparently permit another 500,000 bales to be stored at the ports. But how are you going to get it there—the first sentence permits you to "move" the cotton only with the consent of the interior warehousemen now storing it. Perhaps this was intended to permit some movement to the ports, but it does not say so. And then the next proviso makes it clear that no cotton should be moved from warehouses storing 7,500 bales or less. Furthermore, if only 500,000 bales are to be moved what incentive have the port warehouses now storing cotton to reduce their rates on 1,173,000 bales now in storage there as they have offered to do? Exactly none, and after this experience if we compel the C. C. C. to reject their

present bids, just how many of them do you think will care to offer low rates for a small volume of cotton?

By taking the Government-owned cotton out of the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation it removes the only bargaining weapon the Government has to keep storage rates at reasonable levels.

The testimony of the Department shows clearly that the only weapon it has held in effecting the 40-percent reduction in rates in 1939 was the right to move Government-owned cotton. The Federal Warehouse Act admittedly provides no effective rate regulation. The interior warehousemen now storing some 11,000,000 bales of cotton, Government-owned, loan, and private, and with all Government-owned and loan cotton under legal restriction against movement, will be in a strong bargaining position in the negotiations this bill will require. It is not much negotiation when one side can say to another—"Of course, it's against the law to move this cotton, and it's costing me and all these interior warehousemen so much to store it we are going to have to raise our rates. I don't propose to charge you substantially in excess of the average but you know that average is going up pretty fast right now as all my competitors face the same situation and have the same rights. You may as well come across, for you can't find an average of carrying charges available elsewhere substantially lower than the rates I am offering you."

The record is replete with statements by the counsel for the large interior warehousing organizations about their cooperation in reducing rates in 1939, but the real answer was given by Mr. Robbins in reply to questions asked by Mr. SPENCE at page 383 of the record:

Mr. SPENCE. How did you induce them to accept the rate?

Mr. ROBBINS. We induced them to accept the rate because the Government could have moved the cotton in case they did not accept. Getting title to the cotton automatically relieved it of the restriction under Public, No. 660, Seventy-fifth Congress.

* * * * *

Mr. SPENCE. I want to know what you did, or how could you make them believe they were going to have the cotton removed if they did not give you a lower rate?

Mr. ROBBINS. It was known that potentially the cotton could be moved under bids solicited for moving cotton, so that a warehouseman in order to hold all the cotton it then possessed had a very substantial incentive to reduce his rate.

But if this Government-owned cotton were placed back under that old rule again, there would be no such incentive. The Government would not be able to utilize competitive forces to hold the rates down to a reasonable level for the farmers or for the taxpayers. And that is the fundamental objection from the standpoint of agriculture to S. 262.

The one independent representative of the farmers who appeared before us begged us not to take away from the Department of Agriculture the only weapon that enabled them to reduce rates to the farmers and the Government alike and yet that is what you are voting for if you vote for this bill.

This being true, if the Government cannot protect its own cotton, it follows, naturally, that it also loses the power to protect the farmer from unfair storage rates.

It is a striking fact, Mr. Chairman, that it was not until the Government had authority to move cotton without consent of the warehousemen that any rate reduction was obtained for either the farmers or the Government. If you take away the bargaining power of the Government on its own cotton, you are taking away all protection for the farmer on his loan cotton and his private cotton as well. You need only refer to what these warehousemen said back in 1939 when they objected to reducing their rates from 25 cents and 18 cents to see that they regard any rate as too low.

Are you more willing to confide the well-being of the farmers and the Government to the tender mercies of these organized interior warehousemen than to the great Department of Agriculture? I, for one, am not. Do you believe for an instant that anything but competition will keep rates down to a reasonable level in the face of rising loan stocks? I, for one, do not.

Do you believe that we should in effect appropriate some $2,000,000 a year as a subsidy for large interior warehousing organizations who have already reaped millions from the storage of Government-loan cotton at this time of emergency? I, for one, do not.

Do you wonder at the well-financed attempt to block competitive bidding? I do not. The Federal Warehouse & Compress Co., alone, receives an additional $100,000 gross revenue every month they can delay acceptance of the competitive bids. They have already made $300,000 and other large interior warehousing organizations are making similar amounts. It is time to stop the subsidy, Mr. Chairman, and it should be done finally and definitely by the vote of this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply intrigued by a score of observations this afternoon to the effect that those who are not familiar with the growing and processing of cotton, by inference at least, cannot speak with authority upon this bill. It reminds me of two gentlemen from a rural town in Illinois who were examining some of the pictures of an art exhibit in the Chicago Institute of Art. They were criticizing vigorously in characteristic rural language a certain picture. A man in front of the picture turned around, after one of these rural gentlemen had said the picture was lousy, and said, "What do you know about it?" He said, "I am the man who painted that picture. You have no business to criticize unless you know something about art." One of these country gentlemen said, "Listen here, kind sir, I am no chicken, either, but I know when an egg is rotten."

By that same token, I would say I know very little about cotton, very little indeed, but I think I can identify a bad bill when I see it.

Time will permit only an observation or two, but I do want to make one observation in reference to the matter of economy. The question of whether this will save much or little is of no great importance at the moment, because of the astronomical sums with which we have been dealing, but it is important whether or not the Congress by fiat law shall say that we must not save any money through Government agencies.

That is what this bill says. It proposes to say to the Commodity Credit Corporation, "You are an agency of the Government, and, of course, economy is a fine thing, but you must not economize." Everyone who presents himself to the electorate must necessarily dwell upon economy, but we are going to reverse the course now. Up to this time we have been shouting in crescendo about economy and doing little about it. But we are going a step further now. We are going to recite in the law that you must not economize. And certainly I am not going to put that kind of an obstruction upon the Commodity Credit Corporation.

After all, Mr. Chairman, they still have permissive authority to deal with this cotton that is owned by the Government and that which is under loan. Shall we now say, "You must store it where the cotton is produced," then recite three fine reasons, and put the argument in the pleadings, as to how it must be done? And, secondly, say to them, "In determining a rate, you must ignore the low rate." And, finally, say, "If all this fails, then, by gosh, we are going to get you by the neck by saying that not more than one-third must be stored in the port warehouses."

Mr. Chairman, that is pretty big to swallow, and I shall go along with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. I think that involves a bad principle. If we are going that far, why not, in all logic, say to the War Department, "Here, you are going to buy 5,000 machine guns, but we want you to ignore the low price"?

There is no emergency involved here that I can see. They talk about farmers. It occurs to me that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture have, after all, done their best in the interest of the farmers of the country; and while I may disagree, certainly I shall not challenge their sincerity in dealing with that matter. So that this whole principle involved here has no particular appeal.

Finally, I want to answer what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said about the possibility under a 1-year contract of shipping this cotton to a reconcentration warehouse, then back again.

Mr. Robbins said before the Agricultural Subcommittee that there was only one thing to be done with all this cotton and that is ultimately to export it. Mr. TARVER asked, "It will be a long time?" He said, "Yes; it will be a long time, but that is the only place we can put that cotton." So when you get it to a port warehouse it is going to have to be fed into the export channels of trade. There is no likelihood therefore of dragging it back and having to pay transportation charges thereon.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I admit that Dr. Robbins testified to that effect, but Dr. Robbins can be mistaken, like any other man. Do you know we are making gunpowder and we are building explosive plants all over the country? We are experimenting now in the use of cotton for different purposes. It is possible and probable that we will bring a lot of this cotton back from the ports.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is possible and perhaps probable too.

Mr. PATMAN. He does not know what the future has in store for us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be so, but that is no reason why we should embrace a wholly illogical principle.

[Here the gave] fell.]

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 262), regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Mr. David E. Lilienthal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Peterson of Georgia, for a few days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 21, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday, March 21, 1941, to resume hearings on H. R. 3684, freight forwarders.

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 27, 1941, to begin hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet to hold hearings on river and harbor improvement projects, as follows: Tuesday, March 25, 1941, Alafia River, Tampa Harbor, Fla.; and Tuesday, March 25, 1941, waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers. All meetings to start at 10: 30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

369. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3528, of the Revised Statutes relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins for the United States, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill H. R. 3735; without amendment (Rept. No. 288). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10. A bill to reinstate in the Court of Claims the suits entitled "Eastern or Emigrant Cherokees against the United States," No. 42077, and "Western or Old Settler Cherokees against the United States," No. 42078; with amendment (Rept. No. 289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HALLECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1824. A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 290). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2684. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard; with amendment (Rept. No. 291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2766. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 292). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PADDOCK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2811. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Dubuque, Iowa, and East Dubuque, Ill., under authority of the act approved July 18, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 293). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIMPSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2828. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 294). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIMPSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2829. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.; with amendment (Rept. No. 295). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIMPSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2830. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 296). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3682. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River in the village of Lowellville, Mahoning County, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 297). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4055. A bill authorizing the city of Keokuk, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Keokuk, Iowa, or to purchase the existing bridge at that locality; with amendment (Rept. No. 298). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3937. A bill to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 299). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3514. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain tribal land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value; with amendment (Rept. No. 300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr BLAND:

H. R. 4105. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4106. A bill to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4107. A bill to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4108. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4109. A bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 4110. A bill relating to the registry at ports of entry of certain aliens now in the United States in whose case there is no record of admission; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4111. A bill to extend the reemployment benefits under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to Government employees who during the existing emergency enlist in the land or naval forces of the United States or in the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4112. A bill authorizing an examination and survey of Fall River Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the conversion of the Panama Canal into a sea-level canal; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. Res. 150. Resolution requesting the President of the United States of America to aid the Government of Eire to purchase, loan, or lease, all foodstuffs, clothing, or any necessary commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14, with reference to a fishway through the Keokuk Dam on the Mississippi River; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 4113. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. B. Tanner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 4114. A bill for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4115. A bill for the relief of Harold Winthrop McElroy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McARDLE:

H. R. 4116. A bill for the relief of James A. Sweeney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACIORA:

H. R. 4117. A bill for the relief of creditors of the National Conference on Legalizing Lotteries, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4118 A bill for the relief of Ruth B. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4119. A bill for the relief of Mina Rust; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADDOCK:

H. R. 4120. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Medal to Albert W. J. Johnsen, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 4121. A bill granting a pension to Anna C. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4122. A bill for the relief of Harry Bradford; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 4123. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

524. By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan: Memorial of the Michigan Legislature, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23, adopted by the Michigan Senate on March 7, 1941, and by the Michigan House of Representatives on March 10, 1941, respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon proposed legislation (H. R. 2488) relative to the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

525. By Mr. BURDICK: Senate Concurrent Resolution G, Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

526. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14, adopted by the Iowa State Legislature, petitioning the Congress and the United States Department of Commerce to use every possible effort to obtain the installation of an adequate fishway through the Keokuk Dam on the Mississippi River, and to secure the necessary orders from the proper departments providing for said fishway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

527. By Mr. DOWNS: Petition of the City Council of Norwalk, Conn., favoring General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

528. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Men's Bible Class of the First United Presbyterian Church of Beaver Falls, Pa., endorsing the provisions of Senate bill 860, prohibiting the sale and traffic of intoxicating liquors and distribution of the same in military camps of the United States or territory adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

529. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. S. B. Manross, and other residents of Venango County, urging passage of House bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

530. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Merchants Association of New York concerning House bill 1585 and Senate bill 279, designed to extend unsubsidized American vessels certain of the tax advantages presently enjoyed by the subsidized lines; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

531. Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York concerning Senate bill 937 amending the Sugar Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

532 Also, petition of the State Charities Aid Association of New York concerning House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

533. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the General Assembly of Iowa urging the installation of an adequate fishway through the Keokuk Dam on the Mississippi River; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

534. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa, urging the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and that said convention, when so called, shall consider amending the first sentence of section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment so that the same shall read: "Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of citizens in each State"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

535. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Hornell Accounting Bureau, Lodge No. 486, of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, etc., New York, urging the preservation and protection of the interests of the people through appropriate legislation in opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

536. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the State Charities Aid Association, New York City, favoring the enactment of House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

537. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Antes Fort, Pa., favoring Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

538. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the executive committee of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, favoring legislation providing for a system of longevity pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

539. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa, petitioning the Members of the National Congress and the United States Department of Commerce to use every possible effort to obtain the installation of an adequate fishway through the Keokuk Dam on the Mississippi River, and that the National Congress and the United States Department of Commerce secure the necessary orders from the proper departments providing for said fishway; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

540. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Norwalk, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

541. Also, petition of the city of Hazelton, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who art God from everlasting to everlasting, the heavens declare Thy glory, and the firmament showeth Thy handiwork. Thou speaketh to us in the majesty of the skies and in the manifold voices of all Thy loving creatures. We pray for a life so simple and natural that we shall be able to enter into sympathetic relations with bird, garden, field, and woodland, which come again as of old as a part of the divine unity. We rejoice that through checkered paths Thou wilt enlarge the mind with long, long thoughts, soothing the feverish pulse with rest. Thou, who hast wrought through the ages, wilt still work through the circuit of the clouds, causing the desert to blossom as the rose, giving seed to the sower and bread to the eater, making glad the earth as though it had just dropped out of creation's mold. Grant that we may strive for the renewing and the cleansing of those hidden forces of our breasts, inspiring us with the joy of living, awakening new affections with the hope of better days. As Thou hast given us the material glories with which we are blest, we pray for that spiritual vision teaching us the gladness of a life responsive to the mes-

sages of Nature. Thou, who hast been the guardian through winter sleep and rest, make each day a delight and a sacred privilege of doing good to others. In our Saviour's name we humbly pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 17, 1941:

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 380; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 21), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint additional acting assistant surgeons in time of national emergency;

H. R. 2113. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States;

H. R. 2953. An act extending the provisions of the act approved August 27, 1940, entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes";

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Joseph S. Albis, Jr.;

H. R. 3297. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 22 of the act of February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1210);

H. R. 3617. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code.

On March 19, 1941:

H. R. 2495. An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River at or near Sandy Hook, Md., to a point opposite in Virginia.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR, WOODRUM of Virginia, CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED ENLISTED STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 139

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3786, a bill to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY (H. DOC. NO. 153)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the text of an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada providing for the construction of dams and power works in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and providing for completion of the essential links in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway when the Governments of the United States and Canada agree that circumstances require it.

The terms of the agreement contemplate that it shall be made effective by concurrent legislation of the Canadian Parliament and of the Congress of the United States.

I expect to request introduction, in due course, of legislation designed to make this agreement effective.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 21, 1941.*

THE LATE CLAUDE B. HUDSPETH

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of sorrow that I announce to the House that a former Member, the Honorable Claude B. Hudspeth, of Texas, passed away on Wednesday of this week, March 19, and his funeral will be held tomorrow at his home in San Antonio, Tex.

For 12 years, from March 4, 1919, to March 3, 1931, he served with distinction and ability as a Member of this House, as a Representative from the Sixteenth Congressional District of Texas, his home at that time being in El Paso. And he voluntarily retired from Congress on account of his health.

It was my privilege to serve as his colleague for 8 years, and I knew him intimately and well, and he was my warm personal friend, and I loved him. Quite a number of the present membership of this House served with him, and I know that they will agree with me when I say that Claude Hudspeth was a man who had many friends and who was popular and much beloved on both sides of the aisle.

He was a typical Texan, rugged, robust, warm-hearted, generous, aggressive, and kind. He was a man of strong likes and dislikes. Whatever cause he espoused, he put his whole heart into it. He was able, active, energetic, and represented his district and the Nation with courage, fidelity, and ability; and during his service here he left his imprint upon the legislation that was enacted during that period.

His death comes to me as a personal sorrow, and I am sure that all who knew him will grieve that he has gone, and our hearts go out in deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and other members of his family. God bless his memory.

Hon. EWING THOMASON, his successor and the present Representative of the Sixteenth Congressional District, is necessarily out of the city on account of important business; and if he were here he would join in this tribute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, during a large proportion of the period in which I have been a Member of the

House of Representatives—now completing 23 years—it was my privilege to serve with the late Claude Hudspeth. During all these years Texas has always had a galaxy of brilliant stars in this House, an unusual group of men. However, none shone with more brilliancy than Claude Hudspeth. He was a sterling Democrat, and only on one basic policy did he depart from his party policy. He was a stanch protectionist and he was never half-hearted or apologetic in his support of that policy. He had exceptional ability as a debater and an engaging personality. He was possessed of those very necessary qualifications for membership in this body—calm judgment and unfailing courage. I regret his passing, and to his family in their bereavement I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

BENJAMIN HARRISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the report of the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial appearing in the Grand Rapids Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I believe in a pay-as-you-go program, and I believe the people of my district are willing to pay as they go. My people want an adequate defense program and are willing and ready to pay for it.

The new defense taxes now under consideration would cost United States wage earners $1,500,000,000 a year, yet our program is costing in actual cash outlay $6,500,000,000 this year, and estimated $12,000,000,000 next year, and at least $25,000,000,000 in 1942. The rest will be borrowed. This means that we must collect by some means three times as much as we are now collecting if we are to pay as we go.

The United States national debt was approaching $50,000,000,000 when the defense emergency began. Commitments already definitely authorized—and in part actually appropriated—for national defense will amount to at least $50,000,000,000 more, and may go far beyond that.

Any policy of taxation now under serious consideration will fall so far behind expenses that the national debt will be at least $100,000,000,000 when the emergency ends, perhaps in 1944.

Interest on a debt of this size would be $3,000,000,000 a year as long as the debt is unpaid, or about four times the cost of the entire Government in 1916.

With these thoughts in mind I respectfully call upon the leaders of this administration to bring on the floor of this House such legislation as will be fair to all and enable us to pay as we go. I am certain the membership will pass without delay any measures which will put us back on a sound basis and forever quit the policy of taxing future generations. When this is done we can say with pride we "pay as we go." [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the smear campaign directed against United States Senator Ernest Lundeen, now deceased, and to include therein a letter I have sent to certain newspapers on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Bridgeport.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Henry F. Boyen, potentate, Islam Temple, Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, at at the Shrine's St. Patrick's Day luncheon in San Francisco on Saturday, March 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE] in Savannah on St. Patrick's Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks so that the complete record of this organization and its Communist leadership may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MINE INSPECTORS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I called the attention of this House to the fact that the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining has stricken out of the mine-inspection bill the House provision that the safety inspectors must be technically trained men. Today I have learned from a gentleman who has recently returned to this country after 15 years as an executive in the mines in continental Europe that over there all mine inspectors are highly trained technical men, specialists in their fields. These men must be technicians to do an adequate job of safety inspection in the mines. [Applause.]

The gentleman to whom I have referred was formerly employed by our own Bureau of Mines and had many years of experience in mines and mining in this country prior to his going abroad to take charge of some American-owned mines in continental Europe, which have now, of course, been taken over by Germany. He tells me that in all of his experiences abroad he met no inspectors who were not graduate mining engineers, and in fact could not recall meeting any deputy inspectors who likewise were not trained technical men. From my conversation with him I learned he is fully in accord with my contention, which I made yesterday, that adequate mine-safety inspection is a job for one who possesses the technical training of a mining engineer and imperatively calls for highly specialized technical training.

Mr. Speaker, before our subcommittee last year, which held hearings for a number of weeks on the mine-inspection bill then before us, representatives of the United Mine Workers appeared before us, as did other proponents of this legislation, and when so doing very frequently advanced the argument that the better safety record achieved in the mines of Continental Europe and in England, as compared with our own safety record, made Federal mine inspection in this country an imperative necessity. As a

matter of fact, the records do indicate that the average mine in Continental Europe and the British Isles is safer than most of our mines. However, the records also indicate, Mr. Speaker, that their national safety records—in mines, industrial, home life, and in essentially peaceful pursuits—is comparatively better than our own national safety record, and on this basis our mines are no more dangerous to any considerable degree than the European mines. Also the available safety records for European mines indicate they are not always based upon the same factors upon which we base our records. But the point I want to make here is that Continental Europe and the English recognize the fact that mine-safety inspection is a job for trained technical men, possessing far more qualifications than simply 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that in the notice for United States civil-service examinations for safety instructors in the Bureau of Mines it states that one of the duties of the safety instructors, whose salary is $1,800 a year, is to "conduct safety inspections of mines." On inquiry of the Bureau of Mines, I learn that this is, perhaps, somewhat of a misstatement in that these instructors do not actually conduct safety inspections of mines until they have had considerable previous training in such technical work under the technically trained men of the Bureau, who, incidentally, qualify as senior engineer, salary, $4,600; engineer, $3,800 a year; associate engineer, $3,200 a year; and even then it is rarely true that they conduct such inspections by themselves, but rather invariably act in an assisting capacity. Likewise I note in passing that the civil-service requirements state that a safety instructor—

> must have had at least 2 years' • • • experience as a mine-operating official, such as shift boss, mine foreman, fire boss, safety inspector—

And so forth. This qualification would, of course, be raised to 5 years under either the House or Senate Mining Committee version of this bill before these instructors could qualify as inspectors. But again I repeat that in achieving the splendid record it has already made the Bureau of Mines has been insisted on, and recognized the value of, technical training of a specialized nature before their men can qualify as inspectors.

I hope that the Senate will restore to this bill the amendment placed in the bill by the House specifying that the inspectors provided by the bill must be—

> an accredited mining engineer or the equivalent thereto with the basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal.

(Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, inscfar as, on the basis of fact and evidence, there can be pointed out the presence of totalitarian agents, Communists, Nazis, or others in the ranks of American labor or in business or anywhere else, you are doing a favor to that labo organization or any other group where you give those facts. I think this is one of the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Correspondingly, when mistakes are made, when unfounded charges are made against individuals, you are doing inestimable harm to the constructive program of the United States and all the constructive groups in it.

Now, in line with that I want to read a dispatch, published in the Boston Globe for March 19 under a Moscow date line, wherein there is quoted from the Communist Internationale, monthly magazine of the Comintern, the Communist view of Sidney Hillman, codirector of the Office of Production Management. Here is what they say about him:

> The American bourgeoisie is using Hillman in a vicious campaign against the working class.
>
> Hillman knows how to act to deal the workers vital blows. He is an enemy of the working class, an enemy of the Communist Party, and a ferocious enemy of the Soviet Union.
>
> He demands merciless measures against the Communist because he feels the instability of his own position.

That is what the Communists think of Sidney Hillman. Yet some Members have made the most irresponsible charges against him. I beg the House to know its facts before it makes unwarranted charges against some of the people carrying this heavy load—some of the men, indeed, who are in the front ranks of the battle to rid the labor movement of these elements. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman fro: Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BENDER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the other day while the House was voting down the amendment which I offered which would have prevented the racket of requiring men to pay tribute to a labor union in order to work for their country, at that same moment a general strike was being called in the Todd Shipyard at Galveston. That strike was called and threw out of work 2,200 men, who are now out of work, and the reason it was called was because the Todd Shipbuilding Co. refused to discharge 1 carpenter foreman who did not belong to that union.

This plant is at present being used for defense work, having contracts with the United States Navy and performing extensive work for the British Ministry.

This yard's principal work is drydocking and performing all kinds of repairs to ships, having three piers averaging about 1,000 feet long, two floating drydocks of 10,000 tons capacity, and one floating drydock of 1,200 tons capacity.

On Sunday, March 16, the plant management was notified that the carpenter department was not going to work unless a foreman by the name of J. Mallani was discharged, this being the only grievance. This foreman has been in the employ of the company for 6 years in the capacity as foreman.

On Monday, March 17, all men reported for work with the exception of carpenters who declared a holiday for meetings. Meetings were held, and they were informed that the foreman would not be discharged.

On Tuesday, March 18, carpenters formed a picket line, and the entire organization refused to pass the line, calling a general strike. These men are still out, and up to the present no agreement has been made. These men are members of the Metal Trade Craft of the American Federation of Labor, affecting approximately 2,200 men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who so touchingly defended Sidney Hillman, seems to be so innocent that he thinks Soviet Russia does not try to cover up some of its agents here.

I have the United Press news dispatch, with the Moscow, March 19, date line, in which it is said that the communistic internationale monthly magazine of the Comintern denounced Sidney Hillman as the agent of the American bourgeoisie.

That is a very familiar procedure of the Communist Party when it wishes to distract attention from those who are aiding it in places where its doctrines are not popular.

The news dispatch is an odd mixture of truth and falsehood. In one paragraph, it states that Hillman demands merciless measures against the Communists. As a matter of fact, Hillman for weeks has done nothing of consequence to end the Communist strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant. The dispatch states further, "Hillman knows how to act to deal the workers vital blows." Hillman does know how to act to keep honest men from work and he has been backing the

closed-shop drive, even in defense industries.

Let me tell you something that Hillman did just recently. There was a strike at the Federal Motor Truck Co. in Detroit, which has a $5,000,000 contract to produce trucks for the Army. Every demand of the C. I. O. was met except the one for a closed shop; that is, the demand that only those who paid the C. I. O. could make army trucks. As mediators, Hillman of the O. P. M. sent Burns and Smith, two vice presidents of the C. I. O., to Detroit. Such, at least, is the information given me yesterday by a gentleman from Detroit who claims to know from personal contact whereof he speaks. That is a fine way to mediate a strike, is it not? Send two partisans, who are members of the organization which is striking, to act as fair and impartial judges?

The Allis-Chalmers strike is still on today. It has been on 58 days, just because Brother Hillman insists that they have a C. I. O. shop out there. Now, you can like him if you want to. I do not. I do not like any man who accepts pay from one organization and pretends to work for another. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a release from the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the other body our illustrious Vice President did the farmers in the Midwest a great service when he was down in the Senate Restaurant consuming roast duck rather than being on the job, because by being there he was not present in the Chamber to break a tie vote, which would have permitted the bringing into our country of millions of pounds of Argentine beef. He later declared he was sorry he was not present so that he could break that tie and vote to permit the importation of Argentine canned beef as a token of good neighborship. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that Henry will be consuming many a roast duck in the future when there are close decisions in behalf of agriculture to be decided in the Senate of the United States.

FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4124, Rept. No. 301) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4124, the fifth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1941, and, pending that, ask unanimous consent that debate continue for 2 hours, the time to be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4124, with Mr. LEWIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. The total amount carried in the bill is $4,073,810,074, which is $39,342,943 below the Budget estimate.

The amounts are as follows:

War Department military activities:	
Direct appropriations	$1,684,940,000
Contract authorizations	2,093,453,254
Total	3,778,393,254
Navy Department, direct appropriations	295,416,820
Total	4,073,810,074

The decreases effected by the committee in the Budget estimates are as follows:

War Department military activities:	
Direct appropriations	−$31,285,000
Contract authorizations	−2,632,943
Total	−33,917,943
Navy Department, direct appropriations	−5,425,000
Total	−39,342,943

The major portions of the amount included in the bill for the War Department are for items in the regular 1942 appropriation bill but which have been lifted out of that bill and put into this supplemental defense bill, in order to get advantage of 3 months' additional time in the awarding of contracts for essential purposes. So far as I know, there is no controversy whatever about any item in the bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Are part of the items in the bill for building new ships?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no money here for building new ships. There is some for acquiring and altering some vessels, but nothing for ship construction. There may be some materials provided for the Navy which will later go into ship construction, but there is no new-ship-construction program in this bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. How about the building of new airplane factories?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is some provision for that.

Mr. PITTENGER. How many new factories are contemplated?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There will be a number of them of various type purposes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at Port Arthur, and Fort William, Ontario, Canada, situated in a northern climate, north of Duluth, Minn., where the climate is somewhat similar, the Canadian Government is already building airplanes and ships, and that up to date the United States Government has done nothing to carry out the decentralization program of the President. They are not utilizing the shipyard which is available at Riverside, Duluth, and there is no program that I can find out anything about that calls for the building of plants for the manufacture of war material. It will be a tragedy if this Congress does not insist that the decentralization program be carried out, when this money is appropriated.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much having the gentleman's observation on that.

In broad outline the amount for the War Department to accomplish the following objectives of our preparation, the totals following comprising both direct appropriation and contract authorization:

	War Department
1. Program for 3,600 bombers, including procurement funds for Air Corps and incidental equipment to be furnished by the Signal Corps and Ordnance Department	$1,000,000,004
2. Deficiency in current airplane program to meet increased costs	63,000,000
3. Deferred munitions program:	
To provide 1,425 airplanes to complete current 18,000-airplane program	343,288,140
Other critical items, including Ordnance, Signal, Medical, Chemical Warfare, Engineer, and other equipment, and for deferred storage facilities	971,769,114
	1,315,057,254

4. Creation of new productive capacity	$868,286,000
5. Additional cost incident to maintaining and training increased Army	379,859,700
6. Seacoast defense, carriages for 16-inch guns, etc	4,151,000
7. Outlying bases, continuation of construction and for defense equipment at	
7. Outlying bases, etc.—Con. Newfoundland, Bermuda, Bahamas, Jamaica, Antigua, St. Lucia, Trinidad, British Guiana, Annette Island and Yukatat, Alaska, and change of Seward terminus of The Alaska Railroad	148,039,296
Total, War Department	3,778,393,254

The largest single above item for the War Department is $1,000,000,000 for 3,600 bombers. We have heretofore provided the money for the building of four assembly plants, at Omaha, Kansas City, Tulsa, and Fort Worth. Those four plants will utilize the products of about 400 subcontractors who will furnish materials and manufacture engines and parts. They will go to these big assembly plants, and there, on the same basis and with the routine used in the mass production of automobiles, they will turn out these 3,600 bombers for which we appropriate $1,000,000,000 in this bill.

We also carry $148,039,296 for continuing construction, equipping, and protecting the outlying defense bases in the Atlantic which we obtained from Britain, two staging fields in Alaska, and changing the Seward terminus of The Alaska Railroad. The break-down of these items will be found on page 8 of the report on the bill and in further detail in the hearings.

The initial contracts have been let for the Atlantic bases. The estimated total cost of construction is $200,000,000 of which $25,000,000 has been made available from the President's emergency fund and the continuing installment in this bill is $87,825,000. The committee has made a general reduction of $2,425,000 in the total estimate for these bases and has eliminated entirely $3,750,000 included for the purchase of land pending a more definite determination of the requirements. This sum contemplated the acquisition of approximately 26,000 acres of privately owned land at an average of $140 per acre. The right exists in the United States to proceed with the construction work and the committee would like to be better advised as to the land-acquisition costs before appropriating the funds.

We carry $1,315,000,000 for the deferred munitions program. This consists of two parts.

When the 18,000-plane program was appropriated for, there was a deferment in connection with it of 1,425 planes, consisting of 1,150 medium bombers and 275 transport planes, due to inability to get capacity for that number. Facilities are now available to procure these planes and the amount of $343,288,140 is included for that purpose. The sum of $971,769,114 for other critical items under the deferred munitions program, combined with a smaller amount in the pending 1942 Budget estimates, will substantially complete the critical items of equipment for an army of 2,000,000 men as contemplated under the munitions program of June 30, 1940.

Another large item for the War Department is $868,286,000 for creation of production facilities. The division of that sum is as follows:

Funds required to complete the productive capacity program already launched—21,000 combat airplanes per year and equipment and supplies for 2,000,000 men on a combat status (with the exception of ordnance for the 3,600 bombers in the program recently adopted administratively and included in this bill):	
Amount required on account of rising costs of materials, labor, equipment, etc., approximately 15 percent in connection with facilities heretofore appropriated for	$137,361,000
Additional amount required to provide increased facilities needed by prime contractors and subcontractors for various items of airplanes and engines, as well as raw and semifinished materials, equipment, etc., involved in Air Corps program	75,000,000
Extinguishment of contract authorizations heretofore granted for the fiscal year 1941	107,000,000
New productive facilities sufficient to equip and maintain a second 2,000,000 men on a combat status, to provide ordnance for the 3,600-bomber program, and provide for those munitions which the War Department procures for the Navy	548,925,000

Another large amount for the War Department is $379,859,700 to meet the additional costs incident to the training and maintenance of the 1,418,000 men anticipated to be in the service by June 30 next. Previous appropriations are not sufficient to do this, the estimates on which they were made being based on normal experience figures for the small Regular Army. It has developed that the experience factors utilized have not given the funds to meet the requirements of the large Army. New needs have arisen and some known requirements of commercially obtainable articles were postponed. The total is comprised of the following principal amounts:

Procurement of 79,003 additional motor vehicles for the Army of 1,418,000 and to maintain allowances in accordance with the War Department prescribed tables	$101,595,929
Air Corps, development and production of service-test bombers, development of special-type airplane, flying field and organizational equipment, shop equipment, equipment for 2 new technical schools, and tuition at civilian schools for training flying cadets and enlisted specialists (exclusive of equipment for outlying bases)	76,149,700
Lumber stock pile of 250,000,000 board feet to be procured gradually to prevent rise in prices and to allow proper seasoning—future possible requirements	$7,500,000
Extinguishment of contract authorizations heretofore granted for the fiscal year 1941	86,281,456
Ordnance Department, modification and improvement of 37-mm. and 90-mm. antiaircraft mounts to permit utilization of new fire-control director to increase rate and accuracy of fire, and for fire-control directors for 37-mm. guns	38,194,000
Clothing and miscellaneous quartermaster supplies	25,068,000
Floating equipment, maintenance and operation, acquisition, charter, etc., and acquisition of railroad equipment, etc	26,277,925
Miscellaneous, including welfare of enlisted men and Infantry School	917,000
Signal Corps, Engineers, Chemical Warfare Service, and Medical Department, miscellaneous equipment, services, etc	16,008,690
National Guard, including $1,740,145 for 14 airplanes and initial equipment for the 129th Observation Squadron, Alaska	1,867,000

We carry for the Navy an aggregate of $295,416,820. The distribution of this sum by major purposes is as follows:

1. Ordnance and ordance stores, including antiaircraft defense for merchant vessels if taken over by the Navy in emergency, aircraft bombs and bomb fuzes, small-arms ammunition, and bombardment projects		$133,118,820
2. Acquisition and conversion of 12 additional auxiliary vessels		60,000,000
3. Naval supply account fund, to increase stocks of materials for working reserve		75,000,000
4. Reserve material of all types		9,700,000
5. Public works:		
Naval ammunition depot, San Diego, Calif., area, ammunition storage, etc	$2,500,000	
Marine Corps, training area, east coast	14,575,000	
Total		17,075,000
6. Medical department		300,000
7. Departmental in Washington, including Hydrographic Office		223,000

I was asked some days ago when I was on the floor how much money we had put into the defense program. I did not answer as definitely as I should like to have done, because I did not then have the data in shape. I have a statement before me now and will insert it in the RECORD.

The amounts in this statement are exclusive of the defense aid supplemental appropriation bill, 1941, $7,000,000,000, which we passed the other day to carry out the so-called Lease-Lend Act. You will note that this statement is dated

March 19, 1941. It covers appropriations and contract authorizations for our Army, Navy, and other agencies concerned with national-defense programs for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. It comprises appropriations made in the Regular Navy and Military Appropriation Acts for 1941, those we have made in supplemental acts since last June when we started with the augmented program, amounts now pending for 1941 but not enacted, and amounts pending but not yet considered for 1942. It also removes some of the duplication that exists because of the use in the totals of these defense bills of both direct appropriations and contract authorizations by deducting the amounts concerned in those overlappings. The full amount of our Army and Navy appropriations are included as a part of the defense program and it is proper to do so, but it should be recalled that we have appropriated for our Army and Navy considerable sums each year before we started on this large program, and some deduction could be made properly for that factor. It has not been done here. This statement will be subject to change from time to time. Possibly new requirements will come into it and some amounts now in contract authorization may be later liquidated by direct appropriation, and other changes will occur frequently. There is also for consideration the fact that these sums represent the authority to make commitments on behalf of the Government during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. They do not represent entirely the cash withdrawals from the Treasury in those years, and use of the figures should be tempered with that thought in mind, because some of this money may not be actually drawn from the Treasury until the fiscal year 1943.

Appropriations, contract authorizations, and recommendations for national defense, fiscal years 1941 and 1942

	Army	Navy	Other agencies	Total
Fiscal year 1941:				
Appropriations and recommendations	$8,184,027,777	$3,495,097,265	$1,372,562,803	$13,051,687,845
Contract authorizations and recommendations	5,009,222,594	946,098,112	278,500,000	6,233,820,706
Subtotal	13,193,250,371	4,441,195,377	1,651,062,803	19,285,508,551
Deduct cash included to liquidate 1941 contract authorizations	203,626,456	28,560,000	75,000,000	307,186,456
Net total, 1941	12,989,623,915	4,412,635,377	1,576,062,803	18,978,322,095
Fiscal year 1942:				
Recommended appropriations, reflecting latest congressional action	5,665,282,239	3,415,601,022	417,720,820	9,498,604,081
Recommended contract authorizations reflecting latest congressional action	266,145,695	31,127,894	104,000,000	401,273,589
Subtotal	5,931,427,934	3,446,728,916	521,720,820	9,899,877,670
Deduct cash included to liquidate 1941 contract authorizations	2,920,235,138	670,790,612	104,500,000	3,695,525,750
Net total, 1942	3,011,192,796	2,775,938,304	417,220,820	6,204,351,920
Net total, 1941 and 1942	16,000,816,711	7,188,573,681	1,993,283,623	25,182,674,015

The total amount shown in the statement aggregates $25,182,674,015. That does not include the $7,000,000,000 bill which we passed the other day. If that is added the total reaches $32,182,674,015.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What amount did we appropriate last May and June for our war and naval services?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not have it broken down by the different bills, but it is in the total of this statement, which I will put in the RECORD, which gives the best figures obtainable to date. It is difficult to keep the totals clear because of the use of both direct appropriations and contract authorizations. The rapid manner in which the program is moving often brings a request for direct appropriation to liquidate contract authorizations made only a few months before.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's statement, in which he says includes the $7,000,000,000, exceeds $32,000,000,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If you add the seven billion.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does that mean that was authorized for the year 1941–42?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It covers both fiscal years, 1941 and 1942.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But it does not include what might have been appropriated in May or June of 1940 that was to be used in 1940?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes it covers our Regular Army and Navy Appropriation Acts for 1941 and some of the new program which started forward in May and June was included in them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think what the gentleman will put in the RECORD will be very helpful, because we are very confusing in what we say as to amounts.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Do the figures include emergency items or emergency and normal Army and Navy maintenance items?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It includes everything.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. THOM. However, authorizations have been made that are still outstanding?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are some, no doubt. The figures I have given you, however, do not include the estimated cost of our long-range naval expansion construction because that is proceeding over a long period of time and is being met from year to year by the direct appropriations in the bills as the funds are needed, and those appropriations are in the statement I am putting in.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. What percentage of that amount does the gentleman estimate will be actually expended?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. During the fiscal year 1942?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the greater portion of it. I think practically all of it will be obligated by the end of that year.

Mr. RIZLEY. All of it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman mean drawn out of the Treasury or obligated?

Mr. RIZLEY. Actually drawn out of the Treasury.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think a very large proportion will be drawn out during the fiscal year 1942. There will be some drawn in fiscal 1943 and a little perhaps falling later than that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any controversy about this bill. I could consume a great deal of time, but I do not care to do so.

Unless somebody wishes to ask me a question, I will yield back the balance of the time I yielded myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for an appropriation and carries contract authorizations totaling a little over $4,100,000,000. It is probably the largest individual item for our own defenses that we have had before the House at any one time. We are here carrying a considerable amount of funds for the payment of some contracts that were authorized to be made a year ago, and we are carrying additional funds to go on with the Army and Navy program.

We have made cuts totaling something like $39,342,000 in the direct appropriations and contract authorizations. We have made those cuts where we did not feel that the items were required for national defense. We have made them because we thought they could get along very well without the things they proposed. Amongst the things we have cut out are some of the expense of additional cargo ships, where we thought the Navy could easily save $3,000,000 by managing the procurement of these ships a little better and by managing the outfitting of them a little better. We have cut down a million and a half from Army transportation, where it is proposed that they take over certain ships for transport purposes. We felt that the prices were high and the cost of operation was higher than it should be, and that they should get better rates on a great many things. A great many of the rates have gone up nine times in the last year or so, and that is not justified outside of the war zones.

I appreciate that this is a tremendously large sum of money. The de-

ficiency subcommittee called in when we were considering items relating to the Army, the military subcommittee; and when we were considering items relating to the Navy we called in the Navy subcommittee and we had the benefit of their advice on all of these items. In marking up the bill I frankly did not see anything for us to do except to provide funds enough so that the defense of the United States of America is absolutely and unequivocally secure.

We are going ahead with an airplane production program. This bill provides for a greater number of large bombers than any bill that has heretofore been presented to the House, and it provides a very large number of the medium-sized bombers. The situation with reference to them is this: In spite of the delays we are having with the air program, the construction of the assembly plants and the time within which airplanes can begin to be produced in them is going to be less than was originally anticipated. The result is going to be that we shall have inside of a year practical completion of the new program which is embarked upon here involving 3,600 large bombers. There are in addition a very large number of other items, and I believe that by the time the next 12 months roll around we shall have available anything we might need for our own national defense along that line.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. This appropriation includes mainly bombers and tanks for our defense.

Mr. TABER. Bombers, tanks, ships, and work upon some of the bases. Provision has been made for lighting air fields and doing other work on the bases.

Mr. DONDERO. But all of it is for our own defense.

Mr. TABER. Oh, absolutely; every dollar of it is for our own defense.

Mr. DONDERO. I hope there will be a roll call and that not one vote will be heard against it.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I would ask the gentleman, in light of the Presidential request expressed to a joint meeting of the Congress on May 16 of last year not to do anything that would interfere with the delivery of munitions, supplies, and equipment of war to the Allies, what assurance has the gentleman to offer the House today that equipment and supplies this money here provided may produce will eventually be placed in the hands of our own troops in continental United States.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will remember, there was a provision in the so-called lease-lend bill, H. R. 1776, Public Law No. 11, which was offered by Senator BYRD in the Senate, which provided that none of the things that are procured by our own Army and our own Navy under appropriations made after the enactment of that law, which was March 11, should be turned over to any other country unless in the act appropriating the funds to provide for those things specific authority was given to the Chief Executive to transfer those things to some other country. In the bill as we bring it to you today there is absolutely no authority given to the Chief Executive to transfer the things that will be procured under this bill to any other country. In other words, by that act, Public Law No. 11, the Chief Executive is expressly prohibited from transferring those things to any other country, and in view of the fact there is no language in this bill that gives the President any such authority it will be absolutely impossible for the President to turn over to any other country any of the things provided for in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say to the gentleman I am very glad to have the benefit of his opinion. Knowing the small amount of modern equipment and supplies that we have provided for our Army, I want to say to the gentleman that I intend to vote for the bill now before us and shall do so with more pleasure than he can know. I believe every man in this House would feel the same way about it if he knew and recognized the present needs of our Army. I am glad to have an appropriation bill before the House which proposes to do something for our own forces, to put modern equipment and supplies into the hands of our own soldiers.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. What the gentleman says may be technically correct; nevertheless, there is nothing in this bill which would preclude the President from taking the same amount of money out of the $7,000,000,000 aid-to-Britain bill which we passed the other day. Great Britain may order 3,600 bombers of the type described on page 4 of the report on this bill and then the President might defer our own orders for our 3,600 bombers, sending 70, 80, or 85 percent to Britain as he has done during the last year, or even 100 percent if he wished to. So this bill does not necessarily guarantee that within a year we shall get any appreciable portion of the material which these funds are to provide unless the President should decide he wants it and that he does not want to give it to Britain.

Mr. TABER. Funds are provided for all of the requests with reference to airplanes that the British have made in the $7,000,000,000 bill.

Mr. MOTT. That is quite true, but our facilities are not capable of producing what we are asking under this bill and at the same time furnishing Britain what she will ask for under the $7,000,000,000 bill. Therefore I say the President can easily defer the whole thing if he considers it good policy and militarily expedient to divert all of these orders to the British. There is no assurance under this bill that within a year we are going to get what we hope to get out of it.

Mr. TABER. There would be no possible way for the President to transfer enough funds to the airplane-construction program contained in the $7,000,000,000 appropriation passed the other day so that deferments in our own set-up provided here could be made and the British given those planes, because the right to transfer funds is not sufficient to permit that to be done. They might get a few of them by increasing the amount permitted to be spent for airplanes from the British fund, but they could not get a substantial portion of these bombers.

Now, so that we may be in the clear on that, our own facilities, which we have already provided, plus those facilities that were provided by the British themselves, plus the facilities covered by the $650,000,000, approximately, carried in the $7,000,000,000 bill considered day before yesterday, will provide complete facilities to build all of the airplanes that are carried in the $7,000,000,000 bill.

Mr. MOTT. Within what time?

Mr. TABER. Within the next 12 months. In connection with that, we have set up four great big assembly plants and, if the gentleman will procure the hearings and turn to page 172 he will see that the assembly plants have already been provided for by allotment of funds, or will be in this bill, and we were told that they would be practically ready to go ahead and that production there would be much more rapid than the production of the flying fortresses and the other large bombers because they had devised a system similar to that which Mr. Ford had inaugurated in the construction of airplanes, whereby small plants produce different parts of these airplanes, which are to be brought in here, put on an assembly line, and the planes would be put together much more rapidly and much more satisfactorily than they could be if the whole set-up complete was under one roof.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MOTT. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that; and if that is the case—and I hope it is—the situation now is very, very much different than it was a month ago, because the hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee at that time showed we were not yet able to use any of these expanded facilities practically and that we would not be in production within the time that the gentleman has mentioned for the completion of the articles carried in this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Knudsen told us that these 3,600 planes would absolutely be completed within 12 months.

Mr. MOTT. I am very glad to hear that. Of course, I am for this bill, and I think everyone is. I am particularly glad to hear a statement made as to the progress they are making in being able to use the new facilities.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This bill carries a total appropriation for a little in excess of $4,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Appropriations and contract authorizations. I do not want to get the thing involved. It is absolutely impossible for anyone to give a correct picture of the appropriations situation, because we have so many of those contract authorizations involved. As I remember it, there are about $300,000,000 that is required of the cash that is carried here, amounting to about $2,000,000,000, to meet contract authorizations that have previously been provided.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand, these appropriations and the contractual authorizations are made for the purpose of production of war materials to be used in this hemisphere in our national defense.

Mr. TABER. I do not know whether they would be used in this country or where they would be used. They would be used in our own national defense by our own services.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I mean for our national defense.

Mr. TABER. They might be used in Hawaii, Panama, or these bases outside, or almost anywhere that our own forces would happen to be.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I am getting at is this: These materials are to be used for the purpose of being manned by our own forces?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am strongly in favor of this bill and will vote for it. I feel that we should spare no money or effort in preparing for any eventuality in this hemisphere. I notice in a breakdown of the bill that there is nothing included for the purchase of agricultural food products. Does not the gentleman feel there ought to be something in the bill with reference to the production of needed agricultural food products?

Mr. TABER. That has all been covered in previous bills. We had a considerable item in the bill, the conference report, on which was agreed to the fore part of the week. We had very large items in the regular bills, and we have had items at different times. There is a very large amount provided in here for clothing, and that sort of thing, of course, and that is an agricultural product. This bill comes to the House with a provision in it requiring the purchase of American agricultural products or things that have been produced from American agricultural products. That was contained in the naval appropriations bill considered by the House last week.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to one thing, and I think he is in favor of what I am going to suggest. We have a tremendous surplus of wheat in this country, aggregating close to a half billion bushels. I have seen no bill which contained a provision, either directly or by implication, that would cause the purchase of any part of that wheat in connection with the carrying out of our national defense excepting as they are used by the Navy and Army.

Mr. TABER. Only as we have had large sums of money provided for rations for the Army, which would use very large quantities of that wheat. I may say to the gentleman that the boys in the service will use about four times as much breadstuffs as the ordinary family in private life, because it is possible to get those foods to them when it is not possible to get some other things to them; so that the ration money will go to a very large extent to buy breadstuffs, which are wheat products.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will agree with me that these wheat products and wheat should be purchased from the production here in the United States when we have such a surplus on hand and that our own farmers should be given preference?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I not understand the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to say the day before yesterday, I believe it was, that approximately $100,000,000 of the $7,000,000,000 appropriation would be used for the purpose of disposing of cotton to England?

Mr. TABER. I think that that might be so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That would approximate 2,000,000 bales of cotton for export, which is almost one-third, over 30 percent, of the total cotton owned by the Government of the United States, so it looks to me as if that is a pretty liberal contribution right there.

Mr. TABER. It would help the agricultural situation very materially. I imagine they need very large quantities of that cotton currently for ammunition.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman was discussing the production facilities for aircraft in this country. I know he reported that Mr. Knudsen believed that the facilities at the present time were adequate to turn out the planes on the schedule which Congress is requesting and the people are desiring.

Mr. TABER. I will correct that a little. Mr. Knudsen said that with the funds we were providing for additional equipment and facilities in the $7,000,000,000 appropriation passed the day before yesterday and in this bill, we would have the facilities to provide the planes that are carried in that bill and in this bill and in all previous bills. He did not make any prediction as to the facilities being large enough to carry a program expanded beyond that territory, unless it might come as a result of taking the place of production when production comes out of those plants.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I notice from a reading of the hearings that the gentleman from New York who is now speaking questioned Judge Patterson on the subject of production facilities for planes.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is my belief, accentuated now over a belief which I have held for many years, that it is absolutely necessary that the production of our aircraft, as speedily as possible, be decentralized into the interior parts of our country, and that we do not have, as we now have, a concentration of aircraft facilities in the coastal regions of the country.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would turn to page 172 of the hearings he would see that large facilities for assembly plants have been built in Omaha, Nebr., Kansas City, Mo., Tulsa, Okla., and Fort Worth, Tex. This does not mean they are built in these cities, but in their neighborhood.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman calls attention here to these assembly plants and their location. I believe it is indicative of a feeling on the part of those who are in charge of our defense program that bringing in these plants from the coastal regions is highly desirable, and I hope the movement continues.

Mr. TABER. I may say to the gentleman that I believe these 4 plants will be in a position to turn out in the neighborhood of 5,000 to 6,000 of the large bombers and the medium-sized bombers in a 12-month period when they get to swinging. They may not do it the first year they are in operation, but when they get to swinging they should turn out from 5,000 to 6,000, perhaps even more, of these tremendously large planes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the distinguished gentleman believe it would be desirable to consider how we are going to pay all this money at the same time we are appropriating the money? That is, should we not consider a tax bill almost simultaneously with an appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. The Committee on Ways and Means should be at work right now on a tax bill that will let the people of the United States make the sacrifices they need to make for their own protection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. On page 6 of the report, at about the middle of the page, the report speaks of equipment and supplies for an Army of 2,000,000 men on a combat status. Then near the bottom of the page it speaks of new production facilities sufficient to equip and maintain a second 2,000,000 men on a combat status. Does this bill have in contemplation the development of facilities and equipment looking eventually to our having an Army of 4,000,000 men on a combat status?

Mr. TABER. Some of the facilities are supposed to be large enough to cover the requirements of 4,000,000 men on a combat status. I do not believe the facilities for a great many things would be large enough to cover 2,000,000 additional men. I believe they would be large enough as to some items because some items do not take so long to procure as the facilities

for the production on a large scale of the large bombers and some of the munitions items, like powder and guns. Some of the factory facilities have to be larger than they would otherwise be required to be, and they have to be built up somewhat in advance. The large bomber development is more or less a new development, and it is not the sort of thing on which we have ever planned on any such scale as this prior to about a year ago. However, the developments of the war across the waters have proven conclusively that it is absolutely necessary that we go ahead with the facilities to produce these large bombers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The report indicates that the War Department or the administration has in mind the procurement and development of facilities for equipping a 4,000,000-man Army on a combat status.

Mr. TABER. The War Department has in mind that if our requirements for national defense demand a 4,000,000-man Army we will be in a position to put it in the field. This does not mean that they necessarily have plans for it, or that they expect to have it, but they feel that for our own protection it is necessary to have a base large enough so that we can expand to that figure if the world military situation and our own defenses should require it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does that include the Navy?

Mr. TABER. Oh no; it has nothing to do with the Navy. The Navy personnel cannot be expanded very much beyond 300,000 under any circumstances that I can see with the number of ships that we may have available.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But if conditions develop so that you need a combat army of 4,000,000 men, that means that the services of these men will not be confined to the Western Hemisphere or to the possessions of the United States, does it not?

Mr. TABER. I do not know; and I do not think anyone could answer that question at this stage of the situation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am for the bill and I have voted for every appropriation——

Mr. TABER. I do not think anyone could answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have voted for every appropriation for our own country. My difference has been when we are giving $7,000,000,000 to foreign countries.

Mr. TABER. I would like to be able to answer the question, but I would not attempt to answer it unless I could tell the truth, and I simply could not answer it, that is all.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman from Kentucky has covered some of the questions I had in mind asking. I am always willing to appropriate money for the defense of the United States and its possessions, but I am concerned when we see a provision in here to supply equipment or facilities for 4,000,000 men, because I understand that military experts are agreed that it takes 4 men and the necessary equipment for each man in a defending force; in other words, there must be 4 men in the invading force for each man in the defending force. Consequently, I am convinced that there must be some thought in mind of using these men outside of our own confines, because I fail to see where anybody could try to effect a landing here with an army of 16,000,000 men and the necessary equipment. There is not that much shipping available in the world.

Mr. TABER. I want to call attention to the statement by Mr. Knudsen with reference to the airplane bomber situation, on pages 187 and 188. For your benefit, the gist of that statement is that these large bombers are the things that we need for the defense of our coast line. That appears toward the bottom of the page, and it is set up here as a part of the 4,000,000-men schedule.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say that if we have these 3,600 bombers or had them today with our present Navy, all the combined navies of the world and all the combined armies of the world could not land a man on these shores.

Mr. TABER. Well, I hope that that may be so.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Does the gentleman know whether there was any information given in the hearings as to whether or not there is any provision made for the acquiring of new and modern designs for airplanes, or whether or not this whole program is based on a program of ships in production?

Mr. TABER. There is a large item in this bill in connection with airplanes for experimental construction. This runs into a very considerable number of dollars. I cannot give it offhand, but I could turn to it in a moment, and every contract for airplanes is let in such a way that many improvements that may be developed can be placed upon them. The whole thing is a management proposition as far as the contract goes. For instance, there is one item of $2,350,000 at the top of page 173, and there is $4,400,000 at the bottom of page 172. Of course, this is a supplemental bill and is not the regular bill with the regular requirements for experimentations, and this does not include the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which has a very substantial appropriation out of the independent offices bill, and for which we carry some large sums of money in some of the supplemental bills.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The distinguished gentleman from New York spoke about the decentralization of defense industry and the location of aircraft-assembly plants at points in the Middle West. One of these plants is located, as indicated on page 172, at Omaha, Nebr., in the district which I represent. Mr. Martin, of the Martin Bomber Co., who is to operate that plant, was present recently at the opening ceremonies and reviewed the whole situation. I have talked with him personally, and I am familiar with the fact that he is quite enthusiastic over the prospects of successful operation of that plant. The question I am asking the gentleman is whether other plants of other characters and other types should not be decentralized and placed in the Middle West in accordance with the ardent desire of the people in the Middle West who are anxious to cooperate in the national-defense program. May I ask specifically if powder plants and shell plants will be placed in the Middle West, where they are geographically protected and where they can be operated for the success of the defense program?

Mr. TABER. There are large quantities of those things being done right now. There is no question but that the program of the War Department calls for just exactly that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I shall take 5 minutes more, but that must be the end of the story.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am not going to ask any questions about the bill, except to make a very brief statement with respect to the provisions of the bill. I was not on the floor of the House when the bill was reported. I understand there was no reservation of points of order, but I find that the bill is interwoven with legislative provision after legislative provision, one of which relates to travel pay of the Army, when there is a bill pending on the House Calendar reported regularly and unanimously by the House committee on that subject. My purpose in asking the gentleman to yield to me is to give notice to the gentleman as an able member of the House Committee on Appropriations and to the committee that hereafter, if the rules of the House are not changed, there will not be any more legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have tried to make some calculations on the cost of these bombers. Apparently the cost per bomber is somewhere between a quarter of a million dollars and $300,000. Is that right?

Mr. TABER. This will be approximately $398,000. The medium-sized bomber would cost $250,000. That is why you cannot figure it exactly. There are two different kinds of bombers, and

when you go to the other, the cost will be more.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman feel that those costs are reasonable?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman must realize that the actual cost of the plane and the original equipment will run perhaps to $250,000, while the spare parts and the extras which you have to have, the extra engines that you have to provide, 100 percent, and all that sort of thing, accounts for the difference. It is not a fair conclusion that you are just getting the bare original plane, because it includes what is required for operation under normal conditions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And as time goes on, if more of these ships are required, would the cost be reduced?

Mr. TABER. It might be on the assembly-line production, perhaps, yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Then I ask the gentleman a brief question about an item previously discussed, about the additional 2,000,000 men. Do I understand that item is in the bill for production facilities rather than for the purchase of actual equipment?

Mr. TABER. Production facilities for some small percentage that would be required, if you had to have 2,000,000 men, like the bombers and some of the munitions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I mean it is for facilities.

Mr. TABER. Facilities only.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And not for the purchase of actual equipment.

Mr. TABER. That is it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Are any funds provided in this bill for sandbags to protect the Capitol Building and funds also for the digging of dugouts for Members of Congress, as is being done now in certain other Government buildings?

Mr. TABER. I have not heard of that operation. Perhaps it should be done—I do not know.

Mr. FISH. I merely wanted to get the gentleman's information on this very important issue at this time.

Mr. TABER. I presume that we could all get into the tunnel that comes over from the House Office Building to the Capitol, if we were right there at the time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The report on the bill indicates that an additional amount of approximately 20 percent is provided for airplane procurement. Will the gentleman advise us if this increase is largely the result of the cost-plus policy, which is the Government policy?

Mr. TABER. I do not think there is any such additional percentage on the airplane proposition.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The report so states.

Mr. TABER. I mean due to that, but that is a wasteful way of doing a job, I think.

I submit herewith a record of the appropriations so far made in this Congress, beginning with January 3, 1941. The table includes contract authorizations and reappropriations just as far as I have been able to get them:

Appropriations and contract authorizations as of Mar. 21, 1941, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

Independent offices:		
Direct	$1,404,576,838.00	
Permanent	356,276,039.00	
		1,760,852,877.00
Treasury-Post Office:		
Direct	1,146,394,496.00	
Permanent	4,516,027,407.00	
		5,662,421,903.00
Urgent deficiency, Work Projects Administration, direct		388,140,000.00
Army clothing, direct		175,000,000.00
Ship construction, direct		313,500,000.00
Agriculture:		
Direct	890,824,037.00	
Reappropriated	11,318,684.00	
R. F. C	250,000,000.00	
		1,152,142,721.00
Fourth supplemental:		
Direct	1,376,464,602.00	
Contract authorization	154,055,000.00	
		1,530,519,602.00
Navy:		
Direct	3,415,457,250.00	
Contract authorization	31,127,894.00	
		3,446,585,144.00
First deficiency, direct		188,863,693.68
Defense aid, direct		7,000,000,000.00
Fifth supplemental, national defense, 1941:		
Direct	2,017,066,820.00	
Contract authorization	2,096,086,197.00	
		4,113,153,017.00
		25,731,178,957.68

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little about political influence in the allocation and disbursement of Government funds for the St. Louis Jefferson Memorial.

Mr. Chairman, the Members will no doubt remember the $30,000,000 Jefferson Memorial project in St. Louis. Congress has turned it down several times, but it still goes forward. On Tuesday the President approved another W. P. A. project, amounting to $210,000, to construct a drive about five-eighths of a mile long on the west side of the memorial site. Nearly $10,000,000 of public money has gone into this real-estate scheme so far, yet Congress has never voted a dime for it. We have been taken for a lot of rides, but this time it seems that politics have entered the picture. On April 1 the people of St. Louis will go to the polls and choose a mayor for the next 4 years. The present incumbent, Bernard Dickmann is a candidate for reelection. Last week a Member of this body spoke in behalf of Mr. Dickmann's candidacy in St. Louis, and on Saturday, March 16, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat's leading editorial was entitled "COCHRAN's Shocking Campaign Plea."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert the editorial in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must obtain that permission in the House.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Then I will have to read the editorial.

The editorial is as follows:

COCHRAN'S SHOCKING CAMPAIGN PLEA

Representative COCHRAN'S right to speak in behalf of Mayor Dickmann's candidacy is admitted. It is his privilege to bolster Democratic morale in his home city, and no exception may be taken to his recital of the achievements of the Dickmann administration, which are material in several categories. But he is in gross error when he declares that a convincing reason why Mr. Dickmann should be reelected to a third term is because he "stands in" with President Roosevelt and can get Government "handouts" for St. Louis, which would be denied this city if a Republican took over at the city hall. This is a frank admission that politics influences the allocation and disbursement of Government funds, and, if true, constitutes an inescapable indictment of the New Deal.

If we understand Representative COCHRAN correctly, Mayor Dickmann's reelection is imperative because he has a "close and cordial relationship with the officials of the Government," which gives him entree in Washington to the public tills where money is available for public works. On the basis of political friendship, then, St. Louis is the recipient of Federal funds which would go elsewhere were the mayor not a Democrat. In other words, the taxpayers' money, which is collected from Republicans as well as Democrats, becomes a political instrument which rewards the faithful and penalizes those who dare to disagree with the New Deal.

Wherein lies fairness in such dealings? Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers may chant themselves hoarse in declaring that politics and relief are divorced, but Representative COCHRAN, than whom no New Dealer is more ardent, has submitted unwitting proof that the contrary is true.

Among the 95,000 Republicans who voted in the recent primary are taxpayers of high and low degree. The money they pay for taxes is the same kind of money used by the Democrats, and presumably is as difficult for them to assemble on specified dates of payment; yet Representative COCHRAN has the temerity to state that if St. Louis has a Republican mayor, the Government in Washington is privileged to invoke punitive measures against the city by withholding funds which would be handed over gladly to a Democratic mayor.

This is precisely the charge leveled in other communities against the New Deal, and vigorously denied in Washington. Unfortunately, Mr. COCHRAN makes the accusations appear real.

Friends of Mayor Dickmann may support him for valid reasons. But the plea that he is faster and surer on the grab than his Republican opponent certainly injects a specious and dangerous issue into the campaign.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of March

15, the paper that won the Pulitzer prize a few years ago for having the most unprejudiced and comprehensive editorial writers in the United States.

This editorial quite pertinently points out that the allocation and disbursement of Government funds may be influenced by politics. Coming at a time when an election is less than 2 weeks off, this allocation of $210,000 for street improvements on the Jefferson Memorial area seemingly has been influenced by politics. Many St. Louisans, in the light of the Congressman's plea for his friend, will consider this nothing more nor less than an attempt to bribe the electorate into voting for the head of the Democratic machine. But the people of St. Louis have become immune to both bribery and intimidation. They know that Mr. Dickmann is not Santa Claus and that any Federal money that comes to St. Louis comes out of their own pockets. St. Louis in the past has had millions in Federal aid. Much of this money now lies at the bottom of the River DesPeres. Nearly a million was squandered dusting off the levee in 1936. This $210,000 will serve only as a reminder of the waste that has gone before. It will crystallize the sentiment against Mr. Dickmann's political machine.

The people of St. Louis will not be fools enough to fool themselves on April 1.

The editorial from the St. Louis Globe Democrat speaks for itself.

To refresh your minds, in closing, I want to say that I am surprised that my good colleague, the senior Member from St. Louis, who has promised so many times that he would never vote for a dollar of money for this memorial, has come out publicly for the mayor who is able to come and get it for this memorial. I think he is a little inconsistent.

This mayor, you know, is head of the realty firm in St. Louis which was barred from the realty board because of misconduct. He sponsored this memorial as one of his baby projects. The President of the United States—and those of you who do not know, get this—the President allocated six and two-thirds million dollars out of relief money to buy this real estate. Now, get that—to buy real estate for this site. Not a dime of it went to labor. Not a dime of it went to feed or clothe the hungry and the needy. Not a dime of it. The mayor got six and two-thirds million dollars at one lift from the President of the United States out of relief money, and the President knew what he was doing; that it was going to buy real estate and help the racketeers, and nobody else.

I think it is a shame and I hope for the sake of good government in the United States, in view of the mayor's stand on this memorial, that he will not be reelected on April 1. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] telephoned me that he was going to make a speech. I appreciate that kindness. Anything can happen here. Now we find a gentleman speaking on the St. Louis mayoralty election, although he lives in the State of Kansas.

Well, it looks like my speech out in St. Louis hurt a little bit; does it not? It seemed to have worried some people—Republicans out there. [Laughter.] If conditions will permit, I am going back next week and worry them some more.

We should not conduct a local campaign on the floor of the House of Representatives. However, it is common knowledge that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] has had for a long time a ghost writer in St. Louis who for several years has been supplying him with speeches or material for speeches concerning the Jefferson Memorial project, and the gentleman from Kansas seems to accep' everything he gets—uses it without investigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not now. I am talking about the gentleman from Kansas, not the gentleman from Michigan.

On this occasion the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] received from his ghost writer an editorial from a St. Louis paper which is supporting the Republican candidate for mayor criticizing a speech that I made in St. Louis last week. The gentleman from Kansas himself used some language in his remarks which I am sure would be expunged from the RECORD if I raised the question. But it is not my purpose to do so. They weaken his statement; and then, again, I can take it.

The editorial in question is in no way a fair analysis of what I said. About the only fair words in that editorial are that I made a speech. I have a copy of that speech before me, and I am going to tell you what I said and why I said it.

St. Louis is one of the large cities of the United States. We found tens of thousands of our citizens out of employment as a result of the Hoover administration. Following the election of President Roosevelt in 1932, we elected a Democratic mayor the following spring, and that mayor, the one the gentleman from Kansas assails, has taken advantage of all the Federal laws that we have passed and has sponsored projects under the policies of the Federal laws that have not only given the city lasting benefits but have also placed unfortunate people to work. If reelected, he will continue to do so. That is what the mayor of every large city must do.

Now, up to the time I reached St. Louis, and, I might add, up to the present hour, so far as I know, the Republican candidate for mayor has failed to say that if he were elected he would likewise sponsor projects that our city is entitled to.

The Republican candidate and his committee have adopted their platform, and it is silent as to whether or not a Republican administration, if by any chance it were placed in power in St. Louis, would continue to sponsor W. P. A. projects and other projects, including the food-stamp plan. I think that is an issue in our campaign. You will see before I get through, he and his organization will, whether they are in sympathy or not, and despite the fact they made no mention of the program in their platform, refer to this subject. I will keep after them until they do.

In my speech I cited the policy of the Federal Government which required the municipality to sponsor a project, pay for the materials, and the Government supplied the labor. Let me repeat here now what I said, and that is unless the mayor of a city—and remember this is exactly what I said in St. Louis—will make the applications to the Federal Government for W. P. A., or other kinds of projects, then the city could not by any stretch of imagination secure any allocation of any funds appropriated by this Congress for that purpose. Yes, I repeat, the present mayor of the city of St. Louis for nearly 8 years has taken advantage of W. P. A., of P. W. A., has sponsored all kinds of Federal-aid projects, and we have always kept at work in St. Louis just as many men under W. P. A. as it was possible to do under the allocation of the administration in Washington by advancing our share of costs, and I want the city to continue until these poor unfortunate people who have not been able to get a job since your last Republican national administration can find some kind of work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not misrepresentation to say that the Republican candidate for mayor of the city of St. Louis is in sympathy with his national organization, and the Republican leaders in this House. It also appears from his silence as though he is in sympathy with the gentleman from Kansas and other Republican members of the Appropriations Committee, who have so consistently—and that is one thing about them, they are consistent—who have so consistently attempted to impede and destroy the efforts of the Democrats to take care of the poor suffering people, who have no other place to go for jobs.

I have no way of judging how the Republicans of Missouri as a whole look upon the sponsoring of W. P. A. projects. There is, however, one record I can refer to that might be an indication of their attitude. A Republican Congressman was elected from the Springfield, Mo., district last November. He took office on January 3. We have had one relief bill since he has been here and he tried by amendment to strike millions of dollars from that bill that would have deprived tens of thousands of people of employment on W. P. A. I answered his argument on the floor of this House. The Republicans stood up and voted for his amendment while the Democrats stood up and voted it down.

What I wanted to know was if by any chance this Republican mayor was elected where would the unfortunate people be if he refused to sponsor the projects and he holds the same view of that Republican Congressman. That is what I talked about in St. Louis, and will talk about again.

The gentleman from Kansas has personally assailed the mayor of the city of St. Louis. I am not condoning the offenses of any man, the mayor of St. Louis or anyone else, who does not conduct his office in the public interest, or who violates a public trust. Just as an example let me say we had an election last November, as you know, and on the face of the returns a Republican was elected Governor of our State by nearly 4,000 votes. A Democrat legislature, unfortunately, as you read, refused to seat that candidate. I happened to be the first Democrat holding a major office in the State of Missouri, up to the time I spoke, who demanded that the legislature seat the Republican who had received the certificate of election. I wanted them to obey the constitution of my State, even though a Republican Governor would be seated. I wanted government by law, and demanded it. Does not that show an attitude of fairness to the people?

I will say one thing for the mayor of St. Louis, and his bitterest enemies must also admit it, that nobody can charge him with dishonesty in handling the affairs of the city of St. Louis for the past 8 years.

Now, as far as the Jefferson Memorial is concerned, I am going to tell the gentleman from Kansas something about that, how members of his party helped in that bond-issue election he has referred to so often.

The memorial has been criticized, the bond-issue election was justly criticized. The charge was made that the election was stolen. Businessmen in the city of St. Louis, outstanding businessmen of both parties, will tell you they collected money for a campaign fund to win the bond-issue election. The Republican organization of the city of St. Louis was supporting it, the Democratic organization of the city of St. Louis was supporting it. Businessmen and civic organizations supported it. I was here at the time, I was not home when that election was held, but I do know that subsequent events disclosed that the money collected for the purpose of getting out the voters and campaigning on election day in support of that bond issue was handed out by a Republican, a man who was a candidate for mayor himself a few years ago, and who did not dare bring up the subject when he was a candidate for mayor; and in his financial statement showing where that money went to; this Republican gave more money to his own party members than he gave to the Democrats. That is a matter of record, not the story of a ghost writer or hearsay.

It is easy to rise on the floor of the House, under the immunity a Member enjoys, and attack the character of a man 800 miles away that has no connection whatsoever with the House of Representatives. If I expressed my feelings in reference to such attacks my words would be taken down and eliminated. I therefore control myself.

Again referring to the speech I made in St. Louis, I by no way indicated, and nobody could honestly put the construction upon it as meaning, that if a Republican were elected mayor of the city of St. Louis that the Federal Government would not allocate any money to the city of St. Louis. I feel that in the many, many years I have served here the Members of this House know me well enough to realize I would not make any such foolish statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to tell you Republicans something else about W.P.A. You assailed W. P. A.; many voted against it. You have voted to reduce appropriations needed for this purpose. You have a right to do it, just as much as I had a right to vote and speak for them.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, as he started this discussion.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does the gentleman mean I voted against the total for relief?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am talking about Republicans in general. Some of you voted for the appropriations, most of you sought to reduce them, and many voted against the bill in the end.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I thought the gentleman meant me.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows there are Republicans very close to him now that voted against all of them. I never mentioned anyone specifically, just spoke of Republicans generally. You know how you voted on votes that were not recorded.

Mr. TABER. I suppose the gentleman is referring to me. I vote against them because they are not for relief but for rackets.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from New York is honest and votes his convictions. That is the truth; the gentleman wanted to turn W. P. A. over to the States where it would be put in the hands of politicians and where the situation would be that Federal money would be spent by local politicians. What scandals you would have had then. The gentleman has his opinion of W. P. A. I do not deny him the right to his opinion, and I know he grants me the same privilege.

Mr. TABER. Would we have had any worse scandal than that of Harold Hunter?

Mr. COCHRAN. I answered the statements made against Mr. Hunter a year ago. I feel he will make an excellent administrator.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not yield to the gentleman. My time is too short. I want to conclude.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been in the W. P. A. office in St. Louis in my life, and I do not know as I will ever go there. If that is not a clear indication that I have kept politics out of the W. P. A., I do not know what is.

In conclusion, let me say before the gentleman from Kansas engages in a smearing campaign he should be a little bit more sure of his facts. He should have found out what the gentleman from Missouri really said in his speech, and I would have been glad to have given him a copy of the speech, if he wanted it, before he made his remarks and used language that I could have had expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the editorial from the paper supporting the Republican candidate, I say again, is not a proper analysis of the speech I made in St. Louis. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say involves a subject that means economic life or death to some of my constituents. On page 8 of the bill now before us is an item for military construction in the total amount of $98,250,000. The details are not given, but on page 8 of the report several items are set out, and in those items is one to which I refer, reading as follows:

Change of Seward terminus of The Alaska Railroad to a point on Passage Bay, $5,300,000.

On the following page, page 9, of the report is the justification as given by General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I have probably as great respect for the achievements, the character, and the outstanding ability of General Marshall as any man in the United States, and I fully concur in the remarks about him that were made the other day, as I recall, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], when he said that we were fortunate, indeed, at this juncture of our affairs to have as the head of our Army a man like General Marshall, and at the head of our Navy, Admiral Stark. That is not an overestimate of General Marshall's value to the country. Yet I suggest to you here that General Marshall in this case has not gone into the matter thoroughly himself, which is perfectly natural, in view of the immense burden of work that presses upon him every day. I suggest further that no one in the Army has gone into it thoroughly, but that the Army officers and officials have simply accepted without much question the recommendation of the general manager of the Alaska Railroad.

I have read the hearings on this subject carefully. They begin on page 231, starting in with the statement of the general manager of The Alaska Railroad. I fail to find there anything to indicate that any Army engineer or anyone else than some engineers of The Alaska Railroad set this estimate up or sought to justify it upon any substantial grounds other than economic ones. It does appear in the hearings, Mr. Chairman, and I think it suffciently well appears in the hearings, that the same ends of national safety and national defense could be accomplished by the expenditure of not to exceed $1,500,000.

I invite the attention of the Members to page 241 of the hearings, the testimony of the general manager, in which he gives figures to indicate that all of the unsafe wooden structures of The Alaska Railroad, which they say are so readily subject to sabotage or destruc-

tion, can be replaced for somewhere around $1,329,000. I will raise that figure a bit and say that $1,500,000 will do the same job. In my judgment, the only thing that is going to be accomplished by this proposed project is to shorten the line of the railroad by some 50 or 52 miles.

It is said here in the hearings by the general manager that the work is going to cost $5,300,000, and that is the item set up in the report on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken counsel upon that subject from engineers who are just as capable as the general manager, and they tell me that the job cannot possibly be done for less than $10,000,000, and will probably cost $12,000,000. I would not be so much interested in the matter of expense, because if national defense is involved we are all ready to appropriate whatever millions or billions are necessary to provide that national defense; but I say to the House that the same objects of national defense can be accomplished by the expenditure of a great deal less money.

It is pointed out by the general manager, too, that immense savings are going to be made by relocating the southern end of The Alaska Railroad, making it run into Passage Canal or Passage Bay, or Portage Bay, as it is alternately called; but nowhere in this record and nowhere in these figures is there any indication of the amount of money that we will have to pay in interest, year after year, on the money that is borrowed to accomplish that change. No credit or no offset has been given for interest; and I say now, from my own knowledge of that entire region and from my own knowledge of all the circumstances, that instead of having a saving out of this you will have a continuous loss throughout all the years until the debt is paid.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say to the gentleman from Alaska that I am somewhat familiar with the proposal to change the route of the railroad in Alaska. I am not unmindful of the fact that the railroad, as it is now located, serves practically all of the farming section of that great area at the present time. Is that correct?

Mr. DIMOND. On Kenai Peninsula, immediately along the line of the railroad.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. What is to become of those farmers in case this railroad is abandoned in that section?

Mr. DIMOND. There are only a few farmers in that area, but there are some 1,500 people, I should say, altogether, who live in the area around Seward and as far north as Moose Pass, 28 miles north of Seward. As to all those people, I tell you they are going to be plowed under unless some remedial measures are taken, and I am glad to note that the committee was sensible of that, because on page 9 of the hearings is a paragraph inviting the attention of the War and Navy Departments to the distressing position in which these people will be placed if the railroad is taken into Portage Bay.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I realize the gentleman has had little time to discuss a very important question, one highly important to the people whom he represents in this House. I hope the gentleman will secure permission to extend his remarks, and extend them to a point where the Members of the House can understand thoroughly just what this involves for the people the gentleman represents.

Mr. DIMOND. I thank the gentleman.

I desire to invite the attention of the Members to a very fine statement of the entire situation which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1234. It is written by Mr. B. C. Johnson, of Seward, Alaska. In my opinion, the statement of Mr. Johnson presents the facts and the truth. [Applause.]

A moment ago, I referred to the concern manifested by the members of the Appropriations Committee in the plight of the residents of Seward and of those who reside along the line of the railroad between Seward and Mile 66, as shown in the committee report on the bill appearing on page 9 of the report. The paragraph to which I refer reads as follows:

> The committee desires to call attention to the hardship that will accrue to the persons residing in Seward who will be forced to move because of the abandonment of the railroad. Virtually the entire town is dependent upon the railroad activity and after its removal there will be little activity left. Railroad employees will be obliged to abandon any property they may have there and move to Passage Bay. The committee recommends that the War Department and the Interior Department give consideration and study to this phase of the situation with a view to advising Congress what action, if any, should be taken in the premises.

I truly pray and hope that the officials of the War Department, and more especially, the officials of the Interior Department, including the heads of those two Departments, will really give some heed to the recommendations of the committee as contained in the language of the report which I have just quoted. The gravity of the condition faced by these residents of Alaska if the terminus of The Alaska Railroad is changed to Passage Canal can scarcely be overestimated.

Many, if not most, of these citizens have lived in that area since railroad construction was started. They have built their homes there, and their meager savings have been invested in local properties. To compel them now to abandon what in many cases will be the savings of a lifetime is a condition that calls not only for consideration but for prompt and remedial action. Hard indeed will be the heart which would say to these good people that by policy of the Government they are rendered penniless and yet that the Government will afford them no measure of relief.

It is all so unnecessary, and so almost entirely based upon false premises. In fact, the Government engineers, who first laid out the lines of the railroad, deliberately rejected the Passage Canal route and chose the Seward route instead. I submit that there is still no substantial evidence to prove that the original choice was mistaken. It is true that the line from Seward north is 50 or 52 miles longer than the proposed new line into Passage Canal. But for all the traffic now moving over The Alaska Railroad the additional distance is insignificant. As Mr. Johnson has pointed out, in his statement which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1234, for all of the traffic now offered one locomotive manned by one crew can easily take care of the additional power required for transportation of trains, where an extra locomotive is necessary, between Seward and mile 66. The idea of spending $10,000,000, or even $5,000,000, to effect any such saving would be absurd if it were not accompanied by such tragic results.

The case would be different if 10 fully loaded trains a day were moving over The Alaska Railroad. Then, indeed, it would be highly important to ease the grades and to shorten the line even though that operation should involve the expenditure of millions of dollars. But with the present light traffic on The Alaska Railroad, which gives no promise of any great increase in the immediate future, the case is entirely different, and it is much cheaper to haul the occasional trains over the present line than to make the capital investment and pay the interest charges which will be necessary for the construction of the shorter line.

Moreover, The Alaska Railroad gets considerable revenue from carrying tourists. It is indisputable that the Seward-Moose Pass-Portage section, extending some 60 miles north of Seward, is scenically the most beautiful and attractive on the whole route except possibly for a short region in the area of Mount McKinley, considerably farther north. The building of the road into Passage Canal will forever destroy the most attractive part of The Alaska Railroad trip as far as tourists are concerned.

From the hearings it must be assumed that national defense can be served in the building of the new line in only two ways: One, by elimination of that part of the line which contains some wooden bridges and wooden trestles, and the other by shortening the line itself, and thus having that much less railroad to guard in case of war. National defense can be as well promoted in the first of those features by replacing the present wooden structures with steel, or with earth and rock fills. The general manager of the railroad has estimated, page 241 of the hearings, that the cost of such replacement with steel would be $1,329,000. Mr. Johnson, page A1235 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has estimated the same work as costing $1,400,000. Other engineers who advise me on the subject have said that the cost should not exceed $1,500,000. Taking even the higher figure, it is obvious that the present line could be made safe from sabotage—as safe as any other part of the line—for less than one-third of the estimated cost of the Passage Canal construction and probably for one-seventh

of the real cost of the proposed new construction. For the life of me, I am unable to see how national defense can be used to justify the proposed new route and, therefore, as great as is my respect for the high command of the Army, it is my considered judgment that the change should not be made, and that it cannot be supported upon grounds of national safety.

The general manager of the railroad claims that there will be a savings to the Government through construction of the new line of more than $500,000 per year. The figures in that respect deserve the same degree of consideration that we give to all other romance. Part of the estimated savings is based upon what is assumed will be lower freight rates if the new line is built. May I remind the Members of the House that there is absolutely no guaranty of any lowering of freight rates through construction of the road to Passage Canal. Indeed, unless the capital investment and interest required by the new construction are totally ignored, there will be no reduction whatever in freight rates. However, if there is such a reduction, it will simply mean that, although the Government agencies will pay less in freight, the United States Treasury will be obliged to support the interest charges without receiving anything in return. If money can be made or saved in this fashion, I do not know why we should not expand the operation considerably and thus save millions and millions instead of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

As to the cost of the proposed new line, I invite the attention of the House to the statement of the general manager appearing near the top of page 233 of the hearings. He there says that a recent survey of the project indicates that the line can be built at this time at the cost of $5,300,000. He further says that the estimated construction of the line surveyed by the Alaska Engineering Commission was between $4,500,000 and $5,000,000. The two estimates are therefore not far apart. It is worthy of note, however, that the Alaska Engineering Commission surveyed the entire line of The Alaska Railroad before the road was built and estimated that it would cost $35,000,000. It has actually cost to date about $73,000,000, as shown by testimony appearing on page 237 of the hearings. So let us not indulge in wishful thinking to the extent of believing that the proposed new line will not cost more than $5,300,000. Every other engineer with whom I talked tells me that the cost of it will be approximately twice the general manager's estimate, and may be considerably higher.

No one can say with assurance at the present time that the cost of maintenance of the line built into Passage Canal will be less than the cost of maintenance of the present road between Seward and mile 66. After all, no one can see into the mountain which it is proposed to tunnel—and one tunnel is to be about 2½ miles long and the other a little less than 1 mile long—and know what will be encountered in the driving of those tunnels or how costly their maintenance will be. Mr. Johnson foresees the need of steam heat during the winter months, and that will furnish quite a problem. It may well be that the cost of maintenance of the Passage Canal route will be greater than the cost of the present Seward route.

Mr. Chairman, we are all equally concerned with national defense. We all desire the greatest possible measure of national defense at the earliest possible moment. Hesitation is dangerous. Delay is still more dangerous. The general manager tells us that it will take 20 months from the date of starting work to complete the proposed new line to Passage Canal. Twenty months is a long, long time, and much may happen within that time. It is probable that we would unhesitatingly spend twice as much money to have the job done in 6 months. And yet, according to the undisputed testimony, we can substantially achieve and accomplish the same national-defense objects which will be served by the building of the line to Passage Canal in 6 months, and that can be achieved and be accomplished through the replacing of all wooden structures on the present route between Seward and mile 66 with steel. That job can unquestionably be completed in 6 months, and upon its completion all material danger of sabotage or accidental destruction will be obviated. It is strange to me that we should deliberately spend $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 to get national safety in this matter in 20 months, when we can surely get practically the same degree of national safety in 6 months at an expenditure not to exceed $1,500,000, and this national safety can be accomplished without dispossessing and economically destroying some of our citizens who are as good and as patriotic as any in the land.

My earnest request and prayer is that the Army engineers, in whom we all have the deepest confidence, make a thorough examination of this entire subject and then determine for themselves, after considering all the relevant factors, whether the new line into Passage Canal should be built or whether the present line should be rehabilitated and maintained. I believe that such a new and unbiased examination and inquiry will impel the engineers to recommend the maintenance of the present line. In any event, such an examination so made by the Army engineers would bring a degree of respect for their final judgment, which we cannot possibly have for anything so far presented to us by the general manager of The Alaska Railroad. I hope that before this bill finally passes and is approved, the appropriation made for The Alaska Railroad will be so worded as to permit the Army high command to use it for the rehabilitation or even the rebuilding of the present line between Seward and mile 66 or mile 81, if that course is deemed the wisest one and the one which is best supported by principles of sound engineering and by considerations of national defense.

At the same time, provision should be made for the extension of a motor road into Anchorage, if the Passage Canal route is adopted. This road has been built 65 miles north of Seward to Sunrise, on the south shore of Turnagain Arm. It could easily be extended across the Arm, a distance of not to exceed 3 miles, and thence by way of Indian Creek into Anchorage, a total distance from Sunrise of 36 miles. The cost of this construction would not exceed $1,500,000. It may be that there is a place in Turnagain Arm about 7 miles long, as indicated on page 242 of the hearings, but, of course, no one would be so lacking in judgment as to make a fill 7 miles long when at another point nearby a fill and bridge of 3 miles would traverse Turnagain Arm. The bill as finally passed should make provision for this road if the Passage Canal route is adopted. I ardently hope and expect that upon full consideration and full examination of the entire project the present line into Seward will be maintained.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] such time as he may desire.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, this bill is obviously for the purpose of appropriating money for the defense of the Western Hemisphere and the construction of war materials to be used and manned by our own people. I am going to vote for the bill.

I regret that there has not been a more equitable and, in my opinion, a more safe distribution of our plants for expediting our production program. It seems to me that plants for the production of war materials should be removed from congested areaas as far as possible. In this connection I want to call to the Members' attention the fact that in the area embraced in eastern Washington, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, the Dakotas, and Nebraska east of Omaha up to date no orders for plants have been given. This entire area would be less likely to be subject to aerial attacks than areas along the coast lines. It seems to me it would be the part of wisdom to decentralize as much as possible the plants for production of materials. We have in that section of the United States less trouble with labor than any other part of the country. We also have good rail and highway transportation facilities and every kind of an agricultural product that is needed for food. We also are abundantly supplied with raw materials, such as coal, copper, manganese, and other strategic materials. There is also plenty of water, particularly in Montana, as well as sufficient power facilities. I might also add that section of the United States is being drained of our skilled mechanics by the defense program, but our W. P. A. problem is just as serious as it ever was. I might also add that the climate is ideal nearly the year around for the convenience and comfort of the laborers employed in plants. I sincerely hope that the Site Board will give due consideration to that section of the country.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the deficiency subcommittee and the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee have considered this measure very carefully. The hearings were exhaustive. The

finest degree of cooperation obtained between both committees—so much so that there is no dispute on any of the items to be presented. Both the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] are to be congratulated for the high degree of statesmanship they exhibited in handling this measure during its consideration.

This bill calls for the appropriation of a little more than $4,000,000,000. Less than 3 days ago we completed consideration of a bill calling for $7,000,000,000 in appropriations. There is the staggering total of more than $11,000,000,000 involved in the two bills which this House will have considered and passed during this week.

These bills have for their purpose, of course, the implementing of our national-security program and providing all-out aid for democratic people throughout the earth. In this particular instance all the money herein provided is for our own armed forces.

I stress again the fact that the American people as a whole, regardless of section, of race, and of political party, are behind this program of national security. The Chief Executive, acting as Commander in Chief at this hour, is receiving magnificent support from the two major political parties and the American people. We are giving to the President of the United States and to the armed services without stint and without limit. We are giving them the money they say is necessary to provide security. We want security.

More than 80 percent of this bill is for the production of matériel. I again stress the fact that this war between two ideologies will be won by the democracies on the production lines and in the factories of the United States. There can be no excuse for lack of equipment as far as Congress is concerned. We are providing in legislation and appropriations everything the Chief Executive and the heads of our armed branches are asking for national security. As representatives of the people of this country who are wholeheartedly behind this program we have the right to expect that the Chief Executive of this Nation, whose voice is more powerful and whose influence is more powerful and far-reaching than that of any other person in the United States, will see to it that we do get national security, that we get production. He, more than any other person, is responsible for whether or not we shall get the production so essential for our security.

Again I commend the patriotism, the courage, and the loyalty of the working men and women of America. Again I pay tribute to the youth of America, who are responding so nobly to the call of duty in a splendid, self-sacrificing way. They are serving as if it were a privilege—and it is—to provide security for America and its institutions.

I also again invite your attention to the fact that there are stoppages in our production program, and these stoppages are engineered in most instances by left-wing, politically self-seeking labor leadership or by outright subversive agents under the influence of a foreign government. I am going to cite you an example.

The gentleman from Michigan called our attention to the fact earlier in the day that the strike at Allis-Chalmers had entered its fifty-eighth day. The Assistant Secretary of War, in his testimony appearing on page 38 of the hearings, in reply to a question of mine as to what was involved in production at the Allis-Chalmers plant for the Army and the Navy, gave the following information:

The following materials are being made for the use of the Navy, directly or indirectly: Gun forgings, housing forgings, complete equipment shafts, and couplings. Parts of gun carriages, gun slides on elevating guns, hoists, rammers for big guns, fabrication and partial machining; propelling machinery for two battleships; main and centrifugal power and steam pumps; metal-clad switchboards.

The following materials are being manufactured for the use of the War Department, directly or indirectly: Tractors, turbine generators for powder plants, tapped spline shafts for transfer of cases to trucks; construction equipment—i. e., rocks screens, tex rope drives, loaders.

Only 7,000 men are involved in this strike. Insofar as the Army is concerned, the amount of money involved is approximately $45,000,000. But your attention is called to the fact that three lines of production for powder, the most vital bottleneck we have in the ordnance program, are being held up at Radford, Va., by failure to deliver generators for use in the plant there. In other words, the program of providing shells and ammunition for both the Army and the Navy is being held up by this strike at Allis-Chalmers.

For the Navy, I am informed reliably that the torpedo boat-destroyer program is being held up because of the lack of certain vital and essential pieces of equipment which must be installed in these boats and are not available and will not be available until this strike has ended and production is resumed.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that the President should act to settle these strikes as he has the power to do?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I most certainly think so, and I thought I had made it plain that I think his voice and influence would be a most potent factor for bringing industrial peace and preserving industrial peace and stopping this wave of unwarranted and unnecessary strikes which is choking the industrial life of this Nation in its defense program.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. Does the gentleman believe that such practices would be permitted for 1 day in the totalitarian nations?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No; and it should not be permitted for 1 day in this democratic Nation of ours because it imperils the safety and the security of our country.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that the absence of the President at this time will unduly hold up the settlement or the correction of this very serious condition?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Of course, that would be speculation, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and I would not want to comment on that.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Does the gentleman know how many men are involved or affected by these strikes?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes; I have here statistics furnished me from a reliable governmental source which show that for the month of January, in production for the War Department, there were 150,211 man-days lost. In February, 468,855 man-days, which is an increase of more than 300 percent, and from March 1 to 14, the rate of increase is accelerated, and in those 14 days there were 289,064 man-days lost. I was reliably informed from a high authoritative source that the rate of increase in strikes in industry on national-defense contracts in March over January of this year was more than 400 percent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has given the figures on the man-days lost, but I want to call his attention to the fact that the figures he gave only includes the men actually on strike and do not include the other men prevented from working because of a strike. In many instances more men are delayed in national-defense work, in plants that are not on strike, because they cannot get the material that is necessary to carry on their work.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The gentleman is eminently correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Before I yield further let me call attention to one thing about the Allis-Chalmers strike, which I think you ought to know. Another committee of this Congress has been investigating for a period of several years the action of agents of foreign governments in this country. We know that the Axis Powers, the Nazi government, striking at the top through its control over patents and licenses and cross patents in this country, have produced choke points in our industrial centers, and that the Communist group exercising its control in certain affiliates of one of our great labor organizations has produced unwarranted, unnecessary, and unlawful strikes in order to create choke points.

The leader of this crucially important strike at Allis-Chalmers is Harold Christoffel. This man's record as a Communist was established by the Dies committee long ago. Despite this fact, he has remained as president of Local 248 of the C. I. O. United Automobile Workers,

which is the striking union at the Allis-Chalmers plant.

A year and a half ago Kenneth Goff, a witness before the Dies committee, told of his personal knowledge of Christoffel's membership in the Communist Party. Goff himself was a member of the Communist Party and also a member of the national board of the Young Communist League. Goff's testimony concerning Christoffel's membership in the Communist Party is fully substantiated by the sworn testimony of one Farrell Schnering before the State Assembly of Wisconsin. Schnering's testimony concerning Christoffel's membership in the Communist Party is a part of the official record of the Wisconsin Legislature. Schnering was formerly a member of the Communist Party and spoke from first-hand knowledge of the facts.

I want to quote a portion of Schnering's testimony which is incorporated in the official records of the Wisconsin Legislature, as follows:

> The Communists used their positions in the C. I. O. to further the mass campaigns of the Communist Party. After acquiring control of the State organization, they had little difficulty in setting up county councils under their patronage. Harold Christoffel became president of the largest county council in Milwaukee. They were able to acquire control of the executive board with relative ease. They launched an organizational drive for the C. I. O. with the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee. Frank Miller, a member of the Communist Party since 1934, became the president of this local union at the Milwaukee works of the International Harvester Co. He was assisted in acquiring this job by Joe Weber, of the national organization of the F. E. W. O. C. Joe Weber is an old-time member of the Communist Party.

Yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] made a statement to this House in which he pointed out that the strike now in progress at the plants of the International Harvester Co. is under the leadership of the Communist Party. I offer this supplemental evidence on the same point. The strikes at both International Harvester and Allis-Chalmers are purely Communist in their leadership, and both strikes have the Communist objective of sabotaging our national-defense program.

The Dies committee records also show that Christoffel has been active in the American Youth Congress and in the American Peace Mobilization, both of which organizations are Communist Party fronts, which, like the party itself, are agitating everywhere for the defeat of our national-defense program. All over the country this thing is going on.

We would not permit for one moment a Communist or a Nazi, a member of the Soviet Union or of National Socialist Germany, to act as leader of the Army or the Navy of the United States in this fight for defense. Why, in the name of God, then, will we countenance further Communist and Nazi leadership in our national production program, which is of vital import to this Nation at this critical hour? [Applause.] I appeal to the American people and the rank and file of labor to place American citizens who believe in the American form of government in positions of trust and leadership in organized labor. [Applause.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago I spoke, and almost continuously since that time, I have spoken, on this floor in behalf of the American citizen who wanted to work, advocating the principle that when a man wants to work he should have that right, that he should have the privilege of exercising that right free from any interference and without first paying tribute. Because I took that position I have been charged with being antilabor, mentally incompetent, riding a hobby, and with being several other unpleasant things. It is with some degree of satisfaction that I note that now when our national-defense program is under consideration, others seem to have that same idea and take the same position on the floor of the House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] spoke yesterday and he spoke again today, each time calling attention to the fact, so often asserted by me, that many strikes were instigated and carried on by Communists. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] offered an amendment the other day which was designed to end this tragic situation. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] again called the attention of the House to the situation where citizens are deprived of opportunity to work until they yield to the demands of a union. This denial of equality of opportunity to work is no different today than in 1937, except that the defense program is involved now. The principle is exactly the same. I notice that the House is very, very willing to kick the Communists around at this particular time. No one cares anything about the Communist support or the Communist vote, but an altogether different attitude is taken the moment you attempt to interfere with labor racketeers.

For myself I can see little difference between sabotage in defense work brought about by Communists and that brought about by grafting labor racketeers. I notice that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], whose patriotism and ability no one ever questioned, has time and time again objected to amendments being placed on appropriation bills which would have opened up the shops of the country to American citizens who have never committed any crime who are loyal, competent workers. How the gentleman can satisfy his conscience—and I know he sits here on the floor—with saying one thing and using a technicality in procedure to justify conduct which is breaking down this defense program, is something I cannot understand, and that may be, and I admit it may be, because I am dumb. How the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] can get up on the floor of the House, as he did the other day, and oppose an amendment which was nothing more nor less than an amendment—and I refer to the one offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]—to give to American citizens the right to work in defense of their country without paying tribute to a union, I cannot understand. I have time and time again from this floor stated that this Congress cannot escape responsibility for the situation which now confronts us by charging it all to the Communists and the labor racketeers. We have the power, we have the opportunity, and the only thing that is lacking to end this interference with our national defense is just one of two things. The responsibility for these present strikes rests upon the majority side in the first instance. You have an administration which harbors within its official ranks the men who are encouraging and lending active aid to this strike program, which is holding up national defense. You have Madam Perkins who would not admit for 2 years and until the Supreme Court had so decided that the sit-down strike was illegal. You submit to these strikes. By your silence you approve of them. You refuse to even bring on the floor the bills I have offered and the adoption of which would end or at least lessen the trouble. You lack, and we on the Republican side lack, the same thing, because we do not force the issue. We lack either the ability or the courage, one or the other, to take hold of a situation which everyone realizes is endangering the very existence of our country and pass legislation to end it. We lack either the ability or the courage. Which is it? I do not like to stand here in the well and say it, but I do not propose to let the thing die until someone takes hold of it either in this Congress or the Congress the people will elect in 1942 because of our failure to protect them and to recognize and act on the situation as it is at the present time. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have tried on previous appropriation bills to obtain an amendment which would have stopped in its tracks the racket prevailing universally in this country of requiring a man to pay tribute to a labor union in order to work for his country. That amendment has been repeatedly voted down. I had intended to offer it to this bill, but on coming here this morning I find that it is a deficiency bill, running to the period of June 30, 1941, and I think it would be a futile thing to offer it after the money in fact has been spent.

There are a few things I want to say on this subject, now that I have a little time to do it. We did not have time the other day.

We all know the conditions that prevail. We know that they are interfering seriously with our defense program in the production of materials, the production of vital materials, that are delaying many things that you must have, and have at once.

When I offered this amendment 2 or 3 days ago, my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], in the heat of debate, was unkind enough to say that the purpose of my amendment was to destroy labor unions in this country. My good friend the majority leader was, I think, thoughtless enough, in the heat of that debate, to say that I was attempting to throw monkey wrenches into the defense program.

So far as the defense of my country is concerned, either in voting for appropriations or anything else, I stand on my record in this House, and I put it against the record of any man here. But let us see who is throwing monkey wrenches into the defense program and let us see who is threatening to break up labor unions in this country and set them back 25 years in the gains they have made under this administration. Do you gentlemen who get on this floor and proclaim yourselves the friends of labor realize that 1 percent of those interested in the labor movement are rapidly destroying the gains of organized labor by their unwillingness to cooperate with their country in the hour of its greatest emergency? Do you suppose for a minute that the average workingman in this country is any less loyal to his country than you or I? If you do, you are wrong. Do you suppose that the average workingman in this country, who in many instances has been out of employment for years, wants to strike on these high wages and stop his work and stop the flow of the pay roll which is supporting his family? Of course not. He has to strike because somebody at the top of the union, for some reason that he does not know anything about, says to strike. When those leaders say "strike," whether there are underlying reasons of communism or fascism, or whatever they may be, he must strike. A picket line is thrown around his place of work and he is not permitted to enter. If you gentlemen who claim to be the friends of labor would just realize what is going on in this country and stand up here and do something to stop this thing and see that the production for our national defense proceeds, you would be doing labor the greatest favor that has ever been done to it on this floor [applause], because I warn you gentlemen who claim to be the friends of organized labor that if something is not done in the next 30 days, and these strikes keep on, all of us who are real friends of labor and real friends of honest organized labor are going to have to stand on this floor and fight drastic legislation that would take away the proper gains of organized labor that it has taken them 25 years to bring about.

Now, let us see who is throwing monkey wrenches into the defense program. I am accused of throwing monkey wrenches into the defense program because I want to see that no man shall be required to pay tribute to a labor union in order that he may work for his country. If that is throwing a monkey wrench into the defense program, what is the Allis-Chalmers strike, brought about by a Communist, and preventing the production of vital defense articles that this country needs? What kind of a monkey wrench is that, and where is it being thrown? If the Members of this House would put their foot down on that sort of thing, they would take some of the monkey wrenches out of the machinery that have already been thrown there by others, and which I have been trying to stop. [Applause.].

I think this thing is too serious and too imminent and the time is too precious for us to hesitate to give voice to the words in our hearts, and the knowledge that we have in our minds, as to these things, irrespective of whom it may offend.

May I say a word about the Mediation Board? We looked forward with great hope that this Mediation Board just created was going to do something about this situation. Have you read the Executive order? I read it with great disappointment. Under the Executive order creating this labor Mediation Board, do you know that it has no functions? It cannot perform one single act to prevent a strike. It cannot operate at all until the Secretary of Labor, having exhausted every means within her power, having used all the facilities of the Conciliation Department, having gotten to the end of the rope, and the strike probably having been going or for some time, finally makes up her mind that she cannot do anything more about it; then she is permitted, if she so pleases, to invite the Mediation Board to come in and see what they can do about it.

Now, what does that mean? That means that this Mediation Board has but one function. That is, after the damage has all been done, and after the strike has been called and defense production has been stopped and your program destroyed in that particular part of the work that is going on, then the Mediation Board may come in and solemnly "view the remains." And that is about all it can do. I challenge anybody to say it can do anything else.

Now, gentlemen, in all seriousness, this program does not need an undertaker; it does not need somebody to come in and view the remains after it is all over; we can all foresee that; what we need is a physician—somebody to prescribe the remedy, somebody to prevent these stoppages in defense employment—and this Congress—this Congress, the representatives of the 130,000,000 people of the United States—is that physician. It is your duty to prescribe; it is your duty to enact legislation. You cannot abdicate your functions to an executive department. Your people and mine will expect us to perform our constitutional functions. How long are the American people to be subjected to the delay in their vital defense matters because this Congress refuses or fails to function? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Just one or two little items of what is happening: In my State the Radford powder plant was built and completed in less time than the contract required. Only one-quarter of this plant can go into operation. Why? Because the machinery for the other three-quarters is tied up by the strike in the Allis-Chalmers plant, and this strike, as the gentleman from Alabama has just demonstrated very clearly to you, was called and fostered and brought about by communistic influences. Do we not realize that when we put these boys in the Army at $30 a month we have got to give them some powder to shoot with? Do we not realize that when we are training these boys at the risk of their lives every day to fly planes, that we must give them some planes to fly?

Then there is the Harvell strike, which was shown by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] yesterday conclusively to be engendered by the Communists. This strike is tying up the vital production of parts for airplanes, and you are advised authoritatively that unless this strike is immediately settled, the whole airplane-production program is going to be slowed up because they cannot get that particular part. I have several instances of similar character, and if I had a few minutes more I could tell you about them. I wish I had the time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request because the time for debate has been fixed by the House. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

It was so ordered.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the members of the committee to this statement in line 3 of the bill:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

You all know that on Wednesday we appropriated $7,000,000,000. This is Friday, and we are adding to it $4,000,000,000. This sounds like the old talisman "Come seven, come eleven." The great question to me is how are we going to get anything out of the Treasury, how are we going to defray the expenses of this appropriation as well as past appropriations? Where are you going to get the money?

When it comes to our own national defense and the things pertinent to our own well-being and life there is not a man who would not sacrifice to the limit to that end; but when we pass bills like that we passed on Wednesday giving the Chief Executive the power to spend $7,000,000,000 as he sees fit, or lend and spend and bend. I cannot get myself to believe that that is sound legislation for the American people, and I thank goodness that I was one of the 55 who voted against that bill. Now I am for our own direct national defense and will vote for this bill.

Much water has gone over the wheel in the past week. People have been criticized because they took part in trying to

prohibit the passage of legislation of that kind, and I am one of them; but I have just received a circular letter this week from Scribner's Commentator. I read from it the following statement:

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: At the suggestion of a friend I am taking the liberty of writing you about Scribner's Commentator.

I felt that you would be interested to discover that one magazine exists in this confused land of ours which has the courage to speak out in behalf of common sense.

I say courage because the editorial policy we have adopted—the policy of thinking of America first and Europe second—is not a popular one with the "go to war crush Hitler now" minority who make the loudest noise and wield the most pressure these days.

Frankly, we had some publishing doubts when we first lashed out on our campaign for reason. We were advised by every imaginable New York pressure group to desist. One prominent publishing executive warned us that if we ran a piece favorable to Lindbergh it would put the magazine out of business because "America thinks of Lindbergh as a traitor."

But we went ahead. As one of our directors said, "If this country has fallen so far that interventionists are hailed as patriots, while a Lindbergh is denounced as a foreign agent, the sooner we find out about it the better."

I take the same view as does Scribner's Commentator. I take the view that when a Member or any sound American citizen feels that his rights are being trampled on or taken away from him he has the right and it is his duty to speak out against it. God forbid that the day should arrive in America when he dare not. I am afraid, however, we are getting fast into that position. To me it seems terrible that we should prohibit free speech when it is for the good of America and our form of government. We have on the floor this afternoon just about as many Members as we had on the floor the other day when we considered the $7,000,000,000 bill. At 1:15 today we had 42 Members on the floor. At 2:15 there were 56 Members on the floor, 20 Democrats and 36 Republicans, to consider this bill which appropriates $4,000,000,000. That gives some idea of what thought the Members of Congress are giving to this legislation. It is handed to us by the administration and then the Appropriation Committee. We have subcommittees that listen to the various witnesses and the Members. We have faith in the members of those committees. I believe they are all honest men, but they take their directions from Army officers under the Commander in Chief of the Army. Then we as a full committee here must accept everything that is given to us. We pass the bill without an amendment. There is nothing wrong about that if everything is right and just. But they tell us that there has been a 30-to-35-percent waste in these war-appropriation measures because of the great haste we are proceeding under. I wonder sometimes whether we are not going just a little bit too fast on national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to insert in the RECORD the amount of appropriations that have been made for 1941 and 1942, amounting to $31,887,000,000. Here is the list:

War defense appropriations, 1941 and 1942

War Department:	
1941 appropriation	$6,482,802,777
Pending appropriation	1,716,225,000
	8,199,027,777
Navy Department:	
1941 appropriation	3,194,059,027
Pending appropriation	300,841,820
	3,494,900,847
Grand total Army and Navy, 1941	11,693,928,624
War Department, 1942 appropriation	5,665,282,239
Navy Department, 1942 appropriation	3,415,457,250
Total, Regular Army and Navy, 1942	9,080,739,589
Grand total, Regular Army and Navy, 1941 and 1942	20,774,668,213
Appropriation for lease-lend bill	7,000,000,000
Deficiency and supplemental appropriation for Army and Navy today	4,113,153,017
Total, Army-Navy and lease-lend	31,887,821,230

Cost of World War, 1917–20, and to June 30, 1932, $25,749,000,000.

With a national debt limit of sixty-five billions—an amount more than twice that of our debt in 1920—with thirty-one billions for national defense and gifts in 1941 and 1942—where are your new tax bills? Soon it will be a property assessment. Then what?

It seems to me we are just going too fast for our own good, and I wonder whether we should not be a little bit more careful lest we wreck our financial structure, and everything falls. What good is an army and navy and no money to support them? I am supposed to be considering the Interior Department appropriation bill, which appropriates $150,087,238. Yesterday all the members of the committee raised an objection because I wanted to save a few dollars in that bill. It was stated here several days ago that we listen to testimony in subcommittee for 4 or 6 weeks, then the bill is brought up here on the floor and is passed in 3 or 4 days. Today we will pass a bill appropriating $4,000,000,000 in approximately 3 or 4 hours for national defense. It would take 65 years to furnish the Interior Department, at the rate of $150,000,000 a year, with the amount of money we will spend this week. I am a whole lot more in favor of spending $150,000,000 a year for the Department of the Interior, notwithstanding I have objected to a good bit of the waste involved in there, to run that Department for 65 years than I am to spend $11,000,000,000 in a week to make war materials with which to go and kill people. I just cannot get that philosophy, especially when we will probably be led into this war and taken across to Europe to fight. We tried in 1917 and 1918 to make the world safe for democracy, and what a miserable failure we made of it, as we can see by present world conditions, and when we consider those soldiers of ours who bled and died over there and are now buried in France, and when we look at the soldiers in this country who were maimed and who are receiving pensions because of their injuries received in the last war, I feel sorry for them. I will feel more sorry if we bankrupt our Nation and they get nothing.

Now, we are using the same strategy to get America in war, just the thing that 2 years ago we said we would not do. Many people want to get America into the war. I am against it. The great majority of the American people do not want to get into this war. God willing, I am going to do everything I can to prevent our getting into this war. I have no other motive than that of a good American citizen, and I want to do what I believe is best for America. I have a right to think this out and think it through. And I must vote my own conviction not what someone else wants me to vote. If we declare war, and if we get into it, then I will back the President of the United States to the limit. Then I will back my subcommittee and the full committee. But until that time, until the time that it is essential for us to declare war, it will be my duty as an honest American citizen to oppose everything that will plunge this country into the war. That is what I expect to do, and, God giving me help, that is what I will do.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to refer back to the statement the gentleman made about those who are not on the floor and in committee. Does not the gentleman feel that we should be cautious about statements that may lead the public to believe that the Congress is not at work unless they are all on the floor? Can we not study this bill, both Democrats and Republicans, in our offices, by consulting the departments, and in the library studying measures over, just as well as here?

Mr. RICH. This bill did not come to the Committee on Appropriations until 11 o'clock. They did not have a chance to get the bill here on the floor until 12 o'clock. The gentleman did not get a chance to see the bill until after 12 o'clock. It is now 2:35 o'clock p. m. How much time did the Members have to look at it? I will wager the gentleman never has read the bill.

Mr. PATRICK. That means we ought to be on the floor every minute.

Mr. RICH. Under such conditions, I say, "Yes."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, some years ago Mark Twain wrote a book, the title of which was "Innocents Abroad." He wrote this

book after he had visited Europe and described his visits to various countries. While he was in Greece he saw the finest bridge, the most substantial bridge, that he had seen anywhere in the world, and he asked some of the people of that ancient city in Greece about the bridge. They told him that on the site of that bridge there had been constructed another bridge, and that bridge had collapsed. So the King of Greece called the populace out at the time he let the contract for the new bridge. He called the contractors who had the original contract for the erection of the bridge that had collapsed as well. While the contractors were there he beheaded the whole bunch of them, and on the same day let the contract for the new bridge. A word to the wise is sufficient.

Several days ago we voted $7,000,000,000 in appropriations. Today we are voting over $4,000,000,000. It seems to me that while we are voting these appropriations, simultaneously we should vote a tax bill. Why wait? Why not have the Committee on Ways and Means almost on the very day, at the very hour that we vote these tremendous expenditures bring in tax bills to pay for the expenditures? [Applause.]

Here I would like to read an article from the Washington News by John T. Flynn:

NEW YORK, March 19.—There is a lot of talk about taxes. Much of it should be reduced to pictures and run in the funny section.

Every sane economist knows that the only way to protect this country from the evil after effects of the war is to pay the costs of the war effort by taxes. Every sane politician knows that if he tries to do this he will be thrown out of office.

Therefore the tax program will be prepared by sane politicians instead of by sane economists.

If the costs of national defense are raised by taxes the costs can be kept to a minimum. If they are not raised by taxes no man can tell what the cost will be. All the blather in Washington about how the strong-armed Mr. Henderson is going to control the cost by controlling prices is just a lot of baloney.

The cost of national defense for this year and next, plus Britain's cut—if we spend it—will be around $39,000,000,000. Of course, nobody has any idea of trying to get that much in taxes out of the American people plus all of the other costs of government.

However, politicians, who are very seldom crazy, say that we must "pay as much of the national-defense bill as possible." Then there is a delicate little suggestion that the rich, who are going to get richer by the national-defense program, will be forced to disgorge most of this cost. That makes the poor man feel better.

However, the poor man can put this in his pipe for an afternoon's smoke—that if the total income of the rich, by which I mean those with incomes of $50,000 a year and over, were to be taken—all of it—it wouldn't be a drop in the bucket toward paying this bill.

As a matter of fact, if any attempt is made to pay the bill by taxes it will have to come out of the pockets of people with incomes between $1,000 and $25,000 a year. Now, I am in favor of paying the bill by means of taxes. But I am also in favor of telling the people honestly—the $1,000 to $25,000 a year men—that the bulk of the bill is going to fall on their necks.

We must take the American people into our confidence. The American people do not want war; they want proper defense; they want our Government to be run as they run their own businesses and their own households. They want us in this Congress, when we appropriate money, to tell them how much the bill is and to pass the tax on to them, irrespective of whom it hits. Certainly we ought to have the courage to vote the taxes necessary to pay for this bill even if none of us come back here again. It seems to me that in following this policy of not permitting our right hand to know what our left hand is doing we are doing our country an injury, an irreparable injury, and creating a debt that future generations will be called on to pay. Otherwise we are not in keeping with the best interests of our country and the traditions of our country.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Before yielding to the distinguished and useful gentleman from Ohio, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Ohio Republican Members of the House for their presence here this afternoon. During the Seventy-sixth Congress and during this session of the Seventy-seventh Congress the Ohio Members are always in attendance.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Those of us here from Ohio are listening with great interest to the distinguished Congressman at Large from our State. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a wise provision on the part of those who have the responsibility of organizing legislation that each time we pass an appropriation bill some appropriate action is taken on this floor to show how we are going to pay for it, or what part of it we are going to pay for by taxation or by some other method?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is absolutely right. This business of deficit financing, of voting appropriations without thinking about the cost, just does not make sense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Welfare of enlisted men: Welfare of enlisted men, $902,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that the matter I want to discuss is germane at this particular point, because this paragraph deals with the welfare of enlisted men. I want to call to the attention of the Committee the sad case of a former Member of Congress who was the victim of a hit-and-run driver last November. I read the following from the Washington News of today:

CONGRESSMAN BEATEN AT ELECTION, BUT HE REFUSES TO GET OUT

Though they may not know it—but how they can help but know is unthinkable—Illinois' Twenty-fifth Congressional District is being represented in Washington by two men. One of them was officially elected last November as the majority choice as their Representative. The other is the defeated man, who had held the post for 8 years.

As a result, Uncle Sam has a "squatter" problem on his hands. He was used to dealing with them in the last century in the vast western prairies, but this is a new type. The "squatter" is the defeated Congressman, Kent E. Keller (Democrat).

Mr. Keller, who has a reputation both as an administration supporter and a wag, didn't take last November's balloting too seriously in his own case—at least, before election day. As a result, when the votes were counted he was more than astounded and hurt to find the voters had let him down and named CECIL WILLIAM (RUNT) BISHOP, a Republican, to take over.

WENT INTO DEEP STUDY

Mr. Keller came to Washington to think it over. For weeks he meditated morosely behind the doors which lead into the House Library Committee's pleasant quarters in the new House Office Building. He couldn't make up his mind, according to those who ought to know, whether to officially challenge the election results or forget it.

Meanwhile at least three new Congressmen—Representatives THOMAS H. ELIOT (Democrat, of Massachusetts), WALTER K. GRANGER (Democrat, of Utah), and JOHN A. MEYER (Democrat, of Maryland)—were looking desperately for office space. Mr. Keller continued to sit and consider the injustice of it all until long past mid-January. At last he moved out.

But he returned to his district, informed the voters who had favored him that, although the majority apparently had been misled, he ex-Representative Kent E. Keller, would continue to represent them in the Nation's Capital. After all, he had got many of them jobs—had contacts with Government officials which shouldn't be sacrificed. In short, he planned to stay on the job—a Congressman without portfolio, as it were.

And he has. Somehow he managed to talk the House Rules Committee, whose chairman is also an Illinois man, Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, into letting him have the use of one of the committee rooms located on the fifth floor of the old House Office Building.

USES EX-EMPLOYEE

There, a day or so each week when he comes to town, he transacts business for his district. Uncle Sam is furnishing him with space, light, heat, and a typewriter, although Mr. Keller has claim to no more privilege than John Q. Citizen. Parenthetically he does have access to the House floor as a former Congressman, although he is not permitted to speak.

It is known, too, that Mr. Keller is making use—in the man's off hours—of a former employee, who now sits in as secretary pro tempore—takes care of mail and other odd jobs. Mr. Keller has become a "squatter" on Capitol Hill, and Uncle Sam's officials are a trifle baffled as to method of disposition in this case.

Mr. Keller's successor, Representative BISHOP, is reticent in speaking of his ballot opponent. Obviously, he's a bit perturbed by the whole business, but says he feels it's better to have the district represented by two men rather than none at all.

If any of his former colleagues may ponder, however, all they must realize is that by his decision Mr. Keller has increased the House by one Member, unofficially—a Congressman without portfolio or vote.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a sit-down strike.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; this is not a sit-down strike. It is merely a "squat."

In view of the fact that this unusual situation exists over there in the old

House Office Building, we should take suitable action. We are now dealing with the welfare of enlisted men. Our friend undoubtedly has enlisted for the duration of the emergency. [Laughter.] I do not like to think of him over there as a lonesome sentinel of the Republic—supposedly alone. [Laughter.] We should do something to make his last years more pleasant and happy. I would suggest to the Appropriations Committee that they bring in another deficiency bill that would make the sinking sun of life more radiant. Think how a cafeteria would contribute to his enjoyment, and a Roman bath, or perhaps a Turkish bath. Then, of course, the Appropriations Committee can provide a hostess.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How old?

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, that would be up to the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not now. My time is very limited.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I was merely going to suggest a yacht on the Potomac.

Mr. KNUTSON. Think how a radio, a phonograph, an electric refrigerator, and an electrically equipped laundry would help brighten that spot. It would not cost much as expenditures go these days, neither would such expenditures evoke criticism when it became known that they were made in behalf of an individual who did much in the 8 years he was here to add to the entertainment of the House.

I offer these suggestions to the Appropriations Committee in the hope that something will be done. Those of us who officed up on the fifth floor of the old House Office Building years ago know that it is not the best place in the world to live. The ceilings are low, the ventilation is poor, the elevator service indifferent. The windows are drafty and the doors refuse to close completely.

I call these little things to the attention of my good friend from Virginia in the hope that he will open that great heart of his and bring in a deficiency bill that will make our friend's last years happy beyond expression. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If I would the gentleman would vote against it. He votes against all the bills that we bring in.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not all. Merely such as have a salmon tinge.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

I am very pleased that we find the gentleman from Minnesota in good humor today. I appreciate his witty remarks. Personally, nowever, I dislike very much to hear him assail and criticize unnecessarily a gentleman who has served in this House with a good legislative record for 8 years. May I say, in view of the article to which the gentleman referred and which was called to my attention, that I am the guilty one who permitted Mr. Keller to occupy a room used for the files of the old Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders Reorganizations. Not having had the necessary help to compile and index all the hearings and the many documents filed with that committee, it has taken me some time to do the work at my own expense. However, it has been nearly completed, and I have notified Mr. Keller that I have been informed by the Architect of the Capitol it will be necessary to remodel the offices on the fifth floor of the old House Building, perhaps one to be used for the convenience of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who seems to need more room, and therefore these offices must be vacated in the near future.

I do not begrudge the gentleman from Minnesota the additional space he will occupy, when the remodeling is completed, because he is an active Member. However, I hope that should he find himself in the same position as Mr. Keller after serving so many years and having been, perhaps, unfairly eliminated from this body, and should he need a few weeks to get his matters in shape, including the compilation of files and documents, the House will accord him the same privilege, inasmuch as it will not cost the Government anything, just as in this instance it is not costing anything to grant Mr. Keller the courtesy of using an unoccupied room for a few days.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If your friend cannot stay there longer, he can have one of my offices for a month.

Mr. SABATH. Thank you. I am sure that any other Member who knew the circumstances, as does the gentleman from Michigan, would make the same gracious offer. It does not cost the Government anything, as I have stated, and a little courtesy shown in this way should not be criticized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, of course, I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. KNUTSON. Merci! [Laughter.] I hope the gentleman did not get the impression that I was advocating that the former Member be dispossessed. I merely wanted to contribute to his enjoyment. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. I know the gentleman is broad and liberal minded, and that he merely called this to our attention so that no newspaper publicity would be given on a similar situation in the future. I am sure that was his underlying reason.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a movement in the hope of taking a former colleague of ours away, or "take the feller, Mr. Keller, and remove him to the cellar." [Laughter.]

This should be a lesson to us, and I hope Members on the minority side will find here a little something to study, because during past years, and the way things look now, I do not see any brilliant hope in some cases that they will not find themselves somewhat confronted with the same situation. So when we come to Washington, all of us, let us remember that a Congressman is just here subject to call or recall—you know we think we run for Congress every 2 years. That is the way it is stated in the Constitution, but the truth is a man runs for Congress constantly. He just has his books checked every 2 years to see if he is still here. [Laughter.] And that applies just as much to us as it did a year ago to the gentleman who has not yet found himself able to so fully remove himself back from whence he came. [Laughter.] So instead of bouncing a rock off a man's head, whenever he is still lingering in the shadows of his earthly, happy abode, let us give him time to remove his roots and tendrils more tenderly from the soil he has cultivated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. No; I do not believe I want to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no law that makes him get out of Washington.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman has such a hard time contributing illumination to thought when he talks that sometimes I am afraid to yield him any of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You might hear something worth while.

Mr. PATRICK. That might be true in my case, I admit, but neither the gentleman nor I has ever been regarded as the solon of this group. [Laughter.]

So I believe if you will just give our former colleague time and let him board around for a while like Ichabod Crane—the gentleman from Michigan offers our erstwhile colleague a month in his office, and it would be interesting to hear what those two particular gentlemen would talk about for a month in that office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield, inasmuch as he has referred to me?

Mr. PATRICK. Please do not break in on me. I am giving a little intellectual address here.

I believe we should feel very grateful toward the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. He has a heart as big as his foot—well, a big heart, anyhow, [laughter]—and I think it would be better if we could deal moderately with these matters instead of getting up on the floor and hollering out about them where they will get out all over the country. We are left to work here for 2 years or 4 years or 6 years, and often we find the thin chicken of our own words helplessly staring us in the face, so let us deal just as kindly and gently as we can, because we never know when that jaded old rooster will be roosting right on top of our own barn. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last line. I am reluctant indeed to contribute to this rather exalted symposium of what happened just a few moments ago, but I could not let this opportunity pass and not take an exception to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the dean of the House. I am sure that he misspoke himself when he said that

the predecessor to our distinguished Member from the Twenty-fifth District of Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] had been unfairly unseated. Certainly that is not a proper remark to make about a sitting Member of this House. If the gentleman's predecessor was unfairly defeated, then it must have been done by a very substantial and clear-cut majority of the people of the Twenty-fifth District of Illinois, because it was they who accomplished that result. I must say for my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP], who occupies that seat today, that he came here fairly and he came here honestly; he came here because a clear majority of the people of the Twenty-fifth District of Illinois extended their suffrage to him, and that is the reason he is here today. Moreover, he is representing his people with courage, distinction, and ability. I sincerely hope that my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] in revising his remarks will expunge that word, because it not only reflects upon the people of that district but it is an unfair reflection upon our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP]. [Applause.]

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] had to wait several weeks before he could obtain office space in either of the office buildings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He is on the floor today, and I think that he has exemplified rare courtesy and patience in that matter. To descend from the high, rarified domain of levity, after all, I am not so sure but what this whole matter does not involve a question of privileges of the House. Though I do not intend to make it, I think it is eminently unfair to our colleague that such a situation obtains today, and the committee which is charged with the responsibility of looking after quarters in the New and Old House Office Buildings ought to address itself to the matter. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Army transportation: For Army transportation, $137,630,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942, of which not to exceed $364,546 shall be for payments under contracts authorized under this head in appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941, and, in addition, the Quartermaster General, when authorized by the Secretary of War, may enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1942, to an amount not in excess of $8,256,000 for the purposes authorized under this head.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, it is a pleasure for me to have an opportunity today to support the bill before us for $4,000,000,000 to provide guns, tanks, planes, shells, boats, and other defense articles for our own country. Only 2 days ago we were urged to vote for the stupendous sum of $7,000,000,000 to provide ships, guns, tanks, planes, shells, food, and clothing for other nations. I voted against that bill. I have always strongly favored our country being thoroughly prepared to defend itself successfully on land, on sea, and in the air against any country or countries that may attack us. No nation will dare to attack us if we are prepared. It is something else when it comes to taking the taxpayers' money of our own country and increasing the debts of our own Nation to take care of the other countries of the world.

I invite your attention now to another matter: The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] pointed out that there has been expended and is about to be expended in the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, and June 30, 1942, more than $32,000,000,000. These expenditures of billions are being centered to a large extent in about five States and in and near a few great cities, where there is already a congestion of population, so much so that the Government must spend hundreds of millions of dollars to build homes to provide shelter for the workmen who are called to work in those places. In Kentucky, in the congressional district of the able Representative [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, where they have an abundance of good coal, water, timber, and thousands of intelligent, competent, idle, patriotic people, yet none of these defense plants are being built or defense work carried on in his congressional district. Furthermore, I see present the able Congressman from the Covington, Ky., district. I have seen statements in the press complaining that the people and industries of that district are receiving no consideration in the expenditure of these large sums of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes, I yield to the distinguished Democrat leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thought has entered my mind whether the gentleman from Kentucky is complimenting his two colleagues to whom he has referred. What is the gentleman's purpose in respect to the two Members that he speaks of?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is not their fault. I know they are industrious and have made every effort possible to secure the expenditure of some of this money on construction plants and projects in their own districts. There are other districts in Kentucky represented by able and distinguished Democrats which have received little or no consideration. In my own congressional district, with plenty of timber and an unlimited supply of the very best coal and natural gas in unlimited quantities, with T. V. A. power available, and with a wonderful climate, far from the bombers, and with thousands of boys, men, and women like in Mr. MAY's district and Mr. SPENCE's district, who are 100 percent loyal to this Government, intelligent, skilled, capable workmen, unemployed, yet in order to secure any employment they must travel to Chicago, to Detroit, to Pittsburgh, or to some other remote section of the country. In those sections there are thousands and thousands of good Americans who are capable, who want to work, who are able to work, and who are out of employment and on relief, and yet we have a system here of carrying people by the hundreds of thousands across the United States to work at these defense jobs and then have to provide shelter for them, when we have already shelter and homes in Kentucky and other States to take care of these workers.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I think all the available sites in my district have been submitted to all the authorities that we could submit them to for their consideration. We hope that they may eventually establish some of them there.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I know how active and earnest and able my friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has been in serving his people, and how active and able the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and other Democratic Members from Kentucky have been in trying to secure some of these defense plants and projects.

Do you know what has been and is going on in this country? I have spoken about it on other occasions on the floor of this House. These defense plants and projects engaged in the manufacture of our defense articles have been located in a very few States and in a limited number of great cities. The same condition prevails in other so-called rural States and rural sections as I have described in Kentucky. We are stripping the interior of the Nation of its men and women workers, and we are adding to the congestion in these great populous centers. We have so much accentuated the congestion in these populous centers that it will be necessary to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to build shelters and homes for these workers who were forced to leave their homes in the interior and the rural sections of the country to secure employment in these great defense plants.

The press reported the other day that three big concerns had received about one-fifth of all these billions we are spending to build up the national defense. The population has been and will continue to decrease greatly in the so-called rural States and rural sections. The policy we are following now is upsetting the economic balance as well as the political balance of this country. These plants and projects should be distributed throughout the Nation, and keep the men and women workers at or near their homes so far as is possible. It would add to our national defense and make our country strong and powerful. Our plants would be much safer, because in these rural States and rural communities you find no communism, fascism, or nazi-ism. They are just good Americans. The Nation's property would be protected, and we will get as efficient service as anywhere.

Furthermore, under the present policy, coal, timber, iron, and other raw materials are being transported at great expense to the Government from Kentucky

and other so-called rural States and communities to these great congested centers to be processed into defense articles. Why not bring these plants and projects near to the raw material and where there is a great surplus of intelligent, experienced, patriotic workers who are out of employment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has referred to our good colleague from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. MAY]. Every Member of Congress from the rural sections, including the State of Minnesota and other States, is working and submitting material to try to get distribution of some of these defense contracts. The gentleman cannot expect other Members to succeed when the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, cannot get anything for his district.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why do those who have the placing of these contracts pursue this policy? What influences are working to place these contracts into certain congested areas rather than to distribute them over the country?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, it seems to me that on pro forma amendments 15 minutes is going a little too far.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I do not speak very often.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman would take about 2 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, do not split this up. Kentucky has got a small part of defense projects thus far. Do not deny them the 3 minutes to talk about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, they must think that Kentucky is tolerably safe. There is now about $14,000,000,000 in gold buried down there and if and when the time comes that Uncle Sam needs the fourteen billions in gold, he will find every dollar there. But there must be a change in policy for the good of the country, and as a matter of fairness and justice to the people.

I say to you ladies and gentlemen who represent these rural States and sections of the country, they are taking the men and women of your State. They must travel hundreds and perhaps thousands of miles to these plants and projects in the great congested centers.

Chambers of commerce and others have come from my own district, Democrats and Republicans, and they have placed before these various boards data with reference to the natural resources, fine water throughout that section, the great abundance of natural gas, iron ore, good coal cropping out of every hill and every mountain, convenient to T. V. A. power, rivers and creeks of sweetwater, and an abundance of food, plains, valleys and mountains, and an atmosphere that cannot be surpassed anywhere, and far removed from enemy bombs. They love this country. They have marched with the stars and stripes in every battle in every war from the Revolution down to this hour. During the World War in some of the counties it was not necessary to draft a single man. They are loyal. They need work. They want to help. They need something to support themselves and their families, but they must go to some distant congested place in order to find work and help their country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was just thinking as the gentleman was speaking of the good labor that would be available, he could also make the point that in these areas about which he is talking there would be less labor trouble, too.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Absolutely.

Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. FADDIS rose.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield first to my friend the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to approve of what the gentleman is saying. In the Northwest, including Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho, where we raise everything, including the best men and women in the world, we have not got a single defense industry, although we have magnesia, copper, wheat, sheep, beef, and everything else, but we have not a single thing by way of industry.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have practically all of the things that my friend from Montana has mentioned. We also have tobacco, hemp, coal, natural gas, timber, and more rivers of sweet water that flow unvexed to the sea than any other State in the Union, with sunshine and the climate that are unsurpassed, and with this we have a abundance of skilled patriotic men. In fact, everything in my congressional district and in my State necessary to carry on defense plants and projects. They will be safe. We do not have a lot of enemy aliens or subversive groups.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I come from a place where we have the best people on earth.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I assume it is pardonable for my friend from Montana to do a little boasting. Kentucky and her people and their record speak for themselves. I now yield to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. I am sure that down in the gentleman's State of Kentucky they would not put up with the interference from Communist and Nazi leaders which they put up with in some other States.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You are absolutely right. There is no place in my congressional district, and I doubt if there is such a place in all Kentucky on which there could be raised the red flag of communism, or the swastika, or any other flag except the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

I am thinking about what effect the policies that are now being pursued will have on the young men and some older men taken from their homes and crowded into these great congested areas during and following this period of emergency. It is in these great industrial and congested centers where communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and other subversive groups grow and flourish. Hundreds of thousands of younger men and older men for the first time will be brought into contact with these groups. These men taken from their homes will have broken their home ties and home connections. When this emergency is over and these plants shut down and millions of persons are thrown out of work, the Nation will be confronted with a real problem of what to do with this great army of men and women workers. Will we be able to get them back to their rural communities, to their farms and homes again? Will they then have any homes or farms to go to? Out of work, they, too, will become an easy prey for these subversive groups.

The policy being pursued is not only upsetting and disturbing the social and economic life of this nation—we are greatly increasing the number of people in these great congested centers. The number of Representatives will increase there. They will continue to diminish in the rural States and rural sections. The people of the farms, villages, and small towns have served as a great balance wheel in this Nation. They have always been first in war and first in peace. In stripping this country of these groups, in my opinion we are greatly weakening the fiber of this Nation and we will continue to add to our social and political problems.

It seems to me we ought to so plan this work as to encourage the people of the so-called rural States and sections to remain there, keep up their homes and their family, church, and social contacts so that when the emergency is over they will have something to cling to.

Furthermore, it will cost this Nation enormous sums to transport the raw materials to these great congested centers and to provide shelter in these great industrial centers. Let these plants be located where there is raw material and a great reservoir of intelligent, competent, loyal, patriotic labor. Thirty-two billion is a lot of money. We may just be starting on this program. We should save wherever we can. It is agreed that a great deal of money is being wasted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has very wisely incorporated in this report a paragraph that should commend itself to the earnest and serious consideration of every Member of Congress. You will find it on page 5 of the report, and it reads in part as follows:

> The committee desire to call attention to the rapidly mounting and excessive cost of acquiring and chartering merchant vessels for Government use in the emergency. It is now indicated that in the early period of the emergency, or shortly prior thereto, bare boat charter of vessels was at rates less than $1 a ton and the present rates approximate $9.

We are, therefore, approaching the point where we are going to have a real problem in this country with respect to auxiliary vessels for the Navy. One does not have to be a naval expert or strate-

gist to know that the Navy is ineffective unless it has sufficient auxiliary vessels and supply ships, but we are in the position of having transferred to foreign registry in the last 2 or 3 years considerable of our tonnage so that in the near future we are going to be faced with an acute shortage. The shortage is causing prices to rise and it becomes a tax upon the Federal Treasury.

The question was asked of me informally the other day respecting tonnage. I went back and checked on it. It might be of interest to know that Great Britain has tonnage of her own approximating 20,000,000 tons, and has allied tonnage under its control amounting to about 9,000,000 tons. The merchant-marine tonnage of the United States now consists of about 1,570 vessels over 2,000 tons burden, which approximates a little less than 10,000,000 tons. So today our merchant marine is not equal to a real emergency. Now we are beginning to transfer vessels to the Navy. We transferred 48 of them last year and there are provisions in this bill for the transfer and reconversion of some of the merchant vessels, but as time goes on we are going to feel an acute need.

In 1938 the Maritime Commission authorized and approved the transfer of 117 vessels, large and small, to foreign registry. In 1939 and 1940 they approved the transfer of 287 vessels. Some of these, of course, were of ancient vintage and some were very small craft of limited use and value. This, of course, is going to show up as a real shortage. When it comes to considering this problem of transportation, one of two things is involved: Either there is a shortage already or there is profiteering. If this is profiteering, if these rates for tonnage have gone up from $1 per ton to $9 per ton, that is a matter of which Congress should take cognizance at once. It is certainly unfair that those who are engaged in the maritime industry and have vessels available should run the price up so sharply in time of emergency.

Sooner or later Congress must take some action not to permit a further reduction of these tonnage figures. As I say in the matter of the transfer of ships to foreign registry we have allowed it to go to the point until today we have only 1,570 vessels over 2,000 tons, or less than half of that which is available to Great Britain today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman mean to indicate that Great Britain now has over 20,000,000 tons of shipping?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the 200-cargo-vessel bill on which Admiral Land from the Maritime Commission testified, figures were brought out showing that England has about 20,000,000 tons of her own shipping plus 9,000,000 tons of the shipping of allied countries. She controls 20,000,000 tons in her own right, but her accretions are more or less offset by the loss of some 5,000,000 tons as a result of the war. She still has, however, in excess of 20,000,000 tons, at least twice as much tonnage as we have.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend on the Merchant Marine Committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman knows the Maritime Commission and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries are wrestling with the problem right now of the possible charter of foreign-owned ships that are now tied up in harbors of this country. I am wondering whether the $9 the gentleman refers to applies to those? Has the gentleman any information on that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know, and I cannot tell the gentleman unless I confer with members of the subcommittee. Perhaps the gentleman from Kansas knows.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I do not know. But I would like to make an observation. The gentleman has been a member of the American Legion for 20 years or so and he knows that organization advocated the conscription of material in the next war, but how little came of that suggestion. That matter was referred to in every State and national convention for 20 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it bears out the thought that the policy is rather shortsighted of letting the Maritime Commission approve the transfer of our ships to foreign registry, because if you examine the type, capacity, and names of the vessels you will find that many of them would be extremely useful today.

Do not underestimate the importance of this matter. This is a critical time. If the Navy must be used, it must be supplied. Supplies must be carried by auxiliaries and cargo ships. A shortage of such ships would bring about a crucial condition. This matter deserves genuine and sustained attention.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the defense of this country is the most important question facing this Congress today. We must settle this question now and settle it well, or we will have failed in our most sacred duty. Helping others is a noble virtue, but that help extended at the expense of our own national safety is neither wise for ourselves nor beneficial to our friends.

Two days ago this Congress passed a bill calling for $7,000,000,000, earmarked for the aid of others. I voted against that bill because I believed it to be a whole flight in that long succession of steps taken by this administration leading toward our active and violent involvement in Europe's current quarrel.

Today we are presented with a bill asking for $4,000,000,000 to be used for our own defense. Personally, I have never felt very safe while depending on the good faith of others to look after my interests. Likewise, I shall not consider my country secure so long as that security is based on the promises of supposed friends. I am now and always have been for a strong national defense—a defense second to none—a defense so strong that no foreign power or combination of powers will ever dare harbor the thought of attacking us.

The people of my district of that great State of Indiana are not war minded. They have not been swept off their feet by the propaganda and war hysteria which has been sweeping this country like a prairie fire for the past 6 months. They do not fear any immediate attack from abroad, but they will not be soothed into a false sense of security by the flattering promises of those who hold out the olive branch in one hand while gripping a sword in the other. They look to the future and make plans for tomorrow, for only in tomorrow's plan is today's security guaranteed. They realize the price in taxes that must be paid, but they stand ready to pay the price, whatever it may be, for their country's unchallenged security. Therefore, because those people whom I represent demand their country's security above all else, and because a strong defense in these perilous times is necessary for the protection of our way of life and its free institutions, I cast my vote in favor of this bill for our own national defense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussion precipitated by the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky with reference to the distribution of plants, I rise to call the attention of the Committee to the portion of the hearings devoted to that subject. On pages 23 and 24 of the hearings on this bill you will find considerable discussion on that point, and when we return to the House I shall ask permission to extend a portion of them in my remarks at this point.

The matter referred to follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF PLANTS

Mr. WOODRUM. What about the geographical distribution of these plants, Mr. Secretary, with reference to the areas which are already pretty heavily congested and other areas that have profited very little by the program?

Mr. PATTERSON. Of course, it is our policy to get them out of the congested areas as far as possible and get them into the military strategic areas. I can give you the method by which that is done. There is established in my office a Site Plant Board. The Chief of the Army, like the Chief of the Air Corps or the Chief of Ordnance, makes a recommendation, and his recommendation is taken to the Site Board. The Site Board goes around and looks at the various locations that are suggested; the General Staff is consulted, and then they make a report. That project has to be recommended by the Advisory Commission and approved by the President.

Mr. STARNES. Then it is the policy of the War Department to distribute the munitions industry in strategic areas?

Mr. PATTERSON. The best example is the latest development in our airplane program, in connection with the construction of four plants for the construction of heavy bombers. Airplane production being mostly on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, we put those four plants in Omaha, Kansas City, Tulsa, and Fort Worth.

Mr. STARNES. Can you not put the ordnance plants in the expansion program away from the extremely limited area in the northeastern part of the country?

Mr. PATTERSON. It is not so easy to do that. Of course, we have our manufacturing arsenals at Watertown, Springfield, Watervliet, Picatinny, Frankford, and Rock Island. There is the business concentrated, so far as

our own arsenals are concerned, but we have gone a long way toward spreading out ordnance orders as well as new facilities for the production of ordnance.

Mr. CASE. A portion of the country that is without orders, and which is the least likely to have an aerial attack, is that portion of the country where no contracts have been placed—in eastern Washington, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, and parts of Nebraska, except at Omaha. I think there has not been any defense installation in any of that area, or in Minnesota west of the Twin Cities.

Mr. PATTERSON. Of course, we cannot be geographical in selecting sites.

Mr. CASE. That is a very large portion of the United States, and you are talking about decentralizing.

Mr. PATTERSON. It is our desire to make use of strategically safe territory, but we also have to take into account things like skilled labor.

People speak about powder plants. We have to put powder plants where the water supply is ample. We cannot put a powder plant in the desert.

Mr. CASE. You spoke about the labor supply. There is less labor trouble out in that section of the country than in any other portion of the country.

Mr. PATTERSON. I assure you that that has been given a great deal of thought by the War Department, and we try to select every site upon its merits.

The Clerk read as follows:

Air Corps, Army: For Air Corps, Army, $888,236,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942, and, in addition, the Chief of the Air Corps, when authorized by the Secretary of War, may enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1941, to an amount not in excess of $524,025,000, for the purposes authorized under this head.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say that I am vitally interested in the national-defense program. I believe also that the Air Corps is a vital part of that national defense. I am interested in the training end of the Air Corps as well as the rest of it. I am not so sure that our training program in the Army Air Corps is keeping pace with the building of the ships and planes to be used in the national-defense program.

I notice on page 162 of the hearings, under the title "Training of Flying Cadets," the statement is made that at the end of the fiscal year 1940, 1,828 flying cadets were undergoing flying training. The statement goes on further to say:

Increased rate of training necessitated by the 7,000-pilots-per-year program was inaugurated June 20, 1940, and this was increased to 12,000 per year with the class of October 19, 1940. A further increase from 12,000 to 30,000 is now pending.

Sometime ago I directed an inquiry to the War Department asking them about the training program and requested information concerning the Air Corps trainees. At the same time I presented an inquiry as to whether or not the Army had sufficient training planes to take care of those who were ready to be trained in the training program. It took practically a month to get an answer from the War Department, and then only after I made a second request and served notice on them that if I was not able to get an answer I would introduce a privileged resolution on the subject. I received the answer on March 6. In that answer they set forth that—

On January 31, 1940, the following number of students were undergoing heavier-than-air pilot training:

Elementary phase	629
Basic phase	473
Advanced phase	223
Total	1,325

On January 31, 1941, the following number of students were undergoing heavier-than-air pilot training:

Elementary phase	2,454
Basic phase	1,484
Advanced phase	955
Total	4,893

It is anticipated that during the period of January 31, 1941, to January 31, 1942, 8,628 students will be graduated from the Air Corps Advanced Flying School.

During the period of July 1, 1939, start of the Air Corps expansion program, to January 31, 1941, the following number of students completed flying training:

Elementary phase	4,588
Basic phase	2,767
Advanced phase	1,786

Ground training is given concurrently with flying training.

There are no students who have finished part of their flying training and are awaiting assignment to additional phases of training due to the lack of sufficient training airplanes.

Sufficient training airplanes are available to meet the present schedules of instruction at Air Corps flying schools.

In regard to the average cost to train a pilot for combat duty no definite estimate can be given inasmuch as the basic and advanced phases are given at military stations where other military activities are carried on and it is very difficult to segregate training costs and military costs.

You will note that on January 31, 1940, there were 629 in the elementary phase. However, there were only 223 in the advanced phase. You will note also that on January 31, 1941, there were 2,454 in the elementary phase and only 955 in the advanced phase. You will note also that it is anticipated that during the period of January 31, 1941, to January 31, 1942, there will be 8,628 students graduated from the Air Corps advanced flying school. Let me call your attention, however, to the fact that only about 50 percent of those in the advanced phase graduate from the Air Corps advanced flying school and become combat pilots. You will notice also that during the period of July 1, 1939, the start of the Air Corps expansion program, to January 31, 1941, there were 4,588 in the elementary phase but only 1,786 reached the advanced phase. Therefore, with only 50 percent of those in the advanced phase become combat pilots, I cannot understand how they expect to have 8,628 graduates by 1942 unless they certainly increase their training program. You will note also they stated they had sufficient training planes available to meet the present schedules of instruction in the Air Corps flying schools.

I just cannot understand the statement of General Brett which appears on page 162 of the hearings of the fifth supplemental national-defense appropriations bill for 1941 where he discusses 30,000 student training program.

Secretary of War Stimson, and by the way the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War are not Democrats but are Republicans, stated in his communication to me of March 6 that there was sufficient training airplanes available to meet the present schedules of instruction at the Air Corps flying schools. I do not like to differ with the distinguished gentleman, but from all the information that I can compile and all the information that I can gather it points to the fact that the Air Corps is sadly lacking in training ships and even in trainees. How in the world are we going to have a real Air Corps unless we have trained men to fly the planes we are now constructing? The Secretary of War stated that sufficient training airplanes are available to meet the present schedules of instruction in flying schools. However, I notice today that the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, made the statement that the Army Air Corps does not have sufficient training planes for their present schedule. I respectfully submit that the Army officials should get together on something that we can rely upon.

I want to call your attention to a very significant fact, and that is that some time in 1939 the Army decided to call for bids for training planes of new and modern design. Certain bids were submitted. Among those bids was one from an airplane company for $3,300 in 100 lots or more. This was a low-wing monoplane of new and modern design, an all-metal plane built on a program of mass production. In other words, a punch press and extruded airplane. This would put the airplane industry into mass production that they, with the help of the War Department, are very cleverly avoiding. At the same time a bid was placed by another airplane company. When the contract was awarded it was not an award to the company who placed the bid for the modern, low-wing monoplane for $3,300 but the contract was awarded to a company that is a part of the big monopoly for a plane already in production—an antiquated wood and wire biplane—and they paid $10,000 a plane. That contract, I understand, is still in effect. A thorough and complete investigation by the Committee on Military Affairs should be called immediately so that we could get real information as to why such a situation exists with regard to the awarding of contracts in the War Department. I submitted a resolution of inquiry to the War Department, which went to the Committee on Military Affairs, and evidently because of a misunderstanding and because of a report from the War Department, which, in my opinion, is far from the real facts, the Military Affairs Committee was misled and brought out an adverse report. I am sincere when I say that the Military Affairs Committee would be doing a real service in our national-defense program by calling the Army officials before their committee for

a full and complete explanation concerning this whole affair. The only way that we may be able to build up a real modern air force is to take into consideration the small owner-operated airplane companies, where they really use their initiative and engineering ability to create new and modern designs. We will never have a real program if the Big Six is allowed to exclude all small airplane companies. This is definitely true at the present time—that the small airplane companies are being excluded.

I trust that the Military Affairs Committee will investigate as to why we do not have mass-production methods in the airplane industry today and why the Army officials do not insist that we set up a real mass-production program with regard to the contracts that they award. In other words, it is about time that this Congress wake up to the fact that when we appropriate money we should know the facts and be guided by real facts. We should know who is doing the spending of that money. We should know what we are going to get for our money. We should not allow this wild squandering that is going on in the War Department with regard to the airplane industry and the awarding of contracts for airplanes. I call on the Military Affairs Committee at this time to think this out and to give full, complete, and thorough study to the training program of the Army Air Corps as well as the construction end of training planes and the combat planes. If we are going to have an Air Corps, we must have men trained to really fly the planes that we are constructing. We do not have them today. We will not have them under the program as set up by the Air Corps and in the interest of national defense we as Members of Congress should determine why this is true.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to read a letter by Col. Charles Lindbergh that appears in this week's Collier's magazine:

> We have not as many thoroughly modern fighting planes in our Army and Navy combined—

He wrote—

> as Germany produces in a single week, and our Army is deplorably lacking in such essential items as tanks and antitank cannon. With the disaster of France and England fresh before us, we are following the same path.

This bill calls for an appropriation of $880,000,000 for our Army air force. The $7,000,000,000 appropriation following the adoption of the lend-lease bill called for $2,000,000,000 for lend-leasing airplanes for the democracies, twice as much as is provided for our own national defense.

Lindbergh, whose statement I have just read—and those who are interested can find it in this week's, today's Collier's—makes that astounding statement about our production.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, the gentleman knows the amount of money he speaks of in this bill for airplanes is an insignificant part of the amount of money we have appropriated for American planes. We have appropriated for capacity production. Not only that, but we have a right to take every one of the planes that are manufactured under the lease-lend bill and divert them to American use if we need them. We have appropriated $2,500,000,000 for American airplanes.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is quite right, and I think eventually we are going to have one of the greatest air forces in the world. However, at the present time we have very few first-class planes in either the Army or the Navy. We have very few modern planes with self-sealing tanks, adequate gun power, speed and armament combined, very few that can compare with the first-line German or English planes today.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. In this bill we provide not only $888,000,000 in actual cash but provide for contract authorizations above that sum in the amount of $524,000,000.

Mr. FISH. Yes.

In view of the fact that we are discussing a deficiency appropriation bill that deals 90 percent with the Army, and almost all the rest of it with the Navy and national defense I propose to speak on the war issue. If there is a roll call on this bill, which I hope there will be, I shall be very glad to support it. The only time I know to wage war on war is in time of peace. Members of Congress have been saying right on the floor of the House—on both sides of the aisle and it is not limited to the Democratic side at all—that we are in the war now, which is a completely defeatist point of view. It is particularly defeatist for any Member of Congress to make such a statement in view of the fact that Congress alone can declare war under the Constitution. Congress has that sole authority, yet you hear Members getting up in the House and making public statements that we are in the war now.

Let me answer any such statement. In the first place it is not true. It is an absolute misstatement of facts, and a Member of Congress is the last one who should make any such statement.

Secondly, we are not in the war, no American has been fired upon, no American has been killed, and no American blood has been shed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Suppose the supply ships are convoyed by American ships and are fired upon, which, of course, they will be when they get into the danger zones, then we are in the war and Congress has had nothing to say about it.

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman. In the first place, I do not believe this administration intends to convoy ships. The Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, told our committee that convoying ships would be an act of war. The President has repeatedly said that he intends to keep us out of war. He said that even in reference to the lend-lease bill. The people back home who supported the lease-lend bill, as well as those in Congress who supported it, did so because they thought it was a peace measure, that it was one of the methods to keep us out of war.

Today's Gallup poll states that the people back home who supported the lease-lend bill—and there were a great many—did so because they thought it was a peace measure. Eighty-three percent of the American people, according to the Gallup poll, want to stay out of war. According to this poll of public sentiment, more people want to stay out of war today than last May, when France was invaded. The sentiment against war is just as strong today as it ever was in this country, and that applies to the Democrats as well as the Republicans.

In further answer to the gentleman, may I say that if the President takes upon himself the responsibility of convoying ships, and according to his own Secretary of the Navy that is an act of war, our ships will be destroyed and American lives will be lost. If a half a dozen or more American ships are sunk, and American lives are lost, and the American flag goes down with these ships, our honor will be impugned, and then we will again have the same war hysteria that we knew 23 years ago. We went to war then because our ships were sunk by German submarines.

I do not believe the President will take that responsibility. In the first place, I do not believe he has the power. The lend-lease bill specifically provided that nothing in it must be construed to give the President that power. In the second place, if he does, he is leading this country directly into war against the will of 83 percent of the American people, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Now, follow me further. If our war material under the lease-lend bill is destroyed and our ships are sunk, it is nothing more than a shipload of goods. We can replace those goods, those commodities, those war supplies. But if it is a shipload of American youth that is destroyed and that goes to the bottom of the sea, we cannot replace those young Americans, not upon this earth, and that is a different proposition to the fathers and mothers of America than the loss of a million dollars or so worth of war materials, which are bound to be sunk and will be sunk, anyhow, even if we convoy them.

However, if we convoy these ships we will be in the war, and it will not be on the responsibility of the Congress, but on the responsibility of the President of the United States, your President and my President. I am not willing to stand here and say that the President of the United States is the greatest repudiator of his word this Nation has ever known. I am not willing to make any such statement, because he has repeatedly said that he is going to do everything he can to keep us out of war, and he knows he will be putting us into war if he convoys a single ship. If he does, he will attempt to place the responsibility upon the Members of Congress, but I do not believe he will succeed.

I admit that I think my party has been somewhat derelict in its duty to the country in not taking a more emphatic and uncompromising position against involvement in war unless attacked. There can be no compromise on this issue, which transcends all party lines and affects the security and destiny of the Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I will have to say that in the future on pro forma amendments I will have to ask gentlemen to take 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. That is all right; I will get the floor later on during the discussion of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Engineer service, Army: For engineer service, Army, including the manufacture of engineer equipment; for expenses of railroad operation, including purchase or lease of equipment and materials and the acquisition of lands, rights-of-way thereon, and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof; and for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, $18,944,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942, of which not to exceed $14,500,000 shall be for payments under contracts authorized under this head in appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941; and, in addition, the Chief of Engineers, when authorized by the Secretary of War, may enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1941, to an amount not in excess of $12,993,500 for the purposes authorized under this head.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 8, line 8, after the word "head", insert the following: "To devise a plan under which American citizens can and will be permitted to work on defense projects without being required to join a union or pay a fee to other than a Government official, $1,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will move to strike out the last word, if that will shorten the procedure any.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman care to be heard on this point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I would rather speak on a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes on his pro forma amendment to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment ruled out is to authorize the Army officers to provide a plan whereby American citizens can work on defense projects without being required to pay a fee to make use of a right given them by the Constitution and which must be used if they are to live.

I was astonished that the gentleman from the northern Peninsula of Michigan has at last discovered that the graft is so rampant; that corruption is so rampant in this administration that it can be smelled from Washington to the shores of Lake Superior clear up to the Canadian border, and I want to congratulate him on that improvement in his sense of smell, to hope that it will continue to be acute, that he will not backslide and to further assure him that that corruption of which he speaks is but a continuation of that graft, that misuse of relief funds which prevailed way back in 1937, and to which I then called his attention—I say after his testimony today that it must be rotten if it is clear up there now and you can smell it up there with all those dead fish on the shore of the Lake and all the smell from the other things that are not used to get votes. It must be getting bad.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; just for a question.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman will recall, however, that most of the State officials are old civil-service men that came under a Republican administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, if there is anybody in office who came in under a Republican administration, boy, he is a curiosity and he ought to be down here in the Smithsonian. The Democratic administration has rooted Republicans all out up there—good or bad, you have got rid of them. Moreover the thing about which you just complained was the action of those connected with the national Democratic administration.

In getting back to this amendment, the gentleman from Kentucky and some other southern gentlemen who are Representatives here in Congress do not understand why there are no defense projects in some of these rural districts. The reason is that Brother Hillman down here in the Defense Commission likes to have all men who want work grouped in the big centers. How do I know that? Up in Michigan, in the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] they had an industry up there in three towns, employing 1,600 people. They were doing a good business, but along came Hillman's friend, Dubinsky, and he wanted to have workers where he could control them—in the big cities—called a strike, shut the plants down, and 1,600 employees went out of work and the factory has been closed from that day to this. Dubinsky had his way, he had his strike, and 1,600 jobs are gone. They want all workers in the cities where they can intimidate them, use mass picket lines, defy the police, because when they get men working out in these Kentucky districts, for example, they cannot manhandle them. They cannot make them sign on the dotted line and they cannot shave their pay checks. Kentucky people and Tennessee people and some others in the States will not stand for that kind of thing. So they throw these organizers out, but when they get into Pittsburgh, Detroit, Philadelphia, New York, or any of these big centers where they mass them in like sheep, they can treat them just like the farmers treat their sheep; the labor racketeers shear them, and that is the reason you do not get any of these defense projects in the country. Labor has control and today it is saying defense will go forward only when its members permit. Right here in Washington this wrecking crew of A. F. of L. has put a picket line around Sam Merando's job because it insists that every man who wants to work there shall pay it first—carpenters $57.50, others fixed sums.

WRECKERS IN WASHINGTON

The A. F. of L. teamsters union here in Washington is again conspiring to prevent Merando & Co. aiding the Government in the construction of the Medical Center. Pickets are once more on the job and, while teamsters delivering material to Skinker & Garrett and to the C. Q. M. are permitted to pass the picket line, those belonging to the A. F. of L. who pass the picket line to deliver material to Merando & Co. are subject to a fine.

While this week Congress will appropriate $7,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to secure equal opportunity everywhere in the world, here in Washington Merando & Co. are denied equality of opportunity to obtain material for work on a Government job.

On the 6th of January, the President sent us a message, in which he said:

> There is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:
>
> Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.
>
> Jobs for those who can work.
>
> Security for those who need it.
>
> The ending of special privilege for the few.
>
> The preservation of civil liberties for all.

Before he left on his vacation, to avoid the charge of hypocrisy, he should have said that this administration sought to establish these five basic things everywhere in the world, except in these United States.

To prevent Hitler denying equality of opportunity, security for those who need it, the preservation of civil liberties for all, and granting special privileges for the few, the President demands the appropriation and the spending of billions of dollars and evidently the sending of an army to Europe. But he will not end

the rule of, nor enforce the laws which would prevent, a few labor leaders granting special privileges to the few, denying jobs which are available for those who want them, refusing equality of opportunity to workers, and destroying the civil liberties of hundreds of thousands of citizens.

I have today written a letter to the Attorney General which is as follows:

MARCH 21, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General, Washington, D. C.
(Attention of Mr. Thurman Arnold.)

MY DEAR SIR: Skinker & Garrett, the CQM, and Merando & Co. have contracts to do the construction work on the medical center at Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington. The local A. F. of L. teamsters' union fines all union teamsters who go through the picket line to deliver material to Merando & Co. Teamsters going through to make deliveries to the other two are not fined.

Is there any reason why the local teamsters' union should not be prosecuted under section 51 of title 18 of the Code?

If the recent decision of the Supreme Court prevents prosecution under this section, I wish you would advise how the Sherman and Clayton Acts or the Code can be amended to include these teamsters.

It does seem as though an American citizen should be protected.

Respectfully yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

The section of the Code to which I call his attention reads as follows:

Conspiracy to injure persons in exercise of civil rights: If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, * * * they shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 10 years and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to any office or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

We can end this un-American practice. We know how. Let us show our courage. Let us pass the necessary legislation. Let us do it now.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHIEF OF INFANTRY

Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga.: For Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., $15,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have asked these 5 minutes in order to speak about the one thing that every American citizen is more concerned about than anything else today—the question of the future of our country, whether it will be peace or war. Over and over in the House, in the course of the debate upon the lend-lease bill and the debate on the $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill, Members have expressed their opinion on one side or the other of this question. It has been mentioned several times also this afternoon. I am speaking as one who voted for all of these measures. But there are, in my opinion, deeper questions even than those that have so far been raised in the course of this debate.

What I want to do now is to present some of these questions to the House. I am convinced there will be a certain degree of prophecy in what I say.

Unless some people somewhere in the world are able to keep their heads, unless some people somewhere are able to retain their sense of the ultimate necessity and possibility of the building of a permanent peace, unless some of us understand this must be done before too long the future of the world is dark indeed. I believe the time is going to come and perhaps far sooner than we expect, when the peoples of the embattled nations of the world will come to understand that this self-destruction cannot go on.

The world today is wracked by war and shaken by one of the worst waves of intolerance and hatred that it has ever seen. The blame for this situation rests in part upon the shortsighted statesmanship that followed the World War, in part upon those in positions of power and influence who have failed to solve the economic problems that have afflicted the people. But most of all the blame must rest upon those men at the head of disciplined dogmatic organizations and nations who have exalted hatred and preached intolerance as a national or class virtue.

Whatever the cause of this tragic situation there is no greater danger than that there will be none of us strong enough to stand against this tide, none of us willing to take the criticism that will come to those who insist and keep on insisting that after all, all men are flesh and blood and that the mistakes of one sort of men are likely to be but a reflection of the shortcomings of others. No place in the world do people have as good a chance to keep the light of tolerance and understanding aflame as here in the United States. If we do not do it it may not be done at all. If it is not done at all something like the Dark Ages will have returned to the earth again.

There has been talk in connection with the lend-lease bill and the $7,000,000,000 appropriations—talk at other times, too—about whether or not these measures will lead our country into war. In my judgment, nearly all such talk has missed the central point, the central decision which will determine whether or not our country can remain at peace.

I do not believe the decision of this Nation to give aid to the embattled opponents of the dictators needs to bring war to America. I believe the question whether or not America will go to war will depend on what the aims of America are in connection with this new and admittedly unprecedented policy which we have adopted.

We have said we were going to send as much material aid as we could send to Britain and the nations fighting with her. But why have we said this? To accomplish what purposes? That is the vital question. Is it indeed because we seek to take first steps toward the establishment by military means of a sort of Anglo-American control of the world? If that is our purpose, then, indeed, our hope of peace seems to me remote indeed. For such an objective can, I believe, only be gained by years and years of war; by an invasion of the European Continent; by the sacrifice of millions of lives, American as well as others; and by the exhaustion of the resources and economic strength of the nations of the world. And afterward, after America and England stand unchallenged in an exhausted world, what then? What sort of government will the peoples of Europe resort to? Not democracy, you may be sure of that. Will America and England attempt to police the world as Britain has done over a large part of it for a long time? What will they do about the birth rate in Japan and Germany, about central Europe, about Russia, yes, about the genius of the German people? If our purpose be a program of Anglo-American hegemony, then I can see nothing but black despair ahead of us for years and years to come. I do not believe the common people of any nation have ever been made happier or better off because their nation's capitalists exploited the resources of other nations. I reject any such purposes in the legislation that has been passed as the ones I have just outlined.

But there are other purposes which can be America's. They are the purposes I sought—the ones I believe a majority of the Members of Congress sought when they enacted the lend-lease bill and made the appropriations for it. I think the first purpose and aim is that England and the other nations resisting the totalitarians be not destroyed. I think our purpose is that the last great nation standing against the dictators shall not go down. To prevent that, America has said she was willing to pour out her wealth and to do it, indeed, with no certainty that she would ever be compensated. America's purpose has been to prevent the wiping out of the old world of nations that dared defy the organized might of the Nazi legions.

But beyond that, what has America been seeking as she took these momentous steps? I am certain I speak for a vast majority of the American people when I say America's purpose is not only to strengthen the hand of those who, in self defense, stand against the totalitarian tide, but also to bring about the earliest peace that can possibly be brought about on a decent basis.

I beg the Members of Congress and the American people to think this matter through. If you seek the destruction of certain nations you must travel a road from which perhaps civilization as we have known it can never return. That must not be America's purpose. Rather, it must be a twofold purpose; first, to make clear that America's resources will be used without stint to show the dictators they cannot wipe out the other nations; and, second, to work as early as we can for the conclusion of a true peace of settlement and agreement among the nations of the world. The sooner we make clear our purposes the better; the sooner we renounce completely any attempt to spread American power beyond the Western Hemisphere; the sooner we base our policy on recognition of the right of every people to its

place in the family of nations; the sooner we do these things the greater will be the chance that America can still hope for peace.

America has embarked upon a new policy. It is a different policy from that pursued by many nations which, hoping to escape, have gone down one by one before the might of the German dictator. It is a policy of bolstering with our resources the nations which we believe to be basically on the right side. There is no use embarking on such a policy in half-hearted fashion. Aid, to be effective, must be all-out aid, which is the justification, and the only one, for the $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill. But this policy will end in disaster and in tragic disillusionment for the American people if we merely try to "go the dictators one better" in embarking on a policy of attempting to remake the world according to our ideas. It will end in disaster unless we are prepared to begin now to work and plan for an early, just, and lasting peace.

And really there is no other alternative. For unless we can stop this thing before too long there will be little left to fight over. The time is going to come, I am convinced, when the peoples of the world are going to see this. We must be prepared against that day for the whole future of mankind will depend upon our seizing it.

What can we do now?

First, we can make our aims clear. We can do it over and over again. We can say, "We do not propose to see you, Mr. Hitler, rule the world. Neither do we propose to try to do it ourselves."

But we can do more. We could begin by making about $400,000,000 available to provide a school lunch for every undernourished American child and to raise the purchasing power for food of every low-income family in our own country by 50 percent, and then we could prepare ourselves to try to feed the hungry and destitute mothers and children of the world. It can be done. Think what it would make them think of our great democracy.

And I think also we could begin now to work with other legislative bodies in free nations to develop a basis for a permanent and lasting peace. These things can be done and done in such manner as to undermine, not help, the dictators.

If England goes down, leaving Hitler in complete mastery of the Old World, the consequences for us and for the world may be disastrous, indeed. That is why we passed the lend-lease bill. But the consequences will also be disastrous unless some nation somewhere begins now to point the way out of the night that threatens to engulf the world. In the midst of our determination to build the greatest defense any nation has ever had, we must not—we cannot if we are true to our duty—neglect these even more fundamental constructive things. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Guard: For the National Guard, $1,867,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see before me a very distinguished former Member of the House, one of the most popular and one of the ablest mayors in the United States, former Representative Fiorello H. LaGuardia. [Applause.]

The remarks I am about to make, of course, are for the benefit of the mayor. [Laughter.]

American businessmen have not the faintest idea of what has been going on in Washington for the last 2 years. During the World War, 1917–19, we spent $27,000,000,000, ten billions of which were used for adjustment purposes after the war was over. In contrast, the last Congress and the present one have appropriated and authorized for purposes of national defense $32,000,000,000, not including the $7,000,000,000 for aid to Britain which passed the House on Wednesday.

It is safe to say that by June 30, 1941, our total expenditures for defense and aid to Great Britain will exceed $40,000,000,000. Several years ago I was ridiculed because I predicted our national debt would be $50,000,000,000 by 1941. It will be nearer sixty-five billions, including the authorizations, and by next year it will be seventy-five billions, or more money than the entire annual income of all citizens of the United States combined last year.

I predict there will be a new tax bill within the next few months calling for from two to three billion dollars of additional taxes. American businessmen, small and large, will be paralyzed by these added corporation and income taxes. The taxpayers with incomes from $2,000 to $50,000 will carry the burden of these taxes by heavy increases. The higher brackets are already drained dry.

I am fearful, if the Government's tremendous spending policy continues throughout the balance of the Roosevelt administration, that the national debt will be so vastly increased it will be repudiated. How could such a gigantic debt be paid? Are we to follow in the footsteps of Germany and Russia in repudiation of our internal debts? Congress is still voting in terms of dollars, but that may only be a habit, and if the spending spree continues, our entire American economic and financial structure may collapse and be replaced by a new order of national socialism. Is this what the radical inner circle around President Roosevelt have been planning and actually want?

Mr. Chairman, on the war issue, I hope the Republican Party will take an emphatic stand and assume the leadership in the Nation to keep this country out of war. [Applause]. If the Democratic Party wants to go along, so much the better. But if the President insists on convoying ships and making the Democratic Party the party of intervention and war, that is his responsibility. On our side, we should take the leadership and let the people know that the Republican Party is today, and always has been, for keeping this country out of war unless attacked by some foreign foe. [Applause.] Let us strip the cover off the ball. Why "hush-hush" the greatest single issue before the American people? All of these other issues have been merely preliminary bouts. The lease-lend bill, the repeal of the arms embargo, conscription, and these other measures were only preliminary bouts to the great event—that is, Shall we go into this war or shall we stay out? Anywhere from 83 to 90 percent of the American people are in favor of staying out, but that 10 or 15 percent are making an awful lot of noise. They apparently have great influence in the press and over the radio; also in places of high authority in the Government and in financial circles. I call upon my Republican colleagues and upon the Republican National Committee to come out at its meeting to be held in Washington next Monday without evasion and state that, while favoring aid to the democracies—short of war and consistent with our own national defense—the Republican Party stands openly and aggressively against involvement in foreign wars unless attacked. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: After line 17, on page 15, insert a new section:

"No part of the funds appropriated herein may be expended to pay for salaries or expenses incurred in the convoy of any defense articles to any foreign nation."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Clerk had read section 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, I think, was on his feet seeking recognition to offer the amendment. The gen-

tleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes. Is the gentleman from Virginia making a point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I made the point of order because the Clerk had already read section 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was on his feet seeking recognition. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment I have offered needs no extended explanation. Many expressions have been made in the debate on the lease-lend bill and during the debate this afternoon as to what this Nation intends to do. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] a few moments ago made a speech which was heavily applauded on the floor calling upon the country to note the course we are following and to face the issue involved. The issue is squarely presented in the amendment I have offered. It merely provides that no part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used to pay the expenses or salaries incurred in the convoy of defense articles to any foreign nation. There is the issue. We have tried to get a vote on that in this House at different times, and we have been ruled out one way or another. We were told it was not germane on the lease-lend bill. You will recall a sort of compromise amendment was worked out in another body which stated that nothing in that act should be construed to confer any authority for convoy. But it gave no protection if authority was found in some other law. Here is an absolute limitation. Here is an opportunity this afternoon to say whether or not this money appropriated for the Navy may be used to convoy defense articles going to foreign nations. There is the issue. You have a chance to put in that limitation this afternoon and to define the course of the United States in the days ahead.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is there any money in this bill that could be used for operating convoys?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I believe not.

Mr. TABER. I have been examining the bill to see if I could find any but have not been able to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think there is none at all. The amendment has no place whatsoever in this bill.

There ought to come a time, Mr. Chairman, when we should stop reconsidering and trying to amend the lease-lend bill in connection with every appropriation bill that comes before the House. This pending bill is a defense bill, a bill for American defense. There are no funds in the bill for things to be sold to the democracies. There is no reason whatsoever to think that one dollar's worth of material to be made under this bill will be sent abroad even in foreign bottoms.

The committee has not considered this amendment. It is not good judgment to put an amendment of this kind in this bill. It has no place here and its only effect would be to confuse the issue. I plead with the membership of the committee not to write this sort of amendment at the end of the bill. This bill has nothing whatsoever to do with convoys. This whole matter was thrashed out in the lease-lend bill, up one side and down the other, and there was ultimately written into that bill a statement saying that nothing in the lease-lend bill should be construed to give the President the right to convoy ships. There it was left and there we ought to leave it unless it comes up in an orderly fashion.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. The proposed amendment also states that nothing shall be convoyed to any foreign country. This does not mean to a belligerent country only, but if the amendment as offered is adopted it would mean that we could not send a boatload of material to Panama or to any peaceful neighbor to the south of us. It would prevent us from using one of our naval vessels to take goods to any other country.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It just shows what may happen by putting hastily considered amendments into a bill—amendments that have not been considered by the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It also means that should an emergency situation arise we could not even convoy goods to the Newfoundland base, or to Trinidad, or any of our newly acquired bases.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amendment has no place in the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the amendment would interfere with our own national defense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman read the amendment correctly, because it was limited to the convoying of defense articles to a foreign nation. It would not apply to goods delivered to ourselves by ourselves, but by us to foreign nations. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if the bill does not carry funds for the payment of salaries in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; but they are not paid for the convoying of materials abroad.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 35, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the same do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEWIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 124, noes 1.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, answered "present" 1, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—327

Allen, Ill.	Camp	Doxey
Allen, La.	Canfield	Drewry
Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon, Mo.	Duncan
Anderson, Calif.	Carlson	Durham
Anderson, N. Mex.	Carter	Dworshak
Andresen, August H.	Cartwright	Eaton
Angell	Case, S. Dak.	Edelstein
Arnold	Chenoweth	Eliot, Mass.
Barden	Chiperfield	Elliott, Calif.
Barnes	Clason	Ellis
Barry	Claypool	Elston
Bates, Ky.	Cluett	Engel
Bates, Mass.	Cochran	Englebright
Baumhart	Coffee, Nebr.	Faddis
Beam	Coffee, Wash.	Fellows
Beckworth	Cole, Md.	Fenton
Beiter	Collins	Fish
Bell	Colmer	Fitzgerald
Bender	Cooley	Fitzpatrick
Bennett	Cooper	Flannagan
Bishop	Copeland	Fogarty
Blackney	Costello	Folger
Bland	Cox	Forand
Boehne	Cravens	Ford, Miss.
Boggs	Crawford	Ford, Thomas F.
Boland	Creal	Fulmer
Bolton	Crosser	Gale
Bonner	Crowther	Gamble
Boren	Cullen	Gathings
Boykin	Cunningham	Gearhart
Bradley, Mich.	D'Alesandro	Gehrmann
Brooks	Davis, Ohio	Geyer, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Tenn.	Gibson
Brown, Ohio	Day	Gilchrist
Bryson	Dewey	Gillie
Buckler, Minn.	Dickstein	Gore
Bulwinkle	Dirksen	Gossett
Burdick	Disney	Graham
Burgin	Dondero	Grant, Ala.
	Doughton	Grant, Ind.
		Gregory
		Guyer, Kans.

Gwynne	McKeough	Satterfield
Haines	McLaughlin	Sauthoff
Hall,	McLean	Scanlon
Edwin Arthur	McMillan	Schuetz
Hancock	Maas	Schulte
Hare	Maciejewski	Scrugham
Harness	Maciora	Shafer, Mich.
Harrington	Magnuson	Shanley
Harris	Mahon	Sheppard
Harter	Mansfield	Short
Hartley	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Healey	Mason	Simpson
Hébert	May	Smith, Conn.
Heffernan	Merritt	Smith, Maine
Heidinger	Meyer, Md.	Smith, Va.
Hendricks	Michener	Smith, W. Va.
Hill, Colo.	Mills, Ark.	Snyder
Hill, Wash.	Monroney	Somers, N. Y.
Hinshaw	Moser	South
Hobbs	Mott	Sparkman
Hoffman	Mundt	Spence
Hook	Murdock	Springer
Hope	Murray	Starnes, Ala.
Houston	Myers, Pa.	Steagall
Hull	Nelson	Stearns, N. H.
Hunter	Norrell	Stefan
Imhoff	Norton	Sullivan
Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.	Sumner, Ill.
Jacobsen	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sutphin
Jarrett	O'Connor	Sweeney
Jenkins, Ohio	O'Hara	Taber
Jennings	Oliver	Talle
Johns	O'Neal	Tarver
Johnson, Calif.	Pace	Tenerowicz
Johnson, Ill.	Paddock	Terry
Johnson, Ind.	Patman	Thom
Johnson,	Patrick	Thomas, Tex.
Luther A.	Patton	Tibbott
Johnson, Okla.	Pearson	Tinkham
Johnson, W. Va	Peterson, Fla.	Tolan
Jones	Pfeifer,	Van Zandt
Jonkman	Joseph L.	Vincent, Ky.
Kean	Pheiffer,	Vinson, Ga
Kee	William T.	Voorhis, Calif.
Kefauver	Pierce	Vorys, Ohio
Kelley, Pa.	Pittenger	Vreeland
Kennedy,	Ploeser	Walter
Martin J.	Plumley	Wasielewski
Kennedy,	Powers	Weaver
Michael J.	Priest	Welch
Keogh	Rabaut	Wene
Kerr	Ramspeck	West
Kilburn	Randolph	Wheat
Kilday	Rankin, Miss.	Whelchel
Knutson	Reece, Tenn.	White
Kunkel	Reed, N. Y.	Whittington
Lambertson	Rich	Wigglesworth
Landis	Richards	Williams
Lanham	Rizley	Wilson
Larrabee	Robertson,	Winter
Lea	N. Dak.	Wolcott
Leavy	Robertson, Va.	Wolfenden, Pa.
LeCompte	Robsion, Ky.	Wolverton, N. J.
Lewis	Rodgers, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Ludlow	Rogers, Mass.	Woodrum, Va.
Lynch	Rolph	Worley
McCormack	Russell	Wright
McGehee	Rutherford	Young
McGranery	Sabath	Zimmerman
McGregor	Sanders	
McIntyre	Sasscer	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—101

Andrews	Eberharter	Kirwan
Arends	Edmiston	Kleberg
Baldwin	Flaherty	Kocialkowski
Bloom	Flannery	Kopplemann
Bolles	Ford, Leland M.	Kramer
Bradley, Pa.	Gavagan	Lesinski
Buck	Gerlach	McArdle
Buckley, N. Y.	Gifford	Martin, Mass.
Burch	Granger	Mills, La.
Byrne	Green	Mitchell
Cannon, Fla.	Hall,	Nichols
Capozzoli	Leonard W.	O'Day
Casey, Mass.	Halleck	O'Leary
Celler	Hart	Osmers
Chapman	Hess	O'Toole
Clark	Holbrock	Peterson, Ga.
Clevenger	Holmes	Piauché
Cole, N. Y.	Howell	Poage
Connery	Izac	Ramsay
Courtney	Jarman	Rankin, Mont.
Curtis	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, Ill.
Delaney	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Dies	Johnson,	Rivers
Ditter	Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Domengeaux	Keefe	Rockefeller
Douglas	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, Okla.
Downs	Kinzer	Romjue
Sacks	Smith Wash.	Traynor
Schaefer, Ill.	Stevenson	Treadway
Scott	Stratton	Wadsworth
Secrest	Sumners, Tex.	Ward
Shannon	Taylor	Weiss
Sheridan	Thill	Youngdahl
Smith Ohio	Thomas, N. J.	
Smith, Pa.	Thomason	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

General pairs:

Mr. Dies with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Green with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Arends.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Downs with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Stevenson.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Thill.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Plauché with Miss Rankin of Montana.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Courtney.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Traynor.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Connery with Mr. Capozzoli.
Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr Cannon of Florida.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Mills of Louisiana.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Ramsay.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Sacks.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I had a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SMITH. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote of "nay," but I would like the RECORD to show I am paired against the bill and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SMITH, is paired for the bill.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made this morning may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short editorial from the Union Weekly of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BEAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two short editorials relative to highways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Col. Charles Lindbergh, which appears in this week's Collier's magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND], I ask unanimous consent that he may be given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole in the RECORD and to include brief extracts from the report and hearings on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain articles on foreign affairs for which I have received an estimate from the printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an

editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Abraham Lincoln—Man of the People" delivered by the Honorable Andrew Schotcky, a superior court judge of Mariposa County, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "We Move the Rains."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article from Labor giving relative figures on the increase of profits compared with the increase of wages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in the Committee of the Whole and include therein a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COLOR OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was speaking with regard to a newspaper article and I participated in the discussion. The subject of my talk at that time was how a conclusion may be so quickly reached on the floor. I did not intend to become involved in the matter, which related to the painting of our warships.

However, it seems that the impression was left that our naval vessels were purposely painted like those of England or other countries. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] went promptly and called the Navy Department. I called the Navy Department that afternoon and then talked with them at some length yesterday morning. They put me first in touch with the office of Admiral Van Keuren. His secretary discussed the subject at some length with me. Then they put me in touch with Admiral Williams, with whom I also talked for several minutes. Admiral Williams informed me that he had been studying the matter of the color of naval vessels for a number of years. He began the study in I think 1932 or 1933, and from 1935 to 1937, while he was manager of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, he made a very earnest study of it. He seems to be recognized as an expert on this matter and has given it careful study.

Admiral Williams himself—and this subject seems to be his specialty and responsibility more than anybody in the whole world, apparently—assured me that there is neither purpose nor desire to simulate the color of the vessels of any navy, that the color of the vessels of our Navy is in no way intended to be similar to that of vessels of any other country. He said that a study was made as to where the ships may go and what colors would be best to use in certain waters. It seems that some seas reflect colors differently than others, so that different shades of gray are used. This fact has been developed by him since 1937, and it has been only recently that the Navy has accepted this latest shade of gray—all are gray, I think—as the best one. He said that if there is any similarity or very close proximity of this color to that used on the ships of other nations it is because those nations, too, have followed the study through.

He stated that this particular shade was developed so that it might be as difficult as possible to see the ship, and that it was the effort of every nation to make ships as difficult as possible to be seen. If all nations could find a color for their ships that would leave them so they could not easily be seen, then all nations would, without doubt, use the same color and shade; that the effort on the part of all nations is to make their ships as nearly invisible as possible.

That is all there is to it. The ships now carry different paints, and when they get to a sea where a little lighter or a little darker shade is thought best to carry out this purpose they use it. There is absolutely no purpose or intention to have our ships look like those of any other nation. He assured me of that more than once. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the cotton-warehousing bill and include therein a certain contract form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BROOKS and Mr. HOOK asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

COLOR OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my good friend from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] has gone into the matter a little bit further about the repainting of our Navy ships, as it was, I believe, first disclosed to the American public by the Philadelphia Inquirer and subsequently has been printed in several other newspapers, including, I notice, an item in the Washington News of yesterday morning.

The gentleman from Alabama has said that he did not believe that there is any "purpose or intent" on the part of Admiral Williams to paint these ships for the precise purpose of having them bombed or torpedoed by enemies.

Mr. PATRICK. That is the admiral's statement—he specifically stated that.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the admiral is quite sincere in that. I cannot conceive of any admiral telling anybody anywhere that the Navy was painting our ships the color of Great Britain's with the specific "purpose and intent" of having them torpedoed; certainly not. I am interested in the possible consequences and the results and I am not charging bad faith on the part of any admiral. I believe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] was not in the Chamber at the time the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman HESS, in answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] cited the fact that another admiral down at the Department, Admiral Alexander H. Van Keuren, who happens to be Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships, told him, a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I quote from the RECORD for March 19, at page 2431, for the exact words of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS]:

> I checked with the Navy Department, through the Bureau of Ships—

and through Admiral Alexander H. Van Keuren—

> and I was informed that the ships of the United States Fleet are being repainted in dark gray, a color similar to the ships of the British Fleet, and that they will probably resemble the *King George*.

I am worried, not about the fact they are carrying some paint pots out to sea to engage in camouflage at any certain time or place for normal defense purposes, but that certain specific ships have already been painted, and the names were in the article I quoted from the Philadelphia Enquirer, which also stated that five overage destroyers have been similarly repainted. Any Navy man will tell you that a bombing plane or a submarine judges a ship largely by its profile, and since the profiles of the overage destroyers on hand are the same as the profiles of the overage destroyers conveyed to Britain, if they are painted in substantially the same colors, you make it almost impossible to distinguish between the national ownership of two types of ships. Thus, under prevailing circumstances, with some of our former destroyers now flying the Union Jack and some the American flag, and with our ports being open to both fleets, it is a reckless, needless, and unconscionable flirtation with fate for our Navy to sud-

denly decide to repaint our fleet to more closely resemble the British Fleet. It seems to me the statements the gentleman from Alabama quoted from Admiral Wilson further verify what Admiral Van Keuran told the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS]. The facts seem to reduce themselves to a direct contradiction of what Secretary Knox told the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]. The ships are being repainted, both admirals now agree. They are being painted in shades more nearly identical with the British Fleet.

Regardless of the motive, Mr. Speaker, the result can well be to make mistaken identity much easier, to make an unfortunate sea incident much more probable, to make the subsequent development of added war sentiment more certain. I say it is an unwise, peace-defying practice to adopt at this particular critical time, and that it should be discontinued in the interests of our national safety and our national peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may place in my remarks that I made during the debate this afternoon a portion of the hearings on the bill which I referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article prepared by Herb Graffis, which recently appeared in the Chicago Daily News, entitled "Don't Hate Roosevelt Week."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COLOR OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, my first discussion was with Admiral Van Keuren's secretary, Miss Baker. Admiral Van Keuren was out of town at that time, I believe, and I cannot understand how anybody got to talk to him when he was out of town. Anyway, I talked to Miss Baker, who has charge of his office work, and she it was, as I recall, who assured me, having had that up and having participated in consultations in which Admiral Van Keuren participated, that the shades may vary even in slight degree, in the shades of gray, and if there is any resemblance between our ships and the *King George*, it does not follow that there was any relation and does not mean that the *King George* was so painted first, but that the slight variation just makes our vessels a little degree darker. There can be nothing to this story except the fancy of some particularly energetic news gatherer. The purpose is not to resemble some other country's warships, but to make ours as hard to see as is possible. I am glad that no other reporters seem to think they have found a news story under this rose petal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman state the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District day, and if the bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs to increase the authorized strength of the Navy and the Marine Corps can come up, we will consider that. If not, that will come up later in the week. On Tuesday there is the Office of Reports bill which we expect to consider. On Wednesday I assume we will take up the bill which was under consideration yesterday, the storage of cotton, the so-called warehouse bill. After that, if the bituminous coal bill is reported out of the Ways and Means Committee, and a rule is obtained, that will be considered probably Thursday. If not, then the cotton net weight bill may come up. I cannot say definitely as to those two bills. If they do not come up we have in reserve the War Department appropriation bill for civil activities.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the cotton warehouse bill which was under consideration will not be here on Tuesday, but the Office of Reports, the propaganda bill will be considered then.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Office of Reports. I must let the gentleman use his own characterization, and we may take issue with that on Tuesday. I do not want to describe it, but I could very well say the next bill on the "Hate Roosevelt Movement," but that would be as unfair as the observation of my friend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 533. An act to amend section 4 (f) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide for extra compensation for overtime of inspectors in charge and radio inspectors of the field division of the engineering department of the Federal Communications Commission;

H. R. 2703. An act for the relief of the estate of Joe L. McQueen;

H. R. 3155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3440. An act for the relief of Edith Platt; and

H. R. 3441. An act for the relief of Daisy Fitzpatrick.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 25, 1941, to resume hearings on H. R. 3684, freight forwarders.

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 27, 1941, to begin hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet to hold hearings on river and harbor improvement projects, as follows: Tuesday, March 25, 1941, Alafia River, Tampa Harbor, Fla.; and Tuesday, March 25, 1941, waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers. All meetings to start at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

370. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of cost, cancelations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1940; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

371. A letter from the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission, Indianapolis, Ind., transmitting report of the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission, in compliance with the provisions of section 3 of Public Law No. 352, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 9, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 154); to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4124. A bill making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. A resolution for consideration of H. R. 3786, a bill to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 302). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 4125. A bill to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members and certain members of the Reserve components thereof from selective training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4126. A bill to amend section 107 of the judicial code to create a mountain district in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4127. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veteran's Administration hospital in or near the city of Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4128. A bill to provide for the creation of conservation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 4129. A bill to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis and fix their rate of pay, and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 4130. A bill to make permanent the rate of postage on mailable matter of the first class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4131. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 4132. A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4133. A bill to amend section 92, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 4134. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 4135. A bill to repeal sections 512, 513, 514, 515, as amended, 3744, as amended, 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes; and the act of February 4, 1929 (ch. 146, 45 Stat. L. 1147; 41 U. S. C., sec. 4a); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4136. A bill for the relief of the counties of Haywood and Swain in the State of North Carolina by reason of their loss in taxable valuation by the establishment of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4137. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of August 29, 1935, relating to Federal assistance in the acquisition and development of State forests, to counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4138. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4139. A bill to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4140. A bill to require that the Federal contribution to States for old-age assistance shall be the full amount paid individuals under the State plan in cases where the State matches to the extent of its ability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 4141. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 4142. A bill to provide for the construction in Los Angeles City and County, Calif., of a superhighway to relieve congestion caused by defense activities; to the Committee on Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 15, with reference to irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 14, with reference to military Federal highways; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 12, with reference to public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolutions Nos. 8 and 9, concerning appropriate legislation which will prevent encroachment upon public domain without approval of States affected; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4143. A bill granting a pension to Alice G. Townsend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4144. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter L. Shearman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4145. A bill for the relief of Burt Savage; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

542. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the New York Board of Trade, concerning House bill 1585, a bill to establish a construction reserve fund under the United States Maritime Commission; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

543. Also, petition of the National Crushed Stone Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., concerning House bill 625, relating to wages in the crushed-stone industry; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

544. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, concerning the St. Lawrence Waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

545. Also, petition of the Central Union Labor Council of Greater New York, concerning the Culkin bills (H. R. 123, 125, 126, and 132); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

546. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Colored Concert Bank of the Work Projects Administration of Southern California Music Project, protesting their removal as part of the Federal Music Project in 1937 and have never since been reinstated, and that southern California Negroes deserve a band to represent them, and that most of the members of this dismissed band are members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and deserve this recreation and remuneration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

547. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Council of the City of New Rochelle, N. Y., definitely opposing any proposals regarding the taxation of the income of municipal bonds as inequitable and that the income which would be secured from that source should be secured by other means; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

548. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Chemung, N. Y., urging the preservation and protection of the interest of the people of the State of New York through appropriate legislation opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

549. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Merchants Association of New York, urging support of House bill 1585 and Senate bill 279; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

550. Also, petition of the Central Union Label Council of Greater New York, opposing House bills 123, 125, 126, and 132; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

551. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Jersey Shore, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

552. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Jersey Shore, Pa., favoring Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

553. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of R. S. Sitler and a large number of citizens residing at and near Knightstown, Ind., who express their opposition to the President exercising the great power vested in him by the lend-lease bill which will lead the United States of America into this war, or which will eventually send American boys upon foreign soil to fight the political and economic war of those nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

554. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of Mrs. T. M. Stone, Mrs. Charles Weight, and citizens of Bellwood, Pa., evidencing interest in

early enactment of Senate bill 860, banning the sale of liquor and beer at Army camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

555. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the International Union United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Congress of Industrial Organizations industrial defense-council plan; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of an infinite majesty, whose work is life, whose love is grace, whose contemplation is glory: We beseech Thee to come to us with the Spirit of Thy counsel, and, as we listen for Thy voice, do Thou direct our wandering steps. Comfort us that we may know Thy comfort; teach us how to fulfill our vocations, to finish the work Thou hast given us to do, and help us to conform our lives to the pattern of the life of the Son of God, our merciful Redeemer and our Friend. O Thou Christ of God, grant to each one of us to know Thee more clearly, to love Thee more dearly, and to follow Thee more nearly, so that living we may live to Thee and dying we may die to Thee, and that when we awake after Thy likeness, we may be satisfied forever and ever. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3636) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before that committee on House bill 3735, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Overton
Aiken	George	Pepper
Andrews	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gillette	Reed
Ball	Glass	Reynolds
Bankhead	Green	Russell
Barbour	Gurney	Schwartz
Barkley	Hayden	Sheppard
Bilbo	Herring	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Stewart
Bulow	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Murdock	Wallgren
Connally	Murray	Wheeler
Danaher	Norris	White
Davis	Nye	Willis
Downey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. ADAMS. My colleague the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER and Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily detained.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CORRECTION OF THE JOURNAL AND RECORD

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on page 2422 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, being the last day upon which the Senate held a session, there appears on the roll call among those not voting on the record vote then taken my name. As a matter of fact, I was present and voted in the affirmative on the amendment. I ask that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

I also understand that the Journal of the Senate contains the same error. I ask that the Journal be likewise corrected.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I assume, conformably with rule III of the Senate, that, on a proper showing or statement, what the Senator from Georgia suggests should be done, but it should be done by the way of motion, with debate, upon the statement of the Senator or someone in his behalf. That is the practice. I understand that the Senator has stated that he voted for the amendment, but his vote was not recorded by the clerk of the Senate. Of course, under rule III, the Senator has a right to make the RECORD conform to the actual truth, but the practice we have followed is that the Senator shall make a statement and move that the correction be made. I have no objection to that course. Naturally, I accept the statement of the Senator and others who have talked to me about it, and those of the members of the Press Gallery who heard the Senator vote. There can be no question about it, however unhappy I may be that he did vote, as, in fact, he did, and he is entitled to have the correction made. I merely suggest that he conform to the practice which has prevailed, based upon the statement by the Senator from Georgia or someone in his behalf.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that I have consulted the Parliamentarian, and he advises me that the precedents indicate that the proper procedure would be for me to call this error to the attention of the Senate, and that there would be subsequent parliamentary procedure. I have no objection. I merely wish to make the RECORD speak the truth.

Mr. MCNARY. The matter should be presented in such fashion as to permit the Senate finally to pass upon it. If a mere request by the Senator to alter the RECORD and Journal was made, it would not give any Senator an opportunity to vote to oppose it, if he thought he should do so. That is the practice, and that is the interpretation I place upon the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is unquestioned that a Senator who has voted and whose vote has not been recorded has the right, the constitutional right, and high privilege of the Senate to correct the RECORD and show that he voted. When it comes to a correction of the Journal itself, the precedents show both ways, that it is sometimes done on motion and sometimes by the Chair ordering it. I have no objection at all to the motion being made, upon the showing of the fact that the Senator from Georgia voted.

Mr. MCNARY. I think that is the proper course. It is an open course; it is a fair one; it gives all Senators an opportunity to pass on the matter. No one will oppose it, of course. That is the proper way to correct the Journal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the only question before us is one of procedure, everybody agreeing as to the situation, I ask that the part of the Journal of last Thursday which deals with the amendment in question and the vote thereon be read, so that I may base upon it a motion for correction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The question being taken on agreeing to the reported amendment, viz, on page 23, strike out all after the sum "$41,399,256" on line 18, down to and including line 2, page

24, as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed, and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto."

It was determined in the negative: Yeas, 32; nays, 32.

On motion by Mr. MCNARY,

The yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Senators who voted in the affirmative are: Andrews, Bankhead, Barkley, Bilbo, Brown, Byrnes, Caraway, Chavez, Connally, Downey, Ellender, Gerry, Glass, Green, Guffey, Hayden, Hill, Hughes, Kilgore, Lucas, McFarland, Maloney, Murray, O'Mahoney, Overton, Reynolds, Schwartz, Smathers, Stewart, Truman, Tydings, Wallgren.

Senators who voted in the negative are: Adams, Aiken, Ball, Barbour, Bone, Brewster, Brooks, Bulow, Burton, Butler, Byrd, Capper, Clark of Idaho, Danaher, Gillette, Gurney, Holman, Johnson of Colorado, La Follette, Langer, Lodge, McNary, Norris, Nye, Shipstead, Smith, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Vandenberg, Wheeler, Wiley, Willis.

So the committee amendment was not agreed to.

On motion by Mr. GURNEY to reconsider the vote disagreeing to the said amendment,

On motion by Mr. DANAHER,

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit the motion which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

I move that the Journal be amended—

(1) By striking out on page 28, at the top thereof, the following: "It was determined in the negative, yeas 32, nays 32," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "It was determined in the affirmative, yeas 33, nays 32."

(2) By inserting, in the names of the Senators voting in the affirmative, the word "Russell" after the word "Reynolds."

(3) By striking out, in the sentence "So the committee amendment was not agreed to," the word "not."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Inasmuch as this correction of the Journal actually changes the action of the Senate in respect to the bill itself, I beg to inquire whether the bill is still within the jurisdiction of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling is that the bill is still within the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How does that happen, if I may further inquire? How long does it usually take for a bill to get from here to the House of Representatives?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has not yet been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire especially the attention of the Vice President. I am very happy that this error on the part of the clerks—the first error they have ever committed in my 8 years' experience here—verifies the statement I made to the Vice President. I am very glad to be justified and verified, and to have the RECORD so show.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the motion I made been adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first part of the motion only has been read.

Mr. BARKLEY. A second motion is included in the matter which I sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the remainder of the motion.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. BARKLEY moves to strike out the following language appearing in the Journal on page 28:

On motion by Mr. GURNEY to reconsider the vote disagreeing to the said amendment,

On motion by Mr. DANAHER,

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Without objection, the Journal as amended will be approved.

Mr. BARKLEY. And, of course, the amendment will be engrossed as a part of the bill transmitted to the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be engrossed as a part of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The bill now being an entirely different bill from that on which the Senate voted, how can we constitutionally have passed the bill when we were voting on the assumption that it did not contain this amendment? How can it now be said that we passed the bill when we did not actually vote on the bill which has just been amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The correction of the Journal does not affect the passage of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. But the bill we voted on was not the bill as it now stands. Consequently, so far as I can see, at least from a constitutional standpoint, we might not have voted for the bill if it had contained the amendment which is now in it. I only ask the constitutional question how we ever passed this bill at all, as the record now stands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The only question before the Senate is the correction of the Journal.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 14, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 189. An act for the relief of William Boyer; and

S. 251. An act for the relief of John Mulhern.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED BY THE VICE PRESIDENT DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that, under authority of the order of the 20th instant, he had signed on Friday, March 21, 1941, the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 583. An act to amend section 4 (f) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide for extra compensation for overtime of inspectors in charge and radio inspectors of the field division of the engineering department of the Federal Communications Commission;

H. R. 2703. An act for the relief of the estate of Joe L. McQueen;

H. R. 3155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3440. An act for the relief of Edith Platt; and

H. R. 3441. An act for the relief of Daisy Fitzpatrick.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE HEARINGS ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 21, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

EMERGENCY NATIONAL-DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 33)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting sundry emergency national-defense supplemental estimates of appropriations for the War Department, fiscal year 1941, to be made available until June 30, 1942, totaling $312,871,100 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., favoring the enactment of House bill 1410, providing for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Councils of the Cities of Norwalk, Conn.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Racine, Wis., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota, favoring amendment of the Social Security Act so as to provide Federal grants to States for public assistance on an equalization basis, etc.; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. NYE on the 20th instant.)

Two Senate joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 4

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the Honorable President of the Senate and to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate from Alaska:*

"Whereas the Honorable ANTHONY J. DIMOND has introduced in the House of Representatives now in session H. R. 84, a bill entitled 'To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes,' and to amend section 26 of title 24 of the United States Code Annotated in this respect; and

"Whereas the subject matter of this bill was included in H. J. M. No. 24 by the fourteenth session of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, and the reasons for the amendment to the law have more urgently appeared during the last 2 years: Now therefore

"We, the Alaska Legislature in fifteenth regular session, after further consideration of the subject matter of H. R. 84, respectfully urge that the same be enacted into law.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 5

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America; to the President of the Senate; and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fifteenth regular session assembled, most respectfully represents:

"Whereas the Honorable ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, did on January 16, 1941, introduce in the Congress of the United States H. R. 2258, providing for 'Transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter fisheries, from the Department of the Interior to the Territory, and for other purposes'; and

"Whereas the entire fishing industry is closely associated with the welfare of the Territory of Alaska and particularly the large number of the fishermen who earn their livelihood from this source; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska is composed of representatives coming from every walk of life in the Territory and are acquainted with the problems of this and other industries in the Territory of Alaska and are particularly well fitted to legislate upon the necessities of such industries and their administration: Now therefore

"We, your memorialist, do most earnestly pray that H. R. 2258 be enacted into law."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14

"Whereas in accordance with an act of Congress a dam was erected across the Mississippi River at Keckuk, Iowa; and

"Whereas in said act of Congress there was a clause requiring that if at any time the Department of Commerce so ordered the owning company could be compelled to install in said dam an adequate fishway; and

"Whereas the Mississippi River Power Co. is now the owner and operator of said dam; and

"Whereas the welfare of the great Commonwealth of Iowa depends in a very large measure upon the installation of a fishway through said dam; and

"Whereas the fishermen of the State of Iowa, both private and commercial, the Eastern Iowa Sportsmen's Protective League, the Mississippi Valley Protective Association, and many others are urgently requesting the installation of said fishway: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house concurring)*, That the Legislature of Iowa, duly assembled in Des Moines, Iowa, respectfully petitions the Members of the National Congress and the United States Department of Commerce to use every possible effort to obtain the installation of an adequate fishway through the Keckuk Dam on the Mississippi River, and that this legislature urges the Members of the National Congress and the United States Department of Commerce to secure the necessary orders from the proper departments providing for said fishway, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Department of Commerce, to each United States Senator and Representative, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the President of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution No. 63

"Whereas the borough and county of Richmond holds the most unique position among all counties of the State of New York in that politically it is both one of the five boroughs of the city of New York and one of the counties of the State of New York, and yet geographically it is wholly isolated from the city and the State, due to the absence of physical connection with other parts of the city and State, and it has therefore been deprived of that degree of development and progress which characterizes the other four boroughs; and

"Whereas bridges and tunnels connect the boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens, and rapid-transit facilities are operated and maintained by the city of New York; and the borough of Richmond, while paying its proportionate share of the maintenance of such bridges, tunnels, and rapid-transit facilities, derives no direct benefit from such improvements; and

"Whereas in the year 1919 the then transit commission (later the board of transportation) commenced a survey upon which a report to the board of estimate of the city of New York was made, in which seven plans were submitted, including both bridge and subway, to connect the borough of Richmond with the city and State of New York, and an appropriation of $50,000 was made by the city of New York for surveys, borings, and preliminary field work, which said plans and investigation were never successfully brought to a conclusion; and

"Whereas in the year 1923 construction was actually commenced under and by virtue of the provisions of the laws of 1921, and two tunnel shafts were constructed at a cost of $1,250,000, a right-of-way through the borough of Richmond was condemned, and ownership was vested in the city of New York; and it is estimated that the actual amount of money expended by the city of New York in connection with the construction and acquisition of title, and interest charges thereon, represented an outlay of over $6,000,000, all of which is still vested in the city of New York and is entirely nontax producing; and

"Whereas this project was abandoned under the laws of 1925; and

"Whereas in the year 1937 the Legislature of the State of New York passed a bill authorizing the construction of vehicular tunnel between the boroughs of Richmond and Brooklyn, which bill was signed by the Governor of the State of New York and became a law on May 7, 1937, the provisions of which empower the New York City Tunnel Authority to construct, operate, and maintain a proposed vehicular tunnel between the boroughs of Richmond and Brooklyn, and which said bill had the support of the board of estimate of the city of New York and the citizens of the borough of Richmond and the borough of Brooklyn; and

"Whereas the New York City Tunnel Authority has failed to exercise the privilege conferred upon it by the laws of 1937 pertaining to this tunnel project; and

"Whereas the project referred to above, i. e., the vehicular tunnel connecting the boroughs of Richmond and Brooklyn, would become a vital part of a complete system of transportation; and

"Whereas the aforesaid project would be of immeasurable value to the Federal Government in its national-defense program; and

"Whereas the aforesaid project has now reached the status where it is necessary to obtain borings, soundings, preliminary plans, and surveys so that arrangements may be made for the issuance of bonds by the New York City Tunnel Authority to construct the said vehicular tunnel; and

"Whereas the New York City Tunnel Authority has estimated that the cost to it for the making of said preliminary plans, surveys, soundings, and borings will be approximately $50,000; and

"Whereas the said New York City Tunnel Authority has by law no funds available for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to appropriate the said sum of $50,000 from funds allocated to the defense of the United States for the use of the said New York City Tunnel Authority for the purposes set forth above; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to His Excellency the President of the United States, all at Washington, D. C."

A House memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Memorial No. 3

"Memorial relating to the erection by the United States Government of a flood-control dam on the San Pedro River, in Cochise County, Ariz.

"*To the Congress of the United States and to the United States Senators and Congressman from the State of Arizona:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That great damage is done annually by flood waters in the San Pedro River, in Cochise County, Ariz.;

"2. That particularly great damage is done to that portion of said county in and around the town of Benson, Ariz.;

"3. That some method of the control of said flood waters is necessary.

"Wherefore your memorialist requests that the Members of the United States Senate from the State of Arizona and the Congressman from the State of Arizona use their influence with the proper agencies of the United States Government and with the United States Congress to procure the erection by the United States Government of a flood-control dam on said San Pedro River at some specific location above the town of Benson."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial No. 10

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the outside fishing operations off the coasts of Oregon, Washington, and British

Columbia catch a substantial portion of the silver and chinook salmon originating from the streams in Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia; and

"Whereas all fishermen operating in the inland waters are being subjected to rigid regulations for the conservation of the species of salmon supporting the commercial fishing in outside waters; and

"Whereas the outside fishing is entirely unregulated, taking unlimited numbers of chinook and silver salmon in any season; and many of them immature: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the present international salmon treaty by expanding the duties of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission to include the investigation of all species of salmon in outside waters from the State of California to Cape Scott on Vancouver Island; and be it further

"Resolved, To provide that commercial fishing in said waters come under the jurisdiction and regulation of said Commission at the time said Commission is given power to regulate the Fraser River sockeye in accordance with the terms of the present covenant; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 4

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition Your Excellency and honorable body, as follows:

"Whereas the present National and State social-security laws relating to old-age pensions are steps in the right direction but have proved unsatisfactory, inadequate, inefficient, and subject to many conflicting State and National interpretations, all of which have created uncertainty and doubt as to the time, amount, and payment of old-age pensions; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt has advocated a liberal, uniform, national old-age-pension system; and

"Whereas the nationally known old-age-pension poll indicated that the citizens of the United States favor a uniform, national old-age-pension system with individual monthly payments of $40 and such additional amounts of the Congress may from time to time decree; and

"Whereas the electors of the State of Washington in the recent general election clearly indicated by the passage of an initiative measure that individual pension payments be increased to $40 per month: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause to be enacted into law a uniform, national, old-age-pension system along the lines of the desire of the people as expressed in the nationally known poll; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 5

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your assembly and honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the United States Government has embarked on a large-scale and long-range defense program to protect the shores of both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans from attack; and

"Whereas there is an area within Pacific County between the cities of Raymond and South Bend, in the State of Washington admirably situated for the establishment of either an Army or Navy air base or both in that such area is but 15 miles from the Pacific Ocean; lies alongside the Willapa River, it has a channel depth of 25 feet and is at least 1,000 feet in width, thereby making the requested air base accessible to and for seaplanes; and

"Whereas the port of Willapa Harbor is the owner of 300 acres, and is willing to convey a considerable portion of such land for such purposes, and has contributed the sum of $20,000, completely diking the land to the extent of 4½ miles, all of which would give the air base a runway of a mile; and

"Whereas the estimated cost of establishing an air base between Raymond and South Bend, Wash., would amount to less than $175,000: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $175,000 for the purpose of establishing a military air base between Raymond and South Bend in Pacific County, Wash.; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States; to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States; to each of the Representatives and Senators in Congress from the State of Washington; to the Secretary of War; and to the Secretary of the Navy.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 7

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition Your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas the practicability of the construction of an international highway to Alaska has been under consideration for some years; and

"Whereas the existing water and air transportation routes to Alaska should be supplemented by a through land route to facilitate economic and military connection with that Territory; and

"Whereas the Army and Navy Departments of the United States Government have pointed out the strategic value of Alaska to the North American Continent and the necessity for a coordinated transportation system reaching from the continental United States through to Alaska; and

"Whereas Congressman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the First Congressional District of the State of Washington, as chairman of the Joint Alaskan International Highway Commission, has made commendatory efforts toward making a through highway from the United States to Alaska an accomplished fact: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to approve and pass suitable legislation for the construction of the Alaskan International Highway for the purposes of providing adequate transportation for defense and development; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A House memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial No. 4

"House memorial urging passage by Congress of H. R. 1036, relating to the general welfare

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The problems of unemployment and social security are among the most vital economic issues now confronting the people of the State of Arizona, as well as of other States of the Union.

"These pressing problems cannot be solved satisfactorily by individual States, but are national issues involving the general welfare of the Nation.

"There has been introduced in the present session of Congress H. R. 1036, relating to the general welfare, which will, if enacted, alleviate in large measure the economic distress resulting from widespread unemployment and poverty among the aged. Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That H. R. 1036, now pending in the first session of the seventy-seventh Congress, be enacted into law, to the end that deserving old people may be properly cared for and the States relieved of the burden resting upon them in that regard."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 15

"Memorial to the President of the United States and the Representatives from the State of Montana and the State of Wyoming in the Congress of the United States requesting careful consideration and prompt support in the passage of an act providing for the construction of storage of water by the War Department, and that such provisions be made as will assure the people of Montana and Wyoming of water necessary for their present and potential needs for domestic and irrigation purposes by the building of proper dams in the Big Horn River in Montana and Boysen, Wyo.

"The members of the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (and House of Representatives concurring), respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the War Department, under direction of Congress, made a survey of the Yellowstone watershed and has made its report wherein it recommends that storage be provided at either the Kane or Boysen sites in Wyoming, and that owing to the complexity of the interest involved and the widespread benefit which would accrue from the storage, it is considered appropriate for the United States to bear the entire cost of the new project adopted; and

"Whereas the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors held a public hearing at Billings,

Mont., on the 30th day of January 1941, at which were present large delegations from the Yellowstone River watershed below the influx of the Big Horn and from the whole Big Horn watershed area in Montana and Wyoming, including Crow Indian representation, and which representatives spoke and presented briefs, all of which were unanimous, in favor of the Boysen storage, provided the water be made first available for domestic and irrigation needs of the area, both present and potential; and

"Whereas the same benefits would accrue to Montana and her people in the elimination of the silt from the stream flow and the supplying of supplemental water now badly needed, if storage were provided at the Boysen site as is provided at the Kane site; and

"Whereas, if it were provided at the Kane site Wyoming citizens would receive no benefits from the elimination of the silt or very little benefit from the storage, and would suffer a very substantial loss as the result of the inundating of a considerable acreage of irrigated land; and

"Whereas storage at the Boysen site would be valuable as such beyond a period of 250 years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to give prompt and careful consideration in the passage of an act providing for the construction of storage by the War Department, and that such provision be made as will assure the people of Montana and Wyoming of water necessary for their present and potential needs for domestic and irrigation purposes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, directed to promptly transmit certified copies thereof to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to BURTON K. WHEELER and JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana United States Senators, and JAMES F. O'CONNOR and JEANNETTE RANKIN, Montana Congressman and Congresswoman, and to JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and HARRY SCHWARTZ, Wyoming United States Senators, and Congressman JOHN J. MCINTYRE, of Wyoming.

"Approved March 6, 1941.

"SAM C. FORD,
"*Governor.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution No. 19

"Whereas section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that Representatives in Congress shall be determined by counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed; and

"Whereas the apportionment of Representatives on this basis works a hardship on certain sections of the United States; and

"Whereas certain other sections of the country have large numbers of persons who are not citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas Congress shall, upon application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, call a convention to consider amendments to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the house (the senate concurring)*, That the Legislature of Iowa, duly assembled in Des Moines, Iowa, respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and that said convention, when so called, shall consider amending the first sentence of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment so that the same shall read as follows: 'Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of citizens in each State'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and Representative from the State of Iowa, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Governors of the 47 States, and to the President of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy to use their offices, powers, and influence to cause our armed forces to be furnished with adequate dairy foods

"Whereas it appears that oleomargarine is used almost to the exclusion of butter, cheese, and other dairy products in feeding the armed forces of the United States; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge that dairy products are far superior in food value to any substitutions; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the industrial benefits from the defense program be distributed uniformly throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas the dairy farmer has not received his equitable share of the increased business resulting from the defense program or any previous Federal program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy to use their offices, powers, and influence to cause our armed forces to be furnished with adequate dairy foods; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1

"Whereas the world today finds itself in turmoil which threatens the very existence of our way of life in the United States of America; and

"Whereas certain nations in Europe and Asia have banded themselves together to terrorize the world and reduce peace-loving nations to a state of vassalage and slavery; and

"Whereas these nations have visited upon their conquered peoples persecution because of race or religion, and have subjected these defenseless peoples to unspeakable brutalities, the ferocity of which the civilized world has never before witnessed; and

"Whereas the United States of America has embarked upon a vast program of national defense to prevent these evil and destructive forces from reaching the shores of the Western Hemisphere and the possessions and territories of the United States; and

"Whereas the President and the Congress of the United States have and are taking appropriate measures toward this end and to render all material aid and assistance to those nations who, with magnificent courage, are combating this ruthless aggression; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, an integral part of the United States of America and situated in the mid-Pacific, occupies a most important place in this vast scheme of national defense: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, in Regular Session assembled this 19th day of February, A. D. 1941 (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby endorses and supports the various measures now being taken by the President and the Congress of the United States in the interest of national defense; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby endorses and supports the foreign policy of the present national administration; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby endorses and supports all measures now pending before the Congress having for their purpose aid and assistance to the embattled democracies; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby pledges the unqualified support and loyalty of all the people of the Territory of Hawaii to the foreign policy and program of the national administration; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to the Secretary of the Navy, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 8

"Senate joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact appropriate amendments to present Federal statutes requiring Federal agencies to comply with State water laws

"Whereas the Federal Government, in proceedings before the Supreme Court of the United States, has asserted claim to all the unappropriated waters of nonnavigable streams of the Western States, and also that the return flow resulting from the irrigation of Federal reclamation projects is the property of the Federal Government, and therefore free of the sovereign control and supervision of the States in which such waters and projects are located, which is contrary to the fundamental principles of water laws in these several Western States; and

Whereas section 8 of the Reclamation Act contains a definite and specific provision requiring compliance with the water laws and recognizes vested rights acquired thereunder; and

"Whereas Federal judicial decisions affirm that sovereignty over such waters is vested in the States and not in the United States; and

"Whereas the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and later acts authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers for flood control and other purposes; the Pope-Jones Act, otherwise known as the Water Facilities Act, authorizing the construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid regions of the United States; the Case-Wheeler Act; the Taylor Grazing Act; and possibly other acts authorizing the construction by Federal agencies of works for the control and use of waters in the Western States, contain no statement that the activities of the Federal Government, under the provisions of these various Federal acts, shall be carried out in conformity with State laws covering the ownership, control, and use of the waters of these Western States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend these several acts and all similar acts at the earliest possible date to include provisions requiring that in the prosecution of all works designed for water conservation and use the particular Federal agency or department involved shall, in all respects, comply with State laws relating to the ownership, control,

administration, and use of the waters of these Western States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and War, to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each of the United States Senators from Nevada, and to the Nevada Representative in Congress, with a request for enactment by the Congress of the United States of amendatory legislation for carrying out the purpose of this resolution."

"STATE OF NEVADA,
"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
"Approved March 15, 1941.
"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor*."

Joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 9

"Senate joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact appropriate legislation which will prevent encroachment upon public domain without approval of States affected

"Whereas the economic life of the people depends largely upon available and usable water resources, and the reclamation policy is based on the multiple use of our water resources for irrigation, flood control, power, grazing, domestic, and industrial water supplies and the abatement of stream pollution; and

"Whereas no dams or reservoirs for the storage of water can be constructed in any national park, and the enormous increase in national parks and national-park areas, particularly in the public-land States, constitutes a direct threat to the economic life of our people, not only in respect to water resources but also as to the use of such areas for forestry, mining, grazing, wildlife, and highways: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Congress be memorialized to enact appropriate legislation which will prevent the creation of any new national parks, monuments, or recreation areas, or additions to those now existing, except with the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, and that Congress be memorialized to oppose the enactment of H. R. 9351, or any other measure which would authorize the President of the United States, in his discretion, to transfer by Executive order virtually any or all of the unreserved or unappropriated lands to national-park status, thereby prohibiting the use of such areas for water, timber, minerals, grazing, or highway purposes, and locking up the areas exclusively for recreation, education, and inspirational purposes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each of the United States Senators from Nevada, and to the Nevada Representative in Congress."

"STATE OF NEVADA,
"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
"Approved March 15, 1941.
"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor*."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial No. 10

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Thomas Parran, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service; the Honorable Congress of the United States; and the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in fifteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas the future well-being and prosperity of the people of Alaska, both white and native, is dependent upon the maintenance of their health; and

"Whereas it has been and is the common knowedge of the people of Alaska and responsible Federal agencies that the disease tuberculosis is more prevalent and is causing more disability and more deaths among the population of Alaska than any other single preventable disease; and

"Whereas the medical and hospital care of the native population of Alaska is the responsibility of the Federal Government through the Office of Indian Affairs, and this responsibility is not being met adequately because of the lack of sufficient hospital beds for the isolation and proper care of hundreds of these Federal wards; and

"Whereas the known prevalence and death rate from tuberculosis is higher than that in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States and is thus a national disgrace and a definite deterrent and menace to the future growth and development of this most strategic and valuable Territory; and

"Whereas the continuous and demonstrable spread of this dread disease among the population, both native and white, appears to be increasing and is certain to extend to numerous individuals at present uninfected, now resident in the Territory; and

"Whereas, with the present large and certain future assignment of Army, Navy, and Air Corps personnel, as well as many civilian employees and families, to posts in Alaska, and the inevitable mingling and close associations of the military personnel with a population which on careful survey shows an unusually high percentage of pulmonary tuberculosis cases, the probability of a high rate of new infection will occur in this previously healthy group; and

"Whereas the Territory cannot hope to adequately meet this urgent need for the care of these thousands of unfortunate individuals; and

"Whereas the condition is undeniably an emergency and becomes in the final analysis not only a necessary social measure but a first-class military issue: Now therefore

"Your memorialist respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States appropriate sufficient funds to construct and maintain adequate hospital facilities in Alaska for the treatment, care, and rehabilitation of both white and native residents of Alaska infected with tuberculosis.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House February 20, 1941."

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of the Townsend recovery plan for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near Army or naval training camps and to suppress vice in the vicinity of such camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23

"Concurrent resolution respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon proposed legislation relative to the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States a bill (H. R. 2488) authorizing the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in or near the city of Gladstone, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

"Whereas the need of this hospital has been long standing, the Upper Peninsula Associaton of American Legion Posts having recognized the necessity of such hospital facility in 1936; and

"Whereas a thorough study has been made and this need attested to in resolutions adopted by numerous civic, social, labor, and veterans' organizations, as well as many individuals; and

"Whereas the reasons advanced after a long and thorough study of this project are:

"1. Because of the geographical situation of the Upper Peninsula, the nearest point of the Upper Peninsula is approximately 300 miles and the farthest point is approximately 700 miles from Detroit, where a veterans' hospital was erected consisting of only 350 beds, the distance of travel being even greater to the Wood Hospital near Milwaukee and the Hines Hospital in Chicago, the point being that transportation is a vital problem to any veteran seeking hospitalization.

"2. The facilities of these hospitals are greatly overcrowded, necessitating veterans in need of hospitalization waiting months before they can be hospitalized.

"3. There are approximately 14,000 World War veterans within the boundaries of the Upper Peninsula, approximately 550 being disabled veterans drawing compensation, and great numbers of these veterans require medical or surgical attention each year, presenting a large transportation problem, whereby they could be taken care of in a facility located closer to their homes, thereby saving human lives and misery to an untold extent, and would mean savings of many dollars in transportation and would expedite the recovery of disabled veterans.

"4. A survey made through officers of the American Legion, Disabled Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars shows that there are approximately 250 veterans in the Upper Peninsula desperately in need of hospitalization at this time.

"5. Cost of transportation and miscellaneous expense necessary for a veteran to appear before an examination board after appeal is prohibitive under the present policy, and as this cost is usually borne by the local posts, the individuals generally not being able to bear this expense, it works a hardship on those furnishing this relief; and

"Whereas it is imperative to the best interest of the Commonwealth to alleviate suffering and misery which now exists among the veterans in this section of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Michigan Legislature hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and approve the proposed legislation aforesaid; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to Vice President Henry A. Wallace, Speaker Sam Rayburn, of the House of Representatives, to all Michigan Members of the Congress of the United States, to Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and Chairman of Board of Hospitalization, and to Governor Van Wagoner and Lieutenant Governor Murphy, of the State of Michigan.

"Adopted by the senate on March 7, 1941.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on March 10, 1941."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against adoption of the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway plan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. RADCLIFFE presented a resolution almost identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by District Council No. 5, Oil Workers International Union, of

Maud, Okla., favoring an amendment to the wages-and-hours law so as to reduce from 40 to 36 the permissive hours of labor in industries which have established a shorter workweek; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of McLouth and Walnut, both in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near Army or naval training camps and to suppress vice in the vicinity of such camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF DETROIT GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG presented a resolution adopted by the Detroit Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Committee, appointed by Hon. Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of Detroit, Mich., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives the people of the United States of vital production and transportation facilities in the Great Lakes area; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel as advocated by President Roosevelt will enable us to make our full contribution to the present needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas our national defense requires full utilization of the potentialities of our 21 active shipyards on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel could be completed in time to aid the present defense program and reliable investigations reveal that the proposed deepened channel could permit passage of all ships except battleships and aircraft carriers; and

Whereas engineering surveys made by our Government have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River provide an unparalleled natural highway of over 2,350 miles from the heart of our Nation to the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas a deep waterway from our great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region is vital to our Nation and a bulwark of strength to our defense; and

Whereas the people of Michigan and the States adjacent to the Great Lakes possess a natural right to transport their industrial products, agricultural and mining commodities to the markets of America and the world in the most economical manner; and

Whereas the midwestern section of our Nation, which is a part of the Great Lakes region, produces more agricultural commodities and has more industrial production than any other section of the country; and

Whereas the Detroit industrial area and the State of Michigan are a part of the great midwestern section of our country in which 40,000,000 people live; and

Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is not only a defense measure but also a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial region: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Detroit Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Committee, appointed by Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of Detroit pursuant to request of the common council, That we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing existing barriers; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States; to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress, and to the mayors of our important sister cities throughout the United States.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Pittsburg (Kans.) Local Union, No. 533, United Mine Workers of America, protesting against the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The resolution states that the project would be greatly injurious to the coal-mining industry of the United States and to the workers employed in that industry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a proposal to approve the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas the approval of said project, or any project similar thereto, would be injurious to the coal-mining industry of the United States and persons employed in said industry; and

Whereas there is no economic necessity or justification for said project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Local Union, No. 533, United Mine Workers of America, in meeting duly assembled, That said project should be, and the same is hereby, condemned because—

1. It will result in ruinous foreign competition by the dumping on the American market of cheap foreign coal mined by nonunion and ill-paid workers and who suffer under the lowest standard of living.

2. The power feature of the project will create direct competition with steam-operated power plants and reduce the market for American-mined coal.

3. The seaway feature of the project will create direct competition with American railroads, reduce their revenues and their demand for American-mined coal, which item alone would take from the market for American-mined coal some two and one-half million tons annually.

4. The project will reduce, if not wholly eliminate, our Canadian market, which is now 17,000,000 tons annually, and due to the transportation facilities proposed by said project would take this market away from the American miner and give this market to the Russian and Welsh coal miners.

5. The project will deprive a great number of American coal miners of employment and the miners that it does not condemn to unemployment and make them and their families a public burden will be employed for a smaller period of time in the year due to the reduction of production of coal in the United States, so that they will earn much less and be reduced to an intolerable standard of living.

6. This measure will impose a penalty upon the patriotic American coal miners without any social, economic, or political justification.

Therefore, this project, or any similar project, should be defeated in the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be directed to the attention of the United States Senators for Kansas and the Members of the House of Representatives from Kansas, and Hon. ALFRED F. BEITER, Member of Congress, and that they be and are hereby respectfully urged to devote their wholehearted effort to defeat this or any related proposal, as we deem it their duty as representatives of their constituents, including the thousands of coal miners employed by the coal-mining industry in the United States.

PAUL O'NEIL,
President,
O. D. SIMPSON,
Financial Secretary,
LAND KENNEDY,
Recording Secretary,
CHARLES SHEETS,
Treasurer,
Officers of Local Union No. 533,
United Mine Workers of America.

WHEAT GRADES—RESOLUTION OF THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a concurrent resolution adopted by the Kansas Legislature urging immediate study of the subject of wheat grades and the making of such revisions as are needed to remove the present disparity in test weight requirements. I am in sympathy with the objectives sought by the resolution.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 12

Concurrent resolution urging the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to make an immediate study and revision of Federal standards for wheat to the end that farmers will be paid for their wheat more nearly on a basis of true value and quality

Whereas the Federal grain standards put undue stress on test weight of wheat as a grading factor, thus penalizing types having light test weight, but excellent baking quality, and putting a premium on types which have heavy test weight, but inferior baking strength; and

Whereas the Federal standards require hard red winter wheat to have test weight of 60 pounds per bushel to grade No. 1, while the standards for hard spring wheat require test weight of only 58 pounds per bushel for No. 1 grade, thus penalizing our Kansas Turkey types: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein), That the Kansas Legislature urge the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to make a thorough and immediate study of the wheat grades, making such revisions as are needed to (1) remove the present disparity in test-weight requirements between No. 1 and the lower grades in hard red winter wheat versus hard red spring wheat, and (2) to more definitely describe the milling and baking qualities of hard red winter wheats of Kansas, to the end that farmers will be paid for their wheat more nearly on the basis of its true industrial value than is practical under the present Federal grain standards; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each member of the Kansas congressional delegation and to each of the United States Senators from Kansas.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body March 14, 1941.

RESOLUTION OF MEN'S BIBLE CLASS OF THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH, LAKE CHARLES, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Men's Bible Class of the First Methodist Church, of Lake

Charles, La., in respect to Senate bill 860, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To His Excellency, the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of Army and Navy:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed a Selective Conscription Act, and already many hundreds of thousands of men have been drafted into the service of the United States in the Army and Navy and all branches of its defensive supplies; and

Whereas these men are gathered into camps for training; and

Whereas the alcoholic drink traffic is busily engaged in transporting and selling alcoholic liquors in and about such camps; and

Whereas it is a well known scientific fact that any amount of alcoholic liquor of whatever degree or character, taken into the human body decreases the mental, physical, and moral stamina of the human body and detracts from its effective service by reason of the inevitable effects of the use of such alcoholic liquor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Men's Bible Class of the First Methodist Church of Lake Charles, La., do hereby approve and affirm the findings of the National Temperance Council of the Methodist Church as adopted at the meeting of said council held in Washington, D. C., on January 15, 1941.

And we do hereby earnestly request and petition Your Excellency that as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, you immediately request of the Congress of the United States that it pass bill S. 860 as an emergency measure and law, prohibiting the transportation or having in possession of any alcoholic liquors in and about such training camps and prohibit the use of the same in any way by any and all persons in and about such camps or within the territory thereof as provided in said bill, S. 860; further

Resolved, That we do hereby petition and request the President and the Congress to pass laws prohibiting other forms of vice from being permitted or practiced in or about such training camps, or any form of vice mentioned in said findings of said National Temperance Council as passed on January 15, 1941, and that suitable penalties be provided for violation of any such laws.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 20th instant,

The following reports of committees were submitted during adjournment of the Senate:

On Friday, March 21, 1941:

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 390. A bill relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 133).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 926. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors in military service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 134).

On Saturday, March 22, 1941:

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4050. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 135).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 994. A bill to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other dispositions of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to prevent depletion of the stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 136).

He also, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

H. R. 2082. An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 140).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 137); and

S. 324. A bill to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; with amendments (Rept. No. 138).

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Rules:

S. Res. 30. Resolution amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration (submitted by Mr. ADAMS on January 8, 1941); without amendment (Rept. No. 139).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON FORESTRY—FOREST LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 32)

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Forestry, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, Seventy-fifth Congress, and House Concurrent Resolutions 11, 23, and 51, Seventy-sixth Congress, I submit a unanimous report. I ask that the clerk may read the letter of transmittal with the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, with an illustration. The clerk will read the letter of transmittal.

The clerk read as follows:

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1941.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I have the honor and privilege to transmit herewith the report of the Joint Committee on Forestry as required by Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, Seventy-fifth Congress, and as extended by House Concurrent Resolutions 11, 23, and 51, Seventy-sixth Congress.

The time is ripe for the establishment of a real forest economy in this country which, as an important segment of the broad agricultural economy, will put to constructive use one-third of our total land area. Forestry offers the means of constructive use.

No one today questions the worth-whileness of forest conservation—the wise use of timber and the other products and services of the forest. Beyond filling tangible consumption needs, the phase which is most readily appreciated by the average citizen, a national forest economy can supply in reasonable abundance services which, though more intangible, are none the less of vital importance.

A forest economy is not a panacea for our economic and social ills. But, properly integrated with farm and range economies, it can help materially to increase rural employment and income, particularly in some of our most critical rural problem areas.

The critical situation which threatens the physical and economic safety of the United States in a war-torn world accentuates the vital importance of a thorough and lasting solution of our forest problem. Timber products are essential in military activities.

This report indicates the variety and seriousness of the problems which must be overcome to make a forest economy a reality. These problems arise in part from destructive forest exploitation; in part from natural economic and political circumstances more or less beyond the control of the individual owner.

From the forest-resource standpoint America is in transition from a philosophy of exploitation to one of planning and applying sustained-yield management and orderly utilization. The knowledge necessary to accomplish this transition is as varied and complex as are the forest conditions and their economic and social relations.

The program necessary to establish a satisfactory Nation-wide forest economy includes a series of public measures or actions, some of which require new legislation, some require modification of existing legislation, and some simply more aggressive action under existing authority.

Respectfully,

JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2d,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1199. A bill relating to the purchase of livestock for slaughter and processing; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 1200. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1201. A bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1202. A bill to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians under tribal agreement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1203. A bill for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall irrigation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1204. A bill for the relief of Hazel Echo Knutson; and

S. 1205. A bill relating to the effective date of awards of compensation to surviving dependents of veterans of the World War, who die or have died from a service-connected disease or disability; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1206. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1938; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1207. A bill to change the times for holding terms of the District Court for the Eastern Division of the Western District of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1209. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Farcher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1210. A bill relating to the district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1211. A bill granting a pension to Earl E. Bayles;

S. 1212. A bill granting a pension to Penira Williams Massey; and

S. 1213. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Rodeheaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1214. A bill to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1215. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1216. A bill for the relief of Henry (Heinz) Gabriel; and

S. 1217. A bill for the relief of Herbert James Pike; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1218. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924, entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1219. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1220. A bill for the relief of G. C. Barco; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1221. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1222 (by request). A bill to provide for a money grant to Harriet F. Wright in recognition of the valuable services rendered to the United States by her late husband; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 1223. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across or tunnel under the Patapsco River at Baltimore, Md., and a bridge across Chesapeake Bay from a point at or near Millers Island, Baltimore County, Md., to a point at or near Tolchester, Kent County, Md., or a bridge across or tunnel under Chesapeake Bay, or a combined bridge and tunnel, from a point at or near Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, Md., to a point on Kent Island, Md.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1224. A bill to extend the crediting of military service under the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (for himself, Mr. BALL, and Mr. CAPPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 101) extending the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF—AMENDMENT TO RULE XVI

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

"*Resolved*, That Senate rule XVI be amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"'7. That the provisions of this rule as to amendments to general appropriation bills shall apply to all bills making appropriations for relief and work relief.'"

REDECORATION OF SENATE CHAMBER AND STUDY OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I ask to have lie on the table until tomorrow. I should like to have the resolution read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and it is hereby, authorized and instructed to make a study of (a) the lighting system of the Senate Chamber, (b) the lighting system of the Senate Office Building, and (c) the redecoration of the Senate Chamber, and report to the Senate, within 3 months after the date of approval of this resolution, the results of its study together with its recommendations. The committee is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of the Architect of the Capitol and any other source of information deemed necessary in carrying out its duties under this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida will lie on the table.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER ON UNITY FOR PEACE

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Unity for Peace," delivered by Senator WHEELER on March 20, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR NYE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several addresses delivered by him, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE HORIZONS OF SMALL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator MEAD on March 22, 1941, on the subject The Horizons of Small Business, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM M. S. ECCLES ON INFLATION

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from M. S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, on the subject of inflation, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LETTER TO AMERICANS BY COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the current number of Collier's magazine entitled "A Letter to Americans," by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE FROM THE NATION ON REPORT OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from The Nation, of March 22, 1941, referring to the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES ON THE O'MAHONEY REPORT

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of March 12, 1941, entitled "The O'Mahoney Report," which appears in the Appendix.]

FINANCIAL AND MONETARY PRINCIPLES OF GEORGE WASHINGTON — ADDRESS BY WALTER E. TRENT

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Walter E. Trent, at Chestertown, Md., on February 20, 1941, on the subject, George Washington, His Financial and Monetary Principles and Achievements, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE VISION OF WOODROW WILSON—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH CONRAD FEHR

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the South Atlantic Quarterly of January 1941 by Joseph Conrad Fehr, entitled "The Vision of Woodrow Wilson," which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE ON FINLAND BY JOHN SAARI

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on Finland by John Saari, published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 15, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

HARSH REALISM FOR AMERICA—ARTICLE BY STUART CHASE

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Progressive of March 22, 1941, entitled "Harsh Realism for America," by Stuart Chase, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY CHARLES J. WELCH ON THE PRICE OF SUGAR

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles J. Welch with respect to the retail prices of sugar, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY T. D. KEMP, JR.

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by T. D. Kemp, Jr., published in the Charlotte Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM BOOK BY QUINCY HOWE ENTITLED "ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY AMERICAN TO DO HIS DUTY"

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a book by Quincy Howe entitled "Eng-

land Expects Every American To Do His Duty," which appear in the Appendix.]

PLANTING OF TREES FOR SOIL CONSERVATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Divide County Farmers' Press of March 21, 1941, entitled "Saskatchewan Plants Trees," which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the call of the calendar will be dispensed with.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE AND IN AID OF DEMOCRACIES

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4050, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, being more commonly known as the $7,000,000,000 bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4050) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations without amendment.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, and for each and every purpose incident to or necessary therefor, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums for the following respective purposes, namely:

(a) For the procurement, by manufacture or otherwise, of defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, including services and expenses in connection therewith, as follows:

(1) Ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, including armor and ammunition and components thereof, $1,313,000,000.

(2) Aircraft and aeronautical material, including engines, spare parts, and accessories, $2,054,000,000.

(3) Tanks, armored cars, automobiles, trucks, and other automotive vehicles, spare parts, and accessories, $362,000,000.

(4) Vessels, ships, boats, and other watercraft, and equipage, supplies, materials, spare parts, and accessories, $629,000,000.

(5) Miscellaneous military equipment, supplies, and materials, $260,000,000.

(6) Facilities and equipment, for the manufacture or production of defense articles, by construction or acquisition, including the acquisition of land, and the maintenance and operation of such facilities and equipment, $752,000,000.

(7) Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities and articles, $1,350,000,000.

(b) For testing, inspecting, proving, repairing, outfitting, reconditioning, or otherwise placing in good working order any defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, including services and expenses in connection therewith, $200,000,000

(c) Not to exceed 20 percent of any of the foregoing eight appropriations may be transferred by the President to any other such appropriation, but no appropriation shall be increased by more than 30 percent.

(d) For necessary services and expenses for carrying out the purposes of such act not specified or included in the foregoing, $40,000,000.

(e) For administrative expenses, $10,000,000.

(f) In all, $7,000,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

SEC. 2. If any defense article procured from an appropriation made before March 11, 1941, is disposed of, under such act of March 11, 1941, by any department or agency to the government of any country whose defense the President deemed vital to the defense of the United States, the President may transfer, from the appropriations made by this act to the appropriate appropriation of such department or agency, an amount equivalent to the value (as computed for the purposes of the $1,300,000,000 limitation contained in section 3 (a) (2) of such act of March 11, 1941) of the defense article so disposed of, but not to exceed in the aggregate $1,300,000,000.

SEC. 3. Any defense article procured from an appropriation made by this act shall be retained by or transferred to and for the use of such department or agency of the United States as the President may determine, in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign government, whenever in the judgment of the President the defense of the United States will be best served thereby.

SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am presenting this bill to the Senate under direction of the Committee on Appropriations. As a Member of the Senate, I voted against the lease-and-lend bill. I appreciate that my individual votes and opinions are of no concern, but I wish to make my position clear. I voted against the lease-and-lend bill because I thought, as I still think, that it was unsound in principle and apt to bring to my country not only danger but catastrophe and disaster. However, the Congress of the United States, in whose power rests the making of policies, passed the bill, and I regard myself as much bound by the legal requirements of the lease-and-lend measure as are those who voted for it. Therefore, as an individual Senator and as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I am presenting the bill now before us upon the premise that Congress having declared the principle, having laid down the policy, Congress should, and I think must, implement the lease-and-lend law by providing adequate financing.

In accordance with the recommendations of the President and the Director of the Budget, the bill provides an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 to carry out the design of the lease-and-lend law. It also provides authority for replacing appropriations which are depleted by the provisions of the lease-and-lend law authorizing the transfer of materials covered by appropriations made prior to the enactment of that law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I am glad to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the $7,000,000,000 include the one billion two or three hundred million dollar item which covers the President's privilege of transferring existing materials?

Mr. ADAMS. In my judgment, and I think I may say in the judgment of others who have been following the bill from the original conference and the bill's inception, the answer is in the affirmative; that the ceiling of the appropriation bill now before us is $7,000,000,000. Statements have been made indicating that the $1,300,000,000 was to be added to the seven billion, and that there was a ceiling of $8,300,000,000 rather than seven billion. As a matter of fact, from the standpoint of the Treasury, there is no difference in the two methods. There is a difference with respect to the application of the lease-and-lend measure. That is, we have, for instance, $4,000,000,000 of appropriations for Army and Navy purposes—I am merely using that as an illustrative figure—which existed prior to the 11th of March. Then under the pending measure we will have $7,000,000,000. My understanding is that if from the $4,000,000,000 we were to send abroad a billion dollars' worth of materials, then $1,000,000,000 would be taken from the $7,000,000,000, and the full $4,000,000,000 would remain. Some Senators and, I know, some Members of the House have had the feeling that that would not be the case. The net result, however, would not be different, because we start with $7,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000. If we take $1,000,000,000 from the $4,000,000,000 and make the replacement from the $7,000,000,000, it leaves $6,000,000,000 of the $7,000,000,000, and then we have the same total as if we had simply added one to the other. That is, it will mean the same net result to the Treasury.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator referred to the fact that there is some disagreement, even in official circles, regarding an appropriate interpretation of

the bill. Is it not possible to make the bill say what the Senator and his colleagues think it means?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the difference arises from the use in the bill of a single word. There is the direct appropriating clauses of the $7,000,000,000. Then there is the provision that if property or funds are taken from appropriations existing prior to the 11th of March the President may, from the $7,000,000,000, replace the amount taken.

I have felt, and have been supported by others with whom I have conferred, that the provision was to be interpreted in a mandatory sense; that it was not discretionary. Some of the Members of the House take the position that it is so far discretionary that it would leave no obligation on the part of the President to restore from the $7,000,000,000 any funds or property taken from appropriations made prior to March 11. Of course, the Senator from Michigan asked a simple question. If we were to change the word "may" to the word "shall" that, of course, would end any possible controversy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This is either a $7,000,000,000 bill or an $8,300,000,000 bill. I do not suppose the difference is of any material moment.

Mr. ADAMS. No; I do not think it is open to the interpretation under any condition that it is an $8,300,000,000 bill. The appropriation is $7,000,000,000. The question arises as to what may or must be done with the $7,000,000,000 appropriated; whether it must be used to restore funds taken from other appropriations or whether it may be used to restore funds taken from other appropriations.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. The reason for the reimbursement section is that if from stocks on hand there should be taken and disposed of by leasing, lending, or selling $1,000,000,000 worth of material now owned by the Army, for instance, from this fund which we are allotting for British aid there would be taken enough money to restore our Army supplies to what they were before the passage of this bill.

There is one thing to be said in connection with the language of the bill authorizing the disposition of agricultural products. If from the stock of cotton on hand 50,000 bales should be disposed of, we would not want to require the money representing the cost of such cotton to be taken out of the British aid fund, and an equal quantity of cotton to be purchased and put back in the warehouses for surplus commodities. I admit I was an advocate of this reimbursement section, because my thought was that this account should stand by itself, so that the people would know, first, what they were paying on account of the passage of the lease-lend bill, and second, so that when Army materials were used under the authority of the $1,300,000,000 item, we should not strip our defenses, as the phrase has been used, but we should restore what we take from them. Doubt may be expressed by some Members of the House, but there is no doubt in the minds of those who will interpret this measure that the materials of the Army or the Navy, taken from stocks on hand and used shall be replenished from funds provided by the bill now before the Senate.

But there will arise some instances of materials for which we have no immediate use, and which we do not want to replace, being taken, and therefore I doubt the wisdom of substituting language which would require such replacement when it was not necessary.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado further yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may have the attention of the Senator from South Carolina. His statement and explanation are completely satisfactory, if that is what the bill means.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that is what the section in question means. I suggested the inclusion of the section because I wanted the bill to show just what the British aid would cost, and also because I wanted to replace in the funds provided for the Navy and Army the amounts taken from them, and which were necessary to assure our own defense.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has referred to the fact that there has been some disagreement among Members of the House over interpretations. Would it apply to the statement which the Senator now makes?

Mr. BYRNES. I may say that on first reading there seems to be a greater conflict than will appear upon a more careful reading. The gentlemen who wrote the report of the House committee simply referred to the measure as appropriating $7,000,000,000 plus $1,300,000,000; and if that statement were left alone, there would appear to be an irreconcilable conflict. But in the very next paragraph the report goes on to state that there will be reimbursement, so that the amount appropriated will be $7,000,000,000, less whatever amount is taken from Army and Navy funds, which will be reimbursed to the Army and to the Navy. Upon careful reading it will appear that there is not so great a conflict as at first appears. But there is no doubt about the intent of the bill, or about the interpretation placed upon it by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and others who have some authority in connection with the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to pursue the matter further so as to be sure it is thoroughly understood. As I understand the Senator's authoritative statement, anything diverted to foreign countries out of existing military or naval facilities of the Government under the $1,300,000,000 section of the bill will be reimbursed within the $7,000,000,000? Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct, with the modification of which I advised the Senator, that in any case where it is not desirable to replace a commodity taken, the discretionary authority not to do so may be exercised. For example, if a certain amount of surplus cotton should be disposed of, and it should not be considered wise to buy more cotton to replace that which was taken, or to buy certain stamp food of which we have a surplus, to replace the cotton which is taken, the discretionary authority not to do so may be exercised.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I completely agree with the Senator on that point. I merely wanted to be equally sure that I understood that the general purpose is to keep within the $7,000,000,000 total.

Mr. BYRNES. The understanding of the Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the bill contains 10 categories, the aggregate of which amounts to $7,000,000,000. Those categories are deliberately lacking in detail. We were told by Cabinet officials, by the Chief of Staff, and others, that, inasmuch as the purpose of the bill is to help Great Britain; if we were to put in the bill the exact things we are to supply her, we would advertise her needs. The amount of the bill, and the amount of each of the categories are based upon confidential statements made by the British Government as to their necessities. They gave detailed statements. We are told that if the bill were to recite that there is absolute necessity for a certain type of munitions it would indicate to Britain's enemies that there is a shortage of that particular type of munitions. Therefore, as I say, the categories were deliberately drawn in general terms, lacking in details.

Very detailed statements were presented before the committee as to the items which the British Government had requested, after the various requests had been carefully gone over by the American authorities. We are told that extreme care was given to each of the categories, and that the same method was pursued as is used in making up a budget estimate for an appropriation for our own Army or Navy. The authorities went over each item, consulted the official of the Army or Navy best informed in reference to it, and then made up the groupings in the several categories. They said to us that it was unwise to have the details made public. However, they are all in typewritten form. They were read to us by representatives of the Army and Navy, and they are available under proper and safe conditions. They are not upon our records. No transcript was made of the statements, but the various items are accumulated in the hands of the Budget officer and of the several representatives from the Army and Navy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In view of the statement just made by the Senator regarding the necessity for a certain amount of vagueness in the language of the bill itself, it seems to me that the subsequent records become a matter of great importance in the administration of the law. I inquire whether or not a record of expenditures under the provisions of the bill, which ramifies into all the various departments of the Government, will be kept at any central point?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. In the first place, the items making up the appropriation are accumulated in the Budget office. They have been brought there from the various sources. Those are the items

which are needed. A common purchasing department is being set up. Contracting and purchasing are being unified. The expenditures from the appropriation will in turn be recorded in a particular office.

I will say to the Senator from Michigan that the British Government has purchased or contracted in this country for about $2,700,000,000 worth of war supplies, which are in the process of manufacture and delivery. The program which was outlined to us is that the British Government itself is not to make more contracts. It is not to spend more money, beyond the $2,700,000,000, but all purchases for foreign use are to be made by this Government. All purchases and all contracts are to be made by the United States Government and its coordinated officials.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the committee have any information as to the nature and extent of the effort which is to be made to reimburse the Government of the United States for the $7,000,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator that the information on that subject which came to the committee was very vague.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And the Senator thinks the prospect of repayment is equally so?

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator that if he should have an opportunity to buy the claim, I should discount it considerably.

A certain amount of British assets is still available in this country. However, I think the estimates which were given to us indicate that not to exceed from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 is available in American securities at this time, which would be applied. Every item bought for the British Government is to be charged. The charge is perfectly plain. As to the payment, I think no one can furnish assurance. Some of us are apprehensive that the British might attempt to make payment in the form of certain islands which we do not want.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a further question, I was not only inquiring about the possibility of cash reimbursement, but I had particularly in mind the President's statement in his original message to the Congress, when he was contemplating H. R. 1776, in which he specifically said that the things we were to furnish were to be repaid in kind at the end of the war. Is the committee advised as to whether or not the advances are to be made on the basis of contracts which contemplate return in kind, if not payment in cash?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator will recall the phrasing of the lease-and-lend bill, which provides that the terms upon which articles are to be turned over shall be determined by the President, and that the consideration may be direct or indirect. I think the information of the committee is no more accurate and no more detailed than that. There is the direction of the lease-and-lend bill that these things be done. The money is here being appropriated. The charges will be made against the British Government; and I apprehend that the British Government will have the same question to answer that we shall have to answer before long, and that is, What shall we use for money?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Let me say in response to the question of the Senator from Michigan that one witness before the committee stated that in the conferences in the executive branch of the Government there was no discussion of making a gift, but that it was contemplated that there would be some contract of some kind in connection with the disposition of property under the terms of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for that reassurance. I should like to ask a further question.

With considerable emphasis and enthusiasm the so-called Byrd amendment was added to H. R. 1776, for the purpose of leaving the control of the purse strings in Congress, as it was stated. What becomes of the Byrd amendment under this appropriation bill?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Virginia is present. Perhaps he can give us a more detailed explanation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not think the pending bill affects the so-called Byrd amendment. The Byrd amendment simply provided that all funds for the purpose of H. R. 1776 should be specifically appropriated for that purpose, and that no future defense appropriations for the security of our own country should be diverted for the purposes of H. R. 1776. As I see it, the bill now pending in no way changes the purpose or intent of that amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator from Virginia mean that the purpose of his amendment, as stated to us at the time, namely, to require specific appropriations, is met by the terms of the pending bill?

Mr. BYRD. It depends upon what the Senator means by specific appropriations. The appropriations are specific in the sense that they are for the purposes of H. R. 1776.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that what the Senator meant when he presented his amendment?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator from Virginia understood that any appropriation for the aid of Great Britain would not specify so many airplanes or so many tanks. I think the Senator from Michigan will probably agree with me that it is not practical to do so. What the Senator from Virginia was attempting to do was to require the President not to use any appropriations made for the defense of this country for the purposes of H. R. 1776.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And that purpose is in no way impinged upon by the pending bill?

Mr. BYRD. It would be in no way impaired by the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan, supplementing the statement of the Senator from Virginia, that what the Senator from Virginia was aiming at in his amendment is well illustrated by the recent action of the House when it passed a supplemental appropriation bill for a very large amount of money. No part of that appropriation can be used to supplement the appropriation contained in the pending bill. The only way in which it could be done would be for the Congress hereafter to give specific authority to use not exceeding 5 percent, or 10 percent, or 15 percent of the appropriation in the way indicated. The Byrd amendment requires the Congress to take affirmative action permitting the use of the money; and the bill which has just passed the House is the best illustration of the operation of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio desire to ask me a question?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely desire to ask the Senator from Colorado whether the fact that this appropriation is for more than 2 years, and that once we make the appropriation we abandon any right to do anything about it next year, is not a violation of the original purpose of the Byrd amendment that we should keep the purse strings in the hands of Congress.

So far as I know, we never appropriate for our Army or our Navy for more than 1 year, because we want to control the purse strings; we want to control the appropriations next year; and I desire to ask whether by this appropriation, which will extend for 2 years and a quarter, we shall not be waiving control over the purse strings to the extent that we ought to have it during the fiscal year 1943.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course the Senator knows that we are constitutionally forbidden to make appropriations for the Army extending beyond 2 years. There is no such limitation as to the Navy. I think it is fair to say that when the Constitution was drawn those who sat in the Constitutional Convention had no conception of the fact that we would be appropriating money to buy material for a foreign government.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think that in appropriating for 2 years and 3 months—an appropriation which may be diverted to the United States Army—we are complying with the constitutional 2-year limitation?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Colorado must ask to be excused from answering that question.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan and also the Senator from Ohio have mentioned the congressional control of the purse. The Congress has the power to control the purse—a most valuable power. That power in these days has been very little exercised. This particular bill is a very clear illustration of

that fact. Congress, under the lease-and-loan bill, having delegated certain powers, having laid down certain policies which in themselves are necessarily vague, the President and his Army and Navy specialists say that it will take so much in material and so much in money to meet the obligations which we have assumed under the lease-and-loan bill; and we are now faced with a $7,000,000,000 request. Congress has the power to fix the amount; but I say to the Members of the Senate that it is impossible for any Senator to say with any feeling of certainty that the amount ought to be seven billion dollars, seven and a half billion dollars, six billion dollars, or six and a half billion dollars. We do not have the machinery to enable us to ascertain the necessary amount. We were driven to accept the estimates of the executive department. So, as a practical matter, while the power of the purse is in the Congress, the actual exercise of it has been in the executive department.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. So far as the inforation of the Senator goes, is any part of this fund to be used to pay for orders previously placed in this country by a country whose defense is deemed vital to curs?

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that there is no indication that that is the case, and I think very clearly that is not the intention, except, as the Senator knows, that under one section of the act Congress may turn over equipment to the extent of $1,300,000,000, and out of this $7,000,000,000 may replace that amount. It may be said that in one sense, by replacing the funds, we would be making the payment.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, that, in substance, covers the statement as to this bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado one further question?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the committee satisfied that $7,000,000,000 is the total requirement for the life of H. R. 1776?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Colorado cannot answer for the committee. For himself he is very fearful that that is not the case.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Was there any testimony before the committee which would seem to be in contemplation of additional appropriations under H. R. 1776?

Mr. ADAMS. No; except in the one respect that the representations of the British Government as to their needs were in excess of the amount included in the bill; and the needs to be covered by the bill are those of the British Government only. The Senator knows that there has been some contemplation in the messages of the President that under the bill authority might be exercised by him in other parts of the world and in other nations. Personally, I see no escape from the necessity of appropriating additional funds if we propose to maintain China and Greece and other countries in their fights.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the $7,000,000,000 is confined exclusively to British needs?

Mr. ADAMS. It was based on statements of British needs. I will say to the Senator that the British may have included in their needs the fact that they were supplying material to Greece. How far their needs may have included the fact that they were contemplating supplying material to Turkey or to some other country I do not know, and neither does the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But, speaking generally, if there is to be any expansion of this aid to other countries beyond the British request, appropriations beyond $7,000,000,000 will be required?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ADAMS. I am very glad to do so.

Mr. BYRNES. As the Senator from Colorado has said, the testimony was that requests were presented in excess of the amount of this bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it fair to ask what the excess was?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not know whether or not the representatives of the departments requested that that information be eliminated from the record.

Mr. ADAMS. I think I may add that the excess was not relatively very great.

Mr. BYRNES. But I will say to the Senator from Michigan that the testimony before the committee was that the representatives of our Army and Navy went over the estimates as they would go over requests from the field officials of the United States Army, and that they used their judgment upon them as to the necessities; and, further, that by reason of the consolidation of production they determined that it would be possible to produce these materials for a smaller amount than it was anticipated would have been necessary if the British themselves had placed the orders in this country. So several factors entered into the conclusion of the departmental officials that this amount would be sufficient; but there is no statement in the record that this amount will be used exclusively for Great Britain, and under no circumstances will be used for Greece. There is in the record no positive statement one way or the other as to that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it the Senator's understanding from the testimony before the committee that the estimates upon which this appropriation is based are exclusively British?

Mr. BYRNES. The estimates were made——

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me a second, let me say that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] asked some questions of Secretary Stimson along that line which appear on page 13 of the Senate committee hearings. The Secretary's statement in substance was that they did have in contemplation the possible necessities of some other countries, particularly the Greek Government, and have had some conferences with the representatives of other governments. It was not definite at all, but their needs were considered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator now saying that they were considered within the $7,000,000,000 or that they are now being contemplated outside the $7,000,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. Within the $7,000,000,000. The point is, that, as the Senator knows very well, there is some difficulty in contemplating an exact stopping point; that is, once the United States Government has entered into a program of maintaining the democracies of Europe, it cannot very well say, "Now we are going in for $7,000,000,000, and, if that is not enough, we are going to quit."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I quite understand that one cannot go half way over Niagara Falls and turn around and go up again.

Mr. ADAMS. Or one cannot go up to the top of a 40-story building if he decides he will stop at the twenty-sixth floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 14 of the hearings we find the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] asking questions of the Secretary of War, among which is the following:

> Senator BROOKS. I understand that. You cannot tell who they may be, but you do have in mind facilities for the production of necessary armament for other governments that are included in the $7,000,000,000?
>
> Secretary STIMSON. Yes.

I think that really answers the question, and that was the information that was given to the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, if the theater of war expands and our interest in our proxies expands accordingly that would be an additional obligation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be like the Senator's illustration of having gone over Niagara Falls and being on the way toward the bottom and then turning around and going up.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand this bill correctly, the appropriation is based upon estimates which were submitted primarily by those who are interested in the British Empire, but, at the same time there is nothing in this appropriation which would deny the President the right to spend the $7,000,000,000 as he might see fit. Am I correct about that?

Mr. ADAMS. Under the bill the President has the right to buy or manufacture material for any government whose defense he regards as essential to the welfare of this country.

Mr. LUCAS. In his wisdom, that might be China or it might be Greece or it might be South Africa or any other country.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct, but, as the Senator has said, it was the British Government that brought the detailed estimates of their necessities though the representatives of some of the other governments and they were consulted. Necessarily their amounts which went into

totals were relatively small. The British problem was uppermost. As the Senator knows, on the floor of the Senate the argument for the lease-lend bill centered around the necessities of Britain.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, and the very reason why amounts cannot be specified is because no one can look into the future and tell what developments may take place. In other words, it might be necessary to aid some country tomorrow that we are not thinking of at this moment, and that is the real reason for the flexibility of the discretionary power.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator in the presentation of the committee there was much detail which indicated a more accurate comprehension of the necessities than is indicated in the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is very informative, and I am happy to hear it.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. I did not like the illustration used by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that one cannot go half way over Niagara Falls and turn around and go back. That seems to have an ominous note in it, suggesting a plunge over an abyss. I would rather use the illustration of loading a cannon to halfway shoot it. You cannot load a cannon to half way shoot it. I would have in mind loading one that will not halfway shoot but will shoot a shot that will be "heard around the world." To me that more truthfully illustrates the proposal of aid to those who are fighting to defend their right to live their lives as they choose.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator knows, as an expert in writing and speaking of English, that all illustrations are apt to be dangerous as well as inaccurate.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I assume, then, that if this $7,000,000,000 is not sufficient to load and shoot the gun, an amount that will be sufficient will be provided, whether it be another $7,000,000,000, or $20,000,000,000, or any other sum, if the philosophy of the Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Montana will have to discuss that with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. We intend to have it big enough to do the job.

Mr. WHEELER. Whether it takes war or whether it takes anything else.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. LEE. The Senator from Montana has been trying to put a declaration of war into the mouths of those of us who have been supporting aid to Britain ever since the program started; in fact, if we do not get into this war, he is going to be so disappointed that he will die politically.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. ADAMS. Before yielding, let me say that I have very carefully avoided interpretation of the bill. We have a lease-lend bill before us, however it may be denominated. We are obligated to go on in good faith and fairness and carry out its implications, regardless of whether we approved or disapproved of the bill in its inception, and I do not think it gets us any place to attempt to characterize it as doing one thing or another; at least I am not going to do so from the standpoint of appropriations.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to state to the Senator that I entirely agree with him. I think that we, in good faith, ought to carry out the law, although I must confess that when we appropriate $7,000,000,000 and turn it over to be used in any country, I suppose that there is included the great democratic Government of China. Did Chiang Kai-Shek tell the committee, or did his representative tell the committee, what that great democracy needed?

Mr. ADAMS. We have had no information from China.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Colorado will pardon me, I merely want to say to the Senator from Oklahoma, who has intimated that I might die politically if we should not get into this war, that many people for a long period of time have intimated and said that I might die politically, but I have not died yet, and anything I said——

Mr. ADAMS. Some of us are very happy to note the Senator's good health.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. And anything I said against the lend-lease bill and anything I have said about keeping this country out of war will never kill me politically in the United States or in my State.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. In the bill is there any specification as to the proportion of agricultural and industrial commodities within the $1,350,000,000 limitation? I think, on the whole, the request is fairly well itemized, but it seems to me that in the case of this particular category the authority is so broad that I am interested to know whether any specification was made by those who appeared before the committee.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not believe the statement would justify being called a particularization as to that; it was rather generalized. There were particular items, but the details in that respect were not presented as they were with reference to other items.

Mr. TAFT. There was no division, then, as between agricultural commodities and industrial commodities?

Mr. ADAMS. It has been recalled to my attention that statements which were off the record showed that the word "industrial" is to be given a little more emphasis than the Senator gave it; that the officials had in mind oil and iron and certain other raw materials, as well as wheat and some other agricultural products.

Mr. TAFT. Taking that particular clause together with section 3, it really is practically a blank check for the President to buy for any department having anything to do with defense up to $1,350,000,000 of anything in the world that it is desired to assign to that department. Is not that the legal effect of that language, taking it in connection with the rest of the bill?

Mr. ADAMS. That is what the Congress voted in the lease-lend bill, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. I just wondered whether the appropriation was meant to carry out that authorization.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator recalls that the term "defense article" was the premise of the lease-lend bill, and its definitions were very, very broad.

Mr. TAFT. Was there any suggestion before the committee as to whether these agricultural, industrial, and other commodities were to be bought in the United States, or bought in the Argentine or some other part of the world?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not know that I can go beyond the hope that so far as humanly possible they would be bought in the United States, though there was no declaration that I recall on that point.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator cannot give us any assurance that these agricultural commodities, for instance, will not be bought in the Argentine or Brazil or any other part of the world, even Australia, or England itself? I suppose probably they will not be bought in England, because the whole purpose is to get them more material.

Mr. ADAMS. I am not in a position to give any assurance on that subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The question of agricultural and industrial products has been raised, and whether or not there is sufficient testimony in the record to enable us to appropriate a billion and a half dollars for industry and agriculture. The question of the constitutionality of the appropriation has been raised, and the question of control of the purse strings also has been raised in these debates.

If any Senator wants to control the purse strings, or if he believes he is violating his oath on the question of the Constitution, or if he is not satisfied with respect to the details of the agricultural program, the only way in which he can protest is to vote against the appropriation. Is not that true?

Mr. ADAMS. No; I do not think so. We have our vocal protests, as the Senator knows.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. I have heard the vocal protests, and will probably hear more of them; but I am asking now for a sincere answer on the part of the Senator. In other words, if there is a constitutional question involved, or if one wants to hang onto the purse strings, the only way in which you can protect yourself in those convictions is to vote against the appropriation. Is not that true?

Mr. ADAMS. That is true; yes. I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois, however, to another item in the bill under this classification which is both agricultural and industrial. It was

pointed out to us that alcohol has become a very vital matter in making certain kinds of explosives, that large quantities of alcohol are being used, and I think it is not going beyond the ordinary bounds of accuracy to state that, of course, in Britain every plant—it may be an ammunition plant, an airplane factory, a powder factory, or an alcohol plant—may be bombed and destroyed. Among the things that were suggested to us as essential was alcohol, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] gave us a good deal of information on the alcohol situation. He stated that it was very vital that there be adequate supplemental alcohol supplies in this country to replace what might be a shortage, but which is not now a shortage, in Great Britain.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to ask the Senator if the situation is not as follows: The Congress has full power over this appropriation without let or hindrance, and this branch of the Congress may do what it pleases for whatever reason it pleases; that this appropriation is made to carry into execution the so-called Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course.

Mr. GEORGE. And under that act aid may be given when the President deems it vital in our defense, and also deems it necessary to support another government whose defense he believes to be vital in our interest, not enumerating any particular country. That is, the basic law, the organic law, does not enumerate any country—neither Great Britain, Greece, nor China—does it?

Mr. ADAMS. No. Of course, as the Senator says, the Congress has full liberty of action in that respect; and if it saw fit to place in the bill limitations as to the countries, it could do so today.

Mr. GEORGE. But the bill before the Congress does not impose any limitation whatever.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. The whole matter is in the hands of the Senate, however, and it may place limitations if it desires to do so.

Mr. ADAMS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GEORGE. And the so-called Byrd amendment, to which reference has been made, was intended and designed to do but one thing, and that was to require the Congress itself affirmatively to designate how much of any usual, ordinary appropriation made by the Congress for our own defense might be used to carry out and execute the purposes of the lend-lease bill.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. It has been suggested that this bill might be unconstitutional because it authorizes the maintenance of any army for 2 years and 3 months. I apprehend that the chairman of the subcommittee is not disturbed by that suggestion, and he certainly would find no possible unconstitutionality in this bill on that ground, would he?

The Constitution, as I understand, in section 8 of article I, in granting powers to the Congress, simply authorizes the Congress to raise and support armies, but provides that "no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years." This bill does not raise an army, does it?

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, it does not.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not say anything about troops, does it?

Mr. ADAMS. This bill relates purely to munitions and other things which tend to further, in a material way, the defense of a country.

Mr. GEORGE. So that unless a bill proposes to raise or support an army, the Congress might appropriate for more than 2 years.

The chairman of the committee said that no limitation was put upon the length of an appropriation that might be made to support the Navy. That is true, and for a very good reason. The only question that disturbed the makers of the Constitution was the danger, as many members of the convention conceived it, that lay in a large standing Army. The Navy has never in our whole history been composed of a tremendous military force. Moreover, it takes a longer time than 2 years to build a navy. Therefore, there is no 2-year restriction on maintaining a navy, nor on maintaining the post office, nor on carrying into execution any other powers given to the Congress under the Constitution. The one, single limitation is on the power to raise and support armies, and "no appropriation of money to that use"—I think that is the exact language of the Constitution—"shall be for a longer term than 2 years"; the whole purpose being to safeguard against raising a large standing Army, to get away from the militaristic idea, because those who framed our Constitution saw in a vast army, which might be appropriated for over a long period of time, a definite danger to free institutions.

So I cannot see that the chairman of the subcommittee should be in doubt about the constitutional questions involved in a bill which does not deal with troops, which does not deal with an army, which does not even deal directly with our own defense, except as our defense may be strengthened by the defense of other nations which we are authorizing the President in the bill to assist. Nor do I see how the question arises whether or not all this appropriation must be used for England or for any other country, because the organic law which is now being carried into execution places no restriction save that the expenditure must be in the defense of this country or in the defense of a country the defense of which is deemed vital to our own defense.

Of course, the Appropriations Committee may have looked into the question whether or not this $7,000,000,000 is to be used exclusively for one country or for more than one country; but as the bill now stands it simply appropriates $7,000,000,000, and divides it into categories for the purpose of executing the organic act, which imposes no limitation as to how much should go to Great Britain, or how much should go to Greece, or how much should go to China. In fact, it mentions no country whatever, save in general terms.

Mr. ADAMS. As a matter of fact, the phrasing of the appropriation bill does not vary from that of the authorization act, the lease and lend act. There are no limitations in this bill that were not contained in the other one.

Mr. GEORGE. Which were not contained in the organic act?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. That is as I understand the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me perfectly clear that the bill is unconstitutional. I do not think it is a vitally important matter, because it involves only 3 months of time. The Constitution provides that Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years." The pending bill appropriates for 2 years and 3 months, for the procurement of "ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, including armor and ammunition and component parts thereof." If we were appropriating that for our own Army it would clearly be an appropriation in violation of the Constitution. We appropriate it for the use of England, and then on page 4 we say, "Any defense article procured from an appropriation made by this act shall be retained by or transferred to and for the use of such department or agency of the United States as the President may determine." If we can avoid the Constitution by appropriating for an army in England and then say that the President may take that appropriation and transfer it to our Army, it seems to me the Constitution means nothing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio whether he has any idea at all that that constitutional provision relates to the pay of the troops, rather than to their supplies.

Mr. TAFT. I think it affords money for pay of the troops, the appropriation of money for supplies, the appropriation of money for clothes, and every other feature in connection with an army. The words "raise and support" certainly include provision for food, ammunition, and everything else in addition to pay. If "to raise and support" armies includes that, then appropriations of money "to that use" certainly apply to ammunition and guns, as well as to pay of men.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator from Texas has concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am through.

Mr. BYRNES. I wish only to say to the Senator from Ohio that when the lease-lend bill was before us I took the trouble to look up some of the precedents, and the position taken by the Senator from Georgia has been the position sustained by the precedents in the interpretation of that language. In addition, the Department of Justice, over a period of 50 to 75 years, on at least three occasions, through the Attorney General, has taken the position stated by the Senator from George in interpreting similar language.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield on another question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did the committee consider the question whether we have the money to meet an appropriation of $7,000,000,000, or where it is to come from? Or did the committee not consider that as within its jurisdiction?

Mr. ADAMS. The committee as a whole did not consider that question. Some members of the committee have been very much concerned. Of course, we have in the bill the customary ironical statement that "there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," the various sums provided by the bill. We always include that statement, knowing that there is no money in the Treasury. It is a form which goes back for a century, I suppose. The Senator knows the answer as to where we are to get the money.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will recall that the Secretary of the Treasury has testified before committees at this session of the Congress that, in his opinion, 60 percent of all moneys spent should be raised by taxation, and only 40 percent borrowed. I wonder whether in passing this bill we are to take that as a policy of the Government and realize that we have to raise some $4,000,000,000 through taxes in order to comply with that general policy.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me add to the Senator's mathematics a little. Last week we passed a $3,000,000,000 Navy bill, and earlier than that we passed two other bills which aggregated $3,000,000,000. There is on the calendar of the Senate another bill for $4 000,000,000. In other words, in addition to the seven billion, we have to provide in the aggregate another ten billion. So if the Senator is searching to find where we are to get the money with which to pay the $7,000,000,000, he had better extend his search to the other ten billion, because we have that problem to meet.

Of course, the Senator knows we have been getting money from two sources, through levying taxes, to a certain extent, and borrowing. I suppose we are borrowing today $3, perhaps $4, for each dollar we are raising by taxation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I desire to say a word about this particular subject.

I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the Committee on Finance will probably bring in a tax bill before this session is over, and he will probably be just as vocal against that tax bill as he has been against the bill now before us.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment, I think he is entirely unwarranted in that statement. I am quite willing to vote for taxes, at least for 60 percent of what we are spending. In fact, I have publicly stated that I am in favor of increasing the taxes by at least $3,000,000,000 a year, and I think the Senator from Texas will find that I will support any tax the Committee on Finance may report.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to hear that. I deliberately made my statement in the way I presented it so as to get a recruit. I wanted to have the Senator committed to supporting the bill we are to bring in, because I rather suspect it is going to jerk some people out of their boots; and I think many of them should be jerked out of their boots.

We frequently hear the statement, "Oh, yes, I am for high taxes," but when we present the bills those making the statement say, "I am for some other kind of a tax. I am for high taxes, but I am not for this tax." I rather apprehend, in spite of all the statements of the Senator from Ohio, that when we bring the tax bill in he will have many different kinds of objections to the particular form of tax provided and will entertain illusory hopes that some other kind of a tax would be preferable and more productive. But I welcome him to the ranks. I am glad he has not waited to be drafted. I am glad he is committed to supporting very, very heavy taxes.

Let me say also, in passing, that, of course, we are all concerned about these gigantic appropriations. The Senator from Ohio asks, "Have we the money in the Treasury?" He knew the money was not in the Treasury. But we have ways of getting money into the Treasury, and if our Government in this emergency cannot raise enough money to carry out the purposes of the lease-lend law, and at the same time protect its own life and defend its own integrity and its own safety, we had better go out of business. This Nation has always found ways of protecting itself, and we are going to find them now. Of course, we are going to have to borrow some of the money we need, but we will have to raise it; and the Senator from Texas is prepared to vote for taxes and for any other measure to carry out what we have to do. I suggest to Senators who are not in favor of the lease-lend law, why do they not come out and say, "I am unconverted; I am still mad about it," instead of picking a flaw here and there? The Nation is pledged to it, and it is our duty to go ahead and carry out the law.

Mr. ADAMS. One further word, Mr. President, since the Senator has asked a question. I have studiously avoided stating on the floor of the Senate my own opinions as to what the financial consequences of these great expenditures and debts will be. I have ideas which disturb me, but I am very hopeful I am wrong, and have refrained from giving expression to my apprehensions. I should like to be able to join the Senator from Texas, but I have not been able to come to the same decision he has reached.

Mr. President, I have concluded what I desire to say on the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] are both members of the Finance Committee, and I apprehend both will be endeavoring to bring in a bill to carry about as heavy a burden of taxes as the American people can well bear. I do not think there will be any lack of opportunity for any of us to endeavor to raise as much of the current expenditures of government, whether it be 40 percent or more, before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is unavoidably detained on important public business, and asked that I submit in his behalf a statement of his reasons for opposing the pending bill. In view of the pertinency of the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin to the discussion which has just preceded, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

I am voting against the pending so-called $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the following reasons:

First. As a protest against the President's failure to inform Congress what steps he is taking to secure collateral security for the people for the $7,000,000,000 of their money which will be spent and lent for Britain under the terms of the lend-lease bill.

Now that the Chief Executive has the lend-lease bill, is Congress to be regarded merely as a stepchild, unable to receive an accounting from the guardian of its trust funds? Congress did not incorporate in the lend-lease bill any requirement for collateral. I urged the adoption of such a requirement, but apparently it was regarded as unnecessary. Now the Chief Executive has an almost unlimited "blank check" power to "spend and lend," and it appears desirable to me that he should justify the trust and confidence which Congress reposed in him, by advising Congress at this time as to how he proposes to protect the people's interest in this vast sum of money.

Second. Because I believe that the appropriation is not "backed up" by a realistic tax program. In the 3 months' period since the first of the year, the House has voted, including the bills in conference and the bill now before the Senate, $16,299,544,862.88. We are now about to vote $7,000,000,000, and apparently the Chief Executive is relatively unconcerned about how this money is to be raised.

My second reason, then, for voting against the appropriation is that neither the Chief Executive nor Congress has had the intestinal fortitude to tell the country that this appropriation means taxation on a scale never before known to the people of this country, unless we are going to keep up the practice of putting off the day of reckoning by continued borrowing.

If the Chief Executive or the Treasury Department had recommended to Congress a tax bill—

(a) Lowering the exemptions for married and unmarried people;

(b) Increasing the tax rate;

(c) Increasing the defense tax;

(d) Appropriating to the Treasury of the United States (as Britain has) for the period of the defense emergency all the individual net incomes over a certain amount—

then he would have been advancing a realistic though possibly politically inexpedient program. It would, I believe, be a more realistic program than Mr. Morgenthau's proposal to sell up to $5,000,000,000 a year in stamps and bonds, which will further postpone the inevitable day of reckoning and which may saddle generations yet unborn with the cost of horses they never rode.

Third. Because of the utter lack of any disposition on the part of the administration

to cut down on nondefense items, I am opposed to the appropriation.

Fourth. As a protest against the laxity—yes, in some instances, criminal negligence—of the administration in handling the people's money, I am opposed to this appropriation. I am mindful of the urgency of the defense program, but I do not believe that urgency should be used as a pretext to pay exorbitant prices for everything. I do not believe that it should be used as an excuse for still further centralizing government and industrial production. That is unsound from an economic standpoint and unsafe from a military standpoint. It means that we are slowing up Government defense channels by a bottleneck in Washington bureaucracy. It means that we are jamming the gears of industry by unhealthy concentration of defense business in the East, while potential defense facilities elsewhere in the country stand partially unused or idle. In this connection we could learn and profit by some of the lessons which have been taught in Europe.

Fifth. Because the power of the Congress with reference to appropriations and other matters has become synonymous with the "must" requests or dictates of the Chief Executive, I am voting against the appropriation. This appropriation comes to Congress not with a clear-cut explanation as to how it is secured and as to how it is to be spent, but merely as a kind of Executive order.

Sixth. Billions of dollars do not grow on berry bushes. I realize that this appropriation measure will pass. I realize also that there will be further requests for billions and that Congress is likely to make these appropriations without any hesitancy, and with comparatively little thought unless the people of this country wake up and say to the Congress:

(a) Take the blinders off and get a little horse sense.

(b) We are ready to pay the freight provided you use discretion and judgment in spending the money.

(c) Providing that when you loan our funds to others you get some collateral.

(d) Providing that when you vote money, you consider how it can be raised, and that you stop playing politics and enact a tax bill which will raise enough revenue to pay the spending bill.

(e) Providing that in consideration of our tremendous defense expenditures you cut out nonessentials, that you cut down in the growth of bureaus and departments not connected with defense, and provided that you decentralize government.

I might add that I have every sympathy with the objectives which this appropriation may further. If the Chief Executive had seen fit, in presenting this measure, to assure Congress that the funds to be lent or leased under the provisions of the so-called lend-lease bill would be collateralized, and if the administration had further indicated that this appropriation measure would be followed by a realistic tax bill, I would vote for the appropriation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I had the privilege of stating my objections to the lease-lend bill on the floor of the Senate, and I had the pleasure and the opportunity of serving on the subcommittee which heard the testimony of the various department heads. Of necessity, this appropriation, according to the testimony of the heads of our Army and Navy, leaves a great deal to discretion. The bill itself leaves much to discretion. But because of the new movement, or the new embarking of the United States on such a course, and the large amount of the appropriation, I should like to make a statement uninterrupted for a couple of moments.

Mr. President, this, I am informed, is the largest peacetime appropriation in our country's history. It is significant, however, that it is appropriated for the creation of implements of war. It is an appropriation to carry out the purposes of a bill which we debated here recently which carried the number H. R. 1776. In answer to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I may say that many of us opposed the passage of that bill. We had ample time to state our objections. I argued that it was a war bill, that it gave us an American dictatorship while opposing dictators in other countries.

I argued that it was the President's own bill, giving him the unusual powers he wanted, and those unusual powers were the first of the standard powers of every dictator.

Honorable Senators who had charge of and assisted in the passage of that legislation argued that it would not create a dictatorship, that it would not usurp the congressional powers, and, above all, that it was not a war bill but was a peace bill. Its purpose and design was to keep the war away from our shores.

The bill was passed and the President signed it so quickly that it startled even Great Britain. With equal promptness he asked for this $7,000,000,000 appropriation. This, too, will be passed quickly, and many of the leaders of this body will be congratulated.

I shall not attempt to delay it. I will vote for it. I will do this on the express promise of the administration leaders on the floor of the Senate, on the radio, and through the press that this is a peace bill and will keep war away from our shores.

I do not, however, for one moment believe that the mere passage of the lease-lend legislation and the appropriation of this unprecedented amount of money relieves me or other Senators of the responsibility for which we were chosen to represent the people who sent us here. I wish to state to the leaders of this body who were privileged to be consulted concerning both the legislation itself and the appropriation now asked for, that they, from this moment on, assume a greater responsibility than before, for by their contact, the confidences they enjoy, and the opportunity for the use of their influence, they can help carry out and make secure the promises made to the people that war will be kept from our shores.

While I will vote for this appropriation, I shall continue to use my influence wherever it may be extended to prevent our country from becoming a voluntary, active, shooting participant in Europe's war, and I respectfully ask Senators to use their efforts constantly in their greater sphere of influence with those who, with such great power now granted, guide the destinies of our country.

I vote for this appropriation in the hope that my fears are unfounded and that we may be spared the spilling of American blood on foreign shores.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding my attitude upon the pending $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill. It presents a difficult challenge to one who does not believe in the general interventionist philosophy of the foreign policy upon which we have embarked, yet who equally does not believe in a divided America when once the foreign policy has been determined, if division can possibly be avoided.

When H. R. 1776 became the law of the land, this issue of foreign policy was settled. It was settled within the interpretations of H. R. 1776, as given us by its sponsors. Certainly it was settled so far as this proposed $7,000,000,000 appropriation is concerned. The appropriation became inevitable, unless it be conceived that a wobbly Congress would sabotage its own solemn judgments in less than 3 weeks, setting us before the world as contemptible vacillators whom none would respect and certainly none would fear.

I repeat, this enormous draft upon our already hard pressed resources really was voted by the Senate at 7:10 p. m. on the evening of March 8, when H. R. 1776 passed this body by a vote of 60 to 31. It was voted by the 60, not by the 31. Indeed we shall be fortunate if this new foreign policy, which may potentially underwrite all the wars of all the world, does not cost us many times this present sum.

I opposed H. R. 1776 from start to finish. I continue to disagree with it. I favored direct credits and direct maximum material aid to Britain short of war itself, in the earnest hope that this might help to destroy ugly, sinister dictatorships, without jeopardizing our own peace and security, and I voted accordingly. I was deeply opposed to the procedure and the prospectus embraced in the lend-lease-give act, which I believed and still believe to be a needless threat to our American peace, to our own essential home defense, and to our American democratic processes.

That, however, is now ancient history and it is beyond recall. It is water over the dam. Whether we like it or not, the die is cast. Under our form of government, it is cast for our whole people—for those who opposed it no less than those who took the responsibility for its sponsorship. We now confront a condition, not a theory. The sole question is, Where do we go from here?

The sponsors of H. R. 1776, in the White House, in the Cabinet, and in both branches of Congress, insisted and reiterated that it was and is a peace measure, and our best insurance against direct involvement in wars abroad. Some were candid and realistic enough to acknowledge its far more dangerous threats and possibilities. But it ever bore the persistent label, "Aid to England short of war." It could have passed in no other guise.

Mr. President, it seems obvious to me that if there is a chance for this new foreign policy to keep us out of wars abroad, it lies in swiftly and boldly proceeding to mobilize, in behalf of our quasi Allies, the maximum material aid of which we may be humanly capable, short of war itself. Therefore, I decline to withhold any part of the material tools

which the sponsors and administrators of this new foreign policy say they need to make good upon their "short-of-war" promises and pledges to the American people. They are responsible for H. R. 1776. They are responsible for what happens under it. They are responsible to us and to America. I hope they spectacularly succeed. But if, unhappily, they fail to keep us short of actual war—which I pray may never happen—I shall be no part of their alibi or their excuse. It will not be because I joined in withholding from them any part of the material aid which they deem essential to their pacific purposes, and which they deem necessary to implement their pacific pledges.

Mr. President, I hope for substantial unity upon this score, so that we may enjoy the maximum opportunity to make H. R. 1776 achieve the precise good fortune attributed to it by its zealous friends, and so that it may make its maximum psychological impression upon those in other lands whom its consequences may affect.

Regardless of my personal views, as consistently maintained from my original opposition to the repeal of the arms embargo down to opposition to the passage of H. R. 1776, I am joining myself in this aspect to the sentiments of Stephen Decatur—

My country! May she always be right; but right or wrong, my country!

With the greatest respect for, and understanding of, those among my anti-interventionist colleagues who may conclude otherwise, and for the reasons I have given, I shall vote for the pending bill. But, Mr. President, in so doing, it seems to me that I have an added right to hold the sponsors and administrators of H. R. 1776 to strictest accountability for stopping short of actual war and stopping short of any program which would needlessly drag us into war in its active sense, because that is the pledge given to me and to every other Member of Congress and to every citizen among our people as a basis for asking for the passage of the bill. No convoys, we were told. No second A. E. F., we were told. No overt acts of war. That is the warrant given us. Senators who gave this promise to the mothers of America, and to their sons, must now keep faith. Otherwise, I shall join in renewed contest with them; and we shall battle to the finish.

With these brief observations, Mr. President, and for the reasons given, I shall reluctantly vote in favor of the pending bill, which its sponsors ever insist they intend to use to keep us out of war. I conceive that I have no alternative. I should prefer to vote for direct credits to Great Britain, as I voted 2 weeks ago, but I have no such option. It is this bill or it is a fatal division among us respecting a program which we have been promised stops short of war, and we should not divide in stopping short of war. It is this bill, or a spectacle of disunity which could easily jeopardize every aspiration of all our hearts and hopes, now that the die is cast.

I fervently hope and pray that the new foreign policy may succeed. But eternal vigilance must watch it every hour. Let it ever be remembered that President Roosevelt was right in 1933 when he said, "Political leaders start wars, not the people." I want vindication not for myself but for those who believe that by this course we stifle dictatorship, stay out of active war, and save democracy not only for others but also for ourselves.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I wish I could completely share in the conclusions which have been reached by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I have wished and tried to confine the appropriation for aid for Britain to a single year and to cut the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 in half. It has often occurred to me that changes might quickly come which would demonstrate a need for a complete adjustment of the appropriations for aid, and that it would be a matter of wise economy to limit our appropriations so far as we could without jeopardizing the policy which was determined in the enactment of the lend-lease bill. Failure to accomplish this, and realization of the burden which we are placing upon our own people, leaves me now with but one alternative.

It will, of course, be said that a vote against the appropriation of seven thousand million American dollars to carry out the purposes of the lend-lease, aid-to-Britain, save-democracy bill—against which I cast 1 of the 32 recorded opposition votes—is a vote against democracy, against adopted governmental policy, and a vote for totalitarianism. Let there be said all that may and will be said. My vote against this appropriation is cast by one who would serve no foreign cause, but who believes that the future of America and the very life of our Republic is best served by contributing to a denial of our blood and our wealth to that wasteful, futile cause that is war in Europe.

However much I wish to see the cause of totalitarianism destroyed, however much I detest the burdens which causes in Europe are bringing to the world, I do not believe those causes nearly so great a challenge to our democracy as will be our larger partnership with any cause in Europe, whatever name that cause may adopt, and our will to let our wealth be poured into the destruction that will never permit return of a penny of it.

SEVEN BILLION IS NO BAGATELLE

There is will here today to deny that $7,000,000,000 to be given to a foreign cause is a serious threat to our strength and our economic system. There is such a will even on the part of honest and patriotic men who were most bitter in their prophecy of destruction of the Republic if we did not stop the appropriation of a billion dollars to aid the suffering and the needy, the appropriation of a few hundred thousand dollars to bolster farm income, and of $10,000 items of aid in the agricultural appropriation bills. Of a sudden $7,000,000,000 as a gift to other lands appears to have become a mere bit of change, a mere bagatelle.

Somehow, seven thousand million dollars still impresses me as being many more dollars than we can afford if we are at all determined to keep our own house in such order as to be inviting to a continued stay with us by that guest we profess to love—democracy.

Seven billion dollars is a lot of dollars. I remind the Senate that the gross income of American agriculture last year was less than $7,000,000,000. Thirty percent of our total population is directly dependent upon agriculture. Would we say that the gross income of this one-third of our population is not a great deal of money? For the life of me I cannot see how we can undertake the policy of underwriting a European war with any measure of assurance of ability on our part to sustain our own system.

I HOPE POLICY WILL PROVE TO BE RIGHT

I hope that what Congress is about to do will prove to be the right thing to have done. I frankly confess that in my votes and protests against repeal of the arms embargo, against the gift of 50 destroyers, against the lend-lease bill, and now against this $7,000,000,000 appropriation, I may have been wrong. Only jealous solicitude for the future of my own country, plus a limited knowledge of the past and the lessons of experience, guide me in these choices.

I know how easily I, along with other millions, was moved to hate and fear by propaganda back in 1916 and 1917; how I contributed to the assissination of the character of courageous men who then had stood in their places and said, "No," to the American push of that hour to war. I have observed the never-ending burdens that came as a result of our country's participation in that war, in the ever-growing debt, the destroyed balances in our economy, the heartbreak at every crossroads in our land; and I remember that it was what President Roosevelt since has called the little steps and considerations short of war that took us into that war. That leadership then insisted that even the declaration of war did not really mean war, since we were to furnsh only dollars for our Allies, and not men.

PRESIDENT APPROVED NEUTRALITY ACTS

With that memory I fought, when chance became mine, to the end that all of us might have a chance to see clearly what was in truth at work behind the scenes, while peace and neutrality and purpose to keep us out of war were paraded in front of the scenes, before and after the last war. I had a hand in writing the laws of neutrality, which an overwhelming majority of Congress, and the President, considered wise and essential if we were to avoid the sad mistakes of 25 years ago.

Then I saw a Congress under the leadership of the same President, as if in fulfillment of his Chautauqua prophecy, put to the test when actual war came or was threatened in Europe, and then I saw the same Congress vote to change the neutrality laws by repealing the arms-embargo feature. I voted against and fought against that repeal. At that time I heard leadership saying that the act of repeal was not a step to war, that repealing the arms embargo would never necessarily mean more than that, or lead to more than that; that they would never support any further neutrality-law

changes, such for example as to repeal the cash-and-carry features of the law.

WE GAVE FIFTY DESTROYERS

After that move of repeal I witnessed the President, who seemed to accept the embargo repeal as something of a license to go much further in aiding the same European cause that was aided by repeal of the arms embargo—I witnessed this President dispossessing our country of 50 destroyers, in flagrant violation of written law; and at that time I observed Congress, and a people, utterly opposed to our involvement in Europe's war, and greatly concerned about our own defense, accepting this action by the President as a thing we could not do anything about, at least until election time; and after the nominating conventions were over last summer, we discovered that we could not do anything about it at election time, either. Anyway, Congress had the sole power of declaring war; the President could not do that, we like to say, while all the time we knew that our foreign policy could be so conducted as to take us into war without any declaration whatever by Congress.

Then I witnessed the appeal of the President for the right himself to abandon the remainder of the neutrality laws, including the cash-and-carry features, and any other laws that might stand in the way of his giving all-out aid to Britain, all out of the wealth and resources of the American people. Three weeks ago I witnessed passage of that authority in the form of the lend-lease bill, with the aid of the votes of men who had declared they would never permit the cash-and-carry provisions to be changed. I voted against the lend-lease bill because I saw it as just one more long step toward war by a nation which was vowing it would not let itself be "taken for another ride" in Europe.

OUR DEBT BURDEN IS STRAINING OUR RESOURCES

Now comes the demand, and now here is the desire by a large majority of Congress to meet that demand, for an appropriation of seven thousand million dollars, all to be used in aid of Britain, with all of us knowing that this is only a first installment in American underwriting of another European war, with all of us quite conscious of the fact that somewhere near at hand our debt burden will reach such a point that our system, our credit, our ability to pay, will end and crack.

I know this $7,000,000,000 appropriation is about to be voted. It will be voted by a body the majority of which today protests the possibility of any part of production resulting from these billions being delivered to Europe by American ships or convoyed there by American naval vessels through the dangerous and war-infested waters of the Atlantic. I give it as my full and honest conviction, and I am sure it is the conviction of many others, that the passage of this bill will be received by President Roosevelt as a license to go however far—without declaring war—he may find it necessary to go to accomplish delivery of this program of aid to Britain; and the larger the vote in support of this appropriation of $7,000,000,000, then the larger will seem to be such license to the President—and not without some reason.

For these reasons I shall vote against the pending bill; not because I will not see the justification for it, but because I cannot see the several plays which have been ours on the fringe of Europe's war as courting anything but disaster for our Republic, a Republic for whose future I will give battle with or without the oath of office to which I have subscribed. I shall vote against this $7,000,000,000 appropriation for the further reason that at a time when our drift to war is so rapid, surely it is well that there be nothing that can be construed anywhere or by anyone as a united-front drift to war.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with the greatest doubt as to whether I am right or not, I have decided to vote in favor of the pending appropriation bill. I think that ordinarily questions of policy should not affect votes on appropriations. I have voted for the support of many New Deal bureaus, the establishment of which I disapproved and which I should like discontinued. Of course, in extreme cases I think one is justified in voting against appropriations even though a policy has been established by Congress.

This bill does not, in my opinion, confer any very extensively dangerous powers beyond what the lease-lend bill and other existing legislation already confer. It does a good many unfortunate things. It does permit the repair of British ships in our ports. It does permit the purchase of materials and the transfer of them to our own departments. It does give the President a certain amount of blank-check power. I think it does authorize, let us say, the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway out of the funds appropriated by the bill. It authorizes the President, in his discretion, to give aid to any country; it authorizes him to buy material in other parts of the world. While I disapprove of these results, they were all discussed and passed on when the lease-lend bill was before Congress. None of those particular things is very likely, it seems to me, to get us directly into war.

So far as actual convoying, or the sending of American troops abroad, or the giving away of the American Navy is concerned, I do not see that the bill would add anything whatever to the existing powers of the President under the lease-lend bill and other legislation and constitutional powers.

The amount of the appropriation is certainly something that must be considered. It does not seem to me to be excessive for the purposes of the lease-lend bill. My own proposal was that we loan $2,000,000,000 to cover the needs of Britain for a period of 1 year. I would have been glad to increase it to $3,000,000,000 if any showing of necessity had been made.

This appropriation is for a period of two and a quarter years, or at the rate of about $3,000,000,000 a year. I am afraid, as a good many other Senators have said, that this is merely a beginning and that we will go on to greater appropriations, but the actual amount in this bill is something that the people should have foreseen when the lend-lease bill was passed.

What really concerns me more than anything else is the fact that we are apparently giving no thought to where this money is coming from. I am reassured by the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia that a tax bill will be brought in, but it is so easy to bring in first the appropriation, to spend the money first, and then decide how the money shall be obtained, that I somewhat doubt whether the proposed tax bill is going to be adequate. Up to this time the only proposal made by the administration has been to increase the debt from $45,000,000,000 to $65,000,000,000; in other words, to borrow the money we need. I estimate that the President in his Budget proposed an expenditure of about $18,000,000,000. Since then we have had supplemental appropriations for at least $4,000,000,000. If we spend three or four billion dollars of this appropriation during this year, we will reach the huge total during the next fiscal year of $25,000,000,000, while the total receipts from taxes today are only $9,000,000,000. If we are to follow Mr. Morgenthau's suggestion that we need to pay 60 percent of our expenses by taxes, we must levy taxes which will produce in the next fiscal year $6,000,000,000 in addition to all the taxes we are already levying under the increased tax bills of last year.

I do not think we ought to pass this bill without facing the fact that we are apparently approaching a crisis in the exhaustion of our own financial resources. We cannot continue to incur deficits of $15,000,000,000 a year. I was concerned when only the other day the President sent down a report of the National Resources Planning Board and, apparently the policy of the Board—and the report was sent here by the President—is, as soon as we stop borrowing money for defense to borrow money for additional public improvements. They actually gloat over the prosperity produced by the defense program. They say, "At last, we have dared to borrow the money to put men to work." If that policy is to prevail, if that is the policy behind the efforts of the administration, then it will be only a very few years before we repudiate the tremendous debt we are building up.

In appropriating this money the Senator from Texas says that I will not vote for taxes. I will vote for any taxes, and I think the taxes ought to come at the same time we vote the appropriation. I have a feeling that even today if we had to levy in taxes $3,000,000,000 of the amount of this bill before we passed the bill, the committee would make a much greater effort to reduce the $7,000,000,000 to some figure less than that which might meet the actual necessities of the situation.

Mr. President, I vote for the bill with great regret. I vote for it simply because I am in favor of aid to England. I was in favor of a loan to England. I want to make it perfectly clear that even today I would vote to repeal the lend-lease bill and substitute for it a British loan, as I tried to do during the consideration of that bill. In voting for this bill, I in no

way approve the policy of the lend-lease bill, but, because today I am in favor of aid to England and because I do not think this bill goes to any substantial extent beyond what the President can do under that bill and under his existing powers, I shall vote for the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. NYE and Mr. BARKLEY asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Overton
Aiken	George	Pepper
Andrews	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gillette	Reed
Ball	Glass	Reynolds
Bankhead	Green	Russell
Barbour	Gurney	Schwartz
Barkley	Hayden	Sheppard
Bilbo	Herring	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Stewart
Bulow	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Murdock	Wallgren
Connally	Murray	Wheeler
Danaher	Norris	White
Davis	Nye	Willis
Downey	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the passage of the bill, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER'S name was called). I announce that my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is unavoidably absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ADAMS (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado was called). The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called to his State by illness in his family. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote on this question as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. I announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent because of illness, is unable to obtain a pair, but if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER and Mr. McCARRAN], the Senators from New York [Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably detained from the Senate. I am advised that if present and voting these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] has been unexpectedly called to one of the Government departments for a conference on matters pertaining to the State of South Dakota.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—67

Adams	George	Pepper
Aiken	Gerry	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gillette	Reed
Bailey	Glass	Reynolds
Ball	Green	Russell
Bankhead	Gurney	Schwartz
Barbour	Hayden	Sheppard
Barkley	Herring	Smathers
Bilbo	Hill	Smith
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Brooks	Hughes	Taft
Brown	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Byrnes	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Caraway	McNary	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Murdock	Wallgren
Danaher	Murray	White
Davis	Norris	Willis
Downey	O'Mahoney	
Ellender	Overton	

NAYS—9

Butler	La Follette	Shipstead
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—19

Austin	Harrison	Miller
Bone	Hatch	Tobey
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Wagner
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh
Bunker	Lodge	Wiley
Chandler	McCarran	
Guffey	Mead	

So the bill (H. R. 4050) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EXPENSES

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 917, relating to the payment by the Federal Government toward defraying the expenses of the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 917) to fix the amount of the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for each fiscal year thereafter, there shall be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as the annual payment of the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total general fund appropriations, as contained in the regular annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year, as the land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia on the 1st day of July of the preceding fiscal year bears to the entire land area of the District of Columbia; but in calculating such land ratio for any fiscal year, a fraction of 1 percent shall be disregarded, except that a fraction of more than one-half of 1 percent shall be counted as 1 percent.

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "entire land area of the District of Columbia" means the total number of acres of land within said District (44,317 acres), less the amount of such land which is permanently covered by water (5,044 acres), or 39,273 acres in all.

(b) Except as provided in section 3 of this act, the term "land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia" means the total number of acres of land owned by the United States within said District as of the 1st day of July of the preceding fiscal year exclusive of the following: (1) Any of such land embraced within the boundaries of streets, avenues, roads, and alleys; (2) 56 percent of any of such land which is embraced within the park areas of said District; and (3) any of such land used exclusively by the government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared that for the purposes of this act the land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia as of the 1st day of July 1940 consists of 8,322 acres, determined as follows: By deducting from the 12,831 acres of land owned by the United States (exclusive of such land devoted to highway purposes) the 4,207 acres comprising 56 percent of such land embraced within park areas, and the 302 acres of such land used exclusively by the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this is a bill identical with one the Senate had under consideration in 1939, on which the Senate voted on three different occasions, and which it passed, only one vote being cast against the bill and that on only one occasion.

The purpose of the bill is to fix the annual payment made by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia for the purpose of maintaining our National Capital. The bill proposes a formula which is based upon certain fixed factors, which are narrated in the bill.

Briefly, the statement of the formula is that the amount of payment shall be the same ratio that the land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia bears to the total landed area of the District of Columbia.

The land owned by the United States Government in the District of Columbia is declared to be the land owned by the United States Government with certain deductions—first, the deduction of all the areas embraced within the boundaries of streets, avenues, and alleys; second, the deduction of all land of the United States that is used exclusively by the District of Columbia; and, third, the deduction of 56 percent of the park area. The reason for deduction of 56 percent of the park area is that 56 percent represents the park area of the average city of comparable size to the city of Washington. In other words, the United States Government is credited with 56 percent and is charged with only the excess park area, which is 44 percent of the total park area.

By dividing the landed area owned by the United States Government by the total landed area in the District of Columbia, we arrive at the percentage of payment that is to be made by the Federal Government. Such percentage, figured on existing respective areas, is 21 percent. This percentage is applied to the general-fund appropriation. It is a percentage of the general-fund appropriation as contained in the annual appropriation bill, because historically the payment by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia government has usually been based on the general-fund appropriations. The general-fund appropriations include all appropriations, with the exception of certain special funds, the highway fund, which is derived from gasoline taxes and certain taxes on automobiles; and the fund derived from water rentals throughout the District; and, lastly, certain trust funds.

Applying the percentage of 21 percent to the present general-fund appropriations, as estimated by the Budget for the next fiscal year, the total contribution by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia will be $9,389,940.

Within the comparatively last few years the Federal payment has been as high as $9,500,000, and it has been, on the other hand, as low as $5,000,000.

The purpose of the bill is to prevent the constant controversies which arise as to the amount of the Federal payment. The purpose is to have it so fixed by the factors of the formula that it will be self-operative and noncontroversial, so that there will be no further dispute as to the amount to be paid.

Ever since there has been a District of Columbia the Federal Government has contributed to the upkeep of the National Capital. During the period from 1790 to 1879 the payments were made as they are now made, in the form of lump-sum payments, and those payments averaged 38.7 percent of the total expenditures by the District of Columbia government.

In 1789 the Congress enacted what is known as the 50–50 plan, under which the Federal payment was 50 percent of the expenditures of the District of Columbia. In 1920 that was changed to what is known as the 40–60 plan, whereunder the Federal Government's payment was 40 percent of the general fund appropriations. Under the pending bill the Federal payment, worked out under present conditions, is 21 percent, as against 40 percent in 1920 and 50 percent from 1789 to 1920.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much additional will it cost the Federal Government if the bill of the Senator shall be enacted?

Mr. OVERTON. It will cost less than was provided by the Congress in 1931, which was $9,500,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I had in mind was with respect to the last year.

Mr. OVERTON. It will be, in round figures, $3,300,000 more than the last payment.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will that work, let us say, with respect to the Capitol Building? Will the Capitol Building be carried as a taxable property on the rolls of the District of Columbia?

Mr. OVERTON. Oh, no. If the Senator will read the bill, he will ascertain that it is based solely on areas, and not on values.

Mr. ELLENDER. In reality, the formula will work out so that it will be on the basis of an assessment, will it not?

Mr. OVERTON. Absolutely not. The trouble with the valuation plan is that there would be as much controversy as to value as there would be in reference to a lump-sum payment. The purpose of the bill is to remove the subject entirely from the realm of controversy. Coming back to the question of the Capitol, only the land area which is covered by the Capitol would be considered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us say the Capitol Building covers an area of 4 acres.

Mr. OVERTON. That will be counted in.

Mr. ELLENDER. On what basis?

Mr. OVERTON. On the basis of acreage; purely land area.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the same method be used throughout the entire District of Columbia?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. It makes no difference what the value is?

Mr. OVERTON. It makes no difference what the value is. So any surveyor can easily determine at any moment exactly what the payment will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice the newspapers recently have carried accounts of the contemplated erection of overhead roadways to ease transportation in the District of Columbia, and that the Government will be asked to contribute money for that purpose. What would happen in that connection if the pending bill were passed? Would the Government still contribute money yearly for these additions to the District of Columbia, or what would happen in that case?

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, that would depend entirely on what the Congress should determine to do. My thought is that the Federal payment toward all strictly municipal purposes ought to be gaged and measured by a formula. Under the provisions of the pending bill, elevated highways, or skyways, would be a charge against the District government only because the cost thereof would be borne by the highway fund and the highway-fund appropriation is not a part of the general-fund appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would that occur if the bill were to be passed as it is now before the Senate? For instance, as my colleague knows, in the past couple of years the Federal Government has spent approximately $16,000,000, or perhaps $18,000,000, for the erection of an airport, just outside the District of Columbia, for the benefit primarily of the District of Columbia. Under this formula, would the citizens of the District of Columbia be called upon to contribute their share to such an expenditure?

Mr. OVERTON. That would depend on what my colleague and other Senators and Members of the House shall determine that the District of Columbia shall pay. We exercise exclusive authority over the District of Columbia, and the Congress now can make the District reimburse the Federal Government for every outlay in the District that it so desires.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the purpose of the bill is to provide a formula so that we will not have to figure out how much the Federal Government shall pay or how much the city of Washington shall pay. Will the result of this bill be that the Congress will not be obliged in the future to determine the District's contribution for such improvements as I have just indicated; that is, the airport, the building of the overhead automobile road, and so forth?

Mr. OVERTON. The contribution by the District of Columbia throughout its history has been for the upkeep of the District of Columbia, its development as a National Capital, and its beautification as such. Whether such a project as the airport, which is entirely outside the District of Columbia, would be considered as coming within such a classification I am inclined to doubt very seriously, but that is a matter which the Congress will have to determine if the question ever arises. The purpose of the bill is to take the payments which have been made for the expenses and upkeep of the National Capital by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia government, throughout the 150 years of its existence, and to remove from controversy the method of payment and the amount of payment, by establishing a fixed formula. That covers all expenditures for upkeep in the Capital, which are met out of the general fund appropriations of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Permanent and otherwise?

Mr. OVERTON. Permanent and otherwise in the Capital.

I now send to the desk a perfecting amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 4, after the word "appropriated", it is proposed to insert "and be made immediately available."

Mr. OVERTON. That provision is proposed, Mr. President, so that at the beginning of each fiscal year the Federal payment can be made immediately available, as it is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 917) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 210, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders. It will not take long to dispose of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, freight commodities have always been divided into two classes—carload and less-than-carload lots. Freight in carload lots moves more rapidly. It takes a lower rate than less-than-carload freight. Less-than-carload freight takes a higher rate, of course. For 30 years efforts have been made to consolidate less-than-carload shipments so as to obtain a carload rate. They have never been subject to regulation. In 1930 the Interstate Commerce Commission called attention to this condition, which had come to be a great problem, and suggested that there be regulation. They repeated the suggestion in 1931 and, I think, in 1932.

The so-called railroad omnibus bill, Senate bill 2009, passed last year, contained a provision with respect to the handling of less-than-carload freight. That provision was deemed unsatisfactory and was eliminated. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and I promised the Senate we would take the matter up immediately and hold hearings on the subject. Hearings were held. The representatives of the railroads were heard; the freight forwarders were heard; the truckmen were heard; shippers were heard; indeed, everyone interested was heard.

In 1935 one of the so-called freight forwarders, who are not now subject to regulation of any kind, went into the United States court in New York asking certain rights or privileges under the Interstate Commerce Act. The court denied the petition. The case went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court upheld the lower court in its decision.

Later a case from Chicago, brought by 41 motor carriers appealing from a decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, was decided, and went to the Supreme Court, which upheld the decision of the lower court. In drawing this bill we have carefully followed the decisions of the Supreme Court in which it has sustained the decisions of the Commission.

I could continue a discussion of this matter for a long time. I do not wish to take very much time, however.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill which, as I understand, was unanimously reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, is an effort to carry out what the Senate tried to do in the Transportation Act, but was unable to do because of disagreement in conference.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have all received many letters in behalf of this proposed legislation, and apparently there is no serious opposition to it from any responsible quarter.

Mr. REED. The report of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. And I wish to join the Senator from Kansas in urging immediate adoption of this measure. I wish to say further, that the Interstate Commerce Commission has from time to time not only recommended such legislation but since the passage of the Transportation Act has suspended any action on this question in part awaiting action by Congress along the lines of the provisions carried in the bill.

Mr. REED. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky is correct. There are quite a number of committee amendments, and I wish to make a very brief explanation.

When the Senator from Montana and myself introduced the bill on January 8 we asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to report on it. We did not receive the report until after the committee had actually met to consider reporting the bill. We had one definition of "freight forwarder." The Interstate Commerce Commission framed the definition in better language. The committee amendments are virtually all the result of suggestions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and have mostly to do with verbiage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce was, on page 2, in the table of contents, to strike out "SEC. 414. Unlawful Acts and Penalties." and "SEC. 415. Effective Dates.", and insert:

"SEC. 414. Allowances to Shippers for Transportation Service.
"SEC. 415. Priority of Emergency Freight.
"SEC. 416. Receipts and Bills of Lading.
"SEC. 417. Unlawful Acts and Penalties.
"SEC. 418. Separability of Provisions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, under the heading "Definitions", on page 2, after line 6, to strike out:

(b) The term "freight forwarder" means any person, other than a carrier subject to parts I, II, and III of this act, who in the performance or discharge of any undertaking to transport property in interstate or foreign commerce for compensation utilizes or employs the instrumentalities or services of any carrier subject to parts I, II, or III of this act, or any combination thereof, and who may, in connection therewith, undertake, perform, or cause to be performed under his direction and control collection, delivery, or transfer services within terminal areas.

And insert:

(b) The term "freight forwarder" means any person which undertakes (other than as a carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this act), for compensation, to provide transportation of property in interstate or foreign commerce, and which, in the ordinary and usual course of performing or discharging any such undertaking, (1) assembles and consolidates, or provides for the assembly and consolidation of, such property and performs, or provides for the performance of, break-bulk and distributing operations with respect to such shipments, (2) provides for the movement of such property under a bill of lading or shipping receipt from point of collection or receipt to point of destination, and (3) utilizes or employs the instrumentalities or services of a carrier or carriers subject to part I, II, or III of this act, or a combination of such instrumentalities and services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 15, to strike out:

"(c) The term 'forwarding operations' means all of the functions, services, or activities performed by a freight forwarder in the conduct of any business described in paragraph (b) hereof.

And insert:

"(c) The term 'service subject to this part' means any or all of the service in connection with the provision of transportation in interstate or foreign commerce which any person undertakes, for compensation, to perform as a freight forwarder, or which such person is authorized or required by or under the authority of this part to perform.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General powers and duties of Commission", on page 4, line 4, after the word "authority", to strike out "to" and insert "to make and amend such general or special rules and regulations and to issue such orders as may be necessary to carry out its provisions", so as to read:

"GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 403. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to administer the provisions of this part, and to that end it shall have the authority to make and amend such general or special rules and regulations and to issue such orders as may be necessary to carry out its provisions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 6, to strike out:

"(1) establish reasonable requirements with respect to continuous and adequate service;

And insert:

"(b) The Commission shall have authority to establish reasonable requirements with respect to continuous and adequate service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 11, to strike out:

"(2) establish reasonable requirements to promote safety of operation of motor vehicles operated by or under the direction and control of any freight forwarder, including qualifications and maximum hours of service of drivers of such vehicles;

"(3) prescribe reasonable rules and regulations governing the filing and approval of surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, in such reasonable amount as the Commission may require, conditioned to pay, within the amounts thereof, any final judgment recovered against a freight forwarder for bodily injuries to or the death of any person or for loss or damage to property of others, resulting from the negligent operation, maintenance or use of motor vehicles operated by or under the direction and control of such freight forwarder;

And insert:

"(c) The Commission shall have authority to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations governing the filing of surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, in such reasonable amount as the Commission may require, to be conditioned to pay, within the amount of such surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, for loss of or damage to property of shippers and/or consignees coming into the possession of a freight forwarder in connection with the performance of transportation subject to this part.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 13, to strike out:

"(4) inquire into and report on the organization of freight forwarders and the management of their business, and keep itself informed as to the manner and method by which the same is conducted;

"(5) transmit to Congress, from time to time, such recommendations for additional legislation as it may deem necessary; and

And insert:

"(d) The Commission shall have authority, for purposes of the administration of the provisions of this part, to inquire into and report on the management of the business of freight forwarders, and to inquire into and report on the management of the business of persons controlling, controlled by, or under a common control with freight forwarders, to the extent that the business of such persons is related to the management of the business of one or more such carriers, and the Commission shall keep itself informed as to the manner and method in which the same are conducted. The Commission may obtain from such freight forwarders and persons such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this part; and may transmit to Congress from time to time, such recommendations (including recommendations as to additional legislation) as the Commission may deem necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 11, to strike out:

"(6) investigate, either upon complaint or its own initiative, whether any freight forwarder has failed to comply with any provision of this or with any order or requirement issued or established pursuant thereto, and, after notice and hearing, take appropriate action to compel compliance therewith."

And insert:

"(e) The Commission may investigate either upon complaint or its own initiative, whether any freight forwarder has failed to comply with any provision of this part or with any order or requirement issued or established pursuant thereto, and, after notice and hearing, take appropriate action to compel compliance therewith. Whenever the Commission is of opinion that any complaint does not state reasonable grounds for action on its part, it may dismiss such complaint.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was not in the full committee when the bill was ordered reported. I have the uncomfortable feeling that it did not receive in the full committee the consideration which a full committee ought to give to a piece of legislation of this importance; but I do know that the subcommittee gave long and searching study to the problems presented. I know that the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has as wide a knowledge of rail-transportation problems as any man with whom I have been privileged to serve in the Congress. I know that day after day and week after week he listened with patience and intelligence to the testimony of those directly affected by the bill. I shall accept as my guide the unanimous report of the subcommittee. The subcommittee consisted of the chairman of the full committee [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from Kansas. I acquiesce in the proposed legislation, without the study which I should have given to it, and in the request that the bill be passed because of the confidence I have in the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Rates, Charges, and Practices: Through Routes", on page 7, line 3, after the words "with respect to" to strike out "transportation" and insert "service"; in line 4, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "part,"; in the same line, following the amendment just stated, to strike out "which it undertakes or holds itself out to perform, or which it is required by or under authority of this part to perform,"; in line 6, after the word "such" to strike out "transportation" and insert "service"; in line 13, after the words "facilities for", to strike out "transportation" and insert "service"; and at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "transportation" and insert "service", so as to read:

"RATES, CHARGES, AND PRACTICES: THROUGH ROUTES

"SEC. 404. (a) It shall be the duty of every freight forwarder, with respect to service subject to this part, to provide and furnish such service upon reasonable request therefor, and to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable rates, charges, and classifications, and just and reasonable regulations and practices relating thereto and to the issuance, form, and substance of receipts and bills of lading, the manner and method of presenting, marking, packing, and delivering of property for transportation, the facilities for service, and all other matters relating to or connected with such service and every unjust or unreasonable rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice is prohibited and declared unlawful.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 17, to strike out:

"(b) Every freight forwarder is prohibited from establishing, publishing, or maintaining a rate or charge with respect to any transportation subject to this part which is lower than the lowest rate published by any carrier or carriers subject to this act whose facilities are used for the handling of such transportation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; and on page 8, line 8, after the word "divisions", to strike out "thereof" and insert "thereof, and which shall not unduly prefer or prejudice any of such forwarders", so as to read:

"(b) Freight forwarders may establish reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications, with other freight forwarders, but it shall be unlawful for any freight forwarder to establish any through route, joint rate, charge, or classification with any carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this act. Where joint rates or charges are established it shall be the duty of the participating freight forwarders to establish just and reasonable regulations and practices in connection therewith, and just, reasonable, and equitable divisions thereof, and which shall not unduly prefer or prejudice any of such forwarders.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; and in line 18, after the word "respect", to strike out "whatsoever" and insert "whatsoever: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be construed to apply to discriminations, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any carrier subject to this act", so as to read:

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any freight forwarder to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, port, port district, gateway, transit point, locality, region, district, territory, or description of traffic in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, port, port district, gateway, transit point, locality, region, district, territory, or description of traffic to any unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be construed to apply to discriminations, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any carrier subject to this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)", and in line 24, after the words "aggregate for the", to strike out "transportation" and insert "service", so as to read:

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any freight forwarder to charge or receive any greater compensation in the aggregate for the service of like kind of property for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same transportation facilities, line or route in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance, or to charge any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of this part, but this shall not be construed as authorizing any freight forwarder within the terms of this part to charge or receive as great compensation for a shorter as for a longer distance: *Provided*, That upon application to the Commission a freight forwarder may in special cases, after investigation, be authorized by the Commis-

sion to charge less for longer than for shorter distances for the transportation of property; and the Commission may from time to time prescribe the extent to which such designated freight forwarder may be relieved from the operation of this paragraph, but in exercising the authority conferred upon it in this proviso the Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariffs", on page 9, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "transportation" and insert "service", so as to read:

"TARIFFS

"SEC. 405. (a) Every freight forwarder shall file with the Commission and print, and keep open to public inspection, tariffs showing all rates, charges, classifications, rules, regulations, and practices for its service with respect to service in interstate or foreign commerce. Such tariffs shall plainly show the carriers subject to parts I, II, or III of this act whose services or facilities are utilized and the points between which they are utilized, and state the places between which property will be carried, the classification of property and, separately, all terminal charges, or other charges which the Commission shall require to be so stated, all privileges or facilities granted or allowed, and any rules or regulations which in anywise change, affect, or determine any part or the aggregate of such rates, fares, or charges, or the value of the service rendered to the shipper or consignee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 4, after the figures "22", to strike out "(1)"; in line 8, after the words "shall apply to", to insert "service rendered by"; and in line 9, after the word "forwarders" to insert "with respect to transportation", so as to read:

"(c) No freight forwarder shall charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or less or different compensation for service with respect to transportation in interstate or foreign commerce than the rates or charges specified for such service in the tariffs lawfully in effect; and no such freight forwarder shall refund or remit in any manner or by any device any portion of the rates or charges so specified, or extend to any person any privileges or facilities in connection with such service and affecting the value thereof except such as are specified in its tariff: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 1 (7) and 22 of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (relating to transportation free and at reduced rates), together with such other provisions of such part (including penalties) as may be necessary for the enforcement of such provisions, shall apply to service rendered by freight forwarders with respect to transportation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 22, after the word "freight", to strike out "forwarder, unless otherwise provided by this part", and insert "forwarder", so as to read:

"(e) No freight forwarder shall engage in service with respect to transportation in interstate or foreign commerce unless the rates and charges for such service have been filed and published in accordance with the provisions of this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission's authority over rates and so forth", on page 12, line 6, after the word "forwarder", to insert "or forwarders"; in line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "complaint and shall be made under oath", and insert "complaint. If such forwarder or forwarders shall not satisfy the complaint within a time specified by the Commission, or there shall be any reasonable ground for investigating said complaint, it shall be the duty of the Commission to investigate the matters complained of in such manner and by such means as it shall deem proper", so as to read:

"COMMISSION'S AUTHORITY OVER RATES, ETC.

"SEC. 406. (a) Any person may make complaint in writing to the Commission that any rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice of any freight forwarder or forwarders is or will be in violation of this act. Every complaint shall state fully the facts complained of and the reasons for such complaint. If such forwarder or forwarders shall not satisfy the complaint within a time specified by the Commission, or there shall be any reasonable ground for investigating said complaint, it shall be the duty of the Commission to investigate the matters complained of in such manner and by such means as it shall deem proper.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 21, after the word "any", to insert "classification", and on page 13, line 3, after the word "lawful", to insert "classification", so as to read:

"(b) Whenever, after hearing, upon complaint or in an investigation on its own initiative, the Commission shall be of opinion that any rate or charge demanded, charged, or collected by any freight forwarder or forwarders for service with respect to transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, or any classification, regulation, or practice of such freight forwarder or forwarders relating to such service is or will be unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential or prejudicial, or otherwise in violation of any provision of this act, it shall determine and prescribe the lawful rate or charge or the maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum, rate or charge thereafter to be observed, or the lawful classification, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 18, after the word "transportation", to strike out "in interstate or foreign commerce", so as to read:

"(d) Whenever, after hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, the Commission is of opinion that the divisions of joint rates or charges, applicable to service of freight forwarders with respect to transportation are or will be unjust, unreasonable, inequitable, or unduly preferential or prejudicial as between the parties thereto, the Commission shall by order prescribe the just, reasonable, and equitable divisions thereof to be received by the several forwarders. The order of the Commission may require the adjustment of divisions between such forwarders in accordance with the order, from the date of filing the complaint or entry of order of investigation or such other date subsequent thereto as the Commission finds justified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 14, after the word "That", to insert "subject to section 405 (b)"; and in line 16, after the word "forwarder", to insert "At any hearing involving a change in a rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, the burden of proof shall be upon the forwarder to show that the proposed changed rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice is just and reasonable", so as to read:

"(f) Whenever there shall be filed with the Commission any tariff stating a new rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice for service of a freight forwarder or forwarders with respect to transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, the Commission may upon protest of interested parties or upon its own initiative at once, and, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading by such forwarder or forwarders, but upon reasonable notice, enter upon an investigation concerning the lawfulness of such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, and, pending such hearing and the decision thereon, the Commission, by filing with such tariff and delivering to the forwarder or forwarders affected thereby a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may from time to time suspend the operation of such tariff and defer the use of such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than 7 months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect; and after hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the Commission may make such order with reference thereto, as would be proper in a proceeding instituted after such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice had become effective. If the proceeding shall not have been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period: *Provided, however*, That, subject to section 405 (b), this paragraph shall not apply to any initial tariff or tariffs filed prior to January 1, 1942, by any such forwarder. At any hearing involving a change in a rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, the burden of proof shall be upon the forwarder to show that the proposed changed rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice is just and reasonable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Certificates of public convenience and necessity", on page 19, line 19, after the figures "405", to strike out "(a)"; and at the end of line 22, to strike out "(3)", so as to read:

"(e) Certificates shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall remain in effect until suspended or terminated as herein provided. Any such certificate may, upon application of the holder thereof, in the discretion of the Commission be amended or revoked, in whole or in part, or may upon complaint, or on the Commission's own initiative, after notice and hearing, be suspended, changed, or revoked in whole or in part, for willful failure to comply with any provision of this part, or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder, or with any term, condition, or limitation of such certificate: *Provided, however*, That no such certificate shall be revoked (except upon application of the holder) unless the holder thereof fails to comply, within a reasonable time, not less than 30 days, to be fixed by the Commission, with a lawful order of the Commission, commanding obedience to the provision of this part, or to the rule or regulation of the Commission thereunder, or to the term, condition, or limitation of such certificate, found by the Commission to have been violated by such holder: *Provided further*, That the right to engage in forwarding operations in interstate or foreign commerce by virtue of any certificate or any application filed pursuant

to the provisions of section 406 may be suspended by the Commission, upon reasonable notice of not less than 15 days to the forwarder, but without hearing or other proceedings, for failure to comply, and until compliance, with the provisions of section 405 or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder or under the provisions of section 403.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Consolidations, unifications, mergers, and acquisitions of control", on page 22, line 18, after the word "Commission", to strike out "may" and insert "shall", so as to read:

"(d) In passing upon any proposed transaction under the provisions of this section, the Commission shall give weight to the following considerations, among others: (1) The effect of the proposed transaction upon adequate transportation service to the public, and (2) where appropriate, the interest of the forwarder employees affected; and the Commission shall require, as a prerequisite to its approval of any proposed transaction under the provisions of this section, a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the employees affected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "any", to strike out "such", so as to read:

"(k) From and after January 1, 1942, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of any carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this act or any person using the facilities or services of a freight forwarder, to own, lease, operate, control, or have any pecuniary interest whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, in any forwarder; and in case of any violation of this provision each day in which such violation continues shall be deemed to be a separate offense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 5, to insert:

"(l) Nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit any freight forwarder from entering into an agreement with another freight forwarder for the joint loading of traffic.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Utilization of services of common carriers", on page 28, line 22, after the words "carriers", to strike out "by railroad, common carriers by water, and common carriers by motor vehicle"; on page 29, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "parts I, II, and III of"; in line 3, after the word "said", to strike out "respective acts" and insert "act"; in line 4, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "part"; and at the end of line 6, to strike out "act" and insert "part", so as to read:

"UTILIZATION OF SERVICES OF COMMON CARRIERS

"SEC. 410. It shall be lawful for freight forwarders to employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of common carriers subject to this act, but not of any other carriers, and only at such rates or charges and under such other terms and conditions as are contained in tariffs of such common carriers filed with the Commission under parts I, II, and III of this act, and such rates and charges or other terms and conditions shall be subject to the provisions of said act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this part shall be so construed or applied as to give any freight forwarder the status of a common carrier under this part.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Collection of rates and charges," on page 29, line 10, after the word "transported", to strike out "by it" and insert "under its service"; in line 16, after the word "such", to strike out 'carrier" and insert "freight forwarder"; and in line 18, after the word "transported", to insert "under its service", so as to read:

"COLLECTION OF RATES AND CHARGES

"SEC. 411. (a) No freight forwarder shall deliver or relinquish possession at destination of any freight transported under its service until all tariff rates and charges thereon have been paid, except under such rules and regulations as the Commission may from time to time prescribe to govern the settlement of all such rates and charges and to prevent unjust discrimination or undue preference or prejudice: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit any such freight forwarder from extending credit in connection with rates and charges on freight transported under its service for the United States, for any department, bureau, or agency thereof, or for any State or Territory or political subdivision thereof, or for the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Enforcement and procedure", on page 32, line 12, after the words "copies of", to strike out "schedules, and"; and in line 13, after the word "rates", to strike out "fares", so as to read:

"(d) The copies of classifications and tariffs of rates, and charges, and of all contracts, agreements, and arrangements of freight forwarders filed with the Commission as herein provided, and the statistics, tables, and figures contained in the annual or other reports of carriers made to the Commission, as required under the provisions of this act, shall be preserved as public records in the custody of the secretary of the Commission, and shall be received as prima facie evidence of what they purport to be for the purpose of investigations by the Commission and in all judicial proceedings; and copies of and extracts from any of said schedules, classifications, tariffs, contracts, agreements, arrangements, or reports, made public records as aforesaid, certified by the secretary, under the Commission's seal, shall be received in evidence with like effect as the originals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 2, to insert:

"ALLOWANCES TO SHIPPERS FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

"SEC. 414. If the owner of property moving in service subject to this part directly or indirectly renders any service connected with such transportation, or furnishes any instrumentality used therein, the charge and the allowance therefor, to such owner, shall be published in tariffs filed in the manner provided in this part and shall be no more than is just and reasonable and the Commission may, after hearing on a complaint or on its own initiative, determine what is a reasonable charge as the maximum to be paid by the freight forwarder or forwarders for the services so rendered or for the use of the instrumentality so furnished, and fix the same by appropriate order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 16, to insert:

"PRIORITY OF EMERGENCY FREIGHT

"SEC. 415. The provisions of section 1 (15) (16), and (17) of part I of the act shall apply to the service of freight forwarders under this part.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 20, to insert:

"RECEIPTS AND BILLS OF LADING

"SEC. 416. The provisions of section 20 (11) and (12) of part I of the act shall apply with like force and effect to receipts or bills of lading of freight forwarders.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Unlawful acts and penalties", on page 34, line 2, after "SEC.", to strike out "414" and insert "417", and in line 10, after the words "not less than", to insert "$100 and not more than", so as to read:

"UNLAWFUL ACTS AND PENALTIES

"SEC. 417. (a) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any provision of this part, or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, or any term or condition of any certificate, for which no penalty is otherwise provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction in the district in which such offense was in whole or in part committed shall be subject for each offense to a fine not less than $100 and not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. Each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 18, after the words "a fine of not", to insert "less than $500 and not", so as to read:

"(e) Any special agent or examiner of the Commission who knowingly and willfully divulges any fact or information which may come to his knowledge during the course of the examination of the accounts, records, and memoranda of any freight forwarder, made under authority of this part, except as he may be directed by the Commission or by a court of competent jurisdiction or judge thereof, shall be subject, upon conviction in any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, to a fine of not less than $500 and not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years, or both.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 6, after the words "enforcement of this", to strike out "part." and insert "part: *Provided*, That the household goods and any other personal effects of any employee changing his point of employment may be transported free of charge", so as to read:

"(g) The provisions of the Elkins Act (U. S. C., title 40, secs. 41, 42, and 43) are made applicable to freight forwarders and shall apply with full force and effect in the enforcement of this part: *Provided*, That the household goods and any other personal effects of any employee changing his point of employment may be transported free of charge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 8, to insert:

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 418. If any provision of this part, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the other provisions of this part, and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 14, to insert:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 219

SEC. 2. Section 219 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 219. The provisions of section 20 (11) and (12) of this act shall apply with respect to common carriers by motor vehicle with like force and effect as in the case of those persons to which the provisions are specifically applicable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 21, to insert:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 202 (C)

SEC. 3. Section 202 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this section or of section 203, the provisions of this part, except the provisions of section 204 relative to qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees and safety of operation and equipment, shall not apply—

"(1) to transportation by motor vehicle by a carrier by railroad subject to part I, or by a water carrier subject to part III, or by a freight forwarder subject to part IV, incidental to transportation or service subject to such parts, in the performance within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery services; but such transportation shall be considered to be and shall be regulated as transportation subject to part I when performed by such carrier by railroad, as transportation subject to part III when performed by such water carrier, and as service subject to part IV when performed by such freight forwarder;

"(2) to transportation by motor vehicle by any person (whether as agent or under a contractual arrangement) for a common carrier by railroad subject to part I, an express company subject to part I, a motor carrier subject to this part, a water carrier subject to part III, or a freight forwarder subject to part IV, in the performance within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery services; but such transportation shall be considered to be performed by such carrier, express company, or freight forwarder as part of, and shall be regulated in the same manner as, the transportation or service by railroad, express, motor vehicle, water, or freight forwarder to which such services are incidental."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 5, to strike out the heading "Effective dates", including the preceding quotation marks, and insert "Effective dates" without preceding quotation marks; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "Sec. 415," including the preceding quotation marks, and insert "Sec. 4"; in line 12, after the words "provisions of", to strike out "this" and insert "such"; and at the end of line 13 to strike out "prescribe.", including the quotation marks following, and insert "prescribe", so as to read:

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 4. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act shall take effect on date of enactment of this act except as therein otherwise provided: *Provided, however,* That the Interstate Commerce Commission shall, if found by it to be necessary or advisable in the public interest, by general or special order, postpone the taking effect of any of the provisions of such part to such time, but not beyond the 1st day of July 1942, as the Commission shall prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I ask that the clerks be authorized to renumber the sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is not a committee amendment.

The main part of the bill authorizes freight forwarders to use the carriers. Part I authorizes them to use the railroads, part II the motor carriers, and part III the water lines. However, the bill does not give authority to use air carriers. When there is great need for immediate movement it is necessary—or at least desirable—for the forwarders to use the air service, and they do use it regularly, so I have prepared the amendment which I now offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 6, it is proposed to change the period to a semicolon and add: "*And provided further,* That nothing in this part shall be so construed as to prevent a freight forwarder from utilizing the services of air carriers operating under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 providing the published tariff rates are paid for all services rendered in accordance with rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 210) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEFENSE HOUSING INSURANCE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 140, House bill 3575, known as the defense housing insurance bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3575) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "State", it is proposed to strike out the comma and "district, or Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 15, to insert:

"(d) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, to strike out the words "(herein referred to as the 'Defense Fund')."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 10, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to propound an inquiry to the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. Did not the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] desire to be present during consideration of the bill? I thought I had that understanding.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that I told the Senator from Ohio, who is a member of the subcommittee handling this legislation, that I expected to take it up at the session of last Thursday. I rather thought that he would be present, and I do not have the slightest objection to the Senator's suggesting the absence of a quorum in order that he may be here. He has a great interest in the bill. I will say that the bill is unanimously reported both from the subcommittee and the full committee. There was no objection to it.

Mr. McNARY. I do not know that the Senator from Ohio has any objection. He spoke to me earlier in the day and inquired if the bill would come up; and I asked our able majority leader, who said he thought it would come up for consideration this afternoon.

Consequently, I understood that the Senator from Ohio desired to be present. At any rate, I should like to have the privilege of sending for him.

Mr. BROWN. Very well.

MARKETING QUOTAS FOR PEANUTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask consent to call up the conference report on House bill 3546, submitted by me on the 20th instant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the conference report on House bill 3546, which was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 3, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "90" and insert the figures "95"; on page 4, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the word "of" and insert the word "on"; on page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 and insert "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary shall

proclaim a national marketing quota with respect to the crop of peanuts produced in the calendar year 1941 equal to the minimum quota provided for said year in subsection (a) hereof and shall provide for the holding of a referendum on such quota within thirty days after the date upon which this Act becomes effective, and the State and farm acreage allotments established under the 1941 agricultural conservation program shall be the State and farm acreage allotments for the 1941 crop of peanuts"; on page 5, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "90" and insert the figures "95"; on page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the period after the word "year", insert a semicolon and strike out the following sentence "In the distribution of such increase of 2 per centum, preference shall be given to the claims of new producers" and insert "Provided, in the distribution of such increases based on such excess acreage the total allotments established for new farms shall not be less than fifty per centum of such increases"; on page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendment after the word "basis" in line 10, insert "of the formula used in determining the parity price of peanuts as"; and on page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendment strike out all of lines 17, 18, 19, and 20; on page 10, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "52" and insert the figures "50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HATTIE W. CARAWAY,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. P. FULMER,
WALL DOXEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

DEFENSE HOUSING INSURANCE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I understand that contact has been made with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and that he has no objection to the consideration of the bill which was under consideration a few moments ago. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3575) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The next amendment was, in section "603 (a)", page 5, line 3, after the word "before", to strike out "said date" and insert "July 1, 1942, or such earlier date, whichever first occurs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in subsection (2), to strike out "the construction of which is begun after January 1, 1941, and which is approved for mortgage insurance or defense housing insurance prior to the beginning of construction. Such obligation shall not exceed", and insert "which is approved for mortgage insurance or defense housing insurance prior to the beginning of construction, and (i) the construction of which is begun after the date of enactment of this title, or (ii) the construction of which was begun after January 1, 1940, and prior to the date of enactment of this title, and which has not been sold or occupied since completion. Such principal obligation shall not exceed—"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 12, to correct the spelling of the word "property."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 19, after the word "mortgage", to insert *"Provided,* That the mortgagor shall not be released from such liability in any case until the Administrator is satisfied that the mortgaged property has been sold to a purchaser satisfactory to the Administrator, and that such purchaser has paid on account of the purchase price, in cash or its equivalent, at least 10 percent of the appraised value of such property as determined by the Administrator as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 13, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 10, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 15, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 25, after the word "of", to strike out "the obligation secured by the mortgage, unless such suit or action is commenced within 90 days after the claim with respect thereto has been transferred to the Administrator", and insert "any claim so assigned unless such suit or action is commenced within 6 months after the assignment of such claim to the Administrator, or within 6 months after the last payment was made to the Administrator with respect to the claim so assigned, whichever is later."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 7, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 11, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 6, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 21, to insert:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 201 of title II of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words "district, or Territory" in subsection (a) of such section, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands."

(b) Section 207 (a) of title II of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words "district, or Territory" in paragraph (1) of such section, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 14, after the word "Defense", to insert "Housing Insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the sections will be renumbered.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3575) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report submitted by the Committee on Banking and Currency to accompany House bill 3575 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 131) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 3575

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3575) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The general purposes of the bill are set out in the following excerpt from the report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency (H. Rept. No. 169, 77th Cong., 1st sess.):

"GENERAL STATEMENT

"The bill as reported adds a new title to the National Housing Act, which, for a limited time and to a limited aggregate amount, makes eligible for 'defense-housing insurance' by the Federal Housing Administrator mortgages on residential properties in defense areas designated by the President.

"The magnitude of the defense-housing problem is such as to require the utmost speed in the production of dwelling accommodations at low cost in certain strategic areas. This can best be accomplished by the maximum use of the numerous builders of low-cost homes and by the use of private capital. This bill is not intended to apply to housing of a temporary nature or to those areas in which the need for housing will cease to exist after the emergency, but only to projects which are 'economically sound.'

"Although it is recognized that operations under this bill may result in a higher ratio of loss than has been the experience of the Federal Housing Administration to date in its normal business, the cost to the Government should not exceed, and may very well be considerably less than, the loss which would be incurred in the disposition, at the end of the emergency, of an equivalent number of housing units provided through the direct expenditure of Federal funds.

"In view of the somewhat increased hazard, the plan has been incorporated into a separate title, involving a separate insurance

fund, so as not to affect in any way the interest of mortgagors in the mutual mortgage-insurance fund under title II."

The principal amendments recommended by the committee to the bill (H. R. 3575) as it passed the House are as follows:

(1) Provision is made in section 603 (b) (2) for extending the eligibility for insurance under the new title to mortgages covering properties the construction of which was begun after January 1, 1940, and prior to the date of enactment of the bill, which have not been sold or occupied since completion. Under the House bill construction must have been begun after January 1, 1941.

(2) A provision has been included in section 604 (b) the effect of which is to prevent the Administrator from consenting to the release of any mortgagor from his liability under the insured mortgage until the Administrator is satisfied that the mortgaged property has been sold to a purchaser satisfactory to him and the purchaser has paid on the purchase price at least 10 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Administrator at the time the mortgage is accepted for insurance.

(3) In section 604 (g) the limitation of 90 days for commencing a suit or action against the mortgagor when the claim of the mortgagee has been assigned to the Administrator has been extended to 6 months from the date of assignment of the claim, or 6 months from the last payment to the Administrator on such assigned claim, whichever is later.

(4) The provisions of sections 203, 207, and the new title VI of the National Housing Act have been extended to the Virgin Islands.

The remaining amendments recommended by the committee are technical and clarifying in character and do not change the substance of the bill as it passed the House.

The following analysis of the bill by sections was contained in House Report No. 169 (77th Cong., 1st sess.):

"ANALYSIS OF THE BILL AS REPORTED

"Section 1 of the bill adds the new title to be known as Title VI—Defense Housing Insurance, which is divided into seven sections under the following numbers:

"Section 601 contains the necessary definitions identical with those contained in section 201 of the present law.

"Section 602 creates the 'defense housing insurance fund' in the amount of $10,000,000, which shall be primarily responsible for the insurance obligations under this title, including expenses incurred by the Administrator in connection therewith. The provisions are similar to those contained in section 202 of the existing law.

"Section 603 places a definite limitation of $100,000,000 upon the aggregate amount of obligations which the Administrator may insure under this title and also prevents his insuring any mortgage thereunder upon which a commitment to insure is issued after July 1, 1942.

"This section also prescribes eligibility requirements similar to those contained in section 203 (b) (2) (A) of the existing law, except that the maximum amount of the mortgage ranges from $4,000 in connection with a single-family residence to $10,500 in connection with a four-family residence; the maximum ratio of loan to value is increased from 80 to 90 percent; and the location of the dwelling must be in an area in which the President shall find that an acute shortage of housing exists or impends which would impede national-defense activities.

"This section also authorizes the Administrator to fix a premium charge for the insurance similar to that contained in section 203 of the existing law.

"Section 604 provides for the payment of insurance under the procedure similar to that contained in section 204 of the existing law, except that under this title debentures are the primary obligation of the defense housing insurance fund and may include a portion of the foreclosure costs, approved by the Administrator, not exceeding $75 or two-thirds of such cost, whichever is the greater.

"Section 605 provides for the investment of moneys in the defense housing insurance fund, the deposit to, and charges against such fund.

"Section 606 is identical with section 208 of the present law and provides that real property acquired by the Administrator under this title shall be taxable.

"Section 607 merely authorizes the Administrator to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Sections 2 to 8, inclusive, of this bill amend certain acts which now authorize particular types of lending institutions to invest in mortgages insured under title II by extending such authority to include mortgages insured under title VI.

"Section 9 of the bill is purely formal."

REHABILITATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, with the administration and the National Resources Committee strongly advocating the conservation of our national resources in the national-defense program, it is with added significance that I call the attention of the Senate to the importance of S. 357, which I introduced at the present session on January 14 and which has also been introduced in the House by Mr. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, as H. R. 1083.

The bill provides for the rehabilitation of the anthracite-coal industry by providing for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region for researches and investigations relating to the mining, preparation, and utilization of anthracite coal, with special reference to conserving resources for national defense. It further provides for the development of new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for anthracite coal and its products. This research laboratory, as proposed in my bill, is planned also to serve as a center for information and assistance in matters pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation in mining operations and other matters relating to problems of the anthracite industry.

Many authoritative sources agree that there is an inexhaustible supply of hard coal. I believe that if an anthracite research laboratory as proposed in my bill is provided by the Federal Government, it will fulfill the twofold purpose of creating new uses for anthracite and of susbtantially aiding in carrying out the program of conserving other national resources, the supply of which is limited.

The anthracite coal industry is the basic and fundamental industry of eastern Pennsylvania. It is the backbone of the business enterprises, especially since there are few diversified industries in the region. The existence and prosperity of our people in that region, therefore, must depend on the efficient utilization and mining of anthracite coal.

EXTENT OF ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

It is a very striking fact, Mr. President, that the only anthracite coal of any commercial importance in the United States lies in four major fields in eastern Pennsylvania, within an area of only 3,300 square miles, less than 500 square miles of which are underlaid by workable coal beds. The present reserves of anthracite coal, I am informed, are estimated at 16,500,000,000 tons, which is about three-fourths of the original reserve.

The northern coal field, commonly known as the Wyoming region, covers the counties of Luzerne and Lackawanna, with Wilkes-Barre and Scranton as the principal cities, and with many mining towns of varying population in the region.

The eastern middle coal field, commonly known as the Lehigh region, covers Carbon County, with Hazelton as the principal center, and the northeastern part of Schuykill County.

The western middle coal field covers parts of Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties, with mining centers of Shamokin, Mount Carmel, Ashland, Shenandoah, Mahanoy City and many other mining towns of varying size and population.

The southern coal field covers parts of Schuylkill and Dauphin Counties, with mining centers of Pottsville, Tamaqua, Minersville, Tremont, Lykens, and Williamstown, and other important mining towns in the field.

GEOLOGICAL FORMATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL

In connection with the preparation of my bill for this research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite-coal region, I have been much interested in the historical records concerning the geological formation of anthracite coal. In my studies I find that the word "anthracite" is derived from the Greek word "anthrax," meaning coal of fossil substances which kindles and burns like wood. Historical records seem to indicate that the first recorded mention of anthracite was made by Theophrastus, in 371 B. C., in a treatise on stones. This historian records that it was found in Liguria and Elis, and was used by smiths. We find today, however, that the words "anthracite" and "hard coal" are synonymous.

It is now generally recognized that anthracite, like all coal, was formed from the vegetation of prehistoric forests. The story of the formation of anthracite coal is in itself an intensely interesting romance.

Geologists, in general practical language, tell us that trees and ferns which grew to gigantic size and unparalleled dimensions in an atmosphere containing carbon dioxide in very large amounts fell, rotted, and decayed, thus forming a deep layer of decayed plant life. In time the earth's surface moved and submerged this vegetation beneath an ocean covering the earth with mud and sand.

Centuries and centuries passed, and thousands of years later the earth rose out of the water and was again covered with vegetation. Submersion again followed, and in the course of many centuries this process was repeated a number of times. The combined forces of heat and pressure transformed the mud and sand of the ocean bed into rock, and every separate layer of former bituminous vegetation hardened successively into peat,

lignite, soft (or bituminous) coal and finally into anthracite.

Then, as the result of great earthquakes and the erosion of glaciers many miles in thickness, the fields of anthracite in eastern Pennsylvania to which I have previously referred were left in their present uneven and disconnected form.

Scientists and geologists, in relating this marvelous romance, tell us further that as the earth's surface cooled and contracted, our beautiful hills and valleys in eastern Pennsylvania were formed.

These beds of anthracite were correspondingly twisted, with the result that anthracite now lies in a number of basins or veins extending roughly parallel to each other in a northeastern-southwestern direction. In many instances—in fact, in most instances—the centers of these veins of coal are many feet underground, while the edges or outcroppings frequently coincide with the surface of the earth.

When the latter condition prevails, it is possible readily to secure coal by shoveling or stripping directly from the surface. In the majority of instances, however, it is necessary to sink deep shafts or slopes in order to reach the coal in or near the bottom of the veins.

According to geological classifications, therefore, these basins of anthracite coal in eastern Pennsylvania have been grouped into four primary divisions—known as the northern, eastern middle, western middle, and southern fields. In the northeastern extremity of this territory these basins slope in rather gentle curves, while in other sections, particularly in the western middle and southern fields, the warping of the earth's surface during the glacier era was much more severe, with the result that the coal beds frequently lie in a vertical position, and in some cases have sometimes been completely overturned since the original formation.

EARLY USES OF ANTHRACITE COAL

According to Dr. A. C. Fieldner, of the Federal Bureau of Mines, anthracite coal in Pennsylvania was discovered as early as 1762, and the first Lehigh coal-mining company was formed in 1793. We find, however, that it was not until about 1812 that the "black stones" of eastern Pennsylvania began to receive recognition in the Philadelphia market as being a highly desirable domestic fuel. In 1830 the first American-built locomotive used anthracite, and in 1835 this fuel was burned on the steamship *Portland*. In 1839 the application of hot blast to Mauch Chunk and Pottsville blast furnaces started an important industrial use for anthracite that persisted for over half a century. By 1838 the yearly production reached $1,000,000, and that year may be taken as the beginning of anthracite as an important American fuel.

It can therefore be seen that anthracite coal was the first of our mineral fuels to find extensive industrial and domestic use. It is therefore equally true that it would naturally be the first fuel to experience the exhaustion of easily mineable beds. It is therefore my humble and frank opinion that if the anthracite-coal industry is to continue and survive, we must apply progressive mining methods and research in developing means and methods for increasing the utilization of anthracite-coal products, as provided for in my bill, S. 357.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS RESEARCH

Mr. President, I have always been interested in scientific achievements, and have an appreciation of the value of scientific research and the importance and application of fundamental and applied research work.

My interest in scientific research has been renewed and strengthened by the establishment by the Department of Agriculture of the four new regional laboratories for scientific research on the utilization of farm products at Wyndmoor, Montgomery County, Pa.; Peoria, Ill.; New Orleans, La.; and Albany, Calif.

These four regional research laboratories were authorized by Congress in section 202 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which reads as follows:

> The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain four regional research laboratories, one in each major farm-producing area, and at such places to conduct researches into and to develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for farm commodities and products and byproducts thereof. Such research and developments shall be devoted primarily to those farm commodities in which there are regular and seasonal surpluses and their products and byproducts.

These research laboratories have been designed as centers for carrying on chemical engineering and related research by a staff of chemists, engineers, and other trained technologists.

The primary purpose of these laboratories is to find and develop new uses of farm commodities in the region in which they are located.

The Eastern Regional Laboratory, located at Wyndmoor, Pa., for instance, will devote attention to new uses for potatoes, tobacco, milk products, apples, and vegetables.

The Southern Regional Laboratory in New Orleans will give attention to cotton, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, and other surplus crops in the southern territory.

The Northern Regional Laboratory at Peoria, Ill., will give attention to corn, wheat, and agricultural wastes from the farm area in the Middle West.

The Western Regional Laboratory at Albany, Calif., will direct attention to surplus fruits, vegetables, wheat, potatoes, alfalfa, and similar crops.

RESEARCH ON UTILIZATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL

It is very gratifying to the farmers of this country to see this splendid development in the Department of Agriculture, whereby the chemists, engineers, and other technologists in the Department are exerting every effort to develop new uses for surplus farm commodities in the various regions in which these regional laboratories are located.

I have followed, as I am sure other Members of the Senate have, the interesting developments in connection with the utilization of soybeans in various industries, and I regard this new undertaking in the Department of Agriculture as one of the most constructive steps taken by the Department to bring the scientist into the field as a direct aid and help to the farmers of this country.

I, therefore, feel that it is equally true that scientific and technical research can be used in a similar manner in affording relief to the depressed anthracite-coal miners in Pennsylvania. I am convinced that science can render a most important and valuable service in the development of new uses for utilization of our valuable anthracite deposits.

In my extensive studies and investigations of the anthracite situation in my State, I have endeavored to secure the advice of chemists and engineers not only in the industry but in scientific institutions and State and Federal agencies. I have given considerable attention to this subject, and I have had an outline prepared of some proposed lines of research on the utilization of anthracite that would be of vital importance to all engaged in coal mining, including both the operators and miners in eastern Pennsylvania.

In preparing this research program recognition has been made of the marked advances in methods of transportation and communication and the increased need and demand for satisfactory motor fuels.

As a very marked example, the development of the automobile to its present outstanding position in both domestic and industrial fields has resulted in a tremendous demand for gasoline. Our supply of gasoline has always been plentiful, but will it always continue to be from the present sources of production?

Already serious questions have been raised regarding our oil reserves, and experts are predicting a marked depletion in future years. Just how long it will be possible to discover new oil reserves is now a very debatable question. Some prominent authorities think a decline may begin within the next 25 years, while others estimate it will be a little longer period. At any rate, it is generally recognized that all oil resources are being depleted, and active measures should be adopted for the conservation of this valuable natural resource.

So, due to the fact that gasoline, which is now produced from petroleum—a mineral resource which we confidently believe at our present rate of consumption will some day be exhausted—the study of new sources of substitute fuel, such as coal, oil shale, and farm crops, should be encouraged by the Federal Government.

We have extensive deposits of coal and oil shale in the United States, and methods for producing gasoline and motor fuels from them should be actively prosecuted and the practicability of these methods from the economic and cost point of view should be definitely determined.

It is interesting in this connection to note that farm crops, especially grains and tubers, can be malted and fermented to produce ethyl alcohol, a liquid which chemists tell us can very well be used either as a blend with or a substitute for gasoline.

It has been suggested that alcohol made from farm crops can be blended

with gasoline as a practical source of motor fuel, and I am sure our scientists will determine in the next few years the practicability of this process. It is again a very splendid example of the value of scientific research in solving these important national problems.

HEATING VALUE OF ANTHRACITE COAL

Mr. President, when we think of gasoline as a symbol of concentrated fuel, it is interesting to observe that a small lump of anthracite coal will yield one and one-half times as much heat as the same volume of gasoline. The high percentage of hydrogen which anthracite coal contains gives it considerable advantage, for instance over coke, in heating value. It is very significant to note that it is seldom realized that Pennsylvania anthracite contains from 400 to 1,000 more British thermal units per pound than byproduct or Beehive coke of the same ash and moisture contents. These statements can be verified from analyses made by the United States Bureau of Mines.

For example, their Report of Investigations, No. 3283, shows that the moisture-free analyses of domestic sizes—egg, stove, chestnut, and pea—of Pennsylvania anthracite samples from 41 coal breakers, averages 9.9 percent ash and 13,535 British thermal units per pound. Their Report of Investigations, No. 2980, states that the typical composition of moisture-free, high-temperature coke is 10-percent ash and 12,900 British thermal units per pound. In other words, while the ash contents of the typical coke and anthracite coal are almost identical, the anthracite has 635 more British thermal units per pound, which amounts to 5 percent more heat units.

I am told the explanation for the higher heating value of anthracite as compared with coke lies in its extra hydrogen content, since hydrogen has the highest heating value of any substance. Although bituminous coal contains more hydrogen than anthracite coal, it also contains more oxygen, which has no heating value.

It is therefore very important to observe that it is generally agreed by combustion engineers that there is no other fuel, whether solid, liquid, or gaseous, that is so concentrated as anthracite and which contains so many heat units per cubic inch. It is not my purpose in this speech, however, to enter into any more details regarding the heating and combustion advantages of anthracite coal.

PROPOSED RESEARCH ON ANTHRACITE COAL UTILIZATION

At this time, when national-defense matters are directing attention to the importance of conservation of national resources, I am particularly interested in directing attention to the national importance and significance of scientific research looking to the development of new uses for anthracite coal and its products. It is therefore of fundamental importance that many of the following lines of research should be undertaken as soon as possible in a research laboratory, as provided in S. 357, for the utilization of anthracite coal.

First. Anthracite coal as a source of liquid fuels for automotive needs:

(1) Passenger automobiles.

(2) Diesel engine power on (a) trucks, (b) busses, (c) railroads, (d) stationary power plants, (e) marine engines.

Second. Anthracite coal as source of compressed gas for motor fuel:

(1) Gas-producer-driven motor vehicles: Gas-producer-driven motor vehicles, principally trucks and busses, have received extended trials in England, Germany, and France. Although wood charcoal is the preferred fuel, anthracite and low-temperature coke have given satisfactory service. In 1936 about 800 gas-producer-equipped trucks and busses were operating in Germany. Encouraging experimental results have also been obtained in England and France.

Third. Anthracite coal for gas production:

(1) Possibility as future fuel in gas producers for heavier types of motor vehicles.

(2) Source of hydrogen for liquefaction of bituminous coal or for production of synthetic hydrocarbons.

(3) Source of fuel for water gas and gas producers.

(4) Possibility of use as raw material for production of synthetic products from carbon monoxide and hydrogen.

(5) Production of water gas by utilization of off-peak electrical energy for heating anthracite-fuel beds and passage of steam through the bed.

(6) Utilization of anthracite coal in processes for gasification of carbonaceous materials.

Fourth. Hydrogenation of anthracite coal:

(1) Heavy-oil production for use in (a) Diesel motors and (b) furnaces.

(2) Gasoline production for use as (a) motor fuel and (b) solvents.

Fifth. Liquefaction of anthracite coal:

Emulsified finely ground coal for use as (a) Diesel engine fuel and (b) furnace oil.

Sixth. Grinding of anthracite coal:

(1) Pulverized form for use in (a) steam generation; (b) Diesel engines, source of solid fuel; and (c) household heating.

Seventh. Blending of anthracite coal:

(1) Heavy oil blended with (a) regular anthracite coal sizes; (b) pulverized anthracite coal for use as (1) steam generation, (2) household heating.

(2) Fine anthracite coal blended with bituminous coal for use as (a) steam generation, (b) household heating.

Eighth. Chemical utilization of anthracite coal for use as:

(1) Filtering media, water filtration plants.

(2) Scrubbing.

(3) Conversions.

(4) Carbonization.

Ninth. Anthracite ash utilization:

(1) Soil conditioner.

(2) Steel alloying with fine coal

(3) Chemical utilization of ash constituents.

Tenth. Anthracite coal for producer gas:

(1) Power production.

(2) City gas.

(3) Gas engines.

SAFETY AND HEALTH IN ANTHRACITE COAL MINING

In addition to providing for scientific chemical and technical researches to develop new uses for anthracite coal and its products, S. 357 provides for this laboratory to serve as a center of information and service in matters pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation in mining operations and other matters relating to problems of the anthracite coal industry.

Matters pertaining to the safety and health of coal miners are of fundamental importance. The hazardous occupation of the miner requires that all possible precautions be taken to assure his safety during working operations.

Due primarily to the hazardous nature of anthracite coal mining, such as large coal beds, pitching veins, and so forth, special hazards are encountered in the mines in the anthracite coal region. In my opinion, continued research studies on matters pertaining to safety and health of our miners should be encouraged.

The establishment of an anthracite research laboratory, as provided in my bill S. 357, will make possible these important studies and investigations.

We are not only faced with the necessity of providing safety for our miners during actual mining operations, but we are now confronted with the problem of safety for the homes of our people in the anthracite coal region. The recent experiences in Shenandoah and West Pittston have caused particular anxiety in those parts of the anthracite coal fields.

SURFACE SUBSIDENCE

As recently as February 6 of this year a three-block area in West Pittston was affected by surface subsidence. The high school with an attendance of 800 was ordered closed as a precautionary measure. A large number of business establishments and residences were affected.

On March 4, 1940, a 17-block area in Shenandoah, a borough of approximately 22,000 people, was badly damaged by surface settling, or what we commonly call cave-in conditions.

A large number of properties, including homes and business places and public schools, were affected. The residents in the section of the towns where this surface subsidence is occurring in the anthracite region are very much alarmed as to their future safety. The uncertainty as to whether there will be a further serious development involving not only these areas but other sections in the anthracite coal regions is causing a great deal of concern.

The direct cause of this surface subsidence in the anthracite coal region should be thoroughly investigated by Federal and State agencies. Our people in the anthracite region are naturally very much interested in ascertaining the facts and circumstances contributing to this condition.

Here, again, is a very splendid example of how the Federal engineers in the Bureau of Mines can cooperate with the Pennsylvania State Department of Mines in conducting investigations relating to surface subsidence and development of effective control measures. It is my feeling that some plan should be worked out to make funds available for this very important and essential undertaking.

A study of safety in mining operations, both as affecting the coal miner at his work as well as his family at home, cer-

tainly should be given every encouragement by the Federal Government. My bill S. 357 provides for studies of this character.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUBSIDENCE

The recent surface subsidence in the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania again indicates the importance of definitely determining the factors that contribute to this condition and the working out of methods for prevention of occurrences of this character in other anthracite mining towns.

I am told it is the opinion of many prominent mining men that under certain conditions the most practical way of preventing loss of unmined coal in pillars and of protecting surface property from damage by subsidence is by filling the workings with refuse material. The value of mine filling as a roof support for surface protection has long been recognized.

United States Bureau of Mines Bulletin No. 60 discusses the use of hydraulic mine filling in the Pennsylvania anthracite mine fields. The author states:

> Hydraulic mine filling has played an important part and been highly effective in the promotion of surface subsidence. Further consideration shall be given to hydraulic mine filling as a means of prevention of surface subsidence.

I favor further appropriation of funds for engineering studies of the factors contributing to surface subsidence or setting. This subject should be given thought by the Bureau of Mines with special attention to the heavy pitching veins in the western and southern anthracite regions.

SAFETY IN ANTHRACITE MINING

One of the most important provisions in my bill, S. 357, is to make possible studies pertaining to the safety and health of anthracite miners and to the sanitation conditions under which they work.

The hazards of mining are well known and many lives have been lost from explosions of mine gases, explosions of blasting materials, falls of roof and coal, and haulage and transportation accidents and other causes.

I am very much interested in the attention that has been given to studies of anthrosilicosis, resulting from breathing the coal dust in anthracite-coal mines and the effect on the miner. Further research, however, is essential to acquire accurate data on the subject, which has for years been so vitally important to anthracite miners.

ANTHROSILICOSIS—MINERS' ASTHMA—AMONG HARD-COAL MINERS

The United States Public Health Service has made a preliminary study of the nature and prevalence of chronic, incapacitating, miners' asthma. The results of this study are published in Public Health Bulletin No. 221, entitled "Anthrosilicosis Among Hard Coal Miners."

In making this study, the United States Public Health Service selected a representative mine in each of the three districts in which the anthracite coal field is divided by geological formations and by method of mining. One of the mines selected was in the northern, one in the southern, and one in the western middle area. It was agreed that all employees, including office, breaker, and other outside workers, as well as underground employees would be examined in each of the three mines selected for study.

Anthrosilicosis is a chronic disease due to breathing air containing dust generated in the various processes involved in the mining and preparation of anthracite coal.

The Public Health Service reports that, according to their conclusions, based on the examination of 2,711 men—about 96 percent of the number on the pay roll of three representative anthracite coal-mining companies studied, first, the prevalence of anthrosilicosis among the entire group of employees was found to be about 23 percent, almost one-quarter of the total number. Second, the mortality from respiratory diseases was found to be much greater among anthracite workers than in the general adult male population of the country. This important problem, which affects the welfare of our miners, should be given attention.

In considering safety in authracite mining, the following conclusions can be obtained from publications of the Federal Bureau of Mines:

First, accident rates—especially fatality rates—in anthracite mines from falls of roof and coal are higher than corresponding rates for other types of underground mining in the United States. Second, accident reports published by the Bureau of Mines indicate that while the number of accidents of all types in anthracite mines is being gradually reduced, those caused by falls of roof and coal still are responsible for over 50 percent of the fatalities, and in 1 year caused more than 140 deaths and almost 3,000 lost-time injuries. Third, statistics on roof-fall accidents reveal that anthracite mines have the highest death rates of all underground mines. Fourth, the injury rate for handling materials, especially timber, is higher for anthracite mines than for any other type of mine. In fact, there are more lost-time injuries from this cause than from any other except roof falls and haulage. Fifth, accident rates for handling material in 1 year were three times as high for anthracite as for metal mines, and almost three times as high as for bituminous-coal mines.

EXPLOSIONS IN ANTHRACITE MINES

According to reports of the Bureau of Mines, there have been a total of 1,243 explosions in anthracite coal mines from 1847 to 1937, causing the death of 2,252 miners.

Many of these explosions were due to the ignition of explosive mine gases and also to blasting operations. Although very marked progress has been made in recent years in controlling mine explosions, this matter will always be of fundamental importance to the coal-mining industry.

Such matters as adequate mine ventilation, improved methods of lighting, safe blasting methods, and similar matters pertaining to mine explosions should be given further attention.

HEALTH IN ANTHRACITE MINING

Mr. President, I am interested in health conditions as they relate to anthracite mining. The Bureau of Mines reports that the subject of health in mining has not been given the attention it warrants. This is particularly true as to the occurrence of dusts, high humidity, and other influences harmful to the health of the mine worker.

It is believed by many authorities that far more underground workers are incapacitated or die immediately from breathing excessive amounts of dusts than are killed by mine explosions and fires.

Air conditioning, although practically in its infancy in general industry, offers a possible fruitful means of safeguarding the comfort and health, and to some extent the safety, of the mine worker.

I am told that a few mining companies are making air-conditioning installations, although definite data are not at hand. Further research should therefore be carried on to discover and develop feasible methods of air-conditioning coal mines.

The Federal Bureau of Mines has done much work on ventilation of mines, as well as on methods of reducing dust and heat humidity. I believe these studies should be continued and expanded to include anthracite coal mines.

It must be recognized that research work on health and safety in the mining and allied industries, as provided in my bill S. 357, offers large remuneration in salvation of life and limb, as well as in dollars and cents for dividends as well as capital investment.

Occupational diseases are harassing industry, both workers and employers, and the mining industry is very deeply affected.

Much research work should be done on the effect of dust on the miners, since thousands of workers are incapacitated annually by dust diseases, and hundreds die from them. Suits involving many million dollars have been in court in connection with dust diseases in mines and tunnels.

The prevention of these dust diseases in mining is a problem that unquestionably can be solved by further research, such as contemplated in the research laboratory provided for in my bill. The investigations of the Federal Bureau of Mines should be expanded to include studies of dust conditions affecting the anthracite miner.

Mr. President, there are many other health and safety problems in the mining and allied industries that can be studied with a view to solution. While much progress has been made during recent years in safety in all kinds of mining, it has been estimated by the Bureau of Mines that accidents in the mining industry could be still further reduced from 50 percent to 75 percent below what they now are. This would result in financial savings of millions of dollars annually to both workers and operators, to say nothing of the admittedly great humanitarian and sociological benefits which would certainly accrue to the Nation.

FIRST-AID TRAINING PROGRAMS

The anthracite region of Pennsylvania has pioneered in first-aid training for mine employees.

As early as 1907 some of the coal companies in the region began to develop

plans for training their employees in both mine-rescue and first-aid work.

This first-aid training work has given valuable returns, and has provided well-trained first-aid organizations at many coal mines. Training work of this character should be encouraged and continued in every mining region in the United States.

The Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with the coal companies, has done very valuable work in first-aid training campaigns in the anthracite region. In the period from January 1934 to September 1939, a total of 1,327 first-aid instructors had been trained, with a grand total of 38,059 miners trained in first-aid work.

RESEARCH IN ANTHRACITE LABORATORY

In my opinion, the most helpful and practical way to study and investigate problems peculiar to anthracite coal mining and utilization is to provide the necessary facilities in the region where actual mining operations are being carried on, and where the problems affecting the life and safety of the miners and people in that region can be best studied by direct contact work with the people concerned.

The major problems that such a research laboratory as that provided for in my bill, S. 357, could undertake, would include the following:

First. Working out new industrial uses and outlets for anthracite coal and its products.

Second. Improvement in mining methods and operations with increased mining efficiency.

Third. Studies of facts and conditions contributing to surface subsidence, and development of methods for control and prevention.

Fourth. Safety and health of anthracite miners, and methods for protection during mining operations.

Fifth. Matters pertaining to problems peculiar to the anthracite coal industry.

Mr. President, my bill, S. 357, provides for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of an anthracite research laboratory in the anthracite coal region in Pennsylvania to carry out the broad and comprehensive research program to which I have referred. My bill provides sufficient funds for the operation and maintenance of this research laboratory to permit the Department of the Interior to carry out this program. I shall greatly appreciate the cooperation of the Members of the Senate in making possible this very essential and important research program, which means so much to the entire population in the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania, and which puts the Federal Government wholeheartedly back of the anthracite coal miner in his fight for future existence.

FOREIGN ACCOUNTS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar number 142, Senate bill 390, relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is it the Senator's purpose to proceed with the bill today or simply to make it the unfinished business?

Mr. BROWN. I was about to discuss that question with the Senator from Connecticut. Similar bills have been passed by the Senate twice, and by the House once, but the two Houses did not get together on any one bill. The bill relates solely to the question of the balances held by foreign governments in the Federal Reserve banks and, by reason of the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado, to such balances held in private banks. In short, the bill places upon the Secretary of State of the United States the responsibility of determining who is the accredited person who may withdraw those balances in behalf of foreign governments. The Senator from Connecticut will recall that we thoroughly discussed the matter in the committee last June, and reported the bill, but, because of some difficulties that occurred at that time, and a desire that some changes be made, it was not passed. It was again brought up on the floor by the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and was passed in October of last year. In the meantime, the House had passed a version of the bill, but not the same bill the Senate had passed. If the Senator feels that it should be delayed until Thursday, that is perfectly agreeable to me. On the other hand, if, as I understand, there is no objection to it, I shall be glad to proceed with the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I feel that properly we ought to let the matter go over until Thursday. It is entirely likely that any possible objection to the bill can be alleviated meanwhile. As things stand, however, I feel that the bill should be more thoroughly discussed than we are presently able to undertake.

Mr. BROWN. As I say, that is entirely agreeable to me. I merely ask that the bill be made the unfinished business, so that we may take it up on Thursday. I make that request for the reason that certain necessities require me to be in Michigan for the following week, and I should like to have the bill disposed of before I leave the city.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator for his courteous cooperation.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, with a view to making it the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 390) relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Michigan have agreed that the pending bill shall go over until Thursday.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill is now the unfinished business.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT (H. DOC. NO. 153)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the text of an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada providing for the construction of dams and power works in the international-rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and providing for completion of the essential links in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway when the Governments of the United States and Canada agree that circumstances require it.

The terms of the agreement contemplate that it shall be made effective by concurrent legislation of the Canadian Parliament and of the Congress of the United States.

I expect to request introduction, in due course, of legislation designed to make this agreement effective.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 21, 1941.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I inquire upon what theory the message from the President was sent to the Foreign Relations Committee instead of to the Commerce Committee, which heretofore has had jurisdiction over this particular project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Foreign Relations Committee has heretofore handled the matter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Foreign Relations Committee had jurisdiction of the matter as long as it was considered to be a treaty. Now, apparently, it has ceased to be a treaty, and is something else; and I confess to some curiosity as to why the message did not go to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the measure contemplated by the message probably will be in the form of an authorization, which will be followed by an appropriation; and the Foreign Relations Committee would have jurisdiction to bring in any legislation upon which an appropriation would be later based, as I understand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it the request of the Senator from Kentucky that the message go to the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. I made no request about it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was wondering why it went there. Automatically, I should not think it would go there. I should think it would go to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose automatically it would go there as easily as it would go to the Commerce Committee. Of course, the Senator understands that in the Senate there is not the meticulous rule which prevails in the other body with regard to the reference of bills. At one time, some years ago, the Vice President of the United States announced that he would send a bill to any committee to which the author of the bill wanted

it to go, which shows the lack of a clear line of demarcation with respect to the reference of bills, although personally I never agreed to that interpretation of the rule. I think this message properly may go, and in all probability should go, to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and that has been done.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no personal feeling about the matter, because I happen to be a member of both committees; but, so far as the project itself is concerned, I conceive it to be essentially a study in commerce rather than a study in foreign relations, and I hope it will have that sort of an exploration.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a joint project between this country and the Dominion of Canada, and it partakes somewhat of the qualities of a foreign-relations matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the situation at the present time, all that is before the Senate is the message from the President, accompanied by an agreement between the two countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If and when legislation is introduced, and the question arises as to whether it should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee on Commerce, it can be decided at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly the reference made is the correct one at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Chair will permit me, the reference of the President's message will in all probability determine the ultimate jurisdiction as between the commitees. When the St. Lawrence waterway matter was before us the last time it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because it was before us in the form of a treaty, which naturally required consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Now, under some remarkable theory, as I understand, it is denied that the agreement is a treaty, although I cannot see that it is anything but a treaty, and therefore should have a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification. The only theory on which the Committee on Foreign Relations could possibly have had jurisdiction of this subject matter originally was that it was a treaty. As in the case of the Senator from Michigan, it makes no difference to me personally, because I happen to be on both committees, but it is very clear that if the agreement means anything it does have to do with commerce instead of foreign relations.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Committee on Foreign Relations has jurisdiction of matters other than treaties, as has just been evidenced by the fact that that committee considered the lend-lease bill, which was not a treaty. The President's message deals with an agreement between our country and another country, and it might be logical that proposed legislation should follow the reference of the message; but certainly a message calling the attention of Congress to an agreement between this country and another is properly referable to the Committee on Foreign Relations, regardless of what may happen later with respect to legislation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in further justification of what I previously stated on the subject, and in complete agreement with the able Senator from Missouri, I call attention to the fact that the agreement deals almost exclusively with navigation on the Great Lakes and the related waters, except as it involves power, and I do not understand how there could be any question in the world as to what committee has jurisdiction over transportation on the Great Lakes, because it has always been in the Committee on Commerce, and always will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the Chair has had no opportunity to examine in detail the substance of the agreement, but it has been the belief of the Chair that inasmuch as the message referred to an agreement between two countries, it would properly be referable to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri that by some remarkable transposition of circumstances this proposal ceases to be a treaty and now becomes merely an agreement, there is nothing remarkable about that. If the Senator from Missouri will look into the precedents he will find that in the past many similar agreements or understandings have been entered into which were not treaties and did not require a two-thirds vote in the Senate. I do not desire to enter into a discussion of that question now, but at the proper time it may be appropriate to discuss it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was just about to suggest that I shall be very glad to argue that with the Senator, and would be willing to begin now if he desires.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to detain the Senate now with an argument on that matter.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I desire to add one thought to the discussion about the reference of the matter which has been presented to the Senate. I have been informed, though it is purely gossip, so far as I know, that in the House of Representatives consideration is being given to double reference—that is, reference of the St. Lawrence waterway matter to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

I happen to be a member of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and I am very anxious, because of the great interest my State has in the matter, to have it referred to the Committee on Commerce. But it occurred to me that we had a precedent here for such double reference as that to which I have referred.

I well remember that the bill known as the Finnish relief bill went first to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and after that committee had passed upon it it was then referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It struck me that, in view of the very large interest in the St. Lawrence waterway proposition, and because it is a matter of interest to both the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Commerce, consideration might be given, when the question arises, to having it referred to both committees.

PROTECTION TO CERTAIN MORTGAGORS IN MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 926, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors in military service. The bill has been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with a very slight amendment. The report from the committee was unanimous.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this bill relates solely to the matter of authorizing the Federal Housing Authority, in case of default on a house, to include in its payment of the guaranteed sum the interest charges which were deferred by reason of the soldiers and sailors' moratorium law. The bill was unanimously reported, and there was no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as there is another bill now the unfinished business, the request should be to temporarily lay that bill aside and to take up the measure in which the Senator from Pennsylvania is interested.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 926.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 926) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors in military service, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "foreclouse" and to insert "foreclosure", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 204 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages executed prior to the enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 and insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act, as amended, on property owned by a mortgagor who is a 'person in military service,' as such term is defined in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, and occupied chiefly for dwelling purposes by the wife, children, or other dependents of such mortgagor, at the date of his entry into such military service, and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe, there shall be included in the debentures an amount which the Administrator finds to be sufficient to compensate the mortgagee for any loss which it may have sustained on account of interest on debentures and the payment of insurance premiums by reason of its having postponed the institution of foreclosure proceedings or the acquisition of the property by other means during the period of such military service and 3 months thereafter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency

on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 134) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 926

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 926) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors in military service, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to protect persons in the military service against foreclosure proceedings with respect to mortgages executed prior to the enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 and insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act, by compensating the mortgagees for any losses they may have sustained on account of interest on debentures and the payment of insurance premiums by reason of the postponement of foreclosure proceedings during the period of military service and for 3 months thereafter.

The bill as reported has been approved by the Federal Housing Administrator, and its enactment is recommended by the Federal Loan Administrator.

The amendment by the committee merely corrects a typographical error.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING BILLS DURING RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Vice President be authorized to sign enrolled bills ready for his signature, as if the Senate were in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR RECEIPT OF MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBMISSION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that, during the adjournment or recess of the Senate, committees of the Senate be authorized to submit reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. ELLENDER. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report favorably the nomination of Norris E. Lineweaver, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of March 1941. I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Norris E. Lineweaver, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of March 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

That concludes the calendar.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, March 27, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24, 1941:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Charles Stevenson Denny, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from January 4, 1941.

Capt. Luke Bruce Graham, Infantry, with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. Frank Huber Partridge, Adjutant General's Department, with rank from August 18, 1940.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Orin Henry Rigley, Jr., Infantry (first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.)

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS WITH RANK FROM APRIL 4, 1941

Maj. Robert Robinson, Finance Department.

Maj. Herman Odelle Lane, Infantry.

Maj. Aubrey Hornsby, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Lawrence Lofton Cobb, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. William Havely McKee, Infantry.

Maj. Garnett Hamilton Wilson, Cavalry.

Maj. William Arthur Beiderlinden, Field Artillery.

Maj. Edwin Moore Burnett, Cavalry.

Maj. Royal Leonard Gervais, Field Artillery.

Maj. Harold Mark Reedall, Ordnance Department.

Maj. Richard Hawley Slider, Field Artillery.

Maj. Allen Louis Stowell, Signal Corps.

×Maj. Richard Turner Schlosberg, Signal Corps.

Maj. Andrew Ed Forsyth, Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS WITH RANK FROM APRIL 19, 1941

Maj. John Andrew Smith, Jr., Field Artillery.

Maj. David Goodwin Barr, Infantry.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.)

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

Capt. Arvo Theodore Thompson, Veterinary Corps (major, Army of the United States) from April 8, 1941.

CHAPLAINS

To be major

Chaplain (Capt.) Andrew Thomas Francis Nowak, United States Army, from April 20, 1941.

×Chaplain (Capt.) Joseph Oscar Ensrud, United States Army, from April 29, 1941.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captain

×First Lt. Leo Joseph Butler, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States) from April 10, 1941.

×First Lt. Frank Whitton Govern, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), from April 26, 1941.

First Lt. Richard Ray Cameron, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), from April 23, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 24, 1941:

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Chalmers E. Bowden, Byfield.

Eugene J. Sullivan, Wakefield.

NEW YORK

Arthur E. Smith, Hyde Park.

Carlton D. Shaver, Schoharie.

PENNSYLVANIA

Martha M. Wilson, High Spire.

Amy L. Johnson, Lincoln University.

Sherman Floyd Haney, Mather.
John E. Bednar, Nanticoke.
Richard K. Valentine, Rome.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Norris E. Lineweaver, second lieutenant, from the 12th day of March 1941.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, blessed Lord, that at the altar of prayer the soul finds freedom from doubts, cares, and fears. We pray Thee to make us strong, wise, and pure, that with increasing faith in the relationships of life, we may acquit ourselves like men. Teach us the simplicity of the religious life that we may walk together with Thee in hope and love and in the spirit of Him who was so patient in a world of woe. Let us tread the ancient way pressed by the holy feet of our Saviour and feel the restful strains that soothe the troubled heart and ease the mind of guilt. We pray for Thy children everywhere, for the homeless, the friendless, and for all hunger-bitten bodies. Living, working, and even sighing for others in kindly brotherly ways, help us to make life rich in an eternal now. O God, our help in ages past, by the prayers, tears, and the matchless valor of our heroic sires, Thou hast raised up a Nation to be great in power and inspiration, inciting men to struggle against tyranny and oppression; we beseech Thee to hear our earnest prayer for our country. Keep our glorious ship of state sailing for countless future years until the teaching of our Master shall become coextensive with the being of man throughout all the earth, and Thine shall be the praise forever. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 21, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3981. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRNES, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPLANATION

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was in the Chamber on Friday last during the debate on the appropriation bill. At the moment of the unexpected roll call I was unavoidably detained in one of the departments. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 22, 1941, entitled "Get the Waterway Started."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a eulogy presented by the Lieutenant Governor of Iowa at the funeral of Harry B. Swan, of Atlantic, Iowa, who was State chairman of the Republican State committee, and who was killed in an accident a week ago last Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article on the memorial exercises for Susan B. Anthony.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short Senate resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CANBY, OREG.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Canby, Oreg., is a little town of 1,000 people. Eighteen years ago when I was Governor of the State I encouraged citizens, when they had some difficulty with the power company furnishing light, to distribute their own electric energy. They started in a small way. They had never generated their own power, they had always bought it from a private utility until Bonneville power became available in February 1940. Since that time they have twice made rate reductions, have paid high taxes, have increased customers to 500, and have doubled the amount of kilowatt-hour monthly use. Because of the municipal plant the town has no debts. It has paid its way out, a shining example of what could be done by the people of a small community working together, delivering their own power and their own light cooperatively. They now have the cheapest power in that region. They are now selling their power so cheaply that it can be used for irrigation, which we thought impossible a few years ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include in the Appendix a release of the Bonneville Administration on the town of Canby.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem having a bearing on the problem of labor and national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Susquehanna Transcript.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS IN NATIONAL DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand some newspaper clippings from my district. There is a picture of the Harvill strike, showing the president of the Harvill organization with Edward Cheyfitz, who is conducting this strike.

I also have a picture of Kenneth Eckert, the leader of the strike, branded by the Dies committee as one of the leading Communists of the country. He admits he was a former Communist. None of these fellows will admit they are Communists now. The gentleman on the floor the other day told us there were only 48,000 Communists in the United States. He is mistaken. Seven thousand voted in my district. Ninety-eight thousand voted for Anita Whitney, who was convicted of criminal syndicalism and served a term in the penitentiary in California. So do not be misled by what these Communists are doing. It is these Communists who are behind the C. I. O. leadership that are carrying on these strikes, who are destroying not only our national defense, but our country. What kind of settlements are being made under all these new agreements with the C. I. O. to stop these strikes? Are our taxpayers and country in general being sold down the river, our constitutional rights being given away, our industry and business being socialized and communized, and all this given to these socialistic, communistic, hijacking, racketeering, C. I. O. leaders in the form of bribery, to bribe them to permit our people and industry to exercise their God-given constitutional rights in safety? Everyone of these communistic leaders striking against our defense program should be in prison or concentration camp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered by Mr. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, over the radio last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOOD FOR EUROPE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in respect to furnishing food for starving women and children of Europe. I notice from the newspapers the last day or so that the State Department is talking about getting permission for a couple of ships of food to go to France for starving women and children. This is fine, and I congratulate the gentleman if he is responsible, or if he had anything to do with securing permission of Great Britain to open the blockade, but I will say also that ex-President Hoover made the remark that we could feed the starving women and children of Poland, Holland, Belgium, and some other countries, without aiding the warring nations. Does not the gentleman think he ought to intercede with the State Department and make an effort to see that these women and children get food to sustain life in Holland, Belgium, Spain, and many other countries. Each night they pray: "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven, give us this day our daily bread." Will their prayers be heard in America? I hope so. Cannot we, with great storehouses filled with grain and foods, give them something to sustain life? Something from our abundance? And does not the majority leader think we should? Will you use your good office to plead for the good-neighbor policy?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Unfortunately, the gentleman consumed all his time, and I cannot answer him.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter therein.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include in each excerpts from the papers showing something about the strike situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PATRIOTISM OR THE CLOSED SHOP?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me call the attention of those Members of the House who believe in and have advocated a closed shop to the effect that policy is having upon our national-defense program.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has been an outstanding champion of the closed shop and has repeatedly opposed legislation which, if adopted, would permit American citizens to work on national-defense projects without buying work permits.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has followed a somewhat similar course and has intimated that I am anti-labor. The gentleman is utterly mistaken. I notice the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the chairman of the great Committee on Rules, is present.

Today, in his own city, we have a demonstration of the result of the closed shop, a policy which he has advocated. For some time the International Harvester Co. plants in Chicago and in Richmond, Ind., have been tied up by jurisdictional strikes. American citizens, because of the quarrel between the two great national unions, have been unable to work at these plants.

May I call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and of other closed-shop advocates to the fact that, by massed picket lines, by violence, and by threats of violence, American citizens have been deprived of their right to work in defense of their country?

This morning in Chicago, under the personal command of Police Captain John Pendergast, 1,300 Chicago police formed a line around the plant, at which were gathered 9,000 A. F. of L. and C. I. O. workers. Under the protection of the police, in 25 minutes, 3,500 workers went into the plant.

But think of it. The protection of 1,300 uniformed policemen was required to enable American citizens to go to their daily toil—simply because we here in Congress have failed to pass adequate legislation to prevent this sort of a situation arising. We have permitted the administration to coddle and encourage these racketeers, some of whom are Communists.

The company announced that the A. F. of L. men would be put to work, making ready the plant for normal production, but Robert Travis of the F. E. W. O. C. boldly and brazenly said that from the steel plants and the packing houses and other places tomorrow would come 800 additional pickets and the further statement was made by the C. I. O., and I quote:

> No one will enter the plant tomorrow, injunction or no injunction, police or no police.

If tomorrow we have another May Day in Chicago, it will be because Communists, law-defying racketeers, saboteurs of our national-defense program, parading under the guise of union leaders—and in no sense do they represent the rank and file of union members—cause it.

In Chicago the battle is on between the forces of law and order; between those who want national defense and those who defy our courts, violate our laws, and would destroy our Nation.

Let those who wish advocate the closed shop, but it is apparent where that doctrine is getting us. It but betrays the union man into the hands of those who would exploit him.

The gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] and other men who advocate the closed shop may change their minds; they may disapprove of this strike, but until words of disapproval are followed by effective legislation, the danger will be ever with us, and Members of Congress cannot longer avoid responsibility.

If bloodshed and death come tomorrow in the Chicago area because of a clash between the C. I. O., their communistic allies, and the forces of law and order, as represented by the Chicago police, we here in Congress must accept our share of the responsibility.

The C. I. O., as quoted above, has made its threat. If this Government of ours, if the police of Chicago back down, then, indeed, have civil rights ceased to exist here in the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has again called attention to the strike in the McCormick International Harvester Co. shops, and it is with regret that I read in yesterday's papers of the trouble that is brewing between the C. I. O., who are out on strike, and the A. F. of L., whose members insist on returning to work. In view of these conditions I fear there may be trouble.

As you all know I have been a stanch supporter of organized labor all my life. I feel that organized labor has done a great deal for labor in general, and for that reason I have, for many years, fought their battles and taken up their cause. Being honestly and sincerely interested in the welfare of labor and knowing that only through organized methods could they cope with organized industry, I have for over 2 years urged and pleaded with both sides to cease fighting one another and to adjust their differences, feeling that if such conditions continued, their cause might be weakened. I am today calling upon them again to cease their strife. The country at this time will not tolerate jurisdictional fights and strikes. There must be mediation and amicable settlement of disputes between labor and industry. There are certain gentlemen in this House and throughout the country who have been attacking organized labor with respect to the high initiation fees levied upon men joining the unions and this also has created prejudice against organized labor.

Mr. Speaker, I stated and I again repeat that I am in favor of organized labor. In fact, I am and always have been in favor of improving the conditions of the laboring men of our Nation. In the 35 years I have been in Congress, I have voted for higher wages, better hours and conditions, but now when the interest of our country is at stake and when every citizen should aid our defense program, I think it is manifestly unfair on the part of labor leaders to cause any delay in that program. It appears that they do not seem to realize the harm they are doing to themselves by failing to adjust their differences.

Personally, if I could bring about the termination of the differences between the two unions and the strike in Chicago, I would be happy to do so, but that is beyond my power or control. All I can do is to call upon the labor leaders of both organizations and voice my hope that they cease their controversies, because I fear that should they unwisely continue them, the gains and progress obtained by the friends of organized labor may be lost or will receive a great set-back. The American people, I repeat, will not tolerate unnecessary strikes at this time and I, for one, urge in the strongest possible terms that all labor organizations and industries join hands in the common cause of America and defend the threat to its freedom and liberty. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a concurrent resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution by the Isaak Walton League.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include portions of a letter I have written to people in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some data on Fort Peck, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 4036, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act, approved May 3, 1935, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act of May 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 166), as amended, is amended by adding after the second subparagraph therein the following new subparagraph:

"Reckless driving, as provided in section (9) (b) of such Traffic Acts, if personal injury occurs as a result thereof."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this measure is to make the provisions of the present Motor Vehicle Responsibility Act in the District of Columbia applicable to all cases where reckless driving results in personal injury.

The law at the present time applies to drunken driving and where the driver of the vehicle leaves the scene of an accident. Under this amendment we would like to stress the fact it would apply only after a person has been convicted by a jury of reckless driving where personal injury results. There have been a large number of these cases in the District of Columbia in recent months and years, and it is believed that the situation justifies the District Committee asking for the passage of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURNISHING OF STEAM FROM CENTRAL HEATING PLANT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3869) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator be, and he is hereby, authorized to furnish steam from the Central Heating Plant, if and when the same may become available, to the Municipal Building of the District of Columbia, on the property bounded by Thirteen and One-half, Fourteenth, D, and E Streets NW., and to such buildings or buildings, or additions thereto, as are now or may hereafter be erected or acquired for the office of the Recorder of Deeds, or for other agencies of the District of Columbia, on the property bounded by Fifth, Sixth, D, and E Streets NW., in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia agrees to pay for the steam furnished at reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Federal Works Administrator: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia agrees to provide all necessary connections with the Government mains at its own expense, and in a manner satisfactory to the Federal Works Administrator: *And provided further*, That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is authorized to prepare plans and specifications and to supervise and contract for the work necessary to connect the said buildings and the building for which the furnishing of steam was authorized by the act of June 21, 1939 (53 Stat. 852), on the property bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue, John Marshall Place, C Street, and Sixth Street NW., with the Government mains, and to receive payment from the District of Columbia by the transfer of funds in advance to cover the cost of such work and services, including administrative expenses.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the reason this legislation is requested is to authorize the furnishing of steam at the proper time from the Government Central Heating Plant to the District Building and to the proposed Recorder of Deeds Building.

At present we find the District Building has a steam and electric power plant which has been in continuous use for over a third of a century. The plant requires extensive repairs in the very near future. It is estimated that under the new arrangement proposed in the pending bill there will be a saving of about $6,000 a year to the District Government and eventually to the Federal Government. The measure has the approval of the District Commissioners and also has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The intention, then, is to abandon the District steam-heating plant?

Mr. RANDOLPH. For the present; yes. At this time the plant is in need of extensive repairs, which repairs will be made at a later date, if it is felt desirable to make them. For 35 years now that plant has been in operation with practically no changes, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Do you make a charge to the District for the steam furnished by the Federal Government?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I may say that the alterations necessary to furnish this service will require a capital outlay of $24,000 at the present time, but it is estimated it will result in a saving of about $6,000 a year.

Mr. RICH. With this new steam plant the Federal Government has constructed for the District, there will be plenty of facilities to take care of the situation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is believed to be true.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman did not, I believe, answer my original question. Do you expect to make a charge to the District Building so that we will know from year to year what that cost is going to be—so that we will not lose sight of the fact because we put through this bill that it is going to be furnished out of the Federal Treasury and perhaps never be accounted for?

Mr. RANDOLPH. There will be an accounting, of course, and we will know exactly how much is purchased, together with the cost thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the legislation to be offered by the District Committee for today.

INCREASE IN ENLISTED STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3786) to increase the authorized strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes, and that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the bill that a rule was granted on the other day?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. A rule has been granted and is on file.

Mr. MICHENER. If this is not disposed of by unanimous consent, it will be by rule?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. There is no opposition to the bill, so far as the committees are concerned?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Michigan is correct. It carries a unanimous report from the Committee on Naval Affairs. As I understand, the rule was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules. This request is merely to do away with the time required to call the bill up under the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. This is to dispose of the rule?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not expect to object, I would have preferred to have the chairman of the Rules Committee or the gentleman himself take this matter up with me, inasmuch as the rule had been reported, and I did not know about this request. There is no opposition to the bill, of course.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, we consulted the acting leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. FISH. I happen to be the ranking member of the Committee on Rules. On anything having to do with rules I would advise that in the future the gentleman from Georgia or the majority leader or any gentleman of the House who wants to take a bill up by unanimous consent should take the matter up with me. I am still the ranking member of the Committee on Rules; I was until yesterday, and I believe I am today, and I know nothing about this.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman does not believe there is any likelihood of his being superseded?

Mr. FISH. I have a high regard for the gentleman. I always want to follow him, anyhow, and I am not going to object to this request, but I am just serving notice that I will object in the future in similar situations.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman that I was under the impression that when the majority consulted the minority leader and he gave his consent, that was all that was necessary, but in deference to the feelings of the gentleman from New York we will consult him in the future.

Mr. FISH. They are separate committees, and they function separately. I hope they will always continue to do so.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I was under the impression that the gentleman from New York, being the ranking member of the minority, always worked in harmony with the minority leader.

Mr. FISH. The minority leader has not spoken to me about it. He is absent today, and I do not know whether he really knows much about it himself. I do work in great harmony with the distinguished minority leader.

May I ask the gentleman from Georgia, will I have an opportunity to discuss this important measure for as much as 5 minutes?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the request I have made, any Member of the House may be recognized for 5 minutes, because the bill will be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FISH. I have no objection, and I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy is hereby increased to 232,000. The President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase this number to 300,000.

SEC. 2. The phrase "authorized enlisted strength," as applied to the personnel of the Navy, shall hereafter mean the total number of enlisted men of the Navy authorized by law, exclusive of the Hospital Corps.

SEC. 3. The total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be equal to 5½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the active list.

SEC. 4. Hereafter the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps shall be 20 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is very brief, and its purpose is simply to increase the authorized enlisted strength and the emergency strength of the Navy.

In times of emergency, when existing systems are found to lack the elasticity needed for varying conditions new legislation has to be enacted to meet all contingencies. This bill is a good illustration of that.

Due to the expansion of the Naval Establishment, in ships and aviation, there must be an increase in personnel. As of today the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy is 131,485, which was established by the Act of July 1, 1918. By this legislation this authorized enlisted strength is raised to 232,000. The emergency strength of 191,000 was established in 1919, and is now raised by this legislation to 300,000. The men that will be required on the active list, according to estimated figures given by the Navy Department, range from 286,000 in 1942 to 532,500 in 1947, after which it is thought that the number of men required will be stabilized. It was thought by the Navy Department and by the Naval Affairs Committee that it would be better to have the authorized enlisted strength increased from year to year, rather than to fix a larger number at this time. So that the Congress will have before it, at each time requests are made for increase in the authorized enlisted strength, full knowledge of developments and the proposed planning of the Navy Department with reference to its personnel.

There has been some confusion because of the wording of the laws above referred to as they now exist and the definitions of "authorized enlisted strength" and the "authorized emergency strength." This confusion was due to the fact that the definition of "authorized enlisted strength," as applied to the Navy, is defined by law as the total number of enlisted men allowed by law exclusive of (1) hospital corps, (2) apprentice seamen, (3) men sentenced by court martial to discharge, (4) men detailed for duty with the naval militia, (5) men furloughed without pay, (6) enlisted men of the flying corps, and (7) men under instruction in trade schools. So that the total authorized enlisted strength was larger than the authorized enlisted strength, due to the fact that these excepted categories ran the figure of 131,485 to 137,405. This bill changes these confusing definitions and does not except any categories, except the hospital corps, which, as a matter of fact, was established by the act of 1916, and its strength fixed at 3½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. This makes a much simpler definition, and as the number allowed by law is used for computations it gets rid of the confusion.

In 1939 the President declared a national emergency; and the enlisted strength of the Navy, under Executive order, was increased to 205,000, the maximum allowed by law. The legal emergency strength at the present rate of recruiting will be reached within the next 60 days, and unless the authorized strength is increased by that time it will be necessary to curtail the procurement rate of replacements required to maintain the strength at 205,000. These personnel requirements for the Navy are based on anticipated operating requirements as estimated by the Chief of Naval Operations, who issues an operating force plan from time to time. The latest revision of this plan indicates that 232,000 enlisted men are required for the operating forces on a basis of 100-percent complement, and if there is no change in existing conditions 300,000 men will meet the emergency requirement during 1942.

In addition to the first two sections of the bill giving the number required for the authorized enlisted strength and the emergency strength and the definition of

the phrases, the other two sections of the bill apply to the number of officers in the line of the Navy and the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps.

As to the first, the percentage of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy is about at 5½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the active list, and this language and percentage is retained in the present bill. There does not seem to be any particular reason for the 5½ percent, except that the experience of the Navy has shown that this is about the ratio of officers to the enlisted strength, and the Navy sees no reason to change the figure. The officer personnel of both the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by this bill, is set out in tables on page 4 of the report, which I will not take the time to read.

As to the last section of the bill, that also follows the language of existing law, with reference to the enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps, which is declared to be 20 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

This bill has the approval of the Navy Department, it is in accord with the views of the Executive, and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House has reported it unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this bill. In fact, I think everybody is in hearty accord with the purposes of the measure. It simply authorizes an increase to 235,000 in the enlisted personnel of the Navy, all of them to be obtained by the volunteer system. Some of you will recall that when the draft bill was up I offered a volunteer amendment which passed the House on two different occasions but was defeated in the Senate. The Navy does not seem to have any difficulty in getting all the volunteers they want for our Navy, and they are good men, according to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the best navy in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion, in view of the fact this bill provides for obtaining additional enlisted men in the Navy through the volunteer system to point out the reasons I voted once for the draft bill and once against it. I voted for it the first time with my volunteer amendment in it. I voted against it when it was eliminated in conference, and I think time has proved that I was right. I also spoke and supported an amendment to make the age limits from 18 to 25 years. The bill as finally written provided for an age up to 36 years. The American Legion and, now, I think, General Hershey, who is in charge of the draft, have come out for an age limitation of from 18 to 24 years, the reason being simply this: Statistics show that 50 percent of the young men of 25 years of age are married, and by 30 you find two-thirds of them are married. Between 25 and 36, most of them are not only married, but they are employed in some kind of permanent business or profession, and when they are drafted they have to make a tremendous sacrifice. They practically lose their jobs. Furthermore, those from 30 up to 36, after a year of training, go into the Reserve for 10 years, and anyone who has served in the Infantry knows that the fighting is done by the younger men and that those from 35 to 45 are of little use for our national defense, at least in combat units.

I made this same argument at the time the conscription bill was up. I was overruled by the House, but now the American Legion and General Hershey, the head of the draft, say the age limits should be from 18 to 23 or 24.

We made a mistake in the Congress, and the reason we made the mistake, probably, was that the bill in its original draft was nothing but an abomination of desolation. It called for draftees from 21 to 64 at $5 a month, an utter absurdity, and the House at least had the sense to strike that out and limit it to 36. I believe if the bill had originally placed the age limit at 36, the House would have done the sensible thing and limited it to 25.

The conscription bill is now causing all kinds of hardships and injustices throughout America by taking young men from 25 to 36 out of their occupations. They lose their jobs and probably will never get them back. It would have been much better if we had set a top limit of 24 or 25 and I hope such an amendment that I am now discussing will soon be added to the draft bill, and the sooner we enact it the better for our national defense, and in all justice this ought to be done immediately to prevent unnecessary injustices and hardships to those over 25 years of age.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I introduced an amendment during the discussion of that bill, when it was being read for amendment providing that private employers would be required to reemploy a draftee upon his release from the United States Government unless the employer had gone broke in the meantime or it was otherwise impossible, and that amendment was voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman recall that amendment? I believe the gentleman supported the amendment.

Mr. FISH. Yes; the gentleman is almost always correct in his statements, except when he goes against the minority party.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the remaining 2 minutes to make a statement about conditions in some of our Army camps, and I hope there are members of the Military Affairs Committee on both sides in the House. Reports are coming to me from Fort Bragg, in North Carolina, one of our larger encampments, that the boys there, who have been drafted at $21 a month, are not receiving ample food; that they are not receiving any milk or any fruit.

It is inconceivable that this can be true, but I heard this directly from a very reliable and prominent man who had been down there to see his son. He told me they were not getting any milk or any fruit, and something is wrong, and something must be rotten if this condition exists. It is up to the Military Affairs Committee to look into the situation and take immediate steps to correct it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to inform the gentleman that I went through Fort Bragg several weeks ago. I went through the quarters, and I saw the refrigeration, and I saw some fine-looking beef, and I asked a number of men there how they were fed, and they said fine; in fact, one man told me he had gained 25 pounds since he had been down there.

Mr. FISH. I agree with what the gentleman says, and that is exactly what they told me; that the food they had was good; that the refrigeration was good; and that the cooks were good. They stated that; but there was not ample food, and they were hungry after every meal, and that there was no milk and no fruit. There was no complaint about the cooking of the food, but the amount of food, and this report comes from other camps. There is a lot of difficulty involved in the situation. The Army provides 45 cents a day to feed our soldiers, and the cost of living is going up, and the net result is that at some of these camps they do not provide any milk or any fruit.

I am asking the members of the Military Affairs Committee to check up on those facts, because nobody wants that condition to continue if it is so. The complaints have come from other camps that I know about, where they say that they have not ample food. As a matter of fact, I heard from an Army camp in New England today where they have not received ample food, where the boys are hungry after each meal, and it is causing a great deal of discontent. This is not a general charge. It is a specific charge that ought to be looked into at once. In conclusion I hope that in the near future the Congress will amend the Conscription Act fixing the age limit of draftees at from 18 to 24. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. I take this time to state that I have just completed a tour of 13 camps from Fort Blanding, Fla., as far north as Pine Plains Camp, N. Y. In a number of instances I went through the kitchens and talked to the cooks and to the men. I would go into the camp in the morning at 7 o'clock, talk to groups of men, and watch them work. In no instance did I hear any complaint regarding food. On the contrary, every individual I asked about the food said it was fine. I had reports similar to the one the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has had. People wrote

me about it. That was the reason I specifically made inquiries. I am sure that these stories are erroneous. I am convinced that the men in the camps are being properly fed.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Did the gentleman understand the statement I made? I said that the boys at Fort Bragg—and I do not know the troops there, and it has nothing to do with the northern troops, so far as I know—are not receiving any milk. Does the gentleman know whether that is true or not?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not. I went to Fort Bragg and went through a number of kitchens. I actually looked into the refrigerators, and I am sure if the soldiers had not been receiving milk or vegetables the men would have told me about it.

Mr. FISH. And they are not receiving any fruit. Does the gentleman know about that specific statement?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not know about fruit or milk, but I do know that the men made no complaints. I am sure that if they had been receiving none I would have heard of it. I was told by men particularly at Fort Bragg that they were satisfied with the food.

Mr. FISH. I am not complaining about the refrigeration or the cooking of the food. It is the amount of the food, plus the lack of fruit and milk.

Mr. COCHRAN. And how about cream; did they get cream?

Mr. FISH. Well, we get it, do we not?

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. HARTER. I know the gentleman has been doing a very worth-while job visiting the various camps, and is making very extensive investigations as to conditions in the camps, and I think the membership of the House owes the gentleman from Michigan a vote of thanks for the efforts that he has been putting forth. It is my understanding that he will shortly address the House and inform us fully of what he has seen. Is it not a fact that the physical condition of most of the selectees is far better after they have been in the camps for a number of weeks or months than it was upon their induction?

Mr. ENGEL. I think that is always the case with recruits coming into the Army. I talked to one individual who said that he had gained 25 pounds. I talked to a number of men. I talked with the construction quartermaster and to some of the Quartermaster Corps, and heard no complaint. They are erecting splendid cold-storage plants to take care of the food. Perhaps in some instances where the cold-storage plants have not been far enough advanced to store great quantities of food there may have been a shortage, but I am sure that when the camps are completed they will take care of every phase of the matter. I have never seen camps so complete in facilities as these are. In one camp I was told they went to the extent of taking out 48 inches of frozen ground, and putting in new dirt, in order to have the cold-storage plant ready for the summer. I feel certain that these men are being taken care of in splendid shape. I was particularly interested in Fort Bragg, because Maj. Gen. Jacob Devers, formerly superintendent of West Point and later in charge at Panama, is a personal friend of mine, and is in command there. He is one of the ablest officers in the Army. I am sure if there is any difficulty of the sort described that General Devers would not be long in making the fact known.

Mr. HARTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. HARTER. I take it that all of us have received complaints about matters in some of the camps. Personally I have had very few. I take it the answers made by the gentleman and the information he is giving us today are the result of his own personal investigation and what he has actually seen himself and not what has been reported to him by others?

Mr. ENGEL. I speak from personal knowledge.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. As an indication that the Army is properly feeding the men, let me say they are now going to open up 34 branches of the Quartermaster's Corps for the purpose of purchasing perishable goods, fresh vegetables, and so forth, as soon as they are available, so that they will be able to feed the men something that is fresh, rather than canned goods. That is a real indication that they are giving them the best that money can buy, to which they are entitled.

Mr. ENGEL. Anyone who was an officer during the World War knows that the first duty of an Army officer is to look after the welfare of his men. If there were any serious shortage of an item of food, Major General Devers, I am positive, would have looked after it. I have every confidence in him. Adequate appropriations have been made for rations and there is no valid reason why the men should not receive them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I seek recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this bill do anything to change the reserve status of men who have served a normal period of enlistment in either the Navy or the Marine Corps? The reason I ask the question is because, as the gentleman knows, the Selective Service Act exempts those men from call who have served a regular term of enlistment in the Regular Army.

Mr. MAAS. No; this does not affect that situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So the situation will still exist whereby men who have served a regular period of enlistment in the Navy or the Marine Corps will be subject to call under the selective-service law?

Mr. MAAS. That is correct. That has to be corrected under the draft act itself. There is an amendment pending before the Military Affairs Committee now which has the approval of the Navy Department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I just wanted to make that suggestion, that the Van Zandt bill covers the point raised by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MAAS. And that has the approval of the Navy Department, and it is anticipated that it will be passed shortly.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. How about the bill correcting the failure to provide longevity pay for Naval Reserves, whereas it is provided in the other branches?

Mr. MAAS. There is a bill pending for that purpose before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, waiting for a report from the Navy Department.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to say that this bill was covered very well by my colleague from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY]. The necessity for the bill is the construction program which has been authorized by the Congress. This bill does not immediately provide any increase to the 232,000. It merely authorizes the Navy to continue this orderly process of recruiting so that men will be available and trained as the ships are commissioned and require their crews. It has a provision that under the emergency the strength may go up to 300,000, if that becomes necessary. However, the increased officer strength will be based only on the 232,000, and the procurement of officers has been extended to include graduates of the R. O. T. C. naval course and to the new class of Reserves called V–7, who are college graduates who take 30 days' training at sea without pay and 90 days in one of a number of institutions established in our great universities or the Naval Academy for that purpose. It will permit us, in an orderly way, to procure and train both officers and men necessary for the expanding Navy as the ships are commissioned and require their crews. Of course, it is obvious that if we are to build our Navy into a two-ocean navy, we must provide men and officers as we provide the ships themselves.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if there are no other Members who desire to avail themselves of the opportunity to address the House under the rules and if there are no further questions to be asked, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 139 was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the address of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] today I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the address of my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT], I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the legislative business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a short letter from Sir Harry Lauder.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein short speeches by Hon. Homer M. Atkins, Governor of the State of Arkansas, and Mr. J. Hendrix Alphin, a representative of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. These speeches were delivered before a State-wide oil and gas proration hearing at Magnolia, Ark., on Friday, March 21, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Senator BANKHEAD in reference to a bill dealing with agriculture, S. 935, introduced by Senator BANKHEAD, and an accompanying digest of the bill by him, and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent editorial from the Binghamton Sun.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE NECESSITY OF ISSUING TREASURY NOTES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of February 1941 I introduced in this House, House Joint Resolution 117, which reads as follows:

Whereas the cost of financing the act known as the Lend Lease Act will probably reach the amount of $40,000,000,000 if we are to successfully protect the entire British Empire; and

Whereas there is no such amount of money in the Treasury of the United States and will not be for several years to come, and that any plan of financing the provisions of said act must necessarily, from past actions, contemplate the borrowing of this money upon interest-bearing bonds of the United States; and

Whereas the interest burden on the public debt is now close to one and one-half billion dollars annually and that the said Lend Lease Act will, through bonds, increase this interest charge until the total will approach $3,000,000,000 annually; and

Whereas it is all unnecessary to issue such bonds at all as is demonstrated by the Lincoln issue of greenbacks in 1861 to 1864: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Treasurer of the United States is authorized and directed to issue Treasury notes drawing no interest, and good for the payment of all debts, public and private, in such amounts as may be needed from time to time to finance the purposes set forth in said Lend Lease Act.

The purpose of this joint resolution has two objects in view: First, to prevent any interest charge on the billions we have already and will hereafter appropriate under the British-aid bill. The second purpose is to conclusively demonstrate that it is a delusion and abject ignorance for this Government to pay interest on its own credit.

There is just one fundamental issue involved in the so-called money question, and there is no occasion for anyone to say that the matter is in the least complicated. The propaganda against this change purposely endeavors to make the matter complicated. The only issue is this: Shall the Government of the United States take control of its own money and credit and regulate the value thereof or shall that power remain with the banking interests of the country, with power to contract the currency and cheapen the income of the workers, on the farms, and elsewhere?

During the dark days of the Rebellion, when it appeared that the Confederate States of America were too strong to be overcome, money was needed to carry on the war. At that time Abraham Lincoln said:

Of silver and gold the Treasury has none, and the banks refuse to lend me any.

Of course, I want it understood that the major bankers of this country have always been patriotic.

Continuing, Lincoln said:

Secretary Chase asks permission to coin the credit of the Government into money to buy food for the soldiers and pay them. I don't see what else we can do, so I recommend you let him try this plan.

The best offer the patriotic banks of the United States would make when the existence of our Nation was in the balance was: Six percent annual interest in addition to a 12-percent discount on the face of the bonds. In other words they would part with $88 providing they received at the end of the year $106. This return would be equivalent to 70 percent on the actual money loaned to the Government.

It might be interesting to know just what the bankers said about this situation at the time. I quote from their own private proceedings:

The chairman of this meeting, the president of a bank in Boston, opened the meeting by saying:

It is evident the Government is in a great strait for funds. It is equally evident that there is but one source of supply. It must borrow. It is an axiom of business that the lender, and not the borrower, should dictate the terms on which a loan is to be negotiated, that is, if the lender should consider it desirable to make the loan on any terms. We are businessmen. We have money to loan. The Government comes to us as a borrower. As businessmen we must treat the Government precisely as we would any other borrower. Why, we inquire what their assets and liabilities are, and for such other facts as bear on the question of whether or not they will be able to pay. If there is no doubt on that score, we let them have our money on liberal terms. But, if there is a doubt of their being able to pay, we refuse to discount their papers or we make the rates high enough to cover the risk as well as the discount. Now, gentlemen, the Government is insolvent. The public revenue is not sufficient to meet the ordinary public expenses. How then is it to meet the extraordinary expenses of a gigantic civil war?

Let me state here that the entire expense of the Civil War was $6,189,929,908.58 and compare that with the forty billions we expect to provide for Great Britain.

I fear I cannot do it. With the facts before me, I shall not invest a dollar of coin in Government bonds.

Of course, the bankers of large caliber have always been patriotic.

Yet, it will not do, gentlemen, for us to refuse outright to heed this appeal from our Government. Patriotism and business policy alike forbid that we turn deaf ears to this call for funds to put down the rebellion. What shall our policy be then? I answer, we shall lend our currency to the Government at a fair rate, say 12-percent discount on the bonds, and 6 percent annual interest. This, gentlemen, is the best terms on which my bank will take any part of the Government loan.

This statement was final and the other bankers arose and enthusiastically approved this speech.

This was the reason why Lincoln made the statement quoted above.

In view of this situation Congress was convened in special session July 4, 1861, and the Salmon P. Chase plan was enacted into law.

The Secretary was authorized to issue Treasury notes in the amount of $250,000,000 drawing $7\frac{3}{10}$ percent interest and $50,000,000 drawing no interest. Experience showed that the $250,000,000 issue

did not circulate for as soon as the banks got possession of them, they were hoarded for the harvest in interest. The $50,000,000 did circulate for the reason that the object of hoarding had been removed.

These greenbacks saved the day for the Union, and Lincoln asked Congress again for authority to issue more on the noninterest bearing issue.

At this point the bankers had another meeting—this time in the city of New York. Mr. Bullion, of Boston, was elected chairman of the meeting and delivered the following speech:

Gentlemen of the conference, I thank you for the honor you have conferred upon me in selecting me to preside over this august body; for it is an august body. I see before me the real rulers of this country, representatives of a class of men who constitute the power behind the throne in every civilized country on the globe. Since civilization dawned the men of money, the financiers, have held the destiny of nations in their hands, kings have bowed before them, and nations have paid tribute to them; empires have arisen and flourished under their smile, and perished before their frown.

Napoleon was victorious while he courted their power, but when he listened to the heresies of Couvier the mighty money power became the ally of Britain, and Napoleon was dethroned and sent into exile. The reign of the money kings threatened by those three infidels of the revolutionary period, Franklin, Paine, and Jefferson, but the great financier, Alexander Hamilton, stood so firmly by the old monetary system that Franklin's fiat paper money idea was swept aside, and Jefferson's opposition to the national bank scheme was of no avail when Washington threw his great influence in its favor.

Time would fail me were I to speak at length of the financial heresies of Jackson and Calhoun. But I cannot omit to note the similarity of the system of finance which they proposed, and the one which is now being urged before Congress. They advocated the use of Treasury notes instead of bank notes They used the specious and most dangerous argument, that the credit of the Nation is broader and every way better basis for paper money than the credit of a bank corporation, and that the value of money should be controlled by Congress, and not by the bankers. These twin heresies, gentlemen, are now, as never before, threatening the stability, aye, the existence of the monetary system we represent. Once the American people come to see that the Government can do its own banking; that a Treasury note is as good as a bank note, and even better, being equal to coin without redemption if made a full, legal tender; let this become obvious to the people and our reign is over, our occupation gone, our power to tax the business of the country ended.

Gentlemen, I am not an alarmist, I speak the words of soberness when I say to you that we stand face to face with the greatest danger that our craft has ever encountered. The issue must be met. That Treasury scheme must be defeated at any cost.

Fortunately for us, Congress is composed chiefly of lawyers, a class of men who know but little of political economy and finance, and who are accustomed to seeing but one side of a case, and that side upon which they have been retained. I am sure, gentlemen, you see my point.

Another circumstance in our favor is, that the officers of the Government, the editors of papers, the professors of political economy, the businessmen of the country, and the people at large look upon us as the chief repositories of financial wisdom. We ought, therefore, to be able to crush this plot of the Secretary to overthrow our power, not only, but to secure instead an adoption of a system of finance that shall increase our powers and profits beyond all precedent.

This speech was endorsed by the conference and a committee was appointed to go to Washington and see the Secretary of the Treasury. The committee called on Salmon P. Chase and requested that the bill be laid aside. The Secretary made this response:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gravity of the question under discussion is such that I shirk from the responsibility of giving you my views further than to say that the policy of issuing Treasury notes to meet public expenses was forced upon the Government by the bankers of this country. The experiment has been a success, and the plan is now so popular that I could not get Congress to lay aside this bill should I ask that that be done, and I could not bring myself to ask it. Your threat that in case of a continuance of this policy the banks you represent would refuse to lend this Government a dollar does not frighten me. It would have frightened me 8 months ago. But the success of the greenback experiment is so signal that I am strongly inclined to the opinion that we can get along famously without borrowing money from banks at ruinous rates of interest. But this bill is now in the Senate committee, and I suggest that you give that committee the benefits of your views.

On reaching the parlor at the Willard Hotel, the committee of bankers held a conference to consider the situation. The speech of Secretary Chase had frightened them almost into a panic.

But this committee knew its business, and while they could not defeat the bill they adroitly contrived an amendment to the bill that saved the day for them. This little harmless amendment was added to the bill:

Provided, That the notes provided for, and authorized by this act, shall be legal tender for all purposes, except duties on imports and interest on the public debt.

While in all Lincoln issued $550,000,000 in greenbacks, the last authorization of $200,000,000 had this innocent amendment attached to it. For this reason gold was required to pay duties on imports, and gold was required to pay the interest on the public debt. For these reasons those who controlled the gold—the bankers—had a class of money—gold—that was in great demand even though they could not reap a harvest on bank notes. The bankers had the gold, and as a result the premium on gold rose 100 percent. This was the real beginning of that infamous private control of money that has come down to us at this very moment.

Quoting Mr. Bland on this very conclusion, he says:

The result of the visit to Washington of that committee of bankers is partly seen in the panics that have wrecked the country and filled the land with millionaires, tramps, and paupers. It is seen, in part, in the millions of mortgaged homes. It is seen in the wealth and luxury of large classes of idlers and in the poverty and privation of the farmers and other classes of honest workers.

Lincoln evidently saw the danger of this money power, for he made the following statement:

I see in the near future a crisis arising which unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. The money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this time more anxious for my country than ever in the midst of war.

Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury, saw the situation all too well. Here is what he said:

My agency in procuring the passage of the National Bank Act was the greatest financial mistake of my life. It has built up a monopoly that offsets every interest in the country. It should be repealed. But before this can be accomplished the people will be arrayed on one side and the banks on the other in a contest such as we have never seen before in this country.

For fear that some may say that the illustrations I have picked out of the history of our past are too remote in time to be of any warning to us of the present day, let me go back only a short time and present to you from the year 1920 the same arguments of the bankers which brought about the great depression in 1920.

On May 18, 1920, the Federal Reserve Board met here in the city of Washington at a time when the business of the Nation was proceeding regularly in an effort to overcome the expense account of the World War. There was no occasion, whatever, for disturbing the tranquillity of business, but on that date the entire country was plunged in chaos, from which it has never recovered.

This Board proposed to raise the discount rates and by that means shut off borrowing by member banks. This, in turn, meant that borrowing banks would have to liquidate their paper. This, in turn, meant the liquidation of all loans and the forced sale of securities. In the farm belt this meant the forced sale of all agricultural products in order to meet obligations that could not be extended.

I want to cite here some of the arguments used by this Board at the time this conspiracy was executed. I quote now from the actual proceedings of the Federal Reserve Board. James A. Alexander, of New York, said:

There is one thing, I think, to be feared, and that is that if the transportation facilities are improved and commodities move freely and credits are thereby released, it may make a temporary ease in the money market and may encourage people to go ahead and expand. I believe now is the time to put up the rates and keep them up.

Mr. Robert Wardrop, of the Cleveland Reserve Bank, said:

I think a reasonable depression in business will be a good thing for the country. I really think we would do better if we could get down to a lower basis, a different basis, and then from that we can work up again.

Mr. John Perrin, of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, said:

The way to meet this problem is to bring about in the next 3 or 4 months a definite amount of contraction, say a 10-percent contraction. That would bring in about $2,000,000,000.

In spite of the warnings given by several members of the Board, that the plan to contract credit would ruin the country, especially the agricultural belt, the board inaugurated the plan that cast

this country into the pit of the depression. John Skelton Williams, then Comptroller of the Currency, and Wesley McDowell, of North Dakota, pointed out what the result of this action would be on agriculture, but these warnings were of no avail.

We saw what happened in the agricultural belt. Livestock was dumped at any price in order to meet loans; wheat was sold down and down in the mad scramble to meet payments that never should have been demanded. In this contraction of $2,000,000,000 it fell the heaviest on the agricultural class for it takes money and plenty of it to market crops in an orderly way.

County banks started closing, not by tens but by hundreds; businessmen were left holding obligations of farmers that were never paid; individuals lost their life savings which they had placed in banks; and the depression swept the Middle West like a prairie fire. By 1929 business straightened up in the East by artificial means, but it is a fact that the depression in which we still find ourselves was started in 1920 and we have not come out of it.

Was there any occasion for this drastic action? None whatever except the private bankers of the country wanted to bring on a depression because they frankly said "there was too much business."

Do we want to allow the private banking interests of the country to longer control the Nation's credit? Do we longer want them to fix the value of money, as they did in 1920?

I say to you that this unauthorized control of the Nation's credit can be wiped off the face of the earth by the issuance of our own money. This Government can do its own banking business as has been demonstrated by the greenback experiment. At this time, when we are appropriating billions for aid to other countries, and perhaps, as a result, will have to spend other billions for our own defense, should there be any hesitation in doing our own banking business? Why should this Government be so simple-minded as to pay interest charges to those who simply loan us our own money? What is back of a bond that is not back of a Treasury note? Can anyone in the United States answer this question? If a Treasury note is not good, is a bond any better? The only difference between the two is that a bond draws interest and a Treasury note does not. Should we not stop this interest loot now, when we are engaged in a superhuman effort to defend the democracies of the world? Should we not take control of our own money now and let every dollar expended be a dollar's worth of defense, unfettered by interest charges?

Are we about to engage in a gigantic plan of defending world democracies or in saving international bankers? To absolutely refute this indictment of saving international bankers, the best way to show it is to take over our own monetary policy and fix the value of a dollar by the Congress. If we are not about to fight in the defense of a bankers' war, let us quickly say so to the people of the United States. We can say so by disconnecting the private banking interest of the United States from their interest-taking system and unfettered control of public funds and public credit. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given an additional minute so that I may ask a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has stated that it would cost the country in his opinion in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 to finance this war, is that correct?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right. That is my estimate.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have an indebtedness now approximating $50,000,000,000.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We will have a total indebtedness then of around ninety to one hundred billion dollars before we get through with this?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If we do not do something about this interest matter; in other words, if we go on as we are now, the Government will be paying from two to three billion dollars a year for interest?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right. It is paying one and one-half billion right now.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If we increase the debt an equal amount to what we now owe, it will mean practically a twofold increase in the interest burden?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With an interest on our indebtedness now of two or three billion dollars a year, it simply calls for something to be done about financing the Government's debts?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement by Booth Tarkington, of Indianapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

W. P. A. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, I was greatly surprised to find that the Congressman from the Thirteenth District of Missouri made a statement referring to me in a very uncomplimentary manner. My colleague said, and I quote:

> We have had one relief bill since he has been here, and he tried by amendment to strike millions of dollars from that bill that would have deprived tens of thousands of people of employment on W. P. A.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing in the RECORD to justify such a statement. It is pure demagogery and was doubtless made for the purpose of injuring me politically. I resent it. Here are the facts. On February 12 I offered amendment to the W. P. A. deficiency bill whereby I sought to strike out $34,105,000 allowed for W. P. A. salaries during March, April, May, and June and insert in lieu thereof $25,000,000. That amendment would not have deprived a W. P. A. worker of one penny, whereas the gentleman from St. Louis on Friday said that it would have deprived tens of thousands of W. P. A. workers of employment. On February 12 the same gentleman, speaking in opposition to the amendment offered by me, said—I quote:

> Only about 3 percent of the money spent in St. Louis for W. P. A. is for administrative employees.

If that statement is true, then why would he object to $25,000,000 for administrative purposes, whereas 3 percent of the $375,000,000 provided in the bill amounts to much less than half the sum that my amendment provided for administrative purposes. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I have never tried to take one penny away from the deserving poor. I do resent the fact that this administration is playing politics with human misery and that much of the money that should go to the deserving poor goes into the pockets of political pets.

Mr. Speaker, the people who elected me to Congress sent me here as their Representative, not the representative of this administration or the New Deal. They did not want a "rubber stamp" or a "yes" man. During my membership here I propose to be neither. It was with this resolution in mind that, on February 12, while in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, considering H. R. 3204, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1941, I offered an amendment to cut the salaries of the administrative personnel in the Work Projects Administration from $34,000,000 to $25,000,000 in the 4-month period from March 1 to July 1, 1941.

This amendment was not directed at the deserving poor or the needy unemployed. It was directed at the administration pets and the political leeches that by underground methods have found places upon the public pay rolls, without any consideration whatsoever as to their need for or advisability of their participation in the public-relief jackpot.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last man in the world to condemn either the objectives or the directors of the present or past W. P. A. activities. But I do believe that in the past the W. P. A. has been the haven and sanctuary of the greatest aggregation of political "chiselers" that has ever been assembled in the world's history.

The record in our State—Missouri—is particularly unsavory.

I recall that as early as 1936 we had a few scandals in the State. On September 21, 1937, one A. R. Hendricks, a chicken thief, who had served as a district director of W. P. A., was convicted of pay-roll padding and sentenced to 6 months in the Buchanan County jail and fined $100 by Federal Judge Merrill E. Otis. There were many other irregularities, and small wonder, for only last week the former W. P. A. director for the State of Missouri, Matt E. Murray, began serving a term in a Federal penitentiary, after having been convicted on the charge of evading income-tax payments amounting to many thousands of dollars. Murray, of course, was one of the key men, placed in the top position by the notorious Tom Pendergast, formerly head of the Democratic machine in Kansas City. No Member of Congress who has taken the time to read the hearing and report in the investigation of the Works Progress Administration during the Seventy-sixth Congress would come forward with a blanket endorsement of what has heretofore occurred; neither should any Member attempt to criticize every project that has been undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, when on February 12, I offered an amendment to reduce the sum allowed for official salaries from thirty-four million plus, to twenty-five million dollars, I stated that far too much money appropriated for the deserving poor found its way into the pockets of political pets. I further declared that, except in those rare cases where it might not be possible, because of necessary professional training, all W. P. A. foremen, timekeepers, and other white-collar workers should be taken from the relief rolls rather than from a list of the politically influential.

I think that Members of the Congress will be interested to know that as a result of offering that amendment and making some remarks in support of it, I have learned that the entire Nation is aroused by reason of the political favoritism shown in administration of the W. P. A. While the Associated Press carried a story about my fight for the amendment proposed, enough letters have come from distant points to convince me that the people are also reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is mailed by Members of this body to every community in the Nation.

Stories of political favoritism have come to me from such distant points as Seattle, San Francisco, Miami, New Orleans, and Chicago, while a very great number have come from my own State and district. The whole W. P. A. set-up in many States is rotten to the core, and if any Member wants evidence to support this statement, I have it in my office files. While I could quote numerous letters from various States, I shall not burden the RECORD. However, I shall with permission of the House, insert in the RECORD just as a typical example of what is being done, a letter and a memo addressed to me and backed by an affidavit from Minneapolis, Minn., giving facts concerning the employment of a 77-year-old woman at approximately $200 per month out of W. P. A. funds, notwithstanding that said woman appears to be financially well-to-do and receives a monthly pension of $162. I dare say there are thousands of needy women in Minneapolis who could do the job assigned to this maiden of 77 summers, much better than she can do it. The trouble is, the poor mothers and widows do not have political pull.

Mr. President, it is high time that this body should make good the President's promise that all nondefense expenditures would be drastically reduced, and that "no politics will be played with human misery."

Evidently the present managers of the W. P. A. set-up are still laboring under the mistaken notion of the Colonel House of this administration—the star boarder at the White House—Harry Hopkins, who when head of the W. P. A. declared that, "The people are too damn dumb to understand."

Mr. Speaker, my correspondence proves that the people do understand and that they are thoroughly aroused and alarmed by this Nation's swift decline.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 4, 1941.*

Hon. PHILIP A. BENNETT,
Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED SIR: We read in our February 20 issue of the Fairmont Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn., a most interesting, and may we say, inspiring, account, of your stand in which you hold that "too much of the taxpayers' money appropriated by Congress for the benefit of the unemployed and deserving poor goes into the pockets of political pets," or words to this general effect.

This corporation, together with the International Humane Education Foundation, Inc., and others, would like to do something to put a stop to the skulduggery, waste, and extravagance. We wish you would put us on your mail list for whatever you issue. We would like to see you undertake a movement to eradicate the evils on W. P. A. They are pretty bad, almost beyond redemption. For one thing there should be no nonrelief employees, or brass hats. The way to stop that would be to make the places less attractive by drastically cutting the salaries, halving them in most cases. We invite your attention to enclosures and particularly the affidavit and memo in the outrageous Countryman case.

Respectfully,
TRUMAN T. PIERSON, *President,*
Minnesota Grand Jurors Associated.

MINNESOTA GRAND JURORS ASSOCIATED,
Minneapolis, March 4, 1941.

MEMO TO CONGRESSMAN HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI

DEAR MR. BENNETT: Herewith a brief statement of facts supported with an affidavit in regard to the case of (Miss) Gratia Countryman, an estimable lady, but by no possible stretch of the imagination an eligible person to W. P. A. insofar as we understand that set-up.

Miss Countryman is in her seventy-seventh year. She retired nearly 7 years ago at 70 and draws pension of $162 per month. In 1938, August 19, some person, we believe it was one Mrs. Cora Sundell Fridley, herself much out of place as a W. P. A. executive, had a hand in having Miss Countryman appointed to W. P. A. Since Miss Countryman had served the city some 48 years at good pay, for many years $6,000 per year, it is said that she was well-to-do and enjoys an income considerable from private sources. Of that we will not say at this time. The third district, Minneapolis, office today (March 4) stated that Miss Countryman, despite her age, was given a classification, by Mrs. Fridley, as B-Supt. stipend $2,400. And she was in her seventy-fifth year then.

Disregarding her income from investments, etc., thanks to W. P. A., the agency of humanity to relieve unemployment, by adding $2,400 per annum to the young lady's pension of $1,944, gave her a net cash income of $4,344.

June 22, 1940, Mrs. Cora Sundell Fridley, Director of the Womens and Professional Division, again classified Miss Countryman, who was stepping into the vigorous 77-year-old class, and Miss Countryman took over as superintendent of the newspaper indexing project, Minneapolis, at $2,306. You will note this was a slight cut of $34 per annum. Nevertheless, it gives her a monthly income of $359.16, plus her private income from other sources, so that although she lays off quite a bit because of illness and indisposition common to people who have passed well on past their three score and ten of allotted years, she is doing pretty well. Even those who work for her point out that she draws five and six times as much as they do, which is why they are underfed, undernourished, and pretty much fed up on W. P. A. skulduggery that permits such un-Godly business.

Your article only told part of the truth of the evil of W. P. A. Ward heelers, politicians, career men and women, cigarette-smoking, rum-guzzling opportunists, soft soapers, petty grafters, chiselers, they get in anywhere, it seems, but for God's sake why tolerate them on W. P. A., and why put at the head of W. P. A. the kind of talent that stands for such? Throw out the aardvarks, gunnels, and gunards. W. P. A., as constituted, needs a revamping. Mostly the fault is with the brass-hat men and women, but there is also faulty business on the relief end of it, and these, together with the brass hats in error, make of the whole a pretty smelly mess.

We commend to your attention the Fairmont Sentinel, Doc Yak article on W. P. A., and urge you to read it to get a slant from still another direction. We will be glad to furnish other facts.

TRUMAN T. PIERSON,
President, Minnesota Grand Jurors Association, Inc.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Hennepin,
City of Minneapolis, ss:

Truman T. Pierson, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that the statements hereto attached were by him obtained personally from facts and sources named, to wit:

1. House Appropriations Committee of the Congress of the United States of America, through a Member of the Senate (March 1, 1941).

2. The Minneapolis Municipal Employees' Retirement Board, Minneapolis City Hall, No. 349½ (Peterson) (March 3, 1941).

3. Minnesota State office, W. P. A., St. Paul (March 4, 1941).

4. W. P. A. Newspaper Index Project, old Trudeau School, Ninth Avenue and Fourth Street SE. (March 4, 1941).

5. P. & S. Division and Personnel, St. Paul office, W. P. A. (March 4, 1941) and District Office No. 3, Mrs. Fridley in charge women's and professional division.

Deponent further states on oath that to the best of his knowledge and belief these statements are correct and true, and where not told directly to him he believes them to be true in accord with the record from which taken.

TRUMAN T. PIERSON.

Sworn and subscribed to before me, this 4th day of March 1941.

A. A. CARLSON,
Deputy Clerk of District Court,
Hennepin County, Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am the guilty one. It so happens that I am the one who made the remarks. I am the demagogue. Those remarks, coming as they do from the other side of the aisle, I do not mind. As I told the gentleman from Kansas the other day, I can take them. Let us see now who is the demagogue.

I made a statement that I refuse to retract, because it is the truth, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a minute I will yield if I have the time. I have only 5 minutes. I did not bother the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman read the RECORD?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am going to read it right now.

Page 922 of the RECORD of February 12, in the first column, reads as follows:

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: In line 23, page 3, strike out '$34,105,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$25,000,000'."

A little more than $9,000,000 the gentleman sought to take away from the W. P. A. appropriation, not for 12 months, not for 6 month, but for the balance of the fiscal year, which ends June 30. If the gentleman will multiply the amount he sought to reduce this appropriation by three, he will find the reduction for 1 fiscal year would be approximately $28,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I said that a little over 3 percent of the money spent for W. P. A. in St. Louis was for administrative expenditures. If the gentleman will make an investigation, he will find that approximately 50 percent of the people holding positions classed as administrative are certified people; men with families, men with wives and children, widows with children. When you take that money away from them you take it away from the poor, because the certified people are surely in that class.

The gentleman says he is no New Dealer. I know he is no New Dealer. I never expected him to be. I will say to the gentleman that the Social Security Act which the New Deal has passed is some of the legislation that I am very proud of, including the appropriations for W. P. A., which are to take care of the millions of people who found themselves out of jobs when your Republican administration went out of office in March 1933.

Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no apologies to make for the statement to which the gentleman refers, that I made last Friday. The RECORD speaks for itself.

I do not know what happened in his part of the State of Missouri, but I do know what happened in the city of St. Louis. I defy the gentleman to enumerate any scandals in the operations of W. P. A. in St. Louis since its inception.

It so happens that I did not even know the man who is now the W. P. A. Administrator in St. Louis when he was appointed. I had never met his predecessor before he was appointed, who unfortunately dropped dead while on duty. I had nothing to do with their appointment. I have not tried to put any politics in W. P. A. But when you say that you are taking $9,000,000 from an appropriation of $34,000,000 over a period of a few months, and that you are not depriving any poor of their jobs, I say to the gentleman that he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not a fact that the bill in question provided $375,000,000 for the W. P. A.?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not a fact that the $34,105,000 was only for official salaries?

Mr. COCHRAN. For administrative expenditures. I told the gentleman that the administrative expenditures would cover approximately 50 percent of certified people. I know what the gentleman has in his hand. He does not need to show me papers about one individual out of millions who was arrested and convicted. That man should have been convicted. As far as I am concerned the judge could have given him twice the sentence that he did give him and I would never complain. So the gentleman does not need to complain about what one individual might have done. Further that case was not a St. Louis case.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman come to my office and let me show him a list of W. P. A. crooks? I have them from all over the Nation.

Mr. COCHRAN. From all over the Nation?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am coming over to look at them. I want to see them. This is a mighty big Nation and I want to see what you have from all over the Nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article relative to income taxes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the question of economic freedom is all-important to all American workers and to all sincerely interested in the welfare of our country. Economic freedom means the securing of or the holding of a job at fair wages. This matter is of special concern to skilled workers who have invested 5 or more years of their lives in acquiring the necessary craftsmanship or skill.

Another question of vital concern to all of us is the continued freedom of the press, free from any outside control or influence.

Both of these subjects are dealt with in a highly informative manner in a letter which I recently received from the president of the International Allied Printing Trades Association. This association is composed of the five national printing-trades unions.

I wish to insert at this point in my remarks the letter which I have just referred to, and sincerely hope that the contents of the letter will be given consideration by all Members of the House. [Applause.]

INTERNATIONAL ALLIED PRINTING TRADES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1941.

SIR: The following open letter, while self-explanatory, deals with the highly important subject of:

Can we continue to maintain a free press if the sustenance of such free press, advertising, is to be continually diverted to radio broadcasting?

Most newspapers, magazines, and periodicals have found it necessary to cut corners to continue in existence, while printing trades workers are today receiving less, in yearly compensation, than they did in 1929. Official reports of radio broadcasting stations show net profits averaging, over a period of years yearly net profits in excess of 60 percent. One network is paying yearly dividends of more than 200 percent on the actual cash invested.

My attention has been called to the joint efforts of a few advertising agencies, working with the radio monopolists, seeking to mislead publishers that a tax on gross incomes of radio stations may lead to a similar tax on publications. Naturally, those few advertising agencies, which have netted many millions more in dollars from radio advertising than was possible through placing the same business with publications can be expected to join with those who control the networks.

The undersigned will greatly appreciate your comment upon the attached statement of facts and such suggestions, in the way of improvement of the program adopted by the printing trades unions, as you believe will help to correct conditions which all must admit cannot continue if we are to have a free press in America.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. HAGGERTY,
President.

To the Publishers of Editor & Publisher, Printer's Ink, and Wall Street Journal:

GENTLEMEN: Your publication recently took occasion to oppose or severely criticize recommendations which this organization has put forth in the hope of maintaining a free press, of protecting the job opportunities of those dependent upon the success of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical industry, as well as making it possible for the employers in those industries to secure a fair return upon their investments.

In view of the following facts, taken from governmental and radio trade sources, may I respectfully request of you some program of a realistic nature, in place of the program adopted by this organization, which you oppose.

Governmental reports show that while the yearly wages of many skilled tradesmen have substantially increased for 1939 over the yearly wages paid in 1929, the workers in the newspaper, magazine, and periodical industry received, in 1939, $284, or 15 percent less than they received in 1929; that there were in 1939, the last year for which governmental

figures are available, 1,656 fewer publishing plants where printing trades workers might secure or hold jobs; that the value added to the product of printing trades workers in 1939 was some $1,700, or 15 percent less than that which prevailed in 1929, thus providing less revenue for the employer to use for the workers' pay roll, materials, taxes, and profit; that the cost of materials, per worker, used in the printing and publishing industry, in 1939, was $406, or some 13½ percent higher than in 1929; that, in many instances, to make possible the continued publication the sales price of newspapers and magazines has been increased as high as 50 percent, thus transferring to the readers the costs previously derived from revenues from advertising which has been diverted to radio broadcasting.

We contend that there is a real difference between radio broadcasting and the publishing of a newspaper, magazine, or periodical. There are publications wherein the readers pay the entire costs of such publications. In other words, there are publications which do not carry any advertising and are wholly supported by the readers. No commercial radio broadcasting station at present operates other than those which are dependent upon advertising as their source of revenue and profits.

The real freedom of the press will continue only so long as newspaper, magazine, and periodical advertising is available at a fair price, or the reading public will agree to pay for such publications a price which will meet the costs otherwise met by advertising. The real freedom of the press is jeopardized when we find 294 publishers, in many cases, forced, through unfair competitive conditions in their trade areas, to purchase, at heavy costs, radio stations, thus becoming dependent upon the good will of a governmental agency to protect these investments, and, in order to insure the continued value of these radio investments, possibly subservient, even in their newspaper columns, to the wishes of a controlling and dominating governmental agency

May we ask that you name some other governmental franchise holders who have yearly profited, as a class or a group, to the extent of a yearly net average of more than 60 percent on their cash investments? Also, that you suggest the names of other governmental franchise holders, who pay nothing to the Government for such monopolistic grants as a radio broadcasting license, and, who do not pay a substantial excise tax, in addition to other governmental taxes? Radio-broadcast stations pay nothing to the Government for the monopolistic licenses which make possible yearly profits as high as 250 percent net on their cash investments.

Is it possible that your publication is unaware of the rebates and the granting of special discounts, as well as the sizeable discounts—as high as 50 percent—allowed to national advertisers and advertising agencies to promote radio advertising?

Is it possible that your publication is unaware that rebates and special discounts prevail in radio advertising? That "rebate to be 12½ percent of the gross billing (after deduction of special blue discounts, if any)" and "a discount of 25 percent in lieu of weekly quantity discounts and annual rebates will be allowed currently to advertisers whose contracted gross billings equal $1,500,000 within a 12-month fiscal year." Weekly discounts and rebates of 12½ percent and annual rebates of 25 percent are also allowed advertisers on the red network. Also, "All network contracts for the same advertiser may be combined in computing discounts." We have not referred to the additional discounts or commissions which the advertising agencies receive from artists who participate in such network programs. The Federal Communications Commission's committee investigating radio monopoly recently reported that 90 percent of the programs broadcast over the networks are built by advertising agencies.

Is it possible that advertising agencies, aware of the rebates paid by the networks, with the further privilege of combining expenditures in computing discounts, do not become the direct purchasers of radio time, passing on the network listed costs to their advertising clients, thus, retaining for themselves the million of dollars annually paid by the networks in the form of discounts and rebates?

Illustrative of the under-the-table dealing and rebating which has resulted in diverting advertising from the printed page to radio broadcasting is found in the contract between the Columbia Broadcasting System and Paramount Pictures wherein Columbia agreed to provide Paramount with 260 nighttime hours of coast-to-coast network broadcasting, other than on Saturday, at the net cost to Columbia.

Is there no significance in the fact 15 advertising agencies listed more than 70 percent of total network advertising in 1940; that 12 advertising agencies, with total billings of $33,701,412, in 1940 (65 percent of the total network billings), qualified for the 25-percent annual rebate from National Broadcasting Co., dividing among themselves proportionately a net of many millions of dollars more than they would have received had they placed such advertising in newspapers, magazines, and periodicals; that 5 additional advertising agencies, with listings of $5,733,927, in 1940, most likely qualified for National Broadcasting Co.'s weekly rebate of 12½ percent?

Is there no significance in the fact that reports show that less than one-half of 1 percent of radio network advertising is placed direct; that advertising agencies collect commissions from a minimum of 15 percent to possibly 40 percent of the advertising dollar spent for 99½ percent of the advertising placed on the networks?

Might we also suggest that you point out, if possible, any class or group of publications which has netted, as has the Columbia Broadcasting System, more than 200 percent yearly in profits. Other instances might be cited.

While official reports of the 705 radio stations show yearly net profits of more than 60 percent, and, while one network yearly distributes dividends of more than 200 percent on invested capital, we find that these 705 stations reported officially to the Federal Communications Commission they employed, for a typical week of October 1939, on full and part time, a total of 2,175 executives, at an average weekly salary of $77.32, and 17,431 wage workers. These wage workers received average weekly wages as follows: 3,158 highly skilled electrical operators $37.73; 2,768 staff musicians $37.74; 594 writers $31.53; 2,191 other artists $27.42; 1,836 miscellaneous workers $21.53; and 1,580 clerks and stenographers $20.53. It is interesting to note that 15 electrical operators, 44 staff musicians, 15 writers, 144 other artists, 102 miscellaneous workers, and 15 clerks and stenographers were not compensated for their services.

Realizing fully that your publication, dependent as it is upon the continued success of the American publishing industry, is desirous of helping to maintain and to insure the freedom of the press, as we are, and, mindful of the fact that we are all fallible, we sincerely trust that your publication will be able to suggest some other course which will make possible that which we all seek, namely, the continued freedom of the press from either governmental or other outside influence, and, at the same time, the employment at fair wages and under fair working conditions of those workers dependent upon the publishing industry for a livelihood, with a fair return to those who have invested their capital in such publications.

Trusting that we may be favored with a prompt response to this inquiry,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. HAGGERTY,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the letter to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN PEANUTS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is interested; and he is here?

Mr. PACE. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 3, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "90" and insert the figures "95"; on page 4, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the word "of" and insert the word "on"; on page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 and insert "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota with respect to the crop of peanuts produced in the calendar year 1941 equal to the minimum quota provided for said year in subsection (a) hereof and shall provide for the holding of a referendum on such quota within thirty days after the date upon which this Act becomes effective, and the State and farm acreage allotments established under the 1941 agricultural conservation program shall be the State and farm acreage allotments for the 1941 crop of peanuts"; on page 5, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "90" and insert the figures "95", on page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the period after the word "year", insert a semi-colon and strike out the following sentence "In the distribution of such increase of 2 per centum, preference shall be given to the claims of new producers" and insert "Provided, in the distribution of such increases based on such excess acreage the total allotments established for new farms shall not be less than fifty per centum of such increases"; on page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendment after the word "basis" in line 10, insert "of the formula used in determining the parity price

of peanuts as"; and on page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendment strike out all of lines 17, 18, 19, and 20; on page 10, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the figures "52" and insert the figures "50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

H. P. FULMER,
WALL DOXEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HATTIE W. CARAWAY,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out the entire House bill and substituted as one amendment a new bill. However, the House bill and the Senate amendment are substantially the same. The Senate amendment restores to the bill an authorization for a diversion program.

The bill as it passed the House provided that neither the national acreage allotment nor the acreage allotments for any State could in the future be less than 95 percent of the 1941 allotments. The Senate amendment provides 90 instead of 95 percent, which we are advised was a typographical error, and the conferees agree to 95 percent as provided in the House bill. Another typographical error in the Senate amendment uses the word "of" when it should be "on" and that is corrected.

Section 358 fixes the acreage allotment for 1941 at 1,610,000 acres. The bill as passed in the House provides that the Secretary shall proclaim as the national marketing quota for 1941 a quantity of peanuts sufficient to provide an acreage in that amount. The Senate amendment merely provides that the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for 1941 without specifically stating the amount. The House language is substituted for the Senate language.

Both bills contain a provision that not to exceed 2 percent of the national acreage allotment for each year shall be provided for new farms. The Senate bill provides that in the distribution of this 2 percent preference should be given to the claims of the new producers. In lieu of that language, the conferees have agreed to an amendment providing that in the distribution of such increases, the allotments for new farms shall not be less than 50 percent of such increase.

The Senate bill provides that parity price of peanuts shall be on the basis now published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the conferees agreed that instead of the word "basis", the amendment should read "basis of the formula used."

The Senate bill authorizes loans at rates of not less than 52 percent of the parity price and the conferees agree to reduce this minimum to 50 percent.

H. P. FULMER,
WALL DOXEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the conferees. Unless there are some questions, I shall move the previous question.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I believe the gentleman should give a brief explanation of the conference report. One or two changes have been made, and I think they should be explained to the House.

Mr. PACE. The majority of the changes are entirely clerical, representing correction of language. The only substantial change made by the Senate was to authorize diversion of the program. In the bill, as passed by the House, loans were authorized from 52 percent to 75 percent of parity. The conferees agreed to reduce the minimum figure from 52 percent to 50 percent, which will have the effect of authorizing a lesser loan than was authorized by the bill as passed the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the completion of the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program and any matters on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FITZGERALD, for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. FORAND, indefinitely, on account of illness of his mother.

THE DEFENSE PROGRAM—A GOLD MINE FOR THE GRAFTERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently all the grafters, the professionals, and the amateurs, who tried to grow rich out of prohibition, like vultures and hyenas, are taking advantage of the national apprehension and the workers' necessity to raid the National Treasury, increase the cost of national defense, and take the necessities of life from the families of loyal Americans who would work in defense of their country. The safety of our country means nothing to these racketeers, who are harbored and housed by both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.

EXPLOITING MEMBERS OF RIVAL UNIONS

Long have some labor leaders traded on, and benefited by, every man's sympathy for and desire to help those who earn a livelihood through physical toil. Digging up and robbing the dead, buried in a cemetery, is a mild and comparatively harmless pastime as compared with these hyenas and vultures who know neither humanity nor patriotism. Bloodsuckers and leeches, they not only weaken the Nation as a whole but they would, if they could, suck the very blood from the veins of those who must work if they would eat. And they prey upon the members of rival unions as relentlessly as upon nonunion men.

CONGRESS REFUSES TO SUPPLY REMEDY

For months this vicious and detestable thing has been carried on in a wholesale manner. A bill to stop this practice was offered by me so long ago—November 25, 1940—that it seems ancient history. It was reintroduced on January 10.

If any Member of this House is unaware of the practice or the remedy offered, it is not my fault. The press from day to day has carried news of the evidence of the racketeering as it spread from place to place. At last editors of the great dailies have decided that even loyalty to this administration will not permit them to remain silent while the very foundation of the Nation is undermined. The Sunday papers, almost without exception, commented upon the situation editorially.

INVESTIGATION RESOLUTION WEDNESDAY

Wednesday next the Rules Committee of the House will have an opportunity to pass upon a resolution which was offered asking for an investigation of the situation here in the District. That resolution should be extended to cover at least Maryland and Virginia, and it is my hope that the Members of the House will support that resolution before the commit-

tee and later on the floor if favorable action is taken.

THE SIZE OF THE LABOR RACKETEERS' KITTY

In order that the memory of the Members may again be refreshed, I once more call attention to the charge of the C. I. O. made November 20 last, that 4,500 workers had filed application for employment at Camp Grant, and that the A. F. of L. was using the opportunity to strive for a $350,000 jack pot to be collected from those applicants for work.

Your attention is directed again to the report that at Camp Edwards the New Bedford Carpenters' Union had collected $262,000 from workers on a defense project and was quarreling over the disposition of the funds. Their activities interfered with, at a union mass meeting came the shout, "If the Army is going to fight us and gyp us out of our living, then we'll fight the Army."

Yesterday came the editorials based on the story of Byron Darnton, of the New York Times, printed Saturday, making the charge that officers at Camp Meade said that some $400,000 had been collected from workers at Fort Meade on that defense project.

A NOTICE DIRECT FROM HEADQUARTERS

Mr. Darnton printed in full the notice to all field workers, copy of which I received some time ago.

That you labor under no delusion as to what some of these organizations are up to, that notice is herein printed in full. It reads:

NOTICE TO ALL FIELD WORKERS

1. It is desired to inform all men in the field that the Consolidated Engineering Co. is a union company and, therefore, all field men, skilled and unskilled, are requested to belong to their respective unions.

2. All men who fail to keep up their good standing in their respective unions by failing to pay their dues, will be subject to dismissal.

3. All union dues will be collected at either the trade-union headquarters in Baltimore, or at the Union Building located on Annapolis Road, off post reservation on the following days and hours:

Carpenters: Monday to Saturday, inclusive, after 4:30 p. m.

Laborers: Monday to Saturday, inclusive, after 4:30 p. m. at union office on Annapolis Road, or union office in Baltimore, Md., from 8 a. m. to 5 p. m. Monday to Thursday, and Friday to 9 p. m.

4. When you pay your union dues, request a regular union receipt for your money, and when total amount of initiation fee is paid, be sure to get regular union card.

5. Dues will be accepted at the union office located on opposite side of Annapolis Road only during the hours listed above, and any worker caught leaving the job to pay his dues during working hours, will be dismissed.

6. Authorized union delegates who show their credentials are authorized to request you to show your union card, or work button. Show either card or button when requested to do so by authorized delegate.

7. Union delegates are not allowed to threaten, annoy, enter into discussion with, or take a worker's button away from him. They are not permitted to collect dues from men during working hours. Officials of the Consolidated Engineering Co. only are authorized to discharge you from this job.

8. Initiation fees and weekly dues are as follows:

Carpenters' union: Full fee: $57.50 entitles man to union card and full membership. If paid in installments: Down payment of $23.50; $8.50 each week thereafter until full amount of $57.50 has been paid. Monthly dues are $2.

Laborers' union: Full fee: $25 entitles worker to union card and full membership. If paid in installments: $5 each week for 5 weeks until total of $25 is paid. Monthly dues are $1.50.

9. Failure to remain in good standing with your union local will result in your being discharged and, once discharged, you will not be rehired.

HAROLD DREHER,
Project Manager, Consolidated Engineering Co.

WERE WE FOOLED AGAIN?

Read again paragraph 9. As you have sat here in this House and voted billions of dollars for national defense, did you have the remotest idea that before your constituents could earn a part of that money by working on national defense, they would have to kick in to a union racketeer? Of course, you did not, and now is the time for Congress to let not only the unions, the people of the United States, but the whole world know that here in America there is, at times at least, equality of opportunity.

MICHIGAN'S OPPORTUNITY

The people of Michigan believe in national defense, but they do not want to be dragged into World War No. 2.

That they are being taken into this war, despite their protests, notwithstanding the fact that every Michigan Congressman—Democrat as well as Republican—voted against the conscription bill, is becoming a certainty.

When this administration insists upon an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 to make and to carry on a war wherever in the whole world the President may choose to wage war, there can no longer be any doubt of the President's intentions. It matters very little what he has said or what he may say. You, as well as I, know from past experience how much, if any, reliance can be placed upon his word.

It is a fact that he has asked, and has received, from Congress funds to raise and equip an army of 4,000,000 men. No one believes for one moment that such an army is needed for defense. It could be used to send an army across the sea. Since Churchill made his remark that men would not be needed this year, an English statesman has said that England did need men.

American liners are being transformed into troop ships. Certainly, American ships should not be used to transport English or Canadian soldiers. Does anyone doubt that they are to be used to take American men to a European or Asiatic war?

The administration's forces in Congress have several times defeated proposed amendments to the Lend-Lease Act, and to an appropriation act, which would deny to the President the power to send American men to fight on foreign soil. If the President does not intend to send them there for that purpose, why does he want the power?

You know very well that here, while we are supposedly preparing for national defense, the President has done nothing of any consequence to hinder or prevent the Communists and the labor racketeers who are delaying and making our national-defense program excessively costly.

Without effective protest, he permits Sidney Hillman, of the National Defense Council; Madam Perkins; and other administrative officials to continue their efforts to wreck Henry Ford and the Ford Motor Co., to compel every American worker to pay for the privilege of working in national defense.

By his failure to act, he has lent support to the procedure of Harold Christoffel, an avowed Communist, shown to be such by testimony offered before the Dies committee, to keep closed for 61 days the Allis-Chalmers plant at West Allis, Milwaukee, Wis., when he and other officials of the administration know full well that the Navy is depending upon that company to furnish the material, the nondelivery of which is hampering the Navy program.

He knows that that strike has held up the delivery of machinery which is necessary for the operation of the Government's powder plant at Radford, Va.

More than a million dollars, with this administration's consent, has been collected by labor racketeers from men who want jobs at Government camps and elsewhere on the defense program.

There is an election in Michigan on April 7 and Michigan citizens will have an opportunity to make what may be their last protest against entering this war. Senators and Congressmen watch elections. Many are influenced by the returns, for they know that sooner or later they must go before their constituents to give an account of their stewardship.

If Michigan citizens will return an overwhelming majority against the Democratic State administration, which is a part of the Federal machine, Congressmen throughout the land will sit up and take notice and, to some extent at least, be guided accordingly.

At least one editor of Michigan, William Berkey, who publishes the Cassopolis Vigilant at Cassopolis, in southwestern Michigan, is aware of the situation. Note this editorial from his issue of March 20. He writes:

We know that ordinarily a very large number of people do not take the trouble to go to spring elections, feeling that such elections are not very important. Well, folks, if you are in the habit of feeling that way, don't feel that way this spring, for the election on April 7 is of unusual importance, and here is one reason:

Michigan is the first great State to hold an election since the passage of the President's lease-lend bill, which gave him dictatorial powers, and if Michigan goes Democratic on April 7, President Roosevelt will immediately construe it as approval of his course, and it will encourage him to go still further on his course leading us toward war. If you do not approve that course, if you do not favor the growing burden of taxes and debt, if you do not favor conscription of your boys to fight (you do not know where), and if you do not favor giving to one man the power to give away our armament and naval defenses, you should be willing to help make Michigan's Republican vote so large that not only the President but all the rubber stamps in Congress will take note of the fact that the great State of Michigan does not approve what has been done. And this is far more important than you may think.

If the voters of Michigan believe we should keep out of this war, that we should not again send millions of our men to Europe and, after the war is over, be

burdened with an additional monumental debt, they should get out and make their protest on April 7.

The issue is clear and, if they let the President drag us into this war without making this indirect protest, Michigan citizens can blame no one but themselves.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Saturday, March 22, 1941, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 533. An act to amend section 4 (f) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide for extra compensation for overtime of inspectors-in-charge and radio inspectors of the field division of the engineering department of the Federal Communications Commission;

H. R. 2703. An act for the relief of the estate of Joe L. McQueen;

H. R. 3440. An act for the relief of Edith Platt;

H. R. 3441 An act for the relief of Daisy Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 3155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 25, 1941, to resume hearings on H. R. 3684, freight forwarders.

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 27, 1941, to begin hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet to hold hearings on river and harbor improvement projects, as follows: Tuesday, March 25, 1941, Alafia River, Tampa Harbor, Fla.; and Tuesday, March 25, 1941, waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers. All meetings to start at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

372. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

373. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

374. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report relating to awards for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. FULMER: Joint Committee on Forestry. Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, Seventy-fifth Congress; House Concurrent Resolutions 11, 23, and 51, Seventy-sixth Congress. Report authorizing and directing the committee to study and make investigation of the present and prospective situation with respect to forest land of the United States, its condition, ownership, and management, as it affects a balanced timber budget, watershed protection, flood control, and other commodities, and social economic benefits which may be derived from such land; without amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOLAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4146. A bill to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; without amendment (Rept. No. 304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Ben Torian; with amendment (Rept. No. 305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette; with amendment (Rept. No. 306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2742. A bill for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt; with amendment (Rept. No. 307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Commmittee on Claims. H. R. 4026. A bill for the relief of S. Uttal; without amendment (Rept. No. 308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4063. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Herbert M. Gregory; with amendment (Rept. No. 309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 6. An act for the relief of Maude Wilcox; without amendment (Rept. No. 310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 97. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joy Montgomery, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 192. An act for the relief of the Johnson Flying Service, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 247. An act for the relief of Hilda C. Allstrom; without amendment (Rept. No. 313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GATHINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 302. An act for the relief of Clayton W. Curtis; without amendment (Rept. No. 314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. S. 307. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. S. 527. An act for the relief of Ernest H. Steinberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 717. An act for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette; without amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCOTT: Committee on Claims. S. 791. An act for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley, Ernest H. Tarpley, and Pearl Tarpley; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. S. 819. An act for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson; without amendment (Rept. No. 319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. S. 933. An act for the relief of John McAlister, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. S. 957. An act for the relief of Glen E. Robinson, doing business as the Robinson Marine Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. S. 1033. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Lee Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3614) granting a pension to Harry A. Croft, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H. R. 4147. A bill for the benefit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4148 (by request). A bill providing for the payment of direct Federal old-age assistance to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 4149. A bill to prohibit the discrimination against persons employed or seeking employment on national defense or other Government contracts because of the race, color, or religion of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 4150. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 4151. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix, in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States of America to aid the Government of Eire (Ireland) to purchase, loan, or lease all foodstuffs, clothing, or any necessary commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 4A with reference to dairy foods for the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4152. A bill granting a pension to Bell D. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of Cleaver Kelley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 4154. A bill granting a pension to Margaret Ragland; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 4155. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

556. By Mr. HARRINGTON: Petition in the nature of a concurrent resolution of the Iowa General Assembly, petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass a bill for an act to abate existing pollution, to prevent the future pollution of the waters, streams, and lakes under present Federal control and to impress upon the Iowa Members of the National Congress the desires of the Iowa people for the abatement and prevention of such pollution by national law; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

557. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York State Retail Hardware Association, Inc., concerning House bill 3821, the Fulmer bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

558. Also, petition of the National Retail Hardware Association, Indianapolis, Ind., concerning the Fulmer bill (H. R. 3821); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

559. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Bronx Woman's Club, Bronx, New York City, memorializing the Government to grant free postage to members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

560. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York State Retail Hardware Association, Inc., Syracuse, N. Y., opposing the Fulmer bill (H. R. 3821); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

561. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Exchange Club of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Detroit-Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

562. Also, petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410, a bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, maker of heaven and earth, to whom we are indebted for life with its ever-present responsibilities, hear our prayer and look upon us with compassion. Upon our hearts do Thou write the words of wisdom and in our minds the lessons of experience. Disturb us with a sublime sense of indestructible craving for a Higher than ourselves. How greatly we need Thee, for the hour is so bewildering. Oh, be not deaf to our cries; the world is a tumult and a tempest; strong men are beaten down, human hearts are weary, and discretion lies prostrate. Before us is the tragic sight, and no sustaining rest seems to be realized. In this urgent hour, blessed Lord, bring men to understand that commerce and labor are most sacred things, uniting them into a fellowship for the safe being of our democracy. Do Thou persuade our citizens everywhere that disunity develops cynicism, contempt for law and order, and stiffens the bloodless hearts and nerves of cruel and false prophets of aggression. As a people, be gracious unto us; bind us so closely together that perilous discord shall never be allowed to cast its dark, threatening shadow upon the aspirations of a free people; help us to walk together in the protective, peaceful pursuits which lead to the higher levels of Christian civilization. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4050. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill H. R. 3735.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3575. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 210. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders;

S. 917. An act to fix the amount of the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; and

S. 926. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors in military service.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3546) entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes."

ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 151

Resolved, That the following-named Members and Resident Commissioner be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Military Affairs: E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; Bolivar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

Naval Affairs: L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Bolivar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MARCH 25, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: I would like to submit to you my resignation as a member of the following committees of the House of Representatives:

World War Veterans' Legislation.
Immigration and Naturalization.
Irrigation and Reclamation.
Census.
Claims.

Yours very truly,

E. C. GATHINGS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 3836

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees have until midnight tonight

to file a report upon the bill H. R. 3836, the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an analysis upon the St. Lawrence seaway agreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for two extensions of remarks in the RECORD, including some resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Boston Evening Transcript entitled "The Weapon of Food."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DAVID LASSER

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most disgusting thing that I have heard of in a long time is the appointment of David Lasser, formerly the head of the Workers Alliance and a visitor at Moscow at the expense of that organization, as a public-relations specialist and employment specialist of the W. P. A. His job is to find out why W. P. A. workers are not employed in private industry. He was frequently in the columns and wrote for the Communist paper in New York, the Daily Worker. I have here a photograph of one of the editions of that paper, dated July 28, 1937, in which Mr. Lasser wrote an article for the Daily Worker, the Communist paper. I think that the bringing of Communists into the W. P. A. is thoroughly disgusting and outrageous. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day the Congress of the United States fails to a greater degree in its obligation when we as Members do not bring before this body corrective legislation to take care of the indefensible strikes now occurring in the defense industries of the United States.

It is reliably reported that some 12,000 men in the employ of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation are on strike. Additional thousands, it is said, will join in the walkout. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation in its several plants employs approximately 21,000 men. Defense orders for the Federal Government totaling more than $1,195,000,000 are being held up at this hour. Employers may be at fault. The workers perhaps have bona fide complaints against management. That is no reason, however, for stopping preparedness production. Mediation should settle the difficulties, but the wheels of our defense factories must continue to turn. As a friend of labor—but, first of all, as a patriotic American—I urge that there be brought from the committees legislation to correct these evils, and at once. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

RUSH-BAGOT TREATY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to include in my remarks a letter which I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy on January 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. YOUNG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Daily, entitled "Are Communists Responsible for These Strikes?"

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS IN INDUSTRY

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable to me that men of the type of Lasser should be appointed to the position he now occupies. However, I want to draw to the attention of the Members particularly this morning the fact that Mr. Hillman is now trying to get control of the personnel of this new 11-man board for mediation. He is bending every effort possible. With Madam Perkins representing the C. I. O. and the Department of Labor; with Sidney Hillman representing the C. I. O. and the O. P. M.; with Benjamin Lasser in the W. P. A.; and with the National Labor Relations Board controlled by subversive, communistic, racketeering C. I. O. leaders, where is the country going to get off? Are these Republicans and Democrats going to sit here and see this country gradually sovietized each and every day a little more? In my district the owner of a plant cannot even get into his plant. What is that—sovietism, communism, or socialism? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3575) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "district, or Territory."

Page 2, after line 15, insert:

"(d) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "(herein referred to as the 'Defense Fund')."

Page 4, line 3, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 4, line 6, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 4, line 25, strike out "said date" and insert "July 1, 1942, or such earlier date, whichever first occurs."

Page 5, line 13, strike out all after "aggregate", down to and including "exceed" in line 17 and insert "which is approved for mortgage insurance or defense housing insurance prior to the beginning of construction, and (i) the construction of which is begun after the date of enactment of this title, or (ii) the construction of which was begun after January 1, 1940, and prior to the date of enactment of this title, and which has not been sold or occupied since completion. Such principal obligation shall not exceed."

Page 9, line 25, strike out "porperty" and insert "property."

Page 11, line 8, after "mortgage", insert "*Provided*, That the mortgagor shall not be released from such liability in any case until the Administrator is satisfied that the mortgaged property has been sold to a purchaser satisfactory to the Administrator, and that such purchaser has paid on account of the purchase price, in cash or its equivalent, at least 10 percent of the appraised value of such property as determined by the Administrator as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance."

Page 11, line 19, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 12, line 17, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 12, line 22, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 15, line 6, strike out all after "of" down to and including "Administrator" in lines 8 and 9 and insert "any claim so assigned unless such suit or action is commenced within 6 months after the assignment of such claim to the Administrator, or within 6 months after the last payment was made to the Administrator with respect to the claim so assigned, whichever is later."

Page 16, line 8, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Pages 16, line 11, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 17, line 1, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 17, line 5, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Page 17, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 201 of title II of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words "district, or Territory" in subsection (a) of such section, and (2) by adding

at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) The term "State" includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands.'

"(b) Section 207 (a) of title II of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words 'district, or Territory' in paragraph (1) of such section, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(7) The term "State" includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands.'"

Page 17, line 21, strike out "SEC. 4" and insert "(c)."

Page 17, line 24, after "Defense", insert "Housing Insurance."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Alabama explain the amendments?

Mr. STEAGALL. Certainly. This is the Federal Housing Act passed recently by the House in which we provided for the insurance of loans made for the construction of houses to be occupied or bought by persons engaged in the work of national defense. The Senate put four amendments on the bill that are of such minor importance that the Housing Administration and those of the committee with whom I have talked feel the amendments should be adopted without the necessity of a conference. They were adopted unanimously by the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain what these amendments are?

Mr. STEAGALL. The first amendment extends eligibility for insurance to mortgagors on property the construction of which was begun after January 1941 and which have not been occupied or sold since completion. The House bill provided that construction must have begun after January 1, 1941. The purpose is to put builders who have unsold houses for sale on equal footing with owners of buildings constructed after the passage of this act. Approval of insurance was before construction. The House bill simply provided for the insurance under title VI for houses constructed since January 1941.

The second amendment provides that where the original purchaser defaults the Housing Administration shall wait until a new purchaser is approved who pays 10 percent in cash of the construction cost instead of surrendering the claim against the original purchaser. The provision is intended to bring about safer and simpler administration.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Is there anything in the amendments that has to do with the construction of slum-clearance projects?

Mr. STEAGALL. No.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I ask that for the reason they are trying to force one down our throats in my district that we do not want.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is an entirely different matter.

The third amendment provides that the Administration may wait 6 months instead of 90 days, as provided in the House bill, within which to institute suits against mortgagors when the claim has been assigned to the Administrator. It is thought further time will be conducive to better administration of that provision of the law.

The fourth amendment adopted by the Senate extends the provisions of the act to the Virgin Islands, and likewise extends the provisions of existing law to the Virgin Islands. That is all there is in the fourth amendment. There is at this time quite an expansion of population in the Virgin Islands because of defense activities that are being carried on there by the Government—the air force, the Navy, and Army—and there is dire need of better housing facilities. I think it might be said that the Administration would be expected to administer this law in that terrtiory in a way to involve fewer hazards perhaps than would be the case under any other provision of the National Housing Act.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Provision No. 3, relating to foreclosures, extends the time from 90 days to 6 months. Is that on final foreclosure or will there be a repayment period beyond that?

Mr. STEAGALL. It does not deal with the matter of foreclosure; it just provides the manner in which the Administration may proceed against the original mortgagor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter on the selective service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the legislative business today and other special orders that have been entered I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I may say that if it is too late today when I am reached under my special order I will ask that the time be transferred to tomorrow. The reason I ask for the time is to have a little period in which to discuss this labor situation and the whole proposition, which I cannot do in 1 minute. The subject, I believe, needs a little more thorough going into than it has had recently in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I use the rest of my minute to state categorically, in case the House is interested, that David Lasser is not now and never has been a Communist. I think it no more than fair that this be said. My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] made a little mistake and got Mr. Lasser confused with Mr. Benjamin. Mr. Benjamin is a Communist. Mr. Lasser and Mr. Benjamin are two different people. I would object as loudly as I possibly could if Mr. Benjamin were appointed to any Government position, but Mr. Lasser is not, and never has been, a Communist, and I think the House ought to know that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Edward A. O'Neal, from The Nation's Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

MAURICE SUGAR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California should listen to this. I will tell him about a Communist. The morning papers carry the notice that Maurice Sugar is asking that Henry and Edsel Ford be subpenaed to a Labor Board hearing. The Labor Board could have called an election at any time in the last 4 years at the Ford plants but they wait until this man Sugar, who is now a nonpartisan candidate for circuit judge in Wayne County, Mich., asks to have these men brought in.

In 1917, Maurice Sugar was convicted and fined $500 for conspiracy to prevent compliance with the then Conscription Act. In the same year he was convicted and served time for evading the Conscription Act himself. There is a fellow who is a Communist and he is raising heck all over Michigan in these defense industries.

I am going to place a petition on the desk and see how many of the Members, who have been talking against strikes will do something about it—sign it so we can legislate.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. How hard will the gentleman and some of his colleagues over there try to support this Mediation Board that is attempting to do that thing?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That Board cannot act until Madam Perkins permits, and

from the way she has failed to act on the Harry Bridges' case it is evident the Board is just a false front.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and in one to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a very splendid address delivered by our distinguished minority leader before the National Republican Committee yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a recent editorial from the Delaware Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of setting forth certain reasons why we should vote against S. 262, the cotton warehousing bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

THE COTTON SURPLUS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an analysis of the bill S. 935, prepared by a Member of the other body. This bill has to do with loans on cotton. Two small paragraphs on page 2 read as follows:

If additional cotton is needed by the trade, the Secretary can release it from Government-owned cotton.

On August 1, 1941, the surplus will be 12,500,000 bales, of which the Government will own about 11,000,000. If a normal crop is produced this year and there is no reduction in planted acreage, the surplus August 1, 1942, will be increased to 15,000,000 bales.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, on this floor a few days ago I made a speech regarding monopolization of the electric power on the American side of Niagara. The Secretary of the Interior has rightfully and legally denied to the Aluminum Co. of America its application for a large amount of power in addition to what it has at Bonneville. In defense of his position he sent an open letter to the Oregon Journal, and he quotes the speech that I made on the monopolization of power at Niagara by the Aluminum Co. of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of the Secretary of the Interior and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the Wisconsin Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New Orleans Item in connection with the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has grown to be the fashion in this present time of crisis to seize upon unpopular issues like communism and sabotage and make much of them. I am from a district in New England which has for its principal occupation dairy farming. My constituents are deep-rooted in Americanism. They would not know a Communist if they saw one. They detest everything that communism stands for, but I know they want their Representative to keep his head even though some about him may be losing theirs in this crisis.

Let me call your attention to the fact that this cry of sabotage is being used for a purpose. I notice every time there is a railroad wreck that immediately thereafter the vice president of the road announces sabotage, when as a matter of fact the inquiries will show that these wrecks happened because of the use of too light equipment for the speed attained, or because the roadbed on which the cars were being run was in bad condition.

It has become popular for us to talk about communism and sabotage, but I believe we ought to have the facts and not merely use these instances to stir up a great deal of worry and concern in this country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from a cooperative dairy in Wisconsin, and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from a bill I have introduced and certain tables and statistics I have had compiled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 127 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 127

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3368, a bill authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "1 hour" and insert "2 hours."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York does not desire any time, I will move the adoption of the rule.

Mr. FISH. I would suggest that I take the whole hour on this side, if that is satisfactory to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York. I know he is at all times so interested in the well-being of the President that he would be willing to adopt without any debate the rule that makes the consideration of this bill in order.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 3368 and provides for 2 hours of general debate. It is a broad rule. It permits the bill to be considered under the 5-minute rule.

I presume most of you gentlemen are familiar with the provisions of this measure. It authorizes the expenditure of $1,500,000 for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President. We all recognize the additional duties and burdens that have been placed upon the President in the last few years. Even if he should work 24 hours a day, with the force he has now, he could not familiarize himself with and get all the information he should have before him.

Further, I believe the House and the country are entitled to know what is transpiring. This legislation will make it possible for the Congress and the President to obtain information which will be of great interest and benefit in more ways than one, not only to the President and Congress, but will also serve to give to the people of our Nation the information which they are daily seeking.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is unnecessary for me to call attention to the fact that the Constitution makes it obligatory that the President render recommendations to Congress. With all the great knowledge, experience, and ability that the President possesses, does anyone feel that he can keep abreast and be informed as to all conditions and to the needs of the Nation? Does it not stand to reason that he must obtain information and reports from many sources on which he bases his recommendations? Is there anyone who does not realize that his trials, tribulations, and work have not only doubled or trebled, but has increased manifold? During the past 3 years he has been obliged to be daily informed on the foreign situation as no other President before him. Reports have come to him from all the nations of the world which, together with the many domestic matters and problems of the greatest importance, must of necessity be passed upon by him. I feel that no President in the history of our country has worked harder, more intelligently, and displayed a greater degree of executive ability than he, and I feel that he is properly and rightly entitled to the aid that he has requested. We know, as Members of Congress, that our work has increased tremendously. Previously where the services of one clerk or secretary would suffice we now require three or four, and even with this additional help it is nearly impossible to keep up with the ever-increasing work here.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] will oppose the rule. I am sure he will not be expressing the views of the gentleman whom he placed in nomination for the Presidency at the Philadelphia convention, and I earnestly hope that the gentlemen on the other side will not permit politics to enter into the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, feeling that there should not be any opposition to the rule, I shall not detain the House. I yield now to the gentleman from New York and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this bill supposedly has for its purpose the permanent authorization of the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President. According to the bill the functions of this office would be (a) to constitute a clearing house for individual citizens in making requests for information to the Government or in registering complaints against the operation of the Government; (b) to assist the President in dealing with special problems requiring the clearance of information between the Federal Government, and State and local governments and private institutions; (c) to collect and distribute information concerning the purposes and activities of the departments of the Government, and to furnish the same to any who might seek to use it; and (d) to keep the President informed currently concerning the opinions of the citizens with respect to the work of the Federal Government. The bill would authorize an appropriation of $1,500,000 annually for these objectives.

On first appearance these objectives would appear to be absolutely innocuous and completely harmless. But in order to really appraise what this bill means it is necessary to review in some detail the present Office of Government Reports and its predecessor, the National Emergency Council. The consideration of its actual activities in contrast to its announced objectives puts an entirely new light on the operations of this agency.

The present Office of Government Reports is a lineal descendent of the National Emergency Council. The National Emergency Council was originally established by Executive order in the summer of 1933. It was created for the nominal purpose of helping to coordinate the various relief and recovery activities recently created. It has also developed as a clearing house of information about the Federal Government and as an information-service agency for the various departments and establishments. The National Emergency Council never really functioned as a unit. It was primarily only a title—all the real functions were vested in the executive secretary, who took on the functions of a major political officer. In the summer of 1938, before the election, and when resentment against the National Emergency Council was running high, the President declared that it would be abolished. But in December 1938, after the election, he provided for its extension to June 30, 1939.

By Reorganization Plan No. II, promulgated on May 9, 1939, President Roosevelt abolished the National Emergency Council, and transferred its functions to the Office of Government Reports. Supposedly the functions of the National Emergency Council relative to radio and motion pictures were transferred to the Office of Education. The only legal authorizations for the functions of the Office of Government Reports were contained in the various relief appropriation acts making funds available to it.

This bill seeks to put the stamp of congressional approval on this agency. Mr. Lowell Mellett became Director of the National Emergency Council in 1938. He had been with the Scripps-Howard newspapers for many years. He left the employ of those newspapers in the summer of 1937, presumably because he did not agree with their stand in opposing the "court packing" plan of the President.

First, last, and all the time, politics is the primary object of the Office of Government Reports and its predecessor, the National Emergency Council. An evidence of this is found in the following quotation from the hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations for 1939, page 612:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What is there in the picture to make you ask for $1,000,000 for next year?

Mr. LEGGETT. The first half of the fiscal year 1938 and the fiscal year 1939 are not comparable. So far as fiscal years are concerned, that period is comparable with 1936, because of the fact that the demands for information during an election year are tremendous as compared with the demands in an off year.

In the fiscal year 1937 it spent $1,092,000—election; in 1938, $780,000—no election; in 1939, $1,015,000—election; in 1940, $775,000—no election; and in the fiscal year 1941, $975,000—Presidential election.

The work of the Office is divided into four main categories: Report and Coordinating Division, Press Intelligence, United States Information Service, and United States Government Manual. The previous organization had two other sections: Radio and film service.

The Report and Coordinating Section is by far the largest section in the Office. In 1940 approximately $630,000 was spent on it. As a part of the activities of this section branch offices are maintained in 34 States. This section employed 94 persons in Washington and 99 in the field. Nominally this Division is supposed to coordinate and make more efficient the activities of the various Federal agencies both in Washington and in the field. One of the activities is to prepare reports for the President on the reaction of the people to various Government programs and policies. The House Appropriations Committee on various occasions has requested copies of such reports, or at least information concerning the subjects on which such reports have been prepared, but on all occasions this information was not furnished to the committee. It is quite apparent that the Office of Government Reports and its predecessor organizations have been used by the administration as a gigantic intelligence service

to keep it informed of the reaction of the people to its programs, and as a tremendous publicity machine to prepare and distribute New Deal propaganda.

One of the major functions of this section is the preparation of detailed reports showing a break-down of Federal expenditures by programs by years by counties. This material is prepared especially for campaign years. It is quite evident why this is done. It is prepared for the benefit of certain candidates for Congress who hope to profit by an exhibition of the accomplishments of the New Deal Santa Claus.

Further, in justification for this section for the fiscal year 1941, it was stated that this section attempts to carry on publicity campaigns for various administration acts, especially where Congress does not, in the judgment of the President, appropriate funds sufficient for such purposes. Thus in the autumn of 1938 the National Emergency Council carried on an extensive publicity campaign to sell the Wages and Hours Act to the people. The council alleged that the reason it did this was that Congress did not appropriate sufficient funds to the Labor Department to sell the act to the people. Since Congress did not appropriate funds for this purpose, would it not be logical for the administration to conclude that Congress did not want that money spent that way? But that did not seem to make any difference. It is just another illustration of the bureaucrats' disregard of the will of Congress.

Proper publicity to explain a Federal statute and to bring about voluntary compliance therewith is quite all right. But Government propaganda to control elections is quite another thing. Such propaganda is reprehensible and thoroughly unworthy of decent, representative government.

There is direct evidence that the State offices of the Office of Government Reports have, in the past, engaged in political activity of the most brazen kind. On May 31, 1938, Senator WHEELER, Democrat, of Montana, asserted that Mr. I. T. Jones, executive assistant of the Iowa office of the National Emergency Council, was endorsing the nomination of Otha D. Wearin for the Democratic nomination for the Senate as against Senator GILLETTE. Senator WHEELER asserted in a press dispatch from Des Moines appearing in the papers for May 31, that—

> Meanwhile the strength of the Federal endorsements for Representative Wearin was indicated by Mr. I. T. Jones, executive assistant of the Iowa National Emergency Council. Mr. Jones asserted the President "should have the right to define and have voice in the election of men he needs to assist him." It develops that Otha D. Wearin is preferred for the senatorial position, therefore the good soldier will say "I am for Wearin," he added.

Thus this fine agency, which was created only for reporting to the President and for coordinating activities, was engaged in the infamous purge of 1938. It is that sort of activity which creates a most justifiable suspicion that political activity, right now, is one of the most important functions of this agency.

Again, on April 29, 1940, it was asserted on the floor of the House that the Colorado office of the Office of Government Reports was having franked at Government expense a reprint of an editorial which appeared in the Emporia Gazette and which was reprinted in the Des Moines Register. This editorial strongly endorsed the reciprocal trade-agreement program of the administration.

In 1937 the staff of President Roosevelt's own Committee on Administrative Management reported that the Field Service of the National Emergency Council was not advantageous and was largely unsatisfactory. Consequently, its abolition was recommended.

If the staff of the President's own Committee on Administrative Management believed that the field offices of the National Emergency Council served no really useful purpose and recommended their abolition it seems to be quite clear that these offices are not worth while. That they are used for political purposes is certainly no justification for their continuing existence. In the face of the recommendation of the Committee on Administrative Management, why should the Congress here provide for the continuance of these useless offices?

I referred a moment ago to the publicity or propaganda campaigns carried on by the National Emergency Council in an effort to convince the people of the country of the value and worth of certain New Deal programs. Possibly those of us who, on occasion, are on the receiving end of such campaigns should not be heard to complain. But in this sort of thing, as in other like political activity, it seems to me entirely fair to suggest that such political campaigning should be done by the political committee at its own expense. The taxpayers' money, ostensibly appropriated for the legally justifiable operations of this agency, should not be diverted to straight-out political activity. I am frank to confess that at times the dividing line between proper governmental activity and improper, if not illegal, political activity is difficult to draw. However, anyone who has listened to some of the Government radio programs, read some of the press releases, and seen some of the Government films cannot help but be impressed with the very definite conclusion that under the direction and supervision of this agency Government money is brazenly devoted to political activity.

Prior to Reorganization Plan II, effective July 1, 1939, there was a radio division in the National Emergency Council. It employed four persons and had a total pay roll of approximately $19,000. It acted as a liaison agent between the broadcasting companies and the Federal agencies and their officials. It put on several weekly broadcasting programs that were recorded and distributed. Among these were programs entitled "The World Is Yours," "Democracy in Action," and "Gallant American Women."

While radio activities were presumably transferred to the Office of Education in 1939, it is quite apparent that the Office of Government Reports is yet engaged in various types of radio activity. Before the House Appropriations Committee in 1940, Mr. Mellett testified that they had a series of thirty-two 15-minute radio programs, covering statements by Cabinet members and the heads of 21 independent establishments.

The ease with which governmental control or direction of radio broadcasting may be exercised is well known. Radio stations operate on a license granted for a period of only 1 year. There have been some stories that the Office of Government Reports has attempted to exercise far-reaching control over radio commentators, even to the extent of pointing out to them that the Government did not approve of their utterances. Some of you may recall reports in the press last fall to the effect that the Director of the Office of Government Reports severely criticized a very prominent and able radio commentator for his alleged biased reporting of certain issues and incidents in the campaign. Clearly, such action should not and cannot be tolerated in this country if we are to maintain freedom of expression.

The control that the Office of Government Reports exercises on Government publicity activities, on newspapers, radio, and motion pictures is not always direct. Frequently it is indirect and subtle. To a large extent its control over Government publicity activities comes through the fact that the heads of the publicity divisions of the various Government establishments frequently owe their appointments to the head of the Office of Government Reports. No less an able commentator than Arthur Krock declared in his column in the New York Times for August 28, 1940, that previously the heads of publicity agencies of Government establishments were named by Charles Michelson, director of publicity of the Democratic National Committee, but lately such appointments have been made by Mr. Mellett. Mr. Krock remarks:

> They constitute an open adjunct of the Democratic National Committee.

Some of the opponents of this legislation who have been the most critical of it are contending that it will provide for censorship. While in fairness it should be pointed out that there is nothing in this bill which would specifically permit or authorize the President to create a censorship, there is undoubtedly some basic reason for the fears expressed.

In the first place, if this bill passes, we are setting up a superagency which will be staffed by upward of 500 people. It will be financed by a grant of a million and a half dollars, and will be aided and supplemented by other agencies of the Government. If it actually serves as a clearing house for information from all Government agencies, it will, in the final analysis, determine what information coming from a given agency shall be given out and that which shall not be given out. In other words, if any given agency believes that certain information not altogether friendly to the administration should nevertheless be divulged, the Office of Government Reports, as I read this proposal, might insist on superimposing its judgment upon that of the

given agency and decree that that information shall not be divulged. Censorship may be applied in many different ways. But all of them have to do finally with the suppression and distortion of the true facts and news which the people should have.

I have heretofore touched upon some of the activities of the Office of Government Reports. I leave it to you to determine whether or not the record might in itself cause some apprehension as to its control or direction of news, particularly in view of the critical times in which we presently find ourselves. Further, the fear on the part of some that some type or degree of censorship might be set up in the present emergency might have some basis in the well-known predisposition of certain of our administration leaders to object vigorously to radio statements or newspaper articles critical of them or their alleged accomplishments.

In conclusion may I suggest that, as I view the operations and activities of the National Emergency Council and its successor, the Office of Government Reports, over the past 7 years, I am thoroughly convinced that their existence has not been justified. They have cost the taxpayers money which might well have been saved to them. So far as I know, all of the agencies of the Government have their own publicity staffs. I have come in contact with many of them. This agency has not performed such proper or valuable governmental service as to justify its existence. If the necessities of our situation arising out of the war become such as to require some sort of overall information agency, then let us inquire into just what is needed, and how such an agency can best protect and advance the true interests of the country. The activities and tendencies of the Office of Government Reports and its lineal predecessor, the National Emergency Council, are not such as to convince me that it is necessary or desirable that its existence in these times be continued by the passage of this legislationn. [Applause.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to be assured of this fact. It is a fact, is it not, that this organization as it has functioned in the past has been financed by emergency funds?

Mr. HALLECK. It was originally financed by funds, I think, that were primarily appropriated for relief purposes.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly; and is it not a fact that if this bill were to be defeated, the President could continue the activities of this organization and provide for their payment out of his emergency funds?

Mr. HALLECK. He has hertofore carried on the operations and I assume he could continue to carry them on.

Mr. KEEFE. And he would do it by Executive order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has done a good job from his point of view. He has, however, made this bill a political question. His attack upon this organization is a direct attack upon the Office of the President of the United States.

Now, what have we here today? We now have under consideration a rule providing for the consideration of a bill authorizing an appropriation of not exceeding $1,500,000 annually for the Office of Government Reports. The gentleman from Indiana is correct in saying that the Office of Government Reports took over the work of the National Emergency Council. He is likewise correct in saying that the National Emergency Council was abolished under Reorganization Act No. II, which I handled, but if you will go back to that act, you will find the Crosser amendment, which provided that the President did not have power to destroy the functions. In other words, the functions are to be continued.

Now, what is this Office of Government Reports and where is it? Is it a separate Government agency? No, it is not a separate Government agency. It is a part of the Executive Office and the Executive Office is the office of the President of the United States. In his letter to the chairman of the committee requesting the enactment of this legislation, the President cites the reasons it is necessary. This bill should be passed by this House without debate and by unanimous consent. Why? Because it is a request from the President of the United States for money to carry out properly the obligations which the Congress has placed upon him.

Members can look back as far as they like, but no Member of this House can rise and show one instance where the President of the United States—any President—ever declined to send a recommendation to the Congress for an appropriation of money where the legislative branch of the Government requested such appropriation. You just cannot find one instance in the history of your country where the President of the United States has told the Congress of the United States, "I do not think you need this money to properly conduct your business." Whenever the Congress wants funds for a given purpose to conduct our business, to employ sufficient help, or for any purpose whatsoever, we ask the President of the United States to submit to the Congress an estimate to include that appropriation in an appropriation bill. That is the regular procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not right now.

And just as soon as it is possible to prepare the papers, that request is always granted by the President of the United States. Why should we not do the same for any President, no matter who he is?

Now, if this bill sets up a separate Government agency, then I would say there might be some reason to debate the question of whether or not it would be justified, but when it comes from the President of the United States and you attack the legislation as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] attacked it, then I say you are directing your attack on the President. I repeat to you that you have made this a partisan issue, when there should be no partisanship involved.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, as I mentioned his name.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman made it a partisan issue, and I think the operations of the agency itself have made it a partisan issue.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; I never made it a partisan issue.

The gentleman, by his speech, shows he knows very little about the operation of this organization. He speaks of fear of censorship in the control of news. The gentleman is an outstanding lawyer. Will the gentleman cite me any law upon the statute books of the United States that would give the Office of Government Reports, or any other Government agency or official, the power of censorship?

Mr. HALLECK. I thought the gentleman understood that in my statement I said that there was no specific authority in the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman said there were fears of censorship. If there be no specific authority in the bill, why bring the question up?

Mr. HALLECK. I said there may be basic reasons for the fear expressed on the part of some.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is no individual or Government agency that has power in peacetime to censor either expression by voice, radio, press, or in any other way, and the gentleman well knows it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is a member of the Rules Committee and can get time from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I need my time.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. COCHRAN. And I want to continue my argument. Now, you have here a minority report, presented by one man, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. The minority report is written in the plural, but there are no signatures. It simply shows the gentleman submits it himself. The gentleman speaks of censorship in his report, and he talked of censorship when the committee held its hearing and he talked of censorship before the Committee on Rules.

If you will but read the Constitution of the United States you will find in the Bill of Rights provisions that will set

your mind at ease as to the dangers of censorship.

Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], when the discussion in reference to censorship was before the committee, became disgusted and demanded that the committee not waste its time in talking about such matters, when there was absolutely nothing in the bill that would give anybody the power of censorship. That is what the ranking Republican member of the committee did.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; as I have been referring to the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman will recall that he was after me repeatedly to file a report. "When are you going to file a report; how soon are you going to file a report?" and before I had an opportunity to get all the names of the committee on the report, which they signed, the report was filed.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman wanted a couple of weeks to file a report, but we wanted to get the legislation out of the way, as the committee ordered it reported.

Mr. Speaker, appropriations to carry on this organization have gone along year by year. They were not authorized by law. Neither the National Emergency Council nor the Office of Government Reports was authorized by law, and the sole purpose of this legislation, as I said before, is to authorize such office, as the President requests.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. Does not the gentleman think that a newspaperman or a publisher would have appeared before our committee if there was a threat of censorship in the matter? Not a single newspaperman or a published appeared before our committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why, of course, they would, but the gentleman is mistaken in part. A distinguished newspaperman—he said he was a newspaperman—appeared before our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. Now I used to be in the newspaper business myself, just like the gentleman from Ohio, although I did not own a newspaper. I used to do a little reporting for newspapers, and the gentleman from Ohio is what we used to call, when I was a reporter on a newspaper, a dreamer. He is dreaming when he says there is something in this legislation that will provide for censorship.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Can the gentleman inform me what this Government activity cost last year and the year before?

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the appropriation for this fiscal year is around $900,000, I am not sure of the exact amount.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. What did it cost last year and the year before?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not recall the exact amount, but around that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Just a second. This bill authorizes an appropriation of not exceeding $1,500,000 a year. The Committee on Appropriations must appropriate the money and name the amount, but not more than $1,500,000 in any one year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. COCHRAN. I shall have something more to say about the real purpose of the Office of Government Reports when the bill is under discussion. I say to you now that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has made this a political question. It is the same old story—a fight on the President of the United States, not a fight on the Office of Government Reports. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel to make with my friends of the minority who attack this resolution. I do think it unfortunate, however, that a party controversy should be made of the matter. This is a simple request that comes to us from the President, and I cannot see how we can in courtesy refuse it. When the application for this rule was being heard before the Committee on Rules the arguments that we heard this morning were made at that time. I knew nothing about the real purpose of the resolution until the hearings. At the conclusion I was convinced that it was the duty of the committee to grant the rule, and as I recall, I made the motion to do so. I am equally convinced that it is the duty of this House to adopt the rule and pass the resolution.

Just what is here involved? Indulge me while I quote from a letter that the President addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures. Irrespective of what we may expect this Office of Government Reports may do in a political way, we cannot in a matter of this kind question the sincerity or the veracity of the President himself. The President said:

> The responsibilities of the Chief Executive have become such that even in normal times there should be, as an integral part of the Executive Office of the President, an organization sufficiently flexible and independent to meet changing conditions, assist in dealing with special problems, serve as a central clearinghouse for information concerning Federal activities, and report on the opinions, needs, and desires of citizens.

Let me quote further. The President also said:

> I feel it desirable that legislation be enacted at this time to provide permanently these facilities in order that the President may at all times have information concerning the progress of the Nation's business and that the Congress, the departments and agencies of the executive branch and the public may have a channel through which is available an over-all picture of the Government's program and activities.

The President said further:

> In brief, the Office of Government Reports operating at modest expense, is an essential part of the Executive Office of the President.

Who will gainsay that the President is wrong in that statement which I have just read? Let us adopt the rule and proceed to pass the bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Bible says, "The Lord works in mysterious ways His wonders to perform." I want to paraphrase that by saying, "The New Deal works in mysterious ways their wonders to perform."

All of that which happens is not always visible to the naked eye. So it is in this particular situation. Of course, I know that in the last 80 days Congress has appropriated over $8,000,000 per hour on the basis of a 24-hour day. Eight million dollars per hour every day since January 3. Of course, $1,500,000 seems like a mere bagatelle. It seems relatively unimportant, but, my friends, since when during peacetime, or at any time in a democracy, is it necessary for a public agency to have a publicity man? Someone either to embellish the news or to keep the news away from people. Public office belongs to all the people. I can understand why a department store needs an advertising man. I can appreciate why a competitive business needs a publicity or a public relations counsel, but I cannot for the life of me understand why a public office, which should be easily accessible to every citizen, would ask for a measure which would make it impossible for us to get uncensored information.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Is it more proper that he should be called a propaganda man rather than a publicity man?

Mr. BENDER. That is quite true.

The Army and Navy are not asking for this. As a matter of fact, leaders of the Army and the Navy have indicated they do not want censorship. They do not want propaganda. It is apparent that this propaganda is for a definite purpose and this censorship is for a definite purpose. That is, to keep the American people from understanding and knowing what is happening to them. As an evidence of that, I would like to call to your attention the recent issue of the Department of Agriculture Yearbook. It is a propaganda book. Compare it with the issue of 1926, for example. The 1926 agricultural yearbook as an information book, giving information to all the farmers of the country about the things they want to know about. You will find during the Wilson administration the yearbook of 1918 is an information yearbook, not a propaganda yearbook like the yearbook of this year. The 1940 issue is a New Deal propaganda yearbook.

> Information is the raw material of propaganda. It is not propaganda itself. Propaganda is a skilled technique of presentation.
>
> Propaganda is an attempt, either unconsciously or as part of a systematic campaign by an individual or group holding certain beliefs or desiring certain ends, to influence others to adopt identical attitudes.—The Propaganda Boom.
>
> In modern war propaganda goes into action first.
>
> It is the advance guard.

Terrible as an army with banners, the unarmed army of words makes the initial attack. The armed forces stand by it. * * * Swift venegeance waits; and art subdues the strong.—Chamberlain.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. No; not now. I will yield later if I have time.

Where dwells the man that dare suppress
The noble freedom of the press?
Sure he who would attempt the thing,
On Haman's gallows ought to swing,
—*Hoover.*

How can the average newspaperman get first-hand information from a department of government when he has to clear through a third party, through a clearing house, and that clearing house presents this matter in the way that the New Deal wants it presented?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BENDER. The people of the United States could ask for no better illustration of the technique by which bureaucracy grows than is furnished by H. R. 3368.

This measure, which authorizes annual appropriations of $1,500,000 for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, perpetuates an agency which has been functioning under an Executive order of the President. The proposed legislation doubles the current appropriation and through the use of the term "annually" removes the entire bureau from the field of "temporary" services into the realm of permanence.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BENDER. Centuries ago one of the Greek authors said, "Our censor absolves the crow and passes judgment on the pigeon." [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for my 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to proceed out of order that I might refer to certain charges, or suggestions at least, made on yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] to the effect that the trainees at Fort Bragg, N. C., were not receiving enough food and were not receiving any milk or any fruits. I happen to live within 10 miles of Fort Bragg, and I wish I had the time to tell the membership of the wonderful progress that has been made in that particular spot along the lines of national defense. I content myself, however, by saying that Fort Bragg was visited a short time ago by General Marshall, Chief of Staff, who expressed himself as highly pleased. A few days later the Secretary of War dropped in unexpectedly. When he left he said the War Department might have some headaches, but Fort Bragg was not one of them.

Many of the trainees at Fort Bragg are from my own district; many of them are from my own little city; and when yesterday the remarks of the gentleman from New York were published in our afternoon paper, I do not know how many phone calls and personal calls and messages, direct and indirect, came to me from the trainees at Fort Bragg indignantly repudiating any such suggestion. I think I have enough personal knowledge of the situation to be able categorically to contradict the statement made by the gentleman from New York. The fort is commanded by Maj. Gen. Jacob L. Devers, who is a fine, alert, efficient soldier, next to whose heart is the welfare of every man under his command. I read to you a telegram addressed by him to me:

Any allegations reference insufficient food, especially milk and fruit, for selectees at Fort Bragg are without any foundation of fact. All men are being provided one-half pint milk per man per day; every man receives fresh fruit and fresh vegetables each day from 1½ to 2 pounds total, and a total food issue of from 5½ to 6 pounds per man per day.
DEVERS.

Under the circumstances, I feel that, in justice to the membership of this House, in so serious a matter the gentleman from New York should either submit to us the source of his authority or he ought to quit making such foolish statements. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes, and I will take half a minute of that to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that my information came from one of the most reliable and one of the most important men of this country who has a son down at Camp Bragg.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman name him?

Mr. FISH. This man recently spent 2 or 3 days down there and he asked a group of the boys to go out to dinner with him. Their complaint was that there was no milk being served in the camp and no fresh fruit. That is all I have to say, and until that is denied by someone who has been down there and investigated the conditions I prefer to stand on that statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield with only 3 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York in order that the gentleman from North Carolina may ask him a question.

Mr. FISH. Then, I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the gentleman if he heard the telegram I read from the commanding officer saying that milk and fresh fruit were allotted daily to each soldier.

Mr. FISH. But did not the gentleman say that it was one-half pint of milk?

Mr. CLARK. Per day.

Mr. FISH. Half a pint of milk per day. What is that, about half a cup, or a cup? And how many oranges do they get per day? Or is it just one a week?

Mr. CLARK. General Devers says fresh fruit is allotted to the men daily.

Mr. FISH. I am just as fond of the gentleman from North Carolina as any Member of the House. I like the gentleman very much and would always be glad to take his word on anything but prefer to check up on other peoples' statements.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman give us the name of his authority for his statement?

Mr. FISH. The reason I do not give his name is that the man has a son in the camp. I will say this, however, that he is absolutely reliable and is the head of one of the largest organizations in America employing men in every State in the Union.

Mr. CLARK. May I ask the gentleman one more question?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the gentleman still maintain his position in face of the dispatch from Major General Devers?

Mr. FISH. I maintain that if the telegram states the enlisted men or draftees are getting half a cup of milk a day, then they probably are; but does the gentleman think half a cup a day is enough? It may be all right with the general, but I do not believe it is enough for healthy young men doing strenuous work from early morning to nightfall.

There is no reason to stint or give half portions of milk to our soldiers with a potential surplus of milk throughout the Nation. I know there is an abundance of milk available in New York State and elsewhere. The dairymen of my district are looking for additional markets and could supply vast quantities of fresh milk, and would be glad to do so.

Getting back to the bill, Mr. Speaker, and away from milk and oranges, this proposal is just another one of the continuous New Deal steps away from free institutions into regimentation, bureaucracy, state socialism, totalitarianism, and dictatorship. It has all the earmarks of the beginning of an American "gestapo."

"Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name."

In the name of liberty it is proposed to propagandize New Deal achievements at the expense of the American taxpayers. The most important, successful, and biggest New Deal crop up to now has been its propaganda. We have been living in a government of propaganda, by propaganda, to perpetuate the New Deal; but not satisfied with past performances it is now proposed to ask Congress for additional power to further propagandize the administration's program and activities. Does this mean an attempt to establish a one-party system? The difference between Americanism based on our republican form of government and nazi-ism, fascism, and the dictator nations of Europe is freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and free elections.

The passage of this bill is the initial step to curb and censor the press and freedom of speech, and is precisely the same method that was inaugurated by the totalitarian nations. We are, by the passage of this bill, setting up a super-propaganda machine to be followed, as night follows the day, by curbs on the radio and press and by wire-tapping legislation. Is it not time for President

Roosevelt to remember his promise to the American people to cut to the bone every expense not of a defense nature? However, that may be too much to ask or expect. After the passage of this bill it will probably be lese majesty to criticize the President or any of his officeholders, and the Congress may soon be notified in advance when to applaud the utterances of the President. We of the minority are for unity in preserving our free institutions. We do not propose, however, by our votes to set up a huge superpropaganda machine and thereby bring the Nazi and Fascist type of propaganda to America by controlling the avenues and channels of information.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the one hundred and twentieth anniversary of the independence of Greece, which is today, and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a person listening to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would think that with the passage of this bill democratic institutions in the United States would cease. Of course, we have been hearing that argument from the gentleman from New York so long that, so far as this Chamber is concerned, it is shopworn. However, I assume the argument is made more for the benefit of appealing to the emotions of some particular people throughout the country than for its effect on this body. Certainly such arguments have a tendency to divide the people. So far as we in this body are concerned, we are interested in the facts.

The fact is that this agency has in one form or another been in operation since 1933. This is not a bill to create a new agency. It is a bill to authorize the future appropriation of money. It is necessary legislation in order to permit the appropriations to be made and not have such appropriations subject to a point of order when included in an appropriation bill. The cry of dictatorship is made. It has no application to this bill. If I were a member of the minority party and opposed to a bill on its merits, I would in all honesty discuss the bill on its merits and not appeal to hysteria or emotion.

Let us see about President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his dictatorship aims, so far as this matter is concerned. In 1910 another great American—a President of the United States, who has gone to the Great Beyond—made a similar recommendation. That President was the late William Howard Taft. What did he have to say? In a message to the Congress dated December 6, 1910, William Howard Taft said:

> The president of a private corporation doing so vast a business as the Government transacts would, through competent specialists, maintain the closest scrutiny on the comparative efficiency and the comparative costs in each division or department of the business. He would know precisely what the duties and activities of each bureau or division are, in order to prevent overlapping. No adequate machinery at present exists for supplying the President of the United States with such information respecting the business for which he is responsible.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is difficult to refuse the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. President Taft at that time was advocating a budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman asking a question or making a speech?

Mr. MICHENER. I am asking the gentleman if President Taft at that time was not advocating and insisting upon a budget system, where the President appointed a Budget Director, which the Congress finally authorized in 1921?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of one thing we are certain. President Taft at that time said:

> No adequate machinery at present exists for supplying the President of the United States with such information—
>
> Respecting what?—
>
> the business for which he is responsible.

That statement was made in 1910, and it is just as applicable today. Those statements are substantially the same as the reasons upon which President Roosevelt predicated his request in his letter to the chairman of the committee, which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] read in full during his remarks.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. The statement the gentleman just read from President Taft had nothing to do with setting up a propaganda machine, but had to do with something entirely different.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's ability to interpret President Taft's remarks, intention, or state of mind when he sent that message is just about as good as his ability to interpret current events when he calls every piece of legislation for the defense of this country, and this particular piece of legislation, as legislation constituting a dictatorship. [Applause.]

Let us be frank. I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], whose statements are based upon erroneous and emotional premises. It will be interesting to note if the Republican Members will follow his leadership or follow their own good judgment and common sense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT OF 1937

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 152

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4146, to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

MARCH 25, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been assigned to the Committee on Naval Affairs, I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees: Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Invalid Pensions.

Respectfully yours,
L. MENDEL RIVERS, M. C.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I expect to make a few remarks later today. I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend these remarks and include therein certain excerpts from newspapers and reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3368) authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3368, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has reported favorably the bill (H. R. 3368) authorizing an annual appropria-

tion of $1,500,000 for the Office of Government Reports, a division of the Executive Office of the President.

The President, in a letter to me as chairman of the committee, stated that he felt it was desirable legislation and should be enacted. The President pointed out that the responsibilities of the Chief Executive are such that—and I quote:

> Even in normal times there should be, as an integral part of the Executive Office of the President, an organization sufficiently flexible and independent to meet changing conditions, assist in dealing with special problems, serve as a central clearinghouse for information concerning Federal activities, and report on the opinions, needs, and desires of citizens.

The President further advises that the Office of Government Reports "is effectively serving this purpose."

The Office of Government Reports was established July 1, 1939, to take up the functions and activities of the National Emergency Council, which was abolished under Reorganization Plan No. II. Going back into the history of the National Emergency Council, we find it was created by Executive order in 1933, under authority of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1933 and the National Industrial Recovery Act. The N. E. C. was created for the purpose of coordinating and making more efficient the numerous field agencies of the Government and was to exercise such functions and duties as were prescribed by the President.

Recognizing the intense public interest in Government affairs, and in the relief and recovery program, as was evidenced by the thousands of letters pouring into the Government agencies and to the President, and to assist delegations of States and other local governments and groups of businessmen who were coming to Washington seeking information, there was established as a division of the National Emergency Council the United States Information Service.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'LEARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. In that connection, I may say that I am receiving 25 reports daily, and the demand is greater than the supply. I could use 50 reports daily in response to requests from businessmen asking my office for these daily reports. Not only that, but the small country papers have been asking for these reports, and in turn they publish them in their little weekly papers. I believe this is a very good organization and should be continued.

Mr. O'LEARY. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I understand there are 800 requests from Members of Congress each month for information from this department.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'LEARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. On page 2 of the bill appears this language:

> Collect and distribute information concerning the purposes and activities of executive departments and agencies for the use of the Congress.

Does this mean that all information the Congress obtains or seeks must be cleared through this agency?

Mr. O'LEARY. If the gentleman will just allow me to develop my argument, I will explain the performance of the Office of Government Reports.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman can answer that "Yes" or "No."

Mr. O'LEARY. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

The Division of Press Intelligence created in 1933, was transferred to the National Emergency Council in 1935. The division was established to provide Federal officials and Members of Congress a prompt and comprehensive press service on all phases of Government affairs. A Division of Field Operations was created with State directors in each State to serve as central clearing houses for information on Federal activities within the State, and to prepare reports concerning the opinions, needs and desires of citizens and of State and local governments with respect to the work of the Federal agencies or activities.

The National Emergency Council, which performed these activities for almost 6 years, received funds for its operations through the Relief Appropriation Act. For the past 20 months these functions have been exercised by the Office of Government Reports, receiving their appropriations through the last two Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts. Congressional approval of this bill will permit the Office of Government Reports to receive its appropriations in the regular and normal manner, and in the same manner as other divisions of the Executive Office of the President.

The maximum appropriation authorized under this bill is $1,500,000, and in this connection I invite particular attention to the statement of the President that there is needed, as an integral part of the Executive Office of the President, an organization sufficiently flexible and independent to meet changing conditions, and to assist in dealing with special problems.

The expenditures of the Office of Government Reports since the fiscal year of 1935 have varied between $680,000 and $1,480,000. In less critical times, and when no special problems were assigned to it, the Office of Government Reports required an expenditure in the neighborhood of $750,000, but when special problems were assigned to it and in critical times such as these, with the demands of the public for information increased, an expenditure up to $1,500,000 may be required.

In the fiscal year of 1936, when $1,481,362 was expended, the President, by Executive order, had created a Division of Applications and Information. This division was the focal point at which applications for projects were made under the $4,800,000,000 works program, and from which accurate information with respect to the status of applications was readily available.

In this fiscal year, because of the public interest in the defense program, the President has allocated to the Office of Government Reports an additional $230,000 of defense funds so that the public may receive adequate information and the defense agencies may receive adequate service from the Office of Government Reports. The funds expended, therefore, for this fiscal year will amount approximately to $1,000,000.

The inauguration of the defense program resulted in a substantial expansion of activities both in the Washington and field offices. The State offices became the chief source of information on the defense program, with the volume of inquiries in some States increasing fourfold between August and January. At present, because of budgetary limitations, the Office of Government Reports has only 34 State offices, with some serving more than one State. With the sharp expansion in activities resulting from the defense program, it is necessary that the appropriation for the next fiscal year be increased, in order that this agency may reopen all State offices.

The President has advised me that the Office of Government Reports "operating at modest expense, is an essential mine the needs of the congressional branch of the Government than is the President.
part of the Executive Office of the President." It is my opinion that the President is in a better position to judge the needs of the Executive Office than is the Congress. It is also my opinion that the Congress is in a better position to deter-

The Budget estimates of funds needed for the legislative branch of the Government, as estimated by our legislative officials, is not questioned by the President. Like treatment should be accorded the President's office, particularly in view of the relatively small cost of operation.

A democracy is defined as a government by the people. A representative democracy such as ours is a government in which supreme power is retained by the people and exercised through a system of representation. The President is required by the Constitution to—

> give to the Congress information on the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

One of the functions assigned to the Office of Government Reports is—

> to keep the President currently informed of the opinions, needs, and desires of citizens and groups of citizens and of State and local governments with respect to the work of Federal agencies.

The minority report submitted in connection with H. R. 3368 characterizes this purpose as unnecessary and states—

> surely the 435 Members of the United States House of Representatives, the 96 Members of the United States Senate, the United States Conference of Mayors, and the hundreds of national organizations which maintain constant touch with our Government are managing to keep the President well informed of their opinions.

Both the Congress and the President are aware of and receive information constantly from national organizations concerning their opinion regarding the various phases of governmental activity. These organizations are qualified to speak for their members and efficiently present their views. It is the right, however, of the average citizen who is not a member of a special group to make his views known directly to his elected representative and to the President. The

Office of Government Reports serves as an efficient channel to the Chief Executive through which citizens and groups of citizens can make known their desires and complaints and receive advice and information.

The desires and complaints of citizens are often reflected in the press, and for this reason it is necessary for the proper administration of Federal programs that Federal officials know of press discussion. It is manifestly absurd for each Federal agency to have a Nation-wide press coverage. The Division of Press Intelligence indexes in a daily bulletin news and editorial comment on public affairs from 350 daily newspapers. This bulletin is distributed each morning to executive officials and Members of Congress. Last year 450,000 news items and 203,000 editorials were indexed. To meet the 1940 requirements of Government agencies which formerly subscribed to commercial clipping bureaus or used their own staffs in such work, 1,771,800 duplicate clippings were furnished. Indicating the scope of the congressional service, 163,300 clippings were sent to Members of the Senate and House, an average of 13,600 a month during 1940.

A weekly summary of magazine abstracts from 50 weekly and monthly magazines is prepared and distributed to 1,271 Government officials and Members of Congress. In 1940, 11,300 magazine articles were summarized. At the request of the State Department, copies of the abstracts are mailed each week to Department representatives abroad.

The United States Information Service provides for the public and for Members of Congress a single central clearinghouse in Washington for inquiries concerning all branches of the Government. Inquiries are received by mail, telephone, telegraph, or in person. Last year approximately 100,000 requests were received, and congressional requests alone now average 900 per month. The Service limits its dissemination of information to the strictly factual. It does not undertake to interpret regulations, orders, reports, or other data, but when interpretations are required it refers the inquirers directly to the sources from which interpretations may be obtained.

I have said that the information made available through the Office of Government Reports is strictly factual. At the present time there is great interest in national-defense contracts. The Office of Government Reports prepares a tabulation entitled "National Defense Contracts and Expenditures," which is the only authoritative and over-all compilation of its kind. This tabulation, broken down by States, is issued every 2 weeks and is furnished only on written request. Complete sets of tabulations of defense contracts for all States are being furnished to 55 Senators, 189 Representatives, 117 Federal agencies, 75 railroads, 99 newspapers and magazines, 99 banks, and 630 individual business concerns. The United States Chamber of Commerce distributes over 3,000 copies of a summary of this tabulation, and the National Defense Advisory Commission distributes it to all local and State defense councils. This tabulation helps small businessmen locate possible subcontracts, shows potential markets to manufacturers, and possible needs to the transportation firms and banks. It helps the Work Projects Administration determine the areas in which defense employment will relieve demands for assistance, and it enables the State employment service to anticipate labor needs.

A booklet in heavy demand concerns defense employment and training for employment. This has been given wide distribution by Members of Congress in answering constituents who want to know how to get a job under the defense program or where they should go to be trained for employment. It is being used as the authoritative publication on defense training and employment by the Civil Service Commission, the Office of Education, the National Youth Administration, the Work Projects Administration, and the Department of Agriculture.

To keep the State offices fully informed of Federal agency activities, a daily information digest is prepared. A weekly summarization of governmental activities in connection with the defense program also is prepared. Other Federal agencies requested that these daily and weekly summarizations of governmental activities be made available to ranking Federal officials. This was done and the service likewise was made available to Members of the Congress. At present This Week in Defense is furnished to more than 3,800 officials in Washington and the States. Many Members of the House and Senate have asked for and received it, and I have been informed that not a single criticism has been made that it is not entirely factual.

It is my opinion, and I imagine the opinion of most of us, that the people are entitled to information on what their Government is doing. This is not a new doctrine, but it is a belief held by every President, and it has been characteristic of our Government from the earliest times to give the public information on the operation of its Government. George Washington in his Farewell Address ably expressed this when he said:

> Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I may need, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the passage of this bill because I believe the people of this country are entitled to know everything that happens. I oppose this bill because it involves an annual expenditure of $1,500,000 which is totally unnecessary. This legislation is another illustration of the methods by which our Government is becoming a bureaucracy rather than a democracy.

Seven years ago the National Emergency Council was established under authority of an Executive order. In 1939 Congress authorized the reorganization of executive departments for the purpose of avoiding duplication of effort and saving taxpayers' money. The President submitted a reorganization plan and the functions of the National Emergency Council were transferred to the Executive Office of the President. And then the Office of Government Reports was established within the Executive Office of the President to exercise the same functions which the National Emergency Council had been performing.

Let me call your attention to the curious technique behind these maneuvers. The funds for the operation of this National Emergency Council and for the conduct of the Office of Government Reports have come from allocations included in the emergency relief acts. I do not know by what stretch of the imagination we can be discharging our duties of good faith to those on relief by using their funds for such a purpose. Apparently the sponsors of the bill recognize this anomaly. They are now proposing to provide a new status for this Office of Government Reports by including its appropriations in the annual independent offices estimates.

Today this Office maintains 34 subdivisions whose purpose apparently is to act as a clearing house for information. Mr. Lowell Mellett, director of the Office, testified before your Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. His evidence is highly illuminating. For the last 7 years, he tells us, this Office has answered literally a mountain of correspondence. It digests bulletins. It furnishes information service. In short, it does precisely what every other department of the Federal Government has been doing since our Government was established. I regard this as nothing but a duplication at $1,500,000 per year.

Of course, Mr. Mellett is a very able man. He is one of the ablest publicists in the country. The New Deal picked a good man—that is, a good publicity man—when it picked him. He is a man who knows how to operate.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Tell us what (c) to which the gentleman referred really means. Does it mean that the information which Congress hereafter shall receive, or wishes to receive, from the various governmental departments must be cleared through this central agency?

Mr. BENDER. Exactly. That is exactly what is happening now. They say there is no authority granted by Congress. As the gentleman has observed, the President, the administration, needed no authority to do many things that they have done during these emergency times.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, if I wish any information from, say, for example, the Treasury Department, that information before it reaches me must be cleared through this central governmental agency?

Mr. BENDER. Not always.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But this would give that agency that power? Am I correct in that?

Mr. BENDER. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Would give it the power to compel me to receive my information from the Treasury through this particular agency?

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then what is this other than a part of this dictatorial scheme being carried on at the present time?

Mr. BENDER. The distinguished gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Andrews	Jarman	Rees, Kans.
Bloom	Jarrett	Rich
Bradley, Pa.	Jenks, N. H.	Rockefeller
Buck	Kelly, Ill.	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Scott
Burdick	Kleberg	Shafer, Mich.
Celler	Kramer	Shannon
Collins	Lambertson	Sheridan
Courtney	Lesinski	Simpson
Domengeaux	McArdle	Smith, Pa.
Duncan	McGranery	Smith, Va.
Eliot, Mass.	Maas	Stevenson
Fitzgerald	Magnuson	Stratton
Flannery	Marcantonio	Sweeney
Forand	Martin, Iowa	Taylor
Gale	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Gavagan	Mills, La.	Thomason
Gibson	Mitchell	Tinkham
Gifford	O'Day	Treadway
Green	Oliver	Wadsworth
Harrington	Patton	West
Hart	Pearson	White
Hess	Plauché	Williams
Hinshaw	Poage	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3368, and finding itself without a quorum, he caused the roll to be called, when 355 Members responded to their names, disclosing a quorum to be present, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman believe that this bill is practically establishing a bureau of propaganda, such as Hitler maintains in Germany?

Mr. BENDER. The distinguished gentleman has asked a very pertinent question. That is exactly what this bill has in mind, the establishment of a bureau of propaganda and censorship.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In reality, that is the purpose of this bill—censorship?

Mr. BENDER. There is no question about it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I notice that the report contains this language on the first page, in discussing the National Emergency Council, which the gentleman was discussing just before the call of the House. This report states:

> The National Emergency Council was abolished under Reorganization Plan No. II, but the functions were not abolished.

I take it from that, of course, that all functions of that general order of the Executive were kept so that it could operate, and it did operate exclusively under the jurisdiction of the President, did it not?

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Now, all we are supposed to do today is to pass a bill establishing a new agency, but not to implement it in the ordinary way but to give the President full power. This will be identically the same kind of an organization that he has had for the last 7 or 8 years right under his thumb, operating as he sees fit?

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman was asked if it would not be necessary, under the provisions of this bill, for Members of Congress to contact executive department agencies only through the Department of Government Reports. I am sure the gentleman means to be fair. Is it not true that there is not a scintilla of evidence in the hearings to bear out that statement, but that, on the contrary, the purpose of that section was to give to Members of Congress the same information that had been made available, in the language of the bill, to the public?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is correct in part. Information will be given to them after it has cleared the bureau and the department has consulted with the bureau.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that, instead of that being the case, the hearings disclose that the information furnished would not be an interpretation but merely factual, giving to the Members of Congress and to the public factual information respecting the various agencies of the Government?

Mr. BENDER. As I said in the beginning, this whole administration works in mysterious ways its wonders to perform. That is exactly my position. It is not what is seen. It is that which is unseen. It is the danger implicit here to which we object.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In answering the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] with reference to whether this is going to be a factual, fair organization, if so, why is it going to be housed in the White House, under the direction of the President?

Mr. BENDER. A New Deal newspaper only yesterday said:

> These five men are F. D. R.'s extra eyes, ears, and legs: Sherman T. Minton, William H. McReynolds, Lauchlin Currie, James H. Rowe, and Lowell Mellett.

Let me continue. Under the terms of this bill the funds appropriated are designed to:

> (a) Provide a central clearing house through which individual citizens, organizations of citizens, and State or local governmental bodies may transmit inquiries and complaints and receive advice and information; (b) assist the President in dealing with special problems requiring the clearance of information between the Federal Government and State and local governments and private institutions; (c) collect and distribute information concerning the purposes and activities of executive departments and agencies for the use of the Congress, administrative officials, and the public; and (d) keep the President currently informed of the opinions, desires, and complaints of citizens and of State and local governments with respect to the work of Federal agencies.

In my opinion, none of these purposes is essential, and each of them is already being performed by other existing instruments of the Federal Government.

Individual citizens seeking information may now direct their inquiries directly to the specific department concerned. The establishment of a central clearing house would mean nothing but the intervention of a third party in the process. The Office of Government Reports can in no case offer a definitive or authoritative reply to the citizen or to a State or local governmental body. It acts simply as an unnecessary and time-consuming intermediary, relaying the questions directed to other departments and adding still further delays to the already lengthy interval between a request for governmental information and a responsible reply. Surely the Office of Government Reports will not assume responsibility for replies to sovereign States or to citizens' organizations which direct their questions to our Departments of War, Navy, State, or Treasury.

The second purpose contemplated by the bill concerns assistance to the President in dealing with special problems requiring the clearance of information between Federal Government and other governmental units. To date neither the President nor any State or local government or private institution has complained publicly of any difficulty which this measure can correct.

I view both of the purposes reviewed above as unwarranted, but I regard the third objective as not only unwarranted but also completely alien to the spirit of our Government. The language of the bill seems harmless enough. It provides for distributing information for the use of Congress, administrative officials, and the public. Stripped of its false front, this means no more or less than the establishment of a bureau of propaganda. It means the establishment of an agency whose major purpose will be the perpetuation of power in the administration which creates it. The word "information," like the word "facts," is capable of great elasticity. Yet even this dangerous foreign innovation of a propaganda bureau might be justified on economic grounds, if the Office of Government Reports were to become the exclusive source of information on our executive departments and agencies. But there is nothing to indicate that the dozens of Federal offices in Washington are ready to surrender their own publicity prerogatives. Many of them are now engaged in putting out enormous quantities of self-laudatory information, glorifying their

achievements and tacitly arguing for their indefinite continuance in operation. If all of these activities were to be surrendered to the Office of Government Reports, the proposal might be justified as an economy measure. As matters stand, however, the work of the Office of Government Reports will simply be in addition to, rather than in place of, the tremendous volume of Federal propaganda already pouring out of Washington.

The fourth and last object stated in the bill, to "keep the President currently informed of the opinions, desires, and complaints of citizens and groups of citizens and of State and local governments with respect to the work of Federal agencies," must impress everyone as totally unnecessary. It is no more than a call for the maintenance of a Washington newspaper-clipping bureau. Surely the 435 Members of the United States House of Representatives, the 96 Members of the United States Senate, the United States Conference of Mayors, and the hundreds of national organizations which maintain constant touch with our Government are managing to keep the President well informed of their opinions. Certainly a task of this kind does not justify an annual appropriation of $1,500,000.

The testimony introduced before your Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was not calculated to demonstrate any real need for the passage of this legislation. No specific instances demonstrating the failure of existing agencies to supply necessary information were cited. Neither in the Nation's press nor in the offices of public or private institutions is there any demand for the establishment of this bureau as a permanent addition to our governmental structure.

As a matter of fact, every news agency in the country is thinking of this legislation as a propaganda and censorship bill and has said so.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman speaks of newspapermen. Does not the gentleman know that if there were any danger of censorship in any legislation pending before the Congress that a person could not get in the office buildings or in the Capitol because of the newspapermen who would be here to protest against it? Yet not one single person appeared before the committee in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman knows that the committee was called without the newspapers having information as to the purpose of the committee meeting.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. O'LEARY. The gentleman is mistaken on that. Everybody was given notice 1 or 2 weeks before the hearing was called.

Mr. BENDER. I was given only a few days' notice and even then was not told what was to be discussed by the committee. Let me say at this point that this bill has been rushed through. Bills more important than this are waiting for consideration of this House, but there seemed to be a passionate desire on the part of those handling the bill to get it in and out in a hurry—in other words, to give it the "bum's rush." The very groups which it is theoretically designed to assist are not asking for the passage of this bill.

The purposes included in the proposed legislation are serious enough in themselves. But there are unstated purposes implicit in this bill which are even more reprehensible. The establishment of this kind of official clearinghouse for the distribution of information means that ultimately only information satisfactory to the powers that be will be publicized. It means that a careful process of selecting, editing, and cutting, with a possible opportunity for a distinct coloring will inevitably result. This development seems inescapable, and it will take place consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or accidentally. Other Government offices will eventually be asked to curtail their own reports, not for the legitimate purpose of economy but rather for the tainted purpose of interdepartmental censorship.

Should events across the sea create emergency conditions even more acute than those which now exist, such an Office of Reports would provide an ideal method for imposing a complete and rigid censorship of every kind of news, military and civil alike.

These are weighty considerations. I do not believe the people of our country are prepared to accept the establishment of a potential ministry of propaganda. We do not believe they desire an agency for the concealment of facts or the "coloring" of information. I believe that our Nation does not desire, and certainly does not need the creation of an official censorship. Before the Congress acts upon this measure, I urge that we consider carefully the implications of its passage. The Nation today is in the midst of a tremendous defense program. We are asking the people of our country to shoulder the greatest tax burdens in the history of this Republic. Are we justified in adding a single penny of unnecessary expenditure to the load they are carrying? Are we justified in adding to the already long list a single additional permanent agency?

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. O'LEARY. The gentleman from Ohio seems to be rather apprehensive concerning the verbiage of this bill. He will admit, however, that it is identical with the Executive order which created the agency years ago, will he not?

Mr. BENDER. No; this creates an entirely new agency.

Mr. O'LEARY. For the gentleman's information, I may say that the bill is identical with the language of the Executive order which created this agency years ago.

Mr. BENDER. This freezes into permanency an agency intended originally to be a temporary one.

Mr. O'LEARY. This only authorizes an appropriation. The Office of Government Reports is established by this legislation and will have to come before the Appropriations Committee every year for its appropriations.

Mr. BENDER. We do not want censorship.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I was under the impression that when Reorganization Plan No. II was before the House for consideration that by a very substantial vote the National Emergency Council was voted out on the ground that it was not a necessary useful agency to the Government. It was said we abolished the agency but not the functions. This new creature now comes along to take over the functions. Was it not the idea in voting out the Emergency Council when Reorganization Plan No. II was up for consideration that it was not necessary, that it was a political arm rather than an administrative arm?

Mr. BENDER. Yes; and the arguments used were those of doing away with unnecessary functions. I recall that very well.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. This legislation is asked for by the President because he says his responsibilities have increased. It is not so long since the Congress voted to give the President the services of six additional secretaries. That was no small assistance to the President. It might be better for the American people if he undertook fewer responsibilities. At the rate we are proceeding in the expenditure of money and at the rate we are taking on more and more employees in Government services of all kinds we shall soon be like the people on the mythical island who made a living by taking in one another's washings.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is absolutely right.

In my opinion, there is no necessity whatever for the continuance of this Office of Government Reports. The agencies of our Federal Government have demonstrated that they are fully capable of reporting the work they are doing to the President, to the Congress, and to our people. They have offered no complaint that they are unable to reply promptly and intelligently to their correspondence. We in Congress who have had frequent occasion to consult with them know that every governmental department furnishes prompt factual responses to the many questions with which we burden them.

I am not alone in my objections to this measure. The functions of the National Emergency Council have been described as the furnishing of information—and some propaganda—to newspapers, radio, movies, and magazines. It is no more than a newspaper- and magazine-clipping bureau which was designed to keep the New Deal informed as to how well it was doing with the public. Among its other essential activities, this agency produced or distributed 2,847 Government movies, until Republican Congressmen—including the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DIRKSEN—denounced it as

"the biggest piece of fakery in the Government establishment." In 1940 the National Emergency Council tried to get $1,500,000, but the Senate blocked its path. A year ago the same office tried to produce a moving picture which would have dramatized "certain aspects of the unemployed problem—man in the machine age," to use Mr. Mellett's own words. This Congress refused to appropriate the $1,500,000 necessary for this film masterpiece.

I believe the American people, knowing something of the way in which censorship operates, do not want us to lend our support to this measure. We have already witnessed illustrations of the working of censors in this country. Only a few weeks ago a British magazine printed information on airplanes flying in Britain but manufactured in the United States. This information was not available in our own country, but, mind you, in Great Britain, at war with the Axis Powers, with its planes carrying the greatest burden of that war, this information was probably printed in a magazine of general circulation. In our own country we were not privileged to learn these facts, and this is at a moment when we are still nonbelligerents. What will happen if the crisis grows more acute no man can foresee, but censorship, a deliberate withholding of facts from the American people, will be vastly stimulated if by our own deliberate act Congress appropriates funds to set up an agency perfectly adapted for censorship purposes.

Mr. Mellett testified that, to his knowledge, no censorship now or in possible time of war was contemplated. I have demonstrated that this censorship already exists. We must not of our own volition do anything which will serve to shut the doors of public knowledge still more firmly in our faces. I therefore urge every Member of this House to discharge his responsibility to the people of this country by voting against this measure. We owe them a duty of cutting down every nonessential expenditure. This is not only a nonessential; it is an unwarranted and a dangerous step in the dark.

I submit that the ultimate underlying purposes of this legislation is the development of an agency which will suppress news instead of distributing information. Intentionally or unintentionally, if we subscribe to the theory that such an Office of Government Reports is necessary, we can be sure that it will speedily degenerate into a propaganda bureau. In 1937 there were more than 300 publicity writers in the Federal agencies. Their salaries ranged from $3,600 to $12,000 a year. I see nothing in this legislation which proposes to cut down on the numbers of Federal employees dealing in the art of "government by mimeograph." We are simply planning to add a new agency which will create further items of expenditure while hundreds of workers remain on Federal pay rolls whose purposes are contradictory. On the one hand, we shall have an Office of Government Reports which seeks to cut down information, and on the other hand, we shall be supporting hundreds of publicity agents whose objective is to flood the mails with tons of free literature. If there were anything in this legislation which proposed to cut down on the 669,000 pieces of free mail handled a few years ago, or to reduce the number of Federal employees engaged in producing moving pictures, writing radio scripts, and otherwise influencing public opinion, there might be some justification for this bill.

I think it is important for Congress to realize the extent to which we have developed this machinery of Government propaganda. In the Public Opinion Quarterly for December 1940 it is reported that—

> In the last 6 years the Federal Housing Administration has built up what is probably this country's most extensive and successful system for showing educational films in theaters. The administration has financed the films itself and has shown them in more than 10,000 theaters and to over 100,000,000 persons. Now it is withdrawing from the field of production, but will maintain its distribution system for educational films on housing which it approves.

In June 1937 the Brookings Institute told Congress that in a 3-month period of that year Government press offices in Washington had released 4,794 newspaper articles and had distributed 7,000,000 copies in the 3-month period.

I am quoting the words of Dr. E. P. Herring, a member of the Department of Government at Harvard University. He says:

> Never before has the Federal Government undertaken on so vast a scale and with such deliberate intent the task of building a favorable public opinion toward its policies.

He says further:

> Can one speak of government by consent when this consent is manufactured by official press agents?

I need not tell you the danger implicit in this kind of restriction on public expression. Dean Carl W. Ackerman of the Graduate School of Journalism at Columbia University made a survey of public opinion in Europe in 1937, and he said:

> The line of demarcation between nations dominated by a war psychology and those still subject to the psychological element of peaceful ideas is between managed public opinion and the free exchange of information. No one can cite a single exception.

Let us think for a minute of what other Members of this body have done in connection with similar legislation. In 1913 a law was passed prohibiting the use of Federal funds for the employment of "publicity experts" unless such funds were specifically earmarked for such a purpose. Representative Gillett, of Massachusetts, expressed the opinion of Congress when he declared that it would be contrary to the best interests of this country "to extol and exploit the virtues" of a governmental department.

Since that time our Federal Government has scouted about for new titles. We have directors of information, chief educational officers, Chief of the Division of Information. And now we propose to set up a permanent Office of Government Reports headed by a new director of propaganda.

Is there any need for the kind of directed information which this bill purports to control? Surely the most important departments of our Government today from the point of information are the Army and Navy. What do they have to say about propaganda and censorship? Maj. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, of the War Department, and Commander Harry R. Thurber, of the Navy, have expressed themselves clearly. They intend to "keep the public informed of Army and Navy activities as compatible with military secrecy." They say their function today "is purely informational and educational." In the War Department a new Bureau of Public Relations has been created and 26 officers and 60 civilians are working in the press, radio, movies, and research divisions. They plan very shortly to go into a 24-hour-a-day basis. The Navy is doing a similar work. Both Commander Thurber and General Richardson believe that the citizens of a democracy should know everything except strict military secrets. They are proceeding on the premise that as much, rather than as little, information as possible should be revealed. We know that the press of this country has already agreed that actual or intended movements of our Navy or our air fleet, as well as technical developments in our rearmament program, are not to be broadcast publicly. This is voluntary censorship and shows abundantly that we do not need the kind of restriction which this Office of Government Reports bill seeks to impose.

The Office of Government Reports has already "invited the executive agencies to clear their news through the Office of Government Reports." In the last few months the feeling has grown throughout Washington that this invitation may become an order. Washington correspondents are already feeling the effect of this Office of Government Reports. A story published in a national magazine only a few months ago tells us that a Washington correspondent was recently asked to find out whether a certain clergyman had been appointed as a chaplain in the Army. He telephoned several sources of information but was immediately referred to another. He finally made six calls, and when the sixth person told him to call the man he had contacted originally, the reporter threw up his hands in disgust and said, "That's where I came in." Information of this kind illustrates how jittery Washington offices have already become over distributing even the most harmless information. [Applause.]

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for his outstanding statement in misrepresenting the provisions of this legislation. May I say at the outset that the wording of this bill is identical with the words used by the President when he created the Office of Government Reports by Executive order; the only addition is the limit in the appropriation. You can get the bills and see for yourselves that the appropriations for the Office of Government Reports, while carried in the general relief bill, did not take one dollar from the relief appropriation

but was carried as a separate item. The purpose of carrying that as a separate item in the relief bill is because the relief bill is a legislative bill coming from the Appropriations Committee, subject in its entirety to points of order. We either get the points of order waived by unanimous consent or secure a rule waiving points of order. That is the reason the appropriation for the Office of Government Reports has been carried in the relief bill.

Boiled down, this bill is for the sole purpose of authorizing an appropriation not to exceed $1,500,000 a year for this particular branch of the President's office. It is not only for the present President but for future Presidents. If this bill becomes law, the appropriation will not be subject to a point of order.

The gentleman from Ohio stated that this establishes a bureau of propaganda and censorship. How any sane man can make a statement of that kind after he reads this bill I cannot understand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why make a statement of that kind?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman may get some time from the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is easy enough to make a charge, then duck it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I duck nothing. Read the bill. Mr. Chairman, the minority report announces that none of the activities of the Office of Government Reports is essential. And I quote his language:

> Each of them is already being performed by another existing instrument of the Federal Government.

I am going to analyze the minority report filed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The report states that the measure authorizes an annual appropriation of $1,500,000, which is double the current appropriation.

This is true, but the annual expenses of the Office of Government Reports and the National Emergency Council, its predecessor agency, during the period of the Works Program in 1936 actually expended $1,482,000 during that emergency. The present defense emergency indicates the necessity of a similar operation.

The report announces that none of the purposes of the Office of Government Reports is essential and "each of them is already being performed by other existing instruments of the Federal Government."

There is no agency other than the Office of Government Reports which is specifically charged with the duties authorized in H. R. 3368 to be performed by the Office of Government Reports.

The report charges that a central clearing house would mean nothing but the intervention of a third party—an unnecessary and time-consuming intermediary.

There is no central information clearing house in the Government other than the Office of Government Reports. The United States Information Service, a division of this office, has served as a central information clearing house for the past 7 years. When a request for information is received by one of the departments, it is answered insofar as that department is concerned, and the letter is then referred to the United States Information Service, which collects and furnishes information on all other phases of the letter. Many of the requests received come in addressed to the United States Government, or the Bureau of Information, or the Office of Information, or some such general designation. In a great many cases the general public does not know the department or agency to which his letter should be addressed. The President, in Reorganization Order No. 2, referred to the United States Information Service as "Uncle Sam, Post Office Box No. 1." Instead of being a "time-consuming intermediary," the United States Information Service in actual practice eliminates much of the delay involved in obtaining information concerning Government activities. Proof of this is found in the almost 8,000 inquiries referred to this office last year by Congressmen.

The report states that the second purpose—assist the President in dealing with special problems requiring the clearance of information between the Federal Government and State and local governments and private institutions—can be performed more directly and effectively by the six administrative assistants to the President.

The report ignores that the purpose of the administrative assistants to the President is to assist the President in obtaining all pertinent information possessed by any of the executive departments to guide the President in making decisions affecting any part of the administrative work of the Government. The administrative assistants are direct aides to the President in dealing with agencies and departments of the Government.

In discussing the third purpose of the Office of Government Reports, the minority report concludes that the distribution of information concerning the purposes and activities of executive departments and agencies for the use of Congress, administrative officials, and the public means "no more or less than the establishment of a bureau of propaganda."

The record of the Office of Government Reports does not support this charge. Each agency furnishes information regarding its own program, but when a program concerns a number of agencies it is usually difficult to obtain in one place information on the whole program. As a need develops for such information a pamphlet is prepared. The information furnished is factual and deliberately avoids "self-laudatory information." An example is this booklet I hold in my hand, Defense Employment and Training for Employment, of which a total of 80,000 have been distributed—over 10,000 to congressional offices. In the committee hearing on H. R. 3368 the Director of the Office of Government Reports categorically denied that the office would serve as a propaganda bureau.

The fourth object stated in the bill is described by the minority report as "a call for the maintenance of a Washington newspaper clipping bureau."

The Press Intelligence Division of the Office of Government Reports is not simply a press clipping bureau. It is a centralized and comprehensive press service to administrative officials of the Federal Government and to Members of Congress. It is a service which is used extensively by Federal agency officials and by military and naval intelligence. The extent of its usefulness to Members of Congress is demonstrated by the 163,300 clippings furnished to Members during 1940. Moreover, it is a permanent index of press discussion of governmental affairs since October 1933, with a file of over 5,000,000 articles indexed for immediate reference purposes.

The minority report claims that there are "unstated purposes implicit in this bill which are even more reprehensible" and charges that ultimately only information "satisfactory to the powers that be will be publicized."

This charge was denied by the Director in the committee hearings on the bill, as was also the statement that the Office of Government Reports would provide an ideal method for imposing a complete and rigid censorship of every kind of news.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that practically every high school, every university and every college in the United States is having its students study government. The requests that come to us and to the executive branch of the Government for information has increased to such an extent that it is absolutely necessary to have some place where that information can be compiled and sent out.

This branch of the President's Office has been performing that function. It is nothing new. It has been going on year after year.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] feels that by passing this bill you will be doing something that will prevent the people from talking and prevent publishers from publishing information. He complains because the newspapers and the magazines of the United States did not publish an article published by a magazine in London. Let him blame the newspapers and the magazines if he wishes to, but why blame the administration?

Another function of the Office of Government Reports as set forth in H. R. 3368 is to assist the President in dealing with special problems requiring the clearance of information between the Federal Government and State and local governments and private institutions. The minority report charges that the President has been given the authority to name six executive assistants who might well perform this function more directly and effectively than the Office of Government Reports.

This charge ignores the purpose of the administrative assistants and misinterprets the scope of that function of the Office of Government Reports set forth in the bill. These men are the President's direct aides in dealing with agencies and departments of the Federal Government in Washington. They assist the President in obtaining pertinent information possessed by the executive departments to guide him in making decisions affecting the administrative work of the Government. They serve as a liaison for

the President with the agencies. They do not, and they could not, effectively clear information between the Federal and State and local governments and private institutions. That task is one requiring an agency with offices in each of the States.

Take for example the legislative service of the Office of Government Reports. The effective functioning of many Government programs depends upon legislation in each State. In some cases enabling or amendatory legislation is needed. Last month, for example, a bill was presented in 41 of the 42 State legislatures now in session to make it possible for local public-housing agencies to be utilized by the Federal Government to provide necessary national-defense housing. All bills, such as this, which agencies want introduced are cleared through the Office of Government Reports. As a result duplication of proposals and conflicts of purposes are avoided. Through conference with interested agencies, any kinks are ironed out and eliminated here in Washington, before the bills are presented to the State legislatures. The State directors in the field offices bring the proposed legislation to the attention of the Governor, the attorney general, and other responsible officials. Bills are, consequently, presented in an orderly and coordinated fashion. The confusion of many overlapping of conflicting proposals, presented by representatives of numerous separate agencies, is avoided. Instead, there is a single man to whom State officials can turn for authoritative information. In 1940 there were only 8 State legislatures in session, yet 58 bills for 7 Federal agencies were cleared for introduction. This year, with over 5 times as many legislatures in session, the volume is correspondingly greater. Over 150 bills have already been cleared this year.

Aside from these federally sponsored bills, legislation is often introduced which, if passed, will severely restrict, if not cut off entirely, the operation of a Federal program in the State. Many times this occurs simply because the sponsors of the bill were not fully aware of its possible effect upon a Federal program. Through the State directors the effects of proposed or existing legislation, and the viewpoint of Federal agencies interested may be brought to the attention of the State officials—to be used or disregarded as they see fit. Just as conflicts of purposes and duplication of proposals arise unless there is a central clearance of bills in Washington, so likewise do duplications and conflicts arise among the bills initiated by State legislators. If close contact between the Federal and State Governments regarding these legislative activities is maintained, that sort of thing can be avoided. The Office of Government Reports provides this contact.

Information as to the introduction and progress of all legislation of interest to Federal agencies is reported regularly to Washington while the State legislatures are in session. More than 300 semimonthly reports on the status of proposed legislation were furnished to 60 Government agencies during 1940. This year, due to national-defense developments, the field of interest has increased greatly and additional agencies are requesting reports. In this way the Federal Government is kept in continual touch with legislative activity in the States, and the States in turn are kept informed of the action necessary for full participation in the programs created by Congress for their benefit.

Many agencies have no facilities for such clearance of information. Many who do have representatives in the field nevertheless prefer to leave these legislative matters in the hands of a single man who is in close contact with the legislative situation in each State, realizing that centralized handling of such matters brings better results for all concerned. The Office of Government Reports fills this need. The necessity for a large number of agencies to maintain their own legislative reporting service is eliminated. By clearing bills for introduction through one office and by providing continual contact on legislative matters between State Governments and the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, confusion is avoided and prompter action results. This special problem in the clearance of information is one that must be met if the State and Federal Governments are to cooperate effectively. Only by such cooperation can the benefits of the Federal programs be brought to the citizens for whom they were intended. It is in special problems of this sort that the Office of Government Reports assists the President—problems which obviously are of the sort that cannot and never were intended to be performed by a single administrative assistant.

The minority report charges further that to date neither the President nor any State or local government or private institution has complained publicly of any difficulty which this measure can correct. The fact that there have been no such complaints has resulted in large part from the very service rendered by the Office of Government Reports. It is interesting that in Texas, South Dakota, and Missouri, the State directors for the Office of Government Reports have been officially designated by the Governors of those States to be the liaison between all of the State agencies and the Federal Government. Similar arrangements on a less formal basis exist in many other States.

I hold in my hand now a letter written by Maj. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, in which he states, in part:

> It seems to me that it would be impossible for the War Department to catch up with and to duplicate the results you are achieving—

Meaning the Office of Government Reports—

> within any reasonable time and at any reasonable expense. As it is, the efficient functioning of your division makes it unnecessary for the War Department to organize a most important operation essential to the work of the Bureau of Public Relations.

An Assistant Secretary of the Treasury says:

> I want to echo the enthusiasm already expressed to you by Mr. Foster of the service which he has been receiving from the Division of Press Intelligence. The clippings and bulletins have been of invaluable assistance in the report which he has been preparing for the Secretary of the Treasury.

I hold here a letter signed by the Director of the Selective Service System. It reads, in part, as follows:

> Colonel O'Kelliher has brought to my attention the very painstaking and excellent work done by Miss Harriet Root in indexing a number of volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This work is very necessary and a valuable addition to our library. I want to take this opportunity to officially express the appreciation of the Selective Service System for this and numerous other courtesies extended to us by your organization.

Here is one from a university—Syracuse University:

> Last May I wrote you requesting 50 copies of Special Activities of Selected Federal Agencies and of the Informational Handbook for use in a summer course in American Government which I gave at the Cornell University. I have received these as per your letter of May 10 and found them so satisfactory for our purpose that we would like to use them in our course here at Syracuse. For this purpose, however, Syracuse University would need 500 copies of each.

I read what Hobart College, of Geneva, N. Y., has to say:

> As a former member of the teaching staff at the school of citizenship and public affairs at Syracuse University, I am familiar with the use there in class of several of your reports.
>
> I am teaching several courses in government here in which I should like to use such reports. I should like, if possible, 25 copies of your pamphlet entitled "The Activities of Selected Federal Agencies" and 25 copies of the Informational Handbook, as soon as the latter is published. The activities pamphlet could be sent at once.
>
> I trust that my request may be granted, for, as you may well understand, there exists at present no published similar material of equal classroom value.

Mr. Chairman, last week 35 young ladies came to Washington who attend a school in my congressional district in St. Louis. They study government. Every year the 35 students in the senior class receiving the highest marks come to Washington—one year the boys and the next year the girls. The girls were here last week. This morning I have letters from some of the young ladies thanking me for showing them around. Literature as furnished by the Office of Government Reports is very helpful to them in their studies.

I say, Mr. Chairman, as I said when talking on the rule, that the fight is not on the bill; it is a renewal of the fight upon the President of the United States. This Office is in the Office of the President of the United States. It is not a separate agency. He needs it to carry on the responsibilities we have placed on him. We should grant this authorization without any argument, the same as he grants us our appropriations when we ask for them for the Legislative Establishment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at the start of his

remarks so that I may get some information? I am not critical, I am simply seeking to get some information.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield to the gentleman before I conclude, if I am permitted.

Mr. Chairman, if there were needed evidence for anyone to support the pending bill I believe we have had a very striking reason in the argument and statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] who has criticized all policies of the administration and the fullness thereof, but points out no real objections to, or defects in, the bill. The administration now in power in its early days found itself face to face with the greatest peacetime emergency in the history of the Republic. Unprecedented powers were conferred upon the Chief Executive in the war against the depression, and the responsibilities of the Chief Executive were multiplied manyfold. By Executive order in 1933 he set up the National Emergency Council as an executive agency to aid him in the discharge of his duties, and provided its functions, from time to time, by rules and regulations, which are substantially the functions now exercised by Government Reports.

In the reorganization bill, Congress provided that the President might abolish agencies but that he was without authority to abolish functions. Therefore in reorganization the functions of the National Emergency Council were transferred to the executive office. Some months thereafter in 1939 by Executive order, in the identical language of the pending bill, the Office of Government Reports was created as an arm of the Executive, to enable the Executive now, when we are confronted with another great national and international emergency and when the responsibilities of the Executive have been increased many more times than during the depression, better to discharge his duties.

We conferred upon him the immense power of lump-sum appropriations in 1933 and succeeding years, and Members of Congress, as well as citizens of the Republic, were eager to know about the functions of the various relief and emergency agencies established. In like manner, since the national-defense program was begun, citizens of the Republic have been desirous of knowing the various agencies making contracts and providing for the defense of our country. This Office of Government Reports is a clearing house to give them and the Members of Congress and the country the information that has been given during the past 7 years.

I say in passing, in response to the criticism of this bill, that there has not been any criticism of the language of the bill save one, and that was a criticism placed in the mouth of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] by his colleague with respect to the collection and distribution of—and I quote from the bill, page 2 (c)—

> information concerning the purposes and activities of executive departments and agencies for the use of the Congress, administrative officials, and the public.

I have read the language of the bill. The purpose of this bill is to give to the public, to the States, and to the people generally information with respect to the agencies that have been established. I say it would be unfair to give that to the public and not give it to the Members of Congress.

The statement or the suggestion that it is necessary for Members of Congress to come to this agency in order to secure information from any Government agency or any department is wholly unfounded and without merit.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want to make a statement first and then I shall be pleased to yield.

Let me remind you that matter was covered in the hearings. As to the information service, there are 900 monthly requests from Members of Congress and no information or service is furnished to anyone except upon request. Information is given with respect to national defense, with respect to other agencies, and then, in the language of the hearing, no suspicion, no guess, only factual data, and if interpretations of that data are desired, this agency refers them to the different departments of the Government, as Government Reports only furnish factual information, and do not interpret regulations.

I say that the charge or the insinuation that the purpose of this legislation is to require Members of Congress to obtain information from Government agencies through Government Reports is wholly unsupported, and is of a piece with the other criticisms of this bill.

It has been said that this bill is propaganda. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] in 42 minutes' arguing against the bill covered practically every criticism of the administration in power, and finally said it was not the language of the bill, it was not what was in the bill, it was not what has been administered for the past 7 years, but "it is our suspicion and our view as to what may be done that is not in the bill."

With respect to propaganda, let me say that the language substantially, and certainly the functions, of the bill have obtained for 7 years. What propaganda has it put forth that you have brought to convince the Members of the House or Committee of your charges?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment.

What evidence has it put forth that you have brought forth to convince the members of the Committee that it is a propaganda agency? The great agriculturalist from the city of Cleveland, Ohio, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], when pressed for proof of his statement that it was a propaganda agency, brought before the members of this Committee an agricultural yearbook issued by another department or agency of the Government with which Government Reports has nothing to do. So I say that the charge or insinuation of propaganda must fall to the ground. The language has been tried for 7 years and not an example of propaganda has been submitted.

But it is said the purpose is to establish a dictatorship. Mr. Chairman, I am just old-fashioned enough to believe in efficiency and economy. I refer to the hearings. I anticipated the objections to this bill. I went into matters in detail. I wanted to know if this agency was going to duplicate; I wanted to know if it was going to be inefficient; I wanted to know if it was going to eliminate some of the press services or some of the bureaus trying to magnify the importance of their work. So I undertook, as I may say without presumption, intelligently, to analyze the bill, and I have this to say with respect to the charge of dictatorship made day in and day out on the floor of the House: The first thing that a dictator does is to abolish and to fire and to discharge. Your criticism has been that the President of the United States—and I refer to my Republican friends—instead of abolishing offices has created offices; instead of firing, reducing, and discharging public officials has created more public offices. If I know anything about history, dictators cut physical and political heads off, abolish departments, abolish bureaus, and discharge public officials; but not so in the case of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In a moment I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the purge—he was cutting off then.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me complete my statement, and then I will be pleased to yield.

It has been said that this is a censorship bill. If it be a censorship we have had it during peacetime for 7 years. We covered that in the hearings. There is and was no evidence of censorship. The hearings disclose that this was an information service to give to the people of the United States and to the Members of Congress information respecting the billions of dollars that we are spending to promote national defense and to provide for the security of our own country. There is not a word in proof of censorship. What censorship has there been in the last 7 years under the language and functions of this bill? I say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], able as he is, summarized it and gave the very best argument he could submit for opposition to this bill and, finally, he was forced to conclude that he could not find any fault with the bill itself; that it was not what was in the bill but what was not in the bill. This same sort of criticism and flimsy reasoning might apply in opposition to any legislation, and let me submit that that sort of argument falls of its own weight because it would be equally proper to say, in undertaking to analyze and discuss any legislation pending before the Congress, "Members of the committee, I shall not discuss the bill; I will undertake to discuss what is not in the bill in an effort to dissuade you from passing this legislation."

Mr. Chairman, this is an authorization bill, as has been stated. The National Emergency Council was provided for in the emergency and relief appropriation bills by separate items and not out of relief appropriations. There has been ex-

pended from $125,000 to something over $1,000,000 for each of the years, sometimes more and sometimes less. This is an authorization bill, and we are spending more money now than ever before in the history of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And if we limited the bill to this administration, my friends on the left would say that we want it to expire with the term of Franklin D. Roosevelt. This is permanent legislation. It does not undertake to make an appropriation. It fixes the limit, when we are spending billions for national defense, beyond which this appropriation cannot be made, and the Committee on Appropriations is the judge of the amounts. As Members of Congress we tell the President and the country what assistance we need in the discharge of our official duties, and the Chief Executive accords us the right to provide other assistance, no matter the cost. The President of the United States, vested with more power and more responsibilities than any Executive in human history, says to us, the coordinate branch of the Government, "I need this agency in the discharge of the obligations that have been imposed upon me by the country and by the Congress," and for my part I propose to give him the assistance that he, of all men on earth, needs today. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental principle upon which democracy exists is government by the will of the people.

In order to perform the control of government most effectively, it is fundamentally essential that full reports of major government activities be promptly furnished to the people, in a thorough and unbiased manner. Naturally, some of the opposition leaders are professionally inclined to challenge all statements emanating from the administration, hence we hear charges of partisanship. If the political situation were reversed, the same critics would very likely be the loudest in their praise of the wonderful work of the Office of Government Reports. The able and distinguished gentleman who will direct this office, Mr. Lowell Mellett, has an outstanding reputation for accuracy of statement and fairness of purpose. Through his knowledge of facts and his experience in the business of news dissemination, Mr. Mellett is admirably fitted to perform the duties of his position. The Congress has authorized the expenditure of the vast sum of $27,000,000,000 for national defense, covering projects for armament on a most colossal scale. These projects affect the destiny of every person. The burden of payment of the bill rests on every citizen of the country. There certainly was never a time in all the history of our Republic when full and complete Government reports were more needed or more demanded by the people. I sincerely trust that the modest authorization requested in the pending measure will be fully approved by the House.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, you and I, as Members of Congress, know the intricacies of the Federal Government far better than the average citizen, yet we Members of Congress go to the United States Information Service in the Office of Government Reports over 900 times each month looking for information; and I might add, we get it. Now, if we in Congress find this one phase of the Office of Government Reports' activities so valuable, imagine how useful it must be to the average citizen who knows so much less than we of the Government and its workings.

The first function of the Office of Government Reports as set forth in H. R. 3368 is to provide a central clearing house through which individual citizens, organizations of citizens, and State and local governmental bodies may transmit inquiries and complaints and receive advice and information. The minority report charges that the establishment of such a clearing house would mean nothing but the intervention of the third party in the process, since individual citizens now send their inquiries directly to the specific department concerned. The minority would lead us to believe that an attempt is being made to route all inquiries through the Office of Government Reports. This is not so, for neither you nor I nor the public would tolerate for long a system which directed us to go through a third party for information which we can obtain directly from the second party. Certainly we would go to the specific source of information if we knew that source. The minority assumes that this direct source is always apparent, but let us be realistic. The fact is that there are thousands of inquiries about the Government—mail, telegraph, personal, and telephone—which are not directed to a specific agency, and these inquiries come from public and private citizens who want information but do not know where to get it. This is where the Office of Government Reports comes in. Congressmen, businessmen, the chairmen of local chambers of commerce, the administrators of Government agencies—all turn to the United States Information Service for direction in obtaining information the source of which is not readily apparent. The postmaster of the District of Columbia will tell you that there is much mail received in Washington addressed "United States Government," or having some equally general address. This mail is sent to the U. S. I. S. by the post office.

You and I realize also that some part of our day is given over to the average citizen from our district who comes to Washington on business, but is at a loss to know just where to go to obtain the information he desires. We are always delighted to be of assistance to these people, but there are many others who come to Washington under the same circumstances who do not find their way to the House Office Building for direction, and the Office of Government Reports has found the task of helping these people with their problem an ever-increasing one.

Daily they are called upon to direct these people to the proper agency and in many cases appointments with the proper officials in these agencies are arranged. Does this official handling of the problems of the average citizen seem like interference of a third party to you or rather is it the effective performance of a first party without which vast numbers of information seekers would be completely helpless? Sixty percent of the written requests for information received by the United States Information Service make the statement that the inquiry is so directed because the writer did not know the specific agency to which the request should be sent. Is this a luxury service or a practical one? I think it is practical when I consider that in the Washington office a monthly average of over 10,000 inquiries are being received by mail, telephone, telegraph, and in person by the Office of Government Reports, while in 1 State, New York, the State office is currently receiving over 600 such calls daily.

The minority report asserts that the Office of Government Reports could in no case offer a definitive or authoritative reply to the citizen or to a State or local governmental body. They add that surely the Office of Government Reports will not assume responsibility for replies to sovereign States or to citizens' organizations which direct their questions to our Departments of War, Navy, State, or Treasury. No attempt is made to do this and questions directed to the above-mentioned departments would not be sent to the Office of Government Reports and further if such requests specifically directed were received by them in error they would immediately be properly transmitted. Whenever an interpretation of the law is required the request is reported directly to the agency concerned or the inquirer is directed where he may obtain the information he desires. The Office of Government Reports has the information and facilities necessary to properly route requests for information and sends them correctly from the beginning to the specific agency or agencies involved so that they will not be endlessly shunted back and forth. This orderly routing by a central organization does not add delays to the already lengthy interval between a request for governmental information and a responsible reply, but does exactly the contrary. It is not a time-consuming intermediary but rather an effective time-saving handling of requests and this is doubly true when we consider that requests received at the Office of Government Reports in many cases concern themselves with the activities of more than one agency—conservation, housing, dams, jobs, and so forth. Now, if we did not have a central clearing house how could such requests be answered? The requests would necessarily make the rounds from one agency to another until a final answer was compiled. As it is now through the United States Information Service the material needed for such a reply can be obtained from all the agencies involved at the same time and thus the period lapsing before a responsible reply is made is

greatly reduced. It would seem to me that the public and private citizens of this country have much to gain by this orderly procedure.

Those of us who have taken advantage of the facilities of the United States Information Service have found that our time has been saved rather than consumed. We know that there is at our disposal by the U. S. I. S. a compilation of informational material covering the entire Government. There is a directory of our Federal employees and also directory lists of executive officials, chief clerks, information and publication offices, personnel offices, and so forth. Through these facilities Congressmen, telephone and telegraph companies, the general public, and Government personnel itself are able to get in touch directly with the people they seek. I would not like to see this function replaced by the old time-consuming process of hit-and-miss contacts.

In his message to Congress, transmitting Reorganization Plan II, on May 9, 1939, the President states—

> The Information Service makes available general information concerning all phases of governmental activity and is provided for all submitting questions or inquiries by mail, by telephone, or by personal call. In one sense, it may be called a post-office address—Uncle Sam, Post Office Box 1, Washington, D. C.—to which persons who want information about the Government but do not know the exact division to which to apply, may write with confidence that the question will be answered, or else sent on to the proper agency for direct reply.

This is a service which we need, and the past performance of this agency stands as a clear refutation of the charges of the minority report that the Office of Government Reports is a useless and time consuming intermediary in assisting the helpless citizens to obtain advice and information from their Government.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] spent most of his 42 minutes criticizing what is termed in the bill the third function of the Office of Government Reports, and I intend to take just a little bit of time in discussing that function, because it is probably more valuable to the Members of this House than any other function of that agency. The third function of the Office of Government Reports is to collect and distribute information concerning the purposes and activities of the executive departments and agencies, for the use of Congress and administrative officials. The minority report, as you heard it read, charges that this function, stripped of its false front, means no more or less than the establishment of a bureau of propaganda. It means, says the report:

> The establishment of an agency whose major purpose will be the perpetuation of power in the administration which creates it.

Further, it says:

> But there are unstated purposes implicit in the bill which are even more reprehensible. Should events across the seas create emergency conditions even more acute than those which now exist, such an office of reports would provide an ideal method for imposing a complete and rigid censorship of every kind of news, military and civil alike.

I believe that I would be one of the last Members of this body to sanction any plan which seeks the curtailment of the freedom of the press. I spent 8 years performing practically every reportorial capacity on a newspaper, and I have the deepest respect and affection for the traditions and ideals of a free press. In addition to that, I witnessed not so many months ago the important function that a free press can perform in the upheavals which occurred in my own State. I would venture to say, however, that every fair-minded newspaperman in Washington today will testify to the invaluable service which has been rendered to the press as well as to the other democratic institutions in our country by the Office of Government Reports. Not one newspaperman or publisher, nor a single publishing association, asked to be heard by our committee and I believe that the Members of this House know that had there been the slightest evidence or the slightest supposition of any danger of censorship, that every press organization in our country would have asked to appear before that committee. It seems to me that the fact that not one even asked to appear lends support to our position that the press is in favor of this bill.

In the hearings on this bill the Director of the Office of Government Reports was questioned at length as to whether or not his office was to be used for the censorship of the press or the radio, and any of you can read what he had to say when so questioned, but I want to quote just a little bit from his own testimony. He said:

> If any censorship is contemplated now, or if this country should become involved in war, I do not know anything about it. When I say that no censorship is contemplated in the event of war, I do not mean that there will not be censorship of military and naval information. I mean there will be no censorship of press and radio such as exercised in some countries abroad.

Mr. Mellett further pointed out that, in any case, the Office of Government Reports would not be particularly adapted for the functions of censorship, even if censorship were contemplated. So you have a man who does not believe in censorship controlling an office which, by his admission, is not adapted to censorship in the first place.

I think there has been too little discussion here today about the real functions of this office and the real service that it performs for our people.

The function of collecting and distributing information concerning purposes and activities of the executive departments and agencies was assigned to the Office of Government Reports 18 months ago.

The information which has been collected and distributed under this function absolutely refutes all charges of propaganda made in the minority report. Members of Congress are thoroughly aware of the difficulty of obtaining in one place information which relates to an entire program, parts of which are conducted by any number of different agencies. Take, for example, the defense vocational-training program. We have the Office of Education, the National Youth Administration, the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Defense Advisory Commission, the apprentice section of the Department of Labor, and State and local vocational educational authorities, all of whom operate in the national defense training program. If information is desired by a Member of Congress on the whole program, it would require calls or letters to each of those agencies to obtain the information. Then it would be necessary to put the data together, eliminate duplication, and arrange it in understandable form.

Last fall Government agencies began receiving an increasing number of requests from people who wanted to know how to get a job on the defense program and how to be trained for defense employment. I do not believe there is a single Member of this House who did not receive hundreds of such requests. To meet this demand for information the Office of Government Reports compiled a booklet entitled "Defense Employment and Training for Employment." To date requests have been received for this booklet from over 200 Members of the House and Senate. Copies of the booklet have been distributed to probably 100,000 different people. I invite the author of the minority report to inspect that booklet, along with any of the other booklets to which I may refer, and point out one word of propaganda that can be found within its pages.

Members of Congress, too, know how difficult it is to obtain current, complete, authoritative information on the activities of the entire Federal Government. Newspapers and magazines provide this only partially. Even then it is necessary to make a thorough scrutiny of the entire publications in order to cull the information of interest. To meet this difficulty, the Office of Government Reports prepares a mimeographed daily summary of all Federal activities, entitled "Information Digest," and a weekly summary of agency operations in connection with the defense program entitled "This Week in Defense."

I have copies of this bulletin before me. I should like to have them examined if anyone so desires, to determine if they, by any stretch of the imagination, might be termed self-laudatory. I should like to have the opinion of any Member as to whether there has been any selecting, editing, and cutting with a possible opportunity for distinct coloring, which the minority report states will inevitably result in the performance of this function.

As an increase in volume of inquiries demonstrates a public demand for a certain type of information, the Office of Government Reports collects it and makes it available.

That is the third function which has created so much criticism.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to finish my statement, if you please.

Among these publications which have been called propaganda are the following, and I am certain that all Members

of the House are familiar with most of these booklets, because they are invaluable; but I will read them to you so that we may make a record of them:

Tabulation of defense contracts by States.

Incidentally, I have before me the only list which the Government has available of every defense contract which has been awarded to date. This list is made up of about $12,000,000,000 of defense work, and this is the only source of obtaining this information. This agency, the Office of Government Reports, has been able to coordinate and obtain that information almost immediately. Businessmen, the National Association of Manufacturers, and all trade associations throughout the Nation are turning to this Office to obtain this invaluable information.

I will mention some of the other booklets which all Members of Congress have used from time to time:

United States Government Manual.

Activities of Selected Federal Agencies.

Consolidated State Report of Federal Expenditures.

Digest of the Purposes of Federal Agencies.

Directory of Federal and State Departments and Agencies.

I have such a directory here for the State of Ohio. I have been unable to find any propaganda in it.

Informational Handbook, which contains data and tables on subjects of general interest, national wealth, and income, employment, and so forth.

Members of the House know that the charges of censorship and propaganda which have been made against this Office are entirely without foundation. They know, too, that the director of this department is a respected member of the newspaper fraternity, completely in sympathy with the ideals and traditions of a free press. Rather than an agency of propaganda, this Office is performing an invaluable service of information both to the Government and to the American people in this time of crisis. [Applause.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to say that I heartily agree with what the gentleman has said about the Office of Government Reports. I would like to call his attention to the fact that last fall, when the floods came into Louisiana and other parts of the South, we called on the Office of Government Reports repeatedly to collect and collaborate information and assist in that respect throughout the whole South.

We had to call on them to work through the agencies of W. P. A., the Farm Security Administration, the A. A. A., the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Soil Conservation Service. They performed outstanding work in helping the people of the South who were suffering from these heavy rains and floods.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman, my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, for his contribution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the fight on this bill is not against what this bill says but what it really represents, because as usual this bill is in form dishonest and misleading. In form it merely provides for an Office of Government Reports. We already have Government reports by the million and by the millions of dollars worth. This bill is to ratify, make permanent, and augment something that already exists. We are not talking about the future, we are talking about something that exists now: Propaganda and censorship from the White House. This is to increase it and make it permanent.

It has been said that no newspaper has spoken against the bill. Here is what Arthur Krock, one of the most distinguished reporters of the New York Times, an important paper, says, and I quote:

If Congress passes the measure any administration, including this one, can make a central propaganda and censorship bureau of the office.

Here is what he states further:

If Congress passes H. R. 3368 it will be simple to synthesize the effort in the pattern of Berlin, Rome, and Moscow.

That is from the New York Times.

How about radio? Lowell Mellett is to be the Director of this Office of Government Reports. Here is the way he operates. Last fall when Fulton Lewis gave a broadcast during the campaign Lowell Mellett did not like it. He called up Lewis and cursed him and threatened to put him off the air. Now Mellett says of the incident, and I quote from an article by Charles G. Ross, contributing editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in the magazine Broadcasting—

Mellett says that he was simply blowing off steam in his private capacity.

What would we do under the Wagner Labor Relations Act if an employer threatened, intimidated, and coerced an employee and then said, "I am simply blowing off steam in my private capacity"? What would we do if a public official under the Hatch Act threatened, intimidated, and coerced a public employee and said, "I am simply blowing off steam in my private capacity"? Such so-called private blowing off steam as Mellett practices is an attempt at censorship through intimidation. It will be easier under this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No; I will not.

What does all of this mean? Under this misleading and dishonest title, "Office of Government Reports," we have not only a ratification of but an increase in a system, a technique, of propaganda and censorship, in which through threats, intimidation, coercion—a typically totalitarian "war of nerves"—against free speech, free press, and free radio; the New Deal can carry out this quiet revolution in our form of government that is going on in the name of national defense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 1 minute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio refused to yield when he made the statement in reference to Fulton Lewis. The facts in regard to that episode involving Fulton Lewis are these: Mr. Mellett and Fulton Lewis have been personal friends for many, many years. The incident occurred following a Government employee's throwing something out of a window, I think, in Detroit while Mr. Willkie was there.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri has already spoken on this bill twice.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is all right. I can speak on it again; I have been yielded additional time. We are under general debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under the rules a Member may speak only once on a proposition. The gentleman will not yield to anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] is in charge of the time and has yielded time to the gentleman from Missouri, which is within his province. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. COCHRAN. As I said, the incident occurred after a Government employee threw something out of the window at the time Mr. Willkie was in Detroit.

The President made it very plain at a press conference that he thought that employee should be dismissed immediately and prosecuted under the State laws. As I understand, every commentator and every newspaperman in the United States commended the President with the exception of Fulton Lewis. In his speech he indicated a lack of sympathy on the part of the administration or Democratic organization. The President was vigorous in denouncing such conduct. To say that a man of Mr. Mellett's intelligence would tell anyone he would take him off the air is, I am sure, an error. I asked Mr. Mellett about this incident, and he told me he was positive he made no such statement to Mr. Lewis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has missed the whole point. My point in bringing the incident to the attention of the House was not to defend Mr. Lewis but to cite an admitted instance where Lowell Mellett threatened some commentator whose broadcast he did not like with extinction in his job, cursed him, and then said he was merely blowing off steam in his private capacity. Here is an admitted example of attempted censorship through threats by the man who is to be Director of the Office of Government Reports under this bill. I am not defending Lewis, but the gentleman's attack on Lewis is no defense of Mellett's attempted intimidation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. EATON. I should like to say that in my judgment Mr. Fulton Lewis has paid the finest tribute to the Members of this House of any man connected with the press of this country; and I want to say further if the gentleman will permit, that this bill seems to be 150 percent pure and absolutely without any colored brother in the woodpile connected with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When seen through New Deal glasses. That is what the gentleman means.

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] did not say very much about this bill. He did not appeal for votes because of the merit of the bill as much as he did for votes in support of the President.

It is an old and familiar procedure for those on the majority side, whenever a measure is criticized, to say that the attack is directed at the President. As the head of the party and as the responsible source for the legislation which for some 8 years has been coming to a Congress which has been known throughout the country as the "rubber stamp" Congress, there is no reason why the President should not be criticized, unless we have reached that point in our history where it is a sin or a crime to do otherwise than accept his conclusions.

Just when did the President become infallible? Just when did it become impossible for him to err? That he wants this bill is neither evidence nor proof that the country should have it.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] stated the whole situation just a few moments ago very concisely, very accurately. Other valuable material was put in the RECORD by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

I only extend my remarks to point out from our past experience with another governmental agency, the N. L. R. B., how this one will function, and to add the thought that, in these days when every dollar is needed for national defense, we are just pouring another $1,500,000 into a rat hole for the continuation of an agency which is not only needless but actually harmful.

APPROVING AND EXTENDING A PROPAGANDA AGENCY

According to its Director—

The Office of Government Reports functions through three operating divisions: Field Operations, Press Intelligence, and Information Service.

If this bill be enacted, the Division of Field Operations will have its agents collecting and interpreting information throughout the land. It will function in somewhat the same manner as has the N. L. R. B.

You will recall that the Smith committee report disclosed that agents of the N. L. R. B. were sent out to gather information as to complaints which had been made against employers or, in some instances, to find facts on which to base such a complaint.

Examiners sent out to hear those complaints were authorized to take testimony and, in addition, at times went beyond their legal authority and, with the aid of the Board's investigators, took testimony off the record. As an illustration, on one occasion, when a witness had testified, an investigation was made to ascertain whether he belonged to the local chamber of commerce. On other occasions, the past record and history of employers was gone into rather extensively; this for the purpose, it was said, of giving a background against which to weigh the testimony and judge the subsequent acts of such employers.

Even a criminal on charge for a felony may not have thrown against him the weight of previous actions or misdeeds unless he has previously been convicted by a jury of his peers.

You may recall how it took two acts of Congress to banish from the N. L. R. B.'s staff David Saposs, who did so much to color the testimony of those who were charged with violations of the N. L. R. A.

The second division operating under this central office would be that of Press Intelligence. Under that Division, undoubtedly the material gathered and the interpretation put upon it by those in control of this agency would be given to the public. Whether all would receive the information obtained through Field Operations in equal degree and at the same time or when requested, those who have had experience with governmental agencies can judge for themselves. It is doubtful if there is a Member on the floor who has not had, at one time or another, occasion to complain bitterly of the inability to get needed information. Many Members have been given the "run-around" by clerks, subordinates, in the governmental departments.

The third branch of the service is that which is designated as Information Service. Briefly, this is a central clearinghouse for information. It is a duplication of a service rendered by other departments of the Government. It is a sort of digest to which departments of the Government which do not know of information in their own files may turn to learn where that information can be found.

It must be remembered that this service is under the control of the President. Its official name is Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President. If this is a representative Republic, why should it not be an Office of Government Reports of the Congress or of the Government? Why make it the tail on the kite of the Executive? What chance has the judicial or the legislative branch of the Government of getting a fair deal when this agency is placed under the control of the Executive?

Have we any assurance that field operations will act impartially or that press intelligence will give out information that is not colored? It is inevitable that field operations cannot gather information on every conceivable topic. It cannot collect and consolidate all conflicting views. Of necessity, there will be discrimination in the selecting of information. As long as human nature remains as it is there will be a biased interpretation, colored, of course, by the views of the administration in power.

It is said that there will be no censorship. That may be true in the sense that all information available will be given out, provided that information is in accord with the views of the director in charge or with the views of the Chief Executive of the land.

Some of those on the majority side, against whom the Executive purge operated in the 1938 election, should be able to see the result to which this legislation may lead.

In the majority report it is stated that the work has been carried on in some form since 1933.

As proof of how the system can become an agency for propaganda, we need but cite the campaign against employers carried on by the N. L. R. B. and call attention to the fact that those who have been on the other side of these labor disputes have been quite free from investigation by this agency.

Throughout the land members of the Communist Party, men with criminal records, have been attempting to destroy industry, make over our Government, socialize our Nation; but this agency, which now wants $1,500,000, has apparently been unable to discover, or else has not given out, the record of these men.

Did you ever try to get the record of, for example, Harold Christoffel, Walter Reuther, Victor Reuther, Richard Frankensteen, Ed Hall, or any of those named in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A1352 and A1353, from a Government source; from, for example, the Labor Department? Not until Congress created the Dies committee were we able to learn the past history of some of these pets of the Labor Department.

Let me give you one concrete illustration: In the 1938 election Maurice Sugar was a candidate of the Communist Party in the city of Detroit. Among the documents put out by his party at that time and asking for support for him and other candidates of the party was one which made this appeal:

To all who hate the smug priests of the Catholic church, and the slimy hypocritical ministers of the Protestant churches; * * * to all who are opposed by this damnable Government, we address this message: Vote for our candidate—Maurice Sugar.

Close the churches and make those buildings into shelters for homeless men and women. Down with religion, which is opium which the ruling class feeds you to keep you satisfied with the miserable existence which you lead. There is no God.

For years Maurice Sugar has been the legal mouthpiece of those back of the Michigan strikes. He was an active figure in the 1937 sit-down strikes.

The A. P. carries the information, under a Detroit, March 24, date line, that at the request of Maurice Sugar, counsel for the U. A. W. A.—C. I. O.—both Henry Ford and Edsel Ford are to be subpenaed to testify before the Labor Board.

At any time during the past 4 years the Labor Board could have ordered an election at any of the Ford plants in Michigan. The C. I. O. and the N. L. R. B. knew very well that if an election was called in the Ford plants to select representatives for collective bargaining the C. I. O. would lose out. Until recently the Board has never shown any indication of calling an election.

The Board, partisan that it is, bent on forcing Ford employees to fatten the treasury of the C. I. O., waited for more than 4 years, while the C. I. O. carried

on its organizing drive among Ford employees.

Many of you will remember the attempt of certain New York financiers to take over the Ford Co. It is matter of common knowledge that for months the C. I. O. has been spending vast sums, using many organizers, to create dissatisfaction among employees of the Ford Motor Co.

During practically all of that time governmental agencies have been assisting, so that now we have the combination of financial interests, C. I. O., Communists, and the Federal Government functioning, in one instance, at least, through Sidney Hillman, of the O. P. M., to destroy the Ford Motor Co.

And right here let me pause to remind you that when a vote was taken among union men, not only the independent workers, men who belonged to no union at all, but the men of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., through a public poll, decided that Ford more than any other man—yes; to a greater extent than William Green or John Lewis—had aided labor.

And who is this Maurice Sugar that Madam Perkins and the N. L. R. B. have taken under their wing? Who is this man Sugar, who, when we are preparing for national defense, when the Nation is dependent to such a large extent upon the industries of Detroit, is back of the strikes there and is making a determined effort to delay production at the Ford Motor Co. by his attacks against Henry and Edsel Ford?

Maurice Sugar is the man, who, on the 13th day of June 1917 with five others, was indicted in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, for a conspiracy to induce other persons to refuse to register in accordance with the Conscription Act.

A motion was made to quash this indictment and, if you are interested, you will find the opinion in 243 Federal Reporter, page 423.

Thereupon, Sugar pleaded guilty to the indictment; that is, he pleaded guilty to a conspiracy to induce people to refuse to register in defense of their country. He was fined $500 on December 4, 1917, and although he took an appeal to the circuit court of appeals, his conviction was affirmed in a unanimous and lengthy opinion filed on July 10, 1918, and reported in 252 Federal Reporter, page 79.

But that is not the end of Sugar's court record. He was indicted on August 22, 1917. That indictment was for failure to comply with the Conscription Act. He entered a plea of guilty and, on December 4, 1917, was sentenced to serve 1 year in the Detroit House of Correction.

That case was appealed and again the conviction was affirmed by the opinion reported in 252 Federal Reporter, page 74. Sugar attempted to review this case in the Supreme Court, but his petition was denied on November 4, 1918.

Michigan now has a so-called nonpartisan judicial election. Lo and behold, this man, Maurice Sugar, twice convicted, once of conspiracy to induce others to evade the Conscription Act; once because of his own failure to comply with that act, now engaged actively in sabotaging national defense through strikes, is a candidate for judge in the city of Detroit.

The Communists have defied the police, the State law-enforcing authorities and, if they can now elect a judge, they will be further strengthened in their efforts to protect the law-violating members of their organization.

Undoubtedly, Maurice Sugar will receive the vote of the Communists, of the C. I. O., and of those who do not know his record. He would not have been nominated by the Republicans and it is doubtful if he could have received the nomination on the Democratic ticket, had the election been a partisan one.

Have you any idea that, if you had requested information about Maurice Sugar from this central office, you would have received a full and complete report, showing his conviction or his interference with our national-defense program in 1917 or in 1941?

After the hearings were held on this bill, just to see what I would get, I wrote on March 4, a letter to the Office of Government Reports, Commercial Building, Washington, D. C., which was as follows:

Was much interested the other day in Mr. Mellett's testimony before the House Committee on Executive Expenditures as to the information which could be furnished by that Bureau, if established.

Perhaps you can tell me where I can find a reference to the news item carrying the information that Vice Premier Admiral Jean Darlan warned that France may go to war against Great Britain, if the British keep on confiscating French food ships.

My information is that it was published February 28, 1941.

You will note that I gave the office an intimation as to where they would find the information sought. On the 6th, the office came back with the following letter:

I have had a search made of the newspapers received by the Division of Press Intelligence in an effort to find the news item, requested by you, carrying the information that Vice Premier Admiral Jean Darlan warned that France may go to war against Great Britain, if the British keep on confiscating French food ships.

The item appeared in the Detroiter Abendpost, a German-language paper of Detroit, Mich., and I am enclosing herewith a translation of the story.

Sincerely yours,

LOWELL MELLETT, *Director.*

Now, that might be cited as an illustration of what the service can do for Congressmen. However, you might be interested in knowing that, before I wrote the bureau, I had the same information from the Daily Pentagraph, published at Bloomington, Ill., under date of February 28. That news item read as follows, and I got it out of the Congressional Library:

DARLAN WARNS WAR POSSIBLE

VICHY.—(Unconfirmed.)—Holding a reunion with former French soldiers, Vice Premier Admiral Jean Darlan warned that France may go to war against Britain if the British keep on confiscating French food ships, it was reported reliably Friday.

Darlan was said to have stated that the Vichy Government does not want to fight Britain, but might "change its mind" if the British continue to halt and seize the vessels.

Why appropriate $1,500,000 to give the President, his six secretaries, and Government bureaucrats a propaganda organization which will feed, not only to each other and other people, to State officials, but to Congressmen as well, those vitamins which it, the Executive office, may think we need?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has naturally created a feeling that there is an attempt at censorship because of the outrageous conduct of the gentleman who is expected to head it. No one could expect anything else.

This is the picture of that outfit. They have been before the Appropriations Committee a good many times, and I have had a little experience with them. It costs them just about four times as much to clip one-third of the newspapers that are published in this country as it does private news-clipping agencies. That makes it an efficient agency. It is 25-percent efficient. From the standpoint of the Government, that is a good recommendation for its continuance and for the doubling of the appropriation covering this agency.

If you will get before any committee of this House a responsible officer of any department who has not been tipped off in advance as to how to answer questions and ask him whether or not this outfit is any good to him, he will say "No." When their stuff comes out and it is published, they will try to run to cover. I have seen them do that more than once.

The trouble with this thing is that we started in and we have multiplied by 20 the cost of sending propaganda out through the mail in the last 8 years. We ought to stop this foolishness. We have gotten to the point where the cost of sending things through the mail on the part of Government departments is $40,000,000. The cost of this thing here, $1,500,000, which is double the appropriation for the current year, is only a minor portion of the terrific expense that there is in connection with the situation. The Government agencies do not use this so much. You can get all of this information direct from the Army and Navy that you get from this outfit, but they have taken over the job of handling it.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to stop adding recklessly to the cost of government. If the President would think this thing over, he would realize that this agency, instead of being an asset to him, is a liability, because no free government can continue to exist with paid propaganda on the part of the administration in power. It is absolutely the antithesis of freedom.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. When the Office of Government Reports comes before the Committee on Appropriations for its annual appropriation, and if it develops it is duplicating, would not the gentleman's committee have the right to deny it funds for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and we try to do that wherever we can; that is, those who are in position to take that stand.

I wish that the gentlemen on the majority side would treat this as a matter of patriotic devotion to the liberties of America and their preservation, and that they would cut out the attempt to pass this kind of a bill here today.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Much has been said this afternoon about the importance of this legislation. Will the gentleman tell the House how many witnesses appeared before the committee urging its enactment?

Mr. TABER. I only have the hearings available to me. There is one witness whose name appears in the printed hearings.

Mr. CANFIELD. No other witness?

Mr. TABER. No other witness. That was Lowell Mellett speaking for his own job.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY].

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, a question was asked of the last speaker which seems to me to have double possibilities. The question was, as I recall it, If this bill is so important and so vital in the conduct of Government, tell me how many Members or how many witnesses appeared before this committee to testify in its favor?

All afternoon the opposition has pointed to this as a propaganda agency. They have talked about control of the press, the complete subjugation of public opinion, the control of the avenues of expression, censorship, and so forth. They have maintained it was everything that was fatal to free speech. I ask the opposition, how many public agencies, press agencies, publications, or private citizens appeared, in line with the argument that was advanced on the floor of the House this afternoon, in opposition to this bill. Absence of such opposition would tend to weaken the arguments that have been made. If there was the remotest chance of these things happening, an outraged public would have stormed the committee room.

Another argument was made here to which I should like to make very brief reference. I believe it was my distinguished friend from Michigan who said:

> Who does the President think he is, a little above the Almighty? What wants he with another press agent, with his wife going about the country?

The Lord knows that the President of the United States needs no defense from me. The President of the United States needs no defense from any man. There he stands.

Let me say parenthetically, I do not deny the right of criticism. It is not only a right but a duty to criticize. Every proper criticism ought to be made not only from the minority side but from the majority side as well, but let us have it fair criticism, let us have it honest, constructive, intelligent criticism.

Who does the President think he is? I do not know who he thinks he is, but I have a fairly good idea who the American people think he is. I have a fairly good idea who the people of this entire hemisphere think he is, and I have a fairly good idea what liberty-loving people throughout the entire civilized world think of him today. I say to you, when our names and our histories and our utterances—yours and mine—have been lost in the abyss of time, he will stand and still stand towering down through the ages, not only as one of the outstanding Americans of this era, but one of the outstanding citizens of the world—of all times. [Applause.]

The President has a terrific task and a gigantic burden. He has asked us frankly as a necessary aid in discharging that task and in carrying that burden to give him this help, and I believe if we can assist in any measure, however small, we should do so, and that we can by supporting this legislation now before the Committee. [Applause.]

There is not a Member of this House who does not make a conscientious effort to keep currently informed of the opinions, desires, and the complaints of the citizens and groups of citizens in his district. In a representative form of government such as ours this is not only important—it is mandatory. It is not a very difficult job for any astute Member of Congress to keep his finger on the pulse of the people back home. You and I know the officials of the political subdivisions of the districts which we represent. We know the members of the chambers of commerce, and most of us know the ordinary fellows who hold no public office or are not members of committees, but who, nevertheless, are thinking very deeply about their country and who, under this democracy of ours, are able to express their opinions as to how best it should be preserved. Still, I never met a Congressman who did not read the newspapers and who was disinterested in what the daily and weekly publications in his district were saying about the measures upon which he must vote. Most of us, however, do not find the time to read all of the publications in our districts as we would like to do. This job of keeping aware of the desires and needs of our constituents is a full-time one for us even though we have the advantage of being able to return to our homes every so often to get a first-hand picture of conditions.

Now, if this job is difficult for us, how much more difficult must it be for the President and the members of his official family whose jobs of necessity keep them stationed in Washington most of the time and whose views are therefore liable to become circumscribed unless they take advantage of every means at their disposal of becoming thoroughly cognizant of public opinion. I do not think that anyone could honestly say that the news and the editorial comment of 350 daily newspapers from key cities in all sections of the country is of little importance to Washington officials. The Daily Bulletin of the Office of Government Reports Division of Press Intelligence reviews this number of daily publications and makes available to executive officials and Members of Congress every day throughout the year a summary of daily news and editorial comment. This complete national coverage serves not only as a summary of news and comment but is a basis for a permanent index of the more than 5,000,000 clippings now on file in the Division. This is not merely a clipping bureau, but rightly has been called the Division of Press Intelligence because, through the means of expert grouping of material as prepared by trained personnel and presented in the Bulletin, officials requesting service on any phase of government have ready access to this information. Under this expert grouping users of the service may select and request only material of actual interest.

There is intelligence in the manner in which the service has arranged its material to meet the complex problem of defense. For instance, the Bureau of Public Relations of the War Department has available in the Division's daily bulletin Navy Department material, lease-lend and national-defense program, housing, labor, selective military service, subversive activities, State Department, Treasury Department, and so forth—items which are of vital interest to the War Department. This type of press intelligence has a definite place in American government today, and we should encourage it to meet the unpredictable requirements of the troubled days ahead.

The Division's permanent files of over 5,000,000 clippings on public affairs, dating back to October 1933, offer an unmatched and invaluable reference library for research on events and public sentiment during this period. Federal officials, especially those just coming into public service, are able to inform themselves quickly on specific events of the past or on long-term situations, such as farm-aid programs, labor matters, tax and revenue problems, foreign policy, and so forth.

The minority members of the committee feel that it is totally unnecessary to maintain an intelligent review of the press, but I still believe the customer is always right and that he would not continue to subscribe to a service that was unnecessary. We find that during 1940, 172,700 clippings were loaned from the Division files in addition to the one and three-quarters million clippings which were furnished to be retained. Most important in the consideration of these figures is the fact that the Division makes clippings available only upon request. I do not think that the customers were wrong one and three-quarter million times. Furthermore, over 160,000 clippings were sent upon request to Members of the Senate and House in 1940, and I am sure that my illustrious colleagues were not wrong on an average of 13,600 times a month.

The Division of Press Intelligence was worked out to meet the requirements of Government agencies which formerly operated their own reading, clipping, and filing units or subscribed to commercial clipping bureaus. It now serves every department and agency in Washington. A centralized service such as that of the Division produces an over-all economy which we must consider during these days, when it is necessary for us to appropriate money for so many new activities which have resulted from the defense emergency.

The President is the representative of all the people, and it is his responsibility

as Chief Executive to manage efficiently the administrative problems of the Federal Government. If he believes that he and his administrators can become better informed through this intelligent summary of United States press comments, I believe that we owe it to him to appropriate money for carrying out this work in his Executive office. The democratic process depends upon the desires of all the people, and we must do everything possible to learn what those desires are.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have tried all afternoon to get somebody to yield, as some of you may have observed, without any success, in order that I might, in a spirit of attempting to know what this is about, fully get an answer to just one or two questions that seem to be rather obscure, and I have listened to all the arguments.

I should like to ask the gentleman from New York, my distinguished friend and the chairman of this committee, if he would inform the committee whether or not this bill enlarges the functions prescribed in the original order of the President creating the National Emergency Council.

Mr. O'LEARY. For the information of my friend from Wisconsin, it does not. It is identical with the Executive order of years ago.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman state whether or not the hearings on this bill contain that original Executive order specifying the functions of the National Emergency Council?

Mr. O'LEARY. No; they do not, but it was referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] at the time. He made the statement then that it was identical, and his statement was not questioned by the minority members of the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the source of the gentleman's information, as I understand, is the statement the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] made to the committee, which was undisputed?

Mr. O'LEARY. No; there was a copy there of the Executive order.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Just for the record, I have here the Executive order which set up the National Emergency Council in 1933. It applies only to the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the Federal Emergency Relief Act. This bill is a different animal altogether from the Executive order of 1933.

Mr. KEEFE. It would seem to me that in the presentation of the matter, important or unimportant as it may be, we ought to be sure of that situation. There has been a lot of criticism directed at this measure. I have listened to all of these arguments, I want to cast an intelligent vote if I can, and I should like to be sure about the matter. I will accept the assurance of the chairman of this committee as to whether or not this bill, if passed, enlarges the powers and functions of this body as set up when the President created the National Emergency Council by Executive order in 1933.

Mr. O'LEARY. I reiterate my statement of a few moments ago that it does not.

Mr. KEEFE. Very well, that is a categorical answer to my question.

Now, will the gentleman follow me in this: It is a fact, is it not, that this organization up to now has been financed out of funds provided and earmarked in the Work Projects Administration appropriation bill, and further financed by supplemental amounts allocated to this office out of emergency relief funds allocated to the President?

Mr. O'LEARY. If the gentleman had listened to my statement on the floor, he would know that I stated that for the past 20 months this Office of Government Reports has operated on funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for this purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that supplemental funds have been given to this agency by the President out of his emergency fund?

Mr. O'LEARY. No; out of defense funds. It was an additional $230,000 given this year out of defense funds.

Mr. KEEFE. That is the emergency defense fund of the President?

Mr. O'LEARY. I say the defense funds.

Mr. KEEFE. Then we have this situation confronting us, that here is an organization that has been created by Executive order, it has been functioning since 1933 and, good, bad, or indifferent, we have that record before us as to the charges of censorship and everything else that has been directed against it since 1933.

Mr. O'LEARY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. O'LEARY. The gentleman has been asking me questions. Has the gentleman ever heard any criticism of that organization since it was first established?

Mr. KEEFE. I have read criticism in the newspapers and I have read criticism in magazines, including a brief article by Mr. Davenport appearing in Collier's.

Mr. O'LEARY. That is a categorical answer. Tell me one specific instance where the gentleman has read a criticism of this organization.

Mr. KEEFE. I personally am not critical at this time. I am seeking information, and I hope the gentleman will understand me.

Mr. O'LEARY. Oh, I do.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not possible for a Member of Congress to stand up here and ask a question seeking information without being partisan and without being critical? I want to cast an intelligent vote in this matter, and I want to know how I should vote.

Mr. O'LEARY. But I am not going to let the gentleman stand there and insinuate that I am not giving him an intelligent answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEEFE. I am not insinuating that at all. I am simply asking the gentleman in a spirit of courtesy to tell me whether or not what I am stating is a fact. I want to be sure about that.

Mr. O'LEARY. I think I have been very courteous with the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, all right; that is, unfortunately, the kind of answer we expect, and I will let it go at that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should merely like to cite the authority from which I quoted: United States President Executive Orders Nos. 6071–6471 (a), March 1933; December 1933, Executive Order No. 6433 (a).

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for giving me one piece of information.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we continue to legislate for national security and to appropriate unprecedented sums for national security. Security for America and victory for democracy will be won on the production lines and in the factories of America. There continue to be stoppages of work on the production lines and in the factories and in the industrial life of America.

I am happy to report to the House that one of the strikes led by Communists which threatened for a time to tie up the entire production of planes on the west coast has ended, but I think the House should know something further about the men who led that strike.

I want to show the kind of people who were prominent leaders in the strike at the Harvill plant in Englewood, Calif. Happily, that strike was concluded yesterday, but the record of two of the strike leaders is still of the greatest importance. When we ask patriotic managers of our American defense industries to bargain collectively with so-called labor leaders such as Kenneth Eggert and Ralph Dawson, we are making a shameful request.

It has already been stated on this floor that Kenneth Eggert, one of the leaders of the Harvill strike, was until recently the section organizer for the Communist Party in Toledo, Ohio. Eggert was sent to the Pacific coast by the Communist Party for the express purpose of sabotage in the aircraft industry. Early this year, Eggert attempted to conceal his identity by changing his name to Eckert. He went so far as to obtain automobile license plates in Ohio under the name of Eckert—to be more exact, under the name of Ken F. Eckert. He then traveled to California in an automobile bearing license plates issued in that name. His Ohio license plates bore the number 9300C.

The Dies committee has obtained still more illuminating information concerning this man Eggert since last week. We have learned that the Communist Party sent Eggert to Russia in 1932 for a period of study in the Lenin school. Our committee has heard competent testimony by witnesses who were former students at

the Lenin school in Moscow. These witnesses have told how American Communists were brought to Moscow to study all the arts of violence and sabotage for special use in American industry. Eggert studied these tactics in Moscow. He had been trained years ago under the very shadow of the Kremlin for the work which he has been doing in the California aircraft industry under the auspices of the C. I. O.

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of Eggert's passport application. There is no doubt about his having traveled to Russia under the name of Kenneth Franklin Eggert. If, as he now states, his real name is Kenneth F. Eckert, then he traveled to Moscow on a false passport. If, on the other hand, he was using his real name in 1932 when he went to Russia, we must conclude that he is now using a false name and obtained his 1941 Ohio license plates fraudulently. At one time or the other, this man has lied about his real name.

I give you the record of another man who was a leader in the Harvill strike. I read you a telegram from our committee's investigators in Los Angeles which shows that Ralph Dawson, actually the head of the whole C. I. O. organization in Los Angeles and right-hand man of Harry Bridges, has also used aliases to conceal his identity. When we reflect on the strategic position in which the C. I. O. has placed this man Dawson, his criminal and Communist record becomes truly appalling.

The telegram follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 21, 1941.*
Re Harvill strike.
ROBERT E. STRIPLING,
Secretary, Special Committee on Un-American Activities,
Washington, D. C.:

Ralph Dawson is identified in press as president Los Angeles Congress of Industrial Organizations and member of Harvill Strike Committee. Los Angeles County sheriff record on subject is as follows: F. B. I. No. 729303 file dated July 26, 1939. First entry arrested San Francisco May 8, 1933, for violating ordinance 833, used alias Ralph E. Olney. Second entry arrested Visalia November 8, 1933, strike agitation and escaped from peace officer. Sentenced to San Quentin for 3 years; sentence suspended on condition leave State. Used alias Ralph E. Austin. Third entry arrested Los Angeles July 12, 1939, assault with deadly weapon. Used present name of Ralph Dawson. Last arrest occurred in connection with California Milling Co. case in Los Angeles at which violence occurred. According to Russell Parsons, former assistant district attorney, subject is Harry Bridges right-hand man. He has been organizer at Seattle for the C. I. O. Druggist Union which is under Bridges domination, and during 1939 was organizer for International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Association. Parsons stated that on Bridges' instructions Communist Attorneys Gallagher, Wirin, and Johnson, who represented Dawson on last arrest, agreed to plead all other defendants guilty provided indictment against Dawson would be dropped. Have reviewed file in district attorney's office on subject. Regarding arrest in Visalia complaint was filed charging criminal syndicalism. Count 1 alleged Ralph Austin (Dawson) in custody of Officers J. E. Hill, deputy sheriff of Tulare County, and Constable D. O. Howard, did willfully and unlawfully escape custody of said officers. Count 2 alleges Ralph Austin (Dawson) on or about October 10 did willfully and unlawfully by spoken and written words and personal conduct justify, attempt to justify, advocate, teach, and aid, and abet criminal syndicalism and the duty, necessity, and propriety of committing crime, sabotage, violence, and unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of changing industrial ownership and control and seeking a political change. Strike at Visalia was led by Pat Chambers, Lillian Monroe, and Caroline Decker, all well-known Communists. Riot was precipitated wherein two persons were killed when subject cried to Communist companions to come and take him away from the policemen who had arrested him. Austin (Dawson) pleaded guilty to escape and applied for probation. Probation was granted sentence suspended for 3 years under conditions that defendant go to State of Washington with his parents to reside during period of probation and not to return to California during probation. Probation Officer C. T. Pools' report states Ralph Olney Austin (Dawson) born November 30, 1912, Spokane, Wash.; parents Ralph O. and Elizabeth Austin, 7740 Thirty-third Avenue NW., Seattle, Wash. Came to San Francisco September 1932, studied at Shaeffer Art School until January 1933; expelled from school because of Communist ideas after being warned. Report of San Francisco probation offices states Austin (Dawson) was arrested in San Francisco for preaching doctrine of communism on street corners. Fingerprints and picture available. Picture of Dawson alias Austin alias Olney obtained from sheriff's files has been identified by three persons as being present president of C. I. O. council and member of Harvill strike committee and prominent figure on picket line at Harvill strike. Additional details will be furnished in report.

The C. I. O. must repudiate Communist leadership in any affiliates. The C. I. O. must cleanse its household of Communists acting as saboteurs of our defense program if it is to retain the confidence of the millions of its own fine, loyal, patriotic American citizens. The rank and file want security. They want Americans as their leaders, and Americans who believe in our form of government.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Government Reports in the the Executive Office of the President a sum not exceeding $1,500,000 in order to (a) provide a central clearing house through which individual citizens, organizations of citizens, and State or local governmental bodies may transmit inquiries and complaints and receive advice and information; (b) assist the President in dealing with special problems requiring the clearance of information between the Federal Government and State and local governments and private institutions; (c) collect and distribute information concerning the purposes and activities of executive departments and agencies for the use of the Congress, administrative officials, and the public; and (d) keep the President currently informed of the opinions, desires, and complaints of citizens and groups of citizens and of State and local governments with respect to the work of Federal agencies: *Provided*, That in the expenditure of such funds section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $50: *Provided further*, That the President may fix the salary of the Director of the Office of Government Reports at a rate of not more than $10,000 per annum.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Getting back to the bill, after a discussion of the Dies committee, I wish to call attention to the provisions of the bill.

We can imagine the effects of this kind of legislation and the prestige it would give to our new propaganda bureau upon radio. Under our laws, the Federal Communications Commission licenses broadcasters. Every year a broadcasting company must receive a reissue of its license, but it must first show that its past operation has been in the public interest. No radio-broadcasting operator, knowing full well that his license is subject to termination, is going to invite that kind of penalty by opening his microphones to "official news" which has not been signed, sealed, and delivered by the recognized authority. This means control of every news broadcast sent out over the air, and it places that control squarely in the Office of Government Reports.

What is the difference between this kind of thing and what we have abroad? In Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, and Great Britain, the so-called information offices and propaganda agencies are one and the same thing. In Great Britain, in fact, the Ministry of Information controls not only all Government publicity but also censors information coming from abroad as well as information which emanates from Government departments. What has happened in Europe is this: Foreign governments have either prohibited information from foreign countries, they have censored it, or they have instituted tremendous drives in the field of counter propaganda on their own hook.

I do not believe that we should blind ourselves to the needs for creating a favorable reaction to our American policies in other countries. It is my understanding that we have taken steps to better our relations with South and Central America. An elaborate campaign is now in progress in this direction. The passage of this bill will mean that all this expenditure of money will now be thrown out the window while we establish a new agency to handle what is already being handled at the expense of our taxpayers.

Only a few days ago, Roger Babson wrote in his column on foreign propaganda that newsmen in Washington have already been photographed and fingerprinted. The Secretary of the Navy has sent a confidential letter to newspapers asking them not to print certain facts. While making studies in Washington relative to the war use and supplies or war arsenic, Mr. Babson confesses himself "at a loss to know whether the Chemical Warfare Service was telling him the truth or stringing him along." And I quote his exact words:

All of this remnds me of World War No. 1 when I worked for the Committee on Information under the able genius of George Creel. Although we now have no such committee, yet Mr. Lowell Mellett heads a great press bureau in Washington which indirectly has the spending of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. This bureau may be used to lead the taxpayers astray. Although I have a large statistical information service scouring the country for facts, I am utterly bewildered at times trying to separate the truth from falsehood.

Mr. Babson's dilemma will be even more pronounced in the next year.

If this measure passes, we shall be doing no less than two grave misdeeds. We shall be, first, suppressing information, which information people have a right to possess, and, second, we shall be creating a central bureau of propaganda, the purpose of which is totally unnecessary and wholly unmerited. We shall be creating in Washington a bitter feud between the hundreds of publicity men now working in every department and the centralized propaganda ministry because there is nothing in this legislation which proposes to eliminate any employees from any other agency. I see no valuable purpose in this bill. Its effect will be to hasten the creation in America of the most vicious corollaries of dictatorship in Europe, suppression of a free press and the establishment of a potentially vicious propaganda. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has made about every charge against this legislation that can possibly be made except that it is advocated by Hitler. I would like to know what connection the Office of Government Reports has with the Federal Communications Commission? The Federal Communications Commission is a separate agency administered by men confirmed by the Senate of the United States, charged with certain responsibilities. If you do not like the Federal Communications Commission Act, introduce amendments to that act; but to say that the Office of Government Reports is going to control the Federal Communications Commission, especially in the issuance of licenses, is going mighty far.

In reference to the Babson proposition, what the gentleman says is probably true. I do not know. The War Department and the Navy Department, I understand, have found it necessary to have cards issued to those who desire to go in and out of the buildings. This is a critical period. If anybody should walk into the War and Navy Departments and get hold of some plans or specifications, what would happen here in Congress? Would the War and the Navy Departments be criticized for letting those people get into the departments? The employees of the War and Navy Departments, as I see them going to work in the morning, do have a little badge with a picture on it. I understand every Congressman is going to get some kind of a card of admission. In fact, I have a card in my pocket now to admit me to this Capitol, although my office is in the Capitol downstairs, to identify me in case somebody happens to be on the door who does not know me. I am not complaining.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; the gentleman from Massachusetts hands me a similar card to the one I have, which admits him to the Capitol. I do not see anything wrong in trying to protect the interests of the United States. I have not heard any complaint from any newspaperman. The newspapermen have not told me they do not like the fact that they have to be identified when they want to go into a Government agency. The newspapermen here are broad enough to understand the reason why this policy is followed.

This is legislation that has absolutely nothing to do with the Federal Communications Commission, and I cannot understand why the gentleman from Ohio should tie it up with that independent agency.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I take this time so that we may keep the record straight in this argument on this bill. I asked the distinguished chairman of this committee whether or not this bill enlarges upon the scope of the functions that were prescribed in Executive order in 1933 creating the National Emergency Council, and he advised me that it did not. Now I have before me that original Executive order, and it is clearly referred to in the United States Government Manual, which the committee was gracious enough to furnish me this afternoon.

The statement is made:

> The National Emergency Council was established under authority of Executive Order No. 6433-A, dated November 17, 1933.

Now, if you will turn to that Executive order you will not find anything in it similar to the provisions of this bill, but you will find that the Executive order provides that the functions and duties of the council shall be prescribed by the President, and provides for an executive director, who is to carry out the functions as prescribed from time to time by the President.

From 1933 down to the promulgation of the Executive order of September 8, 1939, I have no doubt but that the President enlarged and changed the functions of this department from time to time to specify what their functions were from 1933 down to 1939, and, finally, as appears clearly, when the President issued his Executive Order No. 8248 of September 8, 1939, he categorically and specifically specified what the functions of this newly reorganized Office of Government Reports was to be.

So far as this present legislation is concerned, examination of that Executive order discloses that the functions specified in the pending legislation are the same as those stipulated in the Executive order of September 8, 1939.

So at least we have got the point cleared up for the purpose of the record.

The further point I wanted to impress upon the chairman of the committee when I sought to ask him some questions was this: Leaving aside all bias and partisanship in this matter, I have personally made use of this Office of Government Reports from time to time since I have been a Member of Congress, not the present order, but that department that was in the Executive Office. I personally have had no complaints in reference to that particular department of government.

I have read the various comments in some of the newspapers and the comment by Mr. Davenport in Collier's magazine, but the fact of the matter is that, whether we pass this legislation or whether we do not, that is the point I think this Congress ought to have in mind, and that the people of this country ought to have in mind, when they attempt to be critical of Congress at times—whether we pass this legislation or whether we fail to pass it, the fact still remains that the Office of Government Reports will continue. It has continued for 7 years without authorization on the part of this Congress. It will continue so long as the President has the power to issue Executive orders defining its functions and powers and so long as he can provide funds out of emergency funds that this Congress appropriates to him to spend as he pleases.

By virtue of this legislation it is evident we are merely providing authorization machinery that will make this thing permanent by authority of law and authorize the Appropriations Committee to include a specific appropriation each year in some appropriation bill, either for the executive offices or independent offices. I do not know where it will ultimately find its way—executive offices, I assume—and it will be up to the Congress then to say whether they will appropriate the money. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. And it will be there for future Presidents as well as the present President.

Mr. KEEFE. Certainly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate the very frank statement the gentleman has made. Let me say to the gentleman that the hearings disclosed, as he said, that under the original Executive order the functions were to be prescribed by the President.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But from time to time the hearings disclosed that those functions were as prescribed in this bill. The further fact is that this bill is an exact copy, as the gentleman said, of the Executive order of 1939.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So that the functions have been the same, practically, since 1933?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. But whether we like the bill or whether we do not like it, it seems to me it is beside the question as far as the argument is concerned here, whether by our action we are going to abolish the function of that agency in the executive department. The President has full power now—and has had it since 1933—to create this department, to determine its functions, and we have given him millions and millions of dollars in emergency funds that he can allocate if he pleases, to a continuation of this function of government in his office. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed 5 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the Members to pause in their consideration of this very important legislation to turn their thoughts, if they will, to a brave little country in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the world is today celebrating one of the most historic anniversaries, the one hundred and twentieth anniversary of the independence of Greece.

The Greek Empire lost its freedom when it was finally overrun by the Turks in 1453, at which time Constantinople was conquered by the armies of Mohammed II. However, before losing its entity, the Byzantine Empire had for 975 years successfully defended Christendom, as well as the civilization that it had inherited from ancient Greece, against numerous attacks from Asia.

The Greek Nation had vanished for 368 years, until it was reborn on March 25, 1821, when Archbishop Germanos, of Old Patras, blessed the banner of the revolution that then began in most of the Greek provinces of the mighty Ottoman Empire. Modern Greece won her liberty and moreover the spark that ignited on that great day inspired other subject races to fight for their freedom.

Ancient Greece created the best civilization the world has ever known and preserved it for us by defending it against the barbarians of the east. The proud and determined Greeks of 1821, true to their traditions, fought for that civilization and regained it for themselves, although the odds were tremendously against them.

Fighting against immensely powerful enemies and winning appears to be the rule with the great race of the Greeks, not the exception. The Greeks of our own day have proven themselves fully worthy of their forefathers. In fact, many of us believe that they have excelled them.

The dictators of Europe, after subjugating their own peoples by force or false pretense, and hypnotizing other nations, large and small, into faint opposition or utter surrender, attempted to do likewise with the Greeks. But the Greeks refused to shame ancient Greece, their Byzantine Empire, or their recent forefathers of 1821. They chose to give battle and, to the amazement of all, are winning the fight for the preservation of their national honor and independence, have shamed their powerful enemies, and turned the tide of the war against them.

In enacting the lend-lease bill recently Congress has given President Roosevelt strong and effective means for aid to Greece in her struggle for liberty and civilization—things in which we so much believe ourselves. It is to our honor that we have done so, thus paying, in part, our moral debt to the cradle of our civilization and the mother of our democracy.

Immortal Greece. May she always be happy and free. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3368, authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, pursuant to House Resolution No. 127, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENDER) there were—ayes 87, noes 77.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted. There is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 144, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—202

Allen, La.	Drewry	Keogh
Arnold	Durham	Kerr
Barden	Eberharter	Kilday
Barnes	Edelstein	Kirwan
Barry	Edmiston	Kopplemann
Bates, Ky.	Elliott, Calif.	Lanham
Beam	Ellis	Larrabee
Beckworth	Faddis	Leavy
Belter	Fitzpatrick	Lewis
Bland	Flannagan	Ludlow
Boggs	Flannery	Lynch
Boland	Fogarty	McCormack
Bonner	Ford, Miss.	McGehee
Boykin	Ford, Thomas F.	McGranery
Brooks	Fulmer	McIntyre
Brown, Ga.	Gathings	McKeough
Bryson	Gavagan	McLaughlin
Buckler, Minn.	Gehrmann	McMillan
Buckley, N. Y.	Geyer, Calif.	Maciora
Bulwinkle	Gibson	Mahon
Burgin	Gore	Mansfield
Byrne	Granger	Merritt
Camp	Grant, Ala.	Meyer, Md.
Cannon, Mo.	Gregory	Mills, Ark.
Capozzoli	Haines	Mitchell
Cartwright	Hare	Monroney
Casey, Mass.	Harrington	Murdock
Clark	Harris	Myers, Pa.
Claypool	Harter	Nelson
Cochran	Healey	Norrell
Coffee, Nebr.	Hébert	Norton
Coffee, Wash.	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Cole, Md.	Hendricks	O'Connor
Colmer	Hill, Wash.	O'Leary
Connery	Hobbs	O'Neal
Cooley	Holbrock	O'Toole
Cooper	Hook	Patman
Costello	Houston	Patrick
Courtney	Hunter	Patton
Cox	Imhoff	Peterson, Fla.
Cravens	Izac	Peterson, Ga.
Creal	Jackson	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Crosser	Johnson, Luther A.	Pierce
Cullen	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Pittenger
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Okla.	Priest
Davis, Ohio	Johnson, W. Va.	Rabaut
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Ramsay
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Ramspeck
Dickstein	Kennedy, Martin J.	Randolph
Dies	Kennedy, Michael J.	Rankin, Miss.
Dingell		Richards
Disney		Rivers
Doughton		Robinson, Utah
Downs		Rogers, Okla.
Doxey		Romjue
Sabath	Sparkman	Walter
Sacks	Spence	Ward
Sanders	Starnes, Ala.	Weaver
Sasscer	Sullivan	Weiss
Sauthoff	Sutphin	Welch
Scanlon	Tarver	Wene
Schulte	Tenerowicz	Whelchel
Scrugham	Terry	Whittington
Shanley	Thom	Williams
Sheppard	Thomas, Tex.	Woodrum, Va.
Smith, Conn.	Tolan	Worley
Smith, Wash.	Traynor	Wright
Snyder	Vincent, Ky.	Zimmerman
South	Vinson, Ga.	
	Voorhis, Calif.	

NAYS—144

Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Paddock
Andersen, H. Carl	Gerlach	Pheiffer, William T.
Anderson, Calif.	Gillie	Ploeser
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Powers
Andrews	Grant, Ind.	Rankin, Mont.
Angell	Guyer, Kans.	Reece, Tenn.
Baldwin	Gwynne	Reed, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rizley
Baumhart	Hall, Leonard W.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bender	Halleck	Robertson, Va.
Bennett	Hancock	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Harness	Rodgers, Pa.
Blackney	Heidinger	Rogers, Mass.
Boehne	Hildebrandt	Rolph
Bolton	Hill, Colo.	Rutherford
Boren	Hoffman	Satterfield
Bradley, Mich.	Holmes	Shafer, Mich.
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Short
Canfield	Hull	Simpson
Carlson	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, Maine
Carter	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Case, S. Dak.	Jensen	Springer
Chenoweth	Johns	Stearns, N. H.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Stefan
Clason	Johnson, Ill.	Stevenson
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Sumner, Ill.
Cluett	Jones	Sumners, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Jonkman	Sweeney
Copeland	Kean	Taber
Crawford	Keefe	Talle
Crowther	Kilburn	Thill
Culkin	Kinzer	Tibbott
Cunningham	Knutson	Tinkham
Curtis	Kunkel	Treadway
Day	Landis	Van Zandt
Dewey	LeCompte	Vorys, Ohio
Ditter	McGregor	Vreeland
Dondero	McLean	Wasielewski
Douglas	Martin, Mass.	Wheat
Dworshak	May	Wigglesworth
Eaton	Michener	Wilson
Elston	Moser	Winter
Engel	Mott	Wolcott
Englebright	Mundt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fellows	Murray	Wolverton, N. J.
Fenton	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodruff, Mich.
Fish	O'Hara	Young
Ford, Leland M.	Osmers	Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—83

Anderson, N. Mex.	Hartley	Pearson
Arends	Hess	Plauché
Bell	Hinshaw	Plumley
Bloom	Howell	Poage
Bolles	Jacobsen	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Jarman	Rees, Kans.
Buck	Jarrett	Rich
Burch	Jenks, N. H.	Rockefeller
Burdick	Kefauver	Russell
Cannon, Fla.	Kelly, Ill.	Schaefer, Ill.
Celler	Kleberg	Schuetz
Chapman	Kocialkowski	Scott
Collins	Kramer	Secrest
Dirksen	Lambertson	Shannon
Domengeaux	Lea	Sheridan
Duncan	Lesinski	Sikes
Eliot, Mass.	McArdle	Smith, Pa.
Fitzgerald	Maas	Smith, Va.
Flaherty	Maciejewski	Smith, W. Va.
Folger	Magnuson	Somers, N. Y.
Forand	Marcantonio	Steagall
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Stratton
Gearhart	Mason	Taylor
Gifford	Mills, La.	Thomas, N. J.
Gossett	Nichols	Thomason
Green	O'Day	Wadsworth
Hart	Oliver	West
	Pace	White

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Dirksen against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Bolles against.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Hartley against.
Mr. Fitzgerald for, with Mr. Hess, against.
Mr. Kocialkowski for, with Mr. Stratton against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Jarrett against.
Mr. Duncan for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.
Mr. Shannon for, with Mr. Plumley against.
Mr. Cannon of Florida for, with Mr. Oliver against.
Mr. Somers of New York for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.
Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. Bloom for, with Mr Maas against.
Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Rees of Kansas against.
Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Lambertson against.
Mr. Kramer for, with Mr. Gerhardt against.
Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Schuetz for, with Mr. Rockefeller against.
Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.
Mr. Thomason for, with Mr. Gale against.
Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Rich.
Mr. West with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Buck with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Pearson with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Gossett with Mr. Forand.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Green with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Russell with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Mills of Louisiana with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Poage.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. White.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Plauché.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Taylor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

WILLIAM F. KLIEWE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of William F. Kliewe, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, RAMSPECK, and JENNINGS.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SCRUGHAM, CASEY of Massachusetts, SHEPPARD, BEAM, THOMAS of Texas, DITTER, PLUMLEY, and JOHNSON of Indiana.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein speeches by Mr. Goss and Dr. Coulter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two topics, one just my own remarks, and in the other to include a statement written and presented to the T. N. E. C. by William Ballinger, of the Federal Trade Commission. This extension exceeds the limit. I have an estimate from the Government Printer, which is attached to the extension.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the life and character of Kenneth Simpson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Jay Franklin on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein statements made by high naval authorities relative to the strategic national-defense importance of San Francisco Bay and Hunters Point, including its immense drydocks, which are among the largest drydocks in the world.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill which I introduced in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article which appeared in the New York Times today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks certain newspaper, magazine, and other editorials in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a certain matter, and in doing so I am not trying to chastise any congressional committee, except to say that some congressional committees release and make statements to the press without verifying the facts they give out. Of course, the papers are always glad to receive "startling news" no matter whether such "news" may hurt some good Americans. The committee may not be careful enough to investigate the charges that are made against certain Americans and to investigate the people who make these charges because they want to protect and hide their own un-Americanism by accusing other people of un-Americanism.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. What is that statement? Repeat the statement.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not referring to any Member of Congress. I am not referring to any Member of this House.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It refers to the committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. I am not referring to them. I said I am not criticizing any committee at all.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. What does the gentleman mean that they are covering up their lack of Americanism?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In referring to their trying to cover up their own un-American activities I was referring to the witnesses who appeared before the committee and not to the committee members.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the words that he used reflected directly upon a committee. Maybe he did not mean them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not mean that at all. I am referring to a published statement in the press dealing with the testimony of a certain witness before the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the press a few days ago made an attack upon an outstanding American citizen by the name of Generoso Pope. Generoso Pope is one of the leading American citizens residing in New York City. The charges resulted from testimony submitted by one Goffredo Pantaleoni at

a hearing before the Dies committee in December 1940. The press release was made a few days ago in which Pantaleoni charged Mr. Pope with being a Fascist leader in this country. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that these charges are utterly untrue; that this fellow, Pantaleoni was seeking to hide his own un-American activities, because from files that I have in my possession I find that this gentleman was a member of the Fascist League of North America in 1927. He was enrolled in the National Fascist Party in 1925. He continued his activities in Fascist movements in this country and received a salary of $10,000 a year from the General Tourist Bureau in Rome, which has a Fascist tie-up in this country. He was dismissed from that service because of an alleged charge of a misappropriation of $13,000. He filed his declaration of intention late in 1939, although he had been in this country for almost 10 years or more. His official title in New York was director of Italian Tourist Office of New York.

This witness is the same man who got up in an open meeting and other meetings that he attended, advocating fascism to Italian-Americans, trying to inculcate into their hearts and minds that fascism is far better than Americanism. He is the same man who used to wear prominently a black shirt at all Fascist parties that he attended trying to whip up sentiment for fascism in these United States. In other words, he was an agent of the Fascist Party in the United States, paid for by the Fascist Government of Italy for his activities here. His handling—or rather mishandling—of funds of the agency proved that he was a cheater and a crook. This is the type of man who is allowed to appear before the Dies committee and to make an attack on an upright, honest, law-abiding American citizen whose honesty and integrity cannot be questioned by anyone who knows him.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pope came to this country when he was 12 years old. His wife is a native-born American. His children were born in this country. He has donated and is donating to every charity I know of, and I am going to list quite a number of them.

Can anyone claim that any of the below-mentioned organizations have Fascist leanings?

Greater New York Fund; American Red Cross; American Red Cross Flood Relief; Catholic Charities; Federation of Jewish Charities; Italian Welfare League; Young Men's Christian Association; Young Women's Christian Association; Greater New York Committee for the Foundation for Infantile Paralysis; Jewish National Fund of America; Musicians Emergency Fund; Yeshiva College; United Hospital Campaign; Mulberry Street Community House; Italian Center of Queens; Sisters of Charity; Downtown Center; Society of the Hillside Hospital; Silver Cross Day Nursery; Night of Stars; Ursuline Academy; Little Sisters of the Assumption; Italian Board of Guardians; Columbia Association, New York Post Office; Talmud Torah; Ninth Street Day Nursery; Beekman Street Hospital; Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church; Italy-America Society; Columbia Association, Police Department; Italian Hospitalization Society; Col. Francis Vigo Post, No. 1093, American Legion; Italian-American Christmas Fund; Gridiron Club, Inc.; National Lawyers' Guild; McCosker-Hershfield Cardiac Foundation; Italian Big Sisters; Brooklyn Jewish Center; Harlem House; St. Joseph's Villa Camp; Order of Vigo; Brooklyn Academy of Fine Art; Hudson Guild; Leonardo da Vinci Art School; Columbia Association, Department of Sanitation; Ladies' Auxiliary of Mother Cabrini Memorial Hospital; Italian Professional Men of America; Williamsbridge Day Nursery; Columbus Hospital; Giuditta Guild; Italian Chamber of Commerce; National Institute of Immigrant Welfare; Italian Holy Name Societies; St. John's Villa Academy; Mother Cabrini Hospital; Italian Bronx Community House, Margherita Society, Inc.; Italian Professional Women of America; Columbia Association, Brooklyn Post Office; Columbia Association, Fire Department; Mother Cabrini High School; Italian-American Civic League; and Columbia Association, Business and Professional Men, Inc.

In order to inculcate the spirit of democracy and true Americanism into the hearts of the younger generation, he has also given scholarships to young men and women who are too poor and unable to provide for their schooling. Mr. Pope's answer to the accusations of his influence upon our higher institutions of learning is contained in the statement he issued to the New York Post:

[From the New York Post of March 21, 1941]

EDITOR POPE ISSUES DENIAL—"WAS NEVER CONNECTED WITH ITALIAN PROPAGANDA"

Generoso Pope, publisher, today challenged secret testimony given by Goffredo Panteleone before the Dies committee to the effect that he controlled Italian-language sources of information and Italian cultural schools in America.

The testimony was published yesterday in a story copyrighted by the New York Post and Overseas News Agency. Mr. Pope's statement follows:

"I have never controlled directly or indirectly the policies of any Italian-language newspapers except the two which I own, namely, Il Progresso Italo-Americano and Corriere D'America; nor have I ever controlled directly or indirectly any Italian source of information.

"The editorial contents of any newspaper except my own have never been checked either by myself or with the assistance of anyone, since I had no reason for doing so.

"I never maintained any liaison with the Italian Propaganda Ministry through anyone, nor has anyone ever influenced the policies of my newspapers. These policies at all times have been set by myself.

"I have never had any control nor have I ever been connected with any Italian cultural schools.

"My only contact with cultural institutions has been with the following:

"Columbia University, Cathedral College (St. Patrick's Cathedral), Fordham University, and Immaculata College, of New York City; Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.; Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.; Yeshiva College, Talmud Torah, and Downtown Center.

"It is true that I have contributed moneys to the above-mentioned institutions, but I am sure that no one can accuse these institutions as being instruments for any subversive propaganda either Nazi, Fascist, or Communist.

"There is only one 'ism' for me—Americanism."

Yet a charge is made in the press as a result of the testimony by this Panteleoni that Generoso Pope is a so-called Fascist leader in this country. When I present, Mr. Speaker, the facts and the background of this great American, you will see that sometimes it is unwise to issue press releases without making definitely sure as to the truth of the charges that are made before any committee.

I do not say that the committee has done this deliberately. It probably did not think enough of the matter to verify the charges made in December, which only came out a few days ago.

I want to go a step further in connection with my discussion and refer to a resolution that I have introduced along this line, House Resolution 147, which states:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to communicate with the heads of the republics and governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere with a view of inducing the heads of such governments to initiate within their own borders appropriate proceedings to expose and prosecute and expel foreign agitators and others who seek to undermine the democratic form of government and thereby endanger the defense of the United States of America.

In the last year or so, through some channels I was able to receive very definite information from a reliable source that the so-called Nazi agents and other Axis Powers are manipulating and operating within the borders of our Government and the governments of Central and South America, and that they are trying to array citizen against citizen, as they have tried to do here since the beginning of 1933, when Hitler came into power. They are propagandizing the United States, in an effort to undermine our form of government and to spread the philosophy that the Hitler ideology will sooner or later take hold of the whole world.

We were able in this country, with the help of the great Department of Justice under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover and the help of other agencies and congressional committees, to expose some of those so-called propagandists and agents who came here to destroy us, but the very same groups and agents are now in other countries of this hemisphere, trying to do the very thing they were not successful in doing in this country. If you go through some of the South American countries today and see the propaganda brought in by the tons, and if you listen to some of the radio and short-wave broadcasts, you will find that there is an average of 45 programs coming over the air from Germany. Two of them are so-called musical programs, but about 42 of them are nothing but propaganda against the United States, trying to array the South American countries against us. The other two have no significance at all and are solely "window dressing."

Mr. Speaker, I am asking by this bill I have introduced that the President of the United States call upon the South American countries and their heads to wipe out all the so-called agitators and the espionage that is being carried on within their borders, for the safety and for the protection of the Western Hemisphere. I think it would be beneficial if the President were to advise all our South American neighbors of what the Axis, and especially the Nazi government, is seek-

ing to do in order to undermine their own governments and thereby create friction between our South American brothers and the United States. So I say to you that this bill I propose is timely and should be adopted at the earliest possible moment, in order that we may have safety on this hemisphere and so that we may know that the Western Hemisphere is protected from spies and espionage and other un-American activities which are too close to our own borders.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. In connection with the statement the gentleman read awhile ago about the charges that appeared in the paper against this gentleman, our neighbor in New York, I am wondering whether or not the gentleman would tell the House just when those charges were made, and where.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. These charges were made I assume in executive session before the Dies committee in December of 1940. They were made, as I stated before, by the man whom I referred to as nothing but an alien Fascist in this country. I have his record. These so-called charges did not come out until somebody in the committee released the information and it appeared in the New York Post of March 20, 1941, and in the Daily News of Thursday, March 20, in which it was charged—I do not want to quote it, I am just going to put in a few extracts in order to save the record—that Generoso Pope, known as Gene Pope, who is an outstanding citizen, is tied up with fascism in this country, and that he is a clearinghouse for fascism in this country.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a nice thing if the committee invited Mr. Pope to appear before them to make any statement he cared to make?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Pope never refused to go before any committee. Personally, however, I think it would be a waste of time, since his record speaks for itself.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Does not the gentleman believe Mr. Pope is entitled to that courtesy and consideration?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What I would do if I were in charge of a committee making charges against any individual is this: I remember when I had the honor to be the vice chairman of the McCormack committee, we always made it a policy to protect character and reputation. A man of Mr. Pope's standing should have never been subjected to publicity of that nature unless the committee had definite proof as to the truth of the accusations. From the appearance of these documents, if any sort of an investigation or examination would have been made by any investigator of the committee, it would have definitely been shown that this man, Goffredo Pantaleoni, is nothing but an outstanding Fascist representing the Fascist Government of Italy.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Does not the gentleman think he could properly make a request or demand of the Dies committee to hear Mr. Pope and give him a chance to refute this statement?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to say this to my colleague: I think he is correct. I hope in the near future to have an opportunity to examine the so-called testimony of this so-called gentleman that I referred to. But I want to go back a little bit further.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I think the gentleman ought to tell the Members of the House, too, that Mr. Pope is the publisher of the Italian papers in New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; he is the publisher of the two outstanding Italian newspapers, Il Progresso Italo-Americano and Il Corrierre d'America. He employs many thousands of Americans. He feeds thousands of American families. He takes care of the poor. He has always condemned fascism and the Mussolini movement. To prove this point, let me at this time insert some correspondence and a statement made by Mr. Pope to the press as far back as May 1939.

IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO,
New York, May 4, 1939.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SAM: I am sending herewith a page from the New York Times of Saturday, April 29, 1939, which carried a translation of an editorial written by me and which appeared in my newspapers, Il Progresso Italo-Americano and Corriere d'America on Thursday, April 27, 1939.

This article reflects my views and that of my publications, and I thought you would be interested in having this for your information.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

GENE.

[From the New York Times of April 29, 1939]

ITALIANS HERE URGED TO END GROUP STRIFE—GENEROSO POPE CONDEMNS QUARRELS AMONG FACTIONS

Generoso Pope, publisher and editor of the local newspaper, Progresso Italo-Americano, has always condemned quarrels among Italian and Italo-American factions as giving a bad name to the law-abiding majorities of both classes. In the following article, published Thursday, he advises them to get together in the interests of maintaining an American peace—"Per la pace Americana":

"What is the duty of the Italians of America?

"Today more than ever separate and associated citizens and organizations have the duty to unite in stabilizing and maintaining relations of friendship, cordiality, collaboration with every other racial group of the great American family.

"We are and we remain most loyal citizens of this great hospitable land, to which the Italian people have given not only the best of their intellectual and moral strength but also, in the last war, tangible proofs of their profound attachment with a percentage of soldiers which constitutes a great title of worth for our immigrants and for our new generations born here.

"This loyalty of ours, this faith and the record of our conduct in time of peace and in time of war give us a greater moral strength to defend, today and always, internal peace and peace with other peoples, who, like those from which we spring, have no cause for enmity with the United States; they confer on us the right and the duty energetically to oppose every mischievous propaganda calculated to draw this country into war for interests not its own; they urge us to encourage every precaution of the Government which visions a stronger defense of the Nation, that would be and ought to be ready to repulse victoriously every eventual enemy attack.

"In short, the Italians of America should strive to live in the best relations with the rest of the people of the United States and should labor together with them to create, to preserve, and to solidify friendship with all the nations of the Old World, whatever may be their political systems or their religious faith.

"And we can render America great service if we are vigilant and active in clarifying situations, badly known because badly viewed; if we know how to substitute for a propaganda of lies and of hatred a propaganda of demonstrable truth, of serene, impartial, and convincing opinions. It is the surest way to relieve America from the perils of unjustifiable conflicts and to assure to this Nation a durable and benevolent peace, by means of which domestic problems, even the most grave, can find more urgent, more radical, more definite, and more satisfactory solutions."

MAY 8, 1939.

GR. UFF. GENEROSO POPE,
New York City.

MY DEAR GENE: I have your clipping which you were kind enough to send me, giving the translation of the editorial written by you.

I have read it with great interest, and wish to assure you that the sentiments expressed by you reflect the judgment of our people.

With kindest personal regards, I remain
Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN.

I have editorials from his newspapers that I will put in the RECORD to clarify his stand on the preposterous accusations against him.

This editorial appeared in the Il Progresso Italo-Americano and the Corrierre d'America:

AN ANSWER TO FANTASTIC CHARGES

The fantastic charges against me which appeared in a correspondence from Washington to the Daily News and in some other newspapers, representing a charge which was made to the Dies committee by Goffredo Pantaleoni, are a heap of falsehoods.

The wild dream of a conspiracy for the creation of a Fascist superstate in the United States could never have entered my mind. On the contrary, I have always been and am opposed to any importation of foreign "isms" of any sort which constitute a danger to the Constitution and the internal peace of the United States. Raised in America, where I reared my family and where I have been able to successfully carry on my activities, I am bound by the sincerest devotion and by the most genuine loyalty to this country and its institutions.

I profess only one "ism," and that is Americanism. And what I have written in favor of national defense, or the unity, discipline, and attachment of the Italo-Americans for the United States, is a glaring proof of this.

I am only interested in my two newspapers. I neither know of nor control any other publications of any sort. Nor have I ever sought or accepted for my newspapers any control foreign to my own judgment.

As regards the 27 schools of Italian culture mentioned in Pantaleoni's deposition, I must declare that I never was concerned with them and do not even know where they are located. I have merely offered scholarships for the continuation of professional studies in American colleges and universities—Columbia, Fordham, Cathedral College, Middlebury College, Randolph-Macon College, Immaculata High School, Yeshiva College, Talmud Torah, Downtown Center—with the sole purpose of encouraging young men of talent, without

means, to complete their education and become more cultured and finer American citizens.

My life is an open book. One cannot read in it what has never been written in it and what shall never be written in it—that is, to betray America, which welcomed me when I was a boy, which gave me every fine opportunity to work here successfully, and which therefore has the right to all my gratitude and all my devotion.

GENEROSO POPE.

If the committee, or its investigators, had only taken the trouble to investigate, they would not have released this serious charge against this man, who has been so loyal to the American philosophy of life and to American principles. I thank my colleague for calling it to my attention.

About 1932, or 1933, or 1934 the McCormack committee got some information on the Black Shirts in this country. I have the original documents that I found in my file about the Black Shirts in this country. I went to Gene Pope, the gentleman who is now charged with being a Fascist, and he, himself, gave me and the committee all the assistance possible to go after these groups that called themselves the Black Shirts. In my presence he condemned their action and absolved the Italian people in this country of any participation in this movement. He did everything he could as an American to destroy the so-called Black Shirts. Yet, because of the testimony of one single alien Fascist in this country, definitely on the pay roll of the Fascist Government, the committee saw fit after December of 1940 to release uncorroborated information charging this man with being the instigator of the so-called Fascist movement in this country.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is most unfair. Whatever the committee may accomplish—and it may have accomplished a lot of fine good things—it hurts itself by doing the things it has done in this particular case.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I shall take up the time of the House further. I only ask my colleagues to read the record and you will be satisfied that Mr. Pope is one of the best citizens we have in this country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HEALEY. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial from the State Legislature of Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago this Congress passed, and the President signed, the so-called lease-lend bill. By this act we have formally adopted as the basic foreign policy of this Nation the principle that it is essential to the future peace and security of this country that the right of nations, large and small, to shape and guide their own destinies without external force or compulsion should be preserved. We have formally announced to the world that as an instrument of our own national defense we shall furnish aid to the nations which resist aggression.

In pursuance of this policy we have already appropriated the tremendous sum of $7,000,000,000 and have demonstrated our determination to marshal the material and moral force of this Nation in supporting the countries which are defending their independence and integrity.

Of course, because of the swiftly changing pattern of world events it is not possible to lay down in specific detail the exact objectives of our foreign policy. However, I believe it to be relatively clear that one of the great objectives is to avert the extinction from the rest of the world of the democratic way of life and thereby prevent the serious threat to our democracy which would result if we should find ourselves isolated in a totalitarian world. The preservation of a world in which freedom, democracy, and liberty can continue to exist is vital to our own safety and it is essential that we aid, with every material and moral resource at our command, those nations which are dedicated to democratic principles of freedom and human dignity.

Such a nation is gallant little Eire, the birthplace of heroes and martyrs. For centuries, that little Emerald Isle has been the scene of violent strife and oppression. Yet the flame of liberty has never been dimmed and the heroes of Ireland have written, with their toils and their sacrifices, an epic chapter in the history of human freedom.

A brief two decades ago, Ireland, after centuries of struggle, achieved an independent government. Under the British Act of 1920 part of Ireland was granted a measure of independence and in the ensuing years this ripened into the entirely autonomous nation of Eire. Up to that time Ireland had been little more than a vast and undeveloped pasturage, a pleasant rural resort, entirely dependent upon other nations for its economic existence and with no independent internal economy worthy of the name. In the short space of 20 years, Ireland has gone far toward developing a sound national economy, based upon the development of its own resources and a program of sound economic relationships with other nations.

Where once manufacture was limited to a few homespuns, decentralized factories have sprung up all over Ireland, producing a host of diversified products which once were wholly imported. Ireland's agriculture has likewise been placed upon a sounder and vastly more productive basis. In this and many other ways Ireland has approached its goal of a balanced national economy.

During this period Ireland has also developed a new program of social development. It is contemplated by the Government that $100,000,000 shall be spent on housing, a part of which has already been spent in this way. Nearly half a million is being spent for milk for poor children and a widows' and orphans' pension system is subsidized by the Government.

The state is buying over about 100,000 acres of idle grazing lands and dividing this among landless men. Great progress has been made in education and rural hospitals have been erected throughout Ireland. The Government has even promoted and fostered the arts and culture of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I mention these facts to show the use to which Ireland has put her freedom, and the progress it has made along the paths of peace and economic development under her independence.

Today this little island stands squarely in the path of the juggernaut of war. Perilously it stands, a neutral between the two contending nations. As winter wanes before the budding spring, the world may well fear the danger that hovers over the Emerald Isle.

Prime Minister Eamon de Valera, in his Christmas broadcast to America, asked for the implements to arm the 250,000 soldiers guarding her shores, men who are now armed with little more than their great courage and love of liberty. Today we realize that Eire is also menaced by a shortage of food, and urgently needs food supplies from this country. There is, at present, in Washington a representative of that Government seeking to purchase from us the arms and food supplies which are so critically needed.

I believe that such supplies can be furnished to gallant little Ireland under the terms of the Lease-Lend Act, and I wish to strongly urge that speedy action be taken to do so. Perhaps no other nation bears a greater spiritual relationship to America than Ireland, and her strategic importance in the Atlantic is certainly a matter of vital concern to us. I am sure that no greater blow could fall upon the sympathies of the American people than the invasion and subjugation of Ireland, and I am confident that the great preponderance of the American people would applaud any aid that this Nation might furnish to Eire.

At this time, I wish to set out an excellent editorial from the Boston Post on the subject of aid to Ireland, which clearly and succinctly points out the compelling reasons for such assistance to the Government of Eire.

[From the Boston Post of March 17, 1941]

ARMS FOR EIRE

In his Christmas broadcast to America, Prime Minister Eamon de Valera of Eire asked the American people for arms for the 250,000 soldiers guarding her shores.

He emphasized that Eire is ready and willing to pay for modern equipment. He stressed that his country could not successfully defend her freedom unless such arms were available.

Now, on St. Patrick's Day, it is well to recall Ireland's vital strategic position in Europe's struggle.

The blockade of England can never be wholly complete without the occupation of Ireland by the Germans. The important sea lanes to England today are those which pass north of Ireland, and here is where the big damage to convoys is being done.

If the Germans occupy Eire their task will be so much easier.

Ireland has a history of never submitting to aggression or tyranny. Her sons have been found fighting for liberty in every major war and in most of the minor ones.

Irish patriots were with Bolivar and Washington, with Brown in the Argentine, and San Martin in Peru.

Of all the nations now beseeching American aid, here is one which never will be found ungrateful. She entertains no dreams of self-aggrandizement or empire.

Ingratitude is not a part of the code of Erin.

The President could order plenty of equipment for Eire, under the powers granted him in the Lend Lease Act. American supplies have been going to countries far less deserving of help, notably Russia and Japan.

The administration apparently has its attention fixed primarily upon England's problem, for, of course, that is the most pressing at the present time.

But to neglect help for Eire might well spell the downfall of England, too.

The matter of shipping to convey the weapons of war does not seem to be an insurmountable one. Many American vessels have been transferred to Panamanian registry to carry arms and supplies to England.

No doubt De Valera could make like arrangements for transport without endangering ships under the American flag.

The Lend Lease Act says that aid can be given any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

What country better suits this term than Eire?

What country has been more friendly? What country has been more consistent in her battle for freedom?

The time has come for generous and fair treatment of Eire. The fate of no other nation is closer to the defense interests of the United States. It could be the starting point for a great invasion.

And come what may, Eire will never be accused of perfidy.

Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, I was privileged to address this House on the subject of aid to the then-embattled Republic of Finland. I urged haste and we did make haste—but we were still too late. We have learned, from the blitzkrieg lessons of the recent past, that we cannot afford to wait until the blow has been struck by the forces of aggression. Aid rushed at that time, with whatever haste, is likely to be too late.

And so with Ireland; let us not wait until disaster has overwhelmed her. Let us supply her, without delay, the food supplies that she so critically needs. Let us speed to her the guns and planes and tanks and other materials which she so desperately requires to make effective the indomitable courage and determination of its people in resisting aggression.

We have, in the Lend-Lease Act, the instrument by which such aid can be rendered to Ireland without delay. We have implemented that instrument with a $7,000,000,000 appropriation. I am sure that the overwhelming weight of public opinion would applaud effective aid to Ireland.

I have introduced a resolution which would record this House as favoring immediate effective aid to Ireland. I hope that this House will approve this resolution and that the President of the United States will take immediate action to furnish to Ireland the food supplies and implements of war necessary to safeguard against aggression the heroic, liberty-loving little nation of Eire.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. I simply want to compliment the gentleman on his very fine address and to say to him that, naturally, I am wholeheartedly in accord with the sentiments he has expressed in his very able speech. I think the gentleman is to be commended for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. It is my understanding that when the neutrality combat zone was set out, as to the zones into which American ships were not to enter at any time, Ireland was included with the British Isles, making it impossible for American ships to enter that zone. While it was not the intention of Congress or any of those in charge of the defining of that zone that any penalty should be placed upon the little island of Ireland, yet a grave injustice really has been done by us, unconsciously, if I may put it in that way, and the least we can do in protecting our own interests with respect to the neutrality zone is to see that sufficient food supplies and other materials necessary for the continued economic life of Ireland are gotten to them rather than have this Government placed in the position of being the cause of continued suffering there.

Mr. HEALEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I am pleased to yield to our majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have made inquiries with respect to the matter about which the gentleman has addressed the House, and I believe the views of the gentleman are absolutely sound. They represent my own views. I am reliably informed that the Government of Eire—Ireland—recently entered into negotiations to purchase a vessel from the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., the *Oklahoma*, and they are undertaking now to buy that vessel and to have its change of registry approved. These negotiations have been in progress for several weeks. The registry of the vessel should be changed as quickly as possible, because, as I understand it, the Government of Eire is going to use the vessel to transport wheat, in the first instance, which is badly needed now. They need 30,000 bushels of wheat very quickly. They also need steel, they need gasoline and petroleum and various important foodstuffs for their own purposes. They also need defense implements, ammunition, and other implements of war; and there is one thing certain about the people of Ireland, they are liberty-loving and a religious people, and they will never stand for dictatorship or the imposition of paganism which Hitler and his allies stand for.

The transfer of this vessel from American registry to the registry of Eire should be authorized as quickly as possible, and I shall certainly do everything within my power to accomplish this, because I consider it important, first for the national defense of our own country that these things that Ireland needs in the way of food and implements of war should be sold or given to the people of that country as quickly as possible. Ireland wants to buy this food and these implements of war. I might also say with reference to food that the spirit of America is to render all assistance possible to the unfortunate people of conquered lands who are in distress, where assistance can be rendered without such assistance becoming an actual contribution to the vicious, destructive Nazi machine.

Mr. HEALEY. I am very happy to have the views of the majority leader, and, of course, very happy to know that he will bend his efforts to obtaining a quick transfer of the registry of the vessel referred to so that foodstuffs may be transported with all due haste to Ireland.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia, for today on account of illness.

To Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, for 7 days, at the request of Mr. GILCHRIST, on account of the serious sickness of his mother.

To Mr. KRAMER, at the request of Mr. COSTELLO, for 15 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 210. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 917. An act to fix the amount of the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 926. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors in military service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3546. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4050. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4050. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, March 26, 1941, to resume hearings on H. R. 3684, freight forwarders.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Wednesday, March 26, at 10:30 a. m. to hold hearings on project for improvement of waterway connecting the Tom Bigbee and Tennessee Rivers.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 27, 1941, to begin hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, new House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Wednesday, April 9, and Thursday, April 10, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day—resume hearings on H. R. 3359 and H. R. 3360, relating to preventing publication of inventions and prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents, respectively.

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m. on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions) relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

375. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the amount of $150,000, as an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year 1942 for the legislative establishment, Library of Congress (H. Doc. No. 155); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

376. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the twentieth annual report and a statement showing the names, titles, and compensation of the members and employees of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

377. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompany papers, on a preliminary examination of Cuchara River, Colo., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

378. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompany papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Big Mulberry Creek (Mulberry River), Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, and the act approved May 6, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 152. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4146, a bill to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3836. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 326). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3835. A bill to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use; without amendment (Rept. No. 327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4125. A bill to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members and certain members of the Reserve components thereof from selective training and service; without amendment (Rept. No. 328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLES:

H. R. 4156. A bill to establish in the State of Minnesota a regional forecasting office of the Weather Bureau; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4157. A bill fixing the postage rates on films, film negatives, and photographic prints; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4158. A bill to amend sections 3341, 3351, and 3361 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 309 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to repeal section 2907 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4159. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of Will Rogers; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 4160. A bill to provide for additional Federal aid for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind under the Social Security Act, as amended, to States with low per capita income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4161. A bill to authorize the construction of the Pine Flat-Kings River project in California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 4162. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pan-American center at New Orleans, La., for the coordination of commercial and cultural relations between the American republics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4163. A bill to amend the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law No. 11, 77th Cong.), so as further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4164. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Division of Star Route Service in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4165. A bill to improve the general economic welfare of the country by establishing, extending, and coordinating business research; and to furnish aid and assistance to small-business enterprises by providing facilities for the study of their problems similar to the research facilities now available in large business enterprises; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4166. A bill to change the name of the Santa Rosa Island National Monument to Santa Rosa Island National Recreational Area; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4167. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 4168. A bill to augment and increase the facilities of the meteorological station at Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 4169. A bill to facilitate public use and enjoyment of lands of the United States adjoining the international boundary within the Superior National Forest and purchase unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 4170. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution to secure the interest of the United States in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 153. Resolution to provide for the appointment of a board to investigate feasi-

bility of construction of pipe line from Baton Rouge, La., to Port St. Joe, Fla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. Res. 154. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that aid should be furnished to the Government of Eire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 45, with reference to national defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 10, with reference to the international salmon treaty; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 4, with reference to the present National and State social-security laws relating to old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 5, with reference to establishing a military air base between Raymond and South Bend in Pacific County, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, with reference to the construction of the Alaskan International Highway; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 63, with reference to a proposed vehicular tunnel between the boroughs of Richmond and Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 10, with reference to appropriate sufficient funds to construct and maintain adequate hospital facilities in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 4171. A bill granting a pension to Earl Irvin Devore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4172. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Goetz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4173. A bill granting a pension to Grace McGrath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4174. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 4175. A bill for the relief of Martha Morrison Hale; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4177. A bill granting a pension to Mary Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4178. A bill for the relief of Mary W. Gardner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 4179. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 4180. A bill for the relief of Edward Keating; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4181. A bill for the relief of Marcel Stark; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 4182. A bill for the relief of Mollie S. McHaney; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

563. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 200 citizens of Milo, Iowa, and vicinity, urging support of House bill 1036, a bill concerning the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

564. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the California State Board of Agriculture, requesting the Congress of the United States to make adequate provision for a continuance of the Tolan committee in order to develop further important facts upon which a sound national program can be based; to the Committee on Rules.

565. Also, resolution of the California Legislature, memorializing the President and the Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that meat and meat products inspected and passed under California meat-inspection law may be sold to and purchased by the United States on the same footing as meat and meat products produced under Federal inspection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

566. By Mr. HARRINGTON: Petition of the Forty-ninth General Assembly, State of Iowa, petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States proportioning representatives in Congress on the basis of numbers of citizens in each State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

567. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of the Kansas State Legislature, urging the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to make an immediate study and revision of Federal standards for wheat to the end that farmers will be paid for their wheat more nearly on a basis of true value and quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

568. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of the Producers Cooperative Gin Co. of Ennis, by L. C. Curtis, secretary-treasurer, Ennis, Tex., favoring the Bankhead parity bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

569. Also, petition of the Ellis County Agricultural Association, by A. A. Owens secretary-treasurer, Waxahachie, Tex., favoring the Bankhead bill for increased appropriations for parity prices to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

570. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Central Union Label Council of Greater New York, opposing House bills 123 and 125 and 126 and 132, introduced by Representative FRANCIS CULKIN, of New York; to the Committee on Interstate and foreign Commerce.

571. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Washington, D. C., concerning airports, national defense highway program, highway user tax diversion, and Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

572. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Mary Barrick, and other members of the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church of Croton, Ohio, opposing war, only as a last resort in defense of our beloved country, and further urging that the Army and Navy training centers be protected against liquor, gambling, and vice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

573. By Mr. MAHON: Resolution of the Crosbyton National Farm Loan Association, Crosbyton, Tex., urging favorable action upon a bill that contains appropriate provisions similar to those set out in Senate bill 4125 of the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

574. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Mine Workers of America, Local Union No. 1190, Ellsworth, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the present old-age insurance plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

575. Also, petition of the Finnish Relief Committee, Abel Maki, chairman, Chatham, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a loan to Suomi; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

576. Also, petition of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, municipality of Sagay, Negros Occidental, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to temporary suspension of the progressive tax on Philippine exports, especially sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

577. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to construction of certain flood-control projects; to the Committee on Flood Control.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of our fathers, we rejoice that our hope and our faith of mankind are in Thee. Thou knowest how little we understand; our infirmities, the sins which spring from within, how often we confess them and yet our strength is so often strong for evil. As little children, enable us to look up and wonder, trusting that Thou art Lord of lords and there is none beside Thee. In this thought of Thy majesty, mercy, and loving kindness, let come to us that sweet quiet and peace which are the balm for all fears and troubles. O Thou Jehovah Father, let us fill this holy Title with meaning which is an ever-present reality. We recall that Thou hast by the very breath of heaven, in times past, moved men to mount up to a high and holy conception of Thy Fatherhood. Today, O God, lift the light upon all who are lying low, smitten with fear and discouragement, those who are sick and heartsick. Give them power to believe that all things work together for good to them that love Thee. In hope and joy, in the power and pride of life, with work to do for men and praise to win for our Master, with free minds to serve and warm hearts to love, do Thou lead us on, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Through Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4183, Rept. No. 329) making appropriations for civil functions of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa on the subject of liquor and vice in the neighborhood of Army camps.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Iowa Press Association on the subject of national defense, social security, and pay-roll taxes

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. Milo J. Warner, national commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from President Green, of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Yankee Division, Veterans' Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to speak for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very worth while common-sense editorial by Col. E. E. Howard, of Wheaton, Minn., on the strike situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following telegrams: A telegram from Philip Murray, chairman of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, to me; a telegram from Clarence Irwin, national representative, Steel Workers Organizing Committee, to me; and my reply to Philip Murray.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS IN INDUSTRY

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to read a part of my reply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I will read only a part of my reply:

As chairman of the C. I. O. please advise me by telegram at once so that I may read your reply to the Congress whether or not the C. I. O. is ready and willing to expel from its ranks and from positions of leadership members of the Communist Party. What does your organization propose to do with the following officials of the C. I. O. concerning whose Communist affiliations there can be no doubt in view of the evidence before our committee: Joseph Curran, head of the National Maritime Union and vice president of the C. I. O., as well as a member of your executive board; Ben Gold, president of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union and a member of your executive board; Donald Henderson, president of the United Cannery Agricultural Packing and Allied Workers of America, and also a member of the executive board of the C. I. O.; Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Association and a member of your executive board; Michael Joseph Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union and a member of your executive board, and also John Santo, Austin Hogan, officials of the same union; Lewis Merrill, president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America and a member of your executive board; Abram Flaxer, president of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and a member of your executive board; Ralph Dawson, alias Austin and Olney, president of the Los Angeles C. I. O. Industrial Council; Kenneth Eggert, international representative of the National Die Casters Association, and many others.

In this telegram I am asking Mr. Murray to advise me at once, definitely and without equivocation, so that I can read it to the House and we can bring this issue to a show-down. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert therein a speech recently made by Chester C. Davis, before the Southern Governors' Conference in New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, April 7, after the conclusion of the legislative business for the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 20 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by Miss Martha Chickering, of the Department of Social Welfare of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE GOVERNMENT'S FISCAL SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the newspapers and on the floor about this month's being the greatest revenue month this Nation has ever seen. We have received $1,415,000,000 so far this month from taxes. A great sum of money. The increase is due to the tax bills we passed last year—making the people pay—taxing our people. But the people will have to pay more unless you spend less. I say spend less.

The increase in revenues, however, is not the thing to be proud of half as much as if we could have a balanced Budget to save our Nation from bankruptcy. I know the Budget will not be balanced at the end of this month notwithstanding these great revenues for the month of March. Why? Just because you spend it too fast. What the Congress has got to do now is to pass a tax bill that will

bring the people of this country to a consciousness of the fact that we are going on the rocks, or to bankruptcy, unless we can get sufficient revenue to balance the Budget. Spend less, tax more. This is the only thing that is going to save America. Unless we do this, America is going broke. Notwithstanding this huge increase in revenues we are going in the red this year over $6,000,000,000; and I ask, Where are you going to get the money? How can you save America unless you spend less and tax more? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a memorial from the State of Iowa relative to the early consideration and passage of Senate bill 860.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein portions of a letter I received this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of river and harbor improvements and to include therein a brief article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent on conditions in agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

I AM THE FARMER!

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will join with me and my colleagues from the Midwestern States in the important consideration of legislation affecting our greatest industry—agriculture. One of my constituents, himself a farmer, Mr. Joseph N. Prokes, of Route 5, Jackson, Minn., has prepared and carries upon his stationery the creed, "I am the farmer!" and under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include his creed:

I AM THE FARMER!

I am the provider for all mankind. Upon me every human being constantly depends. A world itself is built upon my toil, my products, my honesty.

Because of my industry, America, my country, leads the world; her prosperity is maintained by me; her great commerce is the work of my good hands; her "balance of trade" springs from furrows of my farm. My reaper brings food for today; my plows hold promises for tomorrow.

In war I am absolute; in peace I am indispensable—my country's surest defense and constant reliance. I am the very soul of America, the hope of the race, the balance wheel of civilization. When I prosper men are happy; when I fail all the world suffers.

I live with Nature, walk in green fields under the golden sunlight, out in the great alone, where brain and brawn and toil supply mankind's primary needs; and I try to do my humble part to carry out the great plan of God.

Even the birds are my companions; they greet me with a symphony at the new day's dawn and chum with me until the evening prayer is said. If it were not for me, the treasuries of the earth would remain securely locked; the granaries would be useless frames; man himself would be doomed speedily to extinction or decay.

I am hopeful that in the consideration of legislation affecting agriculture that my colleagues of the Congress will reread this creed and give agriculture the important place upon the legislative calendar that it deserves. [Applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEFENSE EMPLOYMENT

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a statement made by Mr. William Knudsen, the very able head of the Office of Production Management, that under the appropriation we passed for aid to Britain 3,000,000 new jobs would be created. This, Mr. Speaker, I think, is the best news the American people and the Congress have received for some time, for it means that a lot of these poor folks on W. P. A. who want jobs can get them in the American way and at an American wage. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Land O' Lakes Creamery Corporation, at their annual meeting, adopted a series of short resolutions pertaining to the farm problem that I feel are of such merit as to warrant their insertion in the RECORD so that the membership of the House may read them, and in order that they may do so I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert the resolutions referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include three short resolutions from the Oregon Legislature bearing on some national problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES NAVAL CONVOYS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it is reported now that high British Government officials are now demanding United States naval convoys of cargo ships to bring aid to Britain. This, together with the "union now" propaganda, should be called to the attention of Members of Congress. We were promised no convoys. Congress expressed its opinion against convoys by amendment to House bill 1776, the lend-lease bill. Convoys mean war. Congress should demand that this expression of its opinion be observed by the President.

CREATION OF AN OFFICE FOR SECRETARY FOR AIR

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, as the result of a careful study of our civilian, military, and naval needs with respect to air activities, I am today introducing a bill creating a Department of Air, which provides for a Secretary for Air, who will sit as a member of the Cabinet, and for appropriate Under Secretaries. Under this bill it is proposed that all of the present defense air forces of the United States shall be consolidated under a unified command. All of the present activities of the Federal Government with respect to civil aeronautics would also be placed under the Department for Air. No proposal so far made, in my opinion, will contribute as much to our national defense or to the safety and efficiency of our domestic and foreign air lines as will this. It will contribute greatly to the future development of aviation in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 35]

Arends	Bolles	Buckley, N. Y.
Bell	Bradley, Pa.	Celler
Bloom	Buck	Chapman

Collins	Jenks, N. H.	Pearson
Creal	Johnson, W. Va.	Plauché
Dirksen	Kelly, Ill.	Poage
Ditter	Kleberg	Rockefeller
Domengeaux	Kocialkowski	Schaefer, Ill.
Fitzgerald	Kramer	Scott
Flaherty	Lambertson	Secrest
Forand	Lea	Shafer, Mich.
Gale	Lesinski	Shannon
Gearhart	McArdle	Sheridan
Gifford	McGranery	Smith, Pa.
Green	Maas	Somers, N. Y.
Hart	Maciejewski	Stratton
Healey	Magnuson	Taylor
Heidinger	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Hess	Martin, Iowa	Thomason
Hinshaw	Mason	Wadsworth
Howell	Mills, La.	White
Jarman	O'Day	
Jarrett	Oliver	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. MCCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and move its adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 155

Resolved, That HARRY P. BEAM, of the State of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Memorials.

The resolution was agreed to.

COTTON WAREHOUSING BILL

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 262) regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 262, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] had consumed 1 hour and 16 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] had consumed 1 hour and 13 minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the arguments for and against the pending bill, and it seemed to me that the arguments generally leveled against the measure were predicated largely upon the immediate amount of possible dollar savings in storage charges. And although we have heard references to the special interest of the large warehousing corporations in trying to monopolize the business, by concentrating the storage of governmental cotton in the big seacoast cities, we have overlooked cardinal and important points, which incline me to the course which I intend to follow in voting for the bill.

I am a believer in the principle of orderly decentralization of industry for the good of the country, but over and above that I am unalterably opposed to any move which would encourage centralization, concentration, and unwarranted monopoly in this instance affecting cotton. The principle, however, insofar as I am concerned, is one and the same, whether it affects cotton, tea, automobiles, or banking.

Industry, if it cannot be encouraged to remain where it has taken root naturally and is sustained by either cotton, timber, or mineral should at least not be coerced into unnatural concentrations for whatever cause or reason.

In my travels through the South, the land of my forefathers, I observed that most towns and certainly all cities have their cotton warehouses to store the chief product of the soil. There may not be much more in the town than the warehouse, there may not even be a bank on Main Street, but there will be a warehouse. Now we propose to cripple this indispensable facility by transferring the storage service to the seacoast cities to large concerns having enormous capacity and great financial resources, turning the local warehouses into yawning, cavernous bat roosts while forcing bankruptcy upon the local owners.

The opposition to the bill stresses the savings feature, an all-out economy argument, all of a sudden. Those of us who have taken the trouble to post ourselves on what is involved in the measure learn, however, on a closer examination, that the cost of transportation to coastal storehouse plus receiving charges, supervision, and compression would amount to an average of $2.18 per bale. Admittedly it would require the savings, promised by the opposition, for a period of nearly 3 years to cover the costs of their proposal.

It appears to me as rather farfetched to assume that all of this cotton which is the subject of our discussion is going to be earmarked for transoceanic or foreign trade.

Suppose a bale of cotton from Dyersburg or Ripley, Tenn., is shipped from its present storage to a large seaport warehouse at the average cost of $2.18 per bale, which will presumably be paid out of the eventual 3-year savings in lower storage charges, and now suppose that within a short time it becomes necessary to ship or transship this bale of cotton to a mill located at some interior point at an approximate cost equivalent of $2.18 per bale less the cost of compression of 60 cents or $1.58 per bale. Who is going to pay this additional charge which would cover storage costs right there in Dyersburg or Ripley, where it was grown and baled, for a period of over 12½ months at the storage rate of 12½ cents per month?

Why concentrate, why centralize, why force monopoly into the storage of cotton upon the specious and untenable argument of savings of a small though uncertain amount? Monopoly enthroned is monopoly entrenched, and once the local warehousing business is reduced to subserviency or eliminated, the big combines will squeeze every cent possible out of the business. Prices will rise as they always have under such circumstances, and the public—the consumer—will pay. Meanwhile the local merchant, banker, cotton buyer, and everybody else dependent upon cotton and the warehouse will suffer a loss, and on the whole a serious loss, which will be felt by the local automobile dealer, the filling-station operator, and through these transmitted to the automobile manufacturer and the refiner, where the repercussion will be felt by our workers in the industrial areas far away from the cotton lands of the South. There is now an unhealthy tendency toward excessive concentration, which is evident all along the coast line. The interior must be considered because the Nation's economy is built upon a well-rounded plan of small, prosperous cities and towns. Small industry is the red corpuscle of the lifeblood in our industrial stream. If by the injection of corrosive or otherwise destructive practice we reduce local industries we will produce industrial and business anemia which will prove our undoing.

Mr. Chairman, as Representative of an important industrial and northern district, I feel I am going to serve my constituency and my country best by waving aside penurious provincialism by voting for this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make one or two remarks with reference to the statements just delivered by my friend from Detroit, as his statements will clearly show that he has not studied this case at all. I was amazed at some of the remarks he made.

To begin with, on the large chart here the bottom figure of 6,183,000 bales of cotton is the cotton owned by the Government of the United States, and that is under discussion in this bill. The other 4,482,000 bales of farmer-equity cotton are not involved in the provisions of this bill.

On February 1, 1941, there were stored in the interior warehouses of this country 4,647,000 bales of cotton which was Government owned, 4,264,000 bales of Government-loan cotton, in which the farmer has an equity, and of other cotton, 2,281,000 bales, or a total of practically 11,000,000 bales.

In the port cities there were stored 1,553,000 bales of Government-owned cotton, 705,000 bales of Government-loan cotton, and 1,186,000 bales of other cotton, privately held, or a total of 3,444,000 bales. If this bill does not pass and the cotton is reconcentrated, which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns and proposes to reconcentrate—namely, 1,500,000 bales—the interior situation will be as I shall now state.

This chart was prepared by the Commodity Credit Corporation, showing an effectuation of their bids when they are put into operation in the event this bill does not pass.

Over here on this chart you have the situation as to storage in the interior warehouses and in port warehouses. The Government-loan cotton, after the Commodity Credit Corporation acts under a competitive-bid system, provided this bill does not become law, will remain the same; that is, 4,264,000 bales of Government-loan, farmer-equity cotton will

remain in the interior warehouses; 2,281,000 bales of cotton privately owned will remain in the interior warehouses. The Government-owned cotton will decrease in the interior warehouses by 1,500,000 bales and be shifted to the port warehouses. So in this case you have an increase in the Government-owned cotton stored in the port warehouses, but the Government-loan cotton is to remain the same in the interior, and the privately owned cotton remains the same in the interior. This chart refutes about 75 percent of the unfair and misleading statements that have been made in connection with this phase of the bill.

What will this bill do if it becomes law? It will grant a right of monopoly without public regulation to protect the farmers and the taxpayers against the abuse of the rights, which the bill grants.

A vote for this bill is a vote against economical and efficient conduct of the business of the Government.

A vote for this bill will reinstate the conditions under which vastly exorbitant charges were made in the past by cotton warehousemen at the expense of the American cotton farmer and taxpayer.

A vote for this bill is a vote which holds that the illegitimate desires of chain warehousemen for excess profits deserve preferential treatment over legitimate needs for relief of 2,500,000 cotton farmers and 130,000,000 tax-burdened American citizens.

I call your attention to the testimony in the hearings of Mr. Williamson, who spoke against the bill and for 250,000 cotton growers.

A vote for this bill is a vote to destroy the principle of competitive bidding for governmental business under section 3708 of the Federal Code and to substitute for the fairness and economy of that proven system of obtaining bids all of the old wastes, political discrimination, and abuses of the public interest that section 3709, United States Statutes, was designed to prevent. This bill cuts directly across the face of that section and eliminates it insofar as the €,183,000 bales of cotton owned by the Government of the United States are concerned.

A vote for this bill is a vote to subsidize enormous combinations of cotton warehouse corporations through storage rates in excess of what competition under the American competitive system will justify.

A vote for this bill is a vote to tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture so that he cannot move cotton from congested warehouses in any locality in order to meet the needs of farmers for adequate local warehousing facilities or to protect them against excessive charges.

A vote for this bill is a vote to deny to cotton farmers forever, or as long as this bill operates, the right to store any of their great accumulations or surpluses of cotton either on their own farms under the loans or in such cooperative warehouses as they may wish to establish for themselves.

A vote for this bill is a vote to freeze for an unlimited time the present haphazard and highly inequitable distribution of cotton which is not in proportion to the historical storage of cotton, not in proportion to the storage facilities of individual communities, not in proportion to the production of cotton, and not in proportion to the manufacture of conton and not in proportion to the consumption of cotton.

A vote for this bill is a vote for a measure which is not supported by one single substantial argument; in fact, all of the principal arguments used in support of the bill have been shown in the official record to be overwhelmingly in contradiction to the facts.

A vote for this bill is a vote against the better judgment of the spokesmen for the 250,000 farmers to whom I referred a few moments ago.

A vote for this bill is a vote that flies in the face of what we all know are the basic principles of good government, namely, obtaining Government service and Government goods under the competitive-bidding system.

A vote for this bill is a vote to thrust upon the President of the United States, who is right in the midst of our enormous defense program, the unpleasant duty of resisting all the pressure that would be centered upon him not to carry out his duties by vetoing this most undesirable piece of legislation.

In this connection, if you will read the hearings and read the letter sent by the Secretary of Agriculture to Senator SMITH of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, you will find where the Secretary sets forth the objections of the administration to the bill, pointing out that on the basis of actual experience with restrictions on the movement of cotton, the provisions of this bill would create special monopolistic conditions in the warehousing of cotton and place unnecessary and excessive costs on the farmers and the Government, and the letter goes on with many other objections to the bill. This letter was signed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has argued in support of this bill and he has inserted several statements in the RECORD which the facts do not support. As an illustration, cotton moving from interior warehouses, for instance in Texas, can move through the port warehouse on an in-transit privilege basis to consuming points in the interior and make unnecessary the back haul to which he has referred and to which, I believe, the gentleman from Michigan ref rred this morning. It is astonishing to me that the gentleman from Texas, knowing as much about cotton as he does, having been raised in the fields, would stand before this House and insert in the RECORD from time to time that misleading and fallacious argument with reference to the back haul on this cotton in order to move to the interior warehouses.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Dr. Robbins did not think that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not talking about Dr. Robbins.

Mr. PATMAN. And the Commodity Credit Corporation does not think that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I refuse to yield further on that point. I am talking about the facts that prevail in the cotton trade in the movement of cotton, in railroad tariffs, and in warehouse tariffs. That is the way business is conducted. It is not conducted on the basis of what the gentleman from Texas thinks or on the basis of what Dr. Robbins did not say. These are the facts in the case. The cotton of the Mississippi Valley, for instance, enjoys transit privileges by New Orleans, Gulf ports, and Mobile, Ala., and the gentleman's argument does not hold to the facts. The other valley cotton enjoys transit privileges by the southeastern ports and Savannah on reconcentration movements. The Oklahoma cotton enjoys transit privileges by substitution rights on freight bills as set forth in the railroad tariff, and if the gentleman does not believe that, I refer him to the railroad tariffs for the exact information.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not contend that there are transit privileges back into the interior?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I contend that the cotton in question can move from the interior warehouses to the ports in the absence of legislation of this kind on railroad transit privileges and from the ports to the interior consuming mills, which is in reply to the argument the gentleman has been making here to the effect that it could not do so because of the back haul involved.

Mr. PATMAN. There can be no back haul in the same area over the same railroads.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do you want to move them back to the warehouses or to the consuming mills? You have to move it to the consuming mills if the purpose is to be carried out, as the gentleman has heretofore argued.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. PACE. What is the gentleman going to do when he has to move it, for instance, from my district, where there is a textile mill in the shadow of every cotton district?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where is the gentleman's district?

Mr. PACE. Southwest Georgia.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is southeastern territory.

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the gentleman knows they do not propose to move cotton from the southeastern territory.

Mr. PACE. They made no such promise to me.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not talking about any promise made to anybody. I am talking about the way this operates.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I think the gentleman is overlooking the fact that this greatest use of this Government-owned cotton now is in the cotton mattress program and the back shipments would be to various manufacturing points throughout the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I suggest that the gentleman get in touch with the Commodity Credit Corporation and see how few bales have been used in the mattress program, and how few are likely to be

used, because we control the appropriation power here with reference to that cotton. And also keep in mind that not within 75 years has your production of cotton and the consumption of cotton balanced. Do you propose to use this unsold cotton in preference to producing cotton? Of course, you do not. Would this House stand up here and pass legislation which would force the cotton producers of this country to keep their production below actual annual consumption for domestic needs? Why, it is fantastic to talk about a legislative body doing such a thing. You are not going to do it, and you know it as well as I do; and that kind of talk is pure bunk, just as pure and unadulterated as chemically pure could make it. Of course, we will not do that. You will move this cotton into the export trade or you will carry it for many, many years at a cost per annum, storage and insurance, until you grow tired and weary, and you will say, "Let us get rid of it and stop these charges." Of course, it may be used in defense. One or the other of those things will happen. When you give it away, of course, that runs contrary to the practices that we generally follow; and if your purpose is to absolutely forever forsake your export market, that is something for the country to think about; but I contend that you will export cotton, because only the other day you voted an appropriation here for $100,000,000 to be used for the purpose of exporting 2,000,000 bales of this cotton. That was just last week. Yet you stood here and repeatedly said that this cotton could not move in export, and between the time we finished the debate the other day and this very hour you vote appropriations to export 2,000,000 bales of cotton which you said you could not export.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. But the gentleman understands that all this money that we voted the other day is to be expended in America, and therefore you will keep it in the interior warehouse.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has the information put into the RECORD by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Also he has the information published in the New York Journal of Commerce, which is notice to the whole world cotton trade, and he has the information put out by the New York Cotton Commodity Exchange, and I suggest he look into some of these trade facts, because, after all, American industry moves on regardless of what we talk or think about here on the floor, and I hope it will continue to do so. Also I point out that all this talk the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has indulged in about the stocks that would remain out in the interior warehouses after this 1,500,000-bale movement takes place is not in keeping with the facts.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The interior warehouses will still have far in excess of 200 percent of normal stocks of cotton heretofore held, and therefore you will see that this alarming talk that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has put into the RECORD about the amount of cotton to be moved is nothing but a tempest in a teapot that has been boiled up in order to get out a lot of steam to camouflage the real purpose behind this bill, which they have not dared to bring out. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, if it is true that the gentleman has assurance that the Commodity Credit Corporation will not move more than about a million and a half bales from the inland warehouses to the port warehouses, then this enormous saving that the gentleman has stated would be effected by the defeat of this bill, when I understand the average port bid is 9 cents and the charge now is 12½ cents, could not possibly be more than a few hundred thousand dollars on a million and a half bales.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is familiar with the figures that have been placed in the RECORD, but the way to get an answer to that is, how many bales are you going to pile up in Government ownership and how long is it to be stored, and at what rate. The gentleman in the other body from Alabama has put forth an analysis of his new bill, and he says your stocks are going to 15,000,000 bales instead of 6,183,000 bales. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with those figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, during the debate upon this bill last week it was indicated that a principle of governmental policy was involved in this bill which transcended any dispute between the port warehousemen, on the one hand, and the interior warehousemen and cotton growers on the other. I agree with my distinguished colleagues that a principle of Government policy is concerned, but I am forced to disagree with them on the particular principle involved.

To my mind, the issue is not whether the Government policy of competitive bidding on contracts shall be maintained. It is whether a governmental agency, by virtue of its position as the largest owner of compressed cotton in the world, shall, for the sake of a doubtful financial saving to itself, be allowed to injure, and possibly destroy, an industry that for years has been giving an essential service to the cotton growers of the South. There is another issue of governmental policy involved, and that is whether a governmental agency, by virtue of its position as the largest owner of compressed cotton in the world, shall, upon its own initiative, be permitted to help one industry to the damage and possible destruction of another.

I do not believe that this bill destroys competitive bidding. I can find nothing in this bill which prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation from advertising for bids for the cotton allowed to be stored in the port warehouses, under its provisions, and which amounts to one-third of the Government-owned cotton. With respect to the cotton which, under the bill, would be stored within the area of production, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be the sole judge as to whether the rates are unreasonable, and if they are found to be so, other storage facilities may be used. The bill specifically provides that—

> If the Corporation is unable to enter into satisfactory contracts at reasonable rates, without advertising and competitive bidding, such contracts may be made pursuant to advertising and competitive bidding.

Let me pursue further the theory of competitive bidding as applied to the storage of cotton under present conditions. The war has largely destroyed our foreign commerce, with the inevitable result that the port warehouses have vacant storage facilities. They have bid at rates which have been called "distress" rates for the reason that at those rates they cannot make a profit but can only "mitigate their losses," as one opponent of this bill testified. When the Government accepts these "distress" bids, the inevitable result will be that the cotton will be siphoned out of the interior warehouses to the port warehouses, and the interior warehousemen will be obliged either to go out of business or raise the rates to the cotton growers in order to survive.

When all the bona fide warehouse space in the ports has been utilized as a result of these "distress" bids, the siphoning out of the cotton from the interior will still continue, for you will then find that every vacant garage and dilapidated factory in the ports will mushroom into warehouses and that ultimately all Government-owned cotton will be stored on the seaboard. That is the only inference that can be drawn from the testimony of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, who, in discussing the rate of 7 and 8 cents per bale charged for storage in New England, testified—page 371:

> In the case of cotton stored in New England, there may have existed a situation that would permit slightly lower bids than in some other parts of the country, because of the possible existence of more empty buildings that could be used for the storage of cotton, buildings having a low market value for other purposes.

I say to you that if you hold to the theory of competitive bidding for the storage of cotton under section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, then you must apply that principle to the storage of every bale of Government-owned cotton, and if that is done you will of necessity either drive the interior warehouseman out of business, or the saving that the Government derives will be a direct charge against the cotton grower in increased storage rates to him which would nullify the whole program of aid to the cotton grower.

Now, let us see whether the Commodity Credit Corporation agrees with its champions; let us see whether this is a serious attempt to save $1,500,000 or an attempt on the part of a governmental agency to help the port warehouseman at the expense of the interior warehouseman and cotton growers. If competitive bidding should be the standard, why does the Commodity Credit Corporation make that standard applicable only to 1,750,000 of the 6,200,000 bales of Government-owned cotton? If competitive bidding should be the standard, how was it that,

as the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation testified—

Bids were solicited from cotton warehousemen in whose port and interior concentration points to which such cotton would be moved in the normal course of marketing—

and not from all warehousemen wherever they might be? If competitive bidding should be the standard, what of the testimony of the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I quote—page 339:

Briefly, it has been found that competitive bidding is adapted and essential in the storage of cotton under certain circumstances, and there is no intent to discontinue the use of negotiated contracts for those parts of the storage program for which they seem well adapted.

It is indeed strange that today the Commodity Credit Corporation should take the position that section 3709 of the Revised Statutes should apply only to 1,750,000 of the 6,200,000 bales of cotton owned by the Government. Tomorrow they may become more legalistic and apply section 3709 to all Government-owned cotton, with the result that the interior warehouse industry will either be ruined or will be compelled to increase its rates to the farmer.

The fact of the matter is that the Corporation called for bids only on such cotton as it assumed—assumed, mind you—would be used, when, as, and if our foreign trade is restored. Who can say when our cotton will again be in the channels of foreign trade? It may be this year, next year, or 5 years hence. Is the Commodity Credit Corporation gambling on the future or is it trying to help the port warehousemen at the expense of the interior warehousemen and cotton growers, and possibly at the expense of the American taxpayer? If the Commodity Credit Corporation is gambling on the future, we ought to stop it; if it is trying to help one industry at the expense of another, we ought to stop that; and this bill does just that.

In conclusion, let me say that the failure of the Commodity Credit Corporation to call for competitive bidding on Government-owned cotton for a full year after it was acquired, its application of competitive bidding even now to only 1,750,000 of the 6,200,000 bales of Government-owned cotton, and the testimony of the president of the Corporation to the effect that negotiated contracts are desirable under some circumstances compel me to conclude that the Commodity Credit Corporation is more concerned with helping the port warehousemen at the expense of the interior warehousemen and cotton growers than in adhering to the principle of competitive bidding as a governmental policy to be applied to the storage of all Government-owned cotton.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is not only proper but that it is the duty of Congress to establish as a definite policy that a governmental agency, by reason of its position as the largest owner of compressed cotton in the world, should not, on its own initiative, help one industry at the expense of another; it is my conviction that it is not only proper, but that it is the duty of Congress to establish as a definite policy that it is not for the best interests of our country for a governmental agency to take advantage of distress rates in an industry for the sake of a doubtful saving and thereby weaken the financial structure of the entire industry and injure those for whom its program of assistance was established. For these reasons, I am going to vote for this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the fact that nobody knows what will become of any cotton that may be reconcentrated at the port warehouses. Our foreign market has dwindled until only 636,602 bales of cotton were exported during the cotton season from August 1, 1940, to January 14, 1941.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will tell the gentleman what I know happened to it one time and what I fear will happen to it again. The big dealers used this great bulk of cotton that was concentrated at those points to beat down the market, and in 1926 they drove the market down from 22 cents a pound to 14 cents a pound in less than 3 weeks when the farmers were putting their cotton on the market. I know, because I investigated it and proved it.

Mr. STEAGALL. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

What I was undertaking to say is that it is simply foolish as an economical proposition to take cotton in the interior part of the country, transport it a long distance to a port warehouse for restorage, when no man knows whether the cotton will be exported before the charges will consume its value. We all know that the probabilities are that nearly all our cotton for years to come must be consumed at the interior communities of the United States.

Not only is that true, but if you will analyze the figures and read the hearings you will find that the charges for transportation and loss in weight, irrespective of any return charges to interior mills, will involve actual loss as compared to the present status. Under the proposed concentration plan, port warehouses could lower rates as they may see fit when they could raise them at will to such a level as would force the movement of the cotton back to the interior sections of the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was impressed with what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] had to say about the big dealers forcing the price down; and the gentleman from Alabama thanked him for his observation. I think the RECORD should be clarified in that respect—that none of this cotton is owned by anyone who can beat the price of it down by putting it on the market but the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, it is well understood that the amount of cotton anywhere affects the price. Untenderable cotton in the amount of probably 2,000,000 bales is now held by the Government. Cotton to which the Government has taken title cannot be sold or tendered on the exchanges, and yet it is proposed to reconcentrate a part of this cotton, the value of which would soon be consumed by the charges at the ports.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] stated that all of the cotton which would be taken away from the interior warehouses and reconcentrated at the reconcentration points would be Government-owned cotton. Will not the chairman of the committee point out to the House that this dead stock of Government-owned cotton is that bulk of cotton which holds down the storage price on the farmer-owned cotton?

Mr. STEAGALL. Absolutely. Let me call attention to this fact: We are told that competitive bids were asked. I say to the House—and I challenge any man to read the record and get the facts—that the bids submitted were not competitive. The bids submitted required the interior warehouses to bid on all cotton, whereas it was known, and so announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation, that the port warehouses would get reconcentration of what is called dead cotton which could not be sold and which would remain for long periods, and which necessarily involves less expense in handling than does cotton which is sold in normal course of trade.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. Our colleague from Michigan inferred there was some sinister or hidden motive behind this bill. I read the testimony, and I voted because I thought this bill did justice to the cotton farmer. I never heard of any such inference. I would like to ask the chairman if he knows of any.

Mr. STEAGALL. Your statement is undoubtedly true. We are undertaking to retain the storage business back in the interior warehouses which serve the farmers and without which the farmers cannot market their cotton or obtain loans on their cotton.

One other thing about these bids. The statement was made in the hearings that over a thousand bids were submitted. The fact is only 87 competitive bids were submitted. Interior warehouses submitted 62 competitive bids—other than bid by one concern. The others came from the port warehouses—I refer to competitive bids; and of the cotton bid for on a competitive basis only 270,000 bales were bid for by interior warehouses, other than that which was bid for by Anderson Clayton Co., who control 14 of the port warehouses and who under the bids submitted and the prices offered would get half of the cotton that would have been reconcentrated if the plan contemplated should be carried out.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. One hundred and fifty million dollars of the seven billion dollars appropriation recently passed

is to be spent for cotton to be manufactured in this country.

Mr. STEAGALL. Absolutely.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. All our cotton mills are in the interior. We shall have to have the cotton in the interior. Later on we may spend some more money to get rid of this surplus cotton. Then if it were all concentrated in the port warehouses we would be at the great disadvantage of having to pay freight on it again to get it back into the interior.

Mr. STEAGALL. If we are ever wise enough to establish normal economic conditions in the United States we shall consume all the cotton we have for domestic purposes. The farmers who produce our cotton crop are not able to supply their homes and bodies with cotton goods necessary to their comfort.

This bill is a competitive bill, as suggested a moment ago by the gentleman from New York in his very able statement. Under the specific language of the bill, if the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot obtain satisfactory prices on storage by negotiation they are specifically authorized to obtain such prices. If not, they are specifically authorized to resort to advertising for competitive bids. Let me say also that the existing law is a competitive law. I want to read you its language, and that law is carried forward in this bill by specific provision. If you turn to page 326 of the hearings you will see what the present law is and where the restriction is placed on the discretion of the Commodity Credit Corporation requiring consent of the owner expressed in writing. You will find that the law reads:

Provided, however, That in cases where there is congestion and lack of storage facilities, and the local warehouse certifies such fact and requests the Commodity Credit Corporation to move the cotton for reconcentration to some other point, or when the Commodity Credit Corporation determines such loan cotton is improperly warehoused and subject to damage, or if uninsured, or if any of the terms of the loan agreement are violated, or if carrying charges are substantially in excess of the average of carrying charges available elsewhere, and the local warehouse, after notice, declines to reduce such charges, such written consent as provided in this amendment need not be obtained; and consent to movement under any of the conditions of this proviso may be required in future loan agreements.

The present law is a competitive law, and this bill preserves the same competitive principle of competition. It makes the present law a part of the bill under consideration. I will read the provision:

SEC. 4. The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving cotton acquired by it from the warehouse in which it was located when title was acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or from the warehouse in which it is now located unless the cotton would be subject to removal under the act entitled "An act relating to the manner of securing written consent for the reconcentration of cotton under section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938," if it belonged to the producer.

The act referred to is the law to which I called attention a moment ago, and every principle of that law is carried forward under the specific provisions of this bill. There are only 17 communities having port warehouses. There are 907 communities with interior warehouses.

The proposed reconcentration of this cotton is the reconcentration plan proposed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and is another blow that would make for the destruction of community life in the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized to enter into 1 year contracts between July 1 and September 15 in each year for the warehousing or storing of cotton heretofore or hereafter acquired by such Corporation and cotton held as security for loans heretofore or hereafter made or arranged for by such Corporation. Such contracts may be entered into without advertising and without competitive bidding; or, if the Corporation is unable to enter into satisfactory contracts at reasonable rates without advertising and competitive bidding, such contracts may be made pursuant to advertisement and competitive bidding.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "one year" and the words "between July 1 and September 15 in each year."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I will take but a moment to touch on the vehemence and sincerity with which our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, referred to existing law merely to call attention to the fact that the law as found on page 326 of the hearings applies only to farmer-owned or farmer-equity cotton and has no reference whatsoever to the cotton mentioned in section 4 of the pending bill except that the proponents of this bill seek to bring Government-owned cotton within the terms of the law the gentleman from Alabama has just read. As a general rule, when we sell anything and lose title to it, we likewise lose jurisdiction over it; otherwise the automobile industry in Michigan could say that although we have manufactured an automobile for you, and although you have purchased this automobile, and although we have given you full right and title to the automobile, nevertheless, you shall not drive this automobile outside of the Detroit city limits. The same principle is involved, and I was rather astonished that the gentleman from Detroit, having perhaps 60 percent of the automotive industry within his own shadow, would advocate any such program as that; but let us get down to the amendment which has been offered.

If the proponents of this bill are sincere, if they do not want to tie this thing up too badly, if they do not want to keep control over this cotton not forever, not for 5 years, not for 1 year, they will concede that the amendment just offered is a very practical one and should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, when the Commodity Credit Corporation was instituted, when it was incorporated, and it was and, I believe, still is a Delaware corporation, the hue and cry at that time was that we should have an administrative agency to supervise loans to farmers to assure the orderly marketing of their crops. There were no restrictions whatsoever put in the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation whereby the Congress should rewrite the bylaws at any time it saw fit in respect to specific instances. There is no more logic in telling the Commodity Credit Corporation that if it can save from 12½ cents to 16½ cents per bale per month on Government-owned cotton it should not do so than there is sense to the proposition that the automobile industry should say that you cannot run your automobile outside the city of Detroit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When we consider that the Government, owning this cotton, has paid charges on it and has carried those expenses from 1934 down to 1941, 7 years, and students of the cotton industry think that may run another 7 or 10 years, and when you calculate all of those months by the savings per bale, it amounts to something. That is the way a businessman would go about this proposition.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me tell you what a farmer said about this whole program, in addition to what Mr. Williamson testified to, and I called this to your attention the other day. This man is D. W. Brooks. He is general manager of the Georgia Cotton Producers' Association. He said:

Our association is in the peculiar position that we are both farmers and warehousemen, in that we own five warehouses which are operated by farmers in the community in which these warehouses are located on a nonprofit cooperative basis.

They are farmers and cooperative warehousemen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, he says first that the warehousemen have never voluntarily reduced the warehousing charges to the farmers, and, quoting him verbatim from page 458 of the record, he says:

Our observation to date has been that it has been well-nigh impossible to obtain any reduction in warehouse rates voluntarily.

He states further:

Examining the bill strictly from the viewpoint of our members as cotton farmers, we do not believe that the movement of the present cotton in storage in interior warehouses will either benefit or hurt us, because from a practical viewpoint none of the cotton which will be moved belongs to farmers.

That is the point. None of the cotton which is brought under the terms of section 383, which the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency read, belongs to the farmer. It is all Government-owned cotton.

Mr. Brooks stated further:

Generally speaking, I would say that our members prefer to have their cotton stored in the locality in which they live as long as

they hold title to the same; however, they are also intensely interested in economical storage, and if they cannot obtain this in the community in which they live they naturally are going to be forced to store their cotton elsewhere in order to obtain the benefit of cheaper storage.

He was talking then of farmer-owned cotton, and we were speaking the other day about the Commodity Credit Corporation forcing the warehouse charges down so that the equity of the farmer will not be completely obliterated by the warehouse charges against that equity.

We want to establish as low a warehouse rate as we can, so that there will be a less charge to the farmer for storing the farmer-owned cotton and against the Government-loan cotton in which the farmer has an equity.

He says further:

However, the main reason why we oppose the passage of this bill is due to the fact that it has a tendency to restrict the bargaining power of the Government and Commodity Credit Corporation with warehouses in the future. Our experience to date has been that when the Commodity Credit Corporation forced rates downward it made it possible for our members to obtain cheaper storage rates generally, and it has made it possible for us to obtain more advantageous contracts for storage of our members' cotton.

Who are we to say that the Government shall not save the taxpayers' money? Who are we to say that the farmers of the cotton-growing South shall not be benefited if they want to be benefited by keeping the warehouse charges down? Who are we to say that we should subsidize to the amount of $5,000 a day and upward a new industry which has grown up in the South, namely, the warehousing of cotton? We called attention to the fact the other day that the facilities for the storage of cotton in the interior had increased over 300 percent in anticipation of this new industry, not to aid the farmer, not to aid the consumer, but to aid the warehouseman, to whose advantage it is to keep up the warehouse charges against the cotton producer as high as possible.

Now, ironically we taxpayers of the North are in line with the cotton growers of the South who are interested in making some money on their crops and who do not want to dissipate their equities in their own cotton by excessive warehouse charges. That is the point of this whole bill. I am surprised that the gentleman from Mississippi does not see the point in this bill. He is talking about the big cotton owner forcing down the price of cotton. If he has the confidence in this administration that even I have, then he has confidence in the Commodity Credit Corporation to withhold these stocks of cotton from the market so that there will not be a demoralization caused by dumping all of this cotton on the market at one time.

This cotton is owned by the Government. There is not one thread owned by the farmer that comes under this bill. The farmer has not title to it. The taxpayers of this Nation own the cotton and it is up to us to give the administrative branch of this Government every possible opportunity to exercise discretion in saving the taxpayers money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the practical operation of American business, did the gentleman ever before hear the argument made that a man who had a corner on the market forced the price down, except the gentleman from Mississippi who argued that awhile ago?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; of course not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment, but I shall not discuss it because I do not believe it is material just at this point. I believe it is more material to discuss the merits of the bill generally because this amendment goes to the merits.

If this bill is understood there will be no objection to it. It is a fair bill. It is a bill that protects the Government. It is a bill that protects the cotton farmer. It protects the local community, as mentioned by the distinguished chairman of this committee. It is in the interest of the country, and it should be passed.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] suggested that the Government can save from 12½ to 16 cents per bale per month storage if we permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to move its cotton. That shows how desperate the gentleman is, using such figures as that, when the maximum rate today is 12½ cents. Yet he says you can save from 12½ to 16 cents per bale per month. That shows how desperate they are to try to make some argument that will appeal to the Members of this House who are not informed on this legislation.

He further quotes one gentleman from Georgia who filed a statement with the committee who happens to control 5 warehouses out of 100 warehouses in Georgia. Ninety-five warehouses in Georgia are for this bill and 5 happen to be against it. He picks out the minority. I hope he is as much in a minority when this bill comes to a vote as he is in quoting the 5 warehouses as against the 95 warehouses.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. It has been argued here that the defeat of this bill is in the Government's interest. I want the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to pay attention to this question I raise. I asked every witness that appeared before that committee, "Suppose you own 1,000 bales of cotton and that 1,000 bales of cotton is located in an interior warehouse. Would you as an individual having good business judgment take that 1,000 bales out of that local warehouse, ship it over the railroads, and pay $2.18 per bale on it on an average to a port warehouse in order to save 48 cents?"

If you do not pass this bill, that is what the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to do. They expect to ship more than 2,000,000 bales of cotton to the ports on the slim pretense of saving 4 cents a month for only 12 months. After the cotton has been down there 12 months, then the owners of the port warehouses can say, "Pay us 50 cents a month, or $1 a month, and if you do not pay us that much, you can just ship your cotton back to the interior where it came from." It would place you at the mercy of the few people who own these port warehouses. No witness appearing before that committee would say that he himself would do it if it were his own private business, and if he would not do it in his own private business, he certainly should not require the Government to do it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON and Mr. CRAWFORD rose.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is it not true that some of those who are fighting this bill know nothing about the problem, and if they knew the facts and the conditions as they are they would probably not be opposing the bill but would be supporting it?

Mr. PATMAN. If it were understood, we would not have a single objection to this bill.

As the best evidence that this is in the interest of the cotton farmer, let me point to the fact that every Representative in this Congress who represents a cotton-growing district is for this bill—every one. There is no exception. Should not that be good and conclusive evidence that it is in the interest of the cotton farmer? Members of Congress do not usually and customarily go against the interest of the farmer constituents who vote for them and elect them to office, so if they vote for this bill they are voting in the interest of their farmer constituents.

The farmers used to pay 50 cents per bale per month for storage. The Commodity Credit Corporation alone did not cause the rate to go to 12½ cents. If they claim credit for that, they should accept the blame for the surplus, because it is the surplus that has caused the rates to go down. The rates go down normally and necessarily. It used to be that when we had an export market the cotton would go to the ports in 2 or 3 months after being gathered and be shipped overseas. The farmer would have to pay 50 cents a bale and insurance in addition for storage. That rate was not too high, because for 9 months the warehouseman did not have any storage at all. But as the surplus began to pile up and the warehouseman had storage for 12 months a year instead of 3 months a year, the rates went down and down, until they are now 12½ cents per bale per month.

I heard one of the Members say awhile ago that the reason those rates were forced down was that the Government owned this cotton. That statement is absolutely unfounded, and I cite as a fact to refute it that until August 17, 1939, the Government of the United States did not have title to one bale of cotton. Do not forget that. Challenge it, if you can, but you cannot. When did the rates go down? The rates went down the lowest

on August 1, 1939, yet the argument is attempted to be made here that because the Government owned that cotton the rates went down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. On that point I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the point the gentleman made awhile ago, when he mentioned my name in connection with the question he submitted to all the witnesses who appeared, the way we submitted the proposition you said you were going to sell the cotton.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield for a speech. I do not yield further.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All right; I will answer it later.

Mr. PATMAN. I asked the question to fit these facts exactly. I cannot understand why any person in his good mind and with common sense would think about taking a bale of cotton anywhere, putting it on a box car, going into his pocket and getting $2.18 to pay freight to carry the cotton to a port, where he would save only 48 cents—4 cents a month for 12 months; that is all there is to it because that is all the contract is good for—just 12 months.

In this case the Government not only would have to pay the $2.18 a bale but the Government must borrow the money in order to pay it. So in this case the Government is doubly penalized, not only paying out $2.18 to save 48 cents but the Government must borrow the money to do it; and by the time the money is paid back they will be out twice that much. So it is not good sense, it is not reasonable, and it should not be permitted; and in order to stop it and prevent it, this fair bill, which leaves it up to the Commodity Credit Corporation to say what is a fair rate, should be passed; and after this bill is passed, if any warehouseman refues to give a fair rate, that cotton can be taken out of his warehouse and carried to the ports. You could not have a fairer provision written into the law than that, and no one who has studied this proposition will take issue with it.

I know it has been argued that this will save the Government $5,000 a day—absolutely ridiculous—suppose it did. It would cost the cotton farmers $17,500 a day. So it would not be very good judgment for the Government to save $5,000 and penalize the group it is trying to help by making them pay $17,500 a day.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] said he believed in competitive bidding. If we were to have a bill here today to make them accept competitive bids, he would be against it. Why? It would not be reasonable. Suppose the Commodity Credit Corporation were required to accept the lowest competitive bid, they would not want a law like that. They would not take it at all. If they were to ask for bids all over the country, some warehouse at San Francisco, Calif., or Butte, Mont., or Salt Lake City, Utah, could pay the Government to send it out there the first year and bid nothing, but after they got it there they would make them pay, and pay dearly, because if they did not want to pay a higher price they would say, "Ship it back." This is exactly the way it is with the ports. There is one big concern, a $150,000,000 concern, that has more to do——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of our committee if there is any idea of squeezing down on debate? If so, I propose to object to these extensions of 5 minutes because we have several amendments we want to discuss.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not ask for further time.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly stated on the floor of this House that this bill, S. 262, is drawn in such a manner as to hide its real intent.

In order to verify this statement I call your attention to lines 3 to 8, on page 1, ending with the word "corporation", which, by including "cotton heretofore or hereafter acquired" by the corporation, wrests from the hand of the Commodity Credit Corporation all control of that cotton, although the Corporation and not the farmers or producers own it outright.

This phrase takes from the Commodity Credit Corporation all control of that cotton insofar as storage is concerned, and here is the reason why.

As a matter of fact, and for all practical purposes, the absolute control of this Government-owned cotton is vested, by the terms of this bill, in the warehouse in which it was stored at the time the Government acquired it.

How is that? you ask.

Section 4 of the bill provides that—

> The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving cotton acquired by it from the warehouse in which it was located when title was acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Yes; there are a lot of fine-turned phrases in the bill that are dressed up to look like qualifying and protective provisions, but in the end they are just words, words, words.

I state without qualification that insofar as terms, conditions, and rates of storage are concerned, that the warehouse interests are in complete control, a control vested by legislative enactment, if this iniquitous bill is passed.

One of the most barefaced hypocrisies in the bill is to be found on page 3, line 23, beginning with the word "not", which reads:

> Not more than one-third of all Government-owned cotton may be stored in such reconcentration warehouses.

Since no cotton acquired by the Corporation can, under the language heretofore quoted, be moved from the warehouse in which it was stored when acquired, or from the vicinity in which it was produced, how in the name of common sense can it be stored in port warehouses? To be stored, it must be moved. Under the hypocritical terms of this bill it cannot be moved.

I am convinced that if the Members will get this bill, read it carefully, they will find that what we are actually doing is creating a mandatory monopoly in the storage of Government-owned cotton. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill I believe it is well enough to keep in mind that the Commodity Credit Corporation was established primarily not for the purpose of securing cheaper warehouse rates but for the purpose of enabling cotton growers to receive more nearly a fair price for their cotton.

The bill under consideration does not involve any new policy. The language of the bill provides for the extension of the existing policy. I have no criticism of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but the Commodity Credit Corporation is a creature of Congress, and this bill involves a policy that Congress has heretofore undertaken to establish. We passed legislation in 1938 providing that the cotton could not be removed without the consent of the grower. We passed legislation subsequently that the Government-loan cotton could not be removed, and we passed legislation to provide for the storage of 300,000 bales in New England. The legislation involved a policy, and no matter what may be the intent of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the reconcentration of cotton in ports is to the detriment of the cotton grower.

I am old enough to remember when the farmers in Mississippi and in the South generally were unable to sell their cotton direct to the buyers. We had no interior warehouses. There were exorbitant transportation charges and there were exorbitant port warehouse and compress charges.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], by eliminating 1 year, might provide for a worse situation than would obtain under the 1-year provision. Under the guise of an economy for storage for 1 year or 6 months or 2 years in order, as it is alleged, to promote competition, we might well provide for a monopoly.

Aside from the matter of transit rates if the contract is made for 1 year and under the national-defense program it develops there is need for this space in the port warehouses 6 months from now or 1 year from now, they could very easily raise the rates and more than offset any temporary savings. By their fruits ye shall know them. At present interior warehouses are giving the growers the same rates, substantially, they are according to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The port warehouses are charging producers twice, and in some instances, as I am advised from the hearings, three times the amount that is charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Again, storage in the interior warehouses guarantees to the grower premiums which many areas enjoy because of the better staple and because of the strength of staple and the types prevailing in such areas. I represent such an area. Generally, Mississippi Delta cotton brings a premium. If such cotton is moved from the compresses in the Delta

it will lose its identity and thus the growers will lose their premiums.

I am anxious to promote the interest of the grower of cotton, and I am not concerned in any conflict or argument between the owners of the 45 port warehouses and the large chain interior warehouses. I am concerned that there should be a warehouse in practically every cotton community, because it is essential that the cotton grower have a place to store and insure his cotton so that he can sample it before he sells it on the market. I know that the storage of cotton for 12 months has had much to do with the reduction of rates. Prior to the present agricultural program, cotton remained in interior warehouses for about 90 days in the year, and by the very nature of things, by competition, even without the Commodity Credit Corporation there would have been a reduction in the rates because there is storage now from year to year.

I do not deny to the Commodity Credit Corporation credit for the good work it has done, but the Commodity Credit Corporation is a creature of the Congress, and it is for the Congress to determine whether or not the policies that have prevailed for the past 7 years involving the utilization of the interior warehouses shall be continued. The very fact that the interior warehouses charge the producer the same rate they charge the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the fact that the port warehouses charge two or three times as much to the grower, is proof that if we undertake to move this cotton to the port warehouses under the guise of saving that sooner or later there might be a monopoly that would result in a vastly increased expenditure without any corresponding benefit to the cotton grower. Therefore I advocate the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

I extend my remarks to say that the Commodity Credit Corporation is entitled to much credit for the reduction of compress rates. As disclosed by the hearings, the rates for storage, including insurance, in effect in 1939 were 25 cents a month for the first season and 18 cents per month per bale thereafter. In 1940 the rate had been reduced to 12½ cents per bale per month.

The warehouses sponsor the bill. Cotton growers are involved. The prevailing interior rate of 12½ cents is fair. The hearings disclose that with continuous storage there is no large profit to the compresses. While the Commodity Credit Corporation is primarily for the benefit of the producer, I want to see compresses given a square deal. I would like to see them prosper. I would like to see the cotton middleman prosper. But the owners and operators of compresses are human; they are not altogether philanthropic; they have made mistakes. I recall that before the wage-and-hour law was passed the cotton compresses anticipated and asked for permission to increase their storage rates. I want the compresses to be fair. There may be increased costs in connection with national defense. The bill contemplates a maximum charge of 12½ cents. It may not be profitable to the compresses, but under the terms of the bill, they will have cotton in their warehouses the year around that was formerly stored for only about 90 days.

As I have stated, the bill involves no new policy. A statute was passed in 1938 that gave expression to the congressional intent. It provided that cotton might not be moved without the written consent of the producer. It is for the Commodity Credit Corporation to execute the laws as passed by Congress.

A second statute was passed with respect to Government-loan cotton in 1938. Is is known as the Bankhead Act. Legislation respecting cotton warehousing is not new. The pending bill is in line with previous legislation. It applies to 6,200,000 bales of Government-owned cotton. A policy is involved. That policy should promote the interest of the producer to whom the loans were made.

I do not question the good motives of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They were advised that the negotiated contracts were for the lowest amounts that the compresses could reasonably do business on. The fact that but few bids were submitted shows that the compresses had agreed to a reasonable charge. The Commodity Credit Corporation might, for the sake of argument, store cotton more cheaply at the ports. It would thus either destroy the interior compresses or give them good grounds to ask for an increase in charges to the growers.

I repeat that the concrete question here presented is whether or not an agent of Congress will adopt a policy that would thwart the expressed intent of Congress with respect to the storage of cotton, and whether or not the Commodity Credit Corporation will adopt a policy contrary to the congressional intent that might result in a temporary saving but could easily result in enormous increased cost to the Government.

Local warehouses enable the farmer more economically to merchandise his cotton. These warehouses cannot exist without storage. The farmer cannot sell, nor can he obtain a loan on his cotton until it has been warehoused. Producers were discriminated against in the old days when there were only port warehouses. It would not profit, even if the Commodity Credit Corporation saved while the costs of warehousing to the growers increased.

THE BILL

The opponents of the bill argue that the Commodity Credit Corporation should not be hampered by legislation. It is insisted that there should be competitive bidding.

The bill provides, and I quote from page 2—

Such contracts may be made pursuant to advertising and competitive bidding.

Again it is argued by the opponents of the bill that a new policy will be adopted. This argument is without merit. The bill states, and I quote—

it being the purpose of this act to continue in effect the system of warehousing or storing such cotton in the cotton-producing States near the places where such cotton is produced, or near the localities where it is commonly warehoused, in accordance with the system in effect during the year 1940.

The bill contemplates the continuance of the present policy.

Also, it is fair to the port warehouses. Cotton may be stored in the port warehouses and cotton may be stored in the interior warehouses. The bill provides, and I quote—

not more than one-third of all Government-owned cotton may be stored in such reconcentration warehouses.

The bill is fair to both the port and interior warehouses. In all of the circumstances the Government-owned cotton should largely remain in the interior warehouses.

The opponents of the pending bill do not urge that all cotton should be concentrated at port warehouses. There are some 45 port warehouses and some 1,600 interior warehouses. Provisions for storing at least a third is certainly fair.

TWO-PRICE SYSTEM

As I have already indicated for handling producers' cotton marketed independently of the loan the charges of the port warehouses are on the same basis that they have been for years. They charge 35 cents for the first month's storage and 21 cents for each succeeding month thereafter. For the average period of 90 days this represents a cost to the producer at the port of 77 cents as compared with 45 cents a bale in the interior.

The adoption of the competitive-bidding system can only mean the spreading of the two-price system throughout the country. It is to be kept in mind that the ports knew they could only bid for Government-owned debt stocks.

It has been said that the interior warehouses did not generally submit bids in 1940. There is a reason. The bids required delivery to shipside. This was an impossibility for the interior warehouse. This service can only be rendered by port warehouses. The competitive bids asked for were therefore in reality noncompetitive.

If Government-owned stock is to be moved to port warehouses, it means an increased cost to the producers. Ultimately they will be the losers. The more cotton stored in the interior warehouses, the smaller will be their charge. If there is no cotton to be stored, the prices will be increased to the levels that formerly obtained when the storage in the interior was for an average of approximately 90 days.

The bill provides that contracts shall be negotiated in the future as in the past, if the Corporation is able to obtain reasonable and satisfactory rates, otherwise it permits the Corporation to advertise for competitive bids in order to protect the Government and the producers.

Without the pending bill, instead of there being competition there might be monopoly. Congress, therefore, is asked to pass the bill to prevent monopoly and at the same time to provide for reasonable storage costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. It is seldom that I speak before this body unless it be upon some bill that emanates from the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means, and has to do in some way with matters of taxation. However, on this occasion I feel that I would be derelict to my duty and unfaithful to the constituency that I have the honor to represent if I did not say a word in support of this bill. From what I have heard of the debate—and I have heard little of it, being busy in my committee on other matters part of the time the House has been in session—I have been impressed with the fact that those who oppose this bill are those who have the least interest in the matter and who know the least about it, and that those who favor the bill are those who have the greatest interest in the matter and who as a result of their environment and their business and their daily life know the most about the effect that this legislation will have on their constituents and upon the country.

Not only are the cotton growers of the district that I represent in favor of this legislation, but I represent quite a large number of cotton manufacturers, cotton processors, and they also are in favor of this legislation. Cotton processing is a great industry in my district, as is the production of cotton. That being so, not only are the cotton growers but the cotton manufacturers vitally interested in the legislation, as are also those who work for the cotton grower and those who labor in the industries that process the cotton.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I regret that I have not the time to yield. I shall be glad to yield if the gentleman will get my time extended.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has said that the people in the cotton-processing plants are vitally interested in this bill. I think it is interesting to the House to know what interest the laborer in the field and in the factories has in this bill, and I wish the gentleman would explain.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The cotton industry, the production of cotton and the manufacture of cotton are two of the most important industries in the district I have the honor to represent, and, of course, anything that affects the production of cotton and the processing of cotton, directly or indirectly, vitally affects the welfare of all of the people in those two industries. I refer the gentleman to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], who, of course, knows more about this bill than I know. I am doing what I conceive to be my duty respecting the sentiment and wishes of the people I have the honor to represent.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Just for a brief observation that is pertinent to the inquiry just propounded. I would like to suggest that the gentleman consider the reconcentration program which was undertaken some years ago, which resulted in only 10,000 bales being reconcentrated in North Carolina, whereas North Caroline processes annually approximately 2,000,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, I understand, process a majority of the cotton which is manufactured in the United States. Our people are interested in both the production and manufacture of cotton.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I decline to yield. I refer the gentleman to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. I am sure he can answer your questions satisfactorily. I do not have the time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I secured 5 additional minutes for the gentleman. I wanted the gentleman's opinion as to how this bill affected the cotton industry.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Those who manufacture cotton, those who produce cotton, and those who work in the cotton mills, as well as the bankers, the merchants, the gas-station men, those engaged in all other industries, are dependent directly or indirectly on cotton growing and cotton manufacture and are vitally interested in and favorable to this bill. All the people I represent are all of one accord and one voice in favor of this legislation. I hope it will pass by a substantial majority. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS and Mr. CAMP objected.

Mr. STEAGALL. If the gentlemen will indicate the time they want, I will be glad to try to accommodate everybody.

Mr. BROOKS. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I may want an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a few minutes ago when we consented that the time be extended and when they consented that our time be extended by mutual agreement, we decided we would not object, because there was no attempt made to limit the time. I think, in view of the fact that the subject matter of this amendment goes to the heart of the bill, there should not be too much limitation of debate. Six Members were on their feet, and I think it is only fair under the circumstances that we have at least 30 minutes' debate.

Mr. STEAGALL. I have no desire to cut off debate. There are other sections, however, that will afford plenty of opportunity. I withdraw the request for the time being, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, we had rather extensive debate on this proposal last week. I do not know how many Members were present and listened to it. I hope that those who were not present and did not actually hear the debate have taken the trouble to read the RECORD so that they may be apprised of what the issues are.

Originally I became interested in this matter because of its presentation before the Rules Committee and the study that was made of it there. Subsequently I inquired into it at considerable length, read the hearings and other available material, and reached the conclusion that this bill should not be adopted.

I would like to suggest to the membership that I am sure there is nothing partisan in the consideration of this measure. First, I would like to suggest to all of you that it is vigorously opposed by the Secretary of Agriculture. If you will refer to the hearings you will find a letter from him in which he vigorously attacks this measure and he refers to the opposition of the Budget Bureau to it. The Commodity Credit Corporation is in vigorous opposition to this measure. I think it is fair to assume from that that the administration is not favorable to the passage of this act.

In addition, I would like to call attention to the fact that the three ranking Democratic members of the Committee on Banking and Currency are vigorously objecting to the passage of this bill. Those members have spoken on the floor and have made their position known.

In order that we may have a brief résumé of the issues as they shape up to me, may I say this: The Commodity Credit Corporation, organized to loan money on agricultural products, loaned money on cotton, starting back in 1933 and 1934. The ownership of the cotton prior to 1939 was retained in the producer. He had an equity in the cotton. Prior to that time there had been some effort looking to the reconcentration of some of that cotton. Thereupon the Congress enacted certain legislation which was designed to prevent this reconcentration and did prevent it by limiting the removal of cotton from warehouses located in the area of production. Under that arrangement the rates per month per bale on cotton were running about 25 cents. That cannot be disputed.

Then in 1939 the Government came into ownership of about 7,000,000 bales of cotton for the purpose of filling an order of 600,000 bales of cotton for Great Britain. When that cotton came into possession of the Government, the Government became the absolute owner of it, free and clear of any equity in the producer. The restrictions that we had put in that legislation against reconcentrating cotton did not apply to the Government cotton. I have heard the chairman of the committee contend vigorously

that the Government should not have taken over that much cotton to fill an order of 600,000 bales for Great Britain. I do not know whether they should have taken it over or not, but they did take it over. It was cotton on which the charges and total costs were so high as to preclude any possibility of any interest on the part of the producer.

It was in 1939 that that cotton was taken over. Then what happened? The Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation at that time became possessed of the bargaining power to drive down the rates charged farmers and the Government for storing cotton. Why? The Government had 7,000,000 bales of cotton to store. So they were in a position to say to the warehouse people: You must give us a lower rate. I submit that in the light of testimony in the record, the rate of 25 cents per bale per month was far too high.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, the gentleman is in error about the bargaining power. The reduction was on August 1, not August 17.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been suggested that the surplus of cotton accumulating is the thing that brought the price from 25 cents down to 12½ cents. There was a similar surplus before 1939. Did that surplus bring the price down to 12½ cents? It did not. Whatever may be argued on either side, the price was brought down because the Government had the bargaining power to insist on a rate of 12½ cents. The Department and the Commodity Credit Corporation insist that this is so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I have not the time. Now, that contract at 12½ cents was for a year, from 1939 to 1940, and then as that year ended the Commodity Credit Corporation determined they would ask for bids to store cotton. That is the competitive bidding that is talked about. That action resulted in the Government receiving bids of from 7 to 10 cents per bale for cotton storage, and those are the figures that support the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] in his contention that the price may be brought down as much as 16 cents from former levels.

I do not believe it can be seriously contended that the Government ownership of this cotton was not the factor. The operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation was the responsible factor in bringing the price down. When you pass this legislation, what are you going to do? You are going to take from the agent of the Government the bargaining power it has had.

First, you will take from the Government the right to ask truly competitive bids, which is the thing responsible for bringing the rate below 12½ cents.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot yield.

You will take away the bargaining power of the Government that brought the rate from 25 cents to 12½ cents. In other words, by restricting the storage of cotton to the area within which it is produced, on Government-owned cotton as well as on producer-owned cotton, the Commodity Credit Corporation will not be able to obtain lowest rates on full competition.

If the bargaining power of the Government that was acquired when it took over this cotton operated to bring the price down to 12½ cents, is it not fair to surmise that if you take away from the Government that bargaining power and if you establish the restrictions, you are making it possible for these warehouse people to up the price to 25 cents, where it was in 1939 before the Government acquired the 7,000,000 bales of cotton?

I do not come from a cotton-producing area, but I have not understood that the only people who could legislate intelligently on a matter before this House were the Members whose districts claimed to have a particular interest. I do not believe we legislate that way. I believe, rather, that I can fairly understand the principle of a proposition just as well as the man whose district is directly involved.

There has been much in this debate about the cotton farmer. But the Senator who champions this legislation said to the House committee that the real issue was the fight between the warehouse people. If this is true, is the Congress of the United States to say to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Budget, "We do not like the efficient way you are doing this job. We are going to restrict you so that storage of Government cotton will cost more, even though the Government owns the cotton. We have already lost $25,000,000 on the cotton we have sold. We do not know how much more we are going to lose before this program is completed, but we are going to insist that you lose $1,800,000 a year more"? To me that just does not make sense.

It has been urged here that these savings will be taken up because of transportation charges; that although you may save 48 cents on a bale, you spend $2 to transport it to the ports. The cotton at the port is worth more than the cotton in the interior, except you are ready to admit, first, that there will not be any more exporting of cotton; and, second, that you are going to reduce the production of cotton below the necessities of consumption, to the end that the cotton stored in the port warehouses will have to move back into the interior. I know of no one who will really admit that. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to know if I am going to get 5 minutes?

Mr. STEAGALL. I counted the gentleman in the request. Mr. Chairman, I revise the request and make it 25 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not want to object, I want to speak on the amendment specifically offered by the gentleman from Michigan, not on the bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I amend the request and make it 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will that give me 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana was on his feet and will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Does that include me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was on his feet. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in a warm contest it is not unusual for the argument to be strained and sometimes shaded to meet the requirements of the position of the man who is making the argument, and I think that is the situation in this case. So far as I am concerned, I cannot go along with the arguments of the gentleman from Michigan or the gentleman from Indiana.

The gentleman from Indiana makes the point that the enactment of this bill will do away with the bargaining power which obtains at the present time and which, he says, has enabled the Government to get favorable storage rates. I am unable to find anything in this bill which removes the bargaining power of the Government. It remains in the bill, and the Corporation is further authorized in the event they are unable to get what it considers favorable or reasonable rates to resort to bidding. He admits favorable rates have been obtained under the present plan which he now seeks to change.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will look on page 3, section 4, of the bill, he will find therein something that prevents the Government from getting reasonable rates. It says:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving cotton acquired by it from the warehouse in which it was located when title was acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If the warehouseman decides to jack up rates, and if the Commodity Credit Corporation is confined to reasonable rates within that district and is prohibited from moving the cotton, how can it expect to get reasonable rates from

the very people in that district who have jacked them up?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I hardly think the gentleman is putting a reasonable interpretation upon that section and the other sections of the bill which go along with it, because the Corporation is authorized to store a certain percentage of this cotton in the port warehouses; and, further, the section specifically authorizes it to ask for bids in case it should not obtain reasonable rates by negotiation. We must not fail to keep in mind that when the Corporation advertised for bids, as is discussed in the report of the committee, it laid down certain requirements and specifications that made it impracticable for any except port warehouses to place bids on any considerable quantity of the cotton. Contrary to what the gentleman from Indiana said, while this is a matter of great concern to the warehouses, it is also a matter of even greater concern to the cotton growers in the South, because unless these 1,700 interior warehouses have an opportunity to bargain and bid for the storage of this cotton, they are placed in a situation which makes it difficult for them to conduct their warehouses in order to conserve the interests of the cotton grower. The report of the committee shows that since this cotton has been stored in the interior warehouses the storage charges to the cotton growers have been reduced by a very large percentage.

As I said in my remarks the other day when the matter was being considered, the warehouse is an essential facility to the production and sale of cotton, and it is unfair to the cotton growers to handicap the interior warehouses as, in my judgment, the defeat of this bill would handicap them. The Congress might find just as much reason for enacting legislation requiring Government-owned corn to be transported to and stored in the city of Chicago and other lake ports as to pass this legislation which requires Government-owned cotton to be stored in the port warehouses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there are several considerations I want to bring to the attention of the House in dealing with the pending legislation. This question is not a local question. I think everyone who has been observing the things that have happened in the South in the last several years knows that agriculture is one of the businesses which enters vitally into our economic unity as a whole. It is impossible to paralyze the buying power of the farmers of this country without it being reflected in Chicago and everywhere else in the country. We of the South are able to buy from you people of the North and East only to the extent of that amount of money you give to us for our commodities.

I do not profess to know the details of this bill, but I do know something about the whole situation. The cotton farmers producing surpluses are at the end of the line, so to speak. We sell in competition with the cheapest producers on earth. The people who live in the North are just as much interested in the prosperity of the people who farm in the fields as I am—as the countryman is. It is one great big job. This question we are discussing today is as important to the man in New York as it is to the man in Texas or elsewhere. Let us see what the situation is:

When the World War ended our situation was changed from a debtor nation to a creditor nation, we were cut off largely from the ability to trade our exportable surpluses in payment of our debts. What happened? The buying power of the cities in the South was paralyzed and, because the farmer could not buy, pretty soon you felt that paralysis in New York, Chicago, and everyhere else.

We have been trying to do something about it. How are we going to do something about it? We are trying to market gradually this product we used to place on the market in a few months. How are we going to do it? We cannot do it unless we have some warehouses in which we can put this cotton to protect it from storm damage. Where can we have them in order to do that? We can have them only at the place of first concentration.

What do you propose to do? You propose to take from those interior warehouses that are necessary for the orderly marketing of cotton—the marketing of cotton that is necessary so that we can get the money to buy the products of the factories of the North and East—the revenues which the people who are familiar with this matter tell me is essential to keep the warehouses in operation. Suppose you do it; what happens? If the men who are familiar with the details tell me the truth about it, when you do that these warehouses that are essential to the orderly marketing of cotton in order to get a fair price, so they can buy the products of the factories in the East, will fall into disrepair and not be able to function, and what will happen? The cotton then is damaged. It is rushed down to the great centers where the farmers cannot control it and where they cannot have an orderly market.

It is horse sense that cotton shall move from the point of first concentration to the point of need free from storm damage. Does this bill work in that direction? It does work in that direction. Does what you are proposing to do work in that direction? It does not work in that direction. Why? If you dismantle the interior warehouses, then this cotton has to lie out in the fields; it has to lie out in the cotton yards; and it cannot be protected; so it goes down to the great centers of concentration, where the individual farmers or their small units or organizations, such as the Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Association, cannot see it and cannot control it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The thing that appeals to me about this bill is that it seems to be the policy of this Government, both politically and industrially, to strip the interior of the country.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Of course, the gentleman is just as smart as he can be. I have found that out on the Judiciary Committee. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we are making a big fuss over something that should not require all this discussion and time. It has been contended here on the floor that only the cotton interests in the South are concerned about this cotton. This 6,500,000 bales of cotton taken over by the Government belongs not to the cotton people of the South but to all the people of the United States. It is the concern of us in the North as well as you in the South.

It has been said here also that only the people in the cotton section know how to legislate with respect to matters of this kind.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the point he has just made?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It was just argued by the distinguished gentleman from Texas that the farmer should control this cotton, the ownership of which has absolutely been taken by the United States Government. I wish to ask this question of the House. Is it to be argued hereafter that all of the cotton the Government takes over is to be controlled by the farmers who grew the cotton? That is a fundamental question for us to raise here in connection with this whole cotton program.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is certainly ridiculous to take a premise of that kind.

Let us get down to brass tacks now and call this thing by its real name.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the controversy involved in S. 262 is simply this: Certain interior cotton warehousing interests, notably a large combine, the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. and affiliates, want the taxpayers of the United States to pay them a subsidy. They want the taxpayers to give them something for nothing.

In substance, the promoters of this scheme argue that unless the Government grants this subsidy they will be forced to charge a higher rate to the farmers for storing their cotton or go out of business. However, there was not a scintilla of evidence presented by any of the witnesses that was proof to me that the interior warehouses would have to raise their storage rates unless they were granted this subsidy.

Even if this were true and the Congress decided a subsidy was necessary, it should not be given to the warehousemen but directly to the cotton farmers. Then the cotton farmers would have a chance to keep it, though from the impression I received from much of the testimony that was given in support of this bill that chance would perhaps be a slim one. In fact, the cotton farmer of the South has not spoken on this question at all.

The principal witness in support of this bill was Mr. A. L. Reed, secretary and counsel for the Southwestern Compress and Warehouse Association of Dallas, Tex. If I understood Mr. Reed correctly, he claimed to be speaking for the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. and affiliates, which I understand is a relatively large cotton-warehousing monopoly. It is the largest of the 12 largest interests and has stored 1,764,989 bales of Government-owned cotton. It has 20 percent of this cotton held by these 12 largest interests. In the final analysis, S. 262 is a proposal that the taxpayers of the United States make an outright grant or gift in the form of money to promote the building of cotton-warehousing monopolies. I do not see how it is possible for anyone to read the testimony by the proponents of this measure and come to any other possible conclusion.

It has been said that the cotton industry in the South alone can legislate for the cotton farmer and for the cotton interests. Who legislated away the foreign cotton markets? Was it not the self-same people who are now claiming they alone know what the cotton farmers need?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have never seen as many expert cotton farmers from the cities in my life. [Laughter.] I come from the deep South where we know a little something about farming and I note that probably 90 percent of the opposition to this bill is by people who probably would not know a cotton bloom from a June bug.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I have not time to yield and the gentleman knows that. You have taken up time all day long and now let me make my few remarks in behalf of the cotton farmers, please—the real dirt farmers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In view of that statement I think the gentleman should yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this is a case of the city farmer against the real country cotton farmer, I am sorry that there has been an impression created that the State of Louisiana probably is not in favor of this bill because two of my colleagues from New Orleans are against the measure. They, like other gentlemen from port cities, are against this bill.

This is a case of the ports against the country. The large port warehouses, owned by some five or six big firms such as Anderson, Clayton & Co., are determined to take this business from the rural sections. I speak for the small warehouses, owned and operated largely by local people in the country. If you do not believe that, just note those who have spoken for and against this bill from start to finish. You will see that it is a case of trying to tear down and destroy what we have left in the country.

I have no financial interest in any warehouse. I never had any interest, directly or indirectly, in any warehouse in my life. But I know that out of the nearly 2,000 country warehouses we have, from one to a dozen families are working for each one of them, and you say you are going to save a little money. You will probably save a few dollars, but for every dollar you save you will take $10 or $15 away from those country people who need it.

What has been the process in this country? It has been to drain everything from the country to the ports. It seems to me that the large port cities are pursuing a short-sighted policy in trying to grab this business. Just as the farmer impoverishes the land when he continues to take everything off, so the port cities do irreparable harm when they continue to pull everything possible out of the surrounding country. It just is not good business, and businessmen ought to see it. The feed roots, so to speak, of the great port cities are spread all around in the country, and the lifeblood of the cities is drawn therefrom. But if the process is carried too far, if greedy men expect too much, if small business is starved to death in the rural sections, then the springs that feed the cities will dry up. It is not a healthy sign when rural schools close, when rural churches lock their doors, when farms fall to decay. Great port cities cannot prosper unless they have a prosperous country from which to draw. Our country must not take the dry rot within, and you gentlemen representing the ports ought to see that, and you ought not to permit anything to be done that will paralyze the country business from which you must draw in order to live. This bill is as much to your interest in the long run as it is to ours. You know that. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] told you that, and I am grateful to her for that statement. Come down South, Miss SUMNER, and we will give you the biggest watermelon you ever saw. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you do not pass this bill, you are going to put more people on the W. P. A. It is false economy. You will probably spend $10 to save $1. Hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of families will lose their jobs, their homes; interior warehouses will rot down; decay will be written here and there. Educational opportunities will be denied thousands of boys and girls, and communities will waste away. Look this thing squarely in the face. Forget for the moment the pleas of the great city farmers and hear us who live with this situation and know the havoc that will be wrought by destroying the interior. The ports have received the cream of the lumber business, the cream of the cotton business, and everything else that is produced in the rural sections. They must all go through the port and the port reaches its hand in and gets a drag out of every bit of it. They are now trying to go back and get the interior warehouse business. I am reminded of the parable of Nathan and the ewe lamb in the Bible. A poor man had one small ewe lamb and the rich man had that lamb slaughtered.

Having received the cream of the crop, having grown fat off the land, they are not even satisfied with getting one-third of the cotton-warehouse business, as provided in this bill, but want it all, and they now return with a sack, figuratively speaking, and would take all. I appeal to you not to let them do it. We representatives of the real farming sections, without a single exception, insofar as cotton is concerned, ask you to pass this bill and thus give the great interior of our country a chance to live. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have only two points I want to bring out in the course of the remarks which I have to make today. The first thing I want to bring out is to call the attention of my friends to a statement by a man named Marcel Garsaud, of the Port of New Orleans. This gentleman states that he represents the "taxpayers of the State of Louisiana, large and small, including the farmer, the tradesman, the laborer, and the investor." I want to say that that gentleman is undertaking to cover a large territory. He is undertaking to represent all of the cotton-producing sections of the State of Louisiana. He is undertaking to represent all the taxpayers and all the businessmen of Louisiana. I do not believe he even represents the good people of the city of New Orleans, who do not want to see the interior sections injured for the purpose of building up the port. I know he does not represent the cotton sections of Louisiana or of the South. I daresay that he does not even represent his own convictions since he is an employee of this port authority and is giving testimony accordingly and under the direction of its resolution.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I have only a few minutes and I regret that fact because I cannot yield.

I know, had Mr. Garsaud read the telegrams and the correspondence I have received in the last few days, he would be convinced of the error of his statements. All of those who have written and wired from my district have been in favor of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time this matter has come before this body for a vote. It came up last year, at which time there was extensive discussion, and when I went home I decided to make a personal tour.

I had known cotton warehouses all my life, but I decided to go back into them again and see just how they were being run and how they were functioning at the present time. I saw during the last planting season these little farmers come in from the country districts with two and three and four bales of cotton on their wagons or in their trucks. I saw them bring them to these warehouses after the cotton had been ginned. I heard them talk to the warehouseman, discuss not only the matter of storage but obtain advice from these little warehousemen who are their friends and in

whom they have confidence. I saw the warehousemen keep their warehouses open long hours after normal closing time. I saw them stay open late Saturday afternoon and Saturday night to render an outstanding and distinctive service to the local farmer who wants to bring his merchandise, which is his whole year's work, to a local warehouse and deal with local people in whom he has confidence; and I saw the cotton stored there, and I saw that little farmer follow that cotton, bale by bale, as it was put in the warehouses, to see under what circumstances and conditions it was to be stored. Now, you ask, What has this to do with it? It has this to do with it: You take out of these little warehouses the Commodity Credit Corporation cotton that is stored there, and you will cripple them largely of their yearly revenue. You will cause some of them, in self-defense, to consolidate with other and larger warehouses, and you will cause other of those warehouses, so I am told, to go out of business.

You will cause others still to raise the storage price of this cotton brought in by the farmer from the fields for storage, and to what purpose? To the injury of the local farmer who brings his cotton into the little village or the town or the city in his own community for the purpose of having it ginned, for the purpose of having it stored, for the purpose of doing business such as buying his normal needs from his own merchant. I submit that which will help and encourage the local community warehouse will aid the local farmer.

This program was begun for the benefit of the cotton farmers of the Nation. It should be continued for their benefit. When this Congress fully understands that the 1,700 interior warehouses render substantial service to the farmer, large and small, it will then not hesitate to support this measure. Especially is this the case when the record clearly shows the possible financial saving of a changed program to the Commodity Credit Corporation is very doubtful. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has offered an amendment to strike out two words in line 4 of the bill, so that the bill, if the amendment were adopted, would read:

> That the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the warehousing or storing of cotton—

And so forth. The bill as drawn limits these contracts for 1 year, and by adopting the amendment it will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to make storage contracts for periods longer than a year. Gentlemen who have spoken in support of this bill, especially the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has made an argument to the effect that if the cotton owned by the Government is reconcentrated in warehouses the Commodity Credit Corporation will find itself the victim of the port warehouses, because the port warehouses would be able to raise the storage rate on the cotton so stored. I urge you to read his statement in the RECORD, indirectly complaining about the 1-year contract, and if he will support this amendment it will leave the Commodity Credit Corporation so that it may make a 2-year or a 5-year or a 3-year storage contract. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas study this language and go along to remove some of the objections that he makes to the situation that may develop.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] dropped a remark to which I wish to refer. What interests me is that the people from one section of the country seem to feel insulted if the people of another section of the country try to understand the basic industries in the first section. I wish the Members of this House would take an interest in the agricultural crops grown in my district so that all of the Members would know just as much about them as I do, and if the people of the North, and the people of my side of this House, understood the cotton sections I am quite sure the cotton people of the South would have been protected against some of the tremendous errors which have been committed by those who have had charge of cotton legislation during the past 10 years or so. I happen to have been born in a cotton district, so that the gentleman's remark about our side of the House, as far as I am concerned, are just as improper as anything could be, and I think he was unfair in making the comparison that he did, because we are trying to understand his proposition a little better.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] made an amazing statement, and the gentleman from Louisiana made another one a moment ago. At the present time your interior warehouses are storing 11,200,000 bales of cotton, and when the reconcentration efforts of the Commodity Credit Corporation are effectuated, which they can do if you do not enact this bill into law, your interior warehouses will continue to store about 9,600,000 bales of cotton. The move which the Commodity Credit Corporation proposes to take is protecting those people who own 6,200,000 bales of cotton, namely, the taxpayers of this country, the people in my district, just as much as the people who grow it, and as we move into the ownership of this cotton we are going to have more to say about your cotton program, because when you sell us 6,000,000 to 10,000,000 bales of cotton you get us interested in this industry, and I am serving notice on you that the North and the West and the Northwest are going to take an interest in your cotton situation. So there is nothing in this movement in opposing this bill that is going to hurt your interior warehouses and the facts of the case support my statement in that regard, and you cannot support yours to the effect that there is anything here to destroy the interior warehouses. This bill is offered in the name of the farmer, but the farmer gets no benefit. The benefits will go to the chain warehouses, and the gentleman from Texas, who has stood on this floor and decried against chain operators finds himself today advocating a special subsidy to chain warehouses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] is recognized.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I hesitate to take your time, but I do think, in justice to my constituency, I should take a few minutes to refute the argument that has just been made that this bill is not in the interest of the Georgia farmers. I come from a district in Georgia in which the county that year after year produces more more cotton than any other in the State is located. We are the banner cotton-producing district. Yet the cotton mills located in my district use almost double the amount of cotton we raise each year.

I want to tell you that the fact that this cotton has accumulated in the hands of the Government by reason of the loan program, has remained in the warehouses in little towns where the gins are located, where the farmer carries his cotton, has enabled those warehouses to reduce their rates from 50 cents a bale per month to 12½ cents a bale per month. Now, do you not see why it is to the interest of the cotton grower to keep this cotton stored in those warehouses in the interior, when his rate would probably be four times as much if it were moved? I hope you will understand that is the reason why the farmers want it to stay there.

The reason why the cotton mills want it to stay there is that when it goes to the port and goes into the port warehouses they compress it into about one-quarter its size. Then when it comes back to the cotton mill for processing they have to tear that compress apart, and it is hard to process.

Another thing—and this is no weak point, in my opinion—cotton, next to steel, is the most important war material we have. We will have one gunpowder plant in this country that will manufacture 300 bales of cotton a day into gunpowder. It is the most inflammable war material we have. Today, under the present program, our cotton is scattered in 2,000 warehouses all over the Cotton Belt, and in 90 percent of the cases, in compartments that can hold 100 bales, so that no one fire can destroy much of that cotton. Are you going to sit here and vote, at no saving to the Government, because the freight from the interior warehouse to the port is more than the saving—are you going to vote to put all this cotton into six or seven warehouses, where one act of sabotage will destroy a considerable portion of your stock? Now, that is no weak point.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We are now trying to scatter our national defenses out into the interior, where they will be safe.

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And if we store all this cotton at the ports and it becomes essential war material, do you not think we would be doing something we would regret and would want to undo in the near future?

Mr. CAMP. I feel sure we would. It is folly to move cotton out of the Fourth District of Georgia to Galveston or to Savannah and then ship it back to the cotton mill right in the same town to be processed.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. Not now. Another point, we used more cotton in the mills of the United States in January of this year than in any other month in the history of this country. If we keep up that record, we will use in America this year the entire crop that we produce this year. My opinion is that a large proportion of this Government cotton will finally be processed by American mills, and we hope it will be bought by American citizens.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. And is that not all the more reason why the cotton should be kept in the interior where it is going to be processed, rather than concentrated in the port warehouses?

Mr. CAMP. Certainly it is. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were ayes 50 and noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. All time has expired on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this section. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 1, line 11, after the word "contracts", strike out the words "at reasonable rates" and insert in lieu thereof the words "at rates which it deems reasonable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. All cotton which is warehoused or stored under any contract or arrangement made by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be warehoused or stored in the locality where it is produced, or in the places where cotton is commonly or ordinarily stored prior to its manufacture or export in the regular course of the cotton trade when such contract or arrangement is made, within which satisfactory facilities can be obtained at reasonable rates, it being the purpose of this act to continue in effect the system of warehousing or storing such cotton in the cotton-producing States, near the places where such cotton is produced or near the localities where it is commonly warehoused, in accordance with the system in effect during the year 1940, so as (1) to prevent unnecessary and uneconomical costs to farmers arising out of the sampling and resampling of their cotton, or arising out of warehousing or storing their cotton and rewarehousing or re-storing it in the same season, or arising out of transportation charges incurred in connection with rewarehousing, re-storing, or reconcentrating their cotton; (2) to prevent the removal of cotton to warehouses far distant from the homes of the farmers who own it, or who have interests in it; and (3) to prevent monopolistic control and monopolistic tendencies with respect to the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton owned by farmers, or by the Government.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to keep the record straight. I am not going to take the entire 5 minutes.

I am sure my colleague from north Louisiana did not intend to misrepresent anybody when he said that Mr. Marcel Garsaud, general manager of the port of New Orleans, did not represent what he purported to represent. I want to keep the record straight and shall, therefore, read you that portion of Mr. Garsaud's statement appearing on page 519 of the hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I did not understand the name of the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Louisiana refers.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman's name is Mr. Marcel Garsaud. He is the general manager of the dock board in the city of New Orleans, which is a State agency, and he is an employee of the State of Louisiana and acting under the direction of that agency of the State of Louisiana. I read the following from his testimony:

Mr. GARSAUD. My name is Marcel Garsaud. I hold the position of general manager of the board of commissioners of the port of New Orleans, an agency of the State of Louisiana. Opposition to S. 262 was approved by the board at a meeting held in New Orleans on Friday, January 24, 1941.

This board is trustee of public funds and represents the taxpayers of the State of Louisiana, large and small, including the farmer, the tradesman, the laborer, and the investor. In a sense, the cotton-producing farmers of Louisiana are stockholders in this corporation. The investment of the State of Louisiana in the port of New Orleans aggregates some $40,000,000, and the number of taxpayers interested in the proper administration of its properties number approximately 60,000.

That is the statement of Mr. Garsaud. He does represent an agency of the State of Louisiana which happens to be located in the city of New Orleans, but which is supported by the taxpayers of the State, and he represented that agency with the authority of the board and he spoke for it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the gentleman contend that the manager of the dock board in the city of New Orleans, a position subordinate to the commissioners, represents the cotton growers, the cotton farmers, and the laborers throughout the State of Louisiana, including those in northwest Louisiana where most of the cotton is grown?

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman represents the board, which is a State agency, with the authority of the commissioners.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I take it from the gentleman's statement that he is not interested in getting any Mississippi cotton for the benefit of New Orleans, but only his own.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am interested in getting any cotton in the United States to New Orleans where we can store it cheaply for the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman will concede, I am sure, that there are eight Members from the State of Louisiana, of which only two come from New Orleans, and those two are the only ones voting against this bill.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will readily admit that and say that the constituents of the other six Members are being represented as vigorously and as earnestly as are the constituents of New Orleans by the two who come from that city.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I would assume from the gentleman's argument that the State of Louisiana is against this bill, whereas the State of Louisiana is for this bill.

Mr. HÉBERT. I say, Mr. Chairman, representing south Louisiana in numbers, speaking numerically, we represent the major portion of the population of the State. I freely admit the other Members of the Louisiana delegation represent several areas and thousands of citizens of Louisiana, but the two Members from New Orleans, my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and myself, represent, in our districts, New Orleans, the largest city in the South, the second port in the United States, the gateway to the Mississippi Valley, the most densely populated area of the State of Louisiana. As such I believe that we represent a majority of the interested people of Louisiana on this bill; and believing in the rule of the majority, I, therefore, say to my esteemed colleague from north Louisiana that the State of Louisiana is definitely opposed to this bill. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one word about these public warehouses. That public warehouse is supported by the taxpayers. They can bid lower than any other warehouse. They do not pay any taxes. One witness referred to it as a big Mammoth Cave warehouse that was subsidized by the State in competition—I call my friend's attention and ask him to notice this—in competition with private business; and he is pleading with you to adopt a policy that will permit him representing a publicly owned warehouse that is subsidized and

pays no taxes to give him an advantage over the privately owned warehouse; and I say to you if for no other reason this bill should pass in opposition to that policy. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 2, line 3, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, section 2 is exceedingly objectionable, in that it carries the implication that this bill is for the benefit of the farmers. It constitutes a stump speech which can have no other purpose than that which it has apparently been successful in doing—convincing so many Members of Congress that this is a farmer's bill.

In the first part of the section we provide that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall warehouse this cotton over which the farmer has no control, in which he has no equity, in the locality where it is produced. For what alleged purpose? First, to prevent unnecessary and uneconomical cost to farmers arising out of the sampling and resampling of their cotton. The farmer has not one iota more of interest in this cotton than the interest which every other taxpayer has in the cotton. This is Government-owned cotton. It is not sampled at the farmer's expense, as is indicated in this stump speech. There is no charge to the farmer or against his equity for the sampling of this Government-owned cotton, and we are not intellectually honest when by the enactment of section 2 we create the impression that there is a charge against the farmer for the sampling of Government-owned cotton.

Next, the claim is held out by this bill that it prevents the removal of cotton to warehouses far distant from the homes of the farmers who own it. Under existing law, cotton cannot be reconcentrated at warehouses far distant from the homes of the farmers who own it without their consent. They cannot remove that cotton if he has an equity in it without the consent of the farmer, so the Commodity Credit Corporation has no authority, moral or in law, to reconcentrate the cotton owned by the farmers in warehouses far distant from their homes. That is another intellectually dishonest statement in this bill.

They hold out for this bill that it prevents monopolistic control and monopolistic tendencies with respect to warehousing, storing, and reconcentrating of cotton owned by farmers or by the Government. There is no reconcentration of cotton allowed under this bill or any other law which we have passed or which we will pass that will allow the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government to reconcentrate farmer-owned cotton and the statement in this bill that the bill is designed to protect the farmer against monopolistic practices in connection with the concentration of cotton owned by the farmers is put in there simply to draw a veil over your mental vision to the point where you might think there is something in the bill in which the farmer may have an interest. The farmer does not own any cotton which is reconcentrated and the Government has no authority in law or otherwise to reconcentrate without the consent of the farmer any of the farmer-owned or farmer equity cotton.

Oh, it says, "Or by the Government." They are right there, because they want to deny the Commodity Credit Corporation the right to accept bids for the warehousing for the Government-owned cotton.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. In determining reasonable rates for the warehousing or storage of cotton for the purposes of this act, consideration shall be given to the rates for such services which generally prevail at this time, taking into account the fact of whether the cotton is compressed or not, and, if compressed, the type of compression, and no consideration shall be given to unusually low rates at which facilities are available by reason of abnormal dislocations in foreign commerce.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 3, line 6, after the word "at", strike out the words "this time" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the time of entering into the contract."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was before the House Banking and Currency Committee it was thought by many members of the committee that this was a typographical error; that the word "this", in line 6, wherein it provides that in determining rates for the warehousing or storage of cotton, the Commodity Credit Corporation must give consideration to the rates prevailing at this time, was purely and simply a typographical error; that what it meant was "at the time of entering into the contract." So we labored under that assumption until we came to reading the bill. Then we found that was put in there deliberately. It was not a mistake, It was not an error. It was deliberate, for the reason if that word "this" stays in there it freezes the Government-owned cotton in these warehouses at not less than 12½ cents per bale per month and will deny the Commodity Credit Corporation the right to exercise the prerogatives which it otherwise would have in asking for bids on this cotton and letting the contract to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this afternoon we have a very small number of Members of this House present outside those from the cotton-producing areas, and we are not going to attempt to do anything except present our case, because under these circumstances you have the votes and it is expected that you will vote down every one of these amendments. However, I do not believe we are going to be denied the right to present our side of the case.

It is not good business to freeze the warehouse charge on this cotton at 12½ cents or any other rate. Why, this stops competition among the interior warehouses themselves. The interior warehouses had a capacity in 1934 for about five and one-half million bales. They have a capacity today for 15,000,000 bales. You gentlemen who are laboring under the assumption that there is going to be any dearth of facilities to store farmers' cotton better look up the record. In 1934 you had a capacity to store 5,500 bales. Today you have a capacity to store 15,000,000 bales, and you have 11,000,000 bales now. Be fair with the country. All you want to do is get 12½-cent cotton to fill up this other space with 4,000,000 bales more.

I cannot blame you. You are delightful gentlemen, and you are doing a fine job for your localities. But remember henceforth that when I come up here and start talking about chicory, which you gentlemen never heard anything about, or when I talk about sugar beets, I do not want you cotton Representatives to say anything about it because you do not know anything about that. There is an economic question involved here in respect to sugar beets, peanuts, chicory, and every other commodity, especially those commodities which come under the A. A. A., and that is the economy of not only advising the departments what they shall do in respect to the cotton when it is grown, but also the mandate to the Commodity Credit Corporation telling it what to do after it has passed from the farmer to the Government. Let me reiterate that it is not good business to freeze the warehousing charge on this cotton, whether the cotton is in the interior warehouses or the port warehouses.

May I say parenthetically that I have not a port warehouse or an interior warehouse in my district, but we do process some cotton. I am interested in it. I am interested in getting this cotton to my processors for the least possible amount. I am interested in getting this cotton to the consumers of the Nation for the least possible amount. I am interested in saving the taxpayers of this Nation every dollar we possibly can; and, if you will believe me, I am sincere in wanting to save your farmers all we possibly can, because by increasing the warehouse charges under which the farmer stores his cotton we reduce his equity proportionately.

Mr. Chairman, the word "this" should come out, and my amendment should be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Masschusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk on the merits of this bill. I have before me the bill and the hearings, and I am influenced exclusively by what they contain. I have read every page of them. I have studied them as assiduously as I know how. I

realize that there are other factors involved than the strict merits of the bill, but I am trying to appeal to the Members of this House who have no personal or selfish interest, and I am going to make out a case that will show you that this bill is a warehouseman's bill, a bill for warehousemen in a particular section of this country.

The administration is not for it, as far as I know, and I do not know anybody on this side of the aisle who is any more regularly an administration man than I am. The cotton farmers' representatives who have appeared before this committee have been against it. The Department of Agriculture is against it, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is against it. Why? Because it seeks to wipe out competitive bidding. It says so very frankly on page 1. I quote:

Such contracts may be entered into without advertising and without competitive bidding.

The friends of the bill try to explain by saying, "Oh, well, we have a proviso that says that if the Corporation is unable to enter into satisfactory contracts at reasonable rates, then you can have competitive bidding." But that is only eyewash, that is only powder in the eye, because who is going to determine what are reasonable rates?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] sought to strike out the "reasonable rates" and substitute what the Corporation should deem reasonable rates, and that amendment was defeated.

Over in section 4 of the bill the Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving the cotton. If the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot say to these men, "You are charging the Government too high a price for storing cotton and, therefore, we are going to move it elsewhere," all control over prices is gone. You have a situation where the warehousemen in one particular vicinity are well known to each other. They can say to the Commodity Credit Corporation, "This is our charge; take it or be damned." In that case, the Corporation has no recourse. It cannot move the cotton. It cannot hold that club over their heads.

Do you suppose that if the warehousemen in a particular vicinity demanded 50 cents a month or a dollar a month for storing cotton, the men making that demand would come down to anything like a reasonable bid? Yet this bill prevents the Commodity Credit Corporation from moving the cotton from within a particular locality.

I say it is the first time in the history of this Congress that we have ever sought to set up a monopoly against the Government itself. That is what you are seeking to do with this bill, because it is the Government that pays the storage rates. You from the warehouse districts are nice fellows; you are affable, and I love you all, but this is something that smells to high heaven. I cannot go along. This is something that will come back and plague a lot of us. The morality of the situation, the national viewpoint of the situation, the logic and the merit of the situation, all cry out for the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and for the defeat of this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak 5 minutes on the amendment I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. We should dispose of this amendment first.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not entertain the point of order, because unanimous consent was given to close debate in 5 minutes, and all time has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the time was set by unanimous consent and this Committee can undo by unanimous consent anything it does by unanimous consent. No vote was taken on the closing of debate. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has asked unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes. If this consent is granted, it ipso facto sets aside the previous order under the unanimous-consent request and allows the gentleman to proceed for 5 minutes. He is not asking unanimous consent to do anything but set aside what the Committee has already done by unanimous consent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. It is my understanding—and I hope to be corrected if I am not correct in this statement—that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] wants to offer a different amendment, another amendment. I believe his unanimous-consent request should properly come after the pending amendment is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEAL). The Chair desires to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] whether or not he was proposing to proceed on his amendment or on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, my request was to proceed for 5 minutes to speak on the amendment to section 3, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. And not on the amendment under consideration?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist we should first dispose of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and then I am sure there will be no objection to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] proceeding for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair desires to call for a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and after that the Chair will submit the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 3, line 5, after the word "given", insert the words "among other factors"; and at the end of section 3 insert the following: "Consideration shall also be given to the rate of return on investment, to the effect of the rates on cotton producers' income, to the need of adequate and efficient warehousing service both locally and at ports and concentration points at the lowest cost consistent with the provision of such service, and to the need of revenues sufficient to enable the warehousing companies, under honest, economical, and efficient management to provide such service."

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] may proceed for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] may proceed for 5 minutes, although the time has expired.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, in section 3 of the bill it is proposed to tell the Commodity Credit Corporation how it shall proceed in determining reasonable rates. Those who are familiar with the activities and performances of the Interstate Commerce Commission in determining reasonable rates for services offered by transportation and warehousing agencies know that certain elements must be taken into consideration. The amendment which I have offered would impose upon the Commodity Credit Corporation in arriving at reasonable rates or in determining reasonable rates that it shall give consideration to the rate of return on investment. This is just as fair as any proposition could possibly be, because if reasonable rates provide an unreasonable return on investment, then that would not be fair to the parties concerned. If the rates that were determined to be reasonable were unreasonable and operated against the small warehouseman, for instance, and put him out of business, that would not be fair.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is also to give effect to the rates on cotton producers' incomes. This takes care of the cotton grower himself, and I think some consideration should be given to that phase of the question.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would have to take into consideration the need of adequate and efficient warehousing service, both locally and at ports and concentration points, at the lowest rate consistent with the provisions of such service, and this is eminently fair to the taxpayers of this country, to warehouse operators whoever they may be, and to cotton growers and cotton consumers. It would give effect to the need of revenue sufficient to enable the warehousing companies, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide such

service. Section 3, as it is here presented in the bill, is arbitrary, it is unfair, it is inadequate. It ties the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it operates toward building a monopoly against the Government, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] has pointed out.

My amendment simply amends section 3 so that the Commodity Credit Corporation would take into consideration cost-building elements in arriving at what is a fair and reasonable rate of return for the warehousing and storing and insuring of cotton.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving cotton acquired by it from the warehouse in which it was located when title was acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or from the warehouse in which it is now located unless the cotton would be subject to removal under the act entitled "An act relating to the manner of securing written consent for the reconcentration of cotton under section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938", if it belonged to the producer: *Provided, however,* That if prices satisfactory to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the storage of compressed cotton are submitted by port reconcentration warehouses, not more than one-third of all Government-owned cotton may be stored in such reconcentration warehouses: *Provided further,* That in the reconcentration of such Government-held cotton the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, wherever practicable, refrain from moving cotton from smaller warehouses storing 7,500 bales or less of Government cotton.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 3, line 12, strike out all of section 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law or in this act contained, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to reconcentrate Government-owned cotton from any warehouse located at a point at which sufficient warehouse space is not available to producers at reasonable rates to provide local storage for all the cotton produced in the immediate locality which producers desire to store for the purpose of obtaining loans thereon, and nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent such reconcentration."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, section 4 as now written undertakes to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from reconcentrating the cotton owned by it, that is, by the Government. It provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from moving cotton acquired by it from the warehouse in which it was located when title was acquired. That is the provision which, it has been charged, establishes a monopoly in behalf of certain warehouses. We have realized, and everybody realizes, that the interior warehouses must and should be maintained, and there is no endeavor on the part of any opponents of the bill to diminish in the least the interior facilities which are now serving the cotton producers, and we retain in this bill by this amendment a provision that the Commodity Credit Corporation can reconcentrate, where there is no room for the farmer's cotton. In the warehouses today are fourteen and a half million bales of cotton, which is two and a half million bales in excess of an average annual year's production of cotton. The time must come when, instead of limiting the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation in respect to the reconcentration of cotton we will have to give the Corporation more authority to move this cotton to make room for the annual yield. Therefore, we have provided for that in this amendment, but we have taken out of the bill this serious, most obnoxious provision that Government-owned cotton cannot be reconcentrated where it is found advisable to do so to get a cheaper rate, without the consent of the farmer.

Section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1938 is set forth in full in the hearings and was called to your attention some time ago by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], and has reference to the reconcentration of farmer-owned and Government-loan cotton. Section 4 seeks to bring Government-owned cotton within the restrictions and prohibitions contained in section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1938, to prevent the reconcentration of Government-owned cotton except by the consent of the farmer, who has lost all right, title, and interest to it; who has no equity in it any more. His equity has passed to the Government of the United States—to the taxpayers—whose duty it is to see to it that the Government business is conducted as cheaply as possible—as much so as it is the duty of an administrative officer, and it is the duty of the taxpayer and of the representatives of the taxpayer to see that the Government business is transacted as economically as possible.

To freeze the storage rate at 12½ cents per bale per month is not economical. It is not good business. The Commodity Credit Corporation has reduced the warehouse charge 12½ cents. The Commodity Credit Corporation, by agreement, has reduced the warehouse charge on Governed-owned, Government-loan, and farmers' cotton 12½ cents a bale—reduced it from 25 cents per month to 12½ cents per month per bale.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto, after the 5 minutes used by the gentleman from Nebraska, be limited to 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we talked a moment ago about the dislocation in foreign commerce. We from the Middle West are just as much interested in your cotton problem as you are in our corn and hog problems.

I want to thank the membership of the House for permitting me to speak out of order at this particular time. I call your attention to the fact that on March 19 I took the floor to warn you that the objectives of our embargo on strategic national-defense material was being defeated because much of that strategic raw material which we withhold from shipment to the Axis Powers was being supplied and is being supplied to the Axis Powers from the Philippine Islands. I called your attention at that time to the fact that the officials of the Philippine Commonwealth Government had promised to use their full cooperation in our national-defense program. That cooperation was not forthcoming, and at the time I spoke to you I made the request that the President of the Philippines, Manuel Quezon, cooperate with us in our program for national defense. Today I am informed that Mr. Quezon has cabled his representative to the effect that he is willing to cooperate in the embargo plan providing the licensing rules and regulations will be extended to the Philippines. In the meantime hundreds and hundreds of tons of chromite, of iron ore, and of oil, which can be fabricated into nitroglycerine and other materials, is finding its way from the Philippines to Japan and to Vladivostok and into Russia, and into the hands of the Axis Powers. Therefore I am thankful that President Quezon has sent this cable to his representative here. I am happy that he is offering that cooperation, and I hope that cooperation will come immediately.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, I wish to congratulate the gentleman for calling this matter to the attention of the House. I wish to ask this question: In view of the fact that the gentleman keeps in such close touch with Philippine affairs and developments over there, is it his opinion that as this war situation becomes more serious the Philippine Islands, economically and from a military and naval standpoint, must necessarily become more and more dependent upon the United States financially, economically, and from a military and naval standpoint?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about it. This Congress voted $7,000,000,000 for Great Britain and for the assistance of democracies all over the world. Although we still hold the Philippine Islands, they will become independent, and, I hope, a democracy, on the 4th of July, 1946, and by virtue of the power this Congress has given the President, they could participate in part of this $7,000,000,000 if the President so desires. They will depend on the United States for many years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Our law, I believe, provides that we shall send our men there who are being inducted into service?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Therefore they should give us all the cooperation possible.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is right, and I am happy to hear that President Quezon has indicated that this cooperation is available. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have had four or five speeches about cotton in my system all day long. The House has been very patient, but I am afraid that very soon the House may become very impatient. For that reason I am indebted to the chairman and to you to permit me to say that I am very, very strongly for the passage of this bill. I have the honor to represent a district which is considered the largest inland cotton market in the world. This means a great deal to the farmers and to the people of that great section of this great country of ours. I deeply appreciate this opportunity to express most sincerely and genuinely the interest of my people in the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

It has been said that the farmers of the Nation have no interest in the matter of where the Government-owned cotton is stored or what the rates for such storage may be.

I want to challenge the accuracy of that statement and I can sustain my position by quoting from the admissions of the Government witnesses in the hearings involving this matter.

I desire to call attention to some very important facts in connection with the consideration of the farmers' interest in this controversy. On November 30, 1940, there were 8,231,337 bales of Government-owned and Government-loan cotton. This is the cotton covered by the bill before you and it is the cotton involved in the call for competitive bids. The 1940–41 loan cotton is not involved and records as to its disposition are not yet available. We are concerned only with the 8,231,337 bales and the effect of the Government's program concerning those bales upon the interest of the producers of the Nation.

Dealing with that 8,231,337 bales, 24 percent is now located at ports and only 76 percent at all of the interior warehouses throughout the Nation, comprising some 1,600 facilities located in 907 interior communities. The average stocks available to these small interior communities are shown to be 6,917 bales. The average stocks in the port communities are 115,172 bales, located in 17 port cities.

First, the farmers as well as the citizens of the small interior communities have an indirect interest in the location of the cotton. It helps to pay taxes, which support the schools and the local governments of the various municipalities and the counties of the various States. For instance, in my State of Tennessee the compress and warehouse industry has paid more than $5,000,000 in wages to employees of the warehouses and compresses located in the State of Tennessee. They have paid more than $600,000 in city, county, and State taxes. The interior States in which the cotton is located, therefore, have an important stake in the location of the cotton and its continued storage at interior locations.

Second, as I said before, this is the indirect interest of the farmers and citizens of the interior communities. The farmers have yet a more direct concern with this matter, and it is this interest to which I intend to address myself. Of the 8,231,000 bales of cotton involved, covering both Government-loan and Government-owned cotton, 6,300,000 bales are owned by the Government. Of the 6,300,000 bales, only 4,878,000 bales are located in the interior of the Nation. The plan of the Government is to move approximately 2,000,000 bales of that quantity to port locations and the major reconcentration centers, and with respect to the rest of it, the plan is to force a reduction in the rates, regardless of whether or not it remains in the interior or moves to the ports for reconcentration.

Many of the interior communities have only the Government-owned cotton on hand as their major stocks. For instance, the total stocks in the State of Alabama on November 30, 1940, amounted to 945,146 bales, of which 875,948 bales were owned by the Government. On November 30, 1940, the total stocks in Tennessee were 546,465 bales, of which 379,931 bales were owned by the Government.

To assert that the movement of this cotton from these interior locations to the ports or to major reconcentration centers would have no effect upon the facilities in the interior is to assert a false and erroneous statement that cannot be justified by any facts, economical, political, or otherwise.

The chairman of your Banking and Currency Committee undertook to obtain from the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation his opinion with respect to whether or not the existence of these stocks at interior points had not, in fact, brought down the handling and storage charges to the producers of the Cotton States. I want to read to you from record 415 of the printed House record:

> The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you, Dr. Robbins, if it isn't true that when these warehouses, which are serving the farmers, found themselves with an accumulation of dead cotton, so-called, if it did not enable them to reduce their charges on current cotton for the reason that the dead cotton remained there over a longer period, involved less difficulty, less labor, and less trouble in all respects? Just answer that. Isn't that so or not? Answer the question.
>
> Mr. ROBBINS. I will answer it "Yes," since you want a "Yes" or "No" answer; but that only half answers it.

The admission of the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation confirms the undisputed testimony in this record that as these stocks have gone up in the interior rates to the producer have gone down.

This, therefore, brings me to the farmers' major direct interest in this question. If it be a fact, and it is proven to be a fact beyond all possibility of controversy, that as these stocks have gone up in the interior charges have gone down, then it must necessarily follow, as a sound economic fact, that if these stocks go down, then charges in the interior must come up, and this is shown to be the fact over a period of many years. The record shows that prior to the loan programs and prior to these stocks of cotton at interior locations, the producers paid 50 cents for the first month's handling and storage charges and 25 cents per month for the succeeding months. It further shows that the average holding time was approximately 90 days. Beginning with that period and coming down to August 1, 1939, the rates have dropped to where they are today—15 cents per bale for the first month and for each succeeding month thereafter. This rate includes insurance, whereas prior to these loan programs the producer had to carry his own insurance. This cost alone, as shown by the record, amounts to 3.25 cents per bale per month. Therefore the 15-cent-per-bale-per-month rate is really less than 12 cents per bale per month as compared with the period prior to the loan programs.

The farmer, during the period these loan programs have been in existence, has marketed over 90,000,000 bales of cotton outside the loan program of the Government. This cotton has been sold into trade channels by the producers, based upon the handling charges that have come down as stocks went up.

I believe that it is fair to measure what may come from this unwise program of the Commodity Credit Corporation by what is now the basis of charges at port locations where the principal advocates of the competitive-bidding system maintain their facilities. The record shows that those facilities have a two-price system, but they make one low rate for the Government cotton and thereafter make their profits at the expense of the producers of the Nation. The record definitely shows that while these facilities would bid low to obtain these dead stocks, that at the same time they are not extending to the producers of the Nation the benefit of such rates. For instance, at one of the largest facilities in the world, owned and operated by Anderson Clayton Co. in Houston, the receiving charge, the storage charge for the first month, not including insurance, for handling the producers' cotton is 35 cents per bale; therefater, the storage charge is 21 cents per bale, not including insurance. If that same rate were made effective at interior points, and it must be made effective if the present system is disturbed, it would cost the producers of the Nation some five or six million dollars per annum, not just once—but every year from now on out. That would be taken out of the income of the producer from the marketing and sale of his cotton. If we are to embrace the two-price system of competitive bids for the Government cotton and the higher charges for the producers' cotton, the system maintained at the ports, then we must embrace it for the ports and the interior alike. We must agree by our action with respect to this matter that all are entitled to the same consideration whether it be on a competitive-bid basis or upon the system heretofore in vogue with respect to the handling of this very troublesome problem.

Heretofore the Government has called the industry in and has negotiated rates

for the handling of both the Government-owned, the Government-loan, and the producers' cotton. These rates have proven highly satisfactory to the producers of the Nation and the bill before you seeks to maintain that system. The rates to the producers and the Government have both come down as a result of the present system. The Government rates have been reduced from 25 to 18, to 15 and to 12½ cents per bale per month, and the benefits of those reductions have been extended to the producers of the Nation. S. 262 seeks to continue that system and requires the Department to negotiate contracts with the industry upon the basis heretofore maintained. If it is unable, however, to obtain reasonable and satisfactory rates through that method, it is left free to advertise for competitive bids so that it may protect both its interest and the interest of the producers. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments, which are at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 3, line 25, after the word "warehouse", strike out the colon and insert the following: "and, notwithstanding any other provision of this act, an amount of cotton to bring the cotton so stored up to such prescribed proportion may be moved to such warehouses."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 4, line 3, after the word "smaller", strike out the word "warehouses" and insert in lieu thereof the words "warehousing concerns."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency.

SEC. 6. This act is not intended to alter, change, or amend the act entitled "An act relating to the manner of securing written consent for the reconcentration of cotton under section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938," approved June 16, 1938, and shall not be construed to have that effect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Page 4, after line 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall repeal or set aside the provision of existing law requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to keep in storage not less than 300,000 bales in New England warehouses."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. I believe I voice the sentiment of the entire committee and the House when I say there will be no objection to the adoption of the gentleman's amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 262) regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to House Resolution 149, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 120, answered "present" 3, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—226

Allen, Ill.	Carlson	Disney
Allen, La.	Cartwright	Dondero
Andersen, H. Carl	Clark	Doughton
	Clason	Downs
Anderson, N. Mex.	Claypool	Doxey
	Cochran	Drewry
Barry	Coffee, Nebr.	Duncan
Bates, Ky.	Cole, Md.	Durham
Beckworth	Collins	Eberharter
Beiter	Colmer	Edelstein
Bennett	Connery	Edmiston
Bishop	Cooley	Eliot, Mass.
Bland	Cooper	Elliott, Calif.
Boland	Courtney	Ellis
Boren	Cox	Faddis
Boykin	Cravens	Fitzpatrick
Brooks	Creal	Flannagan
Brown, Ga.	Crosser	Fogarty
Bryson	Culkin	Folger
Buck	Cullen	Ford, Miss.
Buckler, Minn.	Cunningham	Fulmer
Bulwinkle	D'Alesandro	Gale
Burch	Davis, Ohio	Gathings
Burdick	Davis, Tenn.	Gehrmann
Burgin	Delaney	Gibson
Byrne	Dewey	Gilchrist
Camp	Dickstein	Gore
Cannon, Fla.	Dies	Gossett
Capozzoli	Dingell	Granger
Grant, Ala.	McLaughlin	Sacks
Gregory	McMillan	Sanders
Gwynne	Maciora	Sasscer
Haines	Mahon	Satterfield
Hare	Mansfield	Sauthoff
Harris	May	Scanlon
Harter	Merritt	Schulte
Healey	Meyer, Md.	Scrugham
Heffernan	Mills, Ark.	Shafer, Mich.
Hendricks	Mills, La.	Shanley
Hill, Wash.	Monroney	Sheppard
Hobbs	Moser	Short
Holbrock	Murdock	Sikes
Hook	Myers, Pa.	Smith, Pa.
Hope	Nelson	Smith, Va.
Hunter	Norrell	Smith, Wash.
Imhoff	Norton	Snyder
Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.	South
Jacobsen	O'Connor	Sparkman
Jennings	O'Hara	Starnes, Ala.
Johnson, Ill.	O'Leary	Steagall
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Toole	Stefan
	Pace	Sullivan
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Patman	Sumner, Ill.
	Patrick	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Okla.	Patton	Sutphin
Johnson, W. Va.	Peterson, Fla.	Sweeney
Kee	Peterson, Ga.	Tarver
Keefe	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Tenerowicz
Kelley, Pa.		Terry
Kennedy, Martin J.	Pheiffer, William T.	Thom
		Tolan
Keogh	Pierce	Traynor
Kerr	Priest	Vincent, Ky.
Kilday	Rabaut	Vinson, Ga.
Kirwan	Ramsay	Walter
Kopplemann	Ramspeck	Ward
Lanham	Randolph	Wasielewski
Larrabee	Rankin, Miss.	Weaver
Lea	Reece, Tenn.	Weiss
LeCompte	Rees, Kans.	Welch
Lewis	Richards	Wene
Ludlow	Rivers	Whelchel
Lynch	Rizley	Whittington
McCormack	Robertson, Va.	Winter
McGehee	Robinson, Utah	Worley
McGranery	Robsion, Ky.	Wright
McIntyre	Rogers, Okla.	Zimmerman
McKeough	Russell	

NAYS—120

Anderson, Calif.	Geyer, Calif.	Murray
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	O'Brien, N. Y.
	Graham	O'Neal
Angell	Grant, Ind.	Osmers
Arnold	Guyer, Kans.	Paddock
Baldwin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pittenger
Bates, Mass.		Plumley
Baumhart	Hall, Leonard W.	Rankin, Mont.
Beam		Reed, Ill.
Bender	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Hancock	Rodgers, Pa.
Boehne	Harness	Rogers, Mass.
Boggs	Harrington	Rolph
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	Romjue
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Rutherford
Cannon, Mo.	Hill, Colo.	Simpson
Carter	Hoffman	Smith, Conn.
Casey, Mass.	Holmes	Smith, Maine
Chenoweth	Houston	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Hull	Spence
Clevenger	Izac	Springer
Cluett	Jenkins, Ohio	Stearns, N. H.
Coffee, Wash.	Jensen	Stevenson
Cole, N. Y.	Johns	Taber
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Talle
Costello	Johnson, Ind.	Thill
Crawford	Jones	Thomas, Tex.
Curtis	Jonkman	Tibbott
Day	Kean	Tinkham
Ditter	Kilburn	Treadway
Douglas	Kinzer	Van Zandt
Dworshak	Knutson	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	Kunkel	Vreeland
Englebright	Lambertson	Wheat
Fellows	Landis	Wigglesworth
Fenton	McGregor	Williams
Fish	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Ford, Leland M.	Michener	Wolcott
Ford, Thomas F.	Mitchell	Woodruff, Mich.
Gamble	Mott	Young
Gerlach	Mundt	Youngdahl

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Canfield	Elston	McLean

NOT VOTING—80

Andrews	Bonner	Domengeaux
Arends	Bradley, Pa.	Engel
Barden	Buckley, N. Y.	Fitzgerald
Barnes	Case, S. Dak.	Flaherty
Bell	Celler	Flannery
Bloom	Chapman	Forand
Bolles	Crowther	Gavagan
Bolton	Dirksen	Gearhart

Gifford	Maas	Schuetz
Green	Maciejewski	Scott
Hart	Magnuson	Secrest
Heidinger	Marcantonio	Shannon
Hess	Martin, Iowa	Sheridan
Hinshaw	Mason	Smith, W. Va.
Howell	Nichols	Somers, N. Y.
Jarman	O'Day	Stratton
Jarrett	Oliver	Taylor
Jenks, N. H.	Pearson	Thomas, N. J.
Kefauver	Plauché	Thomason
Kelly, Ill.	Ploeser	Voorhis, Calif.
Kennedy, Michael J.	Poage	Wadsworth
Kleberg	Powers	West
Kocialkowski	Rich	White
Kramer	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Leavy	Rockefeller	Wolverton, N. J.
Lesinski	Sabath	Woodrum, Va.
McArdle	Schaefer, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Canfield against.
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. McLean against.
Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Elston against.
Mr. Poage for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Thomason for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Dirksen against.
Mr. Kocialkowski for, with Mr. Jarrett against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Stratton against.
Mr. Pearson for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.
Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Bolles against.
Mr. Martin of Iowa for, with Mr. Oliver against.
Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Flaherty against.
Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Andrews against.
Mr. Kramer for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.
Mr. Fitzgerald for, with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey against.
Mr. Somers of New York for, with Mr. Crowther against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Wadsworth
Mr Kleberg with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. West with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Green with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Leavy with Mr. Barnes.
Mr. White with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] voted?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is not recorded.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have a pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BONNER. Were he present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BARDEN, who, if he were present, would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. JARMAN. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 2788, the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (Rept. No. 331), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 156

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 43, a joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

EXEMPTION FROM INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXES OF ARTICLES IMPORTED BY CONSULAR OFFICERS OF FOREIGN STATES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (Rept. No. 332), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 157

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 3835, a bill to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY] on the occasion of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner at Philadelphia on March 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a rumor came to me this morning in connection with the new 11-man mediation board, and that was that Mr. Sidney Hillman was either going to control, or is now endeavoring to maneuver himself into such a position that he would control, the selection of all personnel under this Board.

In connection with this matter, I called Mr. Dykstra's office at Republic 5500. I was there referred to the Office of Production Management, Republic 7500, and talked to a Miss Rouse and a Mr. Capella. They advised me that it was not yet definitely determined as to who would handle the required personnel.

I think that this Congress should rouse itself to a point of finding out whether Hillman is going to select this personnel. If he is, it might be pretty definitely stated that we will then have a board who will tell capital where to get off, and nothing will be told to this destructive, communistic C. I. O. leadership as to what they must do.

Lock at this picture. Madam Perkins, the great defender of Harry Bridges, the biggest failure that the Labor Department has ever had; through her control has set this destructive communistic C. I. O. leadership in the saddle on the Labor Board. This same destructive C. I. O. leadership completely dominates the N. L. R. B. Now then, who do we find as cochairman in the Office of Production Management? None other than Sidney Hillman, a foreign-born C. I. O. leader. If a plan had been predetermined to set this communistic C. I. O. leadership in complete domination of our defense program, it could not have been more thoroughly carried out, and if the ultimate object of this racketeering, hijacking, socialistic, communistic leadership is to sabotage our national-defense program and the Nation itself, they certainly have been placed in the key positions to do it.

Let us look at the results that this group, the Perkinses, the Hillmans, the Murrays, the N. L. R. B., and their half-baked Socialistis and Communists have brought upon us. The administration has nourished and coddled and bred what they should have been outlawed leadership and most of them placed in the penitentiary. Now, this same administration has had this racketeering, hijacking, communistic C. I. O. group come back home to roost. Now they have been placed in power, they are ready to sink their poisonous fangs into the heart of the defense program and destroy it as their first step, and with their second step they are already proceeding to sovietize and communize the United States, its Government, and everything therein.

Look at this morning's paper, the Washington Post, dated March 25, 1941, and note where the destructive communistic C. I. O. is sinking its fangs into the heart of our defense program, namely, the steel companies which are supposed to produce the steel with which this country can defend itself. Note the trend of violence, where 700 policemen had to help carry out a court injunction in connection with the opening of the McCormick works of the International Harvester Co. Note that the Ford Motor Co.'s Lincoln plant had to shut down, and that the entire automobile industry throughout Michigan is threatened with a shut-down, due to a 2-week-old strike at the Midland Steel Products Co. Note that the socialistic, communistic C. I. O. administered N. L. R. B. has signed subpenas for Henry Ford and his son, Edsel to appear; that they are going to communize this plant or ruin it. Note, also, that John L. Lewis has seized this time of crisis in our national-defense program to say that his union's demands will not amount to $500,000 a day, but will only amount to $225,000 a day increase. Is it coming to a point where $225,000 a day is small change to these racketeers and highjackers, and that these amounts may be extracted from the taxpayers with impunity? And does it mean that these demands are so important that the national-defense program may be sabotaged in order to get them?

Every newspaper you pick up, from any section of the country, shows this communistic C. I. O. leadership advocating strikes, even as far out as Death Valley. They are striking in the Trona plant, a plant which produces chemicals on which the United States is dependent. It does not make any difference where you go, from coast to coast, and in the interior.

You will note that I have termed these activities communistic, and I submit to you that they are. The best evidence of this now is the owner of the Harvill Aircraft Die-casting Corporation plant at Inglewood. The owner of this plant, although proceeding under a superior court order, was not permitted, with his office workers, to enter into his own plant. What is this? Is this not revolution, and are not these communistic C. I. O. leaders proceeding under what they term as a new "front," calling these revolutions strikes? And is this not, in fact, a revolution to seize private property? They certainly have seized private property and have kept the owners out.

If I owned a plant and had a court order to back me up to enter in my own plant, I would see these strikers in hell with their backs broken before I would be kept out.

What is this going to come to in the final analysis? This spineless administration has either got to take some American action or else they are going to face revolution and real bloodshed.

There is no question in my mind that the owners of these properties are not going to have these properties invaded by hoodlums, bums, Socialists, Communists, and C. I. O. leaders, and take it lying down. The time has come when the owners of small industries are ready to protect their industries with their lives, and they are going to do it.

In order to obviate any such terrible revolution and loss of our defense program, I am going to ask every Democrat, and every Republican, to waive aside any party consideration and, for the sake of the safety and welfare of our country, and for the sake of preserving this country through the accomplishment of our national defense, and the saving of our form of government, to address a note to the President of the United States asking the removal of Madam Perkins, Sidney Hillman, Murray, or anyone in the N. L. R. B., or any of the boards appointed by the President, who is connected in any manner with this subversive, socialistic, racketeering, hijacking, communistic C. I. O. leadership.

I think that every Congressman in this House is accountable for what is happening to our form of government, that is, socializing, sovietizing or communizing it, or whatever you choose to term it, and I think that these same Congressmen are pledged to their constituencies to stop these things before they happen, rather than let them happen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

DAVID LASSER

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I called the attention of the House yesterday to the appointment of David Lasser as employment relation specialist of the W. P. A. Let me read you a little bit from the hearings on the investigation of the W. P. A.:

In connection with the so-called hunger march of the Workers Alliance and other pressure groups in 1936, they occupied the State capitol of Pennsylvania and refused to leave. During occupancy serious damage was done to the furniture and the building. According to reports, more than $1,139.77 was expended by the State in connection with repairs to the senate gallery and State property. The above figure does not represent the only expense to the State in connection with this affair. Photographs are in the file showing David Lasser and others engaged in this rioting.

I have here in my hand a photograph showing Mr. Lasser right in the middle leading the riot at the Pennsylvania State capitol. Is that not a nice kind of a fellow to put in a $4,000 job in the W. P. A.? I wonder how long the people are going to stand for this kind of performance.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What are his duties in his new position?

Mr. TABER. He has to go around and find out why W. P. A. employees are not accepted by employers in defense industries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on life-insurance companies published in the Bridgeport Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS UNDER CALIFORNIA STATE INSPECTION

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, in the permission given me to extend my remarks, I wish to include a joint resolution passed by the California Legislature memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress to take the steps necessary to permit meat and meat products prepared under California State inspection to be sold on the same basis as meat and meat products under Federal inspection. Those packing plants in California operating under the State meat-inspection laws maintain fully as high a standard of quality as those with Federal inspection. For the Army and Navy to confine the bids to those plants having Federal meat inspection would limit the large national-defense orders to only five plants in California, to the exclusion of the many well-qualified independent packers. The independent packers have provided the best market for the ranchers of California and have consistently protected their interests. We had a similar situation in the supplying of the C. C. C. camps some years ago. After investigation by the War Department, State-inspected plants were qualified to furnish the meat requirements. Where standards are maintained by a State equaling those of the Federal

Government, the fact of equal merit under equally rigid rules should be recognized by the Government in its purchases.

The resolution follows:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 4

Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress to take the steps necessary to permit meat and meat products prepared under California State inspection to be sold on the same basis as meat and meat products under Federal inspection

Whereas the California meat-inspection law was patterned after and conforms to the Federal meat-inspection law and it is a recognized fact that California's meat-inspection law and the administration thereof is equivalent in all essential respects to Federal meat inspection; and

Whereas inspection under the Federal law in California is limited to 5 packing plants while more than 450 packing plants are inspected under the State law; and

Whereas at the present time bids on the sale of meat and meat products to the Federal Government by packing plants under State inspection are not approved and the privilege of selling meat and meat products to the United States and its agencies and institutions is granted only to the few plants operating under Federal inspection; and

Whereas the prosecution of the national-defense efforts is causing and will cause a great increase in the amount of meat and meat products required to meet the needs of the Army, Navy, and other Federal institutions and agencies and it is desirable to provide an expanded source of supply which may be assured by opening a new outlet for the products of a vitally necessary industry; and

Whereas the privilege of selling meat and meat products to the Federal Government in California should be extended to all State-inspected packing plants and can be done without in any way diminishing the quality of the products supplied to the Government since the legend "California inspected and passed" is equivalent to the legend "United States inspected and passed" in all material respects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation or to take such other steps as may be necessary to provide that meat and meat products inspected and passed under the California meat-inspection law may be sold to and purchased by the United States and its agencies on the same footing as meat and meat products produced under Federal inspection; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of California is hereby requested to cause to be transmitted copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States; and that such Senators and Representatives from California are hereby respectfully urged to support such legislation or such other proceedings as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose and intent of this resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Chester C. Davis before the Southern Governors Conference and a resolution of the Southern Governors Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of March 13, entitled "Seven Billion for Britain" by M. E. Garber, editor of the Madison Courier, Madison, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a joint resolution passed by the State Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to repeal or modify the Embargo Act of 1927 relating to the importation of meats from foreign lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the speech of Mr. Chester C. Davis before the Southern Governors Conference has already been placed in the RECORD. I therefore modify my prior request and ask unanimous consent to include only the resolution of the Southern Governors Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Indianapolis News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain comment by the president of American Airlines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for tomorrow and Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow there will be considered the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act. On Friday we will take up the War Department civil functions appropriation bill. If the bill under consideration tomorrow is completed early enough that there is sufficient time left, we may start general debate on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill and complete its consideration on Friday, but the probability is that there will not be enough time and that the bill will come up on Friday.

If the Committee on Rules reports a rule making in order the consideration of the Hobbs bill, it is my intention to have that considered on Monday. However, if there is a roll call on that bill, it is my intention to have the roll call go over until Tuesday. If that rule is not reported, or, if it is, after the bill is disposed of, the cotton net-weight bill will be next in order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Tomorrow there will be considered only the bill providing for the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act? Two rules were reported out today. They will not be called up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. One of the rules reported out today relates to the coffee agreement. That will not come up until next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand there are several conference reports that will come in tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. One of the bills reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, on which a rule was granted today, has a unanimous report. The chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means have agreed that they will ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That request may be made tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If unanimous consent is granted for the consideration of that bill, there will be no necessity for calling up the rule. I understand there is no controversy over the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no objection on my part to that. I am acquainted with the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If unanimous consent is not granted, the rule will not be called up and the bill will not be considered tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] wants to know what the Hobbs bill covers.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the alien deportation bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Office of Government Reports bill that passed the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MANUFACTURERS' SALES TAX

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the letter I am now going to read has nothing whatever to do with the subject I shall later discuss, but it was written by a very, very distinguished and brilliant member of the bar of Montana, a most patriotic man and one of the foremost lawyers of the entire West. He is an ex-chief justice of the Supreme Court of Montana. The letter is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

HELENA, MONT., *March 22, 1941.*

JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'CONNOR: Regardless of my attitude on the lend-lease bill, it is now a law. It was passed upon the assurance that it was a measure to keep the United States out of war. Many Representatives and Senators voted for it upon that pledge, otherwise they would have voted against it. But now every sign is that the United States is going into the war, all-out, and unless United States citizens rise up and stop it that fate, with all its disasters and horrors, is impending. The people of Montana are almost unanimously against going to war or permitting this country to be engaged in it as an active participant.

I am telling you my fixed policy. If any Senator or Member of Congress from Montana fails to do his utmost to keep the United States from participating actively in the war, or in anywise engaging in combat, I will do my utmost to defeat that Representative or Senator when he comes up for reelection. I say this in all kindness, but the time has come when personal friendship is a very minor matter as compared to the maintenance of this Republic.

Very truly yours,

LEW L. CALLAWAY.

Mr. Callaway lives in Helena, Mont. In my opinion, he expresses the sentiment in the West.

Mr. Speaker, on the 13th day of March, this year, I introduced H. R. 3995. The purpose of this bill is to provide for a manufacturers' sales tax in lieu of property taxes, in whole or in part.

This bill is designed primarily to help the farmer. His tax position has been so unfavorable as to warrant a sincere effort in finding a more equitable method of taxation as it applies to him. The bill applies to home owners and other real-property owners.

SERIOUS DIFFICULTIES WITH THE PROPERTY TAX

No other factor in the agricultural or in the economic situation of the Nation is more important today than our taxes. Forty-nine major tax systems, with thousands of subsidiary jurisdictions, extract tax money unsystematically from both bursting and empty purses. The income tax, whether State or Federal, treats kindly the purses of those adept at simulating tragedy in the showing of their joint business-personal financial accounts. It favors the crafty to the disadvantage of the scrupulous.

Never before was there a time when the necessity was more urgent for revamping our tax system as it applies to real property than the present. Our undertaking in Europe to underwrite the expenditures of the democracies for war purposes is going to cost the American taxpayers before the story is told not less than from twenty to thirty billion dollars. It is not fantastic to assume that by the time the appetite for war has been satisfied that our indebtedness will approximate around $100,000,000,000, and unless we provide a different system of financing this program than we now have our annual interest burden will reach two to three billions. The heaviest of the burden of all of this indebtedness will finally rest on the shoulders of the persons who have the property that the tax collector can find and who cannot pass their taxes on, such as the farmer. Consequently this is the time to commence to get set for trouble in the future.

The property tax commits injustices more personal and direct. Whether the individual property owner has current income or not, whether the property has paid the owner a return or cumulated a loss for him, the amount of the tax levy against it is determined on the theoretical assumption of normal or average income. I have seen thousands of farmers in Montana lose their homes through taxation because of drought, insects, hail, or some other disaster over which they had no control, as they were required to pay taxes on an assumed valuation on their lands.

The theoretical average person does have income from which he can pay taxes, and for such an individual the property tax need never be disastrous. But few, if any, property owners conform to such an average. During the past decade farmers, in particular, have been taxed by this method far beyond their ability to pay.

The property tax is regressive, and in two ways. First, it falls with relative severity on low-income classes, such as farmers and wage earners, because these classes have little wealth outside the classes of tangible property regularly found and assessed for tax purposes. This means that the burdensome property tax applies to nearly their entire wealth. Although higher-income groups also own property, they own in addition large amounts of income-producing wealth which, first, may be given a special low rate; second, may escape the property tax completely; or third, may be entirely exempt from all taxes. The property tax is regressive secondly for the reason that assessment for tax purposes is almost universally unfair to the smaller, the lower-value, and the poorer-quality properties. Both small farms and poor farms are commonly assessed higher per dollar of value than are the large and the valuable ones.

Furthermore the difficulty probably cannot in most cases be credited to dishonest assessment. There is no clear-cut and definite way of assessing property. There is sale value or market value, yes; but only when a farm is sold. It is estimated that the average farm changes hands only once in 15 years. Further, many transfers are not voluntary sales, and, hence, fail to determine true market value. Voluntary sale occurs perhaps once every 40 years. In addition, most voluntary sale records fail to show the full sale price, so that the transactions are useless for assessment purposes—unless coupled with cumbrous and expensive legal methods of requiring true reports of full consideration on every transaction.

Still another charge against the property tax is that its levy is in relation to technical ownership rather than equity. Whether a farmer has his farm free of debt or has 80 percent of its price still to pay, he is taxed on the entire assessment for the property.

Two other serious difficulties with the property tax relate to the revenue requirements which depend upon this tax. Greatest dependence upon the property tax exists in the case of the smallest geographical jurisdictions, the local governments. These local communities, from their very restriction in size, fail to have the diversity of industry, income sources, and tax-paying ability which exist in broader units. This lack of diversity, in turn, means that good or bad times, prosperity or depression, will have a greater effect on the whole community. Need of emergency revenues will occur at relatively short intervals and with relatively great severity. The property tax is practically the sole local source of the revenue required.

In other words, the property tax in most States virtually a real-estate tax, furnishes the principal cushion for the whole State and local tax system. It can be claimed conservatively that property-tax levies are largely of the nature of "fixed charges" against the farmer's business. The percentage which such a fixed tax takes from a farmer's cash receipts rises in bad years and falls in good years. Worse than this, levies often increase in bad times, and cause even greater variation in the proportion of receipts taken by the State and local governments.

I am not going to go into the question of delinquencies. The details are more or less familiar to the person who has given the subject any thought.

THE FARMERS' TAX POSITION

We may take as an indication the relationship between taxes and returns. According to the Bureau of the Census reported in 1929 farm real-estate taxes in Montana took 22.3 percent of the gross on cash rented farms.

In some States this percent reached as high as 56½ percent. In Montana, taxes amount annually to approximately $37,821,000, 68 percent of which is collected against property regardless of the revenue it produces. In addition to the property tax which the farmer pays, he usually has considerable personal property which adds from 10 to 15 percent to his real-estate taxes. In 1929 the total farm property taxes made up 81 percent of the principal levies falling directly on the farmers. Later it fell slightly. It is conceded that for several decades property taxes have risen faster than have incomes. From year to year the tax levies fail utterly to reflect income changes. In the eyes of the law and the tax collector the farmer with a complete crop failure can, under the usual property tax law be granted no favor as compared with the farmer with a bumper crop. Even if his efforts are destroyed year after year by hail, flood, fire, or other dis-

aster, even if he is forced to accept charity to obtain food and clothing, the farm owner must meet a tax levy based on a theoretical concept of the value of his property, at pain of paying a tremendous penalty or of losing his farm.

Property taxes levied on the average farm acre in 1939 were 90 percent higher than those levied in the period 1909–13; they were higher by 202 percent than those levied in 1890. It will be observed that the period from 1909 to 1914 is used for the yardstick years for parity payments now. In other words, if a farmer today were to receive parity payment for wheat, such parity would not take into account the 90 percent increase in his taxes. Therefore, it would still not oe parity. As the farmer cannot include his taxes in the prices for which he sells his products, he cannot pass them on and must absorb them, but when he buys an article he must pay the seller's taxes all the way back to the manufacturer in the price that he pays for what he buys. It is therefore obvious that if the farmer is to survive we must find a way of changing the system under which he is taxed. I have given this subject thought for many years and have reached the conclusion that the bill I have introduced comes nearer to a solution than any other remedy I have been able to find, and will do more in solving the plight of the farmer and home owner than any legislation thus far enacted. Our tax system so far as the farmer is concerned is still in the "horse and buggy" days. Before attempting an analysis of this bill I want to say that I do not claim to be an expert on taxation and neither do I claim perfection for the bill. I feel that if I have presented something to the Congress that will cause a serious study to be made of this problem, with a resultant remedy, though it be not mine, that I will have carried out one of the purposes for which I came to Congress.

MANUFACTURERS' SALES TAX

The type of levy offered in the present bill as fulfilling the requirements follows essentially the plan used by the Dominion of Canada in taxing manufactured and imported commodities. Aside from administration and any additional portion retained in the Federal Treasury, it would cost precisely what is now paid in another form, because it would be levied in lieu of property taxes. It is recognized that a tax in lieu of the property tax cannot well be instituted to the fullest extent, at least for the present; thus provision is made for permitting retention of the property tax but with differential disadvantages based on the relative extent to which property taxes continue to be used. The method used to accomplish this end will be discussed more fully in connection with the allocation formula to be used to distribute the receipts from the in-lieu tax.

The bill provides for an excise tax of 8 percent upon articles sold by the manufacturer or importer thereof. To avoid pyramiding of the tax and to simplify administration, a licensing plan is set up in section 5 of the bill, which permits tax-free sales between licensed manufacturers. This avoids taxing any goods which are one manufacturer's finished products and another manufacturer's materials. The tax applies at only one point in the process of manufacturing; namely, when the article leaves the manufacturing process and enters consumption channels. The bill further provides for the allocation of 90 percent of the revenues from the tax to the several States to be used only to reduce the property tax.

The 8-percent rate provided in the bill will permit the reduction of property taxes by about two-thirds. In 1937, when property taxes levied by all jurisdictions amounted to about four and seven-tenths billion dollars, the value of manufactures reported by the Bureau of the Census was over $60,000,000,000, of which about one-third represents duplication due to one manufacturer's output becoming the materials of another. Thus, had the proposed tax been in effect in 1937, it would have applied to manufactures valued at about $40,000,000,000 and taxes amounting to about three and two-tenths billion dollars would have been collected. The latest available figures for 1940 suggest a potential yield in that year of about the same sum. It would, of course, be possible to replace even more of the property tax later merely by increasing the tax rate on manufacturers to 9 or even 10 percent.

To insure attainment of the major objective of reducing property taxes, provision is made for the distribution of most of the revenues among the States for that purpose. It is recognized that individual States have the right and the privilege of shaping their tax systems as they see fit. The distributive plan, however, has been developed so that every State can participate if it wishes. In fact, the plan is so generous that no State can afford to stay out. And yet this generosity is restricted to those States which can present acceptable plans for reducing property taxes within their jurisdictions. Section 15 of the bill provides that 90 percent of the revenues will be available for distribution among the States which meet the specified requirements. The remaining 10 percent of the revenues will be retained in the Federal Treasury to cover the costs of administration and collection and also to provide a moderate amount of revenue for the Federal Government.

The allocations to the various States will be made on the basis of the three-part formula included in section 15. After the amount of the distributive revenue has been determined, it will be prorated among the States as follows: First, one-third according to the total tax revenues raised within each State by the State and its political subdivisions during the preceding year; second, one-third according to the total tax revenues raised otherwise than by taxes on property during the preceding year; and third, one-third according to their population as shown by the last preceding census.

The first part of the formula recognizes the importance of avoiding sudden disturbance to the pattern of governmental services and revenues already established within a State. It will be noted that this operates to the advantage of States which have been financing their current activities with a minimum of borrowing. The second part provides a differential favoring those States which are already or shall in the future approach the objective of reducing their relative reliance upon property taxes. The third part of the formula will result in an augmented share of the funds going to areas where, despite an appreciable concentration of population, the distribution of wealth is such that they are unable to use many of the more productive types of taxes to raise the amounts of revenue necessary to finance adequate levels of Government services. In short, this may contribute toward raising the leve of Government services in certain areas where this would be highly desirable. But in no case would any State receive the amount allocated to it unless it first shall have submitted and had approved a plan for utilizing such funds for the reduction of property taxes levied by the State and its political subdivisions. It will be noted that if in the course of time the reliance of the various States upon property taxes is reduced to a uniform proportion of their total tax revenues, parts (1) and (2) of the formula approach identity. Any State, however, which continues to rely heavily upon property taxes is at an increasing disadvantage in part (2) of the allocation formula.

Once the property tax has been reduced, provision must be made for ways and means of preventing it from rising again. Insofar as subdivisions of the States are concerned, it would be possible for the States to provide for maximum tax rates that could not be exceeded except under exceptional circumstances. One method currently used is to permit individual jurisdictions to increase their rates above the maximum only when approved by affirmative vote of two-thirds of those voting on the question.

Provisions for such local limitations on taxes are without the scope of the Federal Government's action, but provision is made in the bill for insuring to a State as a whole retention of the benefits of the initial reduction in property taxes. The bill permits an increase of 10 percent in the aggregate property-tax revenues within any State without penalty. If the increase exceeds 10 percent, however, the State is penalized under part (2) of the distribution formula by deducting the total amount of such property-tax revenues from the total non-property-tax revenues in fixing the basis for the proration.

The adoption of the plan contemplated in this bill would redound to the advantage of both local governments and individuals. This in-lieu tax should relieve the fiscal distress of many local governmental units, reduce their need of frequent borrowing, and improve their credit standing. Of even wider social significance, it should make sweeping reductions in the distress caused to individuals and communities by the sequence of regressive assessment, delinquency, usurious interest and penalties, and loss of equity. All too often there is such a depletion of working capital and credit as to preclude any reasonable chance of

regaining a livelihood, then impossible debt and bankruptcy or abandonment, followed by tenancy, relief, itinerant efforts at new occupations, and so on.

Of tremendous importance to our landed resources and the conservation of national productive capacity is the fact that the displacement of much of the property tax by such an in-lieu tax should avoid an important fraction of the misuse of rural lands induced directly and indirectly by the property-tax difficulties. Extent of the probable saving in human and landed resources cannot be measured. In fact, no realistic measure of the damage done and in progress appears possible. The composite story of the various programs approved by Congress since 1932 in relation to agriculture and the conservation of resources can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as laying extensive blame on local taxation situations. And local taxation in rural areas has been approximately synonymous with property taxation.

Displacement of property taxation frequently is opposed on the grounds that no other system is workable. Upon analysis one may be led to wonder whether the real ground for opposition is not the belief that substitute measures would be workable—and as a result would levy the tax where the ability rests, instead of continuing to impose it on property owners, such as farmers, without regard for their ability to pay.

On the question of ability to bear the burden, may I call your attention to the fact that the farm population in the United States is about 25 percent of the whole of our population, and according to the latest figures furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the farmers of the country receive from 6 to 7 percent of the national income, and the taxes on property amounts to approximately 32 percent of the total revenue raised for tax purposes by the Government and all subdivisions. So the injustices of our tax system are obvious. Another point, while not directly related but pertinent, the longer the European war is prolonged, the more the farmers will suffer. Our agricultural exports during the last year of World War No. 1 amounted to excess of $5,000,000,000. In 1940 exports of agricultural products amounted to approximately one-half billion dollars. Great Britain is taking little of our agricultural products as seen by these figures. No agricultural products raised in Montana are contemplated to be benefited in the lease-lend program. I point this out primarily to show the urgent necessity of revamping our tax system.

The shocking economic injustice our farmers are required to bear is graphically shown in the table inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A1182, by the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON.

Time and again I have seen farmers mortgage even their milk cows and farming implements to raise funds with which to pay their taxes after they had been droughted out or lost their crop in some other manner beyond their control or were forced to sell when prices were so low that their farms would not produce sufficient income to meet their tax bill. The injustice of a system permitting this cannot be overemphasized.

I think that one-third of this tax will be absorbed by the manufacturers and importers. This will come about by competition and reduction of taxes on their real property. I think that this will be the best means of aiding in the saving of the homes of the farmers.

Some may fear that certain of the present property owners will gain unduly from the reduction in property taxes. But all too many farmers and other property owners are on the verge of insolvency due in no small measure to the crushing burden of property taxes. For such persons the reduction in property taxes will contribute to an improved financial standing through reducing their fixed charges. Those for whom the tax saving is an addition to net income will not necessarily receive an unfair competitive advantage. Such property owners will be subject to income taxes, which it is assumed will continue to be levied on net incomes at the present rate or at increased rates. It is to be expected that the economic gain from the improved situation of those now handicapped by heavy property taxes will far exceed any possible disadvantage from the heavier income-tax payments by the others. The latter, of course, will be paid only by those who have sufficient net income to subject themselves to the provisions of the income-tax laws. Aside from the possibility of such added income-tax payments, the burden on the total economy of the Nation would not be changed by the proposed bill because the tax levied upon manufacturers would be offset by corresponding reductions in property tax. I believe that business would be stimulated by increasing the property owners' purchasing power. I hope the Members of Congress will study the bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

"IT IS A FOULE BIRD THAT FYLETH HIS OWN NEST" OR, AS SKELTON HAS IT, "THAT BYRD IS NOT HONEST THAT FYLETH HYS OWNE NEST"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most amazing aspects of our aid to Britain—national-defense program—is the manner in which administration officials defeat the President's purpose.

If aid to Britain and national defense, rather than a revolution and the seizure of the industrial plants, be the President's objective, it is difficult to understand why he permits Sidney Hillman, his subordinates, and the Labor Department to prevent the accomplishment of his purpose.

It is conceded that the strike at the Allis-Chalmers Co., which is now in its sixty-third day, has prevented for 63 days, and now prevents, the delivery to the Navy of machinery which is essential to the construction of ships which the Navy needs and must have. That same strike is holding up the production of powder at the Radford, Va., powder plant, which we must have, if Britain is to be aided.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] offered proof from the well of the House that it was inspired and carried on by the Communists. The excuse for the strike is the demand of the C. I. O. that only members of its organization shall hold jobs in that plant. The C. I. O. claims the exclusive right to sell jobs, and to sell them only to its own members. This assertion cannot be successfully disputed.

Why is the C. I. O. permitted to keep more than half of the employees of the Allis-Chalmers Co. from their jobs, from producing and delivering the material which the Army and the Navy need?

The reason is not hard to learn. Sidney Hillman, vice president of the C. I. O., and other administration officials are back of the C. I. O. drive to the extent at least that they are encouraging the strikers, are doing nothing to open the plant to those who would work for defense, for their Government.

Time and again representatives of the management of Allis-Chalmers have been called on the carpet and warned on occasion that if a settlement was not reached the Government might consider the taking over of the plant. The only settlement which the union is willing to accept is one which would require the Allis-Chalmers corporation to violate the N. L. R. A. by discharging two A. F. of L. men who are characterized by Harold Christoffel, president of the C. I. O. local, as "disrupters."

Christoffel, in a hearing before the Wisconsin State Labor Board, described a "disrupter" as one who—

First. Wears an A. F. of L. button while working in the shop.

Second. Says with a scowl that he does not like local 248 (Christoffel's union).

Third. Says the leaders of local 248 are communistic.

Fourth. Says the leaders of local 248 are radical.

Fifth. Says the leaders of local 248 are very unreasonable.

Christoffel claims that a majority of the C. I. O. employees voted in favor of a strike. That claim has been shown to be fraudulent by testimony taken before the Wisconsin State Labor Board. It now appears from statements of the attorneys for the union and from Christoffel's statement that their own handwriting expert, Katherine Wheeler, had "informed them there was a considerable" number of irregular votes; that she estimated there were 1,800 irregular votes and that she expressed doubt over several hundred other ballots.

This hearing has disclosed the fact that there were more than 2,200 fraudulent ballots cast at the election at which the strike vote was taken, and that a majority of the employees did not vote to go on strike. Yet, by the use of fraudulent ballots and by stuffing the ballot box, Christoffel and his associates have given the impression that the employees were

on strike. The truth is that Christoffel, the Communist, and his associates called and have maintained this strike.

And, notwithstanding his admission that the first election was fraudulent, Christoffel refuses to give the employees another opportunity to vote on the question of continuing the strike.

Yet to our shame be it said that officials of the Federal Government, with Sidney Hillman at their head, have permitted this strike to continue and, instead of opening the plant to loyal citizens who want to go back on the job, they try to intimidate the management of the company, force the company to yield to this Communist leader.

To show some of the excuses which the union has used during the past 7 months to stop work at the plant, let me give the following:

May 3, 1940: One man refused for a few hours to work with a nonunion welder.

May 25: The union refused to work overtime if nonunion employees were also given overtime work.

June 13: A 2-hour work stoppage in a toolroom to protest against the presence of a nonunion man.

June 26 and 27: Two-hour work stoppages by tractor assembly line painters who wanted higher piece-work rates and more painters.

July 2: One hour stoppage in tractor toolroom to protest because a man refused to join local 248.

August 15: Work stoppage in No. 2 tractor shop because nonunion men were working there.

August 27: Work stoppage in No. 1 foundry because a colored worker would not pay his union dues. The foundry was shut down.

September 9: Stoppage in No. 2 foundry because a worker had not joined the union. Men went back to work after one-half hour as the foundry was about to be shut down.

September 25: One and a half hour stoppage in the pattern shop because of nonunion workers.

October 16: A large crowd in No. 6 shop stopped work to demand that Charles Straessle be fired. One-half hour of production lost.

October 24: A large crowd gathered in No. 6 erecting shop to demand that Straessle be removed from the department. He was laid off 3 days.

October 28: Work stopped in the entire plant from 11 a. m. until noon to protest against the company's military-service policy. The company planned to give a bonus of 1 month's wages to all who volunteered or were drafted; the union wanted the company to make up the difference between Army pay and average shop pay.

November 1: A demonstration in No. 6 erecting shop against Straessle resulted in the men being docked three-tenths of an hour's pay.

November 11: Stoppage in No. 1 tractor shipping department as a protest against nonunion clerks. The department was shut down for the rest of the day.

November 13: Five-minute stoppage in tractor shipping department to protest against nonunion workers.

December 14: The second shift in one shop was sent home for refusing to work Saturday night because an A. F. L. member came back to work.

Once more, according to the press, the officials of Allis-Chalmers have been summoned to Washington, where, if the usual procedure be followed, they will be told that their policy is hindering the Government's program.

I would like to ask those Members of Congress who heretofore have spoken in favor of the closed shop, men like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and others; and I would like to ask the Government officials if they believe that our form of government can long be maintained if Government officials insist that jobs, especially jobs which must be taken and performed if we are to have aid to Britain and national defense, are to be given out only to those who meet the approval of an organization controlled by a Communist.

I ask these gentlemen, each and all, if they believe that liberty and freedom can be maintained here in America when Government officials back up a Communist in his demand that no one shall work in defense of our Government until that man has secured permission from a union?

When will Sidney Hillman, the National Defense Council, and the administration direct their efforts toward opening the gates of struck plants so that American citizens, eager and anxious to pass through, can go back to work?

If the administration will not protect our citizens then the responsibility falls upon us. Up to this time we have failed to act.

CONGRESS IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

We gain nothing by ignoring our responsibilities for the strikes which are now interfering with national defense.

The National Labor Relations Act contains provisions which not only enable unions to prevent the employment of nonunion men but which make it comparatively easy for one union to drive from their jobs members of another union. Under the law as interpreted by the National Labor Relations Board and sustained by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, it is possible for one group of employees to deprive another group of the right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

The House amended this act in such a way that many of the abuses would have been corrected but the Senate refused to pass upon those amendments.

So far this session we in the House have failed to again pass amendments which would do away with at least some of the causes for the present strikes.

Taking advantage of this unfair act, encouraged and actively assisted by the administration, by the N. L. R. B., by the O. P. M., Communists and labor racketeers have seized upon the present emergency and, taking advantage of this unjust and tyrannical law, are using it to prevent the accomplishment of the purpose for which it was enacted.

They are using it not only to delay national defense but to deprive employees of their jobs, to collect millions of dollars from helpless workingmen.

Every day that Congress sits here and lets this situation continue, thousands of dollars are collected from the workers whose friends we pretend to be, the Army and the Navy are deprived of needed supplies, and disrespect for the law is encouraged.

The great tide of public resentment and indignation is growing against these strikes and the strike leaders. We are all cognizant of that feeling, but with that resentment there is a ground swell of disgust against Congress itself because of our failure to deal adequately with the problems, and unless we bestir ourselves, and that right soon, we will be reaping the harvest at the polls in 1942.

If we lack the patriotism to deal at once with this evil thing, let self-interest move us before the feeling grows so high that the Halls of Congress will be swept clean because of the people's anger at our lack of initiative and courage, if lack of courage it be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SOME PERTINENT DAIRY FACTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of pertinent dairy facts which should be called to the attention of the producers and consumers of this country.

For instance, out of 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States, 42.1 pounds are made into butter, 6.6 pounds are made into cheese, 4.1 pounds into condensed and evaporated milk, 3.8 pounds into ice cream, 2.6 pounds are fed to calves, 11.5 pounds are consumed on farms where it is produced, and 29.4 pounds are sold as fluid milk and cream in cities and villages.

To clearly present the situation, I submit the following official figures from the United States Department of Agriculture giving the milk statistics for nine of the dairy States of the Nation for 1939, three of which represent the eastern section; three, the dairy section of the Central West; and three, the South:

Milk, 1939

States	Total production on farms	Value per 100 pounds	Value of production	Number of milk cows
	Pounds			
New York	7,465,000,000	$2.00	$149,300,000	1,355,000
Pennsylvania[1]	4,622,000,000	2.40	110,928,000	882,000
Massachusetts	804,000,000	3.29	26,452,000	137,000
Wisconsin	11,973,000,000	1.23	147,268,000	2,108,000
Minnesota	8,160,000,000	1.08	88,128,000	1,600,000
Iowa	6,519,000,000	1.08	70,405,000	1,393,000
Texas	4,227,000,000	1.81	76,509,000	1,342,000
Tennessee	1,936,000,000	1.64	31,750,000	553,000
Mississippi	1,375,000,000	1.62	22,243,000	522,000

[1] Note the wide price variation in the eastern area.

An analysis of this table will afford anyone interested a picture of some of the problems confronting a portion of the dairymen of this country.

Minnesota farmers milked 1,600,000 cows to produce 8,160,000,000 pounds of milk for which they received $1.08 per hundredweight, or a total of $88,128,000 for the year, while Pennsylvania farmers milked 882,000 cows and received $2.40 per hundredweight, or a total of $110,928,000.

In other words, first, although Minnesota farmers milked 80 percent more cows than Pennsylvania farmers, they received over 20 percent less money for their product.

Second. Wisconsin farmers had to milk over 2,100,000 cows to obtain 11,973,000,000 pounds of milk, which had a value of $147,268,000, while New York milked only 1,355,000 cows and produced only 7,465,000,000 pounds of milk but received $149,300,000, or over $2,000,000 more than did the Wisconsin farmers with their 60 percent more milk.

Third. The prices obtained by the Southern States average considerably higher than the prices prevailing in the Central States due to the fact that a large portion of this milk produced in the South was sold as fluid milk.

Fourth. The $3.29 per hundredweight Massachusetts price is due to the milk-marketing agreements where the price was "fixed" or "set." Over $1,800,000 worth of milk was given away in the Boston area in 1 year at the expense of the Federal Treasury.

Fifth. The causes of these wide differences in price throughout different sections of the country are (a) proximity to market, (b) milk-marketing agreements, and (c) artificial trade barriers under the guise of health requirements.

DEDUCTIONS

In making deductions in connection with this milk situation I wish to state that I do not want to tear down any price structures which are in existence at the present time. I do not want the fluid-milk producers to receive lower prices, but I certainly do want to see that the many, the 70 percent, receive equal legislative consideration accorded to the 30 percent of our producers.

First. There is no justification for such wide differences in prices as transportation charges do not equal the disparity in prices.

Second. If the Federal Government sets the price of milk for the 29.4 percent of the producers of fluid milk up to $3.29 per hundredweight, I maintain that the same Government can set the price up for the 70.6 percent of the producers who do not have a protected market and who sell their products in the manufactured form. Any other course is legislation for the few at the expense of the many.

Third. Common justice does not accompany a procedure which sets a price for only a minority group of our citizens, especially noticeable when the Government agencies purchase cheese on the lowest bid they can secure.

Fourth. While the Government agencies were setting the price that helped the 29 percent of the producers, the New Deal turned around and lowered the tariff on cheese by 42 percent and depressed the prices to be received by a large percentage of the producers whose milk was going into manufactured dairy products.

Fifth. We must have a correction of the cross-purpose schemes and enact parity legislation which gives equal benefit and opportunities to all the farmers of the country.

Sixth. We cannot set the price of over $3 per hundredweight for one group of milk producers and let the big majority of producers get as low as $1 per hundredweight without equal and fair legislative assistance.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3546. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 27, 1941, to begin hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, new House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015, House Office Building, as follows:

Wednesday, April 9, and Thursday, April 10, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day—resume hearings on H. R. 3359 and H. R. 3360, relating to preventing publication of inventions and prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents, respectively.

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions) relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

379. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1940 was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and proper reference as follows:

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4183. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. Senate Joint Resolution 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 156. Resolution for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 43, a joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 157. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3835, a bill to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use; without amendment (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3186. A bill to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian; without amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McINTYRE: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2672. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement fixing boundary lines on Wind River Indian lands, Wyoming; without amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 2788. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 335). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 4184. A bill to authorize the deferment under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 of men engaged in the study of medicine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4185. A bill to repeal the provision relating to compulsory removal from the rolls of Work Projects Administration workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4186. A bill authorizing the construction of public works on Ouachita River, near Calion, Ark., for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4187. A bill to amend the act approved June 25, 1938, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4188. A bill providing for the promotion and regulation of hours of duty of employees in the Customs Field Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4189. A bill to authorize the erection of an addition to the existing Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 4190. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon and the equipment of buildings and appurtenances for a coast guard academy in southern California; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4191. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises for utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 4192. A bill to establish a Department of Air; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4193. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4194 (by request). A bill to provide for the use of scientific tests to determine degree of intoxication of motor-vehicle operators in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution authorizing the restoration and preservation of the frigate *Constellation*, and making Baltimore, Md., her home port; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 4195. A bill for the relief of L. G. Poyter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4196. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Charles C. Morrison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4197. A bill for the relief of Merchants Distilling Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4198. A bill for the relief of John King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 4199. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Salierno; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4200. A bill for the relief of J. W. Mardorf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4201. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Cassius M. C. Robinson; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

578. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

579. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: House Concurrent Resolution 28 of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa, respectfully petitioning the Members of Congress to give early consideration to Senate file 860, now before the Senate, and to the enlargement of the provisions thereof in order to include the suppression of vice in the vicinity of ordnance plants or projects now or hereafter erected and maintained by the Federal Government in the development of national defense, and to enact such legislation at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

580. By Mr. GILCHRIST: Petition submitting to Congress Concurrent Resolution No. 28 of the Iowa Legislature, asking Federal legislation for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of ordnance plants or projects erected or maintained by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

581. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of about 175 farmers and businessmen of Scurry County, Tex., urging parity prices for farm commodities, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

582. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Walter H. Beam, secretary of the Senate, Forty-ninth General Assembly, Des Moines, Iowa, urging the members of the National Congress and the United States Department of Commerce to use every possible effort to obtain the installation of an adequate fishway through the Keokuk Dam on the Mississippi River, and urging that the necessary orders be secured from the proper departments providing for said fishway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

583. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Senate Joint Memorial No. 10, enacted by the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation authorizing the continuance of the purchase of silver; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

584. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 14, enacted by the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; and to the Senators and Representatives from Montana, relating to the utilization of facilities at Fort Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

585. Also House Joint Memorial No. 12, enacted by the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, requesting enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to provide for payments to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax revenue resulting from the use of certain lands by the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

586. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 15, enacted by the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, to the President of the United States and the Representatives from the State of Montana and the State of Wyoming in the Congress of the United States, requesting careful consideration and prompt support in the passage of an act providing for the construction of storage of water by the War Department, and that such provisions be made as will assure the people of Montana and Wyoming of water necessary for their present and potential needs for domestic and irrigation purposes by the building of proper dams in the Big Horn River in Montana and Boysen, Wyo.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

587. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of the Kansas State Legislature, urging the Secretary of Agriculture to make an immediate study and revision of Federal standards for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

588. By Mr. STEVENSON: Petition of E. A. Hall and other residents of Baraboo, Wis., seeking abolishment of the use of alcohol in the Army, Navy, Air and Marine Corps, and all the training units thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

589. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., supporting House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

590. By Mr. TALLE: Concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa, petitioning the Members of Congress to give early consideration to Senate bill 860, and to enlarge the provisions thereof in order to include the suppression of vice in the vicinity of ordnance plants or projects now or hereafter erected and maintained by the Federal Government in the development of national defense, and to enact such legislation at an early date; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

591. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State of Georgia, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of Senator BANKHEAD'S plan to put a floor under basic farm commodities, including tobacco, to bring the farmer's income up to full parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

592. Also, petition of the State of Georgia, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of legislation for the benefit of farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

593 Also, petition of the State of Iowa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the early consideration and passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God who art hidden from sight, veiled from sense yet manifest to faith, to whom we turn wistfully in the night of grief, and in the darkness of disappointment: Make us ever mindful of the fact that the place whereon we stand is the place of Thy feet, and though no sound of Thy going is heard,

help us to discern by faith Thy fatherly care and Thy tender leading through paths where the eyes of sense are holden.

As we stand today in the valley of decision may we heed the words of Thine apostle of old, "Quit you like men, be strong." Sustain us with the strength of patience, help us to live according to our vision, bearing Thee forth upon men by Thy effect upon us in our fortitude, our moral courage, our helpfulness, our devotion to duty, our readiness to minister; and this we pray in the name of Him who is the spirit of our prayer and from whom all our aspirations come, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, March 24, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 262) regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3575) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of William F. Kliewe, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. RAMSPECK, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. BEAM, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. DITTER, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3368. An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President;

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3869. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 4036. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act, approved May 3, 1935.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3575) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

AGREEMENT FOR USE AND OPERATION OF AIR AND NAVAL BASES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 158)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 3, 1940, I transmitted for the information of the Congress notes exchanged between the British Ambassador at Washington and the Secretary of State on the preceding day, under which this Government acquired the right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland and in the islands of Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, and Antigua, and in British Guiana. I now transmit for the information of the Congress a copy of an agreement for the use and operation of these bases, which was signed in London on March 27, 1941, together with the notes exchanged in connection therewith. These bases are for American defense against attack and their construction is consistent with such defense. International developments since my message to the Congress of September 3, last, have emphasized the value to the Western Hemisphere of these outposts of security.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 27, 1941.*

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED BY THE VICE PRESIDENT DURING RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that, under authority of the order of the 24th instant, he signed on Tuesday, March 25, 1941, the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 3546. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4050. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under authority of the act of June 10, 1872, reappoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under authority of section 4863 of the Revised Statutes, appoints the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE — FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 34)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, fiscal year 1941, in the amount of $4,100,000, for the construction of temporary office buildings in or near the District of Columbia, etc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RECREATIONAL BUILDINGS AT ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, GIVING NAMES, SALARIES, ETC.

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement supplementary to the annual report of the Commission showing the names, titles, and compensation of members and employees of the Federal Power Commission (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Commerce.

JANUARY 1941 REPORT OF THE R. F. C.

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of January 1941, including a statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the construction by the Federal Government of certain flood-control projects urgently needed to alleviate flood conditions which impede the operation of aviation factories and obstruct communications via highways and railroads serving the Los Angeles area; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the executive board of Chrysler Local No. 7, in the State of Indiana, endorsing and approving the C. I. O. industrial defense plan as presented to the President of the United States by Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., favoring the enactment of House bill 1410, providing for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of New Britain, Conn., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to create General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter signed by Thomas M. Beatty, chairman of the Quincy (Ill.) Committee on Military Roads, and a statement favoring the direct routing of main military highways, avoiding congested areas as being more economical and serving military purposes better than some of the present contemplated routes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress to take the steps necessary to permit meat and meat products prepared under California State inspection to be sold on the same basis as meat and meat products under Federal inspection

"Whereas the California meat-inspection law was patterned after and conforms to the Federal meat-inspection law and it is a recognized fact that California's meat-inspection law and the administration thereof is equivalent in all essential respects to Federal meat inspection; and

"Whereas inspection under the Federal law in California is limited to 5 packing plants, while more than 450 packing plants are inspected under the State law; and

"Whereas at the present time bids on the sale of meat and meat products to the Federal Government by packing plants under State inspection are not approved and the privilege of selling meat and meat products to the United States and its agencies and institutions is granted only to the few plants operating under Federal inspection; and

"Whereas the prosecution of the national-defense efforts is causing and will cause a great increase in the amount of meat and meat products required to meet the needs of the Army, Navy, and other Federal institutions and agencies, and it is desirable to provide an expanded source of supply which may be assured by opening a new outlet for the products of a vitally necessary industry; and

"Whereas the privilege of selling meat and meat products to the Federal Government in California should be extended to all State-inspected packing plants and can be done without in any way diminishing the quality of the products supplied to the Government, since the legend 'Cal. inspected and passed' is equivalent to the legend 'U. S. inspected and passed' in all material respects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation or to take such other steps as may be necessary to provide that meat and meat products inspected and passed under the California meat-inspection law may be sold to and purchased by the United States and its agencies on the same footing as meat and meat products produced under Federal inspection; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor of the State of California is hereby requested to cause to be transmitted copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States; and that such Senators and Representatives from California are hereby respectfully urged to support such legislation or such other proceedings as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose and intent of this resolution."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 22

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass a bill for an act to abate existing pollution, to prevent the future pollution of the waters, streams, and lakes under present Federal control, and to impress upon the Iowa Members of the National Congress the desires of the Iowa people for the abatement and prevention of such pollution by national law

"Be it resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and requested to pass a law along general, broad, and effective lines to abate existing pollution and to prevent the future pollution of the Federal waters, streams, and lakes of the United States.

"That the Governor of the State of Iowa is hereby requested to officially convey such memorial and petition to the Congress of the United States and to the Iowa Members thereof."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully request and petition as follows, to wit:

"Whereas the heinous crime of lynching still continues occasionally in various States of the United States; and

"Whereas local law-enforcement officials have in numerous instances been unwilling or unable to protect citizens against this outrageous practice; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oregon, in common with nearly all citizens of the United States, are eager to see the crime of lynching forever eliminated from our democracy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully request and petition the Congress of the United States and the Members of Congress from the State of Oregon to consider favorably and enact Federal legislation against the crime of lynching; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Oregon to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Oregon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Whereas the defense of America requires strong bulwarks of protection on both seaboards; and

"Whereas there now are pending in Washington, D. C., proposals to establish supplementary naval and military academies at various points along the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon is strategically located with respect to harbors, rivers, and mountain ranges; and

"Whereas training and instruction near to home often result in stronger cultural and social ties so far as the recruit is concerned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring), That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to provide for the establishment of a supplementary military or naval academy somewhere within the borders of the State of Oregon; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and to all the Members of the Oregon congressional delegation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Whereas the President of the United States in a recent broadcast to the Nation has warned that conditions abroad and lack of military preparedness at home constitute a menace to the safety and security of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States is now intensively engaged in preparation for hemispheric, North American, and national defense, and Congress has appropriated large sums of money for this purpose; and

"Whereas an adequate system of military highways over which troops, artillery, mechanized equipment, and other materials of war and supplies may be moved without interruption and with the utmost dispatch is one of the essentials of modern warfare and a necessity in the defense of this country; and

"Whereas the State of New York, one of the most important of industrial, commercial, and financial areas of the United States, and a section in which arms and munitions are being manufactured and concentrated in enormous quantities, and in which many Army posts and military training camps are established, is located, in part, upon the eastern seaboard, while its northern frontiers bordering the Dominion of Canada, a country now at war, are entirely unfortified; and

"Whereas in the event that a hostile power or hostile powers should overcome Great Britain, its naval vessels and transports might steam through the Gulf of St. Lawrence, capture Quebec and Montreal, and, in the latter city, be in a position to strike at the rich industrial and commercial centers of the northeastern United States, and hurl its armies upon Albany and New York; and

"Whereas should such events threaten, it would be of vital importance to the United States to be in a position to move troops and military equipment and supplies to our northern frontier in great numbers and in enormous quantities for use in repelling the invader; and

"Whereas, if such a situation should develop, the safety and security of our entire country might depend upon the ability of our Government to move defense forces and equipment to our northern frontier, to the Atlantic seaboard, and between strategic points in the State with the utmost speed; and

"Whereas our present highways are unsuited to the purpose because many of them are narrow and run through congested metropolitan districts, and some are not sufficiently substantial to carry the fleets of heavy transport vehicles, motorized artillery, and other vehicles which would make use of them in the event of war; and

"Whereas the joint legislative highway survey committee has recently made a report to this body in which its members assert that with the present contemplated allocation of Federal funds at least 4 years will be required to improve the 3,200 miles of New York State highways considered vital for defense purposes; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of this body that New York State, because of its

geographical location and because its entire northern frontier is unfortified, would be among the first to be invaded if Great Britain and Canada should be defeated and there should be an attempt by an aggressor nation or nations to conquer the United States: Now therefore

"Be it resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby petitions the Federal Government of the United States to make available from funds appropriated, or to be appropriated, for defenses purposes, a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State and Nation; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

"1. To request the Congress of the United States to amend section 30 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, entitled 'An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes,' approved March 2, 1917, as said section was amended by an act of Congress of June 1, 1938, by adding to said section a provision that will read as follows:

" 'The office of any senator or representative shall also be declared vacant if the electors of Puerto Rico of the senatorial district for which said senator was elected, or of the representative district for which said representative was elected, or of the whole island in case of a representative or senator at large, resolve to withdraw from said senator or representative his certificate of election because he is not carrying out the mandates of the people or is not honorably discharging the duties of his office.'

"2. To request the Congress of the United States to amend section 36 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, entitled 'An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes,' approved March 2, 1917, as said section was amended by an act of Congress of June 5, 1934, by adding to said section a provision that will read as follows:

" 'The office of Resident Commissioner shall also be declared vacant if the electors of Puerto Rico resolve to declare that office vacant because said Resident Commissioner is not carrying out the mandates of the people or is not honorably discharging the duties of his office.'

"3. To request the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, entitled 'An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes,' approved March 2, 1917, as subsequently amended, so that the Legislature of Puerto Rico be authorized to establish by law, at the regular session following the approval of the amendments set forth in sections '1' and '2' of this resolution, the procedure to be followed by the electors of Puerto Rico to declare vacant the office of any senator or representative, or of the Resident Commisisoner, in the cases specified herein.

"4. Also to request that the Organic Act of Puerto Rico be amended in such manner that, in case a vacancy occurs in the office of a senator or representative, or of the Resident Commissioner, because the electors have withdrawn the election certificate from said senator, representative, or Resident Commissioner, the vacancy shall be filled in the manner prescribed by sections 30 and 36, respectively, of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

"5. To transmit the terms of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington.

"6. To request the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington to introduce in the House of Representatives of the United States a bill amending the Organic Act of Puerto Rico in the terms specified in this resolution."

By Mr. SMITH:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose the restriction of acreage for peanuts in South Carolina

"Whereas it is noted that the Department of Agriculture at Washington is attempting to restrict the acreage of peanuts; and

"Whereas such a restriction of acreage at this time would work a hardship upon the farmers of this section who already have such small cotton-acreage limits: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested that it oppose any such restricted acreage for peanuts, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the Congress from South Carolina."

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the disposal of surplus cotton to Great Britain and Greece under whatever terms they may deem fit, even to the point of a free gift if necessary

"Whereas there has accumulated over a period of years a surplus of cotton that cannot be sold abroad nor consumed at home; and

"Whereas this surplus has no economic value as a stored product, nor is it needed in the defense of our country; and

"Whereas as long as this surplus exists it is doubtful if the production of cotton will be profitable; and

"Whereas Great Britain and Greece badly need this staple to clothe their people and to manufacture articles of defense; and

"Whereas it is generally accepted policy of the United States Government to aid Britain and Greece in their fight on the dictator countries and in the defense of the democracies; and

"Whereas such disposition will materially decrease the stock and surplus cotton on hand and greatly benefit the farmers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States take proper and necessary steps to authorize the supplying to Great Britain and Greece their cotton needs from the surplus stock now held in this country; and be it further

"Resolved, That the terms of supplying this surplus cotton be made so liberal that if necessary no compensation whatsoever should be required; and

"Provided that the War Department deems it necessary, they can provide sending the cotton as here intended in resolution; be it

"Resolved also, That copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to Members of Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the commissioner of agriculture of South Carolina, and to him as president of the National Association of State Commissioners of Agriculture."

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution G

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

"Whereas, approximately 85 percent of the citizens of North Dakota must derive all of their living from the production and sale of grain and other farm products; and

"Whereas the costs of all agricultural implements and all supplies necessary for the purpose of maintaining and continuing farm operations have greatly increased with the result that the present Government loan values allowed for grains and other farm products are not sufficient to cover the actual expense of farming operations and necessary living requirement: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That we memorialize Congress to pass such legislation as may be necessary to enable the Federal Government to increase the loan value on grains and farm products at least 25 percent, and especially upon the grains most universally raised in North Dakota, namely, wheat, rye, barley, and corn; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Gerald P. Nye, senior Senator from North Dakota, the Honorable William Langer, junior Senator from North Dakota, and to the Honorable Usher L. Burdick and the Honorable Charles R. Robertson, Representatives in Congress from North Dakota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Y

"Whereas sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 make it unlawful for any State to construct any bridge, dike, or causeway over or in any navigable river or other navigable water of the United States without the consent of Congress and without the approval of the plans by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War; and

"Whereas by the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 no State may construct or permit the construction of a water-power development in any such navigable river except pursuant to a license from and under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in a recent decision with respect to the navigability of a stream in the State of Virginia, under which decision, as stated in a dissenting opinion, 'every creek which has enough water when conserved by control works to float a boat drawing 2 feet of water,' is rendered navigable if such condition can be brought about by the expenditure of enormous sums of money; and

"Whereas the effect of said decision is to obstruct the State and other governmental subdivisions in the building of bridges over rivers and streams which no one has ever considered navigable; and

"Whereas the situation resulting from the newly prescribed test of navigability will operate to demoralize the activities of the State of North Dakota in the construction of highways, irrigation systems, and other works of internal development in a manner never intended by Congress in passing the laws affecting the navigability of streams and the development of water power; and

"Whereas on the Yellowstone River and on that portion of the Missouri River above the south line of North Dakota, waterway transportation has been found to be impractical and has long ago been abandoned, and an urgent demand now exists that all of the waters of these two streams be used for purposes other than navigation; and

"Whereas, in view of the said Court decision, it is important that all rivers and streams in the State of North Dakota which

are not navigable in their natural condition and which are not now considered navigable be declared by the Congress of the United States to be nonnavigable: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House concurring therein), That the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be, and they are respectfully urged to use their best efforts to secure the enactment of legislation by the Congress designating as nonnavigable all of the Yellowstone River and that portion of the Missouri River above the south line of the State of North Dakota, and all rivers in North Dakota which are not navigable in their natural condition and which are not now considered navigable; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen of North Dakota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution P

"Resolution requesting Congress to amend the Social Security Act to provide Federal grants to States for public assistance on an equalization basis, taking into consideration the ability of the State to finance public assistance, to permit the States to develop medical-care programs for recipients of public assistance, the cost of such medical care to be matched with Federal funds on a 50-percent basis; to provide 100-percent Federal grants to States for assistance for certain Indians; to increase maximum grants-in-aid for dependent children; to provide for Federal participation in costs incurred by States in referring persons to federally financed welfare programs; and to provide for the enactment of a new title to the Social Security Act providing for grants-in-aid to the States for general assistance to needy residents and migrants

"Whereas geographical location and the location of industries and other factors result in wide differences in the taxpaying ability of citizens of the various States, as evidenced by differences in the per capita income of the States; and

"Whereas the problem of providing medical care for public assistance recipients under the social-security programs and of providing general assistance to needy residents and migrants has become a burden which exceeds the taxpaying ability of many States and local communities; and

"Whereas the cost of the States and the local subdivisions of providing public assistance to Indians living on public reservations in those States having a large Indian population is a burden which those States and local subdivisions cannot and should not be expected to carry; and

"Whereas the cost to the States and local subdivisions of taking applications, making investigations, and referring persons to welfare programs such as the Work Projects Administration, Farm Security Administration, and Civilian Conservation Corps, financed with Federal funds, is becoming an increasingly heavy burden on the States because of the requirements of those Federal agencies in connection with such referrals; and

"Whereas the maximum amount which the Federal Government will match for aid to dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act is $9 for any month with respect to one dependent child and $6 with respect to each other dependent child in a family, which maximum amount is entirely inadequate to provide for the needs of a mother and one or two children: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby memorialize Congress to amend the Social Security Act to—

"1. Authorize equalization grants to the States under each public-assistance title on the basis of the relationship of the average per capita income in the State to the national average per capita income, with respect to costs of assistance;

"2. Add a new title to the Social Security Act providing for grants-in-aid to the States for general assistance to needy residents and migrants on a matching basis equalized in accordance with the relationship of the average per capita income in the State to the national average per capita income;

"3. Amend each public-assistance title in the Social Security Act to permit the States to develop medical-care programs for recipients of public assistance on a matching basis;

"4. Amend each public-assistance title to authorize 100-percent Federal grants to the States for costs of assistance and administration with respect to Indians living on public reservations;

"5. Provide for Federal participation in costs incurred by State agencies in referring persons to welfare programs financed with Federal funds as Work Projects Administration, Farm Security Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, etc.;

"6. Amend title IV of the Social Security Act increasing the grants which the Federal Government will match to $20 for the first child in each family and $6 for each additional child in the family; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President and the Congress of the United States and the congressional delegation from North Dakota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution O

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas the national-defense agencies of the Federal Government have designated 985 miles of the North Dakota State highway system as being highways of major importance in the defense emergency now facing this Nation; and

"Whereas surveys of this strategic military mileage have been made by the Public Roads Administration cooperating with the North Dakota Highway Department through the State-Federal Highway Planning Survey, said surveys disclosing that an important part of this mileage is still a dry-gravel road without a dustless surface, and other portions of the mileage are obsolete so that a substantial part of the designated mileage must be built to present-day standards to provide for the movement of vast quantities of munitions and supplies and large numbers of men necessary for the effective operation of the defense forces of the National Government; and

"Whereas it is estimated that to bring the strategic military network of highways in North Dakota to the minimum standards required to meet the defense program of the United States will cost approximately $20,600,000; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Highway Department has available during the coming biennium an estimated amount of less than $1,000,000 of State funds that may be available for matching regular Federal-aid funds for expenditure on the strategic network of highways, the State funds thus available being collected from road-use taxes on the motor-vehicle owners of the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Highway Department is confronted with a serious shortage of available revenue to meet the normal demands of highway construction and maintenance on the State highway system, it being estimated that, in addition to the cost of standardizing the 985 miles of the strategic network, it would require an additional expenditure of approximately $21,000,000 to bring other portions of the State highway system to modern minimum standards; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is now collecting in North Dakota through Federal gasoline taxes, lubricating-oil taxes, and other excise taxes on the operation of motor vehicles a sum substantially greater than the amount returned to North Dakota as Federal highway aid; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Highway Department contemplates cooperating with the Federal Government in improvement of the strategic military network so far as available funds will permit and the improvement of other sections of the State highway system may be deferred, and intends to cooperate with the Federal Government in every way possible by using its engineering facilities in preparing surveys, plans, and specifications for a strategic network of military highways; and

"Whereas the State of North Dakota is unable to provide any material increase in the amount of State funds available for matching regular Federal-aid funds on highway construction and it is not feasible to accomplish the improvement of the strategic military network of highways on the present basis of matching Federal-aid funds with State funds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the twenty-seventh legislative assembly (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to give early and deliberate consideration to the need for emergency appropriations to expedite the construction of roads on the strategic military network, said funds to be appropriated for expenditure through the same agencies as regular Federal aid and to be allocated among the several States on the same basis as regular Federal aid at the present time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress be respectfully requested to make such appropriations as may be necessary for improvements of the strategic military network available for expenditure on a basis that will reduce to a minimum the funds required by the States to carry out such defense program; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation."

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy to use their offices, powers, and influence to cause our armed forces to be furnished with adequate dairy foods

"Whereas it appears that oleomargarine is used almost to the exclusion of butter, cheese, and other dairy products in feeding the armed forces of the United States; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge that dairy products are far superior in food value to any substitutions; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the industrial benefits from the defense program be distributed uniformly throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas the dairy farmer has not received his equitable share of the increased business resulting from the defense program or any previous Federal program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy to use their offices, powers,

and influence to cause our armed forces to be furnished with adequate dairy foods; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

USE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS BY ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 32 citizens of Baraboo, Wis., have presented a petition to me and asked that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, without the names attached. I ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD and appropriate reference of the petition.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the names attached, as follows:

BARABOO, WIS., *March 8, 1941.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: As citizens of Wisconsin, we are vitally interested in the defense of our Nation and the attainment of the utmost efficiency among those who are to defend this country.

Therefore we ask you, by virtue of your authority as Senator, to exercise all your power to abolish the use of alcohol in the Army, Navy, Air and Marine Corps, and all the training units thereof.

Respectfully yours,

RESOLUTION OF NORTHEASTERN DISTRICT (WIS.) CHIROPRACTIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have also received a resolution from the Northeastern District Chiropractic Association, of Wisconsin, which I ask may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD in full at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIROPRACTIC ASSOCIATION,
March 15, 1941.

Whereas many of our young men who are now in the national-defense service and who have been dependent upon chiropractic to maintain their health; and

Whereas no provisions have yet been made whereby these men can obtain chiropractic health service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress enact legislation making chiropractic health service available to the men serving under the national-defense program.

A copy of this resolution to be sent to our Senators and Representatives from this district at Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS OF NORTHEASTERN DISTRICT, WISCONSIN CHIROPRACTIC ASSOCIATION,
F. A. STAUBER, D. C., *Chairman.*
GEORGE H. KOPP, D. C.
FRANK J. RADKE, D. C.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from the Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis., a letter and resolution relative to General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF RACINE, WIS., *March 17, 1941.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith is certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis.

Very truly yours,
FRANK J. BECKER, *City Clerk.*

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1940, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Racine and the State of Wisconsin:*

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, a joint resolution adopted by the City Council of Pawtucket, R. I., in reference to the enactment of the General Pulaski Memorial Day joint resolution now pending in Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF PAWTUCKET.

Joint resolution of the city council

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Pawtucket hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Rhode Island.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have received two resolutions from cities in the State of Connecticut, one a resolution adopted by the city council of Norwalk, on March 17, and the other a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of New Britain, on March 22, each of which memorializes Congress that the President name October 11 as General Pulaski Memorial Day. I ask unanimous consent that both resolutions be printed in full in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions are as follows:

Resolved, That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Connecticut.

Approved:

FRANK T. STACK, *Mayor.*
NORWALK, CONN., *March 11, 1941.*

MARCH 22, 1941.

Mr. JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senator of the United States.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is called to the following, accepted and resolution adopted by the common council at its session held Wednesday evening, March 19, 1941, No. 55:

"*Resolved by the Common Council of the city of New Britain, and the State of Connecticut, in session assembled:*

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Connecticut."

Attest: H. E. SCHEUY,
City Clerk.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA SENATE

Mr. DAVIS. I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution which I have just received from the senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it appears that the present Congress of the United States will be called upon to pass upon the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway because of its economic impracticability, its entire lack of advantage as a defense measure, and its detriment to business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and be it further

Resolved, That the senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

[The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.]

SUPPRESSION OF VICE AND LIQUOR TRADE IN THE VICINITY OF MILITARY CAMPS, ETC.—RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF IOWA

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a concurrent resolution adopted by the Iowa General Assembly memorializing Congress favorably for the passage of Senate bill 860.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 28

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the early consideration and passage of Senate bill 860

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation, designated as Senate bill 860, providing for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; and

Whereas the Federal Government has located in the State of Iowa, and may hereafter locate in this State, an ordnance plant or other plant or plants which it may deem desirable in the development of the national defense; and

Whereas it is desirable in the interest of the common defense to provide for the suppression of all forms of vice in the vicinity of such plants or projects, and the people of the State of Iowa are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Iowa respectfully petition the Members of Congress to give early consideration to Senate bill 860, now before the Senate, and to the enlargement of the provisions thereof in order to include the suppression of vice in the vicinity of ordnance plants or projects now or hereafter erected and maintained by the Federal Government in the development of national defense, and to enact such legislation at an early date; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Iowa in the Congress of the United States, and that they be urged to use their best offices to procure the enactment of such legislation in Congress.

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 24th instant,

The following reports of committees were submitted during recess of the Senate:

On Tuesday, March 25, 1941:

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 935. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to commodity loans and marketing quotas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 141).

On Wednesday, March 26, 1941:

By Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3205. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 142).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 143).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1091. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 144).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1090. A bill to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 145); and

S. 1166. A bill for the relief of Daniel Steele; with an amendment (Rept. No. 146).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 755. A bill for the relief of W. W. Carlton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 147); and

S. 1190. A bill for the relief of Julia Neville; with amendments (Rept. No. 148).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1225. A bill to provide for the construction of two bridges between Newcastle and Portsmouth, N. H.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1226. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. HARRISON):

S. 1228. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. B. Tanner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1229. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to punish willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. GEORGE):

S. 1230. A bill to provide for the general welfare through the construction of needed hospitals and grants to States and political subdivisions thereof for the construction, improvement, and enlargement of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1231. A bill for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1232. A bill to provide for supervision and detention of certain deportable aliens; to establish a board for the supervision of deportable aliens; to provide for the relief of certain aliens from deportation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1233. A bill for the relief of Philip V. Sullivan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1234. A bill granting a pension to Alfred A. Abel; and

S. 1235. A bill granting an increase of pension to George B. Sheldon; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1236 (by request). A bill to provide for a Pan American Plaza and a site for an office building for the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1237. A bill to prohibit the admission into the United States of immigrants who are nationals of certain countries; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1238. A bill to authorize determination of the compensation, if any, which should be made to water users on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, for damages suffered by reason of a canal break; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1239. A bill for the relief of Essie M. Jackson; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1240. A bill designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day; and

S. 1241 (by request). A bill to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1242. A bill designating the fourth day of July of each year as Democracy Day; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 1243. A bill for the relief of Eldredge L. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1244. A bill for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1245. A bill to extend certain benefits under the Social Security Act, as amended, to persons performing services in connection with the preparation of fruits and vegetables for market; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 1246. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; and

S. 1247. A bill to repeal sections 512, 513, 514, 515, as amended; 3744, as amended; 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes, and the act of February 4, 1929 (ch. 146, 45 Stat. L., 1147; 41 U. S. C., sec 4a), relating to the Returns Office for Government

contracts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1248. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Isle Royale National Park, in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; and

S. 1249. A bill to accept the cession by the State of Michigan of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Isle Royale National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution changing the effective day of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 (Public Law No. 850, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3368. An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3869. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 4036. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act, approved May 3, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADVISORY WAR REFERENDUM

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit a concurrent resolution. I am joined in its submission by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. I ask that the concurrent resolution be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), as follows:

Whereas the Democratic Party platform of 1940 stated: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack"; and

Whereas the Republican Party platform of 1940 states: "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign wars"; and

Whereas the President, during the 1940 campaign, stated:

"I hate war now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand with my party upon the platform adopted at Chicago." (Address to teamsters' union convention, Washington, September 11, 1940.)

"To Republicans and Democrats, to every man, woman, and child in the Nation, I say your President and your great Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat that I stand on the platform of our party. * * * It is for peace I have labored; and it is for peace I shall labor all the days of my life." (Address in Convention Hall, Philadelphia, October 30, 1940.)

"I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars; they are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores." (Address at Boston Garden, October 30, 1940.)

"The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war." (Address at Cleveland, November 3, 1940.)

And

Whereas public-opinion polls taken since September 1939 show over 80 percent of the American people opposed to the United States entering the war; and the poll completed March 15, 1941, on the question, "If you were asked to vote on the question of the United States entering the war against Germany and Italy, how would you vote—to go into the war or to stay out of the war?" shows 83 percent opposed; and

Whereas the Congress has made clear its intention to keep out of foreign war through such provisions as it wrote into the Selective Service Act against use of those inducted in service outside the Western Hemisphere or the possessions of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in order to ascertain the will of the people regarding the use of our naval and air forces, as well as land forces not inducted under the Selective Service Act, outside the Western Hemisphere or the Territorial possessions of the United States, the Congress shall, before it shall authorize, or support by appropriation, the use of such forces elsewhere, order a national advisory election of all eligible voters on the following question:

"Shall the Congress under existing conditions approve the use of land, naval, and air forces outside the Western Hemisphere or the Territorial possessions of the United States and appropriate funds necessary for such military and naval operations?"

Congress shall by law provide for the fulfillment and enforcement of the provisions of this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NAVAL AIR BASE AT QUONSET, R. I.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the great northeastern air base at Quonset, R. I., is approaching completion, and there is a general appreciation of its tremendous value to the Nation's defense. In that connection, the Providence Journal printed an editorial in its issue of March 26, 1941, which I will not read but which I should like to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. This editorial offers a very striking contrast to an editorial on the same subject printed by the Providence Journal on January 29, 1939, which I should also like to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. In the language of the advertisements of patent medicines, such contrasting data are usually labeled "before" and "after." I will not take longer, but will let the editorials speak for themselves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the Providence Sunday Journal of January 29, 1939]

PORK OR PRIORITY

Senator GREEN's effort to amend the $65,000,000 Walsh-Vinson naval bill by directing immediate establishment of an air base at Quonset Point is another example of his readiness to spend other people's money at every opportunity. A board of experts previously listed Quonset Point in the category B group of projects proposed for later construction. Senator GREEN would place it in category A and add $1,000,000 to the $65,000,000 total, although the Navy Department recently estimated a base such as the one advocated for the Rhode Island site would cost $4,500,000.

Whether national safety demands immediate building of a naval air base on Narragansett Bay or whether the plan should be deferred until more vitally needed defenses have been set up elsewhere are questions best answered by experts. Keeping in mind that the welfare of the Nation in this matter outranks whatever advantage may be expected for the State, the people of Rhode Island will abide by competent official decision.

Senator GREEN's action places pork-barrel psychology above considerations of priority in providing for the common defense. It can be explained only by excessive eagerness "to get something" for his State, because a great deal of Federal money may be made available for defense. He displays little statesmanship in his short-sighted view of the entire national picture.

While Governor of Rhode Island Mr. GREEN was ever lavish in advocating expenditure of public funds. He has not broken that habit. He will not impress his constituents in this instance who are thinking too realistically and too patriotically of defense to debase the national interest to a mess of pork.

[From the Providence Journal of March 26, 1941]

AT QUONSET

Anyone visiting the naval air base under construction at Quonset Point might be forgiven for having a first impression of chaos, particularly if the day should be a windy March one, causing great clouds of dirt to rise and half obscure to stinging eyes the multitude of operations in progress.

Trucks, bulldozers, power shovels, and cranes perform their herculean tasks. Hundreds of men afoot and awheel pass and repass on innumerable obscure errands. Flapping tarpaulins big as circus tents make elephantine the structures they protect from cold, while within masons lay up brick curtain walls and salamanders roar. Offshore, amid the whitecaps, great dredges suck insatiably at a vast shallow bottom which must be deepened to clear keels more formidable than any that have ever known those waters. These are but an obvious few of the proceedings.

But it is not chaos to the engineer. It is order, the lovely integrated order of an engineering project that is moving along ahead of schedule despite the discouragements of a harsh New England winter, problems of material supply and transport, and the frequent compulsion to design today for tomorrow's construction.

The fact is that a base which would ordinarily take 3 years to build is being built in one or less. The project was begun the middle of last July, and the base may be commissioned before the first anniversary rolls around. That is the simplest and best testimonial to the Navy, the contractors, and labor from Commander Raymond V. Miller, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, the officer in charge of construction, on down to scarlet-faced, wind-bitten workmen ashore and afloat.

What they are doing is making the old Quonset landscape, once a camp ground, then a summer colony, unrecognizable by reshaping land and shore and erecting a compact, functional, military city which is practically

self-sufficient. It has water supply, sewage disposal, power plant, railroad, highways, housing, storehouses, shops, offices, service buildings, seaplane hangars, landplane hangars, seaplane ramps, landplane runways, cleared water areas for taking off and landing, a protected basin for small craft, a slip and turning basin for aircraft carriers, and a channel to deep water in the East Passage.

There may still be some public misapprehension regarding the function of the base. It has no aspect and not much implication of a battleground except as a potential military objective in war. It is not to be a training school for Navy aviators. Rather, it is intended to perform the same functions for Navy aircraft, including those carrier-borne, that the New York Navy Yard, for example, performs for ships—service, repair, and supply.

As such it represents a part of a coordinated plan for improved defense of the Atlantic seaboard virtually from the Arctic Circle to the bulge of Brazil. The means of defense include the fleet and its bases, the Navy air arm and its bases, the insular and coastal fortifications, tactical troops of the Army, and the Army Air Corps, comprising, in all, a cooperative, fluid grouping organized in great depth from far at sea to inland on the continent.

The Quonset Naval Air Base will, of course, be a permanent establishment. Unlike most of the recently constructed defense stations, its structures are of concrete, steel, and brick, for long life at low maintenance cost. Its personnel will include many officers, perhaps 2,000 enlisted men, and hundreds of civilian workers, for whom a housing project at Cocumcussoc is to be provided by the U. S. H. A. Thus the base will become a part of the life of Rhode Island. It is welcomed by this old maritime State which has so long been the home of other Navy establishments and which early gave to the Navy three distinguished commodores; its first, Esek Hopkins, and the brothers, Oliver Hazard Perry and Matthew Calbraith Perry.

CANADIAN ADDRESSES BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses made by him in Canada, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON PRESENTING STATE FLAG OF WISCONSIN AT INDEPENDENCE HALL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him on the occasion of the presentation of the State flag of Wisconsin for inclusion in the permanent display of State flags in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LANGER before the Second Division Post of the American Legion at Washington, D. C., March 18, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER BY SENATOR BROWN ON ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a letter written by him to Senator BAILEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, dealing with the general subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIALS FROM MANCHESTER UNION AND CONCORD MONITOR ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union of March 22, 1941, and an editorial from the Concord Monitor of March 21, 1941, both relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY UPTON SINCLAIR TO THE CONQUERED PEOPLES OF EUROPE

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address to the conquered peoples of Europe, delivered by Upton Sinclair in February 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ABOUT STEEL IN DEFENSE

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "Answers to Questions About Steel in Defense," prepared by the American Iron and Steel Institute, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFECTS IN EDUCATION SYSTEM—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY INQUIRER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Education in America Is Recreant," published in the New York Daily Inquirer of March 3, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR FRANCE—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Just Let France Starve?" published in the New York Daily News of March 11, 1914, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPROVEMENTS IN ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT MADE BY EMPLOYEES OF R. E. A.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some information given out by the Rural Electrification Administration showing various improvements that have been made in electrical equipment by employees of the R. E. A.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VIRGINIA R. E. A. COOPERATIVE FIRST TO USE NEW TROUBLE-LOCATING DEVICE

At Bowling Green, Va., yesterday a group of R. E. A. officials and representatives of the electrical manufacturing industry, led by M. M. Samuels, Chief of the R. E. A. Technical Standards Division, and R. S. Brunhouse, manager of the utility division of the Stewart-Warner Corporation, watched a revolutionary new device invented by two young R. E. A. engineers pass its final tests with flying colors and go into full service.

In addition, they saw demonstrated a by-product result of the same research which may prove to be eventually more valuable than the device itself.

The device, an automatic recording outage locator, was installed experimentally on the Virginia Electric Cooperative system. Now that its installation tests are over, it will go into commercial production and become available soon to rural power systems at low cost.

This equipment provides a solution to the troublesome problem of long outages of rural power service. Whenever any part of a rural power system equipped with this device is out of service for any reason, the time of the outage and the precise section on which it occurred is printed on receiver tape located at headquarters. When the trouble clears up, the fact and time of service restoration is also recorded on the tape.

Inasmuch as rural telephone lines are commonly the first casualty in storms which damage power lines—and many farms do not have telephones—maintenance crews often do not learn of outages for hours, sometimes more than a day; then they must patrol scores of miles in an effort to find the trouble. The new equipment will save much of this patrol expense and obviate much of the revenue loss. Moreover, it will make service much more dependable for farm operations in which long outages can be disastrous, such as electric chick brooders, incubation, or milk cooling.

In addition to the automatic recording features, the research by which this equipment was developed has a rather unexpected by-product which may become even more valuable than the outage-reporting equipment. The same current which operates the outage senders permits one-way communication between the headquarters and the maintenance crews in the field and two-way communication appears possible. This result is possible by use of the power lines as telephone circuits, with radio-broadcasting effects on a portable receiver within a few rods of the lines.

Technically, the equipment consists of a sender for each section and a recording instrument centrally located. Both are operated on high-frequency electric current, the so-called carrier current. Normally the sender does not operate. When any section of the power line goes out of service, the sender starts operating, and this actuates the recorder mechanism. Each recorder will accommodate a large number of senders, and duplicate recorders may be located at two or more places.

Engineers in private industry have worked on this problem for years, but developed nothing which could be produced and installed at low cost. The installed price of the R. E. A.-developed equipment is about $2,500 for a power system requiring 20 section senders. The whole system is based on the same principles as those installed on high-tension networks, the cost of which runs into thousands of dollars for a similar number of sections.

Two young men who were selected while still in school to be engineer-trainees in R. E. A. are responsible for this new equipment. They are D. E. Basler, who came to R. E. A. upon his graduation from the University of Michigan in 1938, and J. F. Atkinson, who came in 1939, after being graduated from the University of Florida. They were selected as part of classes of about a score of engineer-trainees which R. E. A. employs each year on the basis of recommendations by their college deans and personal interviews. Under the direction of M. M. Samuels, Chief of the Technical Standards Division of R. E. A., and in the later stages working in collaboration with Radio Engineer Stephen Jucius and Chief Radio Engineer Fred Johnston, of the Stewart-Warner Corporation, Basler and Atkinson devised the new system and have made it practical for commercial production. The Stewart-Warner Corporation is manufacturing the equipment; already three R. E. A. systems—one each in Virginia, Michigan, and Minnesota—have ordered installations in addition to the experimental one.

The first installation, which has just completed its service tests with complete success, is on the system of the Virginia Electric Cooperative, with headquarters at Bowling Green, Va.

One of the coinventors, Mr. Basler, entered military service as a lieutenant in the Signal Corps on the day the final tests were made. He is a Reserve officer and received a call for a year's active service.

This is the latest in a long series of inventions and new procedures in power-line engineering and maintenance which have come from the R. E. A. research staff. These include low-cost cyclometer-type meters, new limited-use service-entrance equipment, a

one-can milk cooler, a low-cost ground-testing meter, a new radio-interference locator, telephone coordination procedures, a motor-toter for large farm electric motors, a new ground fitting, a unit combining the meter and the circuit breaker of an individual service, and a new demand meter. Most of these resulted from collaboration between R. E. A. and private engineers, but R. E. A. provided the stimulus. In every case R. E. A. systems pay less for the devices because the inventors charge no royalties for such users.

FARM-DEBT ADJUSTMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Bottineau Courant, of Bottineau, N. Dak., entitled "Debt Adjustment Is Ignored by Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

DEBT ADJUSTMENT IS IGNORED BY CONGRESS

Though rural attention is still focused on the debt-adjustment campaign which the administration supported at the last session of Congress, both the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture report that no dates have been set for hearings. As yet the Wheeler-Jones bill No. S. 3509 at the last session has not been reintroduced.

It is understood that national farm-loan associations all over the country have held discussion meetings with their membership on the need for scaling down the farm debt and that the membership is definitely interested in such action. The basis for such discussion was provided by circular A-21, prepared by the Farm Credit Administration and entitled "Statement of a Method and Principles of Organization for Providing Long-Terms Farm Mortgage Cooperative Credit."

"The Farm Credit Administration and the Department of Agriculture have recognized the necessity of adjusting agricultural indebtedness to the debt-paying ability of all farms and borrowers," this Farm Credit Administration circular states. The proposals set forth in circular A-21 embody principles closely resembling those of the former Wheeler-Jones bill.

Since the F. C. A. does not itself have the power to scale down farm indebtedness, it would be necessary for Congress to pass enabling legislation. Though some debt adjustment measures—H. R. 100 and H. R. 1390—have been introduced at this session, a survey shows that they are merely duplicates of an old outmoded bill introduced on June 5, 1939, and discarded in favor of the much-improved and much broader Wheeler-Jones bill, S. 3509. No explanation has been given for the failure to reintroduce the Wheeler-Jones bill.

Pointing to the need for effective debt-adjustment action, Gov. A. G. Black, of the Farm Credit Administration, declared in a recent speech, "Tenancy is growing, and the concentration of the land in fewer and fewer hands continues." He cited the fact that two-thirds of all land in farms is "operated by less than 20 percent of all the farmers."

"On the other hand," he asserted, "there are estimated to be 3,000,000 men living on farms, half of whom registered in 1937 as totally or partially unemployed, and the other 1,500,000 and their dependents barely exist on gross cash incomes from their farm operations, averaging less than $200 a year." He stated that such conditions "are being made more acute by the second World War."

For the first time the B. A. E. has officially estimated the actual number of forced farm sales and related defaults over a 10-year period. This count shows a total of 1,739,000 such sales from 1930 to 1939. Since there are now 6,096,789 farms in the United States, according to the 1940 census, this means that more than 1 out of every 4 farms suffered a forced sale in the 10-year period.

Farmers in 1939 paid out $1,400,000,000 for interest charges, taxes, and rent. Yet, even so, thousands of farmers were in default. Instead of scaling down debt levels inflated during the last war, farmers have been required to bear this excessive overhead, with the result that each year more than 100,000 farms are lost by their owners and many thousands of tenants are forced to move on.

STORM FORECASTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Fargo Forum of March 21, 1941, entitled "Storm Forecasts."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

STORM FORECASTS

Out of Saturday's tragic storm has come a flood of criticism directed at the United States Weather Bureau based on the charge it did not adequately warn the public of the approaching blizzard; that had such warning been given, through the facilities of the newspapers and the radio, many of the seventy-odd who died might now be alive.

And the Weather Bureau has not yet given a satisfactory answer to that criticism.

The Saturday forecast read as follows: "Light local snows tonight and Sunday, with cold wave and strong northerly winds."

Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, in whose portfolio the Weather Bureau lies, in answer to a protest from Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, maintains the forecast quoted above constituted an adequate warning of the approaching storm.

At this point it becomes apparent that the Weather Bureau is talking in one language and the public in another; by no stretch of imagination, in the ordinary mind, would the term "strong winds" be an adequate description of Saturday's ferocious blast.

To the man on the street, the wind is strong one day, there's a light breeze, perhaps, the next day, then maybe it's calm. But in the Weather Bureau official classification a strong wind is one of 32 to 38 miles per hour velocity, which, to put it mildly, is a violent wind. The actual peak of the tornado, as registered by the Moorhead Weather Bureau, was 41 miles per hour, or only 3 points more than the top of the official strong-wind bracket. (At the Fargo airport the peak reading was 74 miles per hour, which may not have lasted for more than a moment or two. The Moorhead data is based on a 5-minute average.)

There seems to be no fundamental reason why the Weather Bureau should speak in one language while its customers—the public—use a different one.

Purely speculative, of course, is the propositon of how many lives might have been saved if early warning had been given. There's a great deal of wishful thinking, when the public interprets weather forecasts, and there was a combination Saturday which was extreme.

The weather was ideal when the forecast was issued. The day was Saturday when country folks traditionally plan their weekly visit to town; when many of the urban folks plan a visit to country relatives, rural dances, etc.

Those who read or heard the forecast of "light snows with cold wave and strong northerly winds" were probably unconsciously influenced by their own personal desires and anticipated the extreme minimum, instead of maximum, of the potentialties.

There are eight regional weather bureaus in the United States. The closest ones to the Red River Valley are at Chicago, where the forecasts are prepared for this area, Billings, Mont., and Kansas City, Mo.

In both the recent storm and the 1940 Armistice Day blizzard there was a terrible toll of human life, and in each case the charge is made that the public had not been properly warned by the Weather Bureau—had not received the warning to which the public feels it is entitled.

Agitation is going forward in the Twin Cities for establishment of a regional weather bureau office there, as a partial preventative of any such future tragedy.

Certainly, in view of the recent experiences, something should be done to get the work of the bureau more closely meshed with the interests of the people it presumes to serve.

Whether that would be accomplished by a further subdivision of the areas served by the regional offices with headquarters in Minneapolis, or, perhaps, for that matter, just as logically in Fargo, probably could best be determined by the Weather Bureau itself.

At this time funerals are going on for the seventy-odd victims.

Families are riven.

Sorrow grips thousands of homes in the Red River Valley.

Those in charge of the Weather Bureau should measure their problem not by their individual interests, not with the callousness of bureaucracy, but in terms of humanity.

EXTENSION OF FOOD-STAMP PLAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Congress to the food-stamp plan, particularly as it refers to the Indians in North Dakota, who, I contend, have not been getting enough to eat, and who, I believe, will be benefited if we enact an amendment to the Food Stamp Act increasing the appropriation from $235,000,000 last year to $500,000,000.

In the food-stamp plan of the Department of Agriculture we have, it seems to me, a program which is both sound agricultural policy and sound national-health policy.

We are in the midst of a tremendous defense effort to insure the preservation of our democratic way of life. The President of the United States has called upon every individual in the country to do his part in this great undertaking. It is an endeavor which calls for the maximum effort of a strong, healthy nation. The health of our people is the real backbone of our national defense. The food-stamp plan makes a unique contribution to the national health, because it moves the farmers' surplus crops through the regular trade channels, and gives our needy families a chance to eat the fine foods which our farmers can grow in such abundance.

The food-stamp plan has already proved its great value to the Nation. It was begun experimentally in Rochester, N. Y., in May 1939, and is now operating in 281 areas throughout the country, with over 3,000,000 people participating in it. An additional 41 areas have been designated for it. Its success is well evidenced by the widespread support it has received from business groups, farmers, and the unemployed. The fact that 1,600 areas have asked for the food-stamp plan speaks for itself.

The plan is a distinctly American approach to the problem of farmers' food surpluses on the one hand and underconsumption of food among our poor families on the other. It uses all the

regular channels of trade. The foods on the surplus list move from the farmers through the wholesalers and retailers to the consumers. The additional purchasing power which our needy families receive in the form of stamps thus directly benefits the farmers and at the same time stimulates the food trades and employment. The greatest potential market for farm products is among the needy families in this country. The food-stamp plan taps that market. It is developing a new and much-needed outlet for the surplus foods which can and should be consumed in increasing quantities right here at home.

The Surplus Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture has efficiently carried on the food-stamp program. The plan has been developed with the maximum benefit to farmers and needy consumers. Broad vision and practical, businesslike administration have combined to insure its success.

For many years we have been aware of the plight of our farmers and of the small share of the national income they were receiving; but only within the past few years have we begun to realize that a very large proportion of our population, both in the cities and on the farms, did not get enough food; that 40 percent of our families were receiving incomes under $1,000 a year. With such incomes they could not afford to spend money on the foods most needed for health—vegetables, fruits, dairy and poultry products. We were neglecting the very foundation of our Nation—the health of our people—on which we must depend for the defense of our democracy. Through the Surplus Marketing Administration's programs—the food-stamp plan, the school-lunch program, the direct purchase and distribution of surplus commodities to needy people, the cotton-stamp plan—we have made a fine beginning in helping farmers remove their surplus crops and in making them available to the people who most need them.

Last year Congress made available $235,000,000 for the surplus-removal programs of the Surplus Marketing Administration. The House has authorized an appropriation of only $200,000,000 this year—a reduction of $35,000,000—for the excellent work of this Administration during the forthcoming fiscal year. Personally, I feel that the appropriation should be increased to at least $500,000,000, not decreased. I am sure the great majority of my colleagues join me in feeling that increased money should be made available, so that the food-stamp plan can be extended to far more areas than the funds under consideration will permit. I should like to see at least half of the additional 1,300 areas which are asking for the plan receive it in the very near future.

I asked the Surplus Marketing Administration to furnish me with a list of the surplus foods which were purchased with the free blue stamps by needy people throughout the country in 1940. I find that many phases of agricultural life benefited directly from the program. Among the surplus foods purchased were 165,000,000 pounds of white flour, 65,000,000 pounds of pork, 41,000,000 pounds of apples, 36,000,000 pounds of corn meal, 31,000,000 pounds of lard, 26,000,000 dozen eggs, 22,000,000 pounds of butter, 16,000,000 pounds of rice, 14,000,000 pounds of oranges, 11,000,000 pounds of tomatoes, and many million pounds of other fruits, vegetables, and cereals. All these products moved through the regular trade channels from farmer to consumer. These purchases were, of course, in addition to the normal amounts of food bought. Families participating in the food-stamp plan must continue to make their normal purchases of food. The free stamps they receive to buy surplus food represent additional purchasing power.

It has been estimated that $1 worth of surplus foods are moved into consumption for every $1 worth of free stamps paid for by the Federal Government. The importance of this as an aid to the American farmer can readily be seen.

During the past decade we have had to face the fact of a decreasing foreign market for our agricultural surpluses. There are many reasons for this. Among them are increased production of foods in other countries, the adoption by several nations of programs to achieve self-sufficiency in food, totalitarian trade policies, and our own tariff policies, which make it difficult for other nations to export to us enough of their products to pay for large imports of goods from us. The present war has intensified the farmers' difficulties. With export outlets for many of our surplus commodities having been progressively shut off since September 1939, we have had to turn to our home market. I, for one, believe it is eminently sensible to help our farmers by giving our unemployed and needy people an opportunity to have a diet which will mean better health and increased energy for them. I know of no better way of doing this than through the food-stamp plan. My own experience with the plan in North Dakota, where it is in operation in 33 counties, has convinced me of this fact.

With so much concentration on the defense program, we are apt to forget that there are still millions of hungry persons in this country. The most recent available figures indicate that nearly 15,000,000 persons throughout the land are receiving public assistance. New employment created by the defense program has begun to reduce unemployment, but is very far from eliminating it. The food-stamp plan now reaches only a small proportion of our needy people who would like to participate in it. I think it would be nothing short of disaster if we should ignore the great benefits of this plan to farmers, consumers, business, and the Nation as a whole, and force its curtailment.

I shall certainly vote for the continued expansion of the food-stamp plan, a program which has more than paid its way in tangible achievements.

AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR—THEODORE GRANIK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the George Foster Peabody radio awards for outstanding meritorious public service in the broadcasting industry during 1940 will be announced on March 29 at a dinner in New York City. One of the awards, which are comparable to the Pulitzer awards in the field of journalism, went to station WOR in New York City for the American Forum of the Air program, founded and directed by Theodore Granik.

As director of the American Forum of the Air, Mr. Granik has made a significant contribution to democracy. A brilliant attorney and writer, Mr. Granik has for the past 15 years devoted a major portion of his time to making the American ideal of free speech into reality over the national radio chains. He started out in 1927, over station WOR in New York City, directing a forum program known as Law for the Layman. This grew over the years into a forum on national issues. Mr. Granik came to Washington in 1937, after serving 4 years as assistant district attorney in New York, to take a position as special counsel to the United States Housing Authority. At that time he founded the program now known as the American Forum of the Air, which by this time is a coast-to-coast Sunday-night feature on the Mutual Broadcasting System. Mr. Granik's forums are widely used as nuclei for local discussion groups.

Mr. Granik handles all arrangements, sparing no effort to make each forum truly representative of the best in American public opinion. No subject is too controversial for him to handle in building the American Forum into one of the most widely heard of the various programs on the air.

Mr. President, effective April 1, Mr. Granik resigns from his position with the Housing Authority to devote more of his time to this radio feature, to his American College Forum, heard locally over station WOL, and to his nationally distributed newspaper forum. Mr. Granik feels that the defense of free speech in this country is its own reward. He serves without recompense as director of the American Forum. He performs this service for nothing. The program is a sounding board; it is an open discussion where the great national issues are thrashed out, where every angle of a situation is freely opened to view. I asked leave to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of subjects covered by the American Forum during the past year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LIST OF AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR BROADCASTS—TOPICS AND SPEAKERS

October 1, 1939, The Neutrality Bill: Senator Key Pittman, Nevada; Senator Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota; Senator Tom Connally, Texas; Senator John A. Danaher, Connecticut; Senator Ernest Lundeen, Minnesota; Senator Frederick Van Nuys, Indiana.

October 8, 1939, American Neutrality: Senator John H. Overton, Louisiana; Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Washington; Senator Rush D. Holt, West Virginia; Senator Sherman Minton, Indiana; Senator Claude Pepper, Florida; Representative James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania.

October 15, 1939, Neutrality: Senator Claude Pepper, Florida; Senator Charles McNary, Oregon; Senator Edward R. Burke, Nebraska; Senator Lynn J. Frazier, North Dakota; Senator Rush D. Holt, West Virginia; Senator Elbert D. Thomas, Utah.

October 22, 1939, Wartime Draft of Capital: Senator Josh Lee, Oklahoma; Senator Styles Bridges, New Hampshire; Senator Chan Gur-

ney, South Dakota; Judge John Gutknecht, president, National Lawyers' Guild; Representative Forest A. Harness, Indiana; Representative H. Jerry Voorhis, California.

October 29, 1939, America's Neutrality Policy: Dorothy Thompson, Ernest K. Lindley, Jay Franklin, Boake Carter, Representative T. V. Smith, Illinois, guest chairman.

November 5, 1939, What Shall the United States Do About Peace?: Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Colorado; Senator Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma; Senator Elbert D. Thomas, Utah; Representative John M. Houston, Kansas; Frederick J. Libby, National Council for Prevention of War; Barnet Nover, associate editor, Washington Post.

November 12, 1939, How Can We Begin To Organize for Peace?: Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, president, Boston University; Dr. John J. Tigert, president, University of Florida; Dr. Franklin W. Johnson, president, Colby College, Maine; Dr. Gordon Keith Chalmers, president, Kenyon College, Ohio; Dr. Thurston J. Davies, president, Colorado College; Dr. Arnaud Marts, president, Bucknell University; Dr. William A. Shimer, secretary of United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

November 19, 1939, the N. A. B. Code: Martin Codel, publisher, Broadcasting Magazine; Morris L. Ernst, noted lawyer; Edward Kirby, director of public relations, National Association of Broadcasters; Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, columnist and commentator.

November 26, 1939, Effect of Neutrality Act on American Merchant Marine: Frank J. Taylor, president, American Merchant Marine Institute; Joseph M. Curran, president, National Maritime Union of America; Joseph P. Ryan, president, International Longshoremen's Association; Representative Sol Bloom, New York.

December 3, 1939, What Can We Do About Our Youth Problem?: Congressman Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Congressman Kent E. Keller, Illinois; Dr. Charles H. Judd, educational director, N. Y. A.; Ralph Hetzel, director of unemployment, C. I. O.; Howard Ennes, chairman, Washington Youth Council.

December 10, 1939, Presidential Candidates: Doris Fleeson, Washington correspondent, New York Daily News; Emil Hurja, publisher, the Pathfinder; W. B. Ragsdale, Associated Press; Jay Franklin, author and columnist; R. L. Wilson, Des Moines Register and Tribune; Raymond Z. Henle, Washington bureau, Pittsburgh Post Gazette; Ernest K. Lindley, Newsweek Magazine.

December 17, 1939, Shall We Have Military Training in the C. C. C.?: Raymond J. Kelly, national commander, American Legion; James J. McEntee, acting director, C. C. C.; Senator Robert R. Reynolds, North Carolina; Representative James P. Richards, South Carolina; Representative Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Edward Keating, former Congressman and editor of newspaper Labor.

December 31, 1939, America's Outlook: Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; W. Gibson Carey, president, United States Chamber of Commerce; Sam A. Lewisohn, noted art and music patron; Frank Graves, commissioner of education, New York; Prof. Walter B. Cannon, Harvard, president, American Association for Advancement of Science; James Lawrence Fly, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Eugene Meyer, publisher, Washington Post; Brig. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, Chief of Operations, War Department; Milburn L. Wilson, Under Secretary, Agriculture; Gov. Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator.

January 7, 1940, The Reciprocal Trade Agreements: Edward J. Noble, Under Secretary of Commerce; Senator Arthur Capper, Kansas; Henry F. Grady, Assistant Secretary of State; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Colorado; William Culbertson, Vice Chairman, Tariff Commission; Representative Frank O. Horton, Wyoming.

January 14, 1940, What Can We Do About Civil Service?: Harry B. Mitchell, President, United States Civil Service Commission; George D. Riley, Washington Times-Herald columnist; Representative Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Representative Guy L. Moser, Pennsylvania; Millard W. Rice, national legislative representative of Veterans of Foreign Wars.

January 21, 1940, Children in a Democracy: Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; William Chenery, editor, Collier's; Dr. William G. Carr, secretary of educational policies commission of N. E. A.; Edith Nourse Rogers, United States Representative from Massachusetts; Homer Folks, secretary, New York State Charities Aid Association; W. R. Ogg, American Farm Bureau Federation; Katherine Dummer Fisher, Winnetka, Ill.; Saidie Orr Dunbar, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

January 28, 1940, Shall Congress Aid Finland?: Senator Prentiss M. Brown, Michigan; Senator Alexander Wiley, Wisconsin; Senator William H. King, Utah; Senator Guy M. Gillette, Iowa.

February 4, 1940, The National Labor Relations Act: Representative Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Senator Sherman W. Minton, Indiana; Representative Reuben T. Wood, Missouri; Representative Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Charles Fahy, general counsel, National Labor Relations Board; Lee Pressman, general counsel, C. I. O.

February 11, 1940, How to Balance the Federal Budget: Senator Robert A. Taft, Ohio; Senator James F. Byrnes, South Carolina; Ernest K. Lindley, newspaper columnist; Ernest Angell, chairman, National Economy League; Senator Josh Lee, Oklahoma; Representative Robert R. Rich, Pennsylvania.

February 18, 1940, The Present Situation of Our Foreign Relations: Senator Key Pittman, Nevada; Senator Guy M. Gillette, Iowa; Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Washington; Senator Alexander Wiley, Wisconsin.

February 25, 1940, Social Security and the Townsend Plan: Senator Robert F. Wagner, New York; Senator Sheridan Downey, California; Kenneth Crawford, president, American Newspaper Guild; Senator D. Worth Clark, Idaho; Rt. Rev. John A. Ryan, director, social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Representative Martin F. Smith, Washington.

March 3, 1940, Seven Years of the New Deal: Senator Alben W. Barkley, Kentucky; Senator Charles L. McNary, Oregon; Senator James M. Mead, New York; Senator Charles W. Tobey, New Hampshire; Representative Marvin Jones, Texas; Representative Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Richard L. Wilson, president, National Press Club, guest chairman of panel.

March 10, 1940, American Transportation: Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Montana; William J. Driver, chairman, board of directors, National Rivers and Harbors Congress; J. J. Pelley, president, Association of American Railroads; Chester H. Gray, director, National Highways Users Conference.

March 17, 1940, Reciprocal Trade Agreements: Senator Arthur Capper, Kansas; Senator Scott W. Lucas, Illinois; Representative Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; Representative Frank H. Buck, California; Representative Frank Carlson, Kansas; Representative A. Willis Robertson, Virginia.

March 24, 1940, The Hatch Bill: Senator Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Senator Sherman Minton, Indiana; Kenneth Crawford, Washington correspondent, New York Post, and president of American Newspaper Guild; Thomas L. Stokes, political correspondent, Scripps-Howard newspapers, and winner of Pulitzer Prize for reporting; Joseph Alsop, coauthor of syndicated column, The Capitol Parade; Charles Lucey, Washington correspondent, New York World-Telegram.

March 31, 1940, The National Census: Senator Charles W. Tobey, New Hampshire; Senator Claude Pepper, Florida; Senator Rush D. Holt, West Virginia; Dr. Stuart Rice, Chairman of Central Statistical Board and former Assistant Director of Census Bureau; Miss Mary Dublin, secretary, National Consumers' League; Mrs. Edward Nelson Dingley, American Legion Auxiliary.

April 7, 1940, Shall Congress Adopt the Chain Store Tax Bill? Representative Wright Patman, Texas; Representative Emanuel Celler, New York; Representative Philip Ferguson, Oklahoma; Representative James McGranery, Pennsylvania; George J. Schulte, editor and publisher of Interstate Merchant; Godfrey Lebhar, editor of Chain Store Age.

April 11, 1940, Amendments to the Federal Wage-Hour Law: Senator James E. Murray, Montana; Representative Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Representative Luther Patrick, Alabama; Representative Joseph W. Byrns, Jr., Tennessee; Representative Harry B. Coffee, Nebraska; Miss Josephine Roche, president, National Consumers' League.

April 21, 1940, The Relief Problem: Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Montana; Senator Styles Bridges, New Hampshire; Senator Claude Pepper, Florida; Mayor Edward J. Kelley, Chicago, Ill.; Representative Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Representative John M. Vorys, Ohio; Richard L. Wilson, president, National Press Club, guest chairman of panel.

April 28, 1940, America's Policy Toward Insular Possessions of Foreign Countries: Senator Elbert D. Thomas, Utah; Senator Ernest Lundeen, Minnesota; Senator Robert R. Reynolds, North Carolina; Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Washington.

May 5, 1940, Governmental Expenditures: Senator James M. Mead, New York; Senator John G. Townsend, Jr., Delaware; Senator Josh Lee, Oklahoma; Representative Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; Representative John M. Vorys, Ohio; Representative Jerry Voorhis, California.

May 12, 1940, Veterans' Pensions: Representative James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Representative John M. Costello, California; Col. John Thomas Taylor, national legislative director, American Legion; Millard W. Rice, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Robert B. Luchars, national commander, American Veterans Association; Representative William J. Miller, Connecticut.

May 19, 1940, President's Defense Message: Robert S. Allen, coauthor, Washington Merry-Go-Round; Felix Belair, Washington correspondent, New York Times, and president, White House Correspondents' Association; Constantine Brown, noted foreign-news expert and writer for Washington Star; Lowell Limpus, military analyst, New York Daily News; Ernest K. Lindley, columnist for Washington Post, and manager, Washington bureau, Newsweek magazine; Thomas L. Stokes, Washington correspondent, Scripps-Howard newspapers and former Pulitzer Prize winner.

May 26, 1940, The National Aviation Forum of 1940: Brig. Gen. Barton K. Yount, Assistant Chief of the Air Corps; Rear Admiral J. H. Towers, Chief of Bureau of Aeronautics; Robert Hinckley, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Authority; Col. John H. Jouett, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Vannevar Bush, chairman of the National Advisory Council on Aeronautics; Capt. Gill Robb Wilson, president of National Aeronautic Association; Ernest K. Lindley, noted columnist and Washington editor of Newsweek magazine, guest interlocutor.

June 2, 1940, Methods of Financing National Defense and War if It Should Come: Senator Homer T. Bone, State of Washington; Senator Prentiss M. Brown, Michigan; Senator Josh Lee, Oklahoma; Senator Alexander Wiley, Wisconsin.

June 9, 1940, Shall the United States Sell Spare Planes and Other War Supplies to the Allies?: Senator Claude Pepper, Florida; Senator Ernest Lundeen, Minnesota; Representative Andrew J. May, Kentucky; Representative Melvin J. Maas, Minnesota; Representative James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Col. Henry Breckinridge, noted lawyer and former Assistant Secretary of War.

June 16, 1940, How Can Young America Aid National Defense?: Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States and defense coordinator of the Department of Justice; Robert Hinckley, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority; Brig. Gen. George V. Strong, Chief of War Plans, United States Army; Rear Admiral E. J. King, member of General Board, United States Navy; Perry Pipkin, president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

June 23, 1940, Preview of Republican Convention: Franklyn Waltman, G. O. P. publicity chief; Dorothy Thompson, noted newspaper and radio commentator; Doris Fleeson, of the Washington Bureau of the New York Daily News; Robert Kintner, coauthor of the syndicated column, The Capitol Parade, and of the recent sensational book, The American White Paper; Richard L. Wilson, chief of the Washington bureau of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and president of the National Press Club; Kenneth Crawford, head of the Washington bureau of PM and president of the American Newspaper Guild; Raymond Henle, Washington head of the Paul Block newspapers.

June 30, 1940, Shall We Adopt Compulsory Selective Military Training and Service Now?: Senator Edward R. Burke, of Nebraska; Senator Arthur Capper, Kansas; Representative Hamilton Fish, New York; Representative Lee E. Geyer, California; Col. William J. Donovan, noted lawyer and commander of the "Fighting Sixty-ninth"; Col. John Thomas Taylor, director, national legislative committee of the American Legion.

July 7, 1940, What are the Chances of the G. O. P. Ticket?: Representative Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Representative T. V. Smith, Illinois; Representative Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Representative Sam Hobbs, Alabama.

July 14, 1940, Preview of the 1940 Democratic Convention: William Allen White, editor of the Kansas Emporia Gazette; Doris Fleeson, head of the Washington bureau of the New York Daily News; Joseph Driscoll, chief Washington correspondent, New York Herald Tribune; Ernest K. Lindley, syndicated columnist, Washington Post and Washington chief of Newsweek Magazine; Frank Kent, columnist, of the Baltimore Sun; Ulric Bell, head of the Washington Bureau of the Louisville Courier-Journal and former President of the National Press Club and Gridiron Club.

July 21, 1940, Outlook of the 1940 Political Campaign: Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States; Senator Edward R. Burke, Nebraska; Representative Sam Rayburn, Texas, majority leader, House of Representatives; C. Wayland Brooks, Republican senatorial nominee, of Illinois; Representative Everett Dirksen, Illinois; Representative Luther Patrick, Alabama.

July 28, 1940, Shall We Conscript American Manpower Now?: Senator Ernest Lundeen, of Minnesota; Senator Rush D. Holt, West Virginia; Representative James W. Wadsworth, New York; Representative Andrew J. May, Kentucky; Representative Frank Carlson, Kansas; Maj. Lewis B. Hershey, of the United States Army General Staff, and executive of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee.

August 4, 1940, Do Present World Conditions Justify the Administration's Steps Toward National Defense?: Senator Josh Lee, Oklahoma; Senator Lister Hill, Alabama; Senator Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota; Representative Hamilton Fish, New York.

August 11, 1940, Financing National Defense: Representative Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina; Representative Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts; Representative Jere Cooper, of Tennessee; Representative Wesley E. Disney, of Oklahoma; Representative Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio; Mr. Ellsworth Alvord, chairman of the committee on Federal finance of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

August 18, 1940, Private Versus Public Ownership of Electric Power: Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Senator Homer T. Bone, of State of Washington; Senator H. H. Schwartz, of Wyoming; Representative John E. Rankin, of Mississippi; Representative Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois; Representative George H. Bender, of Ohio.

August 25, 1940, Shall the United States Make Available to England Some of Its World War Destroyers?: Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida; Senator Gerald P. Nye, of North Dakota; Senator John A. Danaher, of Connecticut; Col. Henry Breckinridge, noted lawyer and former Assistant Secretary of War.

September 1, 1940, How Far Shall the United States Aid Great Britain?: Senator Josh Lee, of Oklahoma; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, correspondent of the Chicago Daily News; Frederick J. Libby, founder and head of the National Council for Prevention of War.

September 8, 1940, The Outlook for Labor: Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah; Senator Clyde M. Reed, of Kansas; Representative T. V. Smith, of Illinois; Representative Gerald W. Landis, of Indiana.

September 15, 1940, National Defense: Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of Interior; Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Senator Sherman Minton, of Indiana; Representative Albert L. Vreeland, of New Jersey.

September 22, 1940, Should Relief Administration Be Returned to the States?: Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; John M. Carmody, Administrator of F. W. A.; Representative Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois; Maury Maverick, mayor of San Antonio and former Congressman from Texas.

September 29, 1940, America's Authors View the Political Outlook: Clarence Budington Kelland, Rex Stout, Nina Wilcox Putnam, Dr. Frank Kingdom, John Erskine, Morris L. Ernst.

October 6, 1940, American-Japanese Relations: Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Representative Hamilton Fish, Jr., of New York; Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr. (retired).

October 13, 1940, Shall We Give Further Aid to Great Britain?: Senator William H. King, of Utah; Senator Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri; Dean G. Acheson, noted lawyer and former Under Secretary of the Treasury; Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, nationally known radio and newspaper commentator.

October 20, 1940, Shall the United States Feed the Conquered Nations of Europe?: Senator Ernest W. Gibson, Jr., of Vermont; William R. Castle, former Under Secretary of State; Herbert Bayard Swope, noted editor and publicist; Clarence E. Pickett, executive secretary.

October 27, 1940, Women and the Election: Representative Mary Norton, New Jersey; Miss Marion E. Martin, director, women's division, Republican National Committee, and Republican national committeewoman from Maine; Mrs. Dorothy McAllister, director, women's division, Democratic National Committee; Mrs. Marguerite Church, lecturer and writer, wife of Republican Congressman Ralph Church, of Illinois; Mrs. Eunice H. Carter, assistant district attorney of New York; Mrs. James Rowe, of women's division, Democratic National Committee.

November 3, 1940, Analysis of the Presidential Contest: Ernest K. Lindley, chief of Washington bureau of Newsweek; Emil Hurja, publisher of Pathfinder magazine; Kenneth Crawford, chief of Washington bureau of PM; Ray Tucker, syndicated columnist of National Whirligig; Gladstone Williams, Washington correspondent of the Atlanta Constitution and the McClatchy newspapers of California; Boake Carter, newspaper and radio commentator.

November 10, 1940, America's Morale Today: C. A. Dykstra, Director, Selective Service; Arthur T. Robb, editor of Editor and Publisher; Ordway Tead, chairman, Board of Higher Education of New York City; Russell Davenport, former managing editor of Fortune Magazine; Leon Henderson, Securities and Exchange Commission, and member of the President's National Defense Advisory Commission; Edward L. Bernays, publicist.

November 17, 1940, The Press and the Presidential Election: Herbert Agar, editor, Louisville Courier-Journal; Irving Grant, contribution editor, St. Louis Star-Times; Arthur Krock, chief of Washington Bureau of New York Times; John W. Owens, editor in chief, Baltimore Sun and Evening Sun.

November 24, 1940, Shall We Give Full Military Aid to Britain?: Senator Rush D. Holt, of West Virginia; Representative Melvin J. Maas, of Minnesota; Ralph Ingersoll, publisher of PM; Rex Stout, noted author, writer, and lecturer.

December 1, 1940: Shall the United States Form a Union With Britain and Her Commonwealths?: Clarence K. Streit, author of Union Now, writer and lecturer; Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan, noted lawyer and wartime commander; Quincy Howe, editor of the publishing house Simon & Schuster, and author of The News and How To Understand It; John B. Trevor, president of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

December 8, 1940: What Can We Do About Strikes in Defense Industries?: Representative Sam Hobbs, of Alabama; Representative Kent E. Keller, of Illinois; Representative Howard W. Smith, of Virginia; Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California.

December 15, 1940, Shall the United States Discontinue Diplomatic Relations With the Axis Powers?: Representative Hamilton Fish, of New York; Frederick J. Libby, head of National Council for Prevention of War; George Backer, publisher of the New York Post; Henry F. Pringle, biographer, author, and lecturer.

December 22, 1940: America Sends Greetings: Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State; Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; Frank Knox, Secretary of Navy; Rear Admiral Russell R. Waesche, commandant of United States Coast Guard; Admiral E. S. Land, Chairman of United States Maritime Commission; Hershel Johnson, Chargé d'Affaires, American Embassy, London; Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis, commanding general, Panama Canal Department, Quarry Heights, Panama Canal Zone; Rear Admiral Claude C. Bloch, commandant of the fourteenth naval district, Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, T. H.; commander of Coast Guard cutter *Spencer*, 700 miles at sea off New York; Capt. Stedman Giles, aboard steamship *America*, 1 day out of New York; United States Army Band.

December 29, 1940: America's Outlook for 1941: Adolph A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator; Walter Fuller, president of Curtis Publishing Co., and newly elected president of National Association of Manufacturers; Neville Miller, president, National Association of Broadcasters; George B. Parker, editor-in-chief, Scripps-Howard Newspapers; Everett Clinchy, head of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War.

January 5, 1941, Is Propaganda Endangering the United States?: Sidney Hertzberg, national publicity director, America First Committee; Clark M. Eichelberger, national director, Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies; Miss Mary W. Hillyer, of the National Committee of Keep America Out of War Congress; Mrs. Irving Berlin, wife of the noted composer.

January 12, 1941, Should Congress Adopt the Lend-Lease Program?: Senator Josh Lee, of Oklahoma; Senator Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana; Herbert Agar, editor, Louisville Courier-Journal; John T. Flynn, noted economist and newspaper columnist.

January 19, 1941, Should Congress Adopt the Lend-Lease Program? (a further discussion): Senator Gerald P. Nye, of North Dakota; Senator C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois; Representative Andrew J. May, of Kentucky; Ernest W. Gibson, former Senator from Vermont, chairman, Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.

January 26, 1941, How Is Our Democracy Most Threatened?: Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida; Representative William G. Stratton, of Illinois; Norman Thomas, leader of the Socialist Party; Col. Henry Breckinridge, noted lawyer and former Assistant Secretary of War.

February 2, 1941, Combating the "Fifth Column" in America: Representative Joe Starnes, of Alabama; Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California; Col. John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion; Morris L. Ernst, noted lawyer and author.

February 9, 1941, Is War Inevitable If Britain Falls?: Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Jerome Frank, chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission; Ralph Ingersoll, editor of PM and author of Report on England; Quincy Howe, writer and commentator, author of England Expects Every American to Do His Duty.

February 16, 1941, What Should Be America's Policy in the Far East?: Paul V. McNutt, former United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, and now Administrator of the F. S. A.; Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., former Governor-General of the Philippines; Robert Aura Smith, of the New York Times; William Henry Chamberlin, former foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, noted writer and lecturer.

February 23, 1941, Do We Need Further Legislation Regarding Labor Disputes in Defense Industries?: Senator Joseph H. Ball, of Minnesota; Representative Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan; Francis P. Fenton, director of organization, A. F. of L.; Allan S. Haywood, national director of organization, C. I. O.

March 2, 1941, How Can Democracy's Aims Best Be Achieved?: C. D. Jackson, president of the council; Harry Elmer Barnes, former columnist of the Scripps-Howard newspapers and noted author; Congressman Thomas H. Eliot, of Massachusetts; Congressman Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois.

March 9, 1941, Shall We Legalize Wiretapping?: Representative Sam Hobbs, of Alabama; Alexander Holtzoff, Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States; Arthur Garfield Hays, Counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union; Julius G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives Association.

March 16, 1941, Women View America's Foreign Relations: Miss Dorothy Detzer, executive secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Democratic National Committeewoman from Pennsylvania; Mrs. Helen Essary, columnist of the Washington Times-Herald, and president of the Women's National Press Club; Mrs. Rushmore Patterson, chairman of the National Woman's Division of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.

March 23, 1941, Shall the Small Invaded Nations Be Fed?: Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; George Sokolsky, noted author, writer, and lecturer; Rex Stout, noted author, writer, and lecturer; Dr. William Agar, professor at Columbia University and one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the question.

March 30, 1941, Should We Convoy Materials to Europe, if Necessary?: Representative Joseph Clark Baldwin, of New York; Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan, lawyer and wartime commander of the Twenty-seventh Division, A. E. F.; Senator Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana; Representative Hamilton Fish, of New York.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. Granik goes to great lengths in his efforts to make the forum absolutely fair to all sides, in view of the increasingly controversial nature of the subjects. He checks with the leaders of both parties in the Senate and House concerning the proposed subject. He clears with the Democratic and Republican National Committees before he invites anyone on the air. I believe that Members of the Congress and other Government officials who have had occasion to work with Mr. Granik will agree with me that he is actively defending free speech in this country at his own expense.

Mr. President, I ask leave at this point to introduce into the RECORD an article from the New York Times, one from the New York Herald Tribune, and a copy of a letter to Mr. Granik by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times]

WHERE FREE SPEECH PREVAILS

(By R. W. Stewart)

Congress has an unofficial battleground. Opposing factions of the Senate and the House rally to the American Forum of the Air Sunday nights to continue arguments on current issues before a coast-to-coast audience. Under the direction of Theodore Granik, a benevolent rather than an arbitrary moderator, free speech prevails as the listeners are treated to the inside of congressional debate complete with arguments, rebuttals, and just plain wrangling.

Mr. Granik is a combination of liberalism and altruism. He is a liberal because he sees no reason why the layman should not have the opportunity to personally question Congressmen on pertinent current affairs. He is an altruist because he provides the layman with this opportunity at no personal gain or compensation and on his own time as originator and director of this forum on the air in New York through WOR.

THE MODERATOR'S BACKGROUND

Mr. Granik is not a visionary or an idealist; he is a hard-headed lawyer who attained the position of deputy district attorney of New York County and who was appointed special counsel to the United States Housing Authority. He sees in his forum the embodiment of his principles and calls it a practical example of free speech, which he believes to be America's most important right. He likes to consider the panel discussions as his contribution to education and pursues them as a hobby.

The forum is of a quasi official nature. Although it naturally has no connection with the Senate or House of Representatives, a verbatim account, including station announcements, of each 60-minute broadcast during the past year has been read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This practice was begun, according to Mr. Granik, by interested legislators who wanted their speeches put into the RECORD as broadcast.

Another purpose of the procedure, he continued, is that through the introduction of the scripts further discussion on the radio topics is carried to the floor of the Houses, and the broadcast record serves as the basis for rebuttal. "It's like an extension of the broadcast," he explained.

Mr. Granik's stand on free speech is not a pose. He carries his principles right into the forum discussion in Washington's Hotel Willard. So long as order is maintained, freedom of expression is the rule, and everyone is given an equal chance. This opportunity also is extended to the speakers—sometimes they need it.

TWO FACTIONS ARE REPRESENTED

Since all the topics are controversial, the forum opens with both sides stating their stand from prepared speeches. This is limited to 30 minutes. Then the panel discussion begins. Rebuttals are made, and it is then that Mr. John Citizen has his opportunity to stand up to the honorable speakers and state his difference of opinion or to ask a question. And Mr. Granik does not permit the legislators to evade the issue. So long as the layman has an argument he is permitted to hold the traveling microphone in the audience until he is reasonably satisfied.

This generous practice often leads to round-robin arguments. For instance, it is not rare for a member of the audience to stand up and take issue with another member for the latter's opinion as expressed to one of the speakers. Members of the listening audience unable to attend the broadcast also are permitted to quiz the speakers by telegraphing questions. These are answered over the air by the speaker involved. "It's like open house," Mr. Granik laughed.

He calls this part of the forum his answer to the people who sent in letters stating that they wanted to hear their Congressmen in action; that they wanted to speak to and question them.

HOW TOPICS ARE CHOSEN

In line with his policy of equal opportunity, Mr. Granik points out that regardless of personal politics he always invites an equal number of Democrats and Republicans to each broadcast. The only deviation from this policy is made when the question under discussion breaks party lines, he explained. As examples of these topics he mentioned the isolationist question, aid to the Allies, and conscription.

Although people from all walks of life have appeared in the forum, Congressmen have made up the greater part of the guest list, mainly because their opinions were of greater importance on the topics selected.

"In booking programs for the forum I try to get those topics which are 'hot' in the news," Mr. Granik continued. "I watch the congressional debates and if a timely subject comes up on the floor of either the Senate or the House I immediately contact the proponents and opponents of the particular legislation and offer them the facilities to broadcast their views."

That is the format of Mr. Granik's forum. He is no green hand at the game. He has been conducting open discussions on the air for 12 years.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 26, 1941]

FORUM REFEREE AT WASHINGTON HAS TRYING JOB—GRANIK NEEDS HIS 15 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE TO KEEP SPEAKERS UNDER CONTROL

Every Sunday evening at 8 o'clock Theodore Granik, director of WOR's American Forum of the Air, steps to the microphone to referee one of the most controversial battles on the air. Mr. Granik has had 15 years of experience in radio-discussion programs. His American Forum is a continuation of The WOR Forum, which he produced before the present program went on a national hook-up. It is produced jointly by WOR and WOL, from Washington, over Mutual.

The forum topics and speakers are anounced only a few days before broadcast time. Listeners and editors frequently comment on his talent for keeping "on top of the news." On occasion he has changed the topic and line-up of the forum on Saturday night because of some sudden and important development on the Capital news front.

Mr. Granik keeps in constant touch with the chairmen and ranking members of important House and Senate committees, many of whom let him know in advance what bills are up for consideration in their committees and when they may be expected to reach the

floor. He says his aim is to keep his radio debate simultaneous with the congressional battles or, if possible, even a bit in advance, so that on Sunday the forum is frequently a preview of the biggest congressional debate of the following week. The proceedings of the forums are noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every week.

The most embarrassing incident Mr. Granik can recall in this regard was when a team of a Senator and two newspapermen debated a similar group of three. Just before going on the air, Senator A won one of the opposing journalists over to his point of view. As a result, Senator B found himself being asked embarrassing questions by the reporter who was supposed to be with him on the issue. "I had weeks of explaining to do to that Senator," Mr. Granik says ruefully.

When the forum was moved from New York City to Washington with expansion of the Mutual network in 1937, and the title of the program was changed, Mr. Granik found that most Congressmen and Government officials had not yet become adept at broadcasting. They were of the William Jennings Bryan school of stentorian tones and oratorical flourishes. Many of them had to learn the informal, personalized approach the radio demands.

Getting some Capital luminaries to cut their prepared messages to allow ample extemporaneous discussion time on the second half of the program is occasionally a problem. Most Congressmen and Government officials, however, have learned to conform to this requirement. Congressmen scheduled for a forum, frequently call on Mr. Granik for advice during the week Sometimes a Senator will telephone him in the middle of the night to read his prepared talk and get his reactions.

Mr. Granik started in the broadcasting business in 1925 as an assistant director of a now defunct New York City station. He presided over a series called Law for the Layman, which he brought over to WOR in the late 1920's. In 1929 the law broadcasts became the WOR forum, when it was found that debate made for a livelier program. He was an assistant New York district attorney for several years, and at present is a special counsel to the new Federal Housing Authority, as well as advisor to the National Selective Service Administration.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 18, 1941.

Mr. THEODORE GRANIK,
Director of the American Forum,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRANIK: Confirming our recent verbal conversation I would like for you to know that as a direct result of the debate conducted by the American Forum of the Air over the Mutual Network on Sunday, January 19, 1941, I received approximately 18,000 letters.

You may recall that during the debate in which Senator GERALD P. NYE and myself opposed passage of the so-called lease-lend bill, while Congressman ANDREW J. MAY, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, and former Senator Ernest W. Gibson advocated passage of the measure, I repeatedly asked the following question:

"What will this so-called lease-lend bill do to aid England, short of war, that we are not doing now?"

Seventy-five percent of the letters received as a result of this broadcast quoted this question almost verbatim, and the following sidelight might be interesting to you:

I attended a meeting of the Passaic, N. J., Marine Corps League, where I was presented with a medal for outstanding achievement by an ex-marine during the preceding year. During the evening seven ex-marines spoke to me about the debate which they had heard over the air. All of them interrogated me as to whether or not I had received an answer to my question. I asked each one if he remembered the question, and each one repeated the question to me practically verbatim.

I know of nothing in my public life that has aroused the interest and enthusiasm so much as the above-mentioned debate.

I want to take this opportunity of again expressing to you my appreciation for the opportunity of appearing on your program.

With every kind personal regard, I am

Yours sincerely,

C. WAYLAND BROOKS.

FOREIGN ACCOUNTS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 390) relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I gave a brief explanation of the pending bill on last Monday. If I may have the attention of the Senate for about 5 minutes, I think I can explain the purpose of the bill.

The measure passed the Senate last October in substantially its present form. It passed the House a little later in a slightly different form. The two Houses did not get together and agree upon a conference report. Therefore, because of the ending of the session, no bill was passed.

In substantially the same form the measure has now been unanimously reported by the Banking and Currency Committee. It relates to the bank balances of foreign governments and foreign central governmental banks in the Federal Reserve banks of the United States, and similar balances of foreign governments and central banks in the private banks of the United States; that is, the national banks and the State banks.

Briefly, the bill provides that those banks may rely entirely upon the certificate of the Secretary of State of the United States as to who is the proper person to draw out of the banks such balances. The bill does nothing else than that. A slight modification is made with respect to section 14 (e) of the Federal Reserve Act, which, briefly, is this: It permits the Federal Reserve bank to receive deposits from foreign governments and foreign central banks without the requirement which is now in the statute that the Federal Reserve bank must first appoint a foreign correspondent or agent in the country of such foreign government or foreign central bank.

That is all I have to say about the substance of the bill. I shall be very glad to answer any questions that any Senator may desire to ask.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice from the report of the committee that the reason why the measure finally failed of passage the last time was because of an objection by the Secretary of State to one of the Senate amendments. Will the Senator refresh my recollection as to what Senate amendment it was to which the Secretary of State objected?

Mr. BROWN. It was the Senate amendment adopted on the floor which extended the provisions of the bill to the accounts of private citizens of foreign nations, which would require the Secretary of State of the United States to determine who was the proper person in a foreign country to transfer the balance in a private account in a bank of the United States, whether it be a Federal Reserve bank or a private bank. The Secretary of State, in a letter to Chairman STEAGALL of the House committee, pointed out that that would impose upon his office a tremendous obligation, and would require him to employ a large number of persons to ascertain who owned the balances held in this country by private citizens of European nations and nations in other parts of the world. The committee struck out that amendment, and it is not in the pending bill.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Does the bill apply to private banks?

Mr. BROWN. No; it applies to insured banks.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Not to private banks.

Mr. BROWN. Not to a private bank in the sense of a bank not in the Federal Reserve System or the insured-bank system.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Congress would have authority to include private banks, would it not?

Mr. BROWN. It is possible it would. I am not certain about it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, would the bill apply to the balance held by Finland, or Norway, or any one of such foreign countries?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; it would apply to any balance held by a foreign government in any bank that is in the insured-bank system, or any Federal Reserve bank.

Mr. President, I believe we are ready for the consideration of the bill; but first I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement regarding the sequestration of funds under the President's order.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL

Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia were occupied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics about July 10, 1940, puppet governments were set up, which offered to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics accepted the offer. However, the United States has not recognized these puppet governments or the change in status of the countries. This Government continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives who were sent here by the former governments.

In the case of Denmark no change in the Government has taken place. It has not moved out of Denmark, and the United States still recognizes it, as well as its diplomatic and consular representatives in this country, although the country was occupied by German forces April 10, 1940.

The Governments of Norway (occupied about April 10), Belgium (May 10), and Holland (May 10) have moved to London. The United States still recognizes these governments, as well as their diplomatic and consular representatives in this country.

In the case of Luxemburg, which was occupied on about May 10, the Grand Duchess is now in Canada, and some of her ministers are in London. They are still recognized by the United States as the Government of Luxemburg.

The United States recognizes the French Government in Vichy.

In the case of Rumania there has been no change in the location or status of the Government insofar as recognition in the United States is concerned.

The following condensed statements indicate the situation with respect to the assets of central banks and governments of certain occupied countries. Most of these cases present not only the primary problem of deciding between the authority of officials located within the country and officials located outside of it, but also the problem of establishing by proper evidence the authority of particular individuals who apparently derive their authority from a government which is recognized by our Government.

LATVIA

On May 17, 1940, a cabinet decree was issued authorizing the Foreign Minister, in the event of an emergency, to make the Latvian Minister in London the senior Latvian Minister in Western Europe and the Americas and to give him power to defend Latvian interests and manage government funds and, in an emergency, to transfer these powers (insofar as they relate to the Western Hemisphere) to the Latvian Minister in Washington.

On July 10 Latvia was occupied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and a puppet government was set up, which offered to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics accepted the offer. However, the United States has not recognized the puppet government or the change in status of the country, but continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives who were sent here by the former Government.

After Latvia "joined" the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the central bank was nationalized and its directorate abolished. Consequently, the right to dispose of the bank's assets in New York might be asserted by the Latvian Minister in London (or in Washington), or by officials now in Latvia or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

LITHUANIA

The historical background is the same as in the case of Latvia; that is to say, on July 10, 1940, Lithuania was occupied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and a puppet government was set up which offered to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The offer was accepted. However, the United States has not recognized the puppet government or the change in status of the country, but continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives who were sent here by the former government.

It is probable that funds will be needed to support Lithuanian legations and consulates in this hemisphere, and that the funds of the Government and of the Central Bank of Lithuania in this country will be required for that purpose. The question may therefore arise whether the Lithuanian Minister in Washington would have power to dispose of these funds or whether this power is still in the directors or other officials in Lithuania.

ESTONIA

The historical background is the same as in the case of Latvia and Lithuania.

NORWAY

Norway was occupied during the first part of April 1940. The government which was in existence prior to the occupation is still recognized by the United States, and is now located in London.

Definite information is not yet available, but apparently the King, on April 22, 1940, issued a provisional decree removing the old directors of the Central Bank of Norway and appointing new ones, and another decree, on June 7, 1940, transferring the head office of the bank from Oslo to London. On October 29, 1940, a further decree was issued transferring all the bank's assets in New York to the Norwegian Government.

DENMARK

The Government of Denmark has not moved out of the country, and the United States still recognizes it, as well as its diplomatic and consular representatives in the United States. The country was occupied by German forces April 10, 1940.

BELGIUM

On February 2, 1940, a decree was issued permitting corporations, in case of invasion, to move their head offices out of Belgium and suspending the powers of officers, directors, stockholders, etc., in any territory which might be occupied by an enemy power.

The invasion began in the early part of May, and the head office of the Central Bank of Belgium was moved from place to place pursuant to this decree so as to stay out of occupied territory. Some of the directors and officers remained in occupied territory and therefore if the decree is effective as to them, their powers are suspended.

On July 19 (after the country had been completely occupied) an official publication in Belgium announced that the principal place of business of the central bank had been transferred back to Brussels and gave a list of the directors and officers who were authorized to sign on behalf of the bank, all of whom were in occupied territory.

The Belgian Government, after several moves, is now located in London, and is still recognized by the United States, as are its diplomatic and consular representatives in this country.

THE NETHERLANDS

Holland was invaded in the early part of May 1940. The government has moved to London, and is still recognized by the United States, as are its diplomatic and consular representatives.

A royal decree, dated May 24, 1940, gave to the government the power to dispose of assets in foreign countries belonging to nationals of the Netherlands who remained in occupied territory, and this power (as to assets in the United States) has been delegated, by power of attorney, to the Netherlands Minister in Washington.

POLAND

Following the invasion, the Polish Government has moved to London, and is still recognized by the United States, as are its diplomatic and consular representatives in the United States.

At the time of the invasion some of the officers and directors of the central bank left the country, but some of them are still there. Presumably, the Polish Government will deny any assertion by the latter that they are authorized to dispose of the bank's assets in New York.

LUXEMBURG

Luxemburg was occupied on about May 10, 1940. The Grand Duchess is now in Canada and some of her ministers are in London. They are still recognized by the United States as the government of Luxemburg.

FRANCE

The Government of France has moved to Vichy, and the United States still recognizes it, as well as its diplomatic and consular representatives in the United States.

In addition, the President has recently sequestered the funds of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Rumania.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it seems to me that there are two objections to the bill which should be voiced here. In the first place, the bill is unnecessary, and, in the second place, it is highly impolitic.

With reference to the first point, on May 7, 1940, the President approved a measure which it seems to me should be ample for the protection of the accounts in question against any possible claimant. In that act we provided:

During time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, investigate, regulate, or prohibit under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit between or payments by or to banking institutions as defined by the President, and export, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, and any transfer, withdrawal or exportation of, or dealing in, any evidences of indebtedness or evidences of ownership of property in which any foreign state or a national or political subdivision thereof, as defined by the President, has any interest, by any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

Reading only so much of the act, it should become apparent that since the President has full power to prohibit the transactions covered by the pending bill he also has the power to license transactions under rules and regulations, short of an absolute prohibition. Because he does thus have complete control of whether or not there will be a transfer of any gold bullion, or any currency, or any credit balance in this country by an American to another nation or to a national thereof, it becomes apparent that we do not need the pending legislation with reference to controlling the transfer by a Federal Reserve bank to an agent named by the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, significantly, when this matter was before the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] asked one of the principal witnesses the following question in connection with the matter:

Then you are, under this, giving the accredited representative of the country control of the property of the central bank?

Mr. DREIBELBIS. Yes, sir; that is right.

Senator CLARK of Idaho. That is the purpose of this, and that is what I am kicking about.

Mr. President, it becomes perfectly apparent that if the agent of one government, accredited by the Secretary of State, can claim from the Federal Reserve bank in this country bullion, if he chooses, to the amount of a billion dollars, or $2,000,000,000, which, as the proceeds of taxation, has been sent here by all of the people of some other nation, by recognizing that agent, and authorizing him to withdraw the property of the people of that other nation, we are exercising a degree of control over the property of such people, and by permitting its disposition for given purposes by such agent we may control or attempt to maintain an international balance of power, which will take us as a nation into the internal affairs of every nation in the world whose funds have been deposited by that nation in the banks in this country.

It therefore seems to me, Mr. President, that the conferring of such power as would be conferred by the pending bill would become impolitic, because if it is to be possible at all it means that some member of the De Gaulle government, for instance, can come to this country, claim representation as an accredited agent for the Government of France, and receive the entire avails of all the moneys of all the people of France deposited in this country before the war broke out. Thus, from whether we should or should not recognize the Vichy government as against the De Gaulle government which is a political question, one which does lie within the power of the Secretary of State, it becomes transmuted into the power to play with the finances, with the funds, of the people of France, by virtue of the transfer here proposed to be authorized.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not fully conversant with the proposal now before the Senate, and what the Senator from Connecticut now says interests me greatly. I have been concerned over the apparent transfer of huge sums of German money, or property representing money, within a very recent period of time, the transfers being made sometimes to corporations in the United States in consideration of a corresponding trade over in Germany, but in any event, it was the withdrawal, by some means, of vast sums of wealth, which, if we retained control of them, would be one means of national defense for this country. I have been concerned about that and I wish to ask the Senator, who seems to know about the pending bill, whether it would facilitate the transfer of funds of Germany beyond the control, by and out of reach of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Quite the contrary. But it would facilitate the transfer of German funds from the United States to Germany, or to any other place to be designated by the accredited representative of Germany when recognized by the Secretary of State. Already, by the act of May 7, 1940, we have given the President the express power to deny entirely the right to make such a transfer. Why that power has not been exercised as a matter of political control by our country over the funds of Germany or her nationals in this country I cannot say.

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree with the Senator; I cannot understand why that power has not been exercised. It seems to me that should be one of the very first steps in national defense, to secure this country against the use against our interests of such wealth lying right here within our borders.

Mr. DANAHER. There are yet other points upon which I have not touched, which are perhaps even more cogent, and let me show the Senator from Vermont just exactly what interests of the United States can and will be affected if this bill shall be enacted.

In the first place, we would be denying to any claimant to these funds access to the courts of the United States, because we would say that upon the issuance of a certificate by the Secretary of State that Mr. A is the accredited representative of a given government, the Federal Reserve bank may recognize that certificate, and upon payment of the money to Mr. A, he shall be deemed conclusively entitled to that fund. And by the action of the Secretary of State in having so recognized Mr. A we estop all other claimants on any account and on any basis from claiming access to our courts for decision as to who is the rightful claimant to that very fund.

Let us take the case of Holland, which has millions of dollars in this country. Will any one say that the Government of Holland has less at stake in the situation overseas than the United States has? Yet, were this bill to be enacted, the funds of Holland within our very control now could be transferred to anyone who the representative of Holland, duly accredited by the Secretary of State, would say should receive those funds. By so doing, and under this bill, not only could no other foreign claimant get into court to ascertain what his rights may be, but no American claimant could either.

Mr. President, that brings me to what I think will be a most significant result of this proposed legislation. If we will retain control of some of the billions upon billions of dollars of gold in our possession and now on deposit at Fort Knox—and we have the power to do so—if we will retain control of those funds, and sequester them until the peace shall be declared, we will have an interest which must be regarded, and the other countries who have a stake in that fund will have an interest which must be regarded. In other words, we will have some economic basis upon which and with which to agree upon terms adequate for the protection of American claimants as well as others to those funds then in our possession.

Mr. President, I am sure Senators will remember that during the last war we trusteed funds in the Alien Property Custodian, and we called him the trustee, and when the war was over, out of that trusteed fund many American claimants were able to satisfy their claims, at least in part; but were the procedure contemplated by this bill to become effective, these funds could be transferred from the United States and they could be dissipated in whatever direction or into whatever channel or to whatever accredited agent the foreign government, and the foreign government alone, shall decide.

In the first place, then, Mr. President, the Congress of the United States, by adopting this measure, will transfer to one man, namely, the Secretary of State, the power to adjudicate between respective or rival claimants from some foreign government. That is one thing he may do; but, second, the accredited agent which he thus recognizes will have the sole power of disposition of the funds so transferred to him.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether this bill recognizes any kind of an interest that American creditors have in the collection of their debts from foreign nationals or foreign nations which have assets in this country? Does this bill recognize the, at least, equitable interest that such creditors have, and does it in any way protect that interest?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the answer is "No" to both questions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. This bill does not take away any rights they now have.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, that is precisely what it does.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Any American creditor can proceed in our courts. If he can reach the property, he can file a proceeding in rem. Of course, he cannot get personal jurisdiction of a citizen living in a foreign land, but if he can find property of that citizen in this country, can he not proceed in an action in rem and sequester the property and get a writ of garnishment, or attach it, or something of that kind?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, answering the Senator from Texas, at this minute—at 12:33 on this day—the answer is "Yes." But if we pass the bill, he cannot.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there anything in this bill which prohibits such court action by a claimant?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; there is, Mr. President. Not only will there be no action authorized to an American creditor or an American claimant the moment this bill passes, but quite the contrary, the moment the Secretary of State issues the certificate that Mr. A is the accredited agent of any government, then, reading from page 2, section 2, paragraph (2)—

> A representative of such foreign state who is recognized by the Secretary of State as being the accredited representative of such foreign state—
>
> May—
>
> receive, control, or dispose of such property.

That is what would happen. He could remove the fund from the jurisdiction of the United States, if he chose to do so, and the American claimant could not even get into court as to that fund, or any part of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why could he not get into court?

Mr. DANAHER. For the reason that the bill prohibits it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh no, I do not agree. If that is the language the Senator has in mind, I do not agree with him at all. All it means is that if the funds in question are the government funds of some foreign government, our Government, if it finds that to be true, turns them over to the legal representative of that government, if I understand the language.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's understanding is usually acute, but in this instance has fallen short of the fact.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator has not pointed out anything in the bill which denies the right of claimants to go into the United States courts and establish their rights to foreign property.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me read to the Senator a provision of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. The fact that the property is turned over to the claimant does not mean that the court is ousted. The agent can be sued.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me answer the Senator from Texas by pointing out to him what appears on page 2, lines 12 to 20, inclusive:

> The authority of such person to act with respect to such property is accepted and recognized by the Secretary of State, and so certified by the Secretary of State to the Federal Reserve bank.

And then Mr. President, what happens?

> The payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such Federal Reserve bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of the Federal Reserve bank for or with respect to such property.

Mr. President, in the next section, in addition to having done that, the bill provides:

> Any suit or other legal proceeding against any insured bank or any officer, director, or employee thereof, arising out of the receipt, possession, or disposition of any such property shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States and the district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction thereof, regardless of the amount involved.

Thus, Mr. President, if any suit were undertaken, and if it were transferred into the District court, the Federal legislation, creating an effective and complete presumption of correct delivery, will be a complete bar equally to the success of any in rem action, such as is mentioned by the Senator from Texas; and the answer obviously is that the claimant will have no funds, there will be no res upon which his claim could attach, and thus there would be no jurisdiction and no suit.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Connecticut point out to me how the situation would differ, if any, under existing law, and under this bill? If any one has a right to garnishee the account of a foreign government in the Federal Reserve bank he has that right under existing law. After this authority shall have been granted the Secretary of State to designate what person may draw a check on that account, how will the situation differ from the present situation? It is identical.

Mr. DANAHER. If it were identical the bill would not be needed; it would be wholly unnecessary. But it is not identical, and the reason it is not identical, Mr. President, is that the moment the bill is passed there will be no fund in the hands of any Federal Reserve bank subject to garnishment, and therefore, it cannot be the basis of an in rem action, for the simple reason that the payment may follow, and this bill makes it a conclusive presumption that the bank will pay it to the right person, and hence there will be no claim as between differing claimants.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator contend that this bill will in any way interfere with the President's right under the statute we passed some time ago, to sequester the funds of any country whose funds he may desire to sequester?

Mr. DANAHER. Answering the Senator from Michigan, let me say, Mr. President, that the act of May 7, 1940, is all we need to give the President complete control over the funds.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator does not answer my question.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me proceed. That is all we need to give him complete control over the funds. But if we pass this bill, not only will the President have all the powers contained in the act of May 7, 1940, but in addition he may utilize the funds in this country to play power politics anywhere with reference to the disposition of the funds or their use, and even to the point, as we have already indicated, of denying American claimants access to the funds.

Mr. BROWN. Then, the Senator's answer to my question is "No"; that this measure in no way repeals the power we gave the President under the sequestering statute?

Mr. DANAHER. It does not.

Mr. BROWN. Therefore the funds of any country which have been sequestered will remain in exactly their present position until the President changes his order?

Mr. DANAHER. No, Mr. President. That is not the answer, and it is not a correct statement.

Let us assume a case of individuals in the Republic of France prior to June 1940 who have paid taxes for years, whose funds have been accumulated in the Central Bank of France, which in turn bought bullion with them and transferred that bullion to the United States. Those funds belong to the people of France. They do not belong to some government in London or Dakar. They belong to the people of France; and if those funds should be sequestered until the end of the war, then in the allocation of funds in our possession in the days of peace to come not only would the rights of American creditors against such funds be regarded but meanwhile we should have a stake in the peace and a voice in the terms on which the peace is achieved.

Mr. BROWN. I ask the Senator if the bill in substance does not do only one thing. Heretofore certain funds have been sequestered by the President's order. I have placed in the RECORD a list of the countries whose funds have been so sequestered. I will say to the Senator that the list does not include France or England. Does not the bill merely place upon the Secretary of State the responsibility for determining who is the accredited agent of a foreign government, instead of having that responsibility placed upon the shoulders of the officers in the bank? That is the only thing intended to be accomplished by sections 2 and 3.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I deny that to be a correct statement of the situation. Let me say that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly pointed out that the determination of what government shall be recognized is a political act, to be executed by the Secretary of State. That is his duty now. He has that right now; but he does not have the right to say to what agent shall be turned over all the funds of private citizens, as well as the public funds of some other country, thereafter to be expended by that foreign government's agent in this country as he shall decide. That is the whole test. What is sought to be accomplished is that the Federal Reserve bank shall pay over the money to the agent named by the Secretary of State, and the Federal Reserve bank shall thereafter no longer be liable to anybody as a result.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. The bill would have the effect of denying access to our courts to claimants who have reposed faith and confidence in our integrity and have transferred their funds to our country on the basis of that trust.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator has, in many words, answered my question by the simple word "yes." All the bill does is to fix the authority definitely in the Secretary of State. I concede that the bill is to a large extent declaratory of the common-law rule which has always prevailed in this country; but it was felt by the Federal Reserve Board, by the Department of State, and by every other Government agency whose representatives appeared before us—and I think there were four of them—that it would be well for Congress to declare the common-law policy in statutory form. That is all the bill does.

The Senator says that the courts are ousted from jurisdiction. There is nothing in section 2 which says anything of the kind. It merely states that the determination of the Secretary of State with respect to the person who is the authorized representative of a foreign government shall be conclusive upon the bank. It is a protection to what is substantially a Government bank, and would obviate the necessity of the bank filing a bill of interpleader or something of that kind to ascertain who is the rightful agent representing a foreign government.

While I am on my feet, I should like to say one thing further. We have two situations confronting us as a result of the deposits of foreign governments in the United States. We have the deposits of those countries which are definitely overrun, where no government exists except government by the aggressor nation. That is the situation in Holland, Belgium, and Norway. We have definitely adopted the policy that the President may sequester funds of such countries, and he has done so. Certain other nations still have a government. That is the condition in unoccupied

France, in Turkey, and in Greece. With respect to those nations we provide this bill, which grants to the Secretary of State the authority to relieve Government banks and private banks of the responsibility of making a decision as between conflicting claimants to the funds, and fixes upon the Secretary of State, who is the representative of the United States in foreign affairs, the responsibility of determining who represents a particular government in the United States. In every other form of international relationship the Secretary of State makes that determination.

I will say to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] that the bill in no way affects the accounts of private citizens or nationals of other nations. It affects solely Government accounts. If any citizen of the United States has a claim against a foreign government, such as the Government of Holland, he may apply to any bank which holds funds of such government. He may apply to the courts for a writ of garnishment, or some other form of seizure of property, and endeavor to procure from that institution the funds which are due him.

The bill in no way interferes with that situation. It merely gives a certain substance, by statutory enactment, to what has been the common-law rule in this country. The Secretary of State shall determine who is the accredited representative of the owner of the fund.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The angle of private interest that comes into my interrogatory arises out of what I understand to have already happened, namely, the use of German funds to put through transactions which are really of a private nature, involving ownership in some great corporations of the United States which were legally here with subsidiaries in Germany. We are appropriating $7,000,000,000 toward the maintenance of national defense. Assume that we have in this country—within our own borders where we could obtain control of it—German assets of $7,000,000,000. Assume that we have a legal basis for control of such funds, namely, a claim as a country, as a nation, as a government. Assume that we have an unpaid and overdue claim against the German Government, which would form the foundation for some sort of equitable action which would secure this Government. Let us assume the thing in its best light. Let us assume that this Government would be secured to the full extent of $7,000,000,000 by sequestration, by seizure, or by some other means similar to that which we have heretofore used. What I desire to know is whether the bill now under consideration touches upon such a transaction—whether it interferes with such future procedure by our Government?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator, first, that I am informed by the general counsel for the Federal Reserve bank that the German funds in this country have not been sequestered. Whatever funds of German citizens or of the German Government are here in banks are open to any form of legal action that may be started by any private citizen, by any corporation, by any person who can show to the courts any interest in such funds. Unquestionably, the President could sequester those funds. He has not done so because Germany is not at war with the United States—because the administration in control in Germany is, of course, recognized by our Secretary of State, our representative in foreign relations. Therefore, nothing has been done.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not asking the Senator to commit himself on this matter. I should like to observe in passing that it strikes me that we ought not wait for a condition of warfare to exist between the United States and Germany in order to feel justified, as a matter of the national defense and protection of our country, in taking action that would secure the collection of our claims against Germany. The relationship between the United States and Germany being that of debtor and creditor, no matter how peaceful the relations may be, it seems to me that when this country is appropriating $7,000,000,000 for national defense it would be justified in taking such action as may be available to it for the collection of its claims against Germany.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further moment?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I had not quite finished my answer. I will say that that is a matter of governmental policy. The President now has power to sequester such funds. We have given him that power, and he may exercise it. Up to this moment he has not done so.

I say to the Senator from Vermont that the bill does nothing more than to say to the Secretary of State that if a dispute arises as to who is the accredited representative of the German Government—and now I am talking about German funds—the Federal Reserve banks and all other banks of the insured-bank system of the United States may rely upon the determination by the Secretary of State as to who is the accredited representative of that Government.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator now has concluded that part of his answer, has he not?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; and I understand that the Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that there is a very great difference between the situation which is in the mind of the Senator from Vermont and that which is reached by the bill.

In the former case, under the act of May 7, 1940, we may sequester and hold in this country any German funds in this country. We may hold here credit balances, certificates of indebtedness, and certificates of ownership. We may hold all their property here. However, that is on the theory—and it is perfectly lawful—that when foreign capital comes to this country to be deposited here, we become trustees for the funds of such foreign depoistors. It should be understood, and the Senator from Vermont will know, that such funds are absolutely at our mercy. We may pass any domestic legislation we choose with regard to them. We may release the funds if we choose. We may put them in a hole at Fort Knox if we choose. We may order them held to answer any claims as to which we give rights of action, if we choose.

However, Mr. President, that is not the situation presented by this bill. This bill, quite the contrary from saying that the trusteed funds are to be held to answer to American claims, says that the agent of the foreign government may take them and spend them in any way he chooses. We have no control over when, where, or how he spends them; and that is exactly where the question of American integrity would arise if this proposed legislation should be passed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator from Connecticut misapprehends the character of these deposits. These moneys belong to the governments of the various foreign nations.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator insert in his statement "or to the central banks"?

Mr. BROWN. In the case of the central banks, they are governmental banks.

What would be the attitude of a South American country, such as the Argentine Republic, or Brazil, or even of a country in Asia, such as China, Japan, or Turkey, or of a European country which has not been occupied by the German Army? The people of those countries have faith and confidence in the United States. They deposited their funds here, not for the purpose of paying their creditors in the United States, not for the purpose of having here a fund against which claims of citizens of the United States might be asserted. They deposited them here in the same way the Senator from Connecticut deposits a sum of money in a national bank in his home city.

There is a certain moral responsibility that we have. That moral responsibility is that the person who is lawfully entitled to the fund may control it. All that we attempt to do in this bill is to say that when any reasonable dispute arises regarding the ownership of such a fund our Department of State shall determine who is the owner of the fund, or, at least, who is the person in control of the fund. I do not for a moment concede that in such a case we have any sovereignty in the sense that we may turn the money over to ourselves, or turn it over to some other person who is not entitled to it. Our position is that of a banker. We hold these funds, but we hold them for the foreign nations. We say that because Holland, Belgium, and certain other countries have been overrun, and possibly because puppet governments may have been set up in

them, and because we are uncertain as to who is the proper owner, we will hold these funds.

In the instances in which there are established governments, those governments are entitled to their money. They are entitled to the use of it. The Government of France is entitled to the use of its money for the purpose of buying in the United States food with which to feed the starving people of France, and with which to clothe them. There is an established government in France, and we recognize it.

So, I hope the Senator will try to consider the moral situation, the right that these people have to the control of their own funds. As I say, it is not a sum of money with which we may do what we will. It is money that belongs to the people of foreign nations. If we take the attitude that we may put that money where we will, then I say to the Senator, that in the future foreign governments will not have much confidence in the integrity of the Government of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to address my remarks to the Senator from Michigan. Is it not actually inherent in the function and responsibility of a trustee—and that is what the Government intended to be, as I understand, in taking over these funds—to see that the funds are finally delivered to the rightful owner of the funds?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct, particularly about the sequestered funds.

Mr. CONNALLY. If one puts his money in a bank, the bank does not have the right to call on the neighborhood and ask who has a claim against the account and then adjudicate the claim, but the bank holds the funds subject to any adjudication by a court as to the rightful ownership, and there is no authority in a bank or a trustee to adjudicate claims to such funds.

Mr. BROWN. None whatsoever.

Mr. CONNALLY. Since my concept of this bill is that it does not deprive our citizens of any right they now have to proceed in the courts as they have always proceeded heretofore, I do not see how the Senator from Connecticut can take the position he now takes.

Mr. BROWN. A citizen could apply to the court for a writ of garnishment, which would be the practice in my State, just as well after this bill is passed as before.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the way I view it.

Mr. BROWN. We are talking about funds, I will say to the Senator from Texas, that are not sequestered; they are funds that are open now to being discharged upon the signature of somebody, and this bill merely determines or places upon the Secretary of State the right to determine who that somebody is.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to speak with reference to the point made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will not the Senator let me say a word first?

Mr. DANAHER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the analogy he pointed out earlier in the debate as to our action in the case of the Alien Property Custodian does not apply here at all. In that case we were dealing with alien enemy property under the law of the Nation, and we had a perfect right, if we desired to do it, to confiscate every dollar of it and put it in our pockets. We did not do that; we held it and administered it, and that was in the exercise of power in the case of a belligerent enemy.

Mr. DANAHER. Let us get the Senator from Texas straight right there. It is true we were talking about a war power; it is true we were talking about an alien enemy under the Alien Property trusteeship; it is true als that the Senator from Vermont was talking about the status of German funds in this country, and we were not at all discussing the right of claimants other than Germany. At that particular moment we were limiting the discussion, as, at least, I tried to limit it, to the purpose the Senator from Vermont had in mind when he raised the question as to just what Germany's status would be at the present time when our entire effort is being directed against Germany. That was the purport, surely, of the question of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, it is said that the right of access to our courts would not be affected by this bill. Let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when this question was before us at a previous time when Senate bill 4174 last year was pending it expressly provided on page 2, line 18:

> No Federal Reserve bank shall be subject to any suit or other proceeding in any court in its own name or in the name of any of its officers, directors, agents, or employees as a consequence of any action taken by such bank, or with respect to any property disposed of, in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

I omit a few words.

> No court shall have jurisdiction to restrain or enjoin a Federal Reserve bank from making any payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of property in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

That was the very objective of the bill then before the Senate; that is the very objective of the bill now pending; and an examination of the report accompanying the bill at the top of page 2, will disclose this statement:

> In such circumstances disputes may arise as to who has authority to withdraw or otherwise deal with such deposits or such earmarked gold; and the Federal Reserve banks may find themselves confronted with situations in which they must either make payments or deliveries at their peril or refuse to make payments or deliveries until the disputes can be settled by litigation or otherwise.

Mr. President, what is really sought to be done is to permit the Federal Reserve banks to make payments without resort to the courts and without the delay involved in settling disputes by litigation.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator knows that one of the reasons why the bill to which he has referred was not enacted was the very language which was in the bill pending last summer. That language has been stricken from this bill. The Senator will probably remember that at the hearing the Senator from Michigan questioned the constitutionality of that provision in the original bill, and when it reached the floor of the Senate much was said about that. The senior Senator from Georgia seriously questioned it, and when the bill got back into the committee it was decided to strike out that language. There is a conclusive presumption, which is established by the determination of the Secretary of State, but the Senator can find no language in the bill which ousts the court of jurisdiction, and can find express language in the bill with reference to what particular court shall have jurisdiction in the event of operations concerning a private bank.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the bill expressly states that not only must suit be brought in the district courts but it gives the district courts the exclusive jurisdiction of claims, and states, in effect, that in any such suit or claim coming before the court all the Federal Reserve bank has to do is to show a copy of this proposed act, and then read to the court a statement from the Secretary of State that the payment or disposition of the property has conclusively been made to the right person. Consequently the bill says:

> The payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such Federal Reserve bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of the Federal Reserve bank for or with respect to such property.

It is idle to say that the Federal Reserve banks would be liable to a claimant. The only reason they want the bill is so that they will not be liable on any claim. When the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan say that the United States, with reference to the funds of foreign governments or of central banks thereof stands as a trustee they are right, for that is just what we are. We are a trustee and, as a nation, we are bound to that degree of integrity which goes with the assumption of a trusteeship and to maintain and hold the funds and property of foreign nationals, either of foreign governments or of their central banks, under the terms and conditions under which they were sent to this country, in the first place, and not to make them payable once they are here to somebody else; not to make them payable to somebody the Secretary of State says is the right person, because he in turn has told the Secretary, "I intend to do such and such with the funds," and the Secretary says, "That is a laudable purpose and you can get the funds." When the agent so accredited and recognized gets the funds from the Fed-

eral Reserve bank, the Federal Reserve bank will never be liable if another should later turn up and say that he was the proper claimant, even if he really is. I submit that, under existing law, not only are these funds safeguarded, because transfer can be prohibited, but it actually regulates the transfer of the funds, and such transfers as are proper can be made. That law is adequate for all substantial purposes, and is consonant with the law of nations.

It would impugn the faith and integrity of the United States as trustee, and it would impugn the status of the depositors' funds in our control to make those funds subject to whatever control the agent accredited by the Secretary of State wishes to exercise over them.

I submit that that would be an inequitable and unjust result; and, above all, impolitic. I also say that when the people of the United States are being called upon to pay $7,000,000,000, as they were by our vote on Monday last, to bail out other countries from the control of aggressors—and it was a proper result, the policy having been so decided by the Congress—now to let these very same countries take all the funds they have in our possession and remove them beyond our control—is an impolitic and unwise decision for the Congress to make, and we should not even entertain such a proposition.

I have said as much as I choose to say on the subject. I think the bill should be defeated.

CONTROL OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate very briefly on the question of strikes, which I think today constitute a great menace to our preparedness program.

It is becoming increasingly evident that strikes in vital war industries must be dealt with sternly and firmly. Our national welfare demands immediate action to control unnecessary strikes which are now preventing the mobilization of our industrial resources to give aid to England and to carry out our own preparedness program. We cannot compromise any longer with interruptions in the colossal task we have set out to perform.

In this hour of national peril what is the supreme obligation of an American citizen to his country—to this country that has given to generations of Americans in the past and, I pray God, will give to all future generations, more peace, more happiness, more contentment than have ever before been enjoyed by the citizens of any great nation? Our supreme obligation today is to prepare ourselves to make this country so invincible and so strong as to overwhelm any attack that may be made upon us and at the same time to continue to give aid in greater and greater amount to Great Britain.

We may pass a dozen lend-lease bills, but the huge task to which this country has set its hand cannot be accomplished without total sacrifice on the part of our citizens. Those who pay taxes must sacrifice by paying heavier and heavier taxes. Industry and businessmen must make their contribution by devoting their industrial output, when necessary, to essential war equipment at the expense of their normal business. Then, too, we must have no war profiteers in this emergency. Our boys must sacrifice by training for military service. Those who labor must sacrifice by working longer hours on defense projects, and not interrupt those hours by unnecessary strikes. We can tolerate no bottlenecks in our program of total preparedness.

We must first recognize that no nation has ever successfully accomplished military preparedness by working 40 hours a week. We have before us the tragic fate of France. France worked 40 hours a week and Germany worked under her totalitarian government as much as 80 hours a week. The result was that France was overwhelmed by the most stupendous military machine and military equipment the world has ever known. In the face of the fall of France, 3 months later we reduced our work-week to 40 hours. Our industry is geared in the main to a 40-hour week, with, of course, some exceptions; but even this short work-week is being interrupted by continuing new strikes in vital industries.

In the month of March it is estimated that 500,000 man-days will be lost by strikes in defense industries, and lost irreparably at a time when every hour and every minute count, and when the Nation is being unified and keyed to quick action in a colossal effort to meet and overcome conditions which endanger our country.

Labor has its proper privileges. I want justice done to every laboring man; but interruptions of work caused by bickerings and jealousies among unions should not be tolerated at the expense of the security of our Republic. I know of nothing more indefensible than the character of the strike which held up for days the air defense at the Army Air Corps Wright Field in Dayton, Ohio. This strike was denounced by the War Department as being for reasons too trivial to justify any interruption. The only reason assigned for it was that the regular workmen belonging to the A. F. of L. objected to working with five men engaged on subelectrical contracts who belonged to the C. I. O. union. It is fantastic that our defense program should be held up even for 1 minute for such a petty reason. If there is one class in which strikes are least justified, it is that of the semiskilled workmen engaged in building the Army camps and other defense projects. Laborers who cannot be classed as skilled workmen frequently receive as much in 1 week as a drafted boy receives in 6 months. Such a condition creates an understandable discontent among those who are making the sacrifice of military service at the call of their country.

I believe in the right of labor to collective bargaining. I know the vast majority of American workmen are patriotic to the heart, and do not countenance the willful acts of a small minority; but for the good of America and for the credit of labor, defense strikes must be stopped, and stopped quickly.

The Mediation Board appointed by the President has no power to act. It has no power even to investigate strikes unless a certification is first made by the Secretary of Labor. It is impotent to deal with any situation, no matter how grave, unless first requested to do so by the Secretary of Labor. The new Board appointed by the President met to organize. Photographs were taken and much publicity was given to the meeting; but the Board found that it had nothing to do, as the Secretary of Labor—who happens now to be sojourning in New Mexico—has not seen fit to certify a single strike for investigation and mediation by the Board.

There are 25 strikes today in vital war industries. Some have been in progress for months. The Allis-Chalmers strike is on its seventieth day and affects such vital war equipment as electrical equipment for steel expansion, electrical equipment for aluminum, and equipment for synthetic rubber, which is directly affecting the Navy's destroyer program, when destroyers today are the most vital of all war equipment.

If Secretary Perkins is not willing to certify to the Mediation Board that any of these strikes should be investigated, at a time when the strike crisis has become so dangerous to our welfare as to impel William S. Knudsen, Director of the Office of Production Management, and Secretary Frank Knox to demand publicly that this strike be immediately settled, when, I ask, will the Secretary of Labor act?

Recalling that the Secretary of Labor never found cause to disapprove of sit-down strikes, is it reasonable to wonder whether the Dykstra board ever will be allowed to proceed to its proper functions?

It was humiliating to me to read this morning of the impotence of the new Board as admitted in the reply made by Chairman Dykstra to Governor James, of Pennsylvania, who asked the National Defense Mediation Board to intervene in the strike at the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant. Chairman Dykstra said:

> Your telegram received. We share with you deep concern for a speedy and equitable settlement of the strike now affecting the plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co., at Bethlehem. This Board can take up cases under the President's order only when certified by the Secretary of Labor.
>
> We are advised that the Federal and State conciliation services are at this moment working earnestly and cooperatively to bring about an early and equitable settlement of this strike. We are watching closely every development, as we realize how essential it is to our national-defense program that this unfortunate situation be quickly adjusted.

When new strikes are in immediate prospect, and old strikes are being continued, without promise of settlement, the Mediation Board has adjourned until April 10; and why? Simply because it has nothing to do, as the Secretary of Labor has refused to certify to the Mediation Board that any existing strikes should be investigated; and this notwithstanding the fact that the efforts of the Labor Department to mediate such strikes have failed after weeks and months of effort.

It is, of course, true that even if strikes are certified by the Secretary of Labor to the new Mediation Board, it has no power to act, and can only make, under the terms of the Executive order, "reasonable efforts to adjust and settle any such controversy or dispute by assisting the parties thereto to negotiate agreements for that purpose."

Immediately when the Mediation Board met, the Secretary of Labor should have certified to the Board the strikes which the mediation efforts of the Labor Department had failed to settle and which were seriously affecting our defense program. As Miss Perkins has refused to act up to this time, what assurance can be given that she will act in the future?

In the meantime there is a tragic loss of time in giving aid to Great Britain—aid which the country is demanding; aid which the Congress of the United States has directed should be given in unstinted measure.

What Congress should do and must do quickly is to vest the Mediation Board with full power to investigate the strike situation throughout the country, to endeavor to prevent strikes before they occur, and then to give the Board authority to enforce its own decisions. Until this is done, we have only the hope of an aroused public opinion to prevent the continued strikes in vital defense industries, but this public opinion, although now aroused throughout the length and breadth of America, has been impotent to force those who are responsible for the strikes to abandon their purposes and work for the common good of our Republic. And I say this with equal reference to industry and to labor, whichever may be responsible for this tragic delay in our preparedness program.

It is a farce that in this time of national peril a board should be created without power even to investigate unless some other agency of the Government first allows it to do so, and then, even after such certification is made, the new board has no power to enforce its own decisions except that of persuasion, which has already been tried and failed.

Political considerations should today be forgotten; the Congress should act with promptness and courage to meet this menace which has arisen to our security and welfare. This is no time to hide behind the cloak of a public act which the people of America are told is designed to accomplish a given purpose, and then refuse to give the agency created the power and authority to accomplish that purpose.

Not only should the interruption of essential defense work by strikes be investigated, but there should also be an investigation of what appears to be the unreasonable and illegal imposition of excessive charges for membership in unions before any American can obtain work in the construction of Army camps and other projects.

It has been shown in detail by reliable newspapers, and not denied, that at Fort Meade the labor unions have exacted the sum of $400,000 from those who have applied for work on this important defense project. Unless those who have applied have paid the fees charged and fixed by the union, then the work has been denied them. A similar situation exists in the construction of all other camps and projects throughout the country. The total of such exactions by labor unions from free Americans who are asking to give their labor to their Government for defense, and to give it quickly, will be many times in excess of this $400,000, and may run into the millions. It follows, of course, that such payments to labor unions will inevitably increase the cost of such construction, and will ultimately fall upon the taxpayers.

It has been asserted, and likewise not denied, that the necessity of obtaining a union card before being permitted to work on Government projects has delayed the construction of these camps, because men who are vitally needed could not be employed. At Camp Meade, for example, the unions were able to furnish from existing memberships only a small percentage of the carpenters required. Yet competent carpenters who were not union members were denied employment unless they first paid the excessive fees and assumed union membership. So the question there and at other camps is not as to whether there are available union men for such work, but whether other Americans must be forced to join the union against their will in order to obtain this work.

I have asked Secretary Stimson for a full and complete report, so far as he can give it, of the fees being charged by the unions before a person can obtain work on defense projects; whether employment is denied to free Americans until and unless such fees have been paid, regardless of the skill and ability of the applicant to perform the duties for which he has applied; and then to what extent the exaction of the payment of such fees has increased the cost of such projects, and caused a delay in the completion of the work.

Yesterday I addressed the following letter to the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
March 26, 1941.

The Honorable HENRY L. STIMSON,
The Secretary of War.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received many complaints with respect to large fees having been charged by the unions to workmen who apply for employment in the construction of Army camps. I am told that not only has the payment of these fees placed an unreasonable burden upon the applicants but that the necessity of obtaining the approval of the union has delayed the construction of the Army camps.

I assume the War Department has made an investigation of this condition, and I would thank you to send me as full a report as possible of the following:

1. The amount of the fees that are being charged by the unions.

2. Under what authority an American citizen is refused work in a time of crisis for the construction of an Army camp unless he first pays tribute to a union.

3. To what extent the exaction of the payment of such fees has increased the cost of these projects, and to what extent has there been a delay caused by this requirement.

I would thank you further to advise me as to the method of contracting for the construction of such Army projects—whether the construction is done on a cost-plus basis, and what protection is given the War Department to prevent extravagances and unnecessary expenditures on the part of the contractor.

With best wishes, I am,
Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

GOVERNMENTAL FINANCING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Monday I caused to be introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by myself indicating why I would vote against the $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill. The reasons I assigned briefly were these:

First. The President's failure to inform the Congress as to what steps he is taking to secure collateral security for the property, credits, and so forth, to be loaned or sold to Britain.

Second. The fact that the appropriations were not backed up by a realistic tax program.

Third. The utter lack of any disposition on the part of the managers of Government to cut down on nondefense items.

Fourth. The careless manner in which the people's money is being spent in this defense program.

Fifth. The power to appropriate has become synonymous with the "must" requests or dictates of the Chief Executive.

I said on that occasion that billions do not grow on berry bushes. There will be further requests for billions, and unless the people of the country wake up we will be heading for the "last roundup."

Mr. President, when you and I were boys there was a school reader which had in it a very graphic portrayal of a man in a canoe on Niagara River. He sailed carelessly down with the current of the stream and paid no attention to the shouts from the shore warning that the falls were below. Individual after individual called to him to head for the shore, but he said he had enough time—that he would carry on with the current.

I have forgotten the name of the reader; I have forgotten the name of the author of the article; but I have not forgotten how the tale ended. Finally, when the careless and lackadaisical canoeist awoke to the reality of the situation, it was too late. With his paddle he turned the canoe and attempted to make for the shore, but the swift current carried him over Niagara Falls into the foaming abyss below.

Mr. President, it is not with any sense of pessimism or defeatism that I make these remarks. I said last Monday that if the President had seen fit, in presenting this measure, to assure the Congress that the funds to be loaned or leased would be collateralized, and if the President or the Congress had suggested a realistic tax measure, and if there had been any disposition on the part of the managers of Government to cut down on nondefense items and stop the loose handling of the people's billions, then I should have been glad to vote for the appropriation.

Mr. President, the Congress has appropriated in less than 3 months about $16,500,000,000.

In Philadelphia last Monday, I stated this fact to a group of taxpayers. What I said did not seem to register. But sitting right next to me was the mayor of Philadelphia, and I turned to him and said, "Mr. Mayor, what is the assessment of your city of Philadelphia?" He replied, "The assessment of the personal and real property of Philadelphia is about $2,000,000,000." Then I said to the group that in the last 3 months Congress had appropriated a sum equal to eight Philadelphias. Then the people began to understand. And I say, Mr. President, there are not eight Philadelphias in this great Nation of ours.

Yes; we shall have appropriated in 3 months over $16,500,000,000. I checked the assessment of my State, and the figures given to me showed that the real and personal property of the great State of Wisconsin had an assessed valuation, which is every bit equal to the real value of $4,353,000,000. In the last 3 months—in fact in less than 3 months—we have appropriated approximately four Wisconsins, and do not forget that Wisconsin is in the upper class of States in this Nation.

Mr. President, if the administration and the supporters of the lease-lend bill meant what they said when the bill was debated before the country, to wit, that this was a "defense bill," and that the $7,000,000,000 voted the other day was "for defensive measures," then in Heaven's name why are not the supporters of the legislation logical, why do they not stop, look, and listen? Why do they not listen to the warning voices from the shore? We have been appropriating this year at the rate of five and one-half billion dollars a month—a month, mind you—and as I have shown, that is a billion and one-half dollars more than all the State of Wisconsin is worth, and we spend four Wisconsins in 3 months.

It has been stated that most of the defense projects and material will cost the people of this country from 100 percent to 200 percent more than was paid for the same material in the last war. Yet, under the mesmeric influence of the great crusading phrase that we are the "arsenal for democracies"—that we are going to the aid of democracies everywhere—the people are lulled into such a condition that they forget there is a pay day, that up ahead there is a niagara.

Because of these vast appropriations, I suggested in my remarks Monday the advisability of Congress passing a tax bill. I am not in favor of taxing the people of this country more, but the way to cut taxes is to cut spending. So long as we keep on spending we will have either taxes or financial chaos, postponement by borrowing. When we appropriate sixteen and a half billion dollars in less than 3 months, we must do something or go over the falls into the abyss as the canoe did.

Last Monday I suggested—and I suggest again—the necessity of a realistic tax bill. Secretary Morgenthau is not suggesting a tax bill; he is suggesting the sale of five or six billion dollars' worth of bonds a year. That is not even a palliative. Not because I want taxes but because it is either taxes or chaos, I suggested a tax bill, one that would hurt, one that would bring the people of this country up short to a realization of what was happening. I suggested a tax bill, first, lowering the exemptions for married and unmarried persons; second, increasing the tax rate; third, increasing the defense tax; fourth, appropriating to the Treasury of the United States, as Britain has, for the period of the defense emergency, all the individual net incomes over a certain amount. That should be determined after study and deliberation.

Mr. President, I was happy to hear the distinguished Senator from Virginia say today that there should be no war profits. In Britain every individual who has an income over $20,000 pays the balance into the Exchequer. Britain has levied a 100-percent war-profits tax. Why? Because the British are fighting for their lives, for their existence. We talked here for 3 weeks about the lend-lease bill, and the whole argument was that our national life was at stake; that we were in a great defensive endeavor, preparing to save country and home.

I ask again, if the majority are in earnest that the lend-lease bill and the $7,000,000,000 appropriated for defense measures represent a defense program, then why not frame a tax bill that will save the country from going over the brink?

There are two ways for America to go down. One is to be taken over by a foreign power, as happened to Poland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland, and France. We are preparing, we hope, against such a possibility or eventuality. But what we do not realize is that there is a second way for this country to go to pieces. We are blind to it. While we sit here under the mesmeric spell of words, thinking in terms of repelling attack, we forget that we can go to pieces on the economic rocks. This second way is for us to muddle our own affairs, close our eyes to realities, and by our own neglect create such a condition during or after the present world crisis as would result in our dropping into the financial abyss below.

This is a time to tighten our financial belts, strengthen our morale, and toughen the fiber of our physical, mental, spiritual, and financial being.

Mr. President, Secretary Morgenthau talks about raising five or six billion dollars by selling bonds, going into debt. Have we not the courage to tax ourselves so we will pay at least the ordinary expenses of government and make a dent in the defense program? Will there ever be a time when the American people will be better able to pay taxes? Is it not better to tax the income of the people now and maintain the principal intact? At the rate we are going, unless we have the courage and foresight and common sense to introduce a tax measure along the lines I have suggested, we may wind up in debt two hundred or more billion dollars.

We expect to go into the red this year between ten and fifteen billion dollars; in the previous 7 years we have gone into the red on an average of three and a half billion dollars each year; and if we keep appropriating at the rate of five or six billion dollars a month or more we shall go about twenty-five billion dollars in the red this year. Then how long will it take us to come to a total debt of two hundred billion dollars. When we come to a total debt of two hundred billion dollars we have come to a debt representing half the valuation of this country. How would we be able to meet the interest charges on such a debt?

Some say that such a tremendous debt is not possible. But it is not impossible, considering the attitude of the managers of Government, considering their appeasing ideas, considering their internal appeasement policy—appeasement of racketeers in every stratum of our society. One was defined here today by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. All over this land, because Government is an appeaser, because it does not dare to face reality, we are approaching a situation when, I suppose, all at once, it will be the sentiment of the people that steps should be taken to restrict organized labor. Of course, labor is not 100 percent clean. On the other hand, Government is not 100 percent clean. Had the Government had sufficient intestinal fortitude to do what it should have done, had it believed that we were engaged in a preparedness program, in a defense program, it would not have appeased. It would have said what I have heard Senators say here on the floor of the Senate. "We mean to protect America, to build her strong, to save her." Instead of that, this internal and infernal appeasing has gone on, with the result that the Government in some instances is paying more for what it gets, and the defense of the Nation is put in jeopardy.

What is needed now is realistic leadership, not pussyfooting tactics. By appeasing the racketeers it is permitting its defense program to slacken, and the safety of the country to be endangered.

Certainly no one should complain if he should be called upon to pay a war-profits tax which will operate to keep his capital intact. Such a tax is in effect in England.

The other day I was speaking to a tax expert in relation to this matter. He said, "We are facing realities, or destruction." He also said, "In Great Britain there is a tax of every cent over a $20,000 income." That means that if a man has, say, $3,000,000 in investments or in properties, and has a net income of $100,000, the British Government gets $80,000 of it. He still has $20,000 to live on. He is not hurt; and what is more, by that process his $3,000,000 is kept intact. But the same government taxes a man with a $2,000 income to the extent of about $400. When it does so it lowers the level of living for that man. However, the standard of living of the man who has $20,000 left is not lowered. I am mentioning this simply as an illustration of what Britain is doing in its defense.

We must think these things through. That is why I am so insistent. We come here with a lease-lend bill, make great speeches, and get the country all "het up." We appropriate $16,500,000,000 in

3 months, and still we go on appropriating and dissipating wealth. Let us learn something from the great British people whom we are trying to aid. They are ready to dig down. Furthermore, they are keeping their capital intact. But if we are to follow the wishy-washy, weak-kneed policy of lending and spending and lending and spending, without taxing, before long we shall run into an era which will call for more than statesmanship. Our social and economic order will be broken up. I do not want to see such a condition. If this is a defense program, a defense of our great American freedoms and our economic values—if we believe that, then those who have, should pay. They receive the greatest advantage. Their economic values are being preserved and kept intact. With respect to those who have not, their great freedoms are kept intact, as well as the freedoms of those who have material values.

The people are ready. The Congress should frame a new tax bill. This is the sentiment of a recent editorial which I read in the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Defense Taxes—No Fooling!" which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

DEFENSE TAXES—NO FOOLING

Work on Federal tax legislation for 1941 will begin sometime after April 1, announces ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee. Just why the subject should be associated with April Fools' Day is not clear; certainly it is not going to be any subject for levity this year, and the intelligent citizen is not fooling himself into thinking that defense can be had without being paid for.

The talk, according to Washington reports, is of new taxes to add $1,500,000,000 to the present scale of collections. This is not enough.

President Roosevelt, if one recalls his Budget message in January, estimated that revenue from present taxes, not counting social-security taxes, will amount to $8,275,000,000 in the fiscal year 1941–42. This would be less than half the governmental expenditures then expected, and prospective outlays for defense and aid to Britain already have been revised strongly upward.

Even after collecting on an increased national income all the taxes now on the books, the United States will incur a deficit somewhere in excess of $10,000,000,000—to be added to the already unprecedented national debt. Is it not possible in larger measure to pay cash for the materials of defense, instead of charging the bill to future generations?

The National Economy League thinks so, and proposed a new special tax of 10 percent on all income to pay for defense. Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, believes that to raise the total of all Federal, State, and local taxation to 25 percent of the national income, as compared with 22 percent a few years ago, would meet the bill. Dr. O. M. W. Sprague, widely known Harvard economist, favors increased taxes on liquors, tobacco, amusements, luxury clothes, tea, coffee, soft drinks, and gasoline.

Possibly even more significant than the opinions of experts is the indication that the people themselves are ready for taxation. Internal-revenue collectors report that the response in income-tax payments, with the 10-percent defense tax included, has been more prompt and willing this year than ever. A Gallup poll 2 months ago found that 51 percent of those interviewed favored an income tax for defense to be levied on every family in the Nation except the destitute. Only 41 percent opposed and 8 percent were undecided.

The people are more ready to face the facts of the situation than politicians may suppose. There is no need to wait to get appropriations through first; people know appropriations mean taxes. Moreover, they are aware that to pay as much as possible instead of borrowing will help keep down war inflation, will fasten attention on more effective spending, will leave a smaller bill after the war is over, and will reduce the severity of post-war readjustments.

The people are ready. The best counsel that can be given to Congress about taxation is simply, "Get at it."

CONTROL OF STRIKES AFFECTING DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have sent a telegram, which I shall read, to the Honorable Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor. I sent it to the address of Secretary Perkins, in Washington, and I am attempting to ascertain her address in New Mexico, where I understand she is at this time, so that immediate consideration may be given to my request.

The telegram is as follows:

As the National Mediation Board has no power even to investigate any strike situation unless first certified by you, as Secretary of Labor, may I ask you upon my responsibility as a United States Senator deeply concerned because of the interruption of our defense program by strikes, that you immediately certify to the National Mediation Board all strikes affecting our defense program where your own conciliation efforts have been so far unavailing. I want to impress upon you that time is of the essence and that no delay must occur in prompt action to prevent strikes, both present and future, from interrupting aid to Great Britain and our own defense program.

HARRY F. BYRD.

FOREIGN ACCOUNTS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 390) relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Byrd	Gillette
Aiken	Byrnes	Glass
Andrews	Capper	Green
Austin	Caraway	Gurney
Bailey	Chavez	Hayden
Bankhead	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Barkley	Connally	Holman
Bridges	Danaher	Hughes
Brooks	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Brown	Downey	La Follette
Bulow	Ellender	Langer
Burton	George	Lee
Butler	Gerry	McKellar
McNary	Reynolds	Tobey
Maloney	Russell	Tunnell
Murdock	Schwartz	Tydings
Murray	Sheppard	Vandenberg
Norris	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Nye	Smathers	Wallgren
O'Mahoney	Smith	Wheeler
Overton	Stewart	White
Pepper	Thomas, Idaho	Wiley
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Reed	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 390) was passed.

REVENUES AND FINANCIAL STANDING OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of March 25, 1941, by Hon. David E. Lilienthal, one of the Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, concerning the operations of that Authority—the financial operations, the power revenues, and the like—for the first 8 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The figures, which have just become available, I think will be found of intense interest by every Member of the Senate, because this subject has so frequently come before the Senate. The figures are tremendously interesting and instructive. I call the attention of all Senators to them, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., March 25, 1941.

The Honorable KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: Some time ago, while I was in your office, you indicated an interest in having available the current figures showing the progress of the T. V. A. with particular reference to revenues and financial standing. I am taking this opportunity, in response to your request, to write you at some length, adding also some information about the navigation and fertilizer programs.

As to power revenues, the figures for the first 8 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, have just become available, and they are very encouraging. As compared with the same period during the fiscal year 1940, there has been an increase of 36 percent in both total sales of electric power and in power revenues. Through February 28, the T. V. A. sold more than 3,230,000,000 kilowatt-hours and revenues had amounted to $13,483,200. Revenues have been increasing month by month and in February exceeded $1,900,000.

As to the financial soundness of the T. V. A. power program, I believe you will be interested in statements of Mr. E. L. Kohler, comptroller of the Authority, in a radio discussion here a few weeks ago. In this discussion, it was pointed out that T. V. A. disbursements since its establishment to the end of the current fiscal year (June 30, 1941) will total about $450,000,000, three hundred and thirty-five million obtained from Congress, sixty-five

million from bond issues, and roughly fifty million from power revenues and other sources. Mr. Kohler was asked, "How much of this total of $450,000,000 will the Authority recover from income of future years?" Mr. Kohler's reply:

"This is a fair question, and it deserves a careful answer. If the power which can be produced at the Authority's generating plants during the next 40 or 50 years can be sold at the present average wholesale price, which is something over 4 mills per kilowatt-hour, the answer is that all of it will be recovered. * * * As you have indicated, fifty million of this total of four hundred and fifty million—more than 10 percent of what the Authority will ultimately spend—has already come back in the form of sales of power. In addition to this recovery of cash outlay, there should be enough left over to represent some sort of an interest return on the investment."

At a later point in the broadcast Mr. Kohler said that it was accurate to say that "this huge regional experiment * * * is a completely self-liquidating project, which will cost the taxpayers of the Nation nothing."

The Authority is selling all the power available at the present time and, as you know, is speeding up its construction program and building new projects to provide additional supplies of power. The industrial demand for power has been stimulated by the national-defense effort, and the Authority's direct sales to large industries in the 8-month period have totaled 1,133,859,000 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 60 percent over the same period in the previous fiscal year. Revenues have increased 73 percent, to $4,655,000. The Aluminum Co. of America, manufacturing one of the vital materials for production of airplanes, has increased its energy purchases by 50 percent, to 692,358,500 as compared to the previous year, and revenues to the Authority have increased 80 percent, to $3,315,000 for the 8-month period. As you know, the Authority is supplying power directly to several other electrochemical and electrometallurgical plants, whose products are important in defense. Municipalities and cooperatives distributing T. V. A. power also supply T. V. A. electricity to industrial plants.

Energy sales of the Authority to municipalities and cooperative associations for the 8 months totaled 1,458,000,000 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 37 percent over the same 8 months a year before. Revenues from these sales totaled more than $6,500,000, an increase of 36 percent. A part of this increase, of course, is accounted for by the fact that the T. E. P. properties were not taken over until August 16, 1939, and service to these customers is reflected only in 6½ months of the 8-month period ending February 29, 1940.

Another indication of the increased distribution of T. V. A. power is obtained by a comparison of figures for December 1940 with December 1939, of the energy distributed under T. V. A. resale rates mainly by municipalities and cooperative associations. Total sales of power in December 1940 were 174,129,000 kilowatt-hours, as compared to 140,229,000 kilowatt-hours for the previous December. Revenues increased 21 percent, from $1,904,000 to $2,297,000. During the 12 months ending with December 1940, distribution of T. V. A. power by these agencies to 427,390 customers brought revenues of more than $24,700,000.

The Authority's installed capacity in its major generating plants has been increased to 1,049,600 kilowatts by the installation of two new units of 32,400 kilowatts each at Wheeler Dam in January and March. As you know, privately owned utilities in this area, even before the requirements of national defense were felt, had commenced to build additional generating plants to meet their increasing loads. The output of the more than half a million kilowatts of new capacity provided by the T. V. A. in this region has been absorbed. The Authority, in order to provide additional power for defense, is constructing Cherokee Dam and Watts Bar steam plant on an emergency schedule to make their output available in 1942. The Authority is planning, even before the plant has been completed, to increase the capacity at the Watts Bar steam station from 120,000 kilowatts to 180,000 kilowatts by addition of a third unit.

It is interesting to note the vast increase in the production of power that has occurred in this area during recent years as compared to the Nation as a whole. Recent figures of the Federal Power Commission show that during 1940 more than 9,049,000,000 kilowatt-hours were produced in Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia, an increase of 123 percent over the 4,044,000,000 kilowatt-hours produced in 1929. In the Nation, the increase over the same period of years has been from 95,925,000,000 to 144,965,000,000, or 52 percent. The increase in production of electricity has been of great benefit to the coal industry in this area, 1,345,000 tons of coal having been consumed in producing electricity in 1940 as compared to 344,000 tons in 1929, and 128,000 tons in 1933.

The operation of the multipurpose system is also proving valuable to navigation, although the channel is as yet incomplete. Traffic on the Tennessee is increasing; a total of 431,000 tons, excluding sand and gravel, having been transported during 1940, as compared to 408,000 tons in 1939. Including sand and gravel shipments, which were affected to an unusual degree last year by the Authority's construction operations, the totals were 2,169,000 tons for 1940, as compared to 1,115,000 tons in 1939. In addition to shipments of gasoline and grain, which appeared on the river during the last 2 years for the first time, transportation of automobiles by water from Evansville, Ind., to points on the Tennessee commenced last December, and more than 600 cars have been carried in five shipments so far. A tow carrying 1,300 tons of soda ash from Lake Charles, La., is expected to enter the Tennessee this week en route to the new Reynolds Metals Co. aluminum plant near Muscle Shoals.

Another activity of the Authority, research and demonstration in the field of phosphate fertilizers, has assumed a new importance in relation to national defense within recent months. The British Purchasing Commission has recently asked that this country supply 40,000 tons of concentrated phosphate fertilizers such as T. V. A. has produced at the Muscle Shoals plant to fortify the soil in its war effort. The demand for concentrated forms of fertilizer, with 45 percent plant food, as compared to the usual commercial phosphates of 18 to 20 percent plant food, is apparent since less than half the number of bottoms is needed to transport the same amount of material. This same economy in bagging, handling, and transportation is of vital importance also in reducing the cost of fertilizer to American farmers. The Authority is about to commence construction of a new electric furnace at the Muscle Shoals plant to increase its production capacity from 100,000 to 150,000 tons annually. This new installation will help to meet the serious shortage of concentrated phosphates which has developed in the United States during the past few years as a result of the demand created through education and demonstration programs of Federal, State, and educational agencies. It will also be of value in continuing the research and demonstration program carried on by the Authority in cooperation with other agencies relating to the use of phosphates in conserving soil fertility and placing United States agriculture on a sound and permanent basis.

I have written you at considerable length because I feel that you will be much interested in these latest developments in the T. V. A. program, as it relates both to the problems of the Tennessee Valley area and of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
DAVID E. LILIENTHAL, *Director*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

WILLIAM F. KLIEWE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of William F. Kliewe, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Office appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. BREWSTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 239) to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases was announced as first in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TESTS OF COTTON SAMPLES

The bill (S. 1088) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the next bill on the calendar, House bill 568, is identical with Senate bill 1088. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill in lieu of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 568) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him, was considered, ordered to

a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1088 is indefinitely postponed.

RALPH C. HARDY AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 941) for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, R. J. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the words "amount of," to strike out "$328.74" and insert "$328.75"; in line 10, after the word "against," to strike out the initials "R. J." and insert the initials "J. T."; and on page 2, section 2, line 17, after the word "said", to strike out the initials "R. J." and insert the initials "J. T."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claims of the United States against Ralph C. Hardy, formerly a traffic rate examiner, National Bituminous Coal Commission, in the amount of $328.75; against William W. Addis, formerly a traffic rate examiner, National Bituminous Coal Commission, in the amount of $328.75; against E. F. Goudelock, formerly a traffic rate examiner, National Bituminous Coal Commission, in the amount of $271.90; against J. T. Polk, formerly a traffic rate examiner, National Bituminous Coal Commission, in the amount of $328.75; and against C. H. Seaman, formerly a traffic rate examiner, National Bituminous Coal Commission, in the amount of $328.75, resulting from the fact that payments of per diem and other nonpersonal expenses to each of the above-named persons authorized by the National Bituminous Coal Commission in accordance with the terms of his employment were subsequently disallowed by the General Accounting Office, are hereby canceled; and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby directed to allow credit in the accounts of the disbursing officer for the payments so made.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said William W. Addis the sum of $328.75, to the said Ralph C. Hardy the sum of $125, to the said J. T. Polk the sum of $328.75, and to the said C. H. Seaman the sum of $328.75, which sums have heretofore been paid to the United States by such persons in partial or complete liquidation of the respective claims of the United States against such persons canceled by section 1 of this act, or have been deducted by the United States when making payment of other claims of said persons against the United States.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount provided for in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, J. T. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock."

HARRY J. WILLIAMS

The bill (S. 529) for the relief of Harry J. Williams was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry J. Williams, of West Townsend, Mass., the sum of $87.30, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for the value of certain tools owned by him which were lost when the office building of the Civilian Conservation Corps camp at South Lee, Mass., was destroyed by a fire on February 23, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HELEN LOUISE GILES

The bill (H. R. 1370) for the relief of Helen Louise Giles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. J. B. EDGAR, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 596) for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$716.01", and insert "$555.51", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. B. Edgar, Jr., of Memphis, Tenn., a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, the sum of $555.51 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement to him of expenses incurred as a result of medical treatment and hospitalization for disability incurred in line of duty in the United States Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAROLINE JANES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1064) for the relief of Caroline Janes, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the article "the", to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury"; in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000 in settlement of claims on account of" and insert "$702, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for"; at the beginning of line 9, to insert "suffered"; in line 10, after the word "at", to strike out "Willoughby" and insert "Wickliffe"; and at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Caroline Janes, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $702, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered as a result of an accident involving an Army truck, at Wickliffe, Ohio, on September 14, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM A. WHEELER

The bill (S. 1104) for the relief of William A. Wheeler, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William A. Wheeler, of Hurricane, W. Va., the sum of $600 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for injuries suffered when acting on May 8, 1939, as a volunteer fire fighter in an explosion of a kerosene tank on a Works Progress Administration road project in attempting to save property endangered by the explosion: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MARY MADELINE ZWALINSKI AND ILENE MARY ZWALINSKI

The bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES P. MELICAN

The bill (H. R. 3001) for the relief of James P. Melican, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. PAUL ROGER ZAHLMANN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1077) for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $51, to Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann, of New Haven, Conn., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment for professional services rendered to Charles Huelsman, an employee of the Work Projects Administration, who sustained injuries while

engaged in the performance of his duties as such an employee: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

M. F. O'DONNELL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2998) for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator who is in charge of the bill will answer a question or two with reference to it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] reported the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, who is familiar with the bill, and, no doubt, has given it especial attention, whether or not, in view of the size of the amount claimed, there was any protection to the Government against losses by way of a security bond or some fiduciary bond?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; there was not in this instance. The losses which were suffered in this case resulted from a burglary for which the postmaster was not in any manner responsible. I presume, since there are so many post offices scattered throughout the Nation, that it is best for the Government to carry its own insurance.

Mr. DANAHER. Directing again the Senator's attention to the bill, actually all it does is to authorize the credit of the account of the postmaster with the sum in question?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is all. The major portion of the amount consisted of stamps which were stolen from the vaults of the post office.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY L. MUNT

The bill (H. R. 2999) for the relief of Henry L. Munt, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. FELIX BELANGER

The Senate proceeed to consider the bill (S. 305) for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,414.50" and insert "$2,914.50", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Felix Belanger, of Billings, Mont., the sum of $2,914.50, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as the result of being struck by a revolving door at the United States Post Office in Billings, Mont., on November 4, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONROE SHORT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 317) for the relief of Monroe Short, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Monroe Short, of Wise County, Va., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for the deaths of his sons, Kermit Short and Victor Short, who were killed on June 9, 1939, as the result of being struck by a bolt of lightning which was carried to the house of the said Monroe Short, a local fire warden, by unconnected telephone wires installed by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps, such wires not having been grounded: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 218) to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who reported the bill and is necessarily absent, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

PROCEEDS FROM SALE OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 994) to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other disposition of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to prevent depletion of stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of June 7, 1939 (ch. 190, 53 Stat. 812; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 50, sec. 98e), is amended by adding at the end thereof a sentence as follows: "Any funds heretofore or hereafter received on account of sales or other dispositions of materials under the provisions of this act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of any appropriation available at the time of such deposit, for carrying out the provisions of sections 1 to 6, inclusive, of this act."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the bill merely proposes an amendment to the Strategic Materials Act so as to make it possible to use as a revolving fund the proceds which are received from the sale of material that has been placed on the stock piles under the provision of the Strategic Materials Act. The proposed amendment is consistent with the act. The amendment is necessary if the stock piles are to be preserved. The theory of the act itself provided for a revolving fund in the case of perishable commodities and perishable materials, but, as to those materials which were not perishable, the original bill did not provide for a revolving fund. Since an emergency was deemed to have existed, since a request was made for the use of some of the tungsten which had been accumulated at a stock pile, since now the receipts from the sale of that material are being returned, and since the stock piles should be preserved, the amendment has been asked for. The amendment, I repeat, is consistent with the original act, and should be adopted.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. How much is in the fund made up of the several appropriations which have been made for strategic material purchases?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As I recall, the Strategic Materials Act carried an authorization of a hundred million dollars, and I believe to date there have been approximately $15,000,000 regularly appropriated. Whether other funds have been assigned for the purchase of strategic materials, I do not know.

Mr. ADAMS. This bill in its present form would make a permanent revolving fund; it would take entirely out of the control of Congress the $100,000,000, and it never would go back into the Treasury, but it would be in the hands of the Department continually and they could buy and sell and the money would go back into the fund and not into the Treasury?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true; but the outside figure would always be the money actually appropriated for the purchase of these materials. It might be actually more if they received more money for the materials than they paid for them, but the revolving fund is controlled, in its outside limits, by the original authorization, and, then, of course, by the appropriations from time to time.

Mr. ADAMS. But the Senator says if they invested a hundred million dollars and sold material for $200,000,000, they would have a revolving fund of $200,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Does not the Senator think there ought to be some termination to this revolving fund by lapse of time or by the happening of some event?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Since the Senator from Utah insisted upon an amendment to the lend-and-spend bill putting a limit on the revolving fund there, of course, he would have to say that there should be some limit. As a matter of fact, there is a limit here, a limit which comes from the natural consequence of conditions. The purpose of the original act was to create a stock pile; the idea was that the stock pile should be used only during emergencies, and the limit on the size of the stock pile was to be determined by the appropriations of Congress. The idea of the act is that the stock pile shall remain constant. Therefore, a limitation is probably properly provided. The materials in the stock pile, however, shall be constant except for emergency purposes, and the idea of the original bill is that materials shall always be available for emergency purposes.

Mr. ADAMS. Without any recourse to Congress or any responsibility to Congress?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That would be true so far as the stock pile is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUDSON RIVER BRIDGE, MECHANICVILLE-SCHAGHTICOKE, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 537) granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE, NEW HARMONY, IND.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 324) to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the necessity for the passage of this bill, please?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that I know a little about the bill. It was introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], was very thoroughly considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, and several amendments were made, so that the bill was entirely satisfactory to the War Department and the Federal Works Agency. We placed a limitation upon the price which may be paid, which was somewhat below the original proposed purchase price. We think we worked the matter out to the satisfaction of everyone concerned, and I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that due to a limitation—I think contained in an option—I will ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] if my recollection is right——

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. There is a date of April 15 which is a deadline on this matter. I assure the Senator from Connecticut that we in the committee, at least, feel that we made a very satisfactory arrangement. The purpose of the bill is to enable a county in the State of Illinois to purchase the bridge from a private corporation. Included also is the power to purchase a small ferry line which is competing with the bridge and operating within a mile, I believe, of the two bridgeheads. The bridge crosses the Wabash River. The Senator from Illinois sat with the committee, and we were in constant touch with the Government departments involved, and think we have evolved a fairly satisfactory bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator explain, if he pleases, how it is that we are purporting to authorize a county within the State of Illinois to exercise the right of eminent domain, for example, in the acquisition of additional property?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that since I have had some contact with the bridge question in both the House and the Senate, I have always wondered just what rights the Federal Government had in this respect, because, as I understand the situation, the only interest of the Federal Government is in the question whether the bridge is an impediment to navigation; but before the Department approves the bills sent to them for consideration they often have required—and it may be desirable that they do—various amendments, and apparently set up in themselves authority, at least acting through the Congress, to make dispositions which they conceive to be in the public interest.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator bear with me for another moment?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator understand that the White County Bridge Commission is to be permanent in nature?

Mr. BROWN. I understand that the bonds which will raise the money to purchase the bridge will be paid in 20 years, and that at the end of that time the bridge will become toll free and will become the property of the county.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like not to have time run against this discussion for just another inquiry, while I call to the Senator's attention the fact that I personally have not seen in the bill any language which says that the bridge will ever become toll free.

Mr. BROWN. It is in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. It is? I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in section 1, page 2, line 10, after the word "within", to strike out "fifteen miles" and insert "one mile," so as to make the section read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the White County Bridge Commission (hereinafter created and hereinafter referred to as the "commission") and its successors and assigns be, and is hereby, authorized to acquire, by purchase or otherwise, from its owners, and to maintain and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River at or near the city of New Harmony, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled, "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act. For like purposes said commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to acquire, maintain, and operate all or any ferries across the Wabash River within 1 mile of said bridge, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 3, line 23, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "thirty years from their respective dates" and insert "twenty years from the date of approval of this Act"; on page 4, line 13, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty-five"; and on page 5, line 22, the word "thereof", to insert *"Provided,* That the cost of acquisition of said bridge and approaches and approach highways, and ferry, shall not exceed the sum of $945,000", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge as may be acquired and its approaches (including any approach highways which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and such ferry or ferries as may be acquired and the necessary land, easements, and appurtenances thereto by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest at the rate of not more than 6 percent per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds and any premium to be paid for retirement thereof before maturity shall be payable solely from the sinking fund provided in accordance with this act and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of such bridge and its approaches. Such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be in such form not inconsistent with this act, shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 20 years from the date of approval of this act, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine. The commission may repurchase and may reserve the right to redeem all or any of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices, not exceeding 105 percent of the principal amount thereof and accrued interest, as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. The commission, when it deems it to the best interest of the commission, may issue refunding bonds to repurchase and redeem any outstanding bonds, before the maturity thereof, which it may issue: *Provided,* That the refunding bonds shall mature at such time or times, not exceeding 25 years from date of approval of this act, as the commission may determine. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bond or

trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect of the maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge and/or the ferry or ferries, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

Said bonds shall be sold in such manner and at such time or times and at such price as the commission may determine, but no such sale shall be made at a price so low as to require the payment of more than 6-percent interest on the money received therefor, computed with relation to the absolute maturity of the bonds in accordance with standard tables of bond values, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge and its approaches and the land, easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, and in the event the ferry or ferries are to be acquired, also the cost of such ferry or ferries and the lands, easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith. The cost of the bridge and approaches and approach highways, and ferry or ferries, shall be deemed to include all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying, and other expenses incident to the acquisition of the bridge or the acquisition of the ferry or ferries, and the acquisition of the necessary property, and incident to the financing thereof: *Provided*, That the cost of acquisition of said bridge and approaches and approach highways, and ferry, shall not exceed the sum of $945,000. If the proceeds of the bonds issued shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the sinking fund hereinafter provided. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates with or without coupons of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, page 10, line 13, after the words "of the", to strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "Federal Works Administrator"; in line 23, after the words "by the", to strike out "Chief of the Bureau" and insert "Commissioner"; and in the same line, after the words "Public Roads", to strike out "of the Department of Agriculture", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act, there is hereby created the White County Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession; may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or other property and apply same to the purposes of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

The commission shall consist of Julius C. Kern, Jennings F. Marlin, and J. Madison Pomeroy, all of Carmi, Ill. Such commission shall be a body corporate and politic. Each member of the commission shall qualify within 30 days after the approval of this act by filing in the office of the Federal Works Administrator an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this act, and each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in like manner within 30 days after his appointment. Any vacancy occurring in said commission by reason of failure to qualify as above provided, or by reason of death or resignation, shall be filled by the Secretary of Agriculture. Before the issuance of bonds as hereinabove provided, each member of the commission shall give such bond as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Public Roads conditioned upon the faithful performance of all duties required by this act. The cost of such bonds shall be deemed an operating expense of the commission. The commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from its members, and may establish rules and regulations for the government of its own business. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 12, line 5, after the words "order of the", to strike out "Chief of the Bureau" and insert "Commissioner", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. The commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the commission shall be entitled to compensation for their services, but the maximum compensation of the chairman in any year shall not exceed $1,200 and of each other member in any year shall not exceed $600. The members of the commission shall also be entitled to receive traveling-expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the commission. The commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorney, and other such experts, assistants, and employees as they may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon shall have been paid and all other obligations of the commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payment shall have been made as hereinbefore provided, and after the bridge shall have been conveyed to the Illinois interests and the Indiana interests as herein provided, and any ferry or ferries shall have been sold, the commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the Commissioner of Public Roads made upon his own initiative or upon application of the commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a public hearing in the city of Carmi, Ill., notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once, at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in the city of Carmi. At the time of such dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the commission shall be divided into two equal parts, one of which shall be paid to said Illinois interests and the other to said Indiana interests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 13, page 14, line 13, after the word "tolls", to strike out "or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the commission, in its discretion, shall have power at any time to sell, transfer, and convey such bridge and approaches thereto either to the State of Illinois or the State of Indiana, or to any public agency, or any political subdivision of either of such States within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly: *Provided, however*, That if such bridge shall be sold, transferred, and conveyed to the States or public agencies or political subdivisions thereof or to either of them, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same, and after a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. In the event of the acquisition of such bridge pursuant to the provisions of this section, an accurate record of the amount paid for the acquisition of the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. No such sale, transfer, or conveyance shall be made except for a consideration sufficient to enable the commission to retire all of its outstanding bonds and obligations and unless prior to or simultaneously with such sale, transfer, and conveyance all outstanding bonds of the commission shall be called for redemption and moneys sufficient to effect such redemption deposited and irrevocably pledged for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO RULE VIII—CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

The resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the resolution go over.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the majority leader has suggested to me that he would like to have the resolution go over. I desire, however, to say a word by way of explanation; and I hope the majority leader will be willing at an early date to have the resolution taken up, if not upon the call of the calendar, at some other time. It is a resolution for the purpose of making in fact the passage of bills by unanimous consent what it is intended that it should be.

What is intended is that in order to expedite business, if there is no objection to a bill, it shall go through promptly; but, on the other hand, we know that frequently bills are passed through the Senate as if there were no objection, as if they had unanimous consent, when objections to the bill exist and are known to exist. The resolution provides that if

a Member of the Senate wishes to place upon the record his objection to a bill, so that it becomes a matter of record, the bill cannot pass by unanimous consent; it will not pass some day when the Senator happens to be sick or absent from the Chamber; so that if any Member has a definite objection to a bill and is willing to sponsor his objection upon the record, thereafter the bill shall not be passed by so-called unanimous consent when it is known that there are objections to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to state in that connection that I asked that the resolution go over because it has just been reported. It proposes an amendment to the rules with reference to the procedure when bills on the calendar are under consideration by unanimous consent. I do not know that I oppose the resolution, but I wish to look into it and see what effect it will have upon the passage of bills. Under the resolution, as I read it, any Senator who objects to a bill may file a written objection and then go off and stay indefinitely, and until he withdraws his objection it will never be possible to take up the bill except on motion. That may be all right, and it may be that the Senate will want to do that; but I should like to look into the resolution before we do it.

For that reason I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over on objection. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

INSPECTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS IN COAL MINES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with an amendment, in section 9, page 8, line 2, after the words "Provided, however," to strike out ", That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors any inspector employed shall be an accredited mining engineer or the equivalent thereto with the basic qualification of five years' practical experience in the mining of coal" and insert "That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors any inspector employed shall be a person with a basic qualification of five years' practical experience in the mining of coal", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil-service laws, such officers and employees as he may deem requisite for the administration of this act; to fix, subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the compensation of officers and employees so appointed; and to prescribe the powers, duties, and responsibilities of all officers and employees engaged in the administration of this act: *Provided, however,* That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors any inspector employed shall be a person with a basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal; and in detailing coal-mine inspectors to the inspection and investigation of individual mines, due consideration shall be given to their previous practical experience in the work of mining coal in the State, district, or region where such inspections are to be made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 935) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to commodity loans and marketing quotas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS

The bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I had expected and hoped to bring the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill to the attention of the Senate today. There are, however, several provisions in the bill which have created the intensest interest; some Senators who are interested in the measure are absent; and upon conference it has been agreed that we shall postpone the consideration of the bill for 2 weeks. I wish to give notice to the Senate that at the end of 2 weeks I shall insist upon the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GLASS. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Upon discussing the matter with the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who probably will have the bill in charge, we agreed upon 2 weeks from next Monday as the date for taking up for consideration the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

Mr. GLASS. That is perfectly satisfactory to me, except that I should like to have the bill disposed of.

Mr. McNARY. That is the understanding.

CORN AND WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act)—

(1) Within 30 days after the date of the issuance of a proclamation provided for in section 322 (c) of the act or of a proclamation provided for in section 335 (a) of the act, relating to marketing quotas for corn or wheat, as the case may be, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of the farmers who would be subject to such marketing quotas to determine whether such farmers are (a) in favor of marketing quotas for the crop of the commodity harvested during the then current calendar year and also for the next consecutive crop or (b) in favor of marketing quotas only for the crop of the commodity harvested during the then current calendar year or (c) opposed to marketing quotas.

(2) The Secretary shall proclaim the results of each referendum on corn or wheat within 20 days after the date thereof. If two-thirds of the farmers voting in the referendum favor marketing quotas for the aforesaid two crops of the commodity, marketing quotas shall continue in effect for the crop of the commodity harvested in the calendar year then current and, without a further referendum, marketing quotas shall be in effect for the next consecutive crop of the commodity, unless the supply of the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year for such crop is less than that which requires marketing quotas under the act. If less than two-thirds of the farmers voting in the referendum vote in favor of marketing quotas for two crops, but the number of farmers voting in favor of marketing quotas for two crops, plus the number voting in favor of marketing quotas for one crop only, represents two-thirds or more of the farmers voting in the referendum, then marketing quotas shall be in effect for the crop of the commodity harvested during the then current calendar year. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum oppose marketing quotas, then marketing quotas for the crop harvested in the then current calendar year shall not be in effect, but a referendum on marketing quotas may be held, in accordance with the act and this resolution, for any crop or crops harvested in any subsequent calendar year or years. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in any such referendum oppose marketing quotas for corn or wheat, as the case may be, no loan pursuant to section 302 of the act with respect to such commodity will be made during the period from the date on which the results of the referendum are proclaimed by the Secretary until the beginning of the second succeeding marketing year for such commodity. The results of the referendum shall not limit the availability or renewal of any loan previously made.

(3) The farm marketing quota under the act for any crop of corn or wheat shall be actual production of the acreage planted to the commodity on the farm, less the normal production or the actual production, whichever is the smaller, of that acreage planted to the commodity on the farm which is in excess of the farm-acreage allotment for the commodity. The normal production, or the actual production, whichever is the smaller, of such excess acreage is hereinafter called the "farm marketing excess" of corn or wheat, as the case may be. The Secretary shall issue regulations under which the farm marketing excess of the commodity for the farm may be stored or delivered to him. "Actual production" of any number of acres of corn or wheat on a farm means the actual average yield of corn or wheat, as the case may be, for the farm times such number of acres.

(4) The producer shall be subject to a penalty of 30 cents per bushel of corn and 50 cents per bushel of wheat on the farm marketing excess of the commodity. The farm marketing excess shall be regarded as available for marketing, and the penalty and the storage or delivery amount for the commodity shall be computed upon the normal production of the excess acreage. Unless the farm marketing excess is stored or delivered to the Secretary, the penalty computed as aforesaid shall be paid by the producer immediately upon failure so to store or deliver. Any corn or wheat delivered to the Secretary hereunder shall become the property of the

United States and shall be disposed of by the Secretary for relief purposes in the United States or in foreign countries or in such other manner as he shall determine will divert it from the normal channels of trade and commerce. Where, upon the application of the producer for an adjustment of penalty or of storage, it is satisfactorily shown to the Secretary that the actual production of the excess acreage is less than the normal production thereof, the difference between the amount of the penalty or storage as computed upon the basis of normal production and as computed upon the basis of actual production shall be returned to or allowed the producer.

(5) Until the producers on any farm store, deliver to the Secretary, or pay the penalty on, the farm-marketing excess of any crop of corn or wheat, the entire crop of corn or wheat, as the case may be, produced on the farm shall be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for the amount of the penalty.

(6) The penalty upon corn or wheat stored shall be paid by the producer at the time, and to the extent, of any depletion in the amount of the commodity so stored, except depletion resulting from some cause beyond the control of the producer.

(7) Whenever the planted acreage of the then current crop of corn or wheat on any farm is less than the farm-acreage allotment for such commodity, the total amount of the commodity from any previous crops required to be stored in order to postpone or avoid payment of penalty shall be reduced by that amount which is equal to the normal production of the number of acres by which the farm-acreage allotment exceeds the planted acreage. The provisions of section 326 (c) of the act shall be applicable also to wheat.

(8) A farm marketing quota shall not be applicable to any farm on which the acreage planted to corn or wheat is not in excess of 15 acres. The marketing penalty shall not be applicable to any farm which, under the terms of the then current agricultural conservation program formulated under sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is classified as a nonallotment farm if the acreage of corn or wheat harvested on such nonallotment farm is not in excess of 15 acres or the acreage allotment for the farm, whichever is larger. If the acreage of corn or wheat harvested on any such nonallotment farm is in excess of 15 acres and in excess of such acreage allotment, the normal production or the actual production, whichever is the smaller, of the acreage harvested in excess of 15 acres or such acreage allotment, whichever is larger, shall be taken as the farm marketing excess and shall be subject to penalty: *Provided*, That there shall be no penalty on wheat grown on any such nonallotment farm from which no wheat is sold if the acreage of wheat harvested on such farm does not exceed such acreage per family living thereon as may be used for home consumption without reducing the payment with respect to the farm under the then current agricultural conservation program.

(9) Until the farm marketing excess of corn or wheat, as the case may be, is stored or delivered to the Secretary or the penalty thereon is paid, each bushel of the commodity produced on the farm which is sold by the producer to any person within the United States shall be subject to the penalty of 30 cents a bushel for corn and 50 cents a bushel for wheat. Such penalty shall be paid by the buyer, who may deduct an amount equivalent to the penalty from the price paid to the producer.

(10) Sections 301 (b) (6), 323 (b), and 335 (d) of the act, as amended, shall continue in full force and effect, and all other provisions of the act, as amended, relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas shall continue in effect insofar as not inconsistent with any provision of this joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was not present when this joint resolution was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I should like to have a statement from the chairman of the committee as to the purpose of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the joint resolution was drawn by the Department, and there was some language which was not easily understandable. The Department asked to have the joint resolution returned to them, and it was returned. They then wrote it in such language that it was absolutely acceptable to the committee.

As the measure now stands, the referendum is clearly up to the farmers on the question whether there shall be a quota for 1 or 2 years, or no quota at all. That is clearly set forth in the joint resolution. If the farmers vote for 2-year quotas, and the current crop is not sufficient to justify quotas for the next year, there will be no quota.

The joint resolution also provides that those who do not raise in excess of 15 acres of corn or wheat shall not be subject to any of the penalties provided. The penalties are 30 cents for corn and 50 cents for wheat on acreage in excess of their normal yield. In my opinion, the matter is absolutely subject to the action of the farmers themselves.

Mr. McNARY. What increase in penalty is applicable to wheat growers?

Mr. SMITH. No increase at all.

Mr. McNARY. I think there is some increase.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean an increase over the previous provision?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. As the joint resolution came from the Department it provided for a penalty of 40 cents as to corn and 50 cents as to wheat. I think originally the penalty was 15 cents in each case.

Mr. McNARY. I am sure of that; but what is the provision in the pending measure? I have not the joint resolution before me, and should like to know what penalty is provided as to wheat.

Mr. SMITH. Fifty cents.

Mr. McNARY. Fifty cents a bushel?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; and 30 cents as to corn.

Mr. McNARY. It does not apply to any producer who has under cultivation 15 acres only or less?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar is completed.

DISCHARGE OR RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate recur to order of business 65, Senate bill 239.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that Senate bill 239 was considered and passed on March 17 and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], and agreed to. Is there objection to recurring to the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 239) to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to say to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that I have looked into the matter to which he referred when the bill was before the Senate recently, as to the probable cost involved. The War Department estimates that the cost for the first year will be $40,000, and probably $... 5 or 6 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senator from Texas for his great courtesy, at the time of the previous call of the calendar, in voluntarily himself withholding action on the bill because of my previous objection. That was typical of his fair play and his sportsmanship.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under the statement which the Senator now makes regarding the bill, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having previously been engrossed and read the third time, the question is on its passage.

The bill was passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBMISSION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session the committees of the Senate be authorized to make reports upon legislation or nominations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think that should be limited to appropriation bills. That was formerly the practice. As to legislative bills, at times no information is given as to the contents.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my request last Monday I included all committees because one or two committees had taken action but the reports had not been prepared. I have no objection to the limitation of this request to the Committee on Appropriations. I have no information about any other committee being ready to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING BILLS AND RECEIVING MESSAGES DURING RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Vice President be authorized to sign any enrolled bills ready for signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have been asked by Senators what the program in the Senate is to be during the

next week or so. It was announced in this morning's newspapers, and I was told privately, that beginning about next Thursday or Friday the House of Representatives will take a recess, under a "gentleman's agreement," for about 10 days. I am not able to say now whether the Senate can enter into any such arrangement as that. We hope to dispose of the agricultural appropriation bill on Monday, and an additional supplemental appropriation bill. If we do that, in all likelihood, no other appropriation bill will be ready for consideration next week. There is on the calendar a bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the so-called parity bill. I have not been spoken to by anyone interested in the bill as to when it should be taken up, and therefore I am not able to give the Senate any information about it. But so far as appropriation bills are concerned, the only two which will be ready for consideration next week are the two which will be reported and taken up Monday. Whether the other bill to which I have referred, or any other proposed legislation of any importance, will arise at any time next week, I am not able to say today, but I think I will be able to make an announcement on that subject Monday.

Mr. SMITH. What is the bill to which the Senator is referring?

Mr. BARKLEY. One is the agricultural appropriation bill and the other is a supplemental appropriation bill.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 5, and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 21 to 35, inclusive, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$165,380,000: *Provided*, That the $1,500,000 transferred hereby from the amount available for 'Pay, subsistence, clothing (and repair thereof), transportation, and hospitalization of enrollees' and thereby made available for expenditure for other expenses of the Civilian Conservation Corps shall continue available until June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That of the funds hereby transferred not more than $75,000 may be used for new repair shops, including equipment therefor"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1942, $2,225,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum allocated for expenditure in connection with the control and prevention of spread of the white-fringed beetle shall be used in any State without the request of the Governor of such State"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville transmission system: For an additional amount for construction, operation, and maintenance, including the same objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, to remain available until expended, $1,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury may enter into contracts for an amount not in excess of $500,000 in connection with five of such tenders to meet contingencies arising under escalator clauses in contracts for such tenders which relate to increased costs of labor and material,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That concludes the calendar.

AGREEMENT AS TO USE AND OPERATION OF NAVAL BASES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, we find on our desks today a message from the President of the United States, from which it appears that the President has transmitted to the Congress a copy of an agreement which was signed in London, March 27, 1941. Is that agreement on file?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message was laid before the Senate this morning, the present occupant of the chair is informed.

Mr. DANAHER. Is the agreement on file in the office of the Secretary of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27 (legislative day, March 24), 1941

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Fred H. Bond, Stephens.

CONNECTICUT

James J. Slattery, Norwalk.

FLORIDA

Louis Goldstein, Fernandina.
Ethel L. Hadsock, Newberry.
Thelma M. Houghton, Port Orange.

ILLINOIS

William A. Schulke, Riverton.

INDIANA

William Wert, Marion.
Udell Smith, New Palestine.
Ivan Dale Watson, Russiaville.

IOWA

Henry W. Graichen, Amana.
Martin O'Connell, Vail.
Jeanette L. Lee, Ventura.
Mary Catherine Winnike, West Point.

MAINE

Ernest C. Libby, Yarmouth.

MICHIGAN

Noah H. Viau, Cheboygan.
Wayne C. Uckele, Erie.
Earl Hudson, Gobles.
William Bonek, Suttons Bay.
William H. Stickel, White Pigeon

MONTANA

Odin H. Blockhus, Big Sandy.
Edwin E. Sykes, Ekalaka.
Ethel H. Burchak, Stanford.

NEBRASKA

Lester H. Andersen, Naper.
Fred W. Schuman, Osceola.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Wallace D. Jones, Meriden.

NEW YORK

William O. Wiley, Cape Vincent.
Edward L. Coon, Chittenango.
Blanche C. Randall, Hilton.

NORTH DAKOTA

Henry R. Wohl, Anamoose.
Emil R. Christensen, Drake.

OHIO

Harry R. Shipman, Orwell.

OKLAHOMA

W. Blanche Lucas, Ponca City.

OREGON

Ruth I. Lyons, Lyons.
Raymond D. Hewitt, Troutdale.

PENNSYLVANIA

Seth Jay Morley, Athens.
Mary Brumbaugh, Brockway.

PUERTO RICO

Antonio Esteves, Aguadilla.

TENNESSEE

Henry E. Hudson, Whitwell.

TEXAS

Albert L. Logan, Marfa.
David C. Harris, Mineral Wells.

UTAH

David S. Betts, North Salt Lake.

VIRGINIA

Rachel E. Dance, Ettrick.

WASHINGTON

John H. Thompson, Midway.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob Simpson Payton, assistant editor of the Christian Advocate, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou great lawgiver, whose statutes are changeless and whose love is unfailing, we bow in recognition of Thy great goodness.

As we recall Thy favor visited upon our Nation in bygone days we realize that it was because our fathers trusted in Thee that they were not confounded. When the nights were starless, Thou didst light the way with Thy pillar of fire, and when the days offered confusing paths Thou didst give direction by The guiding cloud.

In this the time of our Nation's testing may these Thy servants turn to Thee for guidance. Above all voices of hatred and pride, of despair and alarm with which the times are made clamorous, may they hear Thy age-old voice bidding them and all mankind seek the things that make for peace.

May the wisdom which is from above direct the deliberations of the day.

We offer our prayer in the name of Jesus Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EXEMPTION FROM INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3835) to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that on many of the materials we are now shipping to Great Britain for the construction of landing fields they are charging us duty. Is there anything in this bill that would cause us to relinquish the right to charge duties against those who come to our shores from Great Britain?

Mr. DOUGHTON. This has nothing whatever to do with tariffs or duties. This deals entirely with internal-revenue taxes. It has no relation whatever to tariffs or customs duties.

Mr. RICH. This refers to taxes on articles that come into this country?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It refers to articles for the personal or official use of consular agents and employees from foreign states which give our consular agents and employees similar treatment. It is an entirely reciprocal arrangement.

Mr. RICH. Are they unable to drink the liquors we manufacture here, or do they not like them?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am not familiar with that. I will take the gentleman's word for that.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this is merely a courtesy which is also extended to our consular officers in the foreign service.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. It involves nothing more than $1,000 in revenue.

Mr. STEFAN. We are returning a courtesy to them. I believe the bill should be passed without any argument.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They extend similar courtesies and exemptions to our consular employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 38 of subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding a new section thereto as follows:

"SEC. 3801A. Exemption of consular officers and employees of foreign states from payment of internal-revenue taxes on imported articles.

"(a) Rule of exemption: No internal-revenue tax shall be imposed with respect to articles imported by a consular officer of a foreign state or by an employee of a consulate of a foreign state whether such articles accompany the officer or employee to his post in the United States, its insular possessions, or the Panama Canal Zone, or are imported by him at any time during the exercise of his functions therein, if—

"(1) such officer or employee is a national of the state appointing him and not engaged in any profession, business, or trade within the territory specified in subsection (a);

"(2) the articles are imported by the officer or employee for his personal or official use; and

"(3) the foreign state grants an equivalent exemption to corresponding officers or employees of the Government of the United States stationed in such foreign state.

"(b) Certificate by Secretary of State: The Secretary of State shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the names of the foreign states which grant an equivalent exemption to the consular officers or employees of the Government of the United States stationed in such foreign states."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is minor in character. I have consulted with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] about it. It in no way changes the purpose or the provisions of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOUGHTON: On page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by renumbering section 3802 as section 3803 and by inserting after section 3801 the following new section:"

On page 1, line 6, strike out "3801A" and insert in lieu thereof "3802."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 157, providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3835, was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—USE AND OPERATION OF LEASED NAVAL AND AIR BASES (H. DOC. NO. 158)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 3, 1940, I transmitted for the information of the Congress notes exchanged between the British Ambassador at Washington and the Secretary of State on the preceding day, under which this Government acquired the right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland and in the islands of Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, and Antigua, and in British Guiana. I now transmit for the information of the Congress a copy of an agreement for the use and operation of these bases, which was signed in London on March 27, 1941, together with the notes exchanged in connection therewith. These bases are for American defense against attack and their construction is consistent with such defense. International developments since my message to the Congress of September 3 last have emphasized the value to the Western Hemisphere of these outposts of security.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 27, 1941.*

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a full report, and there

is no controversy about it. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered as having been read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 5, and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 21 to 35, inclusive, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$165,380,000: *Provided*, That the $1,500,000 transferred hereby from the amount available for 'Pay, subsistence, clothing (and repair thereof), transportation, and hospitalization of enrollees' and thereby made available for expenditure for other expenses of the Civilian Conservation Corps shall continue available until June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That of the funds hereby transferred not more than $75,000 may be used for new repair shops, including equipment therefor"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1942, $2,225,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum allocated for expenditure in connection with the control and prevention of spread of the white-fringed beetle shall be used in any State without the request of the Governor of such State"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville transmission system: For an additional amount for construction, operation, and maintenance, including the same objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, to remain available until expended, $1,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury may enter into contracts for an amount not in excess of $500,000 in connection with five of such tenders to meet contingencies arising under escalator clauses in contracts for such tenders which relate to increased costs of labor and material,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Appropriates $10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for payment to the widow of the late Senator Pittman.

No. 2: Strikes out the appropriation of $50,000, inserted by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Board of Investigation and Research.

No. 3: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, language in the House bill which is a duplication of legislation contained at another point in the House bill.

No. 4: Transfers $1,500,000, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,000,000 as proposed by the House, from the allocation "Pay, etc., of enrollees", Civilian Conservation Corps, to the allocation "Other expenses" of such corps, and limits the amount that may be expended from such transferred funds for new repair shops to $75,000 instead of $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 5: Strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, changing the method of allocation by States of funds of the National Youth Administration for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Nos. 6, 7, and 8: Inserts appropriations totalling $245,000 for an additional school building and site and an additional school building site in southeast Washington to expedite construction of school facilities to meet congested and inadequate classroom accommodations.

No. 9: Appropriates $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for national forest protection and management.

No. 10: Appropriates $2,225,000, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, for control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, but eliminates any allocation in the appropriation language for any particular insect pest.

No. 11: Appropriates $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Bonneville Transmission system, modified so as to eliminate the language of the Senate limiting such sum to certain specific purposes.

No. 12: Appropriates $28,500, as proposed by the Senate, to defray a deficit in the treasury of the municipality of Saint Croix, Virgin Islands.

No. 13: Makes $29,000 of existing funds for salaries of the Wages and Hours Division available for miscellaneous expenses of such division, as proposed by the House, instead of $45,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 14 and 15: Appropriates $1,057.50, as proposed by the Senate, for payment of claims for damages by Naval vessels certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

Nos. 16 and 17: Makes a transposition of the location of an appropriation in the House bill without changing the amount, language, or purpose of the House item involved.

No. 18: Appropriates $37,500, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of the Department of State.

No. 19: Appropriates $457,800, as proposed by the Senate instead of $89,800 as proposed by the House, for emergency construction, Coast Guard, to provide $368,000 for construction of a hospital and classroom building at the Coast Guard Academy.

No. 20: Accepts the provision, inserted by the Senate, permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into contracts, in addition to the amount appropriated, in the amount of $500,000 in connection with the procurement of five lighthouse tenders by the Coast Guard.

Nos. 21 to 35, inclusive: Appropriates for the payment of judgments, claims certified by the General Accounting Office, and claims certified by heads of departments, all in accordance with existing law and all under budget estimates transmitted after the bill had passed the House.

C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is a conference report on the deficiency bill. The items in disagreement were not so very large. There was finally an item involving $1,000,000 for additions to the Bonneville power plant, which we were told was exclusively for the production of aluminum. Is that the way the gentleman understands it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. TABER. The other items were rather minor in amount, and they were compromised or the Senate receded.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman give us the total amount that is now in the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. One hundred and ninety-one million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. How is it that all the money that is now being spent for Bonneville is supposed to be for the manufacture of aluminum? I thought the original idea was that the power was to be furnished to the municipalities for the benefit of all the people living in the Northwest. Is the power there to be used now for the making of aluminum?

Mr. TABER. There are some of us who feel that extraordinary expenditures at Bonneville should not be made at this time; that no development with reference to the furnishing of power to individuals or private manufacturing concerns should be made, but that all the power should be used as it is developed for what the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense believes is needed for the manufacture of aluminum.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This $1,000,000 is for transmission lines to the aluminum plant.

Mr. TABER. That is it, exactly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a telegram received by me this morning, as follows:

BEAVER FALLS, PA.

LEWIS E. GRAHAM,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Starting with the 3 o'clock shift today a picket line was formed around our plant to prevent the employees from going to work. This has resulted in a shut-down in all principal production units. The subregional directors of the S. W. O. C. have publicly stated that they have no grievance with management and have also stated the employees of our plant have no grievance with the management. The sole purpose of this shut-down is to compel nonunion men to become members of the union and to compel union members to pay their dues. This plant is engaged 95 percent in the production of materials for defense purposes. The shut-down, if prolonged, will seriously handicap defense, particularly the production of tubes for the new Navy vessels, as we are producing 80 to 90 percent of the Navy tube requirements. We anticipate a complete shut-down beginning with the next shift starting at 11 o'clock tonight.

THE BABCOCK & WILCOX TUBE CO.,
P. D. WHITE, *General Manager.*

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other matters on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds an important bill which has to do with the furnishing of community facilities in congested areas of national defense. In the Hampton Roads area and the Norfolk area in Virginia a typical problem of this sort exists. By reason of the proximity of these areas to Washington, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is leaving tomorrow night to go, at its own expense, to investigate these two areas; and in view of the fact that we shall not be able to return until Tuesday morning, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds may be excused from the House on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short article from the Southern Lumber Journal, under the heading "Is the United States doomed to follow France?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

VERMONT A DAIRY STATE—OUR MILK SETS A WORLD STANDARD

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress and a lot of people are woefully ill informed with respect to the resources of the State of Vermont.

It is generally known that we lead the world in the granite, marble, and maple-sugar fields. It is not generally known that despite the foregoing modest, but incontrovertible statements, we are a dairy State.

The last cow census to which I could hurriedly have access this morning discloses the fact that Vermonters own 308,000 cows, that produce an average annual cash farm milk income approximating between twenty-five and thirty millions of dollars.

The census showed that 647,000,000 quarts of milk were produced; 2,302,000 pounds of butter made; 695,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese manufactured; and 715,000 gallons of ice cream distributed in 1 year.

Dig the cotton of yesterday's discussion out of your ears and listen to me while I tell you that the United States is the greatest dairy nation in the world, annually creating an output valued in excess of three and one-half billion dollars.

Do you realize that there are 25,000,000 cows on three-fourths of the Nation's 7,000,000 farms? Or did you know that one out of every 15 families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood?

Well, both statements are facts, and milk is the largest single source of farm cash income. Larger than cattle, twice that from cotton, three times the income from wheat, and five times that from tobacco.

Economical distribution, meticulous sanitation, pasteurization, and other safeguards make the milk produced in the United States a world standard. And, incidentally, the milk we produce in Vermont is the best in the world. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE ALLIS-CHALMERS STRIKE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukee breathes easier today. I believe the statement issued by Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox last night to the Allis-Chalmers Co. and the Allis-Chalmers Union has the full support of public opinion in Milwaukee. It is my earnest hope that the company and union members will accept it in the spirit in which it is made; that in the patriotic interest of national defense they will resume work Monday or sooner if possible. National defense can stand no more delay.

(Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject The New Labor Mediation Board, and to include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Secretary Knox.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald, on the subject of unemployment in the West.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include my reply to the open letter of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh to the American people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. IMHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Gov. Sam Jones, of Louisiana, in connection with the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JAMES STEWART

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Members of this House to two distinct types of conduct or philosophy and let you pass your own judgment as to each.

The first is that conduct of the actor, James Stewart, from West Los Angeles in my district, who could have dodged the draft had he so chosen, on account of being underweight, but who went out and put on the additional poundage so that he could qualify for the patriotic service of the United States. This man gave up a position paying $1,500 per week to give his services to the United States Government at $21 per month. This exemplifies the real type of patriotic Americanism that has, and will eventually have, to maintain this Government.

Contrast this attitude above with that of the imported European philosophies, socialism, fascism, nazi-ism, and communism, as exemplified by the C. I. O. racketeering leadership, who demand their pound of flesh in money before they will consider the safety and welfare of the United States Government, who have become the greatest profiteers that this Nation has ever known; who also scream for fairness and individual liberty; and who would deny these privileges to anybody but themselves. Have the men who want to work in our industrial plants any rights under our Constitution? Have the men whose jaws, arms, and bodies have been broken any rights under the Constitution? Have these lawbreakers, revolutionists, disturbers of the peace, who are now defying law and order in this country, any fairness in their makeup? These are the people who scream, when it suits their mutinous, revolutionary purpose, for freedom of speech, freedom of action, and individual liberty.

I give you this in order that you may do your own thinking and draw your own conclusions, which I hope you will do according to American standards; and, if you do, you will brand these revolutionaries for what they are.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and quote from a statement made by Admiral Charles F. Hughes, Chief of Naval Operations, before a committee of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, respecting the repeal or modification of the Embargo Act of 1937.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRIKES

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BECKWORTH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from G. G. McElroy, president, American Soya Bean Association, relative to the exportation of soybean products to Great Britain.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter written by Miss Helen E. Downs to Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, relative to reclamation of defense materials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution adopted day before yesterday by the State Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the New York State Legislature having to do with national highways.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two short editorials from the Long Beach Press-Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short newspaper article from the New York Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] may be allowed to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKES IN INDUSTRY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing each morning many statements with reference to the strikes going on in this country delaying national defense. The President has appointed a Labor Mediation Board, but everybody knows that that Board cannot act until Madam Perkins certifies to the Board any strikes that may be going on in the country for mediation. What is the use having a board to settle disputes until the Labor Department, with Miss Perkins at its head, certifies to this Board? Everybody knows that Madam Perkins is not going to certify any strikes to this Board for mediation. She seems to be for anything radical labor leaders want. What is the use trying to do business that way? Everything now is in the lap of the President of the United States, and, unless he takes some definite action, you are not going to have any relief from strikes going on at the present time. The responsibility is his. Let him do something. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PHILIPPINE EXPORT LAWS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I endorse unqualifiedly the position taken by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr.

STEFAN] that the initiative to pass a law to place the Philippines in correspondence with our policy of export control as set forth in section 6 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," is with the Philippine government under the Tydings-McDuffie Act and not with the Federal Government.

Under section 2 (a–9) of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, the Philippine government can enact laws affecting currency, coinage, imports, exports, and immigration, but such laws shall not go into effect until approved by the President of the United States.

The Philippine government should proceed under this provision. This is compatible with their local autonomy and it is the simplest and most effective method of arriving at the desired conclusion.

I understand that thought is being given to make the act of July 2, 1940, which I just mentioned, operative in the Philippines. I wish to warn very solemnly against this procedure, not only because it would be an invasion of the local self-government and independence of the Filipinos under the Tydings-McDuffie Act, but also it will make operative in the Philippines the other sections of that act of July 2, 1940, which will create confusion in the Philippines because its provisions contemplate the enforcement of other Federal acts which we recently passed in the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat very earnestly that if the Philippine government desires to carry out its laudable purpose of cooperation with the United States in this particular case of export control, it should proceed by the most efficient method, and that is pass the enabling act and then send it to the President of the United States for his approval. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Towanda Daily Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RUTHERFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 152

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4146, a bill to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, day in and day out we hear complaints, sometimes justifiable, about strikes, discontent, and strife between capital and labor. Personally I am of the opinion that the fault is not at all times with labor. This bill which the rule makes in order aims to eliminate and will eliminate that strife that has existed in the coal industry for many years.

In 1937 we passed a bill which some of you gentlemen on both sides of the aisle opposed. Personally I was not overpleased with the work that was done by the Commission during the first few months, but since that time and of late that Commission has functioned in the interest of our Nation and in the interest of the coal industry, as well as in the interest of labor. I feel that this bill which the rule makes in order, when adopted, will aid not only the coal industry, but will have a wholesome effect on labor and conditions in general.

The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate and I understand the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], will be very broad and liberal, as he always is, in allocating time to all those who desire to speak for it.

I understand, too, that the gentleman on the left who will have the other hour will also support the splendid recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee for the passage of this bill.

All this bill does is to extend the life of the Coal Commission 2 additional years. The original proposition was to extend it 1 year, some feeling that 1 year's extension might suffice, but in view of existing conditions better judgment prevailed and 2 years were agreed upon.

I feel in view of the consideration this legislation has received from that extremely efficient Ways and Means Committee that there will be very little time lost in opposing either the rule or the bill itself. The bill is meritorious and deserves immediate consideration.

I may also say to the membership that negotiations are now in progress on the part of coal operators and coal miners to renew under the same terms the agreement that expires on April 1. It is therefore absolutely necessary that we do not delay the passage of this bill because it will tend to help provide, I hope, early settlement of their matters. I feel that had other industries been as fair as the coal industry we would not now have all this strife and contention.

This bill is approved, recommended, and urged not only by labor but by the operators themselves because they realize the necessity for continued production of as much coal as possible in the interest of national defense.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I listened with interest when the gentleman said the extension of this act was asked for not only by the miners themselves but by the operators also. I should simply like to add strength to the gentleman's statement by saying that when this legislation originally was enacted a large majority of the operators of the country were against it. That they are now for it certainly speaks for the benefits which have accrued to them as well as to the miners.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for calling attention to that fact. I am pleased that these operators came to their senses, and I hope these other industries will follow the splendid example of the coal operators.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a unanimous report from the Rules Committee, and I believe also from the Committee on Ways and Means. It is merely an extension of the Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years to promote peaceful and better conditions in the soft-coal industry. This act was the result of some 25 years or more of investigations by the Congress of the United States into the problems and into the deplorable conditions of the bituminous-coal industry.

When I first came to Congress many years ago I was more or less of a young crusader and helped lead the fight for remedial legislation to solve some of these tragic problems in the soft-coal industry. How time has changed and how the point of view of Members of Congress has changed. Those few of us who were then leading the fight were denounced as radicals, as bolsheviks, as despoilers of private property, as wanting to destroy the profit system and vested interests. The conditions in the soft-coal industry were just the same 20 years ago, but it has taken the Congress and the people all this time to catch up with them. What we tried to do 20 years ago will today go through this House with practically no opposition. We were even told in those days that such legislation was completely unconstitutional and beyond the powers of the Congress. Let me read you what the Supreme Court of the United States had to say in the case of the Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co. against Homer M. Atkins. The Court said:

The history of the bituminous-coal industry is written in blood as well as in ink. * * * If the strategic character of this industry in our economy and the chaotic condition which has prevailed in it do not justify legislation it is difficult to imagine what would.

Today we find the unions 100 percent strong back of this bill extending the act for a 2-year period, and we find 97 percent of the coal-mine operators and owners in favor of this legislation. It is more important to continue the Commission in existence now during an emergency period than ever before, because a strike in the soft-coal industry today would be a catastrophe which might eventually tie up 50 percent of all our factories. That is what might happen if our soft-coal supply should be stopped by a long-drawn-out strike.

This legislation in my humble opinion is in line with the philosophy of today. Twenty years ago you were unpopular to stand up here and appeal for legislation of this kind, but today the American people are for this type of political philosophy or ideology. It is humane legislation seeking to do away with certain social and industrial injustices, to stop cut-throat competition, to enable a great industry employing 500,000 men to stabilize itself, to prevent strikes, and to eliminate the deplorable conditions of the past, including impoverishment and ruin for hundreds of thousands of hard working and loyal American citizens and bankruptcy for the mine owners and operators. I congratulate the Ways and Means Committee for reporting this bill by unanimous vote, and in advance I congratulate the Members on both sides for their change in political philosophy and for doing something constructive to stabilize a great industry and above all for promoting social and industrial justice and a square deal for labor and capital in the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 was passed by Congress as a means of stabilizing the bituminous coal industry, which for many years has existed in a state of acute depression and instability. Numerous studies and investigations, conducted over a period of many years, convinced Congress that the social and economic consequences of conditions in the industry were so grave and of such Nation-wide importance that the problem was one for the Federal Government to solve. It also was recognized that the interstate character of coal distribution made the question one which could not be effectively met by action of the individual States.

The problem of the coal industry is complex. However, it may be summed up, fundamentally, as one of a greatly expanded mine capacity which can produce tremendously more coal of various kinds, qualities, and sizes than the Nation will buy. This is complicated by the difficulties peculiar to the business of mining and distributing coal. Among other things, these include the comparative ease with which production capacity can be expanded quickly by opening new mines; fluctuations in demand for coal due to seasonal influences and fluctuations in the general industrial activity of the country; difficulties involved in disposing of particular sizes of coal which are not immediately salable except at distress prices but which must be mined as a joint product in producing the sizes of coal which can be marketed, and so forth.

Left to its own resources, the coal industry attempted to meet its problems by destructive competition. Producers bid against each other for coal orders, cutting their prices in order to expand production and cheapen costs of operation. The battle became one for existence, and the mortality was high. But, whenever a producer fell in the bankruptcy courts, there nearly always was another person, with high hopes, to take his place and attempt to carry on.

Income-tax records show that the industry in general has shown a net deficit of millions of dollars every year since 1927. This was true even in 1928 and 1929 when prosperity in general was at high levels in the country. The following table made up from income-tax records vividly portrays the demoralized condition of the industry during those years:

Year	Number of companies	Number reporting net income	Number reporting no net income	Net income of industry	Tax	Industry's profit or loss
1917	1,234	1,149	85	$203,918,518	$70,961,656	$132,956,862
1918	1,234	1,106	128	148,846,132	65,763,660	83,082,972
1919	1,234	817	417	62,259,694	12,934,424	49,325,270
1920	1,234	1,152	82	249,367,379	76,223,563	173,143,816
1921	1,234	503	731	28,889,194	10,559,444	17,329,750
1925	3,650	1,065	2,585	[1] 22,363,497	4,517,057	[1] 26,880,554
1928	2,982	863	1,842	[1] 24,508,330	3,441,860	[1] 27,950,190
1929	2,646	934	1,535	[1] 11,822,033	4,000,019	[1] 15,822,052
1930	2,356	781	1,458	[1] 42,071,042	2,637,057	[1] 44,708,099
1931	2,207	582	1,513	[1] 47,745,000	1,039,000	[1] 48,784,000
1932	1,897	289	1,575	[1] 51,167,000	777,000	[1] 51,944,000
1933	1,917	396	1,455	[1] 47,549,000	1,029,000	[1] 48,578,000
1934	2,071	660	1,357	[1] 7,584,000	3,308,000	[1] 10,892,000
1935	2,012	591	1,384	[1] 15,576,000	2,750,000	[1] 18,326,000
1936	1,995	590	1,355	[1] 12,402,000	3,214,000	[1] 15,616,000
1937	1,853	539	1,276	[1] 7,662,000	3,208,000	[1] 10,870,000
1938	2,125	363	1,524	[1] 30,522,000	1,661,000	[1] 32,183,000

[1] Deficit.

As labor represents about 65 percent of the cost of producing coal, the battle between producer and worker to cut wages as a means of reducing costs was always present. The history of the labor strife in this industry is well known. Numerous times strikes and lock-outs have reduced or entirely cut off the Nation's supply of coal. The hazard of such an interruption in the Nation's coal supply was always present while conditions in the industry remained unchecked.

We all know how important it is now that there be no interruption in the distribution of bituminous coal. Coal is vital to the defense program. You cannot make steel without it, neither can you operate factories, railroads, and shipping, which depend upon it for power.

As the gentleman from Illinois said, the producers and miners now are about to negotiate a new wage agreement to cover the next 2 years. Continuation of the act is of much importance to these negotiations. A producer cannot agree to pay wages unless he has some assurance of protection from conditions such as those which have prevailed in the coal industry.

An article published February 22 by the Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., from its Washington bureau, stated, in part:

> Extension of the law [Coal Act] will become an important factor a month before its expiration date because in mid-March the bituminous operators will enter into New York negotiations with the mine workers for a new wage contract to replace the present one, expiring March 31. Possibility of a a deadlock and shut-down of the mines is viewed with apprehension by national-defense chiefs. The union is expected to seek wage increases. Operators declare they cannot maintain present wages without a bulwark for prices.

The Coal Act provides for stabilizing the markets for bituminous coal by maintaining a cost floor under the sale of coal at the mine and eliminating destructive price cutting and unfair trade practices. Minimum prices and marketing rules to effectuate these aims became effective on October 1, 1941. The coal industry recognizes in them hope for permanent protection which it has long sought. Coal Age, one of the principal journals of the coal trade, conducted a poll of the industry last month. The journal stated that mine executives voted 3 to 1 for extending the Coal Act. The sentiment for extension of this law to give it a thorough trial is general in the industry.

There are many reasons for extending the Coal Act, other than to protect the country against a possible break-down in coal production. There are factors such as mine safety and conservation and benefits to the national-defense program by giving the Government some supervision over the production and marketing of bituminous coal and close contact with representatives of the industry and with all persons engaged in the production of coal.

Considering the mine-safety phase for a moment—mines are unable to finance proper safety measures to protect the lives of their employees and their investments under conditions which prevailed before the establishment of minimum prices. The decision whether to make worn and obsolete equipment do, rather than to close down a mine because there is no money to replace or repair it, is a difficult one for a businessman to make.

Whether to work under conditions where there is doubt about the safety or to stop work and let his family starve, is equally difficult for a miner to make. I do not think any producer would willingly and knowingly take a chance with the lives of his men. But I do think that the financial condition of the industry has a direct bearing upon the terrible loss of life and limb in the mining of coal.

From the conservation standpoint, it is recognized that the conservation of bituminous coal is important. The economic condition of the industry has caused excessive waste due to the use of uneconomical methods of mining in effort to cut costs to the bone to meet cutthroat competition. A cost floor under the price of coal will help this situation a great deal.

The many other reasons for placing the coal industry on a sound foundation are obvious. The country cannot possibly be secure with such a great unit of its domestic economy lingering in such a condition as has prevailed in the coal industry. The mine fields cover 30 States. More than 500,000 miners are employed in producing coal alone, and their families bring the total of persons directly depending upon coal mining for a living to more than 2,000,000. The total of persons directly and indirectly dependent upon bituminous coal for a living is much greater. They include the railroad workers who haul the coal to markets, those employed in supply industries, in services and trades such as doctors and merchants, and many others. The welfare of the coal industry affects the whole Nation.

Administration of the Coal Act does not place a burden on the country. Provision for the protection of the consuming public is made through the Consumers' Counsel whose duty it is to look after their interests. The intention of the Coal Act is merely to keep the level of coal prices from going below the industry's cost levels.

Furthermore, administration of the law is not placing any burden on the taxpayer. The coal industry is paying this cost, and more, too, under special taxes levied on the industry by the act itself. A report compiled by the Coal Division shows that this tax has given the United States Treasury $2,156,823 more than the Government has spent in the administration of the law during the time in which it has been in effect. That represents a profit for the Government on the operation of the Coal Act, as this money can be used for purposes other than administering the law.

The marketing of practically all of the bituminous coal produced in the United States now is protected by the Coal Act. Approximately 14,000 producers have become members of the Bituminous Coal Code, and as such are participating in this market stabilization plan.

This industry is looking to Congress to continue this law in effort to give it a thorough trial. A period of less than 2 years for such a trial would not be sufficient, as such a test should carry the industry through all types of marketing conditions.

However, the Coal Act, the Division, and the minimum prices and marketing rules all become null and void after April 26, 1941, if the law is not extended. It took more than 3 years of hard work to set up these prices, and all of which will be lost if the law is not extended before this date.

That would plunge the coal industry into uncertainty and chaos, and would be a blow to the security of the country.

I think it appropriate to call to your attention a recent statement by a committee comprised of leaders of the mine workers' union and the mine owners of the country urging extension of this law. This is the advisory committee of the Bituminous Coal Division, whose membership includes such outstanding coal leaders as George W. Reed, Chicago, vice president of the Peabody Coal Co.; E. C. Mahan, Knoxville, chairman of the board of the Southern Coal & Coke Co.; Charles O'Neill, New York, president of the United Eastern Coal Sales Corporation; Maj. Percy Tetlow, A. D. Lewis, and John T. Jones, all nationally known United Mine Workers officials. This committee issued a statement on February 22, 1941, in which it was stated:

> It is to be noted that in every major coal-producing country, with the exception of the United States, the coal industry has been either nationalized or subsidized by the various governments. It is the opinion of the committee that the American coal industry can be saved from such measures as cash subsidies or nationalization if the present Coal Act is extended for a further period of 2 years in order to observe properly the results of its operation under varying conditions.

The following is a summary of eight reasons why the Bituminous Coal Act should be extended:

First. The act is operating successfully. Minimum prices became effective October 1, 1940. For the first time in many years the bituminous-coal industry is realizing its cost of production.

Second. Continuation of the act preserves the investment and guarantees the livelihood of 13,000 producers, most of them small businessmen.

Third. Continuation of the act means a living wage for miners. It means no more ghost-towns caused by starvation prices and starvation wages.

Fourth. Continuation of the act is necessary to national defense. The wage contract between the operators and the miners expires April 1, 1941. A new contract can be negotiated without a strike only if the act is extended. Otherwise, prices will collapse and agreement as to wages will be difficult if not impossible.

Fifth. Continuation of the act is necessary to avoid Government subsidy or nationalization. In every major coal-producing country except the United States, the coal industry is supported by subsidies or has been nationalized. The Coal Act enables the American coal industry to avoid these measures.

Sixth. Administration of the Coal Act does not cost the Government a single penny. Costs are paid by a special tax on coal produced levied by the act, and by assessments paid by producers.

Seventh. The Coal Act is a cooperative undertaking by Government and industry. The industry, through boards of its own selection, plays an important part in administration of the act.

Eighth. Finally, continuation of the act is in the interest of the consumers. It prevents demoralization of the industry and assures the public a supply of coal at all times at reasonable rates.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert two tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short resolution passed by the Kansas Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if I properly sense the feeling of this House, it is that this rule will be adopted practically unanimously and that the bill which the rule makes in order will also be passed. Those who have preceded me have stressed the fact that the coal industry is a great industry. There is no question but that coal is still king in our country. It is one of the greatest individual industries of the Nation. The fact that in 1929 the coal industry reached its peak of production and in that same year the industry lost nearly $12,000,000, goes to prove the statement heretofore made today that this is one industry that needs stabilization.

We are not passing a new bill today. We are simply considering whether or not we will extent for 2 years an act that is already written on the statute books and, as the gentleman from Tennessee stated, an extension of 2 years is not too much while an extension of less than 2 years would not accomplish the purposes intended. The present price schedules have only been in operation a few months and have not had a fair trial yet. Man must have certain commodities to live. He must have enough food, he must have enough shelter, he must have enough heat. To have heat he must have coal or something that takes the place of coal. Whenever we talk with reference to energy and with reference to heat, we think of coal as being about 70 percent of the energy of this Nation. When you talk of substituting electricity for coal you must remember that probably more than half of electricity consumed is generated by coal. Coal is the great poor man's fuel. Basically, so far as the products produced in the Nation are concerned, coal comes next to food products in necessity.

Mr. Speaker, coal is only produced in a comparatively few locations, consequently transportation is one of the greatest factors in the price of coal. It

has been said that this legislation is price-fixing legislation and many Members opposed it in 1935 and 1937 because they thought it involved the proposition of price fixing. I have here a chart, which I shall refer to a little later.

The impression has been abroad for many years that the production of coal is a sort of racket, that the operators and miners are more or less to blame for that impression; but I am glad to bring the information that there is no industry in the Nation comparable in size where the man who employs labor and the man who labors agree so amicably. Both the producer of coal and the miners agree that this legislation should be continued and that the bill should pass.

Today all over the Nation we are confronted with strikes. There was a time many years ago when people would point their finger at the miners' union as being an organization that fostered a good many strikes, but there has not been a serious strike between the miners and operators of coal for many years.

Further, there is no group of men organized in what we call unions that has done so much for the uplift of the laboring man, the workingman, as this organization we call the miners' union. They have carried the burden of the fight for a higher standard of living without being able to bring as much improvement in this respect to themselves as they have brought to other workers. The figures show that the average wages of miners is less than $1,000 per year.

Someone has said that he does not believe this law is constitutional. Let me remove any fear you may have with regard to the constitutionality of this bill. The Supreme Court has already spoken on the constitutionality of the act. If those of you who are lawyers will read the Sunshine case, decided by the Supreme Court a few months ago, you will find there one of the most complete cases that I believe I have ever read, as handed down by the Supreme Court. In that case the Supreme Court deals with every provision in the act and finds it constitutional from every angle.

Let me discuss with you for a moment how this bill operates. It is not an easy matter to discuss all this in the short time at my disposal. But let me present to you, the best I can, how this law is handled, how it operates.

In the first place, the law sets up what we call the Bituminous Coal Commission. We had such a Commission, consisting of seven men, until about a year and a half ago. These seven men proved one fact, that seven man cannot officiate very intelligently and properly in the handling of governmental business. There were too many of them; that was the trouble with this Commission. Individually most of them were splendid gentlemen; but collectively, when harrassed by a few high-ranking politicians, each wanting to put on the pay roll a great long list of his own friends, the thing was so very top-heavy that it would not function. Everybody who knew about this felt it was a disgrace. It got so bad that the President of the United States reached out one day and got the Commission by the nape of the neck, as it were, and drew it in to the White House and discharged the whole Commission, and turned the work over to the Secretary of the Interior, and it has been functioning pretty well down there ever since.

Of course, if you need to know the cost of producing coal you are going to have to leave it to somebody that knows the coal business. You cannot leave that to a dry-goods merchant, you cannot leave it to a man who produces wheat, any more than you can leave the matter of determining the price of producing wheat to the coal people. Consequently, the miners, and the mine owners, and the consumers of the Nation were all considered in the proposition of determining how this law should be operated.

When this bill was prepared, all due consideration was given to the proposition of taking care of the consumer. There are two people in nearly every public transaction who must be taken care of. One is the little producer, who comes in competition with the big producer, and the other is the consumer. They are the two people that must be taken care of. In the very nature of things they cannot take care of themselves. As to this bill, the little producer of coal may have a right to complain. It is hard sometimes to do much for him. I have done the best I can for him, and the Committee on Ways and Means has done the very best it can, and I hope the Commission has done the best it can. If it has not done the best it can for the little producer, it will do better in the future. This act cannot be justified in the future if it results in serious disadvantage to the great group of small producers or if it increases the price of coal unduly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will recall that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, promised in 2 or 3 months the Congress would be asked to consider amendments to the Guffey Coal Act, thereby giving the small producer an opportunity to have his day in court.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am glad to say to the gentleman and to the Congress that the Committee on Ways and Means gave a great deal of consideration to the proposition of how best to take care of the little producer. Here is what the committee did. They have exacted from the Commission an understanding that it will resurvey the situation, especially with the thought in mind to remove all inequalities. The Committee on Ways and Means has also appointed a subcommittee. The duties of that subcommittee will be to consider amendments to this act, and to give consideration to what may be done for the little producer.

What will be done, of course, I am not here to promise. I have no right to promise it. However, I am as much interested in that proposition as anybody else, and as long as I have a voice I expect that voice to be raised in the defense of the little fellow whenever he needs to be protected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. May I make further observation to the effect that the small producer is not opposed to the principle of the Guffey Coal Act. As a matter of fact, he believes the principle is correct, but asks for greater consideration than is accorded him at the present time.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It is fervently claimed for this act that it helps the little man in that it stabilizes prices. The small operators no doubt benefit from a stabilization of prices. If there is anybody who needs to have the price stabilized it is the little fellow. The big fellow can operate better without stabilization than the little fellow can. If this act stabilizes the price, to that extent it does some good to the little fellow.

Let me discuss briefly whether or not there is anything in this act that is price-fixing. No doubt, every person on this floor this afternoon is willing for the man who produces coal to have at least the cost of production. He ought to have cost of production. This bill does not do more than that. I have said on the floor of this House many times to those who are a little skeptical about the price of coal that I can go into my district and produce and put on the cars a thousand carloads a day of as fine coal as can be produced anywhere at less than $2.50 a ton. You can come and get it and take it into the Northwest, where you have to pay $6, $7, and $10 a ton for it, or take it into New England, where the price also is necessarily high, and the price my people will exact for this fine coal will not be as much as $2.50 per ton.

We will pay the miner, we will pay the operator, and the taxes and all costs of every kind. So you see the cost of production, if it is guaranteed, is not one-third of the cost to the consumer in many cases. If that is the fact and if all we deal with in this bill is simply the cost of production, then we are only dealing with one-third of the cost to the consumer. Consequently, you cannot truthfully say that this is a price-fixing bill. It simply takes this method of regulating an interstate industry by providing that the price of coal should be at least enough to cover the actual cost of producing it ready for it to proceed into transportation. Some form of this kind of control is exercised in all kinds of industries. For instance, textile industries are regulated as to minimum wages for women and as to working conditions and as to insurance, all of which goes directly toward fixing the price of the article manufactured.

Let me show you just where the money goes when you compute the cost of production. I want to give you now the cost of production of a ton of coal, not the cost of 1 ton in one mine but the weighted average cost taken by the Coal Commission and by the actuaries in the coal business of this country. These are not my figures but are figures made from compilations with respect to all the coal produced in the country. I shall insert into the RECORD at this point this table of figures that I have here pre-

pared on this chart, and I shall proceed to explain it briefly.

Producing, administrative, and selling costs—Minimum-price area No. 1 (70 percent of national production)

Mine labor: Paid on monthly, daily, and tonnage basis, including supervisory, technical, and clerical forces at mines	$1.3708
Mine supplies:	
All except purchased power and mine fuel	.1999
Purchased power and mine fuel	.0735
Taxes: Property, equipment, social security, unemployment, and Bituminous Coal Act of 1937	.0651
Insurance: Fire, catastrophe, compensation, and vocational disease	.0531
Assessments: Operators' associations and district boards	.0065
Royalties	.0564
Depletion	.0433
Depreciation	.0809
Total producing cost	1.9495
Administrative expense	.0552
Selling costs	.1257
Total	2.1304
Average minimum price fixed by Bituminous Coal Division	2.0885

As I have already stated, this arrangement of words and figures represents the total cost of producing coal as computed under the provisions of this act and covering 209,861,131 tons of coal. This is 70 percent of all the coal produced in the United States and represents all of the big coal-producing fields. It includes all of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, Tennessee, and practically all of Kentucky and West Virginia, and also some additional areas. These prices are, as I have said, not the prices in any one mine but the weighted average price of all the mines producing this amount of coal.

You will notice that the total cost of production is $2.1304. In other words, the general weighted average cost of production of all these mines is $2.13.

This figure represents the total price controlled by the Bituminous Coal Commission in its program of stabilization. If you agree that industry should have at least the price of production, then this is the figure to which you can easily subscribe.

You will notice below here that I have a figure, to which I am pointing, which is $2.0885. This represents the average minimum price fixed by the Bituminous Coal Division. You will notice that this is nearly 5 cents lower than the cost of production. You probably wonder why the Commission fixed the average minimum price below the cost of production. The reason is that in fixing the average minimum price the Commission is required to take into consideration other factors besides the cost of production. They are expected to take into consideration such factors as transportation and distribution. This has required very extensive computations and they have arrived at the figure $2.0885. It is fortunate that this is lower than the cost of production, for the law provides:

> Said prices shall be proposed so as to yield a return net per ton for each district in a minimum price area * * * equal as nearly as may be to the weighted average of the total cost per ton.

From this you will see that the Commission has been fair to the consumer of coal in that it has fixed the average minimum price a little less than the cost of production. Of course, this does not mean that this is the fixed price of all grades of coal at the point of production in all sections of the country. Some grades of coal are sold at a price considerably less than this price, but this is the average price just the same as the production price that I have given to you is the average production price.

You will note that the first item on this chart is the item covering the labor required to produce a ton of coal. This is by far the largest item. This item covers the wages to all employees that are engaged in the production of the coal, including many different types of labor. I have explained on this chart just what is included in this item.

The next item you will notice is an item of 19-cents-plus. This represents mine supplies. Of course, there are many supplies required especially in these modern days of highly mechanized equipment in mines and it would seem that this figure is a very modest one to cover all these expenses.

The next item is an item of taxes. This is only 6½ cents. It includes such taxes as social security, unemployment compensation and various other items of taxation. The mine owner has no control over the amount of this item.

The next item is one of insurance which is very high in this industry because this is the most hazardous of all of the great industries of the country.

The next item of assessments is a small one, being just a little more than one-half a cent.

The next item of royalty and depreciation may be considered together. Of course, if these computations were allowed to be used at the arbitrary wish of the producer he could run his costs up considerably but these are not such items as are under the control of the producer of coal. These are all the items that are allowed and allowable by the Internal Revenue Department in computing income tax.

You will note that the total of these figures amounts to $1.9495. It is practically $1.95. This is the cost of putting the coal on the railroad car ready to move. There is additional expense in an administrative way. This represents the services of those who are not actively engaged in the physical production of the coal. It is made up principally of office expense. You will notice that it amounts to about 5½ cents.

The next item is the item of selling cost. It is well recognized that to sell coal successfully it frequently requires that the producer belong to some selling agency or at least engage assistants. From this chart it would seem that this item costs a little over 12½ cents. All these taken together make the grand total of $2.1304.

As I have already stated, this chart shows the total cost of production and also the average minimum price fixed by the Bituminous Coal Division.

As I have already stated these prices are the "floor" of this program. We start to build on this safe foundation. You ask what next then? My answer is that from this foundation you proceed to prepare this coal into different sizes to meet the demands of the trade. You begin to put the coal into traffic. Then new problems arise. These are the problems of free competition. The Coal Commission has as little to do with this as it can, except it has the authority to prevent exorbitant and unreasonable prices. Following the World War we remember that the price of coal jumped tremendously. Most of the high profits made then were made by coal "sharks," who did not own a mine and probably never saw one. The Commission under this law can prevent that and I hope it does. So, my friends, if the greatest part of the price of coal is the result of transportation and of free competition, no harm has been done to the industry or to the consumer.

Price fixing has nothing to do with any elements of cost except the very necessary elements in the production of coal. So I want to say to those of you who are skeptical about price fixing in this bill that you need not be so, and if you men who live in the Northwest, where the per capita consumption of coal is high, want an even flow of coal which should bring a fair price to the consumer, you should want to put the industry on a safe and fair foundation. During the seven or eight months this bill has operated, the figures show the price to the domestic consumer has been increased but 1.1 percent. Many of the consumers get their coal cheaper than they ever did. I have always maintained on the floor of this House that what we need in the coal industry is a smooth movement of coal. Get rid of this ruthless, cut-throat competition and this reckless rebating. We need stabilization so that you in the Northwest and consumers everywhere do not need to buy your coal 6 or 8 or 10 months in advance and you in New England do not have to build great cellars and great bunkers to take care of your coal, because if the industry is stabilized, delivery may be made uniformly to the consumer, and this is bound to permit him to reduce his coal bill. This is why the figures show that the cost to the domestic consumer since this law has been in operation has only been increased 1.1 percent.

Then you may ask about the industrial consumer. The cost to him may or may not be more on the average. It is bound to be more and should be more to those large consumers who in the past were able to buy their coal at such ridiculously low prices as 50 cents per ton. The testimony before the committee showed that some very large consumers have been buying their coal for years at much below the cost of production. In that kind of business somebody is sure to lose. In the coal business it usually was the producer but sometimes it was the smaller consumers.

I dare say that there is not 1 coal producer in 500 who has made an average profit in the last 10 years. I do not say in 1 year, but I said who has made a profit, balancing off one year against another during the last 10 years. He has

usually gone in the red. I knew a coal man from my own section who, about 10 years ago, was confronted with an income tax assessment of $400,000 that he could not pay. After dragging him over the coals for several years the Government compromised with him for $18,000. He lost his business and lost his life by worry. That is not the only casualty along the way. The story of the coal industry is a tragic one; many a business skeleton can be seen along the way of the coal industry. This should not continue. This fine, necessary business must be stabilized. [Applause.]

This bill does something else, which it has done admirably so far. It stabilizes the cost of transportation. If it stabilizes the cost of production, and the cost of transportation, and if it prevents cutthroat competition and holds things on a level, it is better for everybody.

What is the justification of the Congress when it attempts to pass legislation that will be better for everybody? Any legislation dealing with a national commodity, with a national industry, with something that the people must have, with a necessity, with a product that the public must have in the winter to drive away the cold; such legislation, I think, is entitled to engage the attention of the Congress. What are you going to do when Congress assumes to speak on a proposition like this which deals with a problem of universal public interest? Is there anything wrong with it? Can you not justify it under the general welfare clause of the Constitution? If not you surely can justify it under the provision of the Constitution that deals with the transportation of interstate commerce. That is the justification, and that is how the bill is justified constitutionally.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. RICH. While the charge to the mining contractor or operator is only a cent a ton, yet does the gentleman believe that the Commission should be granted three and a half million dollars now to continue the work it is doing?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I can answer that very easily. What has happened? The Commission has been in operation about 3 years. The tax of 1 cent per ton required of the producers has been paid into the Treasury of the United States and it has amounted to $15,111,524. The cost of administration has been $12,954,801. Leaving a balance of $2,856,723. The transaction has netted the Government a clear profit of $2,856,723. If every activity of the Government had done as well, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania would not be called upon to call out—as he does nearly every day—"Where are you going to get the money?" I compliment my good friend for his solicitude for the Public Treasury.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman put those figures into the RECORD?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; very gladly.

Mr. RICH. I have one more question. The gentleman is representing the miners of this country. If we go ahead and put in a big power plant on the St. Lawrence River, what will happen to the miners in Pennsylvania and Ohio?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; I do not represent the miners of the country, but I am proud to have in my constituency several thousand splendid citizens and their families who make their living at mining coal. We will have to take care of this St. Lawrence question when we get to it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; I always yield to my friend who is so well posted on everything pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, this Guffey Coal Act places a floor on the price of coal so that the operators and the owners can continue operating their mines and labor be paid. Let me ask the gentleman this question: In view of the fact that this is done by legislation, can the gentleman see any objection to giving agriculture the same treatment by placing a floor under prices for agriculture?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If it could be done as it can be done in this case, it ought to be done, but the trouble with agriculture is that the agricultural people cannot agree. The wheat producer cannot agree with the milk producer, and the corn producer cannot agree with the wheat producer. Their interests do not run together, they run in opposite directions, and consequently you ask the Congress to solve a puzzle, and it is a hard thing to do. I yield to no one in my esteem for the farmer and in my sympathy for his problem. I was brought up on a farm and know something of the farm problem. But here is a national industry that produces a commodity that the people must have. Wheat is grown every place; potatoes are grown every place; cows give milk everywhere; but you cannot buy coal except where the good Lord has put it. It is not a crop that can be grown. It is not a product that can be replenished. It is a part of the very life of the Nation. It is a national resource. You in the great and prosperous Northwest cannot live without our coal, but we can live without your milk and cheese.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Oh, no.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. My friends, let us take up the problem of agriculture in due time and solve it. But today our problem is whether we are to give the coal industry the protection that it needs so that it may serve us and the Nation in these stressful times as the mine owners and the 500,000 patriotic miners are anxious to do. I know we will. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY].

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly delighted to see the good feeling in Congress on this bill at the present time, when I remember what effort we made to pass it in 1935. Of course, this bill is necessary in the coal industry, and everything has proved that.

The condition of the coal business before the passage of the bill and the condition after the passage of the bill is proof that it is necessary for some bill to control in some way prices in the coal industry. The coal industry is different from any other industry in the country. It is affected much more easily. Two percent overproduction of wheat does not make much change in the price of wheat or in any other industry, but 2 percent overproduction of coal simply gluts the market and starts the cutting of prices. Also, 2 percent underproduction increases the price, runs the price sky high. It seems that only once in every 20 or 25 years the coal industry pays. Then something happens which makes the industry prosperous. Because it is affected, as I say, by overproduction and underproduction so much there is no way that industry itself can control it. I remember in 1932 coal was selling in the Cleveland yard at $1 a ton on the car. Of course, it could not be produced at the mines at $1 a ton, but they had no place to put it except on the cars. When it is on the cars they have to sell it. If they cannot sell it, they have to pay demurrage, of course. The coal industry is an industry that needs protection not only for the men but for the producers themselves. There was scarcely a mine in the United States that operated from 1926 until this bill became effective where the mine owner himself made enough to pay his taxes and a profit out of the sale of his coal.

Coal lands in the Pittsburgh area have dropped from $300 an acre, which the operator paid to the man who owned the coal, until today I believe he can buy it from $25 an acre. Since 1926 hundreds of mine owners were absolutely broken up. Some of the largest producers in this country were destroyed by the deplorable conditions in the coal industry. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that we have something not only to guarantee to the mine owner a decent, fair, and reasonable profit, but to give him an opportunity to pay his men so that they can have at least a fair and honest living under working conditions.

I remember in the campaign of 1932, when conditions in the coal industry were deplorable, I saw men who worked in the mines in West Virginia who had to go into the mine without anything to eat; maybe load a car of coal and come out and go to the company store and buy a quarter's worth or 50 cents' worth of food for his family and then return to the mine. I saw men walking from one part of that district to the other during that time with burlap wrapped around their feet in lieu of shoes. That was the condition in the coal industry. It was deplorable.

As I say, we passed this bill in 1935. The operator has had no benefit of it until last fall, I believe in October. I know that all the mine owners in my district have importuned me to do everything possible to try to get prices fixed so that they would know what they were doing under this bill. They have paid to the Government from 1936 until the present time without receiving any benefit at all. It is imperative for the conditions of the coal industry that this bill be extended for a period of 2 years. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist expressing to the gentleman from Tennessee, the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from West Virginia my appreciation for the splendid way they have presented the cause of this bill. It is true that in 1937 this House had a great deal more trouble in agreeing to this bill, as has been stated, but it has been demonstrated that it was legislation in the right direction. I think it has done more to bring about stability in the coal industry than anything that has been done in years, and it may be helpful in stabilizing other industries in the near future.

Had it not been for the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND] who introduced this bill, stated to me that he was willing to waive his time which I was ready to yield him under the rule, and that he was going to speak on the bill later, I would not have taken this time. But I recollect the great work he did in 1937 for weeks and weeks to bring about the passage of this legislation, and again this time. Day in and day out he has been working as only he knows how to work, because he is a very careful man. The genial gentleman from Pennsylvania, besides serving as Democratic whip of the House, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and of the Democratic steering committee has, for the past 2 weeks, also devoted his time in obtaining action by his committee on the bill before us. Then, in his beguiling way, he coaxed the members of the Committee on Rules to grant a rule carrying a provision waiving all points of order against the bill, a provision which is very seldom included in a resolution for a rule reported by that committee. The gentleman, as we know, is extremely studious in his committee work and in considering legislation before the House, and in official and personal matters, he is extraordinarily careful and deliberate before he decides to act or raise his voice. [Applause.] But finally when he comes to a conclusion that he is right, he never lets up, and continues in his efforts to accomplish those things that are not only in his interest but in the interest of the country. That is the underlying reason why I have taken these few minutes to thank him in behalf of the House for the wonderful work he has done to convince the country that this legislation is for the best interests of all. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF THE COAL ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4146) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4146) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the comments made by the chairman of the Committee on Rules in regard to my activities on this bill. In 1937 Congress enacted the Bituminous Coal Act. The purpose of this statute was to bring relief to a great industry producing coal in more than 20 States of the Nation, and in which the total investment runs to billions. The act was designed to enable the industry to realize its average cost of production, without allowance for interest on investment or any profit whatsoever, and by stabilizing the industry and rescuing it from bankruptcy to aid half a million workers and their families who depend on the industry for their livelihood.

As originally enacted, the bill expires on April 26, 1941, less than 1 month from today. The bill now before the House—H. R. 4146—extends the provisions of the act for an additional 2 years, with an amendment reestablishing the Consumers' Counsel as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of acting as guardian of the consumers' interest in the administration of this act. The 2-year extension will enable the industry and the Government to make a fair test of the act and it will tide the Nation over a critical period in its history.

Three primary factors make it imperative that the House take favorable action on the bill without delay.

First. The extension of the provisions of the Coal Act is vital to the national-defense program of the Nation. If the act is not extended, the successful effectuation of that program will be seriously jeopardized. The need for the Coal Act during the period of emergency which lies before us is clear.

During the first World War, there was a shortage of coal at consumption points. This resulted in heatless and lightless days and in fuel shortages in vital industries. Coal prices ran as high as $20 a ton at the mine in 1919 and 1920. These difficulties were not due to shortages of coal at the mine. They were due to the lack of information, personnel, and governmental machinery to take care of the situation. Coal was shipped from the Middle West to eastern destinations, and from West Virginia and Pennsylvania to the Middle West. Because of these practices and because our transportation system was heavily burdened with other war requirements, our railroads were unable to haul coal in the necessary quantities. Coal shortage and skyrocketing prices resulted. It was not until August 1917 that the Government set up the United States Fuel Administration to deal with the situation, and it required this agency about 11 months to put into effect zoning restrictions. Much damage had already been done.

This situation need not and should not arise during the next 2 years if the Coal Act is extended as the bill provides. The Bituminous Coal Division currently collects the information necessary to direct the routing of coal from the mines to consumption points by the most direct and economical means, and it has the personnel necessary to do the task. Utilizing this information, it can, in cooperation with other agencies, do a great deal to prevent the recurrence of the World War shortage of coal at consumption points.

In addition, the minimum prices themselves have a tendency to prevent undue rises in the prices which consumers pay for coal. The minimum prices tend to stabilize the market at approximately the established level, and it is difficult for producers to obtain substantially higher prices. However, if prices for coal should tend to rise unduly, the act authorizes the Division to establish maximum prices at an increase above the minimum prices which already are in effect, whenever this becomes necessary, in order to protect the consumer of coal against unreasonably high prices therefor. This power is a necessary protection not only to consumers, but also the Nation as a whole.

Second. Failure to extend the act will considerably multiply the possibilities of a strike in the bituminous-coal industry. The devastating effects of such a strike at a time when our defense industries are so in need of an adequate supply of bituminous coal are terrifying in prospect.

There is little room for doubt that the absence of any substantial labor difficulties in the industry during the past few years has been largely due to the stabilizing effect of the act. Both operators and mine workers have been sustained by the hope that the act would rescue the industry from insolvency. That hope was realized in October 1940, when the minimum prices became effective. If the act is allowed to expire, it is quite likely that the industry will return to its old condition of violent strife between employer and employee. Employers will be unable to pay decent wages, and workers will have nothing to which they can look forward except a poor share in a failing industry.

It is particularly important at this critical juncture in the Nation's history that stability be maintained in this basic industry. Coal is still our principal fuel. It supplies 45 percent of the Nation's energy, more than 50 percent of the fuel for industries, 84 percent of the fuel which runs our railroads, and produces 49 percent of the electric power generated by public-utility plants. Labor disorders in this industry at the present time would, if continued, shortly paralyze our economy and disrupt our national-defense program. Certainly a realistic appraisal of the situation indicates that we should not at this time imperil the Nation's welfare by failing to extend this act.

The importance of this point is emphasized by the fact that the existing contract between the operators and the

United Mine Workers of America—which represents about 98 percent of the mine workers—expires on April 1, 1941. The operators and the labor union are now negotiating for a new contract. Without doubt, failure to extend the act would adversely affect the possibility of prompt agreement upon the terms of a new contract because of the doubt that would exist as to the operator's ability to pay an appropriate wage and because of the probability of a return of chaos to the coal markets.

Third. The reasons which prompted enactment of this legislation in the first instance demonstrate the necessity for providing an adequate period during which its operation may be appraised. The chaos and waste which have characterized this important segment of our economy demand corrective legislation. As Justice Cardozo said in the Carter case, free competition had been "degraded into anarchy," and congressional intervention was essential.

Even though industrial activity and the demand for coal have greatly increased as a result of the national-defense program, the testimony before the committee demonstrates that unless the act is extended there will be a return to the chaotic conditions of cutthroat competition which preceded the operation of the act. It is estimated that the demand for bituminous coal in 1941 will reach 500,000,000 tons. The productive capacity of the industry approximates 675,000,000 tons. Consequently there will still be an enormous surplus available. In 1929, a peak year for the Nation's industry generally, coal sales reached 535,000,000 tons, but the industry lost $11,822,000. Without the stabilizing effect of the act, therefore, it appears clear that the industry will return to a below-cost basis.

The concern of Congress for the welfare of the bituminous-coal industry is quite natural, of course. Too much emphasis cannot be given to the importance of bituminous coal in this Nation. Coal represents almost one-half of the energy supply used in the United States. It is a vital part of the industrial system. It runs the railroads, steel mills, munition plants. All industries depend upon it.

The bituminous-coal industry has been in serious difficulties since the close of the World War. During the war period the demand for coal increased rapidly. This was accentuated by a temporary railroad car shortage. The resulting scarcity and marked rise in coal prices encouraged the opening of many new mines. The production and sale of bituminous coal expanded considerably, until in 1918 and 1920 production totaled the peak tonnages of 579,385,820 and 568,666,683 tons, respectively.

Soon after the war, however, the demand for coal began to fall off, and the ills which have since beset the industry began. In part, the slackening in demand was due to technological improvements which permitted a fuller utilization of each ton of coal consumed. Competitive fuels, such as oil, gas, or electricity, also made inroads into the fuel market. Whereas, in 1918, bituminous coal supplied almost 70 percent of the total British thermal units equivalent contributed by mineral fuels and waterpower to the energy requirements of the United States, it supplied less than 45 percent in 1939. Oil and gas, which contributed only 15 percent in 1918, contributed more than 45 percent in 1939.

With the passing of the era of constant expansion which preceded the World War and was further stimulated by the war itself, the market no longer served as an adequate instrument of control. On the one hand was a heavy surplus capacity, on the other a static or declining demand. Congress investigated these problems comprehensively. When the economic depression of the thirties came, it found bituminous-coal operators already in a highly precarious financial state. Even during the winter of 1928–29, when business generally was booming, Mr. Davis, Secretary of Labor in President Hoover's Cabinet, told Congress that "America's poorest relation is coal," and that the bituminous-coal industry was "out of tune with American industrial life," and urged the enactment of a law to regulate the industry. As the depression deepened, the industry was thrown into chaos. As the Supreme Court has put it, free competition was—

"degraded into anarchy." Overproduction and savage, competitive warfare wasted the industry. Labor and capital alike were the victims. Financial distress among operators and acute poverty among miners prevailed even during periods of general prosperity. This history of the bituminous-coal industry is written in blood as well as in ink.

A bitter struggle among producers for whatever business was available resulted. Prices fell sharply. Miners' wages were cut. Deficits became the rule rather than the exception. In 1928, when the country generally was prosperous, the bituminous-coal industry suffered a general net deficit of more than $24,000,000. These losses were widespread. That year 2,982 companies made income-tax returns. But only 863 of them had any income to report. The remaining 1,842 reported either that they had suffered a deficit or else had no income. In 1929 the net deficit was over $11,000,000, and the deficit ran as high as $51,000,000 in 1932.

In fact, the bituminous-coal industry has operated at a loss for the past 15 years. This has led to the wiping out of investments, to precarious standards of living for the families of more than half a million workers, to ghost towns, and to economic waste and human misery.

In 1933 the industry was prostrated. The N. R. A. partially restored order. However, in 1935 the industry as a whole was still operating at a deficit, and with the collapse of the N. R. A. under the Schechter decision both operators and miners united in the demand for Government regulation.

The Congress answered the pleas of the industry by the enactment of the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act in 1935, and when that was declared unconstitutional, because of the labor provisions, it enacted the Bituminous Coal Act, which this bill would extend for 2 years.

As the Supreme Court has put it:

It was the judgment of Congress that price fixing and the elimination of unfair competitive practices were appropriate methods for prevention of the financial ruin, low wages, poor working conditions, strikes, and disruption of the channels of trade which followed in the wake of the demoralized price structures in this industry. If the strategic character of this industry in our economy and the chaotic conditions which have prevailed in it do not justify legislation, it is difficult to imagine what would.

Whereas other major coal-producing countries faced with similar critical conditions have sought to solve these problems by nationalizing their coal industries or by granting subsidies or other financial assistance, this Congress met the problem in a democratic American way. It established a method for cooperation between Government and industry and labor through their representatives on the district boards for the several regions set up in the act.

A statement was recently issued by a committee made up of leaders of the coal industry—both producers and miners—urging extension of the act. This is what it said:

It is to be noted that in every major coal-producing country, with the exception of the United States, the coal industry has been either nationalized or subsidized by the various governments. It is the opinion of the committee that the American coal industry can be saved from such measures as cash subsidies or nationalization if the present coal act is extended for a further period of 2 years in order to properly observe the results of its operation under varying conditions.

From the enactment of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 until September 1940, the National Bituminous Coal Commission and its successor, the Bituminous Coal Division, were engaged primarily in proceedings leading to the promulgation of minimum prices and marketing rules and regulations. These became effective on October 1, 1940. They had to conform with specific standards set up in the act, and the fact that no court case has been brought to challenge the general price structure demonstrates that the Coal Division has done an excellent job. The task of setting up these thousands of prices was a gigantic one. It was a task comparable to setting up the Nation's railroad freight-rate structure. There were inefficiency and unfortunate delays at the start of the job. Subsequently, on July 1, 1939, the National Bituminous Coal Commission was abolished and the administration of the law was transferred by Executive order under the Reorganization Act of 1939 to Secretary Ickes. Secretary Ickes in turn set up the present Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior, which has administered the act since July 1, 1939.

I want to say a word about this Division. Gentlemen, I sat on the Committee on Ways and Means through some 8 days of hearings on this resolution. There were complaints, of course, as there are complaints about any administrative agency, or, for that matter, about the way we ourselves carry out our

functions here in Congress. But there was not one serious charge but that the Coal Division had performed its job fairly and equitably to all concerned. The Director of the Division, Howard A. Gray, is a man of many years' experience in the steel and machinery manufacturing industries. He has no financial interest in the coal industry. Representatives of the industry and editorials in the trade journals and press commend him for his fairness and good business sense.

On October 1, 1940, minimum prices and marketing rules and regulations for the bituminous-coal industry became effective. Since October 1, 1940, for the first time in almost 15 years, the bituminous-coal industry has earned its cost of production.

Of course, the effective minimum prices have brought with them an increase in the cost to the consumer. But the increase, particularly to the domestic consumer, has been only slight. The bill has reestablished the Consumers' Counsel Division as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government to protect the interest of all consumers. I do not know how any fair-minded person can complain at paying for a commodity below what it costs the seller to produce it. Business cannot be done on that basis without serious damage to the Nation's economy. And the reputable buyer does not want to do it on that basis. In the long run, he does not benefit any if his fellow businessman, the coal producer, must operate under his cost, cut prices, and resort to unfair methods of competition lest he go out of business.

I personally think the Coal Act is the answer to the problems of the bituminous-coal industry. Producers and mine workers have recommended a 2-year extension. They said, "We think this act holds great promise of curing the ills of the industry. We believe it is a workable act. It has brought stability in the industry." However, experience under it has been limited to 5 months. Prices have been effective only since October 1. Congress ought to test the act for 2 years more before it decides whether the machinery should be made permanent.

A shorter extension would not provide a reliable and representative test.

If a lapse of even a few hours should occur in the life of this law—which expires by limitation on April 26 of this year—chaos would follow. The minimum-price structure would collapse and the result of months and years of painstaking work would be destroyed. Competition in the industry again would degenerate into anarchy. Producers now negotiating a new wage contract with their employees would again be confronted by the necessity of selling coal below cost. Where would they get money to pay decent wages? How could they see their way clear to enter into a 2-year labor contract? Avoiding labor strife amid such circumstances would be extremely difficult if not impossible. And the interruption in the supply of coal which might come at this time would still the wheels of industry in this critical period in our country's history.

Gentlemen, the declaration made in 1925 by the commission headed by the late John Hay Hammond, the eminent mining engineer appointed by President Harding to investigate conditions in the coal industry, is still applicable:

> The Government can act only through administrative agencies; and it is clear that if anything is to be done at all commensurate with the gravity of the problem, an effective agency, with sufficient funds, experience, and powers at its disposal, must be charged with the direct responsibility for such regulation and supervision as is necessary. Honest and efficient coal operators and dealers have nothing to fear from this. On the contrary, they have reason to welcome it.

I therefore urge upon my colleagues in the House that they pass the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, thereby advancing the well-being of the Nation as a whole and protecting its economy in this hour of need from the chaos which will result if the Coal Act is not extended.

The act provides that there shall be 23 district boards, each consisting of from 3 to 17 members. The number of members in each district is determined by the code member-producers within that district. One member of the board is elected by the organization of employees which represents the preponderant number of employees in the industry within that district. The remaining board members are producers or representatives of producers. One-half of that number are elected by numerical vote, each code member having one vote. The remaining half of the producer members are elected on a tonnage basis, that is to say, the number of votes cast by each producer depends upon the tonnage produced by that producer. The district board members are elected for a period of 2 years and until their successors are elected. The Division has the power to remove board members who, after notice and hearing, are found guilty of inefficiency, willful neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

Our committee held hearings and took testimony on this bill for 8 long days, and I want to take this opportunity of saying what I think about the evidence. We heard witnesses representing the miners' union, the coal producers, large and small, the cooperative organizations; and invariably, in fact almost 100 percent, everybody was agreeable to the legislation. The principle of the legislation was not attacked by anybody. It was just a question of what length of time the act ought to be extended.

I have no bituminous coal fields in my district, I come from the anthracite region which is not at all affected by this legislation. I have never had any connection with the bituminous-coal industry, but I fully realize the great need for legislation of this kind. That there was need for this legislation is amply demonstrated by what the Administrator of the Bituminous Coal Act has accomplished during the past 5 months. In the early days of the legislation the experience was rather unfortunate. The original legislation was enacted in 1937, and as we all know the Commission had to be abandoned and an Administrator appointed to carry out the act. Administrator Gray has done a remarkable job during the time he has been in office. Originally, 4 years ago, and again 2 years ago, some producers were solidly against this legislation, but the experience of the last 5 months has proven conclusively that this legislation should be extended throughout the next 2 years.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. What is the gentleman's provision as to the extension of the provisions of this act to the anthracite-coal industry?

Mr. BOLAND. I am perfectly satisfied that this legislation has proven its worth, that during the next 2 years if this bill passes, it will prove its worth still more and that it will be found to be the answer to the ills of the anthracite region. The gentleman himself comes from the anthracite fields, he has anthracite operations in his district and understands fully the chaos in the anthracite industry at the present time, chaotic conditions they have been trying to deal with for the past 20 years, yet they are as far away from solving them today as they were when they started. Some State legislators, of course, have recently provided for the allocation of anthracite production to different localities to prevent the ghost towns that have so frequently followed anthracite operations in the past.

I believe this bill will be found to be the answer to the problems of the anthracite-coal industry and I believe the experiences of the bituminous industry during the next 2 years under the operation of this act will demonstrate its good so conclusively that automatically the anthracite fields will come under this kind of legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I was quite interested in the statement that has been made by the Brookings Institution that as a wartime measure the anchracite fields should be brought under this act.

Mr. BOLAND. I fully agree in that. I am convinced myself, but the Congress has got to be convinced. I believe this legislation will do the job it is claimed it will do. If it does, the anthracite industry will automatically come under its terms. I did present a bill to put the anthracite industry under this act 2 years ago, but because of the situation in the Coal Commission, that had to be abandoned, as we were told earlier today, but now we have a different situation. We have an Administrator who has no connection with coal. He has done a remarkable job. The testimony of the producers themselves is sufficient evidence of the fact that he has done a remarkable job for the industry; and I do hope, without going further into the merits of this bill or occupying the time of the House, they will pass this bill. I believe the House is fully satisfied that this act should be extended for 2 years. Let me say, however, that there are seven reasons why this act should be extended, namely:

First. The act is operating successfully. Minimum prices became effective October 1, 1940. For the first time in many years the bituminous-coal industry is realizing its cost of production.

Second. Continuation of the act preserves the investment and guarantees the livelihood of 13,000 producers, most of them small businessmen.

Third. Continuation of the act means a living wage for miners. It means no more ghost towns caused by starvation prices and starvation wages.

Fourth. Continuation of the act is necessary to national defense. The wage contract between the operators and the miners expires April 1, 1941. A new contract can be negotiated without a strike only if the act is extended. Otherwise prices will collapse and agreement as to wages will be difficult, if not impossible.

Fifth. Continuation of the act is necessary to avoid Government subsidy or nationalization. In every major coal-producing country, except the United States, the coal industry is supported by subsidies or has been nationalized. The coal act enables the American coal industry to avoid these measures.

Sixth. Administration of the Coal Act does not cost the Government a single penny. Costs are paid by a special tax on coal produced levied by the act and by assessments paid by producers.

Seventh. The Coal Act is a cooperative undertaking by Government and industry. The industry, through boards of its own selection, plays an important part in administration of the act.

I expect to have Federal regulation of anthracite coal considered at a later date.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows, of course, that the act is maintained by a special tax on the production of coal, and therefore this money comes from the operators and the owners of the mines.

Mr. BOLAND. That is right.

Mr. MAY. The price-fixing arrangement, which is the meat of the whole transaction, if there is any in it, was put into effect just a few months ago after an expenditure of nearly $15,000,000 in an effort to regulate prices.

Mr. BOLAND. Five months ago. I think the gentleman is wrong about the $15,000,000.

Mr. MAY. There has been that much collected.

Mr. BOLAND. I believe some $15,000,000 was paid in and about $12,000,000 paid out.

Mr. MAY. Whatever the amount is, it is several million dollars. Both the operators and miners ought to try it out for another 2 years in order to determine whether or not it will work.

Mr. BOLAND. That is right.

Mr. DUNCAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DUNCAN. There have been $15,111,525 collected and $12,954,801 expended—more than $2,000,000 collected in excess of what has been expended.

Mr. MAY. I was not raising any question as to the accuracy of the figures. I may be in error. I am simply trying to emphasize the fact it would be absurd and ridiculous for the Congress to allow the industry to spend as many millions as $12,000,000 or $15,000,000, then kill the thing before it is fairly tried.

Mr. BOLAND. I understand what the gentleman is trying to tell the Congress and I agree with him fully that it is the proper thing to extend this for 2 years.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It appears that the 5 months of the operation of this act also coincides with the period when we have had great industrial expansion, where I, as a layman—and I am not a student on the subject—would feel that even without the act we would have had a greatly increased demand for coal.

Mr. BOLAND. Very true.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Was there something in the bill that I have not yet been able to find, or does the gentleman know of something, which might explain to us that this fine period in the coal industry is due to the workings of this act and not merely to the increased demand caused by an expansion in our industrial program?

Mr. BOLAND. I believe this is abnormal. One of the real reasons the act should be extended for 2 years is to see what it does through normal periods, not abnormal periods such as we have had, because the demand for coal now certainly does not give the right idea so far as this kind of legislation is concerned. It has to go through lean years in order to be able to tell whether this is the proper thing or not. In other words, it is in its experimental stage. I think it is the proper kind of legislation, but I believe it has to go through lean years just the same as other periods.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows that for possibly 10 years the operators failed to enjoy a profit?

Mr. BOLAND. For 15 years.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Since the act has been in effect they have enjoyed a reasonable profit?

Mr. BOLAND. That is right.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And expect to continue so as long as the price fixing remains in effect?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true, and is it not possible, that the Bituminous Coal Commission will have a chance to enforce its maximum prices during this boom period?

Mr. BOLAND. That is right. The law as written gives the Administrator the right to fix maximum prices so that no advantage can be taken of the consumer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, I became prejudiced against this legislation. The first witness who appeared before our committee was very mysterious in the type of evidence he gave. I refer to the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes. He said he advocated the passage of this bill, but stated that there were many things about it which needed correction and—

eventually we are going to correct them. We have amendments waiting and as soon as you extend the law for 2 years we will begin to suggest amendments.

The natural question came to all of us, perhaps to me more than to some others, "Why not lay your cards on the table now so far as the changes you want to make in this bill are concerned?" Every administration witness who came before us hedged on that point. They would not tell us the type of amendments they had in mind. All the Secretary said was that the coal situation had only been under his charge since July 1, 1939, and he had not had time enough to test the thing out, but he did know that eventually he was going to offer suggestions in the form of amendments. Then they said, too, that there is not time enough. Well, the Ways and Means Committee has not been perspiring a whole lot since the session opened.

There is too much crowding of matters at the last minute. That is what is being done with this bill and that is why you are asked today to extend this measure for 2 years. If it had been extended 1 year that would have been ample and they could have offered any amendments that might be necessary. I came to get the idea that there was something mysterious here and I still feel so. One great objection to the bill is the minimum price fixing. Not a man will say that the principle of price fixing is a proper thing, but the proponents of this bill claim that the bituminous-coal industry is so different from everything else that we must agree to minimum price fixing on that commodity. If we are going to fix minimum prices let us make it a general proposition or let us keep out of it altogether. I realize this bill is going to pass today without any struggle whatsoever, but the person who is going to suffer from its passage is the same old forgotten man, the consumer.

According to tables furnished the committee, the price of coal advanced 20 cents per ton after minimum prices were put into effect last October. On the basis of a production of 500,000,000 tons production per annum, this means an increased cost to consumers of $100,000,000 annually.

Many coal producers would like to sell their product for less than the fixed price. They are prevented from doing so by the penalty tax of 19½ percent on coal sold below the minimum price as fixed by the Coal Division.

I happen to be one of those who represent a consuming section. There is a little window dressing in the bill in the form of a Consumers' Counsel. The strange part of it is that the Consumers' Counsel, who is supposed to be looking after the consumer, is simply an appendix to the main proposition of the control of the

Bituminous Coal Board by the Secretary of the Interior. Both the Administrator of the Coal Division, who fixes minimum prices, and the Consumers' Counsel are under the same head, the Secretary of the Interior. How can the Secretary look after the coal producer and the coal consumer at the same time? The Committee on Ways and Means did do one very good thing, and that was to take away from the Department of the Interior the control over the Consumers' Counsel and set him up as an independent agency, as was the original intention of the Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that the consumer usually pays the cost in a higher price; but does not the gentleman feel that the coal industry, generally speaking, know well enough that, if they charge exorbitant prices, substitute fuels, such as electricity, gas, and oil, will take away their market?

Mr. TREADWAY. I agree with that. The only real control there is over the situation is the competition of rival fuels, such as oil and gas. If you let the price on them go up, the coal price will go up, whether you have a Bituminous Coal Act or not.

Mr. MAY. Electricity is also included in those competitives.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; hydroelectric power also.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What has happened to the Consumers' Counsel since 1937? Have they functioned?

Mr. TREADWAY. Not much; no. There has been no Consumers' Counsel for several months. There is a department of that title, but the Consumers' Counsel has gone to another position.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. New York State will not have to buy any coal after the St. Lawrence project is completed.

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman and I are Members of Congress when that project is finished at the request of the President of the United States, we will be here some time longer than the electors are liable to leave us here.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman believe that this price-fixing system should be extended to the farmers as well as to the coal operators?

Mr. TREADWAY. I believe the gentleman has hit on a very strong point. If it is good for one, it should be good for all.

Mr. O'CONNOR. At least cost of production.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania a few moments ago said they wanted another coal commission for anthracite. It is just another effort to fix the price. There is just as much reason to fix the minimum price on woolen goods manufactured in Massachusetts as there is on the coal dug in Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman believe that we should fix this cost-of-production price for the sheep that produce the wool, and for cattle, and for wheat, and for cotton, and for everything else?

Mr. TREADWAY. I believe if you are going to do it for coal, you should do it for all. I am not in favor of any price-fixing. Supply and demand will take care of prices.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are making a preference as to the coal industry.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman made the statement that I advocated another commission for the anthracite-coal region. That is not true.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. BOLAND. No; I said the anthracite-coal region should come under legislation of this character; in other words, if a commission was set up for bituminous coal, the same commission certainly could operate in the anthracite industry.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; but the gentleman would like commission control for anthracite.

Mr. BOLAND. I will not swallow the charge that I am trying to have appointed another commission for anthracite coal.

Mr. TREADWAY. Nothing has been said so far in reference to one feature that probably helped to bring about a favorable report on this bill from the Committee on Ways and Means. It was so generally understood, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is imperfect; that in the Committee on Ways and Means there was a definite understanding that a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means will be appointed right away to consider amendments to the bill we are expected to pass here today.

Since this is a poor type of legislation, and since we know there are errors in the bill, why not correct them as we go along rather than set up a subcommittee to study them for the next 2 years?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. The matter about which the gentleman just spoke is something I was going to ask him about—that is, the setting up of the subcommittee.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it is just a little more sugar on the pill.

Mr. ELSTON. There were a number of witnesses who appeared before the gentleman's committee from the Cincinnati district.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; very good witnesses, too, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. And they were asking the committee to adopt an amendment which would clarify the situation in the Cincinnati district insofar as the prices of river coal and railroad coal were concerned. Those witnesses will have to be told, of course, that the committee did not adopt their amendment, and what I would like to know is how soon this subcommittee may complete its investigation and report back to the full committee an amendment which would be suitable.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would prefer that the gentleman ask one of the members of the majority that question rather than myself, because actual control of the appointment of the committee, as well as their action, is in the hands of the majority rather than our side.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman feel that an investigation of a subcommittee and a report back to the full committee will solve this problem?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I do not believe it will at all, because I do not think it will go far enough; in fact, there ought not to be any problem. I agree fully that a subcommittee should be appointed even on the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior who, himself, admitted that the bill was not perfect and should be amended.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman has in mind, of course, the emergency and the fact that a free flowage of coal to the industrial centers is absolutely essential and that we ought to do everything we can to facilitate that at this time.

Mr. TREADWAY. I agree with that.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman referred to consumers, and I want to call his attention to one question that I asked a witness who I thought was a hostile witness to this bill, and I had in mind the position of the consumer in my section of the country and the gentleman's section of the country.

Mr. TREADWAY. Naturally, the gentleman would favor the consumer, because we do not have any coal in our section.

Mr. HEALEY. The question was, "Do you not think a continuance of this act will be a protection to the consumer of coal?" And he said, "That is exactly why I am for it."

Mr. TREADWAY. That is just one man's opinion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HEALEY. What I want to point out to the gentleman is that I think both the gentleman and myself will best protect the consumers of coal in our section of the country by going along with this act now.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is a matter of judgment.

Mr. HEALEY. In view of this emergency.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I say, that is a matter of judgment. The Ways and Means Committee having acted as it has by a majority vote, without reference to party lines, I will go along with the

majority. We are going to pass this bill promptly, and then we will see what happens under it. I have only stated, as the gentleman will realize, certain objections and prejudices I have against it from the nature of the testimony we have had.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman has in mind, of course, the fact that there was a runaway market of coal in 1917 and prices of coal rose to very exorbitant amounts.

Mr. TREADWAY. That was a situation where maximum price fixing was needed. We are dealing here with minimum price fixing.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the gentleman will permit, 1919–20 was the runaway market.

Mr. HEALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, when this coal-control bill first came before the Ways and Means Committee, I fought it at every step of the way. It will be recalled it was that bill which the President urged be reported out and acted upon favorably notwithstanding doubts as to its constitutionality. I opposed it and spoke against it and voted against it because I believed it to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court as then constituted declared it to be unconstitutional. Later on the bill was reenacted and the objectionable features eliminated, insofar as they were unconstitutional, and the act has since been in force. I doubt if any man on the floor of the House, no matter how ardent he may be in favor of the bill, will dispute the fact that the first organization set up under the second bill enacted by the Congress was undoubtedly the most inefficient, partisan board that was ever created, probably, in the history of the Government. No one disputes that, and when an investigation was threatened the Commission's staff members ran to cover, fearing they might be found and served with papers.

However, I want to be perfectly fair. I have listened to the testimony, all of it, given in support of the extension of this act, and I feel honestly and sincerely that they made out a very good case in favor of the extension of the act.

I almost abhor the Fascist philosophy behind this particular type of legislation. I think it is only an entering wedge to similar legislation for other so-called sick industries, and on this excuse, or because of some other plausible circumstances that will be offered, legislation of a similar character will come along. But I am convinced from the evidence that the coal situation is different, perhaps, at this time from that of any other group of industries, and I am willing the act should have a fair trial. And if I may speak facetiously, I believe in giving the devil his due; that Secretary Ickes has done a fairly good job in ridding this incubus of a lot of inefficient people and has put the administration of the act in order. The operators and the laboring men in the coal mines seem to be quite satisfied with the progress that has been made.

So far as I know there has been very little complaint, if any, on the part of the consumers. As I stated, when one of the gentlemen was on the floor, the Brookings Institution seems to feel that there must be some organization as we go into this war that will tend to regulate the price of bituminous coal, but they did recommend, however, in this finding that the anthracite coal should come under the same control. We do know that during the first World War the prices of coal skyrocketed very rapidly. I was looking up the figures. Bituminous coal in New York City in November 1914 was $3.15 a ton, and in 1919 it was $5.45 a ton. In the same period coke went from $1.75 a ton to $6 a ton. Under this bill there is a Consumers' Counsel set up as an independent agency. The only thing that worries me is that the procedure required to put a ceiling on the prices in the event they start to soar will be too cumbersome and slow to meet the danger of price increases. However, the coal operators have made out a strong case in favor of an extension of this act, and much as I dislike the philosophy of this type of legislation, yet, in view of the testimony and the action of the committee—and I certainly am not interested or influenced by any coal mines in my district—I am going along with this extension of the act with the hope that if anything arises we can take prompt action in the way of amendments to meet the situation.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. This question is prompted by a letter from one of my constituents, who is in the coal and lumber business. He indicated there was something in this legislation which gave special discount to certain people engaged in handling coal that was not given to retail dealers generally.

Mr. REED of New York. I know nothing of that kind. If there is any such thing, I do not know of it.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not know of any such provision, and I wondered if there is any.

Mr. REED of New York. I know of none.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. RICH. What is going to happen to the miners of Pennsylvania and other States when we construct the St. Lawrence waterway and take away from the miners of Pennsylvania the opportunity to even mine coal?

Mr. REED of New York. Well, you will not need any commission, and you will not need to bother about your mines, for we will have all the power we want.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, listened to all of the witnesses, and I am wondering whether he has been convinced that the problem of the small producer, especially the trucker, has been ignored to a certain extent and that amendments are necessary to protect his interest?

Mr. REED of New York. I believe there should be amendments, and I believe that if this committee of several members is set up to watch the operations the Ways and Means Committee will be prompt to act in their behalf, if the necessity arises. I thought the committee was impressed very much with the testimony given by the small coal operators.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Of course, during this 2-year period, if this proves unsuccessful, we might expect it to be abolished? Is not that true?

Mr. REED of New York. Well, the gentleman knows that we have the assurance of the President of the United States that whenever anything in the New Deal repertoire does not work he will be the first to notify us, and he has not notified us yet.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On the other hand, is it not true that if this coal-control business proves successful, we may expect to see it extended throughout our economy? There is not anything so peculiar about coal that it might work there and not other places. Is not that true?

Mr. REED of New York. I have said here on the floor that I am opposed to the philosophy behind this legislation because it is a form of nazi-ism, and when it comes to the next step of controlling what labor shall get, then you are going practically the whole way.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The gentleman's position on this bill is a great deal the same as mine. Two years ago I felt it was not proper legislation. I had a number of complaints—letters from various people—asking me to oppose this bill. This year I must say that I have had no letters to oppose it. Both the operators and the mine unions in my State are in favor of giving it a 2-year trial.

Mr. REED of New York. Was not this true, that the complaints you received were prior to the reorganization?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Prior to the reorganization.

Mr. REED of New York. But since that time your experience and mine has been the same. I have had no complaint.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. And for that reason I am going to support this measure.

Mr. REED of New York. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, with the end of the World War in 1919 an era of prosperity ended in the bituminous-coal industry. Since that time until last October, when is was given a new lease on life by the fixed prices promulgated by the Coal Division, the coal industry was very sick indeed.

The degraded condition of the industry and its reflections on the social scene have provoked numerous official investigations by Congress and governmental agencies during the past two decades. Those surveys uncovered widespread

financial ruin, bankruptcy, wholesale loss of investments, low wages, general poverty, deplorable living conditions, strikes, lock-outs, wanton destruction of life and property, great toll of life and limb in mine accidents, loss of civil rights, open warfare between large groups of armed men, armed conflicts resulting in trials on charges of treason against the United States, brutal beatings, abductions, arson, dynamiting—the list of horrors is even longer.

The producers of bituminous coal are not cruel persons. They are ordinary businessmen quite willing to pay living wages and trying to do business the fair and healthy way. But with overcapacity and a shrinking demand for bituminous coal, and the price cutting which inevitably resulted, they were forced to pass their losses on to labor and to operate below cost in order to remain alive. The industry has been in a depression for nearly two decades. It has suffered a financial net deficit of millions of dollars every year for approximately 15 years.

In the words of the Supreme Court, free competition was "degraded into anarchy," and labor and capital alike were the victims. Financial distress among operators and acute poverty among miners prevailed even during periods of general prosperity. Coal sold generally at levels substantially below cost, and producers were under constant pressure to cut costs even beyond the bounds of economic reason in order to sell enough coal to keep their mines open.

The widely scattered location and ownership of coal reserves, rivalries between districts, legal obstacles of the antitrust laws, and other factors prevented any form of centralized organization. Control of the industry remained in the hands of some 15,000 constantly warring independent producers in 30 States. No power other than that of the United States Government could bring order out such chaos. This was recognized as far back as 1925 by the United States Coal Commission, headed by the late John Hays Hammond. This eminent mining engineer, appointed by President Harding to investigate the coal industry, recommended Federal regulation of the coal industry as the only solution.

Now the Coal Act has eliminated destructive cutthroat competition and has replaced it with fair competition. The bituminous-coal industry is emerging into an era of stabilization. It is realizing its cost of production for the first time in more than 15 years.

When minimum prices became effective on October 1, 1940, one of the most shameful chapters in the economic and social history of this Nation was closed—a chapter, to quote the Supreme Court, which is "written in blood as well as in ink."

Extension of the Bituminous Coal Act will ensure that that chapter need never be rewritten.

A committee of outstanding leaders of coal producers and coal miners' representatives, the advisory committee to the Bituminous Coal Division, in a public statement calling for a 2-year extension of the Coal Act, issued several days ago, made the following statement:

The extension of the act will protect the tremendous investment that has been made in the bituminous-coal industry, a large portion of which is owned by small businessmen of limited means, and will tend to conserve the national resources of the country which were being wasted under open competition.

A continuation of the act for a further 2 years will protect the livelihood of and guarantee a living wage to those who are dependent upon the industry for a living, and will mean that no more ghost towns will grow up or will be caused by starvation wages due to selling coal below cost of production. It will go a long way to prevent strikes and lock-outs in this basic and hitherto strife-torn industry.

I submit that it is vital to the health and welfare of our Nation that the Coal Act be extended. I congratulate the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and those who joined with him in bringing out this legislation for an extension of the present law for 2 years. This Congress, I feel, will by a large majority continue this meritorious program. It benefits properly the miners and the operators of this country—and lifeblood runs strong in an industry too long ill. [Applause.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed happy to see that this piece of legislation which 6 years ago provoked so much stormy and acrimonious debate on the floor of this House has at last got to the point where it is being kindly received by its former opponents. I want to assure those former opponents that this legislation has brought a great deal to the industry which it was designed to assist—the bituminous-coal industry.

The bituminous-coal industry, in general, has never been a paying industry. In its very infancy, because of the vast amount of money spent to purchase the coal lands from the original owners, it obtained a bad start. That placed the industry in a position where it had a high overhead in the way of taxes and interest. It was overfinanced—unfavorably financed—from the start.

During the World War, because of the great demand for coal, the industry became very much overextended and bituminous coal was placed in the position whereby there was a great deal more of it being mined every year than the country could consume. This brought deplorable conditions to the miners. The living conditions of those who labored in the mines became perhaps the lowest of any of the workers in the United States. Because of this legislation this industry has at last been put in a position where those who produce it are not losing any money and where those who work in the mines are at last in a position where they can live as we would like all American citizens to live, where they can have some of the comforts of life and be able to give their families some of the advantages to which all American citizens are entitled.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take the time of this Committee any further. I simply wanted to state that I am very happy to see this legislation renewed for 2 years. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few observations from the viewpoint of a coal operator and one whose experience in that industry covers almost a generation.

Back as far as 1925 the necessity for some Federal regulation was apparent. The industry had gotten into such a condition that it could not help itself and it had brought, as a result, a great deal of suffering to the miners, a great deal of embarrassment and worry to the coal operators. The Federal Government did take some action in 1935 and, finally, in this act of 1937.

My impression about Federal regulation of the coal industry is that the coal industry is not in the same category as other industries. Coal is a natural resource. It was placed in the ground by the Almighty in the process of creating the world. It does not belong to any particular generation. It cannot be replenished. When it is exhausted it is finished. Therefore, no group of people, no individual, no generation has the right to exploit or to waste that natural resource, because it belongs to the generations yet to come.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I understood the gentleman to say he was a coal operator?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman any information on the question of whether or not the passage of this act 6 years ago has had any effect in driving the consumers of coal into the oil field? In other words, using oil instead of coal. Has the gentleman any statistics or figures on that?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I have no statistics on that.

Mr. DONDERO. What has been the gentleman's experience?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. The experience I have had since the price has been regulated, since October 1, 1940, is that nothing like that has occurred.

Mr. DONDERO. That is, it has had no adverse effect.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. It has had no adverse effect so far as I know.

Mr. DONDERO. I am inclined to go along with the legislation and give it a trial of 2 more years, but I was wondering whether or not it has had any effect in causing more people to use oil and in fact divorcing people from the use of coal. This would affect the coal industry.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. No; there has been a great deal of coal business lost to oil and to natural gas in the past dozen years, but not particularly since the 1st of October.

Mr. DONDERO. Has it had any effect in raising the price of coal to the consumer? I mean in a material sum.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman means this bill?

Mr. DONDERO. This particular type of legislation.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes; it has raised it, I think, on an average of 11 cents a ton.

Mr. DONDERO. A very small amount.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. A small amount throughout the coal industry.

If the coal industry cannot regulate itself it should be regulated by the National Government in order to preserve it and to conserve this natural resource for future generations. Regulation of the price is one effort to conserve coal.

The consumer, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said awhile ago, was the forgotten man. I love the consumer because I must in my business, but I want to say to you frankly that the forgotten man in the coal industry has been the miner. The consumer has been the beneficiary of the low prices of coal at the expense of the miner and the coal operator for 15 years. If now the price of coal is raised to the consumer it is only an act of justice to enable the operator to recover the bare cost of production and pay a decent wage to the man who digs and mines the coal. I do not believe the coal consumer would have any hesitancy in paying a little more for his coal were he familiar with the conditions in the industry during the last 5, 10, or 15 years, with the utter destitution of the miners and the plight of the coal operators. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us this afternoon provides for extending the life of the Bituminous Coal Division for 2 years. This agency was established in 1937. It required several years to accumulate data and make the extensive surveys that were necessary before the Commission could announce minimum prices for coal. This data and information was secured and the price schedules were announced on October 1, 1940. This means that the act has been in actual operation and effect only a little over 5 months. No one questions the ability and sincerity with which Mr. Gray, the present Director, has administered the act. It has been a real problem, and he and his organization are entitled to much credit.

A study of the coal industry must convince anyone that it was a sick industry. It was and still is suffering from World War expansion, high competition, and labor problems. The statement is made that the Bituminous Coal Division should be given extended time in order to prove its merits. We have spent millions of dollars in starting this experiment, and the question now is whether or not the expenditures warrant an extension of the agency. The Bituminous Coal Act was the continuance of the principle of Government control and regulation as originally planned in the N. I. R. A. It applies the principle of Government control, price fixing, and regulation that was originally sponsored in the N. I. R. A. to one industry or one phase of our industrial machine. If you believe in bureaucracy, centralized control, and possibly Government ownership, you can enthusiastically support this measure. However, if you are opposed to price fixing, Government monopoly, and a discontinuance of free competition as we have known it in the United States, you might well question the merits of this legislation. This is a price-fixing bill. It assures the coal operators of cost of production. It stabilizes the industry and it does these things at the expense of the consumer. Much will be said this afternoon in regard to the small additional cost to the consumer, but, after all, it is the consumer who pays. If this is to be the policy of our Government then it is reasonable to assume that other industries and agriculture might demand the same legislation. How can we as a government honestly insure one group of producers cost of production and not give the same advantages to any other group? As I stated previously, the coal industry has suffered seriously during the past few years, but that same statement would be equally true with agriculture. During the past few years Congress has enacted legislation which had as its basis parity prices for agricultural products. Those who have studied the effects of this legislation fully realize how inadequate it has been. Few people indeed have had the temerity to ask Congress to give agriculture cost of production. After all, why not if we are to do it for other groups? Agriculture has been hopeful that it would be able to secure a purchasing power that would place it on a parity with labor and industry.

At the present time the purchasing power of the farm dollar is 79 cents. Many individual farm commodities are now being sold at 50 to 60 percent of parity. It is my firm opinion that we will not have economic security or economic prosperity until agriculture's purchasing power is placed on a parity with labor and industry. The great national-defense program that we have now entered into is causing further dislocations and increasing the gulf between agriculture and labor and industry. The export markets of the farmers are practically gone. This has meant serious losses and price reduction to the growers of cotton, wheat, tobacco, apples, and other exportable surplus farm crops. I am going to cite just one illustration showing the loss of our farm markets. In the crop year 1917–18 we exported 511,000,000 bushels of wheat. Since July 1, 1940, we have exported only 29,000,000 bushels. This shows the effect of the World War on the prices paid the wheat farmers. If Congress approves the principle of price fixing, then I believe in all seriousness we should begin at once to work on a cost of production or price fixing for agriculture. The farmer cannot exist in an economy which provides greatly increased costs for the things that he buys and in no way assures him parity prices.

The approval of this act today will mean increased costs for the consumers of this Nation. Much has been said this afternoon about the slight increase in cost to the consumer, but according to the estimates submitted to the committee the cost is not so slight. The hearings disclose, from a table submitted by the Director of the Bituminous Coal Commission, that coal prices to the consumer in November 1940 were on an average 20 cents per ton higher than in November 1939. This does not sound like a very large amount, but on an annual production of 500,000,000 tons of coal it means a hundred million dollars. At the present time the coal operators and miners are attempting to reach an agreement on increased wages for the miners. John L. Lewis has stated that if cash-wage increases are granted it will mean an additional cost of 17 cents per ton. The mine operators contend that this is too low, and the additional cost will be somewhere nearer 30 cents per ton. Under the proposed legislation the coal operators can order a hearing before the Director of the Bituminous Coal Division and present facts showing the increased costs, and it will be up to him to grant them. The cost of coal to the consumer has varied greatly under this act in the various sections of the United States. In some sections the coal prices have not increased to any material extent, while in other sections they have increased greatly. This is especially true in areas which receive a large portion of their coal by truck. The Consumers' Council estimate that the price schedules, as submitted by the Commission, have made a difference in some cases of as much as $1.55 per ton. If the act is extended, I sincerely hope that the Director will use every power he has to correct this inequality. A certain community or section of our country should not be penalized just because it does not have a certain type of transportation. If this act is to continue, the consumer and the small coal-mine operator must be given more consideration than they have in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us what has been the increase in the price of steam coal? And when I say steam coal I mean mine-run coal that used to sell for around 90 cents a ton.

Mr. CARLSON. No, I cannot, because I am not in a coal section. I heard the testimony presented to the committee. If I remember correctly, it was $2.35 a ton for mine-run coal in some sections, but I am not thoroughly familiar with it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not these local committees, in arriving at reasonable prices, take into consideration invested capital in the mines, as well as the wages desired to be paid, the standard of living, and so forth?

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand it, the price of coal in an area is based on the average cost of production, not for an individual mine but the average cost of all mines.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For that region?

Mr. CARLSON. For that region.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That average takes into consideration the investment and so forth?

Mr. CARLSON. There is some question about that. The Consumers' Counsel in his statement, as I read it, ques-

tioned the method that is used in arriving at the cost of production, and that is one of his criticisms.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This cost that the gentleman speaks of represents the cost per ton at the mouth of the mine or the tipple, is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is true, and I want to make a statement on that. We hear much about the minimum cost of coal at the tipple of the mine. One would gather from the debate and from hearing witnesses that that is all the effect this act has; but the fact of the matter is it deals with the transportation of coal, and by the time it gets to the consumer he does not get the benefit of lower transportation facilities, such as water, trucks, and so forth. The consumer gets an additional cost, and I think that is one thing that should be studied and corrected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do the gentleman's studies and observations of the operations under this act indicate that it tends to stimulate the formation of coal monopolies?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, I think any price-fixing organization or any price-fixing program establishes a monopoly. It does not tend to do that, it just does establish it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have heard it stated again and again that the operators and miners are universally for the continuance of this act, yet in my territory we have many small operators operating mines where they do not employ more than from 10 to 100 miners. They turn out a very limited amount of coal. As nearly as I am informed from those places, both the miners and operators contend that the continuance of this act will cause them to close down, or it will put them out of business. Are they wrong or is the testimony before the committee wrong?

Mr. CARLSON. The testimony before our committee shows that this bill has worked disadvantageously to a number of small operators, and some of them testified to that effect before our committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is anything being done or is anything going to be done to take care of these small fellows?

Mr. CARLSON. The Bituminous Coal Commission is familiar with this problem, and I certainly hope it will take the matter into consideration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But the bill does not give them relief?

Mr. CARLSON. It does not.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Unfortunately, I have missed most of the remarks of the gentleman, having been detained outside the Chamber. I think he agrees with me, however, that this is a poor time to increase the hazards of any business?

Mr. CARLSON. I am in accord with the gentleman's statement, and I believe that is another reason why this bill is getting the favorable consideration that it is today.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I agree entirely with the gentleman. It is safe to say that the committee has given this bill as much consideration and as careful consideration as any bill we have had before it in a long time. I believe it is the opinion generally of the members of the committee that nothing should be done to disturb that great industry at this time, and that this law should be extended.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, it has been a favorite criticism of the New Deal to say that it is antagonistic to legitimate business and that it seeks to destroy profits. Surely in the case of the Guffey Coal Act this has most emphatically not been true. Instead, we have sought in ways somewhat new in our economic system to rescue a bankrupt industry and give not only the miner but the coal operator as well a chance to live.

There are extensive coal mines in my district, as well as in the State of Ohio. One of the outstanding operators in my district, who, by the way, is high in the councils of the Republican Party, has written me the warmest approval of the operation of this act. We ought not, therefore, be considered business destroyers in the eyes of the mine operators, at least.

In Ohio, in view of the inferior quality of some of the Ohio coal, it is contended that the price relationship established with other coal-producing districts is unfair, and to this end the Consumers' Counsel has filed a petition before the Coal Division for a modification of Ohio prices. Hearings will be held at Cleveland, and it is believed that any injustices to our operators may be rectified. There have been some retail dealers who have registered complaints, and it is understood that in their case, too, some consideration will be given in future amendments to this act.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to go along and vote for an extension of this act for 2 years so that we may thoroughly see its workings under the most favorable conditions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, most of the points in relation to this bill have been touched upon by previous speakers, but to you Members from New England I wish to call attention to a matter that could very seriously affect your industries up there in New England.

There has been a tendency in recent months to take cut of the collier service the coastal-trade boats that haul coal from the tidewater section, from Norfolk and Baltimore, to your New England industries. Most of your industries in New England are not equipped with railroad sidings. Even though it were possible to transport by rail the tonnage of coal to your manufacturers, they do not have sidings, because they have equipped themselves to secure this coal from the boats. Many of the boats are being attracted from that trade due to the increased freight rates they may get on cargoes to Europe and South America. The tonnage thus carried has been greatly reduced. With the expansion of the need for coal for power to carry on the national-defense program in the New England States, this can very readily become a serious handicap to your section of the country. We urge you to join with our Representatives from the coal-producing States to appeal to the Maritime Commission to render aid in securing new boats and holding the existing coal-carrying boats on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. I am glad the gentleman is bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I know it really is a very serious and critical matter. I may say to the gentleman that I have discussed this same proposition with the Administrator of the Coal Act. He is familiar with it, and he is going to do everything he can to keep these colliers in the service, because it is true that the railroads are not in a position, at least, in my judgment, and I know in the judgment of the Administrator of this act, to absorb the burden they would have to absorb in the event the colliers were taken from this service.

Mr. EDMISTON. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly the case.

Let me quote from a well-known Pennsylvania coal operator who is not in the tidewater coal trade and is not affected by the coastal trade, as almost all of that coal comes from West Virginia and Kentucky. He says:

> We might as well face it. We couldn't meet the New England needs if more colliers are taken out of service. The railroads couldn't handle the business. They don't have the facilities, many plants don't have rail sidings, and there's a car shortage showing up now. Unless the fleet is maintained intact, maybe enlarged next fall, we'll see New England industry slowed up and domestic consumers facing a shortage of heating fuel.

This is a serious question that I call particularly to the attention of the New England Representatives. I think and I hope that the passage of this bill by the House today will have a very beneficial influence on the wage conference that is now being held in New York between the operators and miners. I believe the passage of this bill and the extension of this act today will have a very good influence on that conference and within the coming week that a new 2-year wage-scale agreement will be reached and that, under the Guffey Coal Act extension, the industry will move on and adequately supply the country with fuel in this hour of serious need. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, this bill—H. R. 4146, "Extension of the Coal Act"—closes another chapter of the bituminous coal industry activities in the United States.

My district contains one of the leading coal counties in the United States—namely, Fayette County, Pa. It was in Fayette County where coke was first produced. Fayette County produced more coke in the last 40 years than any other county in the Nation. Prior to 1935, the owners of the coal land, the producers of coal, and labor never knew when the cutthroat practices would put them out of business. Congressional investigations were held at various times for the last 25 years, but it was on June 12, 1935, that the Ways and Means Committee of the House started hearings on my bituminous coal-conservation bill. On August 19 it passed the House. The Senate held hearings on the companion bill, introduced in the Senate by Senator GUFFEY.

The bill passed the House by a 28-vote majority on August 19, 1935. The Senate with a few minor amendments passed the bill a few days later and we had the Snyder-Guffey Bituminous Coal Conservation Act.

However, the Supreme Court declared the act unconstitutional because of the labor provisions it contained and then Congress passed the Vincent-Guffey bill in 1937 eliminating the labor provisions objected to by the Supreme Court.

Both these acts provided for a commission of seven men. The President's Reorganization Act of 1939 abolished the commission, and transferred its functions to the Secretary of the Interior and by so doing put teeth and action back of the administration of the act. It is generally agreed that the 2-year extension asked for in H. R. 4146 will be necessary to insure stabilization of the industry in these days of uncertainty and at the same time work to the best interests of all concerned.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, some days ago I was talking with one of my colleagues and he told me about his deep interest in the passage of this bill. I have no coal mines in my district or in my State, but I can readily understand what this bill will mean to the operators of coal mines. What I cannot understand out of my long experience in Congress, in coming in from time to time with legislation that may tend to place the farmers of this country on an equal basis, is that it is almost impossible to do anything about it. Just as soon as we mention price fixing or doing for the farmer what we have done for every other group, on both sides of the House we have gentlemen standing up and saying, "Oh, no; that will interfere with this group or that group."

That is true; the trouble is that these other groups are absolutely grazing on the farmers of this country and they do not want to be interfered with. If you will do for the farmers what should be done, in line with what you have done for practically every other group, naturally it would interfere with the fellow who is grazing on the farmer.

When industry in this country found itself in trouble, what did it do? It came to the Congress and the Congress gave it a tariff commission and a tariff policy costing the consumers millions annually. You did not ask the consumers or farmers about the passage of the tariff act. I realize that it was passed in the name of what it would do for farmers and wage earners.

Years ago, as you recall, when the railroads got in trouble through giving rebates and cutting freight rates, just as the coal operators did prior to the passage of the Guffey Coal Price Fixing Act, what happened? They came to the Congress and you gave them the Interstate Commerce Commission and delegated to that Commission the power of Congress to fix freight rates; and they are doing a beautiful job for the railroads. More than that, just recently the Commission came to the Congress and said, "We want to take charge of the busses, the trucks, and the water lines of the country." What did you do about it? You passed legislation turning these lines of transportation over to the Commission; and today the railroads are putting in paralleling truck lines, and water rates are being increased. You did not ask the farmers or the consuming public about the passage of this legislation.

Thousands of manufacturers who could not get together, like most of these organized groups, in fixing prices came to Congress through their associations and stated: "We want the Fair Trade Practice Act." You gave it to them. You know that it is absolutely a price-fixing act. Thousands of manufacturers can actually fix the wholesale price, as well as the retail price on trade-marked goods and on all goods that have their name on their goods through the retailer, and you can take it or leave it.

Then along came the passage of the Wages and Hours Act. I am for that great class of laboring people who benefit by that act. In my part of the country today there are thousands of wage earners who are not securing enough to actually buy the real necessities of life. You gave them the Wages and Hours Act, and you put a bottom under wages and hours.

I could stand here and speak about other well-organized groups that today, more than ever before in the history of this country, who absolutely control their production and their distribution in line with purchasing power. And they absolutely fix their prices; you can take it or leave it.

I now want to say to you that during this session of the Congress the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am chairman, expects to bring into this House a bill proposing to put a bottom under farm prices and that will put agriculture on a sound basis, with full-parity prices in line with other groups; not price fixing, if you please, but doing so in such a manner that we will get for the farmers what you are giving the coal operator, industry, the railroads, and every other group you have legislated for. I would like to know whether or not you will be just as deeply interested and concerned about helping that great patriotic group who are slaving long hours to feed and clothe 130,000,000 American citizens.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman believe the passage of this bill will help to get parity for the farmers?

Mr. FULMER. Not at all, but what I am telling the gentleman is that you will have no trouble in passing this bill, but when we come in with something to do the same thing for unorganized farmers, then it will be said that it will interfere with every other group.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Do I understand that the gentleman intends to bring in a bill that has for its purpose doing the same thing for the farmer?

Mr. FULMER. That is what my committee intends to do, and I hope that we will have the favorable consideration of this Congress. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill, which will extend for 2 years from the date of the expiration of the present act in April of this year, is absolutely imperative in my judgment.

The necessity for this act grows out of the history of the coal-mining industry of this country and the facts in the present situation. I have been living in a coal-mining section all my life and I believe I am familiar with the problems of the operators and of the miners. For years the coal industry of this country has produced a surplus, and in addition to that more men undertook to work as miners than there was adequate employment for. This surplus of coal thrown upon the market resulted in low prices and in cutthroat competition. The records of the courts of my section of the country constitute a cemetery where abide the judicial and bankrupt remains of any number of coal companies that failed by reason of the fact they could not make ends meet. I recall that on one occasion I said to a gentleman who lived in my town, the little town of Jellicoe, which is a coal-mining town, a fine man named Z. D. Baird, who has long since passed to his reward, but who was a financial genius and made money out of everything he touched, "Mr. Baird, how would you like to have a coal mine?" He said, "I would rather have a cancer."

Then in addition to that, due to the surplus of coal and inability to sell it for a price that was equal to the cost of production, labor troubles resulted. For 15 years in this country, prior to the enactment of this law, the loss of the people engaged in the operation of coal mines ranged all the way from $7,500,000 a year in 1934, to a loss of $51,000,000 in 1932.

Some suggestion has been made here that the enactment of this measure is unfair to other industries. I have this conception of the economic system of this country, it is interlocking and interdependent. When the financial welfare of a half million men who dig coal is at stake, the interest of every other body of working people in the country is likewise involved. Consequently, when the coal miners of this country and the coal operators of the country get an adequate return or at least some return upon their labor and investment, this means an increased measure of prosperity to the farmer and to every other industry in the country which produces things that the people in the coal-mining industry use and consume.

There is another reason why this bill should be enacted and that is this. During these periods of depression and hard times for the coal operators and those who dig coal, when the industry was sick, the best mining practices were not employed, gouging operations were resorted to, and as a result, vast bodies of coal were wrapped up and lost to the industry. Coal mining is a progressive industry that must be carried on along scientific lines in order to make all of the coal which is sought to be mined available. Then in addition to this, lack of adequate return to the operator prevented him from employing safe mining practices and installing safety devices in the mines. Coal is a vital commodity and more so now than ever before, perhaps, in the history of this country. It is the source of 45 percent of the energy of the country. It furnishes 50 percent of the fuel now used in industry so essential to the safety of this country. It furnishes 84 percent of the fuel for railroads and produces 49 percent of the electrical energy now produced and consumed by this country.

We now face a national emergency and this is no time to rock the boat. This is no time to throw any great basic and essential industry out of joint. The miners and the operators are now negotiating for a new contract and I believe that the passage of this act and the security afforded by its terms and provisions will lead to a speedy consummation of a fair settlement between the operators and the miners. The act has worked for a little more than 5 months and has proved to be advantageous. There has been but little increase in the cost of domestic coal; that is, the coal used by the housekeepers and the householders to warm their homes. The increase in price has been greatest in the industrial field. Formerly steam coal was sold as low as 50 to 70 cents a ton and this act has required those who use it to pay as much as something like $2 a ton.

In other words, it simply guarantees a uniform price throughout the country for this product, and as a result 500,000 men have received continuous employment and a living wage. Heretofore the coal-mining industry was a seasonal occupation, and the miner received work only when it was cold enough for people to demand coal for heating their houses, but now this act has stabilized the industry, and as a result these men are getting continuous employment and a living wage. I know them, I live among them, I have been in their homes and talked to their people and I have represented them in court and I know that this act has brought a great measure of security and comfort to a fine body of patriotic, industrious, and energetic American citizens.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Has the policy of fixing the price of coal had the effect of creating a demand for fixing the price of competitive fuel?

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not know about that. That question involves the expression of an opinion, and entry into a field of speculation. I am undertaking to discuss a situation that now confronts this country when we must have coal to drive the wheels of industry, to keep from throwing our industrial system out of joint. This year it is estimated that we will need 500 million tons of coal. We are capable of producing 675 million tons, and I think we ought to pass this bill, as I know we are going to do today—I am morally certain of that—because it places a floor under prices, stops unfair trade practices and insures an adequate supply of coal which is absolutely necessary in the development of our national-defense program. In addition to that the industry has paid the cost of the administration of this act. The industry has paid in taxes some 15 million dollars and has left a surplus of two million dollars in the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, at the outset I wish to express my appreciation for the support given to this bill by the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee; the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], and a number of other gentlemen who have no coal mines in their districts.

The soft-coal-mining industry is one of the most intriguing subjects for study and discussion. Most of us think of bituminous coal as providing only heat, power, and electricity for our country. We must not forget that the beautiful and wonderful fast colors of red, purple, crimson, blue, green, and yellow come from coal. The beautiful and popular nylon hose for women, as well as many other useful articles of wearing apparel, are made from coal. Coal provides not only power, heat, and light, but it is from coal that we take the chemicals that form the base of our high explosives for our great guns and other weapons and munitions of destruction in war. No pharmacopoeia is complete unless it has hundreds of tried and effective remedies derived from coal.

I have the honor to represent one of the great bituminous-coal-producing districts of the Nation. A single county of my district in some years has produced and marketed 20,000,000 tons of coal in a single year. One great bituminous-coal mine produces from ten to twelve thousand tons of coal per day.

There is no industry which has so many drawbacks, losses, handicaps, uncertainties, ups and downs, as the bituminous-coal-mining industry, and there is no class of workmen in this country in any industry subject to as many hardships, lack of employment, poor living conditions and low wages as the miners have experienced in the bituminous-coal industry for much of the time for many years. It is a very hazardous employment. The miners perform their work in the bowels of the earth and the floor or bottom of a great many of the mines have water in them all the time and the miners come from their work with their clothing covered with mud and soaked with water.

The Federal Government and State governments have enacted laws to provide inspection to lessen mine disasters, yet mine disasters are almost a weekly occurrence in which many miners lose their lives. One out of every ten employed in the mines loses his life, and the lives of thousands of others are shortened and they become prematurely aged because of the exposure and hardships.

The Supreme Court, in upholding the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, in the case of *Sunshine Anthracite Coal Company* v. *Homer M. Adkins* (310 U. S. 381), said:

> The history of the bituminous-coal industry is written in blood as well as in ink. * * * If the strategic character of this industry in our economy and the chaotic conditions which have prevailed in it do not justify legislation, it is difficult to imagine what would.

The Supreme Court might have added that the history of the bituminous-coal industry is written in tears, privation, disappointment, and hardship on the part of the miners and in many cases in the loss of the savings and fortunes of those who invested in this industry. For about 15 years the industry has operated at a loss, ranging from $7,500,000 in a single year to more than $50,000,000. There is no industry which requires stabilization more than this industry.

In 1937 the operators were divided in their support of this legislation. The miners were united in favor of it. It is most gratifying now to observe that the operators as well as the miners are practically united in urging the extension of this law for a period of 2 years as provided in this resolution.

THE REAL SORE TOE OF INDUSTRY

We have heretofore pointed out that there has been for many years more distress in the bituminous-coal industry and among the workers in this industry than in any industry in this Nation, and because of this condition the industry and the workers have been the subject of more than 25 years' intense study and investigation. During this period there have been meetings of Governors and other representatives from bituminous-coal-producing States. They have formed many organizations and associations, and with great diligence have tried to

formulate plans to meet the hazards and distress of this industry and protect the workers engaged therein. All of these plans have come to nought. It appears no plan stabilized this industry so as to provide a fair return on the investment and provide regular employment and wages comparable to those received by workers in other industries, and out of all this investigation there was developed and crystallized into law the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937.

In 1923 we produced over 550,000,000 tons of soft coal and there were employed in the production of this coal more than 700,000 miners, and they received wages amounting to $900,000,000, but in the peak prosperous year of 1929 the production had dropped and the amount of coal produced per man per day had greatly decreased so that the wages received by the miners in 1929 amounted to less than $600,000,000, and the number of miners had dropped from 700,000 to 500,000. Coal production dropped to 310,000,000 tons in 1932. The average price per ton for coal the Nation over dropped from $2.68 in 1923 to $1.34 in 1933. For many years before the stabilization provisions of this act were put into force the average price was less than $1.50 per ton while a great deal of high-class bituminous coal sold for as little as $1 or $1.25 per ton. The actual cost for wages, taxes, and so forth, and selling a ton of coal is about $2.12 per ton.

The Treasury Department shows that this industry in 1930 sustained a loss of $32,000,000. In 1931 it was nearly $48,000,000. In 1932 it was more than $51,000,000. In 1933 it was $48,000,000, and in 1938 it had jumped to $60,000,000. The Bituminous Coal Act was put in a bad light before the country because of strife and other conditions prevailing in the Bituminous Coal Commission whose duty it was to administer the law. Millions of dollars were collected from the coal producers with apparently nothing but confusion resulting. The fixing of minimum prices as provided in the act was not accomplished until about 5 months ago, and we are informed since that time most beneficial results have come to both the operators and the miners. The consumers of the Nation now are assured of a steady flow of coal with little likelihood of a stoppage, and with reasonable prices.

It is especially important in view of the large defense program that there be a continuity of the operation of the mines at this time. The wage-and-hour contract for the bituminous coal miners expires on April 1. Neither the miners nor the operators could know upon what basis to enter into the new 2-year contract unless the life of this Bituminous Coal Act is extended. I wish to commend the representatives of the coal operators and the representatives of the mine workers in taking no drastic action and in causing no interruption of the production of coal pending their deliberations and the making of a new contract. I trust that they may be able to carry out this high patriotic purpose so that we may have an ample supply of coal without any interruptions during this emergency and the building up of our national defense. Without the stabilization of the coal industry there have been many interruptions. During the World War and in 1919 and 1920 following the World War the price for coal soared and reached the high figure of $20 per ton at the mines. Under the prices fixed by the Bituminous Coal Commission high grade soft coal sells now at the mines for $2.50 a ton. Under the old conditions block coal dropped to as low as a dollar or less per ton; the other grades sold as low as 20 cents a ton. We had a great surplus of coal at times and then a great shortage of coal. The coal operators in trying to dispose of their coal and prevent demurrage on loaded cars were forced to sell their coal at much less than cost and a lot of this loss had to be reflected in the wages of the miners themselves. By reason of the price war among the operators they went out and cut each other's throats, and disposed of their coal at much less than the cost of production. Of course, the net result of this was that the miners' throats had to be cut or the operators would go into bankruptcy and take away the jobs of the miners, and hundreds of coal operators went into bankruptcy.

The railroads of the country consume about 25 percent of the coal supply. Perhaps 20 percent or more is consumed by factories, mills, shops, and other industries and commercial enterprises. Twelve or fifteen percent only is taken up by domestic consumers. The railroads and the other large consumers of coal secured their coal at a very low rate as a general rule, and in many instances below cost. If the operator stayed in business he had to make up this loss in the price charged to the domestic consumer. Under the Bituminous Coal Act railroads and other large consumers must pay the minimum price as fixed by the Commission, just the same as domestic consumers, and although the average price of coal has been increased over the minimum prices fixed by the Commission it has in the long run added a mere trifle to the increase in cost to the domestic consumer, but the consumer has the assurance that he can get his supply of coal regularly and does not have to store up a year's or 6 months' supply at a time. There is not a likelihood of the great fluctuation in prices we had before the stabilization of this industry. The producers of coal are assured such a price as will enable them to pay decent American wages, and make a reasonable return on their investment.

This country has enough equipped mines and skilled miners to produce a billion tons of coal annually. Our country can only consume about 500,000,000 tons, and unless there is some stabilization this industry will continue to be the real sore toe of industry in this country.

JUSTICE TO ALL

I am one of those who sincerely believe that we consumers ought not to expect to secure our meat, flour, meal, vegetables, fruits, cotton, sugar, and other products of the farm, or clothing, shoes, machinery, furniture, coal, or other products of the factories, mills, mines, or transportation either by rail, highway, or water at prices that will not pay a fair compensation to the producers, a fair return on the investment on the farm or in industry, and will not make it possible to pay real American wages and provide a real American living standard for the producers and workers in the various economic activities of our Nation. [Applause.]

All of us should be willing to pay such prices for our food, clothing, shelter, coal, and other products consumed by us as will insure a fair return to the producers and workers who provide these necessities and luxuries of life for our use. None of us, whether living in Boston, Chicago, New York, or any other part of this great land of ours should insist upon having good bituminous coal at a price that does not pay a reasonable return on the investment and a decent wage for those who toil in the mines and risk their lives in producing this coal. Prosperity for the coal operators and miners helps bring prosperity to all the Nation. [Applause.]

I have tried to visualize in my mind what would happen if we were out of bituminous coal for 24 hours. Many of our great cities would be plunged into darkness; our great railroads would come to a standstill; the wheels of the factories, shops, and mills would cease to turn; perhaps more than 100,000,000 people in wintertime would suffer, and many would perish with cold; most of our common schools, colleges, and universities would be closed; our hospitals could not provide for the sick and disabled; the ordinary and common offices of the household in cooking, laundering, bathing, and so forth, would stop—in a word, almost all the activities of this Nation would at once become paralyzed.

In this time of crisis in the Nation and in its preparation for national defense there should be no interruption in this great industry, and I sincerely believe that the passage of this resolution providing for the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act will continue, as it has in the last 5 months since the Division fixed the minimum prices, to stabilize the industry and insure the highest and very best cooperation between the operators and the miners.

We have an unlimited supply of the very best bituminous coal in this country. As I recall, geologists say we have more than 65,000,000,000 tons in Kentucky, and perhaps there is a greater tonnage in each of the States of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. The State of Utah has enough good commercial coal, with some seams 32 feet thick, to furnish coal for this country for the next 500 years. It was well said by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] that our supply of coal is not only for this generation but for countless numbers of unborn generations, and when coal is once removed it can never be replaced. My friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] and others representing farm sections have spoken in behalf of this bill, but he and others insist that the farmers be given similar consideration.

I said in 1937 in my speech on the bituminous-coal bill, and I have said through many years on the floor of this House, that I am one of those who sincerely believe that we ought to be willing to pay such a price for all of our economic products and for our transportation as will provide a fair return on the investment and for the intelligence and work of management and to pay such a wage as will enable those who work on the farm, on the railroad, in industry, and in commerce to provide for themselves and their families a decent American living. That was my position years ago when I supported actively on this floor the McNary-Haugen farm bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Kentucky 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Some of those who favor farm relief insist that we take the money out of the Treasury and pass it out in the way of handouts or bonuses. This plan has helped to pile up our huge national debt. That is not the way the coal business is stabilized. It provides for a 1-cent tax on each ton of coal. This 1-cent tax has brought into the Treasury more than $15,000,000. It has cost the Government less than $13,000,000 to administer this law, and that means that the Treasury is $2,000,000 ahead. As the administration of this law will cost less in the future in my opinion, the operation of this law will increase the benefits to the Treasury.

Those who consume the coal pay a price that represents the cost of production, a fair return on the investment, and fair wages to the miners. The McNary-Haugen bill provided for a similar plan for agriculture. When that was up in the House some years ago I supported it, and I shall continue to support such a plan. That plan will provide fair compensation for the producers of our farm products, a fair return on the investment, and a fair compensation for those who work on the farm. We must admit that it is unfair to ask an able-bodied man to work from daylight to dark on the farm, in all kinds of weather, producing the things that provide us with food and clothing and to feed our Army and Navy, working from daylight to dark at a dollar per day, while others who do less laborious work of 8 hours receive from $5 to $15 a day. I want to see the farmers of our Nation secure such a price for their products as will pay them compensation comparable to other workers and a fair return on their investment. Some years ago when I looked up the question, I found we had $65,000,000,000 invested in agriculture and it was paying less than 2 percent on the investment.

I have criticized some of the policies of the administration that has borrowed billions of dollars and has increased the national debt year by year to hand out bonuses. My thought is that those who use the cotton, meat, flour, corn, wool, fruits, vegetables, milk, butter and cheese, and clothing should pay such a price for same as will enable the farmers and their workers to enjoy benefits comparable to those engaged in other industries.

I have seen through the years miners working in the mines at a dollar a day because of the uncertain conditions of the market. In view of the large number of coal mines and the skilled coal miners and the fact that waterpower, natural gas, and crude oil are now being used in great quantities in competition with coal, I do not think the consumers of coal should be alarmed that they will have to pay an exorbitant price. The Government is making it hard for the coal producers and the miners. It permits great quantities of crude oil to be brought into this country. It is spending billions of dollars to develop waterpower. It is encouraging the production of natural gas and pipe lines. These displace more than 200 million tons of coal each year, and this renders more uncertain the bituminous coal industry and the jobs of tens of thousands of miners; and this is another good reason why this industry should be stabilized as provided in this law.

We have about 26 States that produce coal in commercial quantities. In nearly all of these States are small producers of coal. Many of them are operating small truck or wagon mines. As I understand the law, none of these truck or wagon mines come within the Bituminous Coal Act except those engaged in interstate commerce—that is, shipping coal from one State to another. The law does not include those engaged in intrastate business or commerce unless their business is of such volume as to unduly burden interstate commerce. The administration of the Bituminous Coal Act has created considerable prejudice and feeling in my own country and in other States in trying to force the operators of little truck or wagon mines under the provisions of this act when they are engaged strictly in intrastate commerce and their business is not a burden upon interstate commerce. Ninety-five percent of the farms in my congressional district have good coal under them, and nearly every farmer has his own coal bank or little coal mine, in most cases for his own use. A farmer came to me sometime ago and stated that he had dug and sold only one load of coal to his neighbor on the adjoining farm and Government agents were after him time and again to have him pay a tax, claiming he came under this law. Then I have had other cases where a farmer had sold his neighbor two wagonloads of coal and they were being pestered by Government agents. These persons, of course, did nothing affecting interstate commerce. In my recollection there has not been a carload of coal shipped from any State or county into my home county. There never has been and likely will never be any interstate coal business in my county or any other county in my congressional district, but they do have these little wagon or truck mines that are engaged in strictly intrastate business, and I do not believe the law applies to them. I know of some other truck mines in my district that have been furnishing employment to men who had been on relief but have been forced to close down by reason of the action of the Bituminous Coal Division in not giving due consideration to the distance that the coal must be hauled.

I was told recently that steps would be taken to correct this condition. It should be, because a number of these little mines have closed down and the workers have been forced to go on relief. In handling the coal from the large mines on the railroad, distance is taken into consideration.

I might point out, however, that these small mines cannot operate unless there is a minimum price fixed, because the large mines can produce and ship coal at a less price than the truck or wagon mines, and but for this law holding up the price of coal the small wagon and truck mines would be put out of business. They could not meet the price and have never been able to operate to any extent except at times when the demand was very great and the price of coal was high.

If the matter of distance is ironed out in a fair and equitable way and each producer of soft coal does meet the price as the law provides, the law will prove to be helpful to the wagon and truck mines that are engaged in interstate commerce.

Those who operate these wagon and truck mines are entitled to receive such a price for their coal as will pay them for their labor, a fair return on their investment, and enable them to pay good wages to their miners. This whole thing should be operated on a basis of justice and right.

I wish again to commend the operators and miners for their attitude toward this important measure and their appreciation of the emergency now confronting our country, and I wish to thank each and every Member of the House who today has spoken and will vote for this measure. I think it is just and right and will be helpful, not only to the miners and operators, but to the consumers generally and to our Nation as a whole. [Applause.]

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I really should not take any part in this discussion, but I am very much interested in this bill, from one point especially. I have supported it from the beginning, even though from the standpoint of the consumers in my district, certainly, it could not in any way benefit them; but as the committee members will remember, I had a number of people here representing the cooperatives. Most of the members of the committee, and perhaps Members of Congress, do not realize what class of cooperatives this affects.

As the law is written today, it was evidently intended to include cooperatives, but there is one word in there that makes it impossible for the large wholesale consumer cooperatives to be included—at least, the Commission has so ruled. I will read that section of the law to you:

> It shall not be an unfair method of competition or a violation of the code or any requirements of this act, first, to sell to or through any bona fide or legitimate farmers' cooperative organization duly organized—

And so forth. The language reads "farmers' cooperative organization." It was evidently intended at that time to

include all cooperatives, but, unfortunately, the Commission has ruled otherwise.

In my district there is a large wholesale cooperative that serves nearly 300 stores. The consumers themselves formed this wholesale cooperative. In other words, after they got 100 or more of these stores organized throughout the three States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, they finally decided they might as well combine their excess earnings and buy the stock of this cooperative. This cooperative, even though it has been organized only a few years, is now doing an annual business of nearly $5,000,000; yet, under the ruling of the Bituminous Coal Commission, the nearly 300 stores that own this cooperative are forced to go to another wholesale coal dealer to buy their coal. This is only one of the large cooperatives. The Midland Cooperative in Minneapolis is another, and there are dozens more. The Farm Bureau has several large cooperatives that are in the same position, and I believe a change should be made to include them.

I should like to make it clear that it is not intended to include all these small cooperatives. It was clear—and I sat through the hearings and took them all in—that many of the members were afraid that somewhere some few farmers would move into a city, start a store, and thereby would be permitted to sell coal and put some existing dealer out of business. This law does not deal with the retailer at all. This section of the law deals only with the wholesaler.

All we are asking is to clarify this section of the law to include the actual wholesaler who distributes or sells to the retailer. We do not want the retailer included at all. So there is no danger that any cooperative is going to interfere with a legitimate retailer who is now in business. We do not want that. It seems to me the cooperatives should receive the favorable consideration of Congress, because after all, Mr. Chairman, the cooperatives are much more desirable than the large absentee-owned chain stores. The chain stores are the fellows who are driving our local businessmen out of business. It is not the cooperatives, because the cooperatives duly organized under the cooperative law do not try to undersell anyone. They sell at the regular going price, and if there is any money made at the end of the year it is redistributed to the members, based on the amount of business done; and the money stays in the community. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position taken by the gentleman from Wisconsin who just preceded me. He has stated my case exactly. The Michigan State Farm Bureau is very much interested in the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have a letter from that bureau and I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD that letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me that this statement is convincing and justifies the proposed amendment. The letter comes from C. L. Brody, executive secretary of the Farm Bureau Services and is as follows:

It is our understanding that there is now pending before Congress a Joint Senate Resolution No. 32 to extend the Guffey Coal Act for another 2 years.

It is our considered belief that this act embodies many desirable provisions, however, it does not provide a jobbing commission for legitimate wholesale cooperative organizations.

Farm Bureau Services, Inc., is a wholesale cooperative, voting stock being held by retail farmer cooperative associations and the Michigan State Farm Bureau, which is a State-wide farmer membership organization. We have handled coal in a wholesale way through our office for many years. Under the N. R. A. code there was at first some question about our qualifying for distributor discount, however, this was soon straightened out and all through the period of the N. R. A. we received the same wholesale distributor discount we had received previously. We have also been receiving these same jobbing discounts since the N. R. A. code days up until the establishment of this new act.

We have filed application for wholesale discounts and have been advised by the Bituminous Coal Commission that we are not eligible to receive discounts unless we qualify for a bona fide and legitimate farmers cooperative organization while we qualify as a legitimate farmers cooperative. The discounts provided for under this classification are lower than the regular wholesale jobber discounts. We feel that the intent of the act as expressed under section 4 part II (i) 13 is clear that "it shall not be unfair method of competition nor a violation of the code or any requirement of this act * * * (3) to pay or allow to any such cooperative organization or to any such intervening agency any discount, commission, rebate, or dividend ordinarily paid or allowed, or permitted by the code to be paid or allowed, to other purchasers for purchases in wholesale or middleman quantities."

We, therefore, request that the act be so amended as to include all bona fide and legitimate wholesale cooperative organizations who resell coal in carload quantities to be entitled to the same wholesale jobbing discount as other wholesale coal jobbers are allowed. May we have your active support in securing the benefits to which we are entitled?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will support this bill in full appreciation of the fact that this is a price-fixing measure.

I have long known of the difficulties existing in the coal industry, and I have long been in sympathy with putting forth some effort to cure them. I should like, however, to remind the Congress that coal is not alone the only industry that has long shown signs of sickness. The passage of this bill today by this House reestablishes again the principle of price-fixing by the Government, and in this connection, I am thinking now of another industry that has a right to come to the Congress for support. I am thinking of an industry greater in all proportions to that of coal, greater in its invested capital, and greater in its employment.

I am thinking of the American farmer. Oh, it is fashionable today to tie everything to national defense. Effort has been made on this floor today to bring the question of this coal measure in line with national defense. We seem to have conceived the idea that anything associated with national defense must win congressional approval. It is my conception that we were a great Nation before we arrived at this day of this emergency, and it is my profound belief that we will be a great Nation after this emergency passes, and I should like to suggest to this Congress that when once this emergency passes, another great problem will confront us, greater than before—the distress of agriculture.

By the passage of this bill today, we have marked the trestleboard. Agriculture has a right to ask the same assistance. Let us think for a moment of the farmer, and I shall not attempt today, though well I could, tie him up with the defense of America. From the farms of America will go many of the young men who make up the personnel of the Army and the Navy, and surely his is an important mission in the growing of foods. But for a long span of time he has been obliged to engage his talents in a program wherein his industry operates on a basis of less than 70 percent of parity with his industrial brother. No one can challenge the patriotism of the American farmer. The American farmer is not on strike today. He asks but one thing of this Congress. He asks for a fair deal, for the same advantages and the same privileges that we see fit to give by law to his industrial partner.

I should like to remind this Congress that probably on the farms of America rest the greates refuge against the "isms" of this day. No one ever heard of a farmer being called before the Dies committee, and I doubt if you ever will. He goes to work at sunrise and he continues throughout the long day, whether it be hot or cold. He is engaged in an industry, the only one in all America that can be considered the producer of new wealth, and yet he is being asked today to live his life in his society on a price basis for his commodities entirely out of harmony with the general price structure of the country. This has long been a gross injustice. America can never become strong in defense until she has brought all of her peoples to a position of equality. If this Congress sees fit to remedy the problems of the coal operator and the coal miner by the establishment of a minimum price, surely that right cannot longer be denied our American farmers.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I am in Congress because the coal miners, men in the coal business, and others in my district were willing to vote for me. We are legislating at this time, Mr. Chairman, against the chaos and waste that characterized the coal-mining business in this country in the past. One Supreme Court Justice said it had "degenerated into anarchy." That was a few years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention particularly to page 4 of the report of the committee reporting this bill in which it calls attention to the fact that on account of the tremendous task involved the actual operation of this bill has only been in motion for between 5 and 6 months. Even in that short time it clearly appears that since October 1940, as a whole, the industry has been getting actual cost for the first time in approximately 15 years, and that in the coal industry the labor relations have been greatly improved.

Except for a comparatively small amount of special-purpose or high-grade coals, market prices have been the same as the minimum prices which were fixed, despite the increase in industrial activity and in the amount of coal sold. The weighted average cost of coal for the country as a whole was determined to be $2.08 per ton. Actual experience in October 1940, under the minimum prices, shows an estimated average price at the mine of $2.10 per ton, as compared with $1.97 per ton in October 1939, or a difference of about 13 cents. In November 1939 the mine price declined to an average of $1.92 per ton, while in November 1940, due to increased industrial activity and increased demand for special coals, the price realized at the mine was $2.12.

This increase in the mine price of coal is not reflected, however, in a proportionate percentage increase in the delivered cost to consumers.

That is the undisputed report. I could develop this further, but any conscientious study of what has been done with this legislation should reveal that it has been greatly satisfactory. There can be and should be no serious number of votes cast against this legislation. To what other legislation can we point that has done better in the time it has had a chance to manifest its value?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I arise at this time in support of House Joint Resolution 101, providing for extension of the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years.

My district is located in the heart of the coal fields of Pennsylvania, and in 2 of the 3 counties comprising my congressional district bituminous coal represents the principal industry. The coal produced in my district exceeds 4,000,000 tons annually and the industry employs over 6,000 coal miners, with an approximate yearly pay roll of $5,000,000.

For the past several years the coal industry has been seriously hampered by a multitude of evils which have resulted in not only unemployment to thousands of loyal American citizens but likewise has brought the coal industry to the verge of bankruptcy. Hence, we who live in the coal fields of the great Keystone State welcome any effort on the part of our Government to stabilize this important industry.

The general debate this afternoon reveals that the code prices established by the Bituminous Coal Division, effective October 1, 1940, have, in a large measure, served to stabilize the industry and brought definite benefits to both employee and mine operator in the majority of cases. Many of the coal operators in my district are members of the bituminous-coal producers' board for district No. 1, with a district office at Altoona, Pa. Through their secretary-treasurer, Mr. Walter A. Jones, Altoona, Pa., they have advised me of their support of House Joint Resolution 101.

BITUMINOUS COAL PRODUCERS BOARD, DISTRICT NO. 1,
Altoona, Pa., March 24, 1941.

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: House Joint Resolution 101 and Senate Joint Resolution 32, extending the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: District board No. 1, at a regular meeting, adopted a resolution approving the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years.

This district includes the coal-producing area in some 20 counties in eastern Pennsylvania, 3 counties in the State of West Virginia, and the entire State of Maryland. This district produces about 9 percent of the total country's production of bituminous coal, or 40,000,000 tons annually.

In support of the position taken by these representative bituminous-coal operators, it is respectfully requested that you use your influence and vote in support of the resolution to continue the coal act for a period of 2 years.

Respectfully yours,
WALTER A. JONES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, the small operators in my district, while agreeing with the principle of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, nevertheless feel that they have been the victims of discriminatory regulations in carrying out the provisions of the act.

Representatives of the small operators were accorded the privilege of appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee at the hearings held on House Joint Resolution 101, and at that time were permitted to give testimony as to their experiences since the code prices became effective. The members of the Ways and Means Committee will recall that the small operators were insistent that the act be amended.

In this connection, I was pleased to hear from my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKS], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, that the plea of the small operator has been recognized and that a subcommittee will be appointed for the purpose of investigating the Bituminous Coal Act in its relation to the small operator. As a result of this study by the subcommittee, recommendations are expected to be received that will be given the form of amendments in remedying any situation deemed to inflict hardship on the small operator.

Mr. Chairman, with the assurance of the Ways and Means Committee that serious consideration will be given to any suitable and necessary amendments, and recalling the testimony of Secretary Ickes of the Department of the Interior when testifying at the hearings that amendments would be considered at a later date, I repeat my assertion that the coal miner and coal operator in my district will support such legislation when they have the assurance that it is a sincere effort to stabilize the coal industry with justice to all concerned. With such a fervent hope in mind, I am pleased to support this legislation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 19 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (relating to termination of the act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 19. This act shall cease to be in effect (except as provided in section 13 of the Revised Statutes) and any agencies and offices established under, or to engage in the administration of, this act shall cease to exist at 12:01 a. m., April 26, 1943."

(b) Section 3527 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of the bituminous-coal taxes) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3527. Termination of tax.

"The taxes imposed by this chapter shall not apply to the sale or other disposal, after April 25, 1943, of bituminous coal."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to help labor and industry by increasing the price of coal. I supported the bill when it was first passed. I have never regretted it. The law has been highly successful. It has achieved the purposes for which it was enacted. It has increased the wages of labor; it has increased the profits of the mine owners, and it has raised the price of coal to the consumer. All of which was anticipated.

But there is one respect, Mr. Chairman, in which I have been disappointed. At the time this bill was passed it was freely admitted that the legislation would increase the cost of production on the farm; that the increased cost of coal would increase the cost of the manufacture of farm machinery; that the increased cost of railway fuel would add to the cost of farm transportation as the farmer pays the freight both ways, and the increased price of fuel would add to the cost of practically every farm operation.

We understood that and we voted for the bill with that expectation—an expectation which has been more than realized.

But we were also told at that time, both privately and publicly, that the farmer in his turn would be given similar legislation enabling him likewise to get a fair price for his products sufficient to

pay the increase in his cost of production saddled upon him by this legislation increasing the price of coal. Unfortunately that assurance has not been realized. Under the benevolent effects of this law placing a floor under the price of coal and raising the wages of the miner and increasing the dividends of the coal operators, the price of coal has soared steadily until the index price of coal, which according to the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee was 260 in 1937, is today more than 300. That means that coal is today costing more than three times what it cost during the basic period, while the index price of agricultural products is today 95. That is 5 points less than during the basic period.

Now, who is paying the increased cost of coal brought about by this legislation? Who is paying the increase in the wages of the miner and the increased dividends of the mine owner? The farmer is paying a larger share of this increase than anyone else. He is the ultimate consumer. Everybody passes the increased cost back to him. But he has no one to pass it back to. So out of less than he received for his own products in 1913 he is paying three times what he paid for coal in 1913.

The farmer is willing to pay this increased price. The farmer believes in high wages and high prices. He wants to pay the man who digs his coal an honest wage. He wants every American workman to have a decent standard of living. He expects the industry that operates the coal mine to make a reasonable profit. He is willing to contribute his part even when it means he must pay it out of his own pocket.

But the farmer is living on a horse-and-buggy income in a tractor age. The war abroad is intensifying that situation. The surplus of farm products is the largest in the history of the Nation. Never before has there been so much wheat, corn, hogs, cattle, and eggs piled in the elevators and packed in the cold-storage plants. To add to the congestion, our exports have been cut off and the vast quantities formerly shipped to Europe, Asia, and Africa are thrown back on the already overcrowded home market. And while farm-buying power is going down, farm costs are going up. The draft is taking the young men from the fields. High-paid jobs in munition plants are drawing labor from the farm. This bill is putting up the cost of coal and machinery and freight. Under other laws passed by Congress all farm costs are going up. How can the farmer continue to pay higher and higher prices for everything he buys when the price at which he sells his own labor and his own products leaves him nothing to pay with?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement that the price of coal had risen 300 percent. I am wondering whether the gentleman means to make a comparison between when the miner was getting a dollar a day and the situation with what he is getting now. Is that what the gentleman means by saying that the price of coal has risen 300 percent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I mean that if the miner and the farmer were each being paid in 1913 on a basis of $1 a day, according to the report of the National Economic Committee, just off the press, the miner is being paid today at a rate in excess of $3 and the farmer is being paid 95 cents. And the farmer must pay the added $2 out of his 95 cents.

This is only one of many bills we have passed increasing the farmer's costs of production and his family's cost of living. We passed the hot-oil bill, which increased the price of oil and the price of the gas the farmer must use in his tractor, an expense he cannot avoid, an added cost of production he must pay, just as he must pay the added cost of coal as a result of the enactment of this law. We have passed innumerable bills, which it is not necessary to enumerate, all of which have increased the wages of labor and the profits of industry by taking money out of the farmer's pockets. That is entirely satisfactory to the farmer. He wants to pay the full price for what he gets and he wants to pay as he goes. He is unwilling to live at anybody's expense. So he is for this bill. He has been for every bill to provide honest wages and fair prices.

But willingness to pay and the means with which to pay are two different things. Congress has passed all these laws requiring the farmer to pay, but has passed no law putting a floor under farm wages or stabilizing farm prices, or giving the farmer an income from which to pay the added burden placed upon him by such laws as we have under consideration here today. Congress has passed every law asked by labor. It has passed every law asked by the middlemen. It has passed every law asked by industry. No Member sitting here before me this afternoon can name any bill reported to the House on the request of either labor or industry or of the middleman or processor which the House has refused to pass. The farmer alone has been left without legislation to do for his wages and his prices what Congress has done for everybody else.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We all know that our distinguished friend from Missouri is interested in agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Somebody ought to be interested in agriculture. There is no class in this country that is receiving as raw treatment as the farmer is receiving, and I fail to hear many Members from agricultural districts sent here by the farmers to represent them talking in their behalf.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I should like the gentleman to give us his views, because we all respect his opinions and his views, as to just how we could put a floor under the prices of farm commodities so that the farmer would be on an equal footing with labor and the coal miner and industry. Would the gentleman mind telling just how we could do that, or just what he has in mind as to how that might be done?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to the kind suggestion of the gentleman, may I say that the chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture, of which my distinguished friend from Missouri is an influential member, has enumerated four methods of accomplishing that result. He has said that his committee proposes to take up the question as to which of the four methods is the most feasible and the most practical. I assure the gentleman that any of those methods his committee reports out will be satisfactory to me, and will have my earnest support. The Committee on Agriculture has as many able men as the Committee on Labor and if the Committee on Labor could bring out the several laws which put a floor under wages (with labor as bitterly divided as it is), I am certain the Committee on Agriculture can bring out at least one law to put a floor under farm prices.

I am certain the gentleman himself will give prompt and urgent attention to this pressing matter, in cooperating with his committee to report out some one of the four proposals discussed by his chairman, or any other method he favors. At least bring out some kind of legislation and give this House an opportunity to consider legislation to help the farmer, just as the Committee on Ways and Means has brought to the floor today legislation to help the miner and the mine owner. Of course, the House cannot help the farmer until the gentleman's committee brings in a bill and gives us a chance, but if he will bring out a proposition of any character to help the farmer, and to do for farm prices what this bill does for coal prices which the farmer must pay, I shall be glad to cooperate with my friend, and I know this House will be glad to have an opportunity to cooperate with him.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I say to my distinguished colleague from Missouri that I here and now, as a member of that committee, extend to him an invitation to appear before our committee and give us the benefit of his experience as a farmer. The gentleman is one of the good farmers in Missouri. I extend him an invitation to give us the benefit of his experience and help us work out a plan which will do the very thing the gentleman is talking about.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman will not reserve this consideration of the farm problem until some other time, because we are trying to expedite this bill and get it through. We will be glad to take up the gentleman's proposition some other time. We have

two other bills we would like to take up today.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to my good friend from Pennsylvania, may I say I am not discussing the farm problem per se. I am discussing the coal problem, and you cannot discuss this bill to increase the price of coal without discussing the man who will have to pay the increased price and legislation to provide him with means to pay the increased price.

And may I say in that connection that the desperate situation in which the farmer is trapped today between rising costs and reduced buying power is due to the fact that Congress has always been ready to say, "Let's pass these laws for labor and industry now and we will take up the farm problem some other time." But "some other time" never comes. And now again this year—true to form—when all the laws labor and industry want have been enacted and the farmer reminds us of the promise to do the same for him, Congress proposes to lean on its shovels and go home and take a rest. Believe me, my friends, some of these farmers are going to be waiting for us when we get back home this time—and they are going to be waiting in November 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In answer to the very hospitable invitation of the gentleman from Missouri, I am not advocating any particular bill. I will support any bill he supports. If the Committee on Agriculture reports out a good bill, as I am certain they will, I will be for it. And if by some unforeseen contingency the committee should report out a poor bill I will be for it. Half a loaf is better than no bread at all.

The committee need not be afraid to report out a bill to maintain farm prices. This House will give the farmer a square deal. It is ready to put a floor under farm wages as it has already put a floor under factory wages. It is as ready to stabilize agricultural prices as it was to stabilize industrial prices. Every great labor leader has repeatedly expressed appreciation of the loyal support the farmer has given labor legislation and has given every assurance of support of similar legislation for the farm. Labor is willing to pay a fair price for its food and industry is willing to pay a price for its raw material commensurate with the price it charges for the finished product. If the committee will give the House a chance it will do for agriculture what it has already done for labor and industry.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. I understood the gentleman to say that he would willingly support a farm program that would bring these increased prices, but did I also understand him to say that he is not willing to do that now for the coal people?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Most assuredly not. When this bill was up before I voted to give the coal miner a square deal and the coal operators an honest profit and I am voting for that now. I am for coal and I trust the gentleman is for cotton and corn.

But as ready as this House is to support farm legislation, the time is short. As has been forecast by the newspapers, and as every student of current events knows, it is merely a question of time, and a very short time, before the administration will place its hand on prices—all prices. In the inevitable course of events, prices of all commodities and wages for all services will be frozen tight. The long arm of the food administrator will reach especially into the farmers' fields and feedlots. Wages and prices will be locked irrevocably at the present level. Labor and industry are receiving today for everything they produce for the defense program the highest wage labor has ever received in the history of the United States, and the dividends of industry are larger today than they have been for many years.

On the other hand, the farmer is getting less. Cotton, corn, wheat, hogs, cattle, milk, and eggs will buy less at the store than last year, or the year before, or 5 years before. Very shortly the Government will freeze prices. Labor and industrial buying power will be the highest in the memory of man, and farm buying power the lowest. Unless the Committee on Agriculture brings in a bill to do for the farmer what the Committee on Labor has done for labor and what the Committee on Ways and Means is doing here today for the miner and the mine owner, everything the farmer buys will be frozen high and everything he sells will be frozen low. For example, coal will be frozen at an index price in excess of 300 and cotton will be frozen at an index price of 92.8.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If we freeze the price of coal at these levels, we will not be honest with the farmer unless we fix the price of cotton at 25 cents a pound and the price of wheat at at least $1.75 a bushel, and the price of corn and other farm commodities in proportion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman puts it mildly. The Department of Agriculture reports that if the price of what the farmer sells had gone up with the price of what he buys, cotton would be 28 cents a pound, wheat $2.02, corn $1.47, and oats 91 cents per bushel. Eggs would be 49 cents a dozen, hogs $16.53 a hundred, and hay $27.18 a ton. The reason the farmers are not getting these prices is because Congress refuses to pass farm legislation to match the legislation it has already passed putting a floor under wages and fixing industrial prices—just as the law we are passing here today puts a floor under the wages of the miners and fixes minimum dividends for the mine owners and raises the price of coal to the farmer.

Let us hope Congress will remain in session to receive and act on any bill which the Committee on Agriculture may decide to report next week. Provision must be made for this crop year before it is too late to plant. And prices must be standardized at least at parity before the Government issues orders against recovery to last not only for the duration of the European war but for the long and tragic aftermath of the post-war period, which will carry even more distress for the family on the American farm.

The ponderous machinery of government which always accompanies war conditions is already moving to lock the buying power of the farm at the lowest level while the farmer pays the highest level in American history. Farm prices must be stabilized before it is too late.

Now is the time for all good Congressmen to come to the aid of the farmer. Let them speak now or forever hold their peace. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 is amended by adding after section 21 a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive branch of the Government an office to be known as the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel. The office shall be in charge of a counsel to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The counsel shall have no financial interest, direct or indirect, in the mining, transportation, or sale of, or the manufacture of equipment for, coal—whether or not bituminous coal—oil, or gas, or in the generation, transmission, or sale of hydroelectric power, or in the manufacture of equipment for the use thereof, and shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The counsel shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per year and necessary traveling expenses. With the exception of a clerk to the counsel, the attorneys, and such special agents and experts as the counsel may from time to time find necessary for the conduct of his work, all employees of the counsel shall be appointed and their compensation fixed in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(b) The counsel shall have and perform the functions conferred and imposed upon the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission by this act as in force upon its enactment. The functions of such office which were transferred, by Reorganization Plan No. II transmitted by the President to Congress on May 9, 1939, to the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior shall not be performed by such office of the Solicitor after the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel has taken office, and in no event after the expiration of 60 days after the date this section takes effect.

"(c) All records and property of such office of the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission transferred by such Reorganization Plan to the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and all records and property of the office of such Solicitor used primarily in the administration of any function of the office of such

Consumers' Counsel transferred by such Reorganization Plan, and all personnel so transferred—not heretofore retransferred or separated from the service under section 402 of such Reorganization Plan—and all personnel used in the administration of such functions are transferred to the office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers Counsel established by subsection (a) of this section for use in the administration of the functions vested in such office by this section.

"(d) So much of the unexpended balances of the appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for the use of the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior in the exercise of the functions of the Office of the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission transferred by such reorganization plan, or for the use of the Secretary of the Interior in the exercise of any function so transferred, as the Director of the Budget with the approval of the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel for use in connection with the exercise of the functions vested in such office by this section. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer: *Provided*, That the use of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds transferred by this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 4 (d) (3) and section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

"(e) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, or the office of such Consumers' Counsel, or the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, or the office of such solicitor, in the administration of the functions vested in such office or officer by this act or such reorganization plan, and in effect at the time this section takes effect, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if this section had not been enacted, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

"(f) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any of the officers or offices referred to in subsection (e) of this section in his or its official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his or its official duties, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this section, but the court or agency before which such suit, action, or proceeding is pending, may (on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date this section takes effect showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved) allow the same to be maintained by or against the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel."

Mr. TREADWAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to continue for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DINGELL. Not if it is to be taken out of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. DINGELL. Then I cannot yield for that purpose, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the bill before the Committee I will confine my remarks to that phase of the bill which deals with the restoration of the Consumers' Counsel as an independent agent of the Congress.

I believe other members of the Committee, more capable than I, might discuss the other important features of the bill.

In the history of this legislation, which had for its purpose the stabilization of the bituminous-coal industry, it was deemed wise and proper to provide certain safeguards. Thus, from the outset a Consumers' Counsel was provided as a governor and balance wheel.

When the Bituminous Coal Act was last considered by the Congress definite assurance was given as to the sufficiency of protection for the interest of the consuming public. Throughout the entire history of this legislation it was the consumer's problem and his protection which was our chief concern. I pursued the problem of a solution continuously and relentlessly until such a time as I was convinced that proper safeguards were included in the act and in this regard I have had the wholehearted and unanimous support of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In a previous speech on the floor of this House, to be exact, delivered at the time of the enactment of the present law, I assured the membership that the Consumers' Counsel was an independent agent reporting annually and directly to the Congress without submitting his report to the Secretary of the Interior or to anyone else. He was privileged to make special reports and to recommend amendments to the law as many times as he deemed necessary. His duties as the sole and only functionary having to do with the consumer compelled action wherever and whenever the consumers' interest was at stake or even remotely involved.

I stated at the time that he had the right to intervene on his own initiative without regard to the Commission, that he had a right to attend hearings, examine and cross-examine witnesses. He had a right to summon witnesses and to sit in the conferences of the Commission itself, whether open or executive, with or without invitation. It was intended that the Consumers' Counsel should be the most powerful individual connected with the Coal Commission.

As an individual member of the committee I stated repeatedly that I cared not how many members composed the personnel of the Commission, whether it was 3, 5, 7, or 70. I was not concerned from where they came or interested in their vocations, provided the committee would safeguard the consumers' interest by the creation of a genuinely independent protector in the person of a consumers' counsel. I was certain that the Congress would approve such a provision.

The act was passed without any changes in this provision, and I say to you now that there would have been no law stabilizing prices and conditions in the vast bituminous-coal industry if this provision were not accepted or if it were in any manner emasculated or made ineffective. The President appointed the Board and the President appointed an able and independent consumers' counsel. Then came the reorganization bill and because of erroneous advice the President in eliminating the Coal Commission and substituting a single Administrator also abolished the Consumers' Counsel and in his stead created a similar functionary in the Solicitor's Office in the Department of the Interior.

The most important and in fact the fundamental principle involved in the establishment of the Consumers' Counsel was then and there struck down. According to my notion it was a direct violation of an agreement under which the bill became a law. I do not charge any deliberate violation on the part of the President. I am not, however, splitting hairs, I am speaking of results. The Consumers' Counsel became a dependent, subservient, and minor official of the Interior Department subject to the Secretary of the Interior. Fortunately, Mr. Ickes, a stalwart champion of the consumer, happens to be the present Secretary of the Interior and while there is no evidence of intervention there is at the same time clear-cut and indisputable evidence that the principal functionary was not independent and certainly was not directly responsible to the Congress. Somebody, somewhere gave the President the wrong kind and misleading advice, took an unfair advantage of our busy Chief Executive, and I have a strong suspicion it came from selfish and powerful sources and was advanced through a spokesman close to the administration. The President, I am sure, acted in the best of faith and with the best of intention but it is the result that I deal with here and now.

The Consumers' Counsel was no longer independent and according to my notion became a useless appendage which could quite properly be eliminated. It seems inconceivable to me that the body which on the one hand establishes prices and creates terms and conditions in behalf of the producer could on the other hand at one and the same time properly act as a governor or a control in the interest of the consumer. It may be possible but it just does not make sense according to my reasoning.

The act has been administered very ably by Mr. Howard A. Gray, a conscientious and hard-working public servant. The reorganization did a great amount of good. No tears were shed because of the dissolution of the seven-man commission. There seems now to be widespread approval, not only of the Coal Act

but of its administration. Certainly, the industry and workers generally approve the degree of success thus far attained although the objective judged by smoothness of operation has not as yet been reached.

The act expires on April 26 and need for its reenactment at this particular time is obviously most pressing. The country faces an emergency which threatens our very existence. Bituminous coal is the basic need in the production of power with which to turn the wheels of industry. More than 80 percent of the power and fuel needs of the country are still supplied by bituminous coal. The free and uninterrupted flow of production is absolutely indispensable at this time. I am willing to lend my entire support to the passage of this bill, but it must be understood that my support is predicated upon the inclusion of the ironclad provision which restores as an independent agent of the Congress a Consumers' Counsel genuinely independent and empowered to act to the fullest extent in the protection of the rights of the consumer.

If this provision were not in the bill I could not support it. I would oppose it. My attitude reflects the feeling of the great majority of the committee. I might even go further than that, but I want to be modest in my claims because I have not polled the entire committee. I am safe in saying, however, that without this provision there would be no extension of the law. It would quite properly be permitted to expire.

I am certain that the Consumers' Counsel provision is ample in every respect to protect the public's interest, but I pledge you that my insistence for the restoration did not terminate my further interest with the submission of this important amendment now a part of the bill. The Consumers' Counsel has been and will continue to be my chief concern and my particular protégé. Any time I am convinced he might need further authority I shall be only too glad to work through my committee to bring about the adoption of the necessary amendments.

I am convinced that every provision of the law as generally understood and expressed by me on the floor of the House on March 9, 1937, is fully written into the law. There will never be any question of the power and the right or the privilege of the Consumers' Counsel. He is an independent agent of the Congress and will be responsible to nobody but the Congress; and we, the Members of Congress, will exercise proper control without going through intermediaries.

May I, Mr. Chairman, at this time serve a warning upon any pseudo adviser that any unwarranted marauding here on Capitol Hill or petty chicken stealing from the congressional hen coop will not be tolerated insofar as the Bituminous Coal Act is concerned? A control provision has been inserted in the bill which some constitutional lawyers believe is meaningless and ineffective, but it nevertheless expresses the feelings and opinions of the committee, and in an extreme instance through the violation of this act the Congress might be aroused sufficiently to repeal it in its entirety. In my estimation, any tampering with the Consumers' Counsel would justify such action. The Congress seems to be rather slow and extremely tolerant when it should be jealous of its privileges and prerogatives and responsibilities. I shall serve notice that I will stand guard over this provision hereafter, as I have up to the present time, and that I assume voluntarily this responsibility, and I will keep the Congress informed. For I say to you that I would not hesitate to sever the lifecord of the act at the navel if the Consumers' Counsel is ever made dependent and ineffective.

Without proper control, without proper balance, the act becomes a one-sided and selfish measure of plunder and oppression which I could not in conscience support. I want to say to the Committee of the Whole that I am certain that when the bill comes back from the Senate that this provision will remain intact or there will be no Bituminous Coal Act. I am willing to stake my reputation as a prophet upon that assertion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this to state briefly that I hope this bill will be finished very quickly. No one I know wants to delay it, but after this bill is disposed of, if it can be accomplished today, a conference report will come up and a bill from the Military Affairs Committee, the latter by unanimous consent, which ought to take only a few minutes. Then, if we can get through the War Department nonmilitary appropriation bill, assigned for tomorrow, I intend to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next. I make this brief announcement for whatever interest it may be to the Members. Of course, we do not want to go much beyond 5 o'clock. That is the position of the leadership of the House, not to go much beyond 5 o'clock. I hope that work can be done between now and 5 o'clock, and then, if so, that we may be able to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The nonmilitary appropriation bill carries something over $200,000,000. Does the gentleman not think that we ought to be able to get through with that in 5 minutes?

Mr. McCORMACK. We certainly should, and that would evidence fine leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He knows that this nonmilitary appropriation bill carries $220,000,000, the exact amount of money that came from the Budget, and he knows, from the language in the bill the purpose of every dime to be spent.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation, I said, would show fine leadership on both sides of the aisle, and I agree with him.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The purpose of this bill, as we all know, is to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years beyond April 26, 1941.

I have from the first been intensely interested in this piece of legislation, because I happened to know something about the long, hard struggle of the coal industry, and thought that it was imperative that this basic industry in some way be stabilized.

The Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 is the successor to the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935. The original act was held unconstitutional in the case of *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238). In the case of *Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co.* v. *Homer M. Adkins* (310 U. S. 381), the present act was held to be constitutional. Therefore there can be no question as to the validity of this legislation. The sole question is, Shall we give the act a fair trial in order to determine if it will solve the problem of the coal industry? At present no one knows. The only way we can find out is by giving the act a fair and honest test. And remember, the coal industry is paying for the test, as the act is self-sustaining. We are not asking for a single dollar from the Federal Treasury.

I admit that the Coal Commission set up under the original act of 1935 and the act of 1937 made a glorious mess of things. Under the reorganization plan, the President abolished the seven-man Coal Commission, effective July 1, 1939, and transferred its functions to the Secretary of the Interior. And I want to say right here, in spite of what some may think of Mr. Ickes, he has, in my opinion, done a good job since the act came under his department.

It is useless to go into the deplorable condition that prevailed in the coal industry for years. We all know that the operators for years lost millions each year and that this loss was usually reflected in the low wages paid the miners.

The legislation will, in my opinion, go a long way toward righting the coal industry. Let us give the legislation a chance.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment to take a few minutes of time to announce to the House that the Senate this afternoon passed the bill H. R. 2082, the mine-inspection bill, with but one amendment added to the bill as it passed the House a few days ago. As the bill passed the House it contained the following language:

> That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors any inspector employed shall be an accredited mining engineer or the equivalent thereto, with the basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal.

As the bill was reported to the Senate and as it passed the Senate, that language was stricken out and the following language inserted in its place:

> That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors any inspector employed shall be a person with a basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal.

As will be seen, the Senate eliminated the qualification that the inspectors must be mining engineers. Knowing that many of my colleagues here are interested in the coal-mining business and in the coal industry, I felt that they would be interested to know that the Senate had passed this bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Then the Senate amendment figures that we do not need technically trained men to inspect safety?

Mr. EDMISTON. Only the qualification of 5 years' experience, and it took away the qualification of mining engineer.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. In my opinion that shows very poor judgment.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEHRMANN: Page 5, after line 21, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The last paragraph of subsection (1) of part II of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'It shall not be an unfair method of competition or a violation of the code or any requirement of this act (1) to sell to or through any bona fide and legitimate farmers' cooperative organization duly organized under the laws of any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or the United States, whether or not such organization grants rebates, discounts, patronage dividends, or other similar benefits to its members; (2) to sell to or through any bona fide and legitimate consumer cooperative organization which performs the functions of a distributor, as provided in subsection (h) of part II of this section, whether or not such organization grants rebates, discounts, patronage dividends, or other similar benefits to its members; (3) to sell through any intervening agency to any such farmers' or consumer cooperative organization; or (4) to pay or allow to any such farmers' or consumer cooperative organization or to any such intervening agency any discount, commission, rebate, or dividend ordinarily paid or allowed, or permitted by the code to be paid or allowed, to other purchasers for purchases in wholesale or middleman quantities: *Provided*, That any discounts, commissions, rebates, or dividends paid or allowed to any such cooperative organizations, which perform the functions of distributors, shall be equal to the discounts or price allowances that may be made by code members to distributors as provided in subsection (h) of part II of this section.'"

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment changes some of the language and clarifies it. You will find, in the committee report on the bottom of page 18, the same language that was read. Of course, we are taking that whole section or subsection 13, and we are only changing a part of that. So the first half or more than half of the amendment is the exact language that is now in the old act. The new language that is changed is in paragraph 2:

to sell to or through any bona fide and legitimate consumer cooperative organization which performs the functions of a distributor, as provided in subsection (h) of part II of this section, whether or not such organization grants rebates, discounts, patronage dividends, or other similar benefits to its members.

The claim has been made by the Commission that it is an unfair discount or rebate. Anyone who knows anything about a cooperative knows that the law provides that there are no discounts or rebates given to anybody, excepting at the end of the year, if any profit has been made, that profit is redistributed to the individual member according to the amount of goods he has purchased. For instance, this company I represent—and there are dozens of others in the United States—does perhaps $5,000,000 worth of wholesale business, and out of that only fifty or sixty thousand is coal. So that all goes into the general fund, and if there is any money made, at the end of the year they declare a patronage dividend of 2, 3, 4, 5, or usually not to exceed 6 percent, depending upon the amount that they made, and that goes back to the members. That it is not a refund or a rebate as the Commission has ruled. It is simply a cooperative that distributes it back, and it only applies to the wholesaler and not to the retailer.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman that the farmers' cooperatives and all other distributors seem to have been treated unfairly in this Guffey Coal Act. They are not even permitted to have seats on Mr. Ickes' new advisory council. I certainly favor the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I thank the gentleman. The reason I put in the last proviso is that it has been established that they have made a differential of rebates allowed between cooperatives and the regular dealers. Where they allowed 50 cents a ton to the regular dealer they only permitted 25 cents a ton to the legitimate cooperative.

This proviso says:

That any discounts, commissions, rebates, or dividends paid or allowed to any such cooperative organizations, which perform the functions of distributors, shall be equal to the discounts or price allowances that may be made by code members to distributors, as provided in subsection (h) of part II of this section.

So that they cannot discriminate against the cooperatives; treat them the same as any other wholesale business.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I understand that the cooperatives cannot purchase coal at wholesale prices under the present law?

Mr. GEHRMANN. They would not permit them to handle it, because they claim that in redistributing the profits to their members they are paying back rebates, which is prohibited in this law. This is not a rebate. They take all the profits they have made on all their sales and distribute them back according to the amount of purchases made. Some years they make a profit and other years they do not.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted. It is simply a clarification. I am sure it will expedite the passage of this bill because I am certain that several Senators already have amendments prepared and it will only delay it after it gets to the Senate if not adopted here in the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this matter was discussed before the committee at the time the hearings were in progress, and it was impossible to determine what effect this would have upon the coal industry. Undoubtedly, if cooperatives of all types were brought within this exemption, it would mean complete disorganization of the whole plan under this bill. It would mean that cooperatives could be organized everywhere and it would completely destroy the competitive features in the various sections of the country in the retail coal industry.

I hope that this amendment will not be adopted and that it can go along with the others which have been suggested, and that we may be given an opportunity to work it out and think it through, and attempt to coordinate this type of amendment with the general provisions of the act, so that we can bring back to the House at some time in the future an amendment, if it can be reached by an amendment, that will have been coordinated with the rest of the act, because we do not know the effect that this sort of legislation would have.

I hope for that reason the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There are many places where farmers' cooperatives are the only retail agency in the district.

Mr. DUNCAN. I will say to the gentleman that farmers' cooperatives are already excluded from the provisions of the act. Nineteen of them have been approved by the Commission. Farmers' cooperatives are taken care of. I call the gentleman's attention to the language of the act:

It shall not be an unlawful method of competition or a violation of the code or any requirement of this act to sell to or through any bona fide or legitimate farmers' cooperative organization.

So the farmers' cooperative organizations are taken care of. It is only the consumers' cooperatives which might be organized in any section of the country, practically every city of the country. If this amendment were included in the bill it would put the retail coal dealer completely out of business in every city of the country, for people could get together, organize consumer cooperatives, and your coal dealers would be out of business. That would be the effect of this amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There are many so-called farmer cooperatives throughout the isolated regions of the country, only they do not call themselves farmers' cooperatives. They exist in small outlying communities miles away

from railroads, and they are at the present time the only store in town, the only one that can get coal, yet they are discriminated against under this act.

Mr. DUNCAN. They are excluded by the provisions of this act.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The only mistake they have made apparently is that they do not call themselves farmers' cooperatives.

Mr. DUNCAN. They certainly must know what is in the law. Farmers' cooperatives are protected under the act, but consumers' cooperatives are not.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I do not believe the gentleman understands the type of cooperative we have in Wisconsin. We are located in an isolated section. The cooperative does not sell to the city consumer, for the moment they sell to a city consumer they are not classified as farmers' cooperatives.

Mr. DUNCAN. That is one of the problems we have got to iron out; but when we adopt a comprehensive amendment without having thought it through we have no idea how it is going to affect the administration of this act in the other sections of the country. I believe we ought to be given an opportunity to work it out and think it through.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Three hundred individual stores have banded together and formed a wholesale unit, yet they are forced to go to independent coal dealers to get their coal.

Mr. DUNCAN. But as a matter of fact according to the testimony before our committee coal was a very, very small part of the commodities handled by cooperatives in the gentleman's section of the country.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Because they were not permitted to handle coal, that is why.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: On page 2, line 22, after the period strike out the remainder of line 22, all of lines 23, 24, and 25, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 3.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to emphasize the importance of the amendment which was introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]. His district is very remote from any coal mine in this country, and so is mine. The people of our section of Wisconsin probably pay the highest price for coal of any residents in any section of the country. It does seem to me that this clarifying amendment which does nothing more than extend to the wholesale cooperatives the same benefits that are given to the jobbers in other lines—that is the only purpose of the amendment—it does seem to me it is only common justice to the people who have organized these associations that they be allowed such benefits as are extended to other jobbers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As a matter of fact under present circumstances a distributor that happens to be a cooperative is discriminated against as opposed to another distributor which is not. Is not that the case?

Mr. HULL. It is an absolutely unfair discrimination against the wholesale coal yard which is operated under the ownership of cooperatives. In other words, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin would merely remove the unfair discrimination, and it is not unjust to any coal dealer, wholesale or retail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes to explain my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, in this bill there is created a Consumers' Counsel. The Coal Commission at the present time has been placed under Civil Service and the President has under the general law the right to make such exemptions as he sees fit. In creating this new office of Consumers' Counsel there is an exemption from the Civil Service written in and my amendment would simply strike that out, leaving these new employees under the general law and in harmony with the bill which we passed last year removing those discriminations.

I hope the committee will agree to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Page 5, line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 is amended by adding to section 3 (e), the following: 'Coal used by a municipality in the operation of a waterworks system shall be considered as used in the performance of a governmental function.'"

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCK. Has debate closed on this section?

The CHAIRMAN. This is a new section.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment at the request of the municipal officials of the city of Atlanta, the city council of that municipality having passed a resolution asking me to offer this amendment. They contend that it has been held that the use of coal for a waterworks operated by a city government is not a governmental function and therefore does not come under the exemption made to the United States, the States, and political subdivisions thereof in section (e) of the original act. They feel—and I think they are right—that it is just as much a public function to operate a waterworks system as it is to heat the city hall, the schoolhouses, or anything else. I cannot see any reason why there should not be an exemption for waterworks systems where they are municipally owned and operated for the benefit of the citizens of a municipality. I do not see any distinction between that use of coal and the use of coal for other city purposes. I hope the Committee will agree to my amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. Chairman, this is a very deep question. It was presented to the committee during the hearings on the whole price structure. The minimum-price feature that has been established and has been in operation for 5 months is based upon the present price of coal. If the amendment offered by the gentleman were adopted, it would mean a resurvey of all the work that has been done up to the present time, and the present price structure would collapse. That is what an amendment of this kind would do, and I certainly hope the Committee will vote the amendment down.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not a fact that it was brought out conclusively in the hearings that the advantage which the Government gets is practically no advantage except the 1 percent?

Mr. BOLAND. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is voted down, and I also move at this time that all debate on the bill close immediately.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4146) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 152, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on next Tuesday at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriation for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. There is no controversy about the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,886,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$79,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 5, and 23.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JED JOHNSON,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FRANCIS CASE (with reservation as to No. 5),
Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19, and 20: Eliminates, as provided by the Senate, authority to purchase press clippings.

Amendment No. 2, relating to national defense activities of the National Resources Planning Board: Appropriates $400,000, instead of $350,000, as provided by the House, and $500,000, as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Corrects a total.

Amendment No. 6, relating to the Canal Zone Biological Area: Eliminates the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, appropriating $10,000.

Amendment No. 12, United States Housing Authority: Authorizes the use of $3,470,000 of Housing Authority funds for administrative purposes, as provided by the Senate, instead of $3,383,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 14, United States Housing Authority: Authorizes $90,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House, for informational service functions.

Amendment No. 15, United States Housing Authority: Authorizes $120,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $103,000 as proposed by the House, for personal services in connection with the functions and duties of the Tenant Relations Division.

Amendment No. 16, relating to motor transport regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission: Substitutes the word "applicable" for the word "applied", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21, Tennessee Valley Authority: Authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, additional steam electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000 kilowatts.

Amendment No. 22, Tennessee Valley Authority: Appropriates $79,800,000, instead of $69,800,000 as proposed by the House and $81,055,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Retains the Senate language prohibiting the employment, from any appropriation contained in the act, of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

Amendment No. 25: Corrects a section number.

Amendments in disagreement

The committee of conference have not agreed respecting the following amendments:

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Relating to the item appropriating emergency funds for the President.

Amendment No. 23, Tennessee Valley Authority: Relating to purchases without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes in connection with the use of funds for national-defense purposes.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JED JOHNSON,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FRANCIS CASE (with reservation as to No. 5),
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a unanimous report, as the gentleman from Virginia has stated.

The bill, as it returns to the House from the Senate, carries a total of $1,414,626,838. This, compared with the bill as it passed the House, reflects an increase of $10,050,000 in appropriations, together with an $82,000 increase in authorizations. As compared with the bill as it passed the Senate, it reflects a decrease of $1,365,000. It is still about $8,893,000 below the Budget figures.

The principal item of increase is in respect to the T. V. A., an increase of $10,000,000 for the development of 35,000 kilowatts additional power for national-defense purposes through expediting the completion of the dam at Coulter Shoals, already authorized, so that it will be available in 1943 instead of in 1944.

In this connection, and in connection with the general power program, I call attention to the fact, as appears from page 39 of the Senate hearings, that as late as December Mr. Dunn, who, of course, is Mr. Knudsen's power expert, stated that there was no justification for the general impression that there was any danger of a shortage of power; that from the contracts entered into by the War Department and their schedule for aluminum and similar metals there was no reason to fear any shortage of power, and that they were in entire disagreement with those who believed otherwise.

I call attention also to the fact that as late as January 7, when T. V. A. was before the House committee, there was no indication of any immediate necessity for a further increase in power facilities.

I further call attention to page 41 of the Senate hearings, and to the following statement by a Member of the other body:

I have been among those who have gone along with the T. V. A. development but it rather looks to me as if they were taking advantage of the situation to conjure up every possible excuse for permanent and expensive construction based on temporary

needs. * * * It seems to me that there is no inclination to try and get along with the already enormous expenditure, but that they are conjuring up the possibilities which may arise in 1942 and 1943 to involve the Government in very heavy permanent expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the increase. I think a reasonable case has been made for it. I hope, however, the T. V. A. will not overlook the comment referred to.

There is a further item in the conference report which provides for the addition of 60,000 kilowatts of power at Watts Bar through the construction there of a third steam generating unit estimated to cost $4,500,000. In view of the liberality which the Congress has shown toward T. V. A., it is encouraging to learn that this item of expenditure can be financed by T. V. A. from its own resources without further appropriation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Massachusetts made reference to the testimony given by Mr. Dunn, the engineer on whom Mr. Knudsen relies. Those statements, as quoted by the gentleman from Massachusetts, were made before the passage of the lend-lease bill and at a time when this country was providing for its own defense only. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that since that testimony was given we have passed the lend-lease bill and we are now about to expend $7,000,000,000 for the defense of other nations. It seems to me that all the testimony given by the experts as to what was needed in the way of power, in the way of equipment, and in the way of housing, had to do with our own defense and not with the defense of the democracies of the world.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There would be great force to the gentleman's observation if the record did not indicate that the additional needs provided for materialized almost immediately after January 7, and therefore, before the passage of the lend-lease bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 6, line 9, after "for", insert "emergencies affecting."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: On page 6, in line 6, after "thereto", insert "for any purpose for which the Congress has previously made appropriation or authorization without regard to the provisions of law regulating the employment of persons in the Government service, such as section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment, insert the following: "for any purpose for which the Congress has previously made appropriation or authorization and without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service, such as section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws; and any waiver hereunder of the provisions of any law regulating such expenditure or such employment shall not be exercised by any agency unless the allocation to such agency or subsequent action of the President in connection therewith permits any such waiver to be availed of."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the motion for concurrence in the amendment with an amendment restores to the bill the language which was stricken from the bill on a point of order raised by me in the consideration of this measure. However, attention should be called to the fact that the amendment now carries considerable additional language, and it is the hope of the conferees that this language corrects some of the reasons for making the objection in the first place.

I cannot say that personally I am entirely satisfied with it, but I am satisfied it was about the best we could get under the circumstances at the present time. I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee, with respect to his understanding of the effect of this amendment on auditing by the General Accounting Office of expenditures from this emergency fund.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We were given very positive assurance not only from the General Accounting Office, but also from the Budget, that this will not waive the necessity for auditing these expenditures.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And I might add that assurance is one of the reasons the conferees reached an agreement on this language.

Further than that it should be pointed out that the waivers of existing law are now limited by the last part of the amendment to those waivers that are approved by the President. The language without that provision would have waived the general laws with respect to expenditure of Federal funds insofar as this $100,000,000 was concerned and would also have waived the civil service laws and classification laws as to salaries. This is redundant as far as the waiver of civil service laws is concerned, because the President already, under the Constitution and by different acts of Congress in years gone by, has the authority to suspend the civil service laws when he deems it necessary, and at this point I would ask permission to extend in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Flemming, Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission, on this particular point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASE: In conformity with your request, I am very glad to provide you with information regarding certain language relative to civil service contained in the independent offices appropriation bill (H. R. 2788), as printed on March 11 with the amendments of the Senate numbered.

The language in question, which appears on page 6, lines 13, 14, 15, 16, is as follows:

"* * * without regard to the provisions of law regulating the employment of persons in the Government service such as section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws * * *."

The authority vested in the President of the United States by the Constitution, by section 1753 of the Revised Statutes and by the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, very clearly gives to the President the right to waive the competitive provisions of the Civil Service Act whenever in his judgment such a waiver is necessary in the interests of sound administration. Ever since the Civil Service Act was passed, Presidents of the United States have exercised this authority.

Consequently, any language in an appropriation bill telling the President that he can make appointments without regard to the provisions of the Civil Service Act is a provision which gives to the President authority which he already has and is, therefore, superfluous.

It is recognized that during an emergency period such as the present one it is necessary from time to time to waive the competitive provisions of the Civil Service Act. Whenever it is apparent that it is necessary to take such action, the President has a clear right to do so without any action being taken by Congress.

In fact, in order to facilitate the recruiting of personnel for the national-defense program, the President has delegated some of his authority for the waiving of the competitive provisions of the Civil Service Act in Executive Order No. 8564, which reads as follows:

"Whenever, because of a public exigency directly connected with the national-defense program, or because of the urgency for the immediate filling of a position involved in such program, the Civil Service Commission determines that it is in the public interest to do so, it may authorize the filling of any position connected with the national-defense program for a term not extending beyond the duration of the national-defense program, without regard to the competitive requirements of the civil-service rules, subject to such noncompetitive tests of fitness as the Commission may prescribe. Persons so appointed will not thereby acquire a classified (competitive) civil-service status."

The Commission has been operating in terms of this Executive order in such a manner as to insure the meeting of deadlines for personnel in connection with the needs of national-defense agencies.

The above reasoning does not apply, however, to the Classification Act of 1923, which has the effect of fixing salaries for positions

according to scales set by Congress. This act is binding on the executive branch of the Government as far as positions in the departmental service are concerned unless it is waived in particular instances by the Congress. Consequently, if it is desired to waive the classification act in connection with the use of the President's fund, the language which appears in H. R. 2788, on page 6, line 16, namely, "and classification laws," would need to remain.

I hope this provides you with the information you requested.

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As far as suspension of the classification law is concerned, I believe there is no existing authority for that, unless it is given by this amendment. I earnestly hope that in the future on all these appropriations, where we are granting large sums of money, and particularly large lump sums of money for the President to expend without specifying the particular object, that we may place about them every possible safeguard to insure conformity to every practicable standard on the expenditure of public funds. When we give a blanket waiver of existing law on the expenditure of Federal funds, we invite waste, graft, and trouble.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23: Page 70, line 15, after "1941", insert *"Provided further,* That purchases may be made by the Authority during the fiscal year 1942 without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, when in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Authority such a procedure will expedite the completion of projects determined by the President to be essential for defense purposes."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and on that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the several motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

THREE-YEAR REGULAR NAVY, MARINE CORPS, OR COAST GUARD MEMBERS, AND CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS THEREOF

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill (H. R. 4125) to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members, and certain members of the Reserve components thereof, from selective training and service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand this bill simply provides that anyone who has had service in the naval branch of our defense establishment is exempt from being drafted into the military branch.

Mr. MAY. It applies to members of the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Regular Navy only as to those who had served a 3-year term of enlistment, and prevents their immediate reenlistment under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does it apply in any way to the service in the event of another war? Does it preclude their being called into the service in the event of another war?

Mr. MAY. No; I think not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There are other amendments before the gentleman's committee that his committee is considering?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. One concerning dentists and college students and physicians. Are they included in this bill?

Mr. MAY. They are not. This merely relates to members of the Marine Corps, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and certain members of the reserve components.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman considering bringing in any other amendment before this session of Congress ends?

Mr. MAY. We are considering a large number of amendments. There are a great many of them but none of them is so urgent as this one which we have brought in at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course the matter of emergency is a matter of opinion.

Mr. MAY. Yes. This bill means this: Men who have completed their term of service and been discharged from their term of service in training in the Coast Guard are being brought in and inducted under the provisions of section 5 (b) of the Selective Service and Training Act, and we felt it would be improper and unfair after giving those men a 3 years' training to pick them up again and subject them to another year of training.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. PACE. Take the case of a young man who in the last few weeks has been discharged from the marine service, and this rank injustice has been done to him by being inducted into the selective service. Will he be discharged from the service in which he has been inducted if this bill should pass?

Mr. MAY. Yes; the bill provides for that, by permitting such persons to exercise the option of withdrawing.

Mr. ANDREWS. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the bill does not provide that. If this bill is passed, a man who has been called will immediately be given his option by the selective service administration of withdrawing.

Mr. PACE. That is not covered in the act?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. As I understand it, this bill is for the purpose of exempting from selective service men who have served in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What does the gentleman mean when he says "men who have just served"? Suppose they went out 2 years ago, or something like that?

Mr. MAY. It applies to all of them, but I merely cited a case where a man has just come out and then is called.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The effect of the bill will be that anyone who has been in the Navy or the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard, and is therefore subject to their call would not be called under the selective service.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman's committee has done a good job.

Mr. MAY. We have tried to do what we felt was fair and just in this instance. There are, however, a large number of suggested amendments that we shall try and consider at some future time. This one was in line with what we wanted to do in the original act, but we were urged by the Navy not to do it at that time and yielded to their demands which has proven unwise. As to future amendments we shall have to give the act a reasonable opportunity to be tried out from an administrative point of view.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can the gentleman give us any assurance as to the probable fate of the bill when it goes downtown?

Mr. MAY. Yes. It has been agreed to by the Selective Service Bureau, and endorsed by the War Department and the Secretary of War has a letter here in which he says it is the proper procedure, and a proper bill. I imagine that the President will approve it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for asking that is this. The gentleman will remember, when the conference report was brought into the House on the passage of the selective service bill by the Senate, I raised this question at that time and asked the gentleman that question, and we were put off by the statement that a representative of the Navy who was present at the considerations of the conferees said that the bill was all right.

Mr. MAY. That was a correct statement at that time, and that was the fact then and it is the fact now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it is a fact now that the Navy is willing to have this bill passed?

Mr. MAY. I stated at that time, and I repeat it now, that we had this provision in the legislation and would have maintained it in conference but for the fact that representatives of the Navy came before the conferees and insisted that it be taken out. Now they say that it is all right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure that the House committee was in the right position then. I am glad that support has come around to that position, because I felt at the time it was a serious injustice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (b) of Public Law No. 783, approved September 16, 1940, be amended to read as follows:

"(b) In time of peace, the following persons shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 3 (b) and from the liability to serve in any Reserve component of the land or naval forces imposed by this act:

"(1) Any person who shall have satisfactorily served as an officer or enlisted man for at least 3 consecutive years in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for registration under section 2.

"(2) Any person who is a member of the active National Guard who shall have satisfactorily served as an officer or enlisted man for at least 1 year in active Federal service in the Army of the United States, and subsequent thereto for at least 2 consecutive years in the Regular Army or in the active National Guard, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for registration under section 2.

"(3) Any person who is an officer or enlisted man in the active National Guard at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein for at least 6 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration.

"(4) Any person who is an officer in the Officers' Reserve Corps on the eligible list at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein on the eligible list for at least 6 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration.

"(5) Any person who is an officer or an enlisted man in the Organized Naval Reserve or the organized Marine Corps Reserve at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein for at least 6 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration or any person who is an officer or an enlisted man in the Naval Merchant Marine Reserve or Volunteer Naval Reserve or Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein for at least 6 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "who", strike out the word "is" and insert the word "as."

Line 6, strike out the word "who."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1942

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I call up the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing in these times to have before us a measure emanating from the War Department, which, to a very large extent, deals not with war and implements of war, but with undertakings solely in the interest of our people in the normal way of life.

I wish I might not have to say there is an exception, but it is true that something more than one-fourth of the money in the bill may be said to be responsive to the present defense-preparation efforts, occasioned very largely by new undertakings in course of prosecution in the Canal Zone.

This is a short bill, dealing with some half-dozen lines of activity, but in its river and harbor and flood-control phases it reaches into every section of the country, and nearly all of us, very naturally, have a keen interest in the projects which such works embrace.

The Budget estimates, upon which the bill is based, call for a total of $221,272,228. The bill you have before you is in that identical amount. We have made an adjustment within one appropriation, which I shall discuss in a moment, and through the report we indicate our desire that the Department should make a minor adjustment within another.

There was very little else for us to do. If we are in sympathy with the principle of providing sparingly for nondefense projects in order not alone that there may be more funds available for national-defense projects but to avoid infringement upon defense preparation by work projects creating heavy labor and material demands. We have adhered to the Budget figures for those reasons. The Budget Bureau itself had thus been guided, and certainly left us with no leeway for effecting reductions.

I shall touch briefly upon the several items in the bill in the order in which they appear therein.

Cemeterial expenses are up and the probability is that they will go up more. If interments measure up to the estimates, there will be need later to provide additional funds for markers and headstones for graves. The bill includes an additional amount of $430,000, using round figures, for caring for the remains of soldier dead that will come about by the expansion that has occurred in our military forces.

The Alaska Communication System, which is self-supporting, is in for an increase of $24,750. Some new Federal buildings are becoming available and there will be some new equipment necessary when branches of the system move into them, and there is need to provide some auxiliary power for all, or practically all of the several stations of the system maintained in the Territory.

For rivers and harbors the Budget allows $20,000,000 for new work. This is the lowest amount since 1935, although project upon project has been authorized since, and pyramided upon a host of other projects awaiting funds for their initiation. There are some $4,000,000 worth of authorized defense projects, or so-called defense projects, which are not cared for in the $20,000,000. The projects provided for you will see in a table on page 36 of the hearings.

Owing to defense preparation, the committee has not disturbed the Budget estimate. As to the authorized projects having a defense aspect, and there are six of them altogether, as I recall, unquestionably, as the defense preparation effort develops we may expect a Budget estimate for their commencement. In fact, it has been intimated to us that an estimate is being discussed now for one of the projects—the Kennebec River project in Maine.

For river and harbor maintenance the allocation is $43,100,000. The distribution of that amount appears in a table commencing on page 37 of our hearings. For the present year there has been made available for maintenance $45,745,310. While unquestionably the engineers could use more to good advantage, I feel that I can assure you that the amount proposed will avoid the undoing of any finished work or work which will attain a maintenance status during the ensuing fiscal year.

For flood control, general, we had an estimate of $71,129,000, and we recommend to you that amount. It is substantially the amount of the current appropriation. With the exception of a project in West Virginia, which has a direct relationship to defense preparation, the estimate includes no money for commencing new projects, and there are many in the program which have not been started. You can see the list, starting on page 57 of the hearings.

The committee found itself in the same situation it was in last year as to this general flood-control work—nothing for new projects in the estimate at all.

We have done the same thing we did last year. In other words, we have earmarked 10 percent of the amount in the Budget for prosecuting work on going projects, for beginning new projects, projects which constitute a part of the authorized general flood-control program. There are many of them, as you will see in the itemization beginning on page 57 of the hearings.

The effect of this course is to make $6,554,035 available exclusively for starting projects which have been in a standby status. Of course, what projects will be selected we simply do not know. The law says that authorized projects shall "be prosecuted in order of their emergency as may be designated by the President."

Turning to the flood-control project applying to the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, the Budget has set up $22,000,000, and this bill, likewise, carries that amount, which is $8,000,000 less than has been made available for the present fiscal year. There is about $92,000,000 worth of work which can be proceeded with at this time. A much larger amount than $92,000,000 is needed to complete the project, but the excess applies to a phase which is being restudied, and, perhaps, there will need to be some additional legislation.

The proposed application of the $22,000,000 you will find itemized on page 70 of the hearings.

We have got two power projects in the bill. One completes the Fort Peck Dam installation, which will make available 50,000 kilowatts. The amount of the appropriation is $1,845,000.

The other power project is at the Bonneville Dam, in Oregon. We carry $7,170,000 for going forward with a 10-unit installation, which will have an output of 518,400 kilowatts, for all of which we are told there will be a demand by 1944. A little more than $3,000,000, over and above the amount in this bill, it has been represented to us, will wind up the work.

As to the Panama Canal Zone, I might say that the normal items are normal. The expenditures proposed contemplate the usual run of outlays for the operation and maintenance of the existing facilities. Getting away from the usual, however, there is an item of $4,670,000 for continuing the special proective works project, and we meet with the second increment for building the new set of locks, a matter of $34,932,000 in cash and $79,000,000 in contractual authority. The authorized cost of the project is $277,000,000. Last year, you will recall, we started the project with $15,000,000 of cash and $99,000,000 of contractual authority. Present indications point to the accomplishment of the work well ahead of June 30, 1946, which was the original objective.

Mr. Speaker, in a rather general way, I believe I have spoken upon all of the main provisions of the measure before us. I deplore the fact, as I know all Members do, that this world situation has so greatly interfered with our normal pursuits and our normal improvement and development programs, whatever their nature may be, and it is my earnest hope and prayer that divine Providence may bring about an early victory for the democracies, so that America, instead of being employed as the arsenal of democracy, may turn its energies into providing protection from the ravages of floods, engage more extensively in soil conservation and reclamation, further improve its rivers and harbors, make available an abundance of cheap power to every section of the country, proceed with the construction of a great arterial highway system, and otherwise engage in undertakings that will make this great land of ours a more happy place in which to live for those who are or who may become privileged to call it home. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] has made a very full and complete statement with reference to the bill. I shall not make a long statement, because the bill is within budgetary limits. There have been a few changes made, simply transfers in certain cases, but I do want to call the attention of every Member of the House to certain testimony in the hearings on page 46 by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] about the St. Lawrence waterway. His questioning runs over to page 47 and into page 48. Then, on page 49, you will find some questions by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] about the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Speaker, shortly we are going to get the St. Lawrence proposition, and I want to say this afternoon, and I want to make it a matter of record, that those of you who are interested in worthy flood-control projects and worthy river and harbor projects had better watch this St. Lawrence waterway rather carefully, because if 300 or 400 or some other amount of millions of dollars is appropriated for that project it will be very difficult for many of the Members to obtain moneys for projects in their own districts which are vitally necessary to their constituencies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to the fact that the Times-Herald tonight carries a statement to the effect that the C. I. O. refuses to call off the Allis-Chalmers strike, and in the newspaper account it says:

By what power are you and Secretary Knox authorized to issue ultimatums when provisions are already made in the Executive order issued—

And so forth. Well, I would like to tell them that unless they call off that strike we are going to do something right here and now. [Applause.]

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, my concern for my country has caused me to view with considerable trepidation at least three things that are going on in this country. One is the ridiculous pastime of the War Department in drafting dancing girls, hostesses, juke boxes, and so forth, to make an army of "woman's home companions," or something of that sort, out of the million men we have drafted to train to defend this country. As far as I am concerned, I am going to start voting against many of the things that the Military Affairs Committee or the Subcommittee on Appropriations for military affairs bring in here until the War Department starts utilizing those funds for the purposes we intended. The social column in the War Department is as dangerous as it is ridiculous and absurd. The second circumstance that I am concerned about is the need to purge this country of dollar-a-year men, who by prostituting the word "patriotism" have gotten into the heart of our Government to utilize those positions to divert appropriations that we are making into the channels of their selfish interests. The whole caboodle are not worth a dollar a year to the public interest.

My third comment, which is the conclusion of this first, and probably the last, speech that I will make this year, is that I am gravely concerned about strikes in this country. Despite the fact that the administrative branch of our Government has power enough to take care of it if they saw fit to invoke those powers, I feel that the United States Congress should now accept the responsibility that is being neglected by the administrative branches of the Government. [Applause.]

As far as I am concerned, regardless of the fact that it will not be pleasing perhaps to a majority of this body, I personally cannot agree to Congress going in recess until something has been done to curb the bottleneck in our production spelled s-t-r-i-k-e. [Applause.]

Leaders of labor and leaders of management are both acting in a hard-headed, selfish way. Uncle Sam may have to take these hard heads and bump them painfully together.

The evident need of my country makes me ready to vote for compulsory arbitration, if necessary. It might even be wise to draft Henry Ford and John L. Lewis and William Green, put them all on buck private's pay, and make them march down the road for America.

Regardless of the right and wrong of strikes, this is no time for a strike. France is not cold in her grave. She is our lesson. She was assassinated by her own people, and the knife that struck her heart was the strike. Strikes must stop now. The very least that our country can expect is a moratorium on strikes until the war is over. If labor and management need compulsion, let us give it to them now. America is bigger and more important than any union or any industry. Congress has the power to declare war on strikes in defense industry. There will be no unanimous consent to recess until this problem is solved.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the end of the debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

For maintaining and improving national cemeteries, including fuel for and pay of superintendents and the superintendent at Mexico City, and other employees; purchase of tools and materials; repair, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying motor vehicles; care and maintenance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, chapel, and grounds in the Arlington National Cemetery, and that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title and the graves of those buried therein, including Confederate graves, and including the burial site of Pushmataha, a Choctaw Indian chief; repair to roadways but not to more than a single approach road to any national cemetery constructed under special act of Congress; for headstones or markers for unmarked graves of soldiers, sailors, and marines under the acts approved March 3, 1873 (24 U. S. C. 279), February 3, 1879 (24 U. S. C. 280), March 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 56), March 14, 1914 (38 Stat. 768), February 26, 1929 (24 U. S. C. 280a), and April 18, 1940 (54 Stat. 142), and civilians interred in post cemeteries; recovery of bodies and disposition of remains as authorized by act of May 17, 1938 (10 U. S. C. 916–916d), including remains of personnel of the Army of the United States who die while on active duty; expenses authorized by act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 743), incident to remains,

dependents, and property of employees dying while in a travel status or on duty in a Territory or possession of the United States or in a foreign country; travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains of military personnel and civilian employees; for repairs and preservation of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, and so forth, made and constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark the places where American soldiers fell; care, protection, and maintenance of the Confederate Mound in Oakwood Cemetery at Chicago, the Confederate Stockade Cemetery at Johnstone Island, the Confederate burial plats owned by the United States in Confederate Cemetery at North Alton, the Confederate Cemetery, Camp Chase, at Columbus, the Confederate Cemetery at Point Lookout, and the Confederate Cemetery at Rock Island; and for care and maintenance of graves used by the Army for burials in commercial cemeteries, $2,765,626: *Provided*, That no railroad shall be permitted upon any right-of-way which may have been acquired by the United States leading to a national cemetery, or to encroach upon any roads or walks constructed thereon and maintained by the United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for repairing any roadway not owned by the United States within the corporate limits of any city, town, or village.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill carries an appropriation sufficient to complete the installation of power and irrigating facilities at Fort Peck Dam, which is the largest dirt dam in the world. It is located on the Missouri River, in Montana, and was completed at a cost of something like $100,000,000. The installation of this power plant is going to be a Godsend to the Northwest for irrigation, culinary, and other useful purposes. It will enable us to put electricity in the rural as well as urban homes. The completion of this plant will furnish the necessary power for industrial and irrigation development purposes. It is the final step in a great and useful project, and I hope the appropriation will remain in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have this afternoon introduced two bills. One provides for the reduction in Government expenditures in all but defense activities bringing them down to the 1933 level. The other provides for the drafting of the manhood of this Nation, having in mind that the President should be given unquestioned power to draft labor, and having that power should exercise it. What is going on is perfectly shameful.

The recent order made by the President setting up a conciliation board does not answer the question. It leaves us completely in the hands of the labor racketeers. We ought to do something and, as has been suggested this afternoon, we ought to do it now.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman's resolution provide for a reduction of all governmental expenditures with the exception of national-defense items?

Mr. COX. It does.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Did the gentleman include in his resolution a reduction of veterans' benefits similar to the Economy Act of 1933?

Mr. COX. No specific provision is made other than that all Federal expenditures other than defense activities should be reduced, and I think they should be reduced. Somebody must make sacrifice somewhere along the line. The veteran has probably already made his. Certainly he is entitled to applause for his fine Americanism in this time of stress.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman realize that Congress recognized the mistake they made in 1933 when they passed the Economy Act by restoring, since 1933, practically every benefit the Economy Act took away from the veterans and their dependents?

Mr. COX. I voted for that act, and am glad I did, and I think it was a mistake for Congress to have shown the white feather and run away from it so soon.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I may say to my friend from Georgia that if we do not cut down Government expenditures some place the veterans will get nothing after a while.

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman. We are headed for ruin and we ought to take this Government out of pawn. It is in pawn to the racketeers. We ought to recover it, and it is the business of Congress to do the job. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Would not this be a good time to pass the Smith amendments to the Wagner Act?

Mr. COX. I understand a resolution has been introduced providing for the continuation of that committee. I hope it is continued and I hope Congress meets its responsibility, reconsiders and re-adopts the amendments they adopted in the last session.

Mr. RICH. If we continue the committee the Congress is going to do nothing unless they adopt the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. COX. I believe the people of this country are fed up on the inactivity of the Congress as regards labor racketeering and its fear or its failure to step up and meet its responsibility and do its job. The same influences that sent France to ruin are now working on us. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Debris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 633); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States, including maintenance of the Hennepin Canal in Illinois; for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 50 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535); for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for printing and binding, newspapers, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, including such printing as may be authorized by the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress, and for the purchase (not to exceed $167,870) of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motorboats, for official use: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, $63,100,040: *Provided*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of War may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1942 shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the actual expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CULKIN: Page 7, line 2, after the word "law", strike out "$63,100,040" and insert "$64,100,040."

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. After hearing the gentleman's amendment I am inclined to believe that one of the reasons it is being offered is because of some erroneous information I gave the gentleman. I recall that several days ago the gentleman asked me something about the rivers and harbors and flood-control appropriations. I told him at that time I thought there would be a certain amount set aside in addition and above the $20,000,000 for rivers and harbors, and I was sure he could sell General Schley his particular project. I was in error, in honest error, and I am sorry I gave the gentleman that information.

Mr. CULKIN. I thank the gentleman for his willingness to make that statement. It will perhaps clarify and justify

my appearance at this time. Mr. Speaker, I have offered this amendment adding $1,000,000 to the appropriation for general rivers and harbors purposes. It is proposed to substantially earmark this item by the discussion here for the purpose of expending the $1,000,000 on a channel at the port of Oswego, N. Y.

Here are the facts: Three years ago at the suggestion of this Government the Central New York Power Co. built an $18,000,000 steam station at that port. The power so created, which amounted to 200,000 horsepower, was to go into the power pool in northern and central New York to service the manufacturers of munitions from Buffalo to Schenectady. That is a very intensely industrialized area. It was supposed at that time that this item of harbor improvement had the endorsement of everybody in the Government from the President down. Today I am faced with the fact and the committee is faced with the fact that this item has been left out because it was not budgeted.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a vital national-defense item. It is so characterized by the National Power Policy Committee, which is made up of Mr. Lilienthal, Mr. Ickes, Mr. Olds, and various other proponents of public ownership. This group says, in a letter addressed to General Robbins in response to an inquiry from him, that the studies of the National Power Policy Committee show that the steam electric plant now being operated and constructed at Oswego will be greatly needed for national-defense purposes. Then the writer of the letter, the able Vice Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Olds, said that the proposed improvements in Oswego Harbor should therefore be among the rivers and harbors projects having a definite national-defense value.

When these arch proponents of public ownership say that a steam plant built by the utilities and built with the money of their stockholders is national defense, and purely national defense, surely that creates an absolute presumption to that end. The utilities have gone ahead on this implied promise from the administration and have spent some $18,000,000 in the construction of this plant. The plant is now constructed and is being operated at tremendous additional expense because of the absence of a channel in the harbor there.

It is intended to bring this coal up from Pennsylvania, amounting to 300,000 tons a year for the present two units. There are under contemplation an additional two units to this plant, which will make the consumption 600,000 tons a year out of Pennsylvania.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the operation of this steam plant now constructed is handicapped in its operation by the high cost in the transportation of fuel. The construction of this channel will enable the utility company to save to the consumers—industrial and household—according to estimates of the engineers, some $300,000 a year. May I say that under the statutory set-up in New York State that such savings are invariably reflected back to the consumers.

This item had the unanimous approval of the Rivers and Harbors Committee which gave it the lone right-of-way in an authorization bill.

We have spent in the aggregate some six or seven hundred million dollars on Bonneville, Grand Coulee, T. V. A., and other public ownership propositions. I have no quarrel with that, but in this case it is a tax-paying private utility spending its own money with the added fact that it stands as a bona fide national-defense project. It is so characterized by the administration proponents of Government ownership in the Power Policy Committee. They urge its inclusion in the bill. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment there is nothing sacrosanct about the Budget. The Budget carries out the beliefs, social and otherwise, of certain gentlemen in the Government and this House should reserve to itself jurisdiction in such a case as this.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was not this plant built really upon the promise or the position taken by the Government that it would in good faith construct this channel so fuel could be gotten to the plant?

Mr. CULKIN. I am not charging anybody with bad faith.

Mr. DONDERO. Well, they did depend on the Government to carry out its agreement?

Mr. CULKIN. There was an implied agreement this channel would be forthcoming after the usual circumstance of authorization and appropriation. Now this utility is stopped in its tracks after it has spent $18,000,000. This patriotic company is making an essential and absolutely important contribution to national defense. It is in aid of every munitions manufacturer from Buffalo to Schnectady, in the most intensely industrialized area probably in the Union.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. As a matter of fact, the Rivers and Harbors Committee considered this favorably, did it not?

Mr. CULKIN. Oh, yes; it got the right-of-way. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is present and I hope he will say a word in reference to this matter. I repeat, we are a legislative body and there is in these days nothing sacrosanct about the Budget. I trust this House will favorably consider my amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the Members of the House to page 32 of the hearings. On page 32 it is stated:

Mr. SNYDER. I see you have a list of the projects authorized by the act of October 17, 1940. I suggest that that be inserted, but I wish you would have included therein the amounts carried in the first deficiency bill, 1941.

That is what I asked General Schley, to which he replied:

Yes; we will do that.

You will notice he inserts the 21 projects that were authorized.

Turn to page 30 and look at the top of the page. I will read what the Bureau of the Budget did:

General SCHLEY. The Budget excluded the following projects:

Kennebec River, Maine	$800,000
Boston Harbor, Mass. (seaplane channel)	2,300,000
Nantasket (Hull) Gut and Weymouth Fore River, Mass	141,000
Channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C	45,000
Silver Lake Harbor, N. C	60,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	1,000,000
Total	4,346,000

You will notice that 21 projects were authorized but that the Bureau of the Budget in analyzing the national-defense aspect of the situation left these 6 projects out as not coming under the same classification or having as high priority as the other 15. If the House were to put in the Oswego project—and I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman from New York and what he said about the usefulness of this project—it only would be fair to put in all the other 5 projects listed here, because they come under the same classification. No estimate was sent up here for those other 5 projects, just as no estimate was sent up for the Oswego Harbor project.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. I call the gentleman's attention to the testimony on page 29, about halfway down the page:

Mr. SNYDER. How important do you consider the Oswego project in the matter of priority in connection with national defense?

General ROBINS. The National Power Policy Committee regards it as highly important. It will save in the matter of transportation facilities in hauling coal into the plant and let deeper-draft vessels come in with coal so that it will not require so many ships. I think that project can be considered as quite important from a national-defense standpoint.

Mr. SNYDER. Are those projects regarded as of paramount importance in a national-defense sense?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman is quite right. The gentleman's project has high priority. So, no doubt, have the other five for which no estimate has come in. I have no basis for the statement, but I have a feeling that all of these projects which the Budget has passed over will be included in a submission in the near future. I hope so and I hope the gentleman's project will thus be taken care of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CULKIN) there were—ayes 28, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON: On page 7, line 2, strike out "$63,100,040" and insert in lieu thereof "$88,100,040."

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker by way of explanation, it will be the purpose of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to offer an amendment to the flood-control item contained in this bill in the same amount as the amount I am offering to the rivers and harbors section of the bill.

If those of you who have copies of the hearings will turn to page 30, you will see there are some 77 projects listed by the Army engineers as being projects to which it is feasible and desirable from a national-defense standpoint to allot funds during the current year. The total amount of the items the Army engineers have said they could profitably expend is $128,861,700. Out of the 77 projects they have listed under the flood-control item, only 33 have been allocated any funds up to the extent of $20,000,000.

It is my contention, addressed particularly to the Members from the Middle West, that inasmuch as national defense has seen fit to take most of the funds which have been available heretofore, we should stand shoulder to shoulder behind an increase in this appropriation as well as an increase in the appropriation for the flood-control items. There is not a single dollar that will go to new work, as I read this bill. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN], in his contention that this item increasing the bill from $63,000,000 to $88,000,000 will give ample funds for every item the Army engineers deem desirable and needful of completion at this particular time. I urge upon the Members of the House that they consider that they have a stake in this rivers and harbors appropriation bill.

Many of them have been left out completely, and, particularly, for example, the gentlemen from Missouri and Louisiana should be interested in this item, because on the river down there they have allocated no funds at all for the purpose of completing that project.

As for the Missouri River, from Kansas City to Sioux City, in which I am chiefly interested, last year the total appropriation for new work on that stretch of the river was $3,900,000. This year the Budget has cut that by $1,200,000, and today we have but $1,700,000 available for the next fiscal year.

In like manner all of the items for maintenance work have been curtailed, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this is the time to assert our influence and quit being rubber stamps for the bureaus. For one, I hope and ask each man who is interested in any river and harbor item to give full consideration to this amendment and vote in support of it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. How did the gentleman arrive at the increase of $22,000,000?

Mr. HARRINGTON. It is $25,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Just what does that include? Do you mean the projects on page 31 of the hearings?

Mr. HARRINGTON. The projects are listed on pages 30 and 31 of the hearings. There are 77 projects listed on which they could profitably spend some additional funds during this year.

Mr. DONDERO. The $25,000,000 is to be allocated among all of them?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Among the entire 77 projects; that is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have every sympathy with my colleagues who have river and harbor and flood-control projects in their districts or in their areas, which are not provided for in the present bill, but we must all recognize that with the enormous amount of funds that is required for the national-defense program it is necessary we cut down on other programs that may not be considered as essential at this particular time as the defense program.

The Missouri River, in that region which has been referred to by my friend from Iowa, has had very generous treatment by the Army engineers. If you take it by and large and look at the history of the flood-control program and the river and harbor program, you will find that the Army engineers have tried to do the fair thing by the various areas of our country. If we depart from the program of letting the Army engineers say what priority the various projects shall have and fight it out on the floor of the House, you know what the inevitable result will be. It will be a dog fight here from dawn until dark, and if we started that sort of program, we would not finish here before Monday morning.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true with respect to various Members of the House from the several States who are interested in particular projects that it would be unwise for us to undertake to put any of those projects in the measure and disrupt the bill and the program?

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman is entirely correct in his statement. For instance, on page 36 of the hearings, there is an item of the Missouri River mouth to Kansas City, $80,000,000, total estimated cost, and there has been previously allotted $75,523,834, and there are other sections equally generously treated. I have friends who have come to me from Louisiana and other States who have suggested that it is most important that their projects be included in the bill at this time, but we have had to turn them down. We have felt it wise to follow the Budget. We have followed the recommendations of the Army engineers, and so we cannot be fish with one and fowl with another. We have got to be fair with the whole House.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield.

Mr. HARRINGTON. That is just exactly what my amendment is attempting to do. It is an attempt to give everybody some of the funds that should be made available this year for river and harbor work, and $25,000,000 additional will give sufficient funds to all of these projects so they can have part of the work going on.

Mr. TERRY. If we give $25,000,000 instead of the $20,000,000, as suggested by the Budget, there are many millions of dollars additional that could be just as wisely spent by the Army engineers.

Mr. HARRINGTON. If the gentleman will yield further, does not the gentleman think it is just as much in the interest of national defense to take care of our own projects in the United States as it is to allocate and give away funds to other nations?

Mr. TERRY. If the Missouri River does not get this allocation of $5,000,000, I do not know that the democracies of the world will be imperiled. I sympathize with the gentleman, but we have to take first things first.

Mr. HARRINGTON. And I am just pointing that one out as an example. There are 77 items in this bill, 44 of which have not a cent allocated to them.

Mr. TERRY. There are a great many flood-control projects that have not got allocations either.

Mr. HARRINGTON. But they should have.

Mr. TERRY. They probably should have and in the course of time we will get to them. The Army engineers have started on this program of building up the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers from year to year, and, as has been pointed out, if the gentleman will read the record, he will see that these rivers have been most generously treated. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including printing and binding, newspapers, law books, books of reference, periodicals, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, the purchase (not to exceed $27,200) of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motorboats for official use, and for preliminary examinations and surveys of flood-control projects authorized by law, $71,129,000, of which not to exceed $7,683,035 shall be available immediately and exclusively for expenditure upon projects on account of which allotments heretofore have not been made, and, in addition, for the protection at approaches to military reservations from flood waters: *Provided*, That $998,342 of this appropriation shall be transferred and made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for preliminary examinations and surveys, as authorized by law, for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of flood-control projects, including the employment of persons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books and periodicals, printing and binding, the purchase (not to exceed $15,000) of

motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motorboats, and for other necessary expenses: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys, prepare plans and specifications, and to procure options on land and property necessary for the construction of authorized flood-control projects or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938: *Provided further,* That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys and securing options shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 8, line 10, strike out "$71,129,000" and insert "$96,129,000."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this amendment in my opinion is an important amendment from the standpoint of national defense. If I did not believe that, I would not offer it here. I have inserted the figures $25,000,000 because under the plan followed by the Corps of Engineers I know whatever the amount of the amendment I offer is, it is not all going to be expended in the territory about which I appeal to you in the few minutes this afternoon. In the break-down of expenditures of funds which is carried in the hearings it is proposed to expend $9,270,000 in what is known as the South Pacific division under the $70,000,000 appropriation. In the statement which I made, and which is contained in the last two pages of the hearings, there is a statement by the district engineer that the Los Angeles County flood-control district, in which he cites the report of the Chief of Army Engineers, who said that $20,000,000 could be spent with great advantage on the flood-control items in that area in the next year.

Now, why do we want this money? The first exhibit that I offer is a bunch of pictures taken of the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation plant, one of the biggest manufacturers of aircraft in this country at the present time. Here is a picture of the inside of the plant with 2 feet of water in it, and here is another picture of the inside of the plant where the sand bags could not keep the water from coming in. There are many more here which I wish the Members would look at. I am talking about a situation existing in Los Angeles County, a county that has already expended of its own money $100,000,000 on flood-control projects, and the reason we need this money is because there is a certain specific project already recommended by the engineers that could be built that would carry the floodwater away so that it would not threaten the Lockheed plant or the main air fields in Burbank.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not at the moment. The Lockheed plant is located at this point on this map, and when we have heavy rains, the flood comes down and sweeps across this territory here, and we do not know just where it will go, nor can it be controlled effectively until the flood-control project is completed. A great deal of the work has been done but it is not finished, and the purpose of this amendment is to make possible its speedy going forward. Another important item is the dam on the San Gabriel River at this point, because that dam will make possible a diversion of waters of the San Gabriel River so that none of those waters will go down what we call the Rio Hondo and enter the Los Angeles River at this point, for when they do it means that there is sometimes a great volume of water going down through Long Beach and carrying silt and boulders and all sorts of debris down into the anchorage of the United States Fleet, which is located right here in the harbor.

Another reason for having this money is that it would make possible to utilize and speed the progress of the completion of the channel of the Los Angeles River, right through the heart of the city of Los Angeles. Until that project is completed in that area, it will mean that all of this shaded area is subject to overflow. In this particular area there are located the Vultee aircraft plant, the Consolidated Steel Co., the North American aircraft plant, and a number of other very important aircraft factories. The Douglas aircraft factory has a plant here and one over in this territory. In all of these cases we have a situation, with our low coastal plain, subject to flash floods coming out of the mountains which are almost unpredictable, which could only be controlled when the program of the Army engineers has been concluded.

I have all sorts of technical information I can give you. I have letters from the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation and others. Obviously I do not have time to read them. Here are some clippings from the papers that will show that for 5 days the Lockheed aircraft plant was shut down completely on account of floods.

It seems to me it is as important for national defense to have these plants able to maintain operation because they are free of floodwaters in their factories as for any other reason. That is the reason I have offered this amendment. Obviously we have not had anything like time to present this thing in a proper manner. I think we should have had debate on this bill. Had we had debate, I could have asked for 10 minutes and presented the matter properly, but as it is I must hurry through and do the best I can.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the committee is sympathetic with the problem of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. We know he is earnest and sincere in his desire to improve the conditions which exist in that area. But I wish to call to the attention of the House that 14 percent of this entire amount is going into the Los Angeles district. If conditions are so bad as painted by the eloquent gentleman from California, it strikes me that he should be able to get Mr. Knudsen of the Office of Production Management, the Board of Engineers and the President of the United States to go along and agree with him. I think that situation is not half so bad as the situation we had 2 weeks ago at the Vultee plant when it was closed down by a Communist-led strike. For my part, I think we have been generous with that area, as generous as with any other section of the country, and probably more so. Obviously we cannot appropriate money for every desirable project in this country. The committee hopes that the House will go along with it and vote down this amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not asking for any personal sympathy from the committee or anybody else. I am trying to do my job here. This does not affect my district especially. As a matter of fact, most of these important plants are not in my district, but are in the districts of other Members of Congress. The only reason I presented this amendment is because I conscientiously believe it is important.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No one questions the obvious sincerity of the gentleman from California. No one assigns to him any ulterior motives. We just say the condition of the Treasury will not permit; that these projects were not recommended by the President, the Budget, the O. P. M., and therefore we feel the House should sustain the committee and vote down the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman knows also there is $7,000,000 here specifically earmarked to take up new projects; and some of us are almost forced to wonder if it would not be a simpler matter to solve the labor problem and the flood problem if these airplane factories were moved to parts of the country where they are not bothered with floods and are not bothered with labor troubles.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I quite agree with the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Power plant, Bonneville Dam, Columbia River, Oreg.: For continuing the construction of the hydroelectric power at Bonneville Dam, Columbia River, Oreg., as authorized by the acts approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1038), and August 20, 1937 (50 Stat. 731), $7,170,000.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

BONNEVILLE PROJECT—EARLY COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT NECESSARY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak briefly in behalf of the item in the bill under consideration providing $7,170,000 to continue work on Bonneville units 7 to 10, inclusive, of the hydroelectric generating plant. When the requests for appropriations for constructing additional generating units in the Bonneville project were before the House last year some concern was evidenced by some of our colleagues as to whether or not we were not building beyond the demands for power in this area. I urged upon you at that time the early completion of the project, and presented estimates showing that we would need not only the power which would be produced by completing these units but would need additional power in order to carry forward our defense program. Time has proven these predictions true. We are now having difficulty in the Northwest to provide sufficient power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee, when it shall be put into production, to supply the demands for power not only for carrying forward the defense program but to provide for local needs.

Last May 8 I outlined in an extended speech, appearing on page 8867 of the RECORD, the relationship of modern metal production and low-cost power. In this discussion I analyzed the defense-metal situation and suggested that the low-cost Columbia River power be coupled to our natural resources in order to provide for our metal independence and to furnish pay rolls. What has happened since bears out the defense needs I predicted.

Mr. Speaker, this item appearing in the War Department civil-functions budget for $7,170,000 to continue work on Bonneville units 7 to 10, inclusive, has the approval of the Budget and the committee. These units were originally authorized in a deficiency bill last fall, and the present Budget item is to cover continuation of this work during the next fiscal year. I have appeared before you to urge full consideration of this item, and I want to outline at this time the need for the early completion of these units.

The necessity for this appropriation and other appropriations for the early completion of the Bonneville project were set forth by U. J. Gendron, Assistant Administrator of the Bonneville Administration, as follows:

Since the 1st of February the Office of Production Management has requested that 80,000 kilowatts of power be made available to aluminum companies for the production of aluminum, in addition to the 165,000 kilowatts of power now under contract to the Aluminum Co. of America—or a total of 245,000 kilowatts, which will produce some 245,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. Delivery of this additional power is to begin in June 1941.

The Columbia Steel Castings Co. is negotiating a contract for 7,500 kilowatts of power for the manufacture and production of steel castings for use in connection with the building of ships and other defense material for delivery this summer.

The Pacific Carbide Co., which now has a contract for 2,000 kilowatts for the manufacture of carbide essential in the manufacture of airplanes, ships, and explosives, is now negotiating for an additional 2,000 kilowatts for early delivery.

A steel company has indicated that it would be prepared to start operation in August 1941, requiring 15,000 kilowatts.

The Bremerton Navy Yard has requested 20,000 kilowatts for delivery in June 1942.

The Electro-Metallurgical Co. is negotiating for power between 7,500 to 37,500 kilowatts for delivery the latter part of 1941.

The Tongue Point naval station at Astoria and the War Department airport at Pendelton will require approximately 2,000 kilowatts by June 1941.

An estimated additional 10,000 kilowatts will be required to meet the demands of R. E. A.'s public utility districts, and municipalities now depending upon Bonneville for power.

An estimated 75,000 kilowatts may be required by the private utilities to meet the peak load of 1941 and to provide the necessary reserve capacity to meet a critical situation should the hydroelectric capacity be curtailed by a critical water year.

To meet the demand the following generating capacity will be available:

	Bonneville	Grand Coulee	Total installed capacity, kilowatts
January 1941	1-4		194,400
August 1941	5		248,400
Do		1	356,400
December 1941	6		410,400
Do		2	518,400
April 1942		3	626,400

We are also confronted with the need of providing service to first, the Army airport at Pendleton by May 1, 1941; second, the naval air base at Tongue Point; third, several Rural Electrification Administration projects; fourth Bremerton Navy Yard; fifth, public utility districts in urgent need of additional power; and sixth, a number of industrial prospects which will require power before the end of the calendar year 1941. Every effort is being made to meet these emergency situations through the reallocation of funds by loans from projects now under construction, most of which must be replaced before the end of the fiscal year.

The critical situation faced by the Administration to meet its contract commitments, brought about principally by national-defense requirements, will probably necessitate pooling of power resources of the region and obtaining available power from the existing public utilities.

The Bonneville-Coulee power administrator reports installation of generators at both Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have been advanced to meet the needs of the national-defense program. The fifth generator at Bonneville Dam has been advanced by the Army engineers from January 1, 1942 to August 1941. Reclamation engineers at Grand Coulee Dam are also speeding up installation of the first major generating unit from October 1, 1941, to August 1, 1941.

By July 1, 1942, three of the world's largest hydroelectric generators will be installed at Grand Coulee Dam, and will be interconnected with Bonneville Dam and other public and private power systems throughout the Northwest. A total of 650,000 kilowatts of Columbia River power will be available by that time.

This large block of energy will be ready in time to take care of national-defense contracts, Administrator Raver said. He also pointed out that the rights of public agencies to Columbia River power are fully protected under the terms of the contracts, and that ample power will be available for the electrical needs of the region, which are growing at an unprecedented rate.

Imperative need for the increased output of aluminum alloys for defense requirements recently was emphasized by the Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management with the announcement that the curtailment might be necessary in the use of the metal for domestic and household purposes. The official statement of the defense organization declared:

Industrial users of aluminum in the nondefense field are being urged to give immediate attention to the use of substitutes, including plastics, because of the impact of a defense program which may make it impossible for them to furnish the general public with the usual supply of aluminum implements.

Production of aluminum on a large scale in the Pacific Northwest had its inception in December 1939, when the Aluminum Co. entered into a 20-year contract with the Bonneville Power Administration for delivery of 32,500 kilowatts of power. It established its first aluminum reduction plant west of the Mississippi River at Vancouver, Wash., and began production of aluminum on September 1 of last year. Since that time production has been maintained at the rate of 60,000,000 pounds a year, Administrator Raver reports.

From official records I find that contracts have been executed by the Bonneville administrator for prime power totaling 278,452 kilowatts of prime power. Of this amount the project has 6 industrial consumers totaling 226,500 kilowatts; 23 contracts with public agencies totaling 20,452 kilowatts; and 2 contracts with private utilities totaling 31,500 kilowatts. I understand from these same official records that 13 different defense metal prospects, with total loads ranging from over 150,000 to 285,000 kilowatts are under active negotiation. Also, it has been estimated that in addition to these defense requirements to be supplied from the Bonneville circuits, an additional 75,000 kilowatts will be needed to supply the capacity deficiency of the public and private systems during the peak 1941 season. The in-sight power requirements, the largest part of which represents very vital defense metals, will, therefore, exceed the ultimate capacity of the Bonneville plant. Right now the Bonneville aluminum construction is in process which will produce about one-half of last year's aluminum production. It will represent from one quarter to one-third of the metal

requirements for our airplane program. This shows the important part that the Bonneville plant is playing in national defense.

Now, let us compare these in-sight loads with scheduled plant capacity. To date, Bonneville units 1, 2, 3, and 4 are completed, totaling 194,400 kilowatts. In December of this year, units 5 and 6 will be completed, bringing the total installed capacity up to 302,400 kilowatts. Unit No. 7, which this appropriation covers, together with the remaining three, is scheduled for service about the end of 1942. The remaining units are scheduled for 1943. These plant schedules and loads show the necessity for this appropriation in order to provide the great power necessities of the Pacific Northwest. Without this power the defense program must be curtailed. This country needs every kilowatt of low-priced hydro power that can be had, in order to produce the equivalent quantity of strategic metals that our defense program requires. The shortage of aluminum caused the lag in French airplane production. We now know what this produced. It may represent the difference between victory and defeat.

I therefore urge your favorable consideration of this Budget item. I thank you for your past consideration. Last year I addressed you on the basis of prepared-load estimates. These early estimates I gave you have been more than fulfilled, and I feel that in the light of these facts it would be most unfortunate, particularly in the interest of national defense, not to provide the necessary funds to carry this project to early completion.

RIVERS AND HARBOR PROJECTS IN OREGON

Mr. Speaker, the Budget and the bill include $20,000,000 for new work on authorized river and harbor projects, and $43,100,000 for the maintenance of existing projects and structures, and certain incidental and necessary expenses. The tentative distribution for new work among other projects includes the following in my State of Oregon for fiscal year 1942:

Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville, Oreg., $542,500.

Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg., $47,750.

Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of the Snake River, Oreg. and Wash., $50,000.

Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho, $50,000.

All of these allocations are to continue existing river improvements on the Columbia and Snake Rivers which are essential for carrying forward this much-needed project, and in view of the increased navigation on these streams, together with needs for national defense in connection with projects now under construction contiguous to these rivers, these allocations should be made. I trust that when the bill has been passed, these tentative allocations will be made permanent.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I have been allocated an hour, I believe, at the conclusion of the legislative program of today. I understand the House is not to meet tomorrow. I believe that is the understanding of Members. It would be unfair, I think, and probably not good strategy for me to attempt to hold the House here for an hour this afternoon. Would it be in order for me to inquire what is the program for next week and to indicate whether I might have some time next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Committee on Rules should report out a rule on the alien-deportation bill, that will come up Monday. After that, if a rule comes out on the net-weight-cotton bill, it will be taken up; and then we expect a rule on a bill providing for the carrying out of a trade agreement with certain South American countries in regard to coffee. That will come up next week. An appropriation bill will come up next week and maybe one or two other matters that will not be controversial so far as I know.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I state to the House, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, that I had expected to make some report to the House with regard to this strike situation. I am willing to do it, but, of course, I have no way of doing it unless I can get some time.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. I am one Member of the House. I feel that probably a majority believes that this is the most important question on the horizon of America today. I am very much interested in hearing what the gentleman has to say. I am anxious to hear him. I believe he should take his hour today. I am sure the Members want to hear him.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word only for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee as to whether he believes this money will actually be used for flood control? There is an appropriation of $492,000 for the reservoir which takes care of the Merrimack River. Inasmuch as we have more industry in that valley than there is in any other valley, we are vitally interested in it from the standpoint of national defense as well as flood control.

Mr. SNYDER. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I believe every dollar will be used for the purposes designated.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

There is also appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 for the operation, maintenance, and extension of waterworks, sewers, and pavements in the cities of Panama and Colon, to remain available until expended, the necessary portions of such sums as shall be paid during that fiscal year as water rentals or directly by the Government of Panama for such expenses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to the newly acquired Atlantic and Pacific bases. That you may have a better idea of their value to our defense I read the following from page 136 of the hearings on this bill:

Mr. CASE. In our discussion a year ago with General Strong, then in charge of the War Plans Division of the General Staff, I believe a remark was made to the effect that the operating radius from land base for a plane was about 1,000 miles. We had some discussion about the desirability of acquiring bases, and since that time we have leased some bases. I want to ask you with reference to the bases acquired at Trinidad, Antigua, Mayagwana, St. Lucia, and Jamaica, for use in connection with the Puerto Rican base. Would they give effective protection from any encirclement of the eastern approach to the Canal, from the aviation standpoint?

Governor EDGERTON. I think they would.

Mr. CASE. Do we have any comparable coverage of the approaches from the western side?

Governor EDGERTON. I do not think we have.

Mr. CASE. It would be just as bad to bomb the Canal from the back door as to bomb it from the front door.

Governor EDGERTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TERRY. How far is Galapagos Island from Panama?

Governor EDGERTON. About 900 miles.

Mr. TERRY. How far is Cocos Island from the Canal Zone?

Governor EDGERTON. About 500 miles.

Mr. SNYDER. How large is the largest one of those islands, or how many square miles does it contain?

Governor EDGERTON. The largest is Albemarle Island which has about 1,500 square miles, I believe.

Mr. CASE. Do those islands have any suitable terrain for landing fields?

Governor EDGERTON. I think that suitable terrain for landing fields could be found on the islands.

Mr. CASE. Do they have good harbors?

Governor EDGERTON. They have a few good small harbors.

Mr. TERRY. Galapagos is owned by what country?

Governor EDGERTON. Equador.

Mr. TERRY. And Cocos Island?

Governor EDGERTON. By Costa Rica.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD FOR EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it has been written that no man can be true to his country unless he is first true to himself. I would be true neither to my country, myself, nor my God if I did not raise my voice at this time. I wish to speak about a great moral issue confronting the United States of America; make a Christian appeal in behalf of millions of helpless Christian peoples; and ask the direct question, "Does America, who has now practically become Great Britain's war partner, accept the principle that the starvation of her lifelong national friends constitute a legitimate weapon of war?"

Great Britain has taken that position. She believes that this war can be won by starving the women and children of Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, Finland, and Denmark. On March 9 Lord Halifax issued a formal statement from his Government replying to, and denying, the proposal of former ex-President Hoover for feeding the hungry children of Belgium, on the grounds that "relief of countries in enemy occupation would,

whatever the conditions might be, postpone the day of victory," and that "the British Government would regard it as false humanitarianism to agree to the admission of foodstuffs to the areas concerned."

To that statement Mr. Hoover very properly replied that "it is no false humanitarianism which saves the lives of countless children," adding that he had excellent reason to believe the American people were interested in saving the helpless little nations who have also fought gallantly for freedom as Britain's ally.

Mr. Hoover is right. The American people will not allow the subject Great Britain has tried to close again to remain closed. They see as mockery these shouts of saving Christian civilization while at the same time condemning small and peaceful civilized nations on earth to famine and pestilence and human decay.

Have any of you ever seen famine? Do you know what it means when thousands and thousands of children, thousands and thousands of babies, thousands and thousands of mothers have literally nothing to eat? Of course not. We Americans are fortunate. We live in the greatest, richest land in the world; we have an abundance of everything—of milk, of bread, of meat, of fats—all the life-giving foods. Hunger is only a word to well-fed people like you and me. Not a nightmare, not a form of slow death as barbaric as any medieval torture ever devised. No. By the merciful grace of God we know nothing of famine. We Americans are fortunate. But we have compassion. And our Government has been ever mindful that we are a compassionate people.

The British Government, however, has a record of looking coldly the other way from famine conditions. It induced the Irish famine, but the Irish were not defeated through it. It suppressed the news of the Russian famines when its politicians were attempting to attract Russia into an alliance with Britain against Germany. I wish to say here that I want to see Hitlerism destroyed, but if Britain thinks it can be destroyed by starving Belgian, Polish, Norwegian, Dutch, and Finnish children, Britain is making another of her disastrous mistakes. She will have forever directed against her the hatred of all men whose wives and children starve—unless we prevent it. That is America's job. We have taken a stake in this war. And when this war is over we will need every friend we can find in Europe. So will Britain. Her need for friends on the Continent will be even greater than ours.

The minds of starving populations are not reasoning minds. It is going to be hopeless to convince a Belgian, a Pole, a Hollander and Dutchman, or a Finn of the usefulness of his family's starvation for Britain. Or expect him to applaud the view put forth by Roland Cross, British Minister of Shipping, when, in a radio broadcast to the United States on December 12, 1940, he said in justification of his country's action in stopping food shipments: "There is only one verdict we can give—we must put the lives of our people first." To the Belgian, Pole, Dutchman, Hollander, and Finn his life is just as important. And although he knows that Germany, the aggressor, is fundamentally responsible for his misery, Britain—the great Christian democratic nation—is already being held responsible for being indifferent to other Christian democratic nations' pleas for life.

In this country there are 15,000,000 Americans whose kin are Belgian, and Dutch, and Polish, and Norwegian, and Finn. They are hearing the cries of their suffering relatives rising above censorship, pleading for aid. These Americans do not want their relatives to be alienated from them or from the democratic way of life. And these Americans are asking: "Is Britain determined to let millions of our relatives and friends starve on the mere suspicion that food may reach Germany?"

From the beginning Britain has rejected the Hoover food proposals on the ground that the Germans are not to be trusted; that they will seize imports to relieve the suffering. She has summarily refused a trial to be made even in Belgium, where conditions are desperate, where children are too weak to go to school. Yet it is a matter of fact that the British are trusting Germany where her nationals are concerned. Fifty thousand food packages have recently been sent to British prisoners in the Reich through the British Red Cross and with the permission of the British Government. The German Government can be trusted with food for the British in enemy country, but it cannot be trusted with what compassionate America wants to send to starving Belgium to be dispensed to innocent children, women, the aged, and unemployed.

Up to the present the American people have accepted Great Britain's refusal to permit food ships to go through the blockade. We have accepted the statements of her statesmen, politicians, and military minds that starvation is a weapon of war, although they soften the term by calling it "military prudence." "Military prudence" sounds prettier. But now that we are Great Britain's partner, committed to the defeat of totalitarianism, and now that the realities, as well as the moralities, are becoming more clearly etched with the passage of each day, it is proper to ask if Great Britain is not cutting off her nose to spite her face on this question of permitting her friends in the small invaded democracies to be fed.

It is now a well-established fact that the last nation in Europe to be starved out in this war will be Germany. According to research results recently reported by British, American, Italian, Polish, and German economists, her self-sufficiency rating, under a well-devised scientific plan, is nearly 90 percent. The hope that Germany can be starved out is extremely remote. Germany began this war with a definite plan of never again being defeated by a food blockade such as brought her to her knees in the World War. Germany has unprecedented food stocks. And she has hundreds of thousands of prisoners—some estimate as high as 2,000,000 of them—available, under compulsion, to help her produce food on every spare, arable acre.

Great Britain argues that if Germany fed her war victims, as one school of thought feels she is morally and ethically bound to do, there would be no famine. I do not believe, however, that even Great Britain seriously believes Hitler will feed foreign and subjugated populations at the expense of the stomachs and national health of the German people. There is just not enough food in Europe for everyone, while here in the abundant Americas, we have huge, usable surpluses—some of which are rotting away and deteriorating in warehouses.

The stark, tragic, horrible fact is that approximately 40,000,000 fellow humans in the small invaded democracies face famine. They hunger as we talk and deliberate and eat sumptuously. These people must be saved if the Christian world is not to be everlastingly disgraced. A Hitler, or any other tyrant or cold materialist, may be able, through some queer process of reasoning, to starve them in the name of military prudence, but a Christian nation such as ours, which has always been compassionate in dealing with the distress of the underdog, cannot do it.

It is my firm conviction that the American people will do everything in their power to keep this question alive until it is solved. Let us be quick about solving it. These defenseless, beaten, and starving peoples, who are in their present plight because of their defense of the democratic ideal—our way of life and Great Britain's, as well—cannot possibly solve their problems without the aid of the two "big brother" democracies. Let us ask our great humanitarian President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to work out with Great Britain immediately some formula—some certain solution—whereby the lives of innocent millions may be saved.

Hungry children cannot wait.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow to file any reports that might be reported out of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House what the committee has in mind? The gentleman has made a rather broad request.

Mr. McCORMACK. The rule on the alien deportation bill, and I believe a rule on the cotton net weight bill, but the latter will not come up on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why not ask for the one that may come up on Monday? There is no need of asking blanket authority unless it is going to be used.

Mr. McCORMACK. I feel that is a fair suggestion. Mr. Speaker, I modify

my request. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow to file rules on the bills just referred to.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman intends to bring up the coffee bill on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The alien deportation bill will come up on Monday.

Mr. FISH. Perhaps both?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not say that, because I believe the alien deportation bill may take the greater part of the day.

Mr. FISH. What does the gentleman propose for Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Tuesday we expect to take up the cotton net weight bill and then the coffee bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the understanding however is that there will be no vote on the alien deportation bill on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my intention if the House will support me that the vote on the alien deportation bill go over until Tuesday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader this question: I think the committee should bring in a bill to deport aliens, but is the Committee on Rules going to bring in a rule on any bill stopping strikes?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] for an hour.

THE PRESERVATION OF THIS COUNTRY AND THE PRESERVATION OF SECURITY IS VITAL QUESTION TODAY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in considerable embarrassment in an attempt to speak to the House at this hour when it has been agreed that we are to adjourn over the weekend, and many Members present, no doubt, have arranged to leave today. But when I consider the situation of the country, when I consider that the people of this country have but one business that is relatively worthy of consideration, that is, the preservation of the country, the preservation of its security; when I consider the actual peril of my country today, it seems to me that many of the things we are working at are pretty trivial. Yet I know they have to be attended to.

It is difficult to realize on a beautiful spring day like this, when we come and go as we will, that probably we are almost in identically the situation as France when it was depending upon the Maginot Line and its people were divided in their attitude toward national defense. I want to get across that picture. I want you to look at it for a minute.

Here was a great, proud nation. Toward its borders were marching the military forces of Germany. Its own people stopped the wheels of industry which were necessary to provide the machines, the instrumentalities, through which its people could preserve the security of a great country. Its own people did that, not somebody else—its own people. What would the people of France give today if in those hours of national peril they had done what they did after the Maginot Line was broken? The testimony before our committee is that even after the Germans had advanced far into France, after much of industry had been taken over by the Germans, those united people, solidified by the consciousness of a common danger, turned out more instrumentalities to defend themselves in 1 month than they had done in two and a half months before that. But it was too late. There are no sadder words of tongue nor pen than those. Men, women, and children worked till they dropped in their tracks, former Ambassador to France Bullitt told our committee, but it was too late.

Mr. Speaker, we also have a "Maginot line," just one line, the Navy. The Navy is all we have. Here we are playing like children, manufacturers fighting for profits, operatives fighting for gains. All the while we are assuming in America to say to all the world, "Stay out of this hemisphere." That is a good deal of territory. I am not saying these things in criticism. I am stating facts. We are deep in the internal politics of Europe, deep in the affairs of Africa, deep in the affairs of Asia. We proclaim to the world that we are the arsenal for one of the two warring groups. Whether wisely or unwisely, our strategy has been different from the basic elementary strategy of military tactics. There has been no effort to divide those who may be our active enemies tomorrow, because we threaten everybody. Let us face it. We have threatened everybody in the world able to fight if England breaks.

We act like children. We go to cocktail parties, we play the horse races, we act like children at play. We stop munition factories when this Nation is facing the greatest peril that it has faced since it began to be a nation, incomparably the greatest today. Our "Maginot line," the ships that float on the seas, great battleships, can be put out of commission by a bomb. We sit down here when we know we are moving rapidly toward actual belligerent contact with this war, unprepared either to carry it on or to defend ourselves. We tie up production essential to our national existence while we fight for profits and gains among ourselves.

We are going to meet the supreme test before this thing is over. An egotistical people have imagined there is not going to be any shooting unless we shoot first. Actually we in Washington have been telling the people that we are going to do everything short of war as though we alone determined the issues of war or peace. If these people to whom we are furnishing munitions of war fall, or whenever those munitions of war that we are furnishing to them make them more hurtful to Germany than our more formal participation, which would compel us to divert a large part of our productive energy to our own defense, is there anybody with little enough sense not to know we will then be attacked? Has anybody little enough sense not to realize that?

I was somewhat embarrassed because of the lateness of the hour, but you have removed all embarrassment by the character of attention you give. I talk to you, statesmen of America, sitting under the dome of this Capitol, in the high peak of human history, clothed in the liberty and security of a great Republic, all conscious that you have a deep sense of responsibility. We are dealing with a difficult situation. It is absolutely essential that this country, which is yet weak inside, have the benefit of the solidifying influence of a consciousness of a common danger if we are to win. We do not do our people justice; we do not discharge our duty here when we deceive the people with reference to the danger they actually face. We are watchmen on the tower. The highest duty we owe to the people is not to lead them blindly and unprepared into this situation.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people knew the truth about this thing, there would be no more strikes in America. They would open their factories to every honest, decent American willing to help prepare his Nation in order that it might not be attacked, or if attacked, that our boys might have all that a loyal, patriotic citizenship could give them with which to protect themselves and defend the opportunity of their Nation to remain great and free. There are in those factories men and women just as patriotic as you are. If they realized the situation and if they knew our danger, they would tear apart the men who stand between them and a chance to put effective guns in the hands of their sons upon whose bodies we have put the uniform of this country.

France went to pieces inside or it never would have broken against the German shock. America is weak inside or these strikes would not be happening, they would not be permitted. Wars are won in the factories today. Let nobody forget that. Wars are won or lost in the factories today. Frenchmen in the factories of France were winning the first great victory for Germany before the Germans struck the Maginot Line.

I am going to send to the Clerk's desk copy of the testimony which Ambassador Bullitt gave to our committee with reference to conditions in France. I will print it in the RECORD immediately following my own remarks. I urge every person who sees this RECORD to read Mr. Bullitt's statement of how France was first destroyed from within, noting the similarity between what happened in France and some things happening in this country now. If anything on earth can warn a sleeping, indifferent, juvenile people and give them a sense of the greatest responsibility that ever challenged a generation since time began, his testimony should warn America.

We wonder about France. We say, "How could the French people have done the things they did, considering their circumstances?" American statesmen and American people, let it not happen that when the history of this period is written it will be said, "How could America have done as it did, even with the warning of France right before it?" We are repeating absolutely the mistakes of France.

Before we do this job these boys whom we are putting in uniform will not be knocking off at 5; they may be standing the night watches. Let nobody be a big enough fool not to know that. We have just one line of defense now, a thin line of battleships that guard the shores. That is all. Wheels of production are not turning. Factories are silent. Essential materials lie unfinished while armies devastate the world, awaiting, perhaps, only the ripening opportunity to accept the challenge of America.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the testimony of Mr. Bullitt, recently Ambassador to France, to which I have referred, and ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read it. It will be printed at the conclusion of my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

(See former Ambassador Bullitt's statement printed at the end of Mr. SUMNERS' remarks.)

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I ask the newspaper correspondents in the gallery, as a compliment to the House, to state to the country somewhere in their reports that even though the hour has grown late, not a person, not a single Representative of the people of the Nation, has left this Chamber since the consideration of this part of the Nation's business began.

Let me now call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Meigs, Chief of the Air Division of the O. P. M., as to what we are doing in this country in regard to airplane production.

His testimony will be printed immediately following that of Mr. Bullitt. The Committee on the Judiciary has received much testimony as to the effect of strikes upon the production of planes, guns, ships, and upon the construction and equipment of new plants and cantonments; but it seems to me that Mr. Meigs' statement in connection with what is learned from the press will give to the people the picture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place the testimony of Mr. Meigs, given before the Committee on the Judiciary, in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The testimony referred to appears at end of remarks immediately following Mr. Bullitt's statement.)

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The number of man-days idle because of strikes does not give the picture. According to Mr. Meigs' testimony, as many as 200 different factories may each be making a different part of a plane. When one of those factories upon which there is dependence for an essential part is idle, the completion of the plane is held up. So it is that a strike at any one factory in the chain of factories producing parts of a plane may hold up completion of the plane as effectively as if there were a strike in each of the 200 factories. That is what makes each individual strike in these plants of such broad importance.

The next question is, What shall be done about it; who shall do it; and when shall it be done? The legislative branch of the Government has already enacted legislation providing for military training. Last week it appropriated for expenditure by the President and executive agencies the sum of $11,000,000,000 to provide arms, munitions, planes, ships, and the other things necessary for war or defense. By the way, that amount is twice the value of all the farm lands in the 13 States which were the Original Colonies. The Committee on the Judiciary of this House has been standing by since November 28 of last year with its inquiry of the executive branch if any additional legislation is needed, and, if so, what, to keep these factories open, and pledging its cooperation. I recognize that there has been a wide swing of the pendulum toward labor comparatively recently. In 1928 we were at the other extreme. I tried to impress the country then of the danger of that extreme position. Neither the Government nor industry would be warned. With your permission I am going to insert at this point in my remarks an excerpt from a speech made by me in this Chamber April 5, 1928:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1928]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. * * * It is contended that modern conditions require an abandonment of this policy of competition. When we do, we abandon our plan of government. Let us not deceive ourselves.

* * * * *

Those who are pressing this movement are not true friends to their own interest. They are getting the country ready for a great swing back. * * *

THE PENDULUM WILL SWING BACK

The thing which is happening now has not infrequently occurred during the almost 2,000 years of the history of our system. It is the phenomenon of the swinging of the pendulum. The Bible speaks of people who have ears to hear but hear not, and eyes to see but see not. Men in great position in government, captains of industry, they have ears but hear not the warnings of history; they have eyes but they see not the danger when the swing back comes. They heed not the law of Nature which every country boy can see manifesting itself through the old grapevine swing, and which students of Nature know is a law universal, operating everywhere. King John went far, and when the swing back came it rested at Runnymede. From Charles and James II and their predecessors came the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and the Act of Settlement; and from George III and his Parliament came the Declaration of Independence. Louis XIV and his successors swung the pendulum far, and it swung back into the blood of the French Revolution. From the Czars of Russia and their advisers bolshevism came. The incompetence and excesses of the Socialists of Italy are responsible for Mussolini.

Just now there is no protest against monopolistic development and no caution on the part of those engaged in such development—none whatever. It is remarkable.

* * * * *

Private fortunes can be imperiled in this country only by those who possess them. * * * Queer notions are in the heads of the people. * * *

We are moving fast toward the crisis. Nobody can forejudge it. * * *

The time has come when in the spirit of patriotic purpose, while we can be calm and deliberate and without prejudice, we should stop, locate our position, and look again at the star of our destiny. In the early constitutional conventions, beginning with the Virginia Convention, to which men came with that yearning for liberty which only tyranny can give, and with that profound wisdom which comes only from deep meditation, they declared a great truth in these words:

"Frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty."

Nobody would heed that warning. There was then a general worshipful attitude toward bigness of things, and then, as now, an exaltation of personages and of their theories. In addition there came upon the people who after the World War had all but ceased to think with their own thinkers, a pestilential swarm of crack-pots who had all the answers. They looked wisely, spoke positively, and told the people what they wanted to hear. Anyway, nothing was done about it.

Then public opinion shifted. The swing of the pendulum came and—I say this without purpose to offend—carried us to the point where we have had for some time practically a labor government at Washington. I mean exactly that.

As a result, during the time of this swing, labor has been deprived of the necessary restraining influence of Government, essential to the safety of any movement of that magnitude and momentum, and essential to the stability of gain. When the facts of these large movements are examined, it becomes clear that whenever such a movement gets under way and begins to accumulate momentum, its own momentum, especially if supported by public opinion, gives it all the speed it is safe to have. Speaking generally, the most dangerous thing in such a situation is for it to have not only no brakes applied by a public agency, but to have that agency provide an additional stimulus. There is a similarity in such matters everywhere, due to the fact that a natural law is in control and natural laws are uniform in their application.

Brakes are just as essential everywhere to everything as they are to safety and the efficiency in the operation of an automobile—just as essential as an accelerator is. I am pressing this point because of the lesson and warning involved. Instead of preventing the pendulum from swinging too far during the period of which 1928 was a part, the indifference of public opinion, the greed of industry, the exigencies of the next election, and the absence of applied statesmanship either inside or outside of industry made the present swing-back certain.

Again now we observe the identical influences operating in the reverse direction from that of 1928, and we also observe greed for power, hunger for office,

absence of applied statesmanship at many important points both inside and outside of labor. I appreciate the difficulties of honest, patriotic labor leaders in responsibility, but the job has got to be done, and done fairly and quickly. Labor and capital not only have a common interest in our preparedness, but it is evident that when this pendulum swings again it will swing away from both labor and capital as free agencies and will carry us deep into some form of nöndemocratic government. I am convinced that the hope of such a result is not the least of the causes for some of these strikes.

In such a situation there is but one adequate law, fundamentally speaking, and that is the law of public opinion. It is to public opinion I appeal today. Ninety percent determined purpose with only 10 percent law can get results, but 90 percent law and only 10 percent purpose may cause some deceptive surface disturbances but no fundamental changes. Labor has really been victimized by the fact that it has not had any restraint either from within or from public opinion or from government during this period of a sort of mushroom growth of power. There is no question anywhere among people who know the facts that agencies of the Government have been aiding labor in strengthening its organization at a time when labor was already moving fast under its own momentum plus the impetus given by public opinion. This situation must be dealt with positively and effectively, but fairly and without passion. The tendency is for such a movement to run off and leave the level-headed, conservative, capable leadership which got the movement started to run ahead of the support of public opinion and to be captured by a different type of leadership. There is no difference between the human nature of the people who are in the factory and the human nature of the people who are in the offices. It will aid us in dealing with this situation if we hold that fact in mind.

It is not meanness. It is the danger which nature associates with too great speed and the limitation which nature puts upon the possessors of too great power. Whether it is a king, a hereditary noble, a church dignitary, a military chieftain, organized labor, organized capital, or I, as an individual, with the possession of too great power, there goes an irresistible disposition to abuse it. God has put a limitation upon the amount of power that people can possess without its abusive exercise. Aside from the disloyal element and the racketeer, it is a fact that just as capital was not able to restrain itself a short time ago, labor has not been able to restrain itself in some of these strike situations, not because they are meaner, but because when capital moved this pendulum far from the center, when we were building up in this country an economic feudalism, the men who worked in the factory had no choice except organization or economic peonage. Public opinion shifted its support to labor, politicians shifted their support to labor just as they are going to shift from labor if labor does not watch its step in this time of world crisis and national peril. It must clean itself of those who are squandering in a perfect debauch labor's hard-earned support of public opinion. It must help to render powerless those who because of a foreign allegiance are fighting now the battles of dictators, fighting them in the factories of our country.

It was the business of statesmanship to help prevent this wide swing of the pendulum that was to be observed in 1928 but we did not do the job and in a sense unjustly condemned industry. Then the pendulum swung back with the aid of Government, until it has reached a point where in the midst of the greatest peril of this Nation's history, labor challenges the power of this people to keep industries in operation to arm their boys who have been commandeered by the Government and have gone willingly. These men, many of them honest, patriotic citizens if they could get their feet on the ground, are actually stopping the wheels of industry that must operate if the security of this Nation is to be preserved.

The first thing to do is to tell the American people the absolute truth about our relationship to this world war. A part of that truth is that it is certain we will be attacked unless before the time that can be arranged we shall have so progressed in our preparation as to discourage the attack. Another part of the truth is that unless we work with united effort marshaling all of our resources of men and of materials, producing to the limit, the probabilities are we may find ourselves involved in a war we cannot win. We are all in the same boat. The boy who goes out from the home of a man who works in the factory will be just as much in danger if he is not properly equipped as the son of the man who goes from the home of the Presidency. As ex-Ambassador Bullitt said, when the Maginot line broke, all the French people realized the danger then. But it was too late. They worked night and day, worked until they dropped. But it was too late. We have to convince ourselves, the people of America, of the fact that if we are called to do battle and we do not win, there will not be any profits for people to scramble over, there will not be any social gains for people to be fighting about. There ought to be a general truce as far as possible and it should be possible, in this economic civil war until by united effort we shall have made our common interest secure. It is not a matter of theory. Look at France today and see how many people are there now who have any property to quarrel about or any social gains to protect.

A good many people are pressing for additional legislation now. The Committee on the Judiciary is not reporting out any bills just yet. The country, through its Congress, has provided the men, has provided the money. The Committee on the Judiciary has met every Executive request for enabling legislation. More laws will not do this job. In this country, enacting new laws is a sort of fetish. More and more laws will not do this job. I do not know all the difficulties the executive agencies of the Government are having except as they report to us. We are told these strikes slow down the program in planes, destroyers, ships, guns—everything. I know that when the Executive asked this Congress for money last week in behalf of the people, we gave them $11,000,000,000. I know we have not failed to give the executive agencies of the Government anything they have asked. The Committee on the Judiciary did tender its services last fall when these difficulties began to develop. Let me read one letter, which is characteristic of those we wrote then. This one was dated November 26, 1940, and was addressed to the Attorney General:

> I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House respectfully to inquire if there is any additional legislation necessary, and, if so, what, to make as certain as may be that the Government's preparedness program be not interfered with, and particularly that the operation of the manufacturing plants engaged in the production of war materials be not interfered with by such strikes as are now tying up some of these plants. I beg to assure you that the Committee on the Judiciary is anxious to be as helpful as possible in these matters.

This was written on the day when the papers indicated that the Attorney General was going to be in conference at the White House:

> I am further directed to ask you to please bring this communication to the attention of the conference which we are advised is to be held at the White House this afternoon with reference to these strikes.
>
> Very respectfully yours,
>
> HATTON W. SUMNERS.

A similar letter was addressed to the heads of the other departments of the executive branch of the Government having to do with these matters. I have no disposition to embarrass anybody. I am trying to do a necessary, difficult job which somebody must do. I am willing to take my responsibility. I stand here this afternoon in my place because the people from my district cannot all come. I am here to represent and speak for them in this council of the Nation. You are here because the people cannot come. We, as nearly as can be brought about in this great country, are the people here assembled under the dome of this Capitol. We are their Representatives. Our allegiance is to them, and to them only, who in the aggregate are the governors of this Republic. This is their country, and I assume my responsibility in my place here again to call upon the people of the Nation to stand together in this hour of the Nation's peril. I call upon the executive agencies of the Government again in the name of my people, because this is an executive job, to bend every energy to get these plants into operation and to keep them in operation; to persuade those who may be persuaded as to the perils in which they are placing this country, and to treat those who will not be persuaded as the enemies of a great republic that is fighting for its life ought to be treated. Whatever additional power the Executive needs to do this job the people of the Nation, acting through us, their Representatives, will give, and give quickly. I speak especially for your Committee on the Judiciary. [Applause.]

This is the day and the hour when people in our position cannot count the cost. I do not pose this afternoon. I think I speak your own sentiments in this hour of our Nation's peril. There is no human being on earth that can give to me or take from me anything that is of the slightest relative concern now. Our jobs are contemplated in their relative littleness now. All over the world men are dying that people may be free. Neither you nor I nor anyone else in any office should be permitted by public opinion to stand guarding anybody's position or policy as against the imperative necessity for the greatest possible efficiency and haste in the preparation for the preservation of our Nation—preparation for every possible emergency. I do not care who he is or where he is. I do not count. You do not count. Individuals do not count. These are times when people who are fit to live are willing to die for the things which make living worth while.

I know these persons in executive responsibility have difficulties. I want to be fair and helpful to those people. We must work now to the limit of human capacity as though we were actually fighting. That is the only chance we have to escape having to fight. There is nobody from the President down who can fail to appreciate the fact that this Nation is being led, or moved, whichever way you want to put it, with tremendous rapidity toward the battle line of this World War. Nobody can pretend not to know that fact. We are at war this minute, only waiting to see whether or not or where the shooting begins, while in the factories men are fighting among themselves. They will not work or permit others to work and are thereby possibly losing for their country the decisive battle of the world's greatest war. In modern warfare wars are won or lost largely in the factories, and we know it. Men are doing this whose sons will furnish the cannon fodder unless we are so well prepared as to protect ourselves against attack. It is an hour of dedication in America, an hour of sacrifice, an hour of high purpose in America. It is an hour when the owner of the factory or the operative who would hinder his country's preparation for the supreme test of its ability to endure, those people who would make merchandise of their Nation's peril, are unworthy of the opportunity to live as a free man among the millions willing now to die if necessary that freedom may survive. Those are not just words; they are facts.

The Maginot Line was gone in France before the French people realized it was a fact. Read Mr. Bullitt's testimony. We have a Maginot Line upon which we are putting a dependence similar to that which the French people placed in theirs, some floating battleships, a thin line of battleships on the seas. Suppose that line breaks. We know we do not have the equipment to defend our ports against a major attack. Let us not argue that fact out of our minds or ignore the warning of intelligent caution. In such situations intelligent people with so much at stake act as though possibilities were certainties. Yet here we are half working at the job, the only one we have, relatively speaking, worthy of consideration, talking about social gains, talking about profits, actually closing factories while we quarrel about them. It is pathetic to see people scrambling with each other to make profits, to make merchandise out of the necessity of this great Republic which possibly tomorrow, as time is measured in the development of great events, may be fighting for its life. In days gone by giants have sat in this Chamber, not because they were any bigger people mentally or patriotically insofar as potentialities are concerned than you are, but they responded to the call of the hour; and you must do it. There have been great generations in our history but no greater potentially than those in the factories, the mines, the fields, those scattered through the vocations of our civilization now. But they measured up to the challenge of great responsibility. We must be greater than they or we lose, because our difficulties are the greatest. The stature of this generation must be the greatest of them all. Its difficulties are the greatest. Victories are now won or lost in the factories, but they must be won first in the spirit and purposes of a people. Only the superbly fit have a chance to survive now. They must win for themselves the right to be free. Inherited rights are not accepted in the scheme of things now as establishing privileges in these sublimely terrible hours when nations and civilizations stand at the bar of judgment. Giants in courage and devotion have to speak again in this Chamber—men who are absolutely indifferent as to what may happen to them. The idea of a Member of this great body, the council of a great Republic, in an hour like this pretending to be fit to sit here who is considering his own political future, whether or not he shall return to this Chamber at the sacrifice of the sublimest duty which has challenged human beings in a thousand years. What does it matter what happens to us here if we preserve the right to walk toward the setting sun unashamed and unafraid. I believe I can sense the unspoken communications which are passing between me and my colleagues in this Chamber. I believe that in this Chamber now, in this House now, there are more men and women willing to die politically and physically for the security of this Republic than sat here a year ago. I believe it. I know it. I want to say another thing.

We misjudge the people of this country if we think those people are not a little bit ahead of us. I have been taking some samples of the public attitude in America. A most interesting thing is happening in America. There is much to indicate that a nation is being reborn in America now. Just a little while ago we were like children at play, a childish generation, indifferent to responsibilities. More people now than at any time since I have been in Congress will stand by their men and women in Congress and excuse their mistakes, if they feel that they are honest and courageous, fit to be representatives of a great people, who tomorrow may be fighting for their lives. It is a terrible hour in which to have responsibility, but it is a great hour, terrible in its responsibility, sublime in its opportunity. It is a terrible and challenging thing for us as a Nation to be as we are today, possibly the last bulwark on the earth of free government. If we break, we in whom at this moment is centered the hope of the ages—if we break, free government disappears from the earth possibly for centuries and centuries. Airplanes are being held up; guns are being held up; battleships are being held up while civil war rages among our own people in factories producing essential things for our security. It is a great commission we have. Under God it is a great commission we have. We are not ready to do the job. We have been talking about profits and gains when we ought to have been talking about sacrifice and service. We will know what these things mean before we get through. The French people learned it. They learned it too late. The American people will learn it before we get through. It is up to us, to the American people, to determine whether we too will learn it when it is too late.

We cannot preserve ourselves unless we profit by the experience of France. We cannot do it unless in America, from coast to coast, regardless of personal interest, there springs again in the hearts of people that holy love called patriotism, but little beneath the love which men have for God.

An unfit people cannot win. It is not written in the book of destiny that we will be able to escape the tests which in these days are coming to the nations of the earth. Often and often I would like to repeat it. I know it is true. This is the high peak of all the ages. You and I and our people each have a responsibility as a part of that generation which, if it is to survive, must be the greatest generation that ever stood on this earth since human history began to be written, because its difficulties are greatest. Difficulties overcome measure and make possible the stature of persons, of nations, and of ages. Are we going to accept that responsibility? Are we going to meet that responsibility? Think of that, men and women. Only a fit people can win. Today we stand at the bar of judgment. Such times come. Careful students of history know that those times come when conditions come to a head, when tests are made, when the balance sheet is struck. These are the times when civilizations and governments stand at the bar of judgment.

No foreign foe has been on our shores in a hundred years. Distance and isolation protected us until recently. The goodness of God Almighty has come to this people with everything to make us happy, prosperous, and fit to endure. What is our responsibility? How are we answering to it now? Statesmen of America, people of America, how are we answering the challenge of the hour now? We are not only the guardians of our own liberty and that of those who are to follow us here, but in us is centered the hope of the ages.

We fight among ourselves, we stop the wheels of production of essential war materials, trusting to a thin line of battleships across the two oceans—our Maginot line. What if it breaks? We are telling all the world to stay out of

this hemisphere, telling peoples how to run things in Asia, Africa, and Europe.

We are partisans in the intracontinental wars of the world while shortsightedness, greed, selfishness, ambition, and positive disloyalty among only a small percent of our people imperils the Nation and leaves the flower of our manhood wearing the uniform of their country but inadequately equipped either to protect themselves or defend their country.

I am sorry; I have spoken over an hour. It is much after 6 o'clock, and many of you have plans for the week end. I appreciate your listening to me.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to my friend, but I hate to delay the House longer.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I just wanted to say to my distinguished colleague that I think it is a tribute to his ability and to the intense interest of the Members of the House that at this late hour there should be so many Members present to hear the able discussion of the gentleman upon this question, which I agree with him is of the gravest and most vital importance at this time. I want to corroborate what my colleague has stated with reference to the feelings and sentiments of the American people upon this question. Judging it by my own mail and by the mail of my colleagues that has been received lately, the American people are aroused upon this question. Talk about the question of labor losing what it has gained. If something is not done the gains that have been made will be far more than lost, because the sentiment of the American people is the most powerful weapon in America and when once aroused there is no power on earth that can stop it. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I appreciate the observations of my friend. Many things we have got to consider. Our obligation is to do this job and at the same time not swing to the other extreme. I mean to be fair to labor; to be fair to the whole situation. As I said a moment ago, this is no time when people can handle these questions in passion.

If ever in the history of this Republic circumstances challenged us to be statesmen—I know the folks laugh about it when you speak about our being statesmen—under God, I confess it, I want to be a statesman in this hour of my Nation's need. Great day! Great responsibility! The praise or the scorn of persons is mighty insignificant, mighty puny now. A scramble for place, for position, is a pathetic spectacle now. I appreciate the complimentary observations of my friend. I know I have not made what will be called a great speech; I have not tried to make it, I could not if I tried. I am speaking extemporaneously. I apologize that I have been engaged with the final report of the Temporary National Economics Committee until noon today. I am glad I was not prepared to deliver an address. I am glad I was able to come here and speak the things that are in my heart at the moment. Of course, I have examined these matters. I have thought much about them. For a long time I have been trying to move and to arouse our people to the sense of their common danger. Only recently would they listen. I pray God it is not too late. The attention which you have given to me is no compliment to me, though I appreciate it. It is a compliment to you and it is a compliment to the people who have had the wisdom to send you here.

I wish the people of the Nation could be in the galleries and look in on this session this late afternoon when all sorts of things could have given you a good excuse to be absent.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. I am sure I speak the sentiments of all in this Chamber when I say we have been moved very deeply indeed by the gentleman's very great statement. We recognize also the powers that are vested in the administrative branch of the Government to put a stop to the strikes in defense industry during the period of the emergency. We recognize also the possibility of labor and management, if they were not too hardheadedly selfish to get together and work out a moratorium on their differences; but the question that is tearing my heart out now is this: In the event that one or the other of these opportunities is not seized either by labor and management or by the administration, can this Congress count on the gentleman's committee to bring in legislation letting Congress assume responsibility and go ahead?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will say this to my friend—he has asked a very pertinent question—the Committee on the Judiciary believes it is advising itself with regard to the facts in this situation. We have had a good deal of experience in legislation. We do not agree with the general popular misconception that you can bring about results merely by passing a law. We do not want to embarrass the administrative agencies of the Government. Things have been drifting along possibly without those in responsibility being conscious of how far they have gone.

It is absolutely essential that the loyal element in labor if possible, and it is possible, be cut away from those who would do this country hurt. It is a pretty delicate matter to be dealt with. In large measure that is a job for their own thinking and for public opinion. Public opinion is rapidly coming to the conclusion that a better method than strikes afford must be found to settle disputes in these industries which are producing essential materials. Labor had better heed the warning which I presume to give as a friend: That it is throwing away the support of public opinion so rapidly that soon public opinion will not consider as "scabs" people who are going in to work in these closed-down industries. They will consider them as patriots responding to the call of their country's need and those who would obstruct them as "scabbing" against their country's interest. I would not be afraid to wager my life on that prophecy.

I will say to my colleague, for whom I have great respect and appreciation, that the Committee on the Judiciary—I think I can speak for each of them—is doing its level best to let the people know what the facts are, to give public opinion an opportunity to get into action to separate the vast majority of labor which is loyal from the minority which is not; to unite the people under a consciousness of a common danger, to be useful to the executive agencies of the Government. When that times comes, when that part of the job shall have been finished—and nobody knows when it will be, nobody knows, but it must be soon—we may make a mistake; but when that time comes, and, I repeat, it must come soon, and the administrative agencies of the Government are failing their action, when that time comes when it is necessary to deal with the enemies of this Nation whether they be in the factory or elsewhere, I believe the sentiment of the Committee on the Judiciary is to bring in whatever legislation is necessary; and if it is necessary to send them to the electric chair in order to preserve the liberty of this country, I do not believe there is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary who would hesitate one split second to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We realize that the gentleman has delivered a very able address, an impressive address, even though extemporaneously, on this occasion. If he ever has occasion to deliver a prepared address, we should be glad for him to let us know and we will have a larger audience.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman may have a larger audience, but he could not have a better one.

I am deeply grateful to you all. I have no apology for holding you. I am grateful to you. You have not complimented me by being here; you have complimented yourselves, you have demonstrated your fitness to be here.

Men and women colleagues in a great responsibility, we have a hard job ahead of us; and tonight, as Member to Member, without reservation, let us pledge each to the other and to our common country, to the hope of the ages, that, under God, no consideration will hinder us in the slightest degree from doing that thing most calculated to preserve this as one spot where human beings have an opportunity to be free. [Applause, the Members rising.]

(Here follow statements of former Ambassador to France Bullitt and statement of Merrill C. Meigs:)

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRY

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. BULLITT, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO FRANCE

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared statement of any kind. When you very kindly invited me to come up here a couple of days ago, as I said to you then, I would be very glad, if it would be of any interest, to describe the situation which developed in France. You seemed to think it might be of interest, because there were some analogies

between the situation over there and the situation in which we at the moment find ourselves, and if I can just proceed with that, I hope at any moment you wish to interrupt me you will, and I will try to answer any questions I can answer on subjects that I know something about.

The situation in France which led to the conquest of France by the Germans developed over a period of years, and in reality developed out of the same sentiment that we all share in this country, and that was the very profound desire to have peace.

The one thing that every Frenchman wanted after the last war was to see a French baby born who could live to the age of 60 without having to pick up a gun to repel a German invasion. And out of that really deep, intense desire for peace came, in the first place, the Maginot line, which the French thought would protect them from all future German invasion, and, in the second place, an attitude of mind which was one of not taking any armed action until the last possible moment.

When Hitler came in on the 30th of January, 1933, he began at once his tremendous program of plane construction, which had been planned before he came in by his staff, those members of his staff who were experts in aviation, especially Goering.

He got the jump by starting in at once at the time on a tremendous program of air expansion. The French, when he came in, had an air force that was completely dominant on the Continent. It was a big air force; the planes were somewhat obsolete, and were entirely obsolete when put up against the planes that finally started coming out of Hitler's factories.

In 1933 the Germans began to turn every energy they could into the building of airplanes, but it was not, however, until the end of 1936 that these efforts, great as they were, began to give results. It takes a long time, as we are learning to our cost now in this country, to build up an airplane industry.

The Germans actually began to get planes in great quantities coming from the factories toward the latter part of 1936. When the German Army entered the Rhineland in March of 1936 the French Army and French Air Force as well was still much stronger than the Germans, and it could have moved in and destroyed the German air factories which were turning out planes in contravention of the Locarno Treaty.

They didn't do so largely because of this basic idea not to take up arms and in the hope it was possible eventually to come to some agreement with Hitler.

That was really their last chance. The moment Hitler had entered the Rhineland and began the construction of the Siegfried line so that France could not invade Germany readily, and the moment a flood of planes began coming from the German factories in the latter part of 1936, it was too late. It was too late to save eastern and central Europe, but this curious illusion existed in France, that they still did not need to turn every energy they had into production, because the Maginot line was so strong that Germany could never get across it. The result was they had many manufacturers who did not want to take government orders and contracts for military machines of different kinds; they had a very large series of strikes of different kinds, and French production, at a time when it should have been raised to the greatest possible height to meet the German menace, without anybody noticing particularly, just quietly did not rise at all.

You had also another element which is often misunderstood, I think—the action of the so-called Popular Front on behalf of the workmen. Now, reforms in France in favor of the French workmen were long overdue, and when they were introduced they were introduced in one great block, just at a moment when, instead of reducing production, you needed a great deal more production, a greatly increased production to meet the German threat. It was not only the 40-hour week, but a lot of other different provisions that entered into what happened there.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't quite catch the significance of your statement that these reforms were introduced in one great block.

Mr. BULLITT. I will try to explain that. When the popular front government came in, I believe, if my memory is not at fault, it was about the month of June or July of the year 1936, there was an enormous number of reforms dealing with wages, hours of labor, paid holidays, a great mass of reforms introduced in one big block, as one big program.

Those reforms were long overdue, and they had the good effect of producing an excellent state of mind on the part of those workmen who were actually loyal Frenchmen. They had no effect in changing the state of mind of the Communists in the factories, whose loyalty was not to France, but to a foreign dictator, and who took their orders from that foreign dictator.

On the other hand, they did reduce enormously French production, because French industry was not organized suddenly to drop hours of labor greatly, and also lots of the manufacturers were very much frightened by these reforms. They said, "We are not going to expand our factories." In fact, in some cases they closed their factories.

The result of this was we had a diminution in production in France just when we needed a greatly increased production to meet this rising German threat.

There was also another curious development, which was this: That in the factories even working a 40-hour week, in many of the most important factories, especially those around Paris, where there were a great many Communists, that the workmen did not do much work during the 40 hours. They dragged their feet a good deal and did not turn out over so much.

But that was under the influence of a different sovereign, a sovereign in Moscow, and was not the attitude of the really patriotic Frenchman.

The result of this whole picture was that without doing anything to produce at war speed when they needed to produce at war speed, the French, because of the existence of the Maginot line, still felt perfectly secure. It was not until 2 months after the war began that the French introduced a Ministry of Munitions which began to organize the production of munitions on a war basis, and had an excellent program for the production of a great many munitions and a great many planes in the year 1942. But France was destroyed in 1940.

It was just a case of the country not waking up to the fact that modern wars are won or lost before they are begun by the preparations that you make, and the analogy, to my mind, between the attitude in France and the attitude in this country during the past few months has been very, very striking.

We are producing, we are producing well, we are producing honestly, but we are producing a 20-foot rope to do the job of a 30-foot rope. That is about as simply, I think, as one could put it.

In my opinion it is of the utmost importance that we take a lesson from the experience of France, and England as well, because they were just as slow as the French, and that we get into production at the present time with as much speed as we would if we were actually engaged in war. And we all know that we are not.

The CHAIRMAN. At what time in the development of this situation did the French people become conscious of the common danger, if, as a matter of fact, they did?

Mr. BULLITT. The tragic and almost unbelievable fact is that the French never became really conscious of the common danger until after the Germans had broken through the Maginot line last May. Up to that time they were so certain that the Maginot line was going to keep the Germans off, and there had been so little fighting on that front, that the people were really still asleep. And then came like a thunderclap the realization that the Germans were through the Maginot line, and you then had all the employers, all the employees, workmen who had not been working much, you had them turning to and working incredibly. They worked incredible hours; they would work until they would drop, and they actually produced in the last month, when the Germans already had in their hands a large number of their plane factories, two and a half times as many planes as they had ever produced in a month before from the whole of France, because they suddenly realized that their country was about to be overrun, that their lives were about to be ruined, that they were about to be enslaved, and every Frenchman turned to and did his utmost.

But it was too late.

The CHAIRMAN. What effect specifically did the consciousness of that common danger have upon the people who owned the factory and upon the people who worked in the factories? Was there any indication of a different attitude?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; there was, of course, a great difference in attitude. There is all the difference in the world between working under a real sense of urgency, with absolute cooperation between employer and employee, the manufacturer and the man who works in his plant, where they realize they are all in the same boat, and they are going to sink or swim together; that the bomb that comes down is going to kill the employer's wife and the workman's wife, the same bomb, that the whole lot of them are going to be enslaved, none of them are going to have anything left. They finally realize it is not a system of reserving this privilege for one man and another privilege for someone else; they finally realize none of them are going to have any privileges and they get together, and they have a national unity under the pressure of danger.

The whole problem we have is to get that national unity before the danger becomes so acute that you cannot save the situation.

That is the simplest way I can say it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Bullitt, you said a very good frame of mind was created by social legislation.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think at that time it would have been possible to have convinced the worker of the need to do their utmost to prepare the country?

Mr. BULLITT. I think this: That you had a most magnificent attitude on the part of the patriotic workman, the workman whose loyalty was to France; but especially in the armament industry which to a considerable extent was grouped around the suburbs of Paris, where you had the great Renault works and the Citroen works, and a great many others; you had an enormous proportion of workmen, indeed the majority, who were Communists, who were controlled from Moscow, took their orders from Moscow, and when they got orders from Moscow not to make this factory run 100 percent, they just didn't do it.

You had a difference there between the honest, straightforward, patriotic French workman and the Communist-controlled workman.

Mr. WALTER. Had the Government at that time, through legislation, endeavored to compel the workers to do their jobs as they

should have done them, would there have been much resistance to that act?

Mr. BULLITT. What happened was that the thing came in a series of steps. There were a great many strikes. My memory of this is necessarily not too reliable; I cannot give you dates and so on, but I can give you the general picture. There were a great many strikes—there was a big textile strike, different sorts of strikes, which were arbitrated first. That was in the Blum government; then there came a government that started in on a program of compulsory arbitration, which was cut off before it was really able to get going. That government went out and Daladier came in finally, and Daladier issued an order that there should be no strikes at all; to strike was a crime against the nation; and strikes were forbidden, which produced a general strike. Everybody struck, and that only lasted 24 hours.

That was finished in 24 hours, because the country felt the danger was too great to have any compulsion in the taking away from the workmen of his right to strike, and to make him work if he feels he has a great grievance.

In France you got this other result. The people went to the factories for their certain number of hours, but the stuff just didn't get turned out. They called it a pearly strike in France.

Now, my belief is you could have gotten the production up in France to a very much higher figure, provided the country realized the danger it was in, because every man would have said, "This is my country; I have got to do what I can to save it," and he would have gone to work.

I will give you an example of that, which I think is of some interest.

At the end of the last war, in 1918, the French got their production of airplanes every month up to the unbelievable figure of 2,000 per month. They got it up to that figure by having parts of planes, gadgets for planes, and stuff needed for planes manufactured all over the country—in a garage, wherever you could get a lathe, wherever you could get something that could make some part of an airplane, it was put to use—and in that country, all the industrial area of which even at that time was in German occupation, they got their airplane production up above 2,000 planes per month by getting everybody in the country who could possibly work on a part of a plane working on it.

I think there is a lesson in that for us. As a matter of fact, at the present time, if you really get your people to realize the needs for the defense of the country, for getting every energy into it, you can get the most tremendous results and unexpected results.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any period during this preparedness preparation when the people of France had the attitude that it was all right for them to get a profit out of it, to get something from the Government to their advantage? And was there a time when that was changed, and when it was regarded as not a patriotic thing for the people to profit from the Government, but the patriotic thing to do something for the Government? Were you there when there was any such change?

Mr. BULLITT. That came, as I indicated a few moments ago, when the Germans had actually broken through the Maginot line, and when it was too late. It came about the 15th of May of last year, and the Germans were in Paris on the 14th of June. We had a month there where every Frenchman and every Frenchwoman and every French child was doing everything conceivable to give what he could to his country, and not thinking of what he could get from his country.

But it was too late.

The CHAIRMAN. If the people had got that attitude in France a couple of years before that time they might be a free people now.

Mr. BULLITT. There is no question about it. If you could have had the spirit that you had just before the defeat of France 2 or 3 years before in France the Germans never on earth could have conquered France. France primarily went down because of German domination of the air and because the French did not have any planes, and neither did the British, compared to the numbers the Germans had. The Germans controlled the air. Five thousand planes in France and 5,000 planes in Great Britain would have prevented completely the destruction of France. It takes you 18 months to get a plane rolling out of the factory from the time you order it, but after 18 months, if they had ordered the planes, there never would have been a German conquest of France.

The CHAIRMAN. One other question in that connection: When France became aroused to the danger was there any change in the attitude of the workingman to whom you referred who theretofore had taken orders from Moscow?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; I think there was a great change at the last minute, because they suddenly realized, after all, they had been sold down the river on this thing. I think there were very few of them who really at bottom wanted to see Germany installed in France. I think there was a great change there. Again, when it was too late.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Ambassador, you have stated that the French people did not realize their danger until the Maginot line was broken through, and after that they worked frantically to correct the situation.

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Was that a complete reliance on the strength of the Maginot Line, or was there any segment of the people, any voice, or group of voices, which were warning the people prior to the fall of the Maginot Line of the danger in their lack of production? In other words, did they do this passively, or did they do it in the face of warnings?

Mr. BULLITT. They did it in the face of warnings, but the most difficult thing, as we all know, with certain politics is to convince people of something they don't want to believe. It is very much easier, very much pleasanter for people to go along, living agreeable lives, and not deranging their normal existence, and not having very high taxes, and not having this, that, and the other thing; and unless you have a real danger very often people are apt to say, "That fellow is just trying to scare us to death; he is just too excitable."

That is what happened in France. There were a great many voices in France that were lifted; there were people who told the truth about the situation, pointed out the danger, but it didn't produce the effect, because the people, in the first place, wanted to believe that they really could continue to live in peace, and, in the second place, they didn't want to sacrifice their normal lives.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Was that the subject of any national discussion, or was it just sporadic? In other words, did the people reject that definitely after having considered it, or was it something that was merely presented and not followed up?

Mr. BULLITT. It was never pushed to what you might call a great and pointed debate, like some of the debates we have had recently in the United States. It was brought up. There was a question in France at one time of really mobilizing the whole country, because the people at the top realized, Daladier realized, his Army Ministry realized, very acutely that French production, in the face of the depleted population, in Germany—it was twice as large as France—it was up to every Frenchman to work not only as hard as every German, but to work harder, and if France was going to be prepared to meet this German attack, France really had to get her back into it, and every man, woman, and child had to get into it. Therefore there was a proposal for getting everybody, so to speak, mobilized—men, women, and children—and working on this problem, but it never came to anything, because there just weren't enough people in the French Congress who like to hear about it. It upset life too much. And that is a very natural attitude for people to take. It is normal. If you haven't had your nose rubbed in this thing it is hard to believe what it is. I think it is normal for any country.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, on that particular point, were the leaders of either of the political parties, when you stated they might have protected themselves insisting upon the people of the country recognizing the necessity of doing something for France instead of France doing something for the people?

Mr. BULLITT. Oh, yes; absolutely. But, of course, the situation in France is a very difficult one, politically, because instead of having two parties, they had, I should say, probably 12, and you would have small groups or fractions of parties, and in order to get a majority in the Chamber of Deputies any party had to make coalitions with other parties, so you rarely got a clean-cut battle between parties, because of the party in the center, making a combination with the people on the left of them and then on the right of them. Do you understand what I mean?

The CHAIRMAN. I do; yes.

Mr. BULLITT. The parliamentary debate in France is a very different sort of thing, of course, from ours.

The CHAIRMAN. In reference to these parties where they hold together by reason of agreement, on any general fundamental principles of government they were held together in order that through that group or association they might get some advantage for the members of that particular group. Do I make myself clear on that?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes. I should say that the basis in France was on the whole idealogical. You had certain fractions of a small party which were very much the instruments of certain groups. For example, there was a group in the Chamber of Deputies which rather definitely represented the French steel industry. They were their deputies. That was one group. You had the Communists, which was the group which represented the interests of Moscow. You had the Socialists, who very genuinely, I think, represented the French workingman. You had the radical Socialists, who were neither radical or Socialists. It is a queer name. Both names sound as if they are more radical than the Socialists. As a matter of fact, the radical Socialists were just about T. R. progressives in their point of view. They were not either radical or socialistic. And that was the biggest party in France, the great center party in France, and they really represented the traditions of the French Revolution, the American Revolution. It had nothing to do with anything socialist. They were definitely idealogical, I should say, not based on a group interest in any group.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Ambassador, I would like you to give us for this record your most enlightening definition of civil rights.

Mr. BULLITT. I don't understand the question exactly.

Mr. HOBBS. As I understand it, you have been quoted as saying that civil rights are just exactly what we have none of under a dictator, or something to that effect.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; I think I did say that once, but I had forgotten it. Civil rights is what no one has any of under the dictator.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right. Now, I want to ask you, please, sir, if your summary with reference to our production, that we are producing honestly and well, but that we are producing a 20-foot rope to do a 30-foot job, is significant in the light of Mr. Knud-

sen's statement that we are about 30 percent behind in our production program. In other words, if you meant we are about 33⅓ percent short.

Mr. BULLITT. I meant something a little bit different. I meant that as well. I mean, that is includ ed in it, but I meant this: That in my personal opinion, and in this I speak only for myself, in my personal opinion our program for the production of planes, program for the production of planes, is too small, our program for the production of merchant ships is too small, our program for the production of a number of other absolutely vital items is too small. Then you have the question of getting your program carried out, but in the first place I believe the programs are not large enough, and I believe that if we really felt the urgency, the danger to the people of the United States in this international situation we would be producing vastly greater quantities of all the implements of defense that we need.

Mr. HOBBS. Now, Mr. Ambassador, of course you are familiar with the fact that during January and February of 1941 there has been a let loss of 591,000 man-days of work.

Mr. BULLITT. I was not familiar with that.

Mr. HOBBS. Due to defense strikes.

Mr. BULLITT. I didn't know that.

Hr. HOBBS. Have you seen the estimate of the Los Angeles Times, written in an editorial several days ago, on what could have been done with the amount of time which was thus lost in this program? Have you seen that?

Mr. BULLITT. No; I haven't seen it.

Hr. HOBBS. I will read you just a part of it, and ask you if it synchronizes with something you have in your mind with respect to the need for pressure and full steam ahead on our defense program. Bear in mind this was written some time ago.

"If the time and money lost through strikes had been devoted to arms making, it would have produced 2,400 light fighting planes; 1,500 light bombers; or 480 heavy bombers for us or for England; or 24 destroyers, the lack of which England considers her greatest danger; or 1,600,000 of the new semiautomatic rifles; or two battleships; or 60,000 tons of bombs; or 12,000 tanks. It would have built a more respectable fleet of merchant ships in terms of the estimated cost per ton of military only objectives than destroyed by Nazi bombing. It is the equivalent of about 8 months of such enemy air attack. It is the equivalent of the defense output of 400,000 skilled artisans for a whole year."

Have you a judgment as to whether or not that is an exaggeration?

Mr. BULLITT. I have absolutely no judgment about it whatever. As I said in the beginning, I never mind saying what I think about something that I have really studied and gone to the bottom of as far as I could, but on this particular situation I have no special information at all, and I know no more about it than I read in the newspapers. So my opinion would be really valueless on that.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, we all realize that the man-days lost due to strikes in the defense industry is small in comparison to the number of days worked, but some of us are very apprehensive of the ramifications of the days lost in certain industries in that they affect other industries. For instance, the wheel strike ran into and closed several other important lines; wheels for landing gear of airplanes and tank wheels and automobile wheels and truck wheels, and so on. We are just cognizant of the fact that while it is relatively small in comparison with the number of days worked, it still is a serious proposition. But you say you have no judgment as to that.

Mr. BULLITT. No; I have no special knowledge on that subject at all.

Mr. HOBBS. I would like to have you tell us definitely and clearly whether or not it is your judgment that we in America are still asleep as France was prior to the declaration of war over there, in comparison with what we should be doing in the defense program.

Mr. BULLITT. I think there is no question about this; that the United States today is in greater danger than at any time in the history of our country. I believe that the people in general do not feel that danger. They simply don't feel it. It is perhaps hard to understand all the complications of international politics, but I believe we are going ahead today, preparing—yes, but preparing with sloth compared to the need, which is tragic.

I believe that we should have from the beginning of this war, certainly from the fall of France, gotten to work as hard as if this country were in war. We have not done anything of the kind, and I think that with the danger which will become certainly very much more evident to every American during the next few weeks when the German attack on England with the submarines and the planes against the shipping, and with the planes attacking directly, I think the people will then begin to feel, "Well, we are not going fast enough about the whole problem of making democracy survive in the world."

It is a problem of making the people realize the danger in time, and not when it is too late, like the French; and that we are not producing at anything like the speed that is called for by the danger to our country.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think the reason for that, fundamentally, is that the people do not appreciate the danger and necessity for getting to work?

Mr. BULLITT. I think that is the simple truth; that they do not have a sense of the urgency. It is only people who in one way or another have seen the same thing happen in other countries; it is terribly hard to have a sense or urgency if you haven't seen the thing happening, if you haven't seen the bombs dropping, if you haven't been with statesmen who believed their country was secure and believed they had done a good job for it, and then had things come about which meant the destruction not only of that man's life but the destruction of his entire country. After you have been through experiences like that you realize that the men who were in government, for example, in France, they were first-rate men. It is the customary thing at the present time to make very slighting remarks about them. Why? Because they led their country to destruction. It is true their country was destroyed, but that could happen in other countries where people also have been first-rate men and have not acted quickly enough.

The CHAIRMAN. It looks as if, with the radio and all that sort of thing, where we are in contact with all the rest of the world, and we can almost hear the bombs falling in those countries, and doing as much talking and threatening as we are doing, that the people ought to be all for intensive preparedness. But our talking and preparations don't seem to be balancing up.

Mr. BULLITT. The best formula for a nation in its relations with foreign countries is the formula put so very graphically by Theodore Roosevelt when he said "Speak softly and carry a big stick." As it is today, our stick just isn't big enough for our own defense.

The CHAIRMAN. It doesn't compare with our talking, does it?

Mr. BULLITT. We haven't been doing much talking as a nation. We have been doing an awful lot as individuals, but not as a nation.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Ambassador, just following my line for one or two questions, I will ask you this: If in your deliberate judgment you think that the time has come when America's tragic plight, as you describe it, requires every man to do his utmost in our defense efforts?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't think I used the words "tragic plight" exactly; but I do think this——

Mr. HOBBS. You said tragic danger.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes. I think this country is in great danger at this minute. I think that all any patriotic American has the right to think about today, not only from the point of view of his own self-preservation but the point of view of the preservation of his family, of his relationship to his church and his God, is to think about just one thing; that is, what he can give to his country, and not what he can get from his country; and to think how he can increase our defense, and to think what service he can do to himself and the rest of the American people. I have a very strong conviction on that. I know that is the duty of every one of us.

Mr. HOBBS. In other words, you feel very intensely that the time has come when America should function as France functioned after the Maginot line had been pierced.

Mr. BULLITT. We should function with the same unity that was only produced at that time, which they should have had long before in France.

Mr. HOBBS. Now I would like to ask you this one other question: Do you think that your experience in France has so warped your judgment as to make you gun-shy?

Mr. BULLITT. That is a question which is a little bit difficult for me to answer. I don't think I have ever been gun-shy of anything. But I have seen personally since 1914 a great deal of war. I happened to be in Russia when the war began in 1914; I was then in Poland and Germany and England and France, and I did war correspondence at the front; and I also was in Russia during the revolution; I was in Turkey during the Turkish revolution. I have seen a great deal of battle, murder, and sudden death from one end of this planet to the other, and so far as I myself am concerned, I should not get very much excited about it unless I thought my own country was going to be destroyed, or might be.

Mr. HOBBS. What I meant was, of course there are going to be people in this country who will say, "You must discount what Ambassador Bullitt says, because he is an alarmist." I just wondered if you have discounted your fears and are expressing what you conceive to be a conservative opinion, or whether you were going the limit to try to arouse us.

Mr. BULLITT. No; I think very simply this: I have said ever since I came back here last July, I have said in every public appearance I have made, and every private appearance, exactly the same thing. I have said it because I fully believe it, and what I say now I completely believe also.

Mr. HOBBS. And you don't think you are exaggerating?

Mr BULLITT. Not in the slightest, not in the slightest degree. There is a French proverb which says: "To govern is to foresee," and nine-tenths of the load of government at the present time, with the world in chaos, as it is, is to foresee the possibilities and to guard against them. You may have an event turn out well instead of badly. For example, no one expected when the Italians attacked Greece that the Greeks would make an absolutely inspired fight such as they have made and would defeat the Italian Army. It was a reasonable expectation when the Italians attacked Greece that Greece would be overrun. You may have an event turn out well, instead of badly. That is true.

Last summer the British had lost such a proportion of all their artillery in France that actually for the defense of Great Britain, and the whole of Great Britain, in artillery, big and small, they only had a few hundred guns. The expectation at that

time was that at least there was a considerable chance that Great Britain would go down for the last time.

The job of any government is to foresee the possibilities, and if there is danger to your own country in those possibilities, to guard against it, and I don't think that any man can say that the danger is not great to our own country, and when you are up against a danger of that sort it is exactly as if your child suddenly gets a temperature of 104 or 105. Would you say, "Oh, well; that is nothing," or would you say, "Get a doctor quick; my child is in danger."

That, it seems to me, is the situation now.

Mr. HOBBS. I don't want to be misunderstood as voicing my own sentiments in asking that question. I think you have rendered a splendid service to us by arousing us by your appearance. Personally I agree with you 110 percent.

Mr. ELIOT. May I ask, Mr. Ambassador, a question or two, also agreeing with the gravity of the danger and the fact that it calls on every one of us to do more active work in defending America. It is, as I judge from your earlier testimony, a fact that in France the outlawing of strikes did not result in expediting the defense effort in itself.

Mr. BULLITT. What you can say is this: In certain ways it did and in certain ways it did not. There weren't any tremendously big stoppages, but there was a good deal of the business of not working hard during the hours that you worked. That did continue.

Mr. ELIOT. It was not a sufficient answer?

Mr. BULLITT. It was not a sufficient answer. The only sufficient answer was to have every man, woman, and child realize that his country was in danger, and therefore he gives everything he can give. That goes for the employee as well as the employer.

Mr. ELIOT. Did any of the social legislation which you said was so long overdue have a particular effect in impeding production? Was there one particular part of that legislation which meant that less was produced as a result of the legislation?

Mr. BULLITT. There was.

Mr. ELIOT. The 40-hour week?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; because of the fact that French industry was in no position suddenly to transfer itself to a 40-hour week with much greater charges of all kinds and higher wages. And the French economy was sick before that. They had been going through difficult times, and that without a doubt did reduce to a considerable extent the output. It was not by any means the decisive factor in the whole situation. There were a great many factors. I mean, you can't oversimplify it.

Mr. ELIOT. The 40-hour week was a prohibition against working over 40 hours?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; it was.

Mr. ELIOT. Therefore it is not analogous to the legislation on our statute books providing for overtime for work after 40 hours, but not limiting the hours.

Mr. BULLITT. I will give you a very simple example of it. I took a summer house in the country that had to have a lot of work done on it, and when the workmen came out to look at this house to put it in shape, the local contractor came over with his workmen—they are intimate friends from the same village—they came over to look at the job and I said, "How long will this take?" They said, "It will depend on whether you can protect us from the Government or not." I said, "What do you mean?" They said, "We would like to work on this job 6 days a week, and from the time it is light until it is sundown, but if we do we are going to go to jail. We really would like to work on this. This has gone too far." And you got that feeling among French workmen, that it had gone too far. It limited them. They would rather work the extra hours. That is a very curious example of it, just within my own cognizance.

Mr. ELIOT. I repeat, it is not analagous, in your opinion, to our wage-and-hour laws which permit any number of hours to be worked.

Mr. BULLITT. That is a different matter.

The CHAIRMAN. You said these workmen said they would like to do the work, provided you protected them against the Government.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were they going to require to do the work?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, it is a simple story, but I wanted this place done as rapidly as possible in order to move into it. First I got hold of the contractors in town, who had sent workmen out who would work very restricted hours, and they said it would take at least 6 months to get me into the place. Then the fellows out there said when they looked at it, "If you really let us work we can get you in here in 6 weeks." As a matter of fact, they got me in in 4 weeks and a half. It shows the difference between a really active desire to get ahead on something and a desire to just put in a certain number of hours. And that is what we have to get. We have to get the country to really realize the problem is a problem of perfecting your instruments of defense.

Mr. HOBBS. What was the difference in cost?

Mr. BULLITT. The difference in cost was about one-eighth for the local people in the country as against what it would have cost me with the big contractor in Paris sending people out there.

The CHAIRMAN. May I remind the committee, and also our distinguished witness, that he has an engagement at the White House.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What time do you have to be there?

Mr. BULLITT. I have to be there at noon.

The CHAIRMAN. You can stay 15 minutes more then.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Ambassador, I would like to ask you this question; what in your opinion slowed up the defense effort of France more, the strikes and the labor situation, or the Communists engaged in defense work?

Mr. BULLITT. It is very difficult to estimate that thing exactly, as to which was more and which was less, because the strikes were very largely caused by the Communists.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Bullitt, when the 40-hour law was passed in France, did France have a great reservoir of unemployment?

Mr. BULLITT. No. They had, I think, when the 40-hour law was passed only a few hundred thousand unemployed, unless my memory is at fault. They certainly didn't have a million unemployed, and I don't think they had even a half million.

Mr. CRAVENS. So that France didn't have a situation comparable to what we had in the matter of unemployment when we reduced hours?

Mr. BULLITT. No; they have never had a similar situation. They have never had anything like the degree of unemployment we have had in this country.

Mr. CRAVENS. Do you know anything authoritatively about the break-through of the German armies in the northeast?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. CRAVENS. What happened there, if you know?

Mr. BULLITT. I know exactly what happened, by chance, because I happened to be present when the reports came in to the people at the top.

What actually happened was very simple and understandable. The French had strung out the center of their line, which was on the Meuse, so that the force which was there was holding a length of line three times as long as a similar number of troops are normally asked to hold. The reason was this: The Germans had an army which was almost twice as big as the French Army with the British Expeditionary Force added. In addition, the French had to keep troops on the Italian frontier, because the Italians were threatening an attack down there. The French General Staff had a theory that if the French Army could meet the German Army in the open field on the plains of Belgium the French Army would defeat the German Army, because of the superiority of the French officer and under officer over his German counterpart. They had therefore drawn up their best troops, all their tanks, everything they had of great value in Belgium, together with the British Expeditionary Force. In order to do that they had withdrawn reserves from a great many other portions of the line. They had their mass of reserves which were left, and which were very small in numbers, opposite the Jurat Mountains away down in Switzerland. This army on the Meuse they thought was absolutely secure because the Meuse is a swift-running stream and the banks are precipitous and they didn't believe any major attack could be made through there. They had made arrangements to blow up such bridges as there were and they thought they could stop any big attack.

Totally unexpected, the Germans attacked there with a technique which had never before been used in war, which was that of wave after wave of bombing planes preceding wave after wave of tanks. When the tanks got to the river, the "fifth columnists" who were in the army had cut the wires leading to the bridges, so that when the French pushed the button and the bridge was supposed to go up, it didn't go up. The bombing planes came across, the tanks followed them across the Meuse and the bridges and with nothing in front of them but a line strung out about one-third the normal thickness of any line—it was the thinnest line on the whole French frontier; moreover, the army which composed that line was an army of reservists. They were not young men; they were men drawn together from their civilian lives, and the break-through was absolute. The French troops had never been trained to meet wave after wave of bombing planes and wave after wave of tanks—and it is a very impressive thing. If you have nothing to stand up to it with, you can't do anything about it. It doesn't do any good to shoot at a tank with a rifle. If you haven't got an antitank gun or a 75 to meet the tank with, you are licked. That is all there is to it, and they break through.

On the day they did break through the reports from the whole front were fairly optimistic. The French were feeling fairly optimistic about the situation. Suddenly in came the news that the Germans had broken the line completely, that the German tanks were rushing on, and there wasn't at that moment one single reserve division between those tanks and Paris. If they had known accurately that there were no French divisions there they could have gone right straight through to Paris the day they broke through on the Meuse. They simply didn't know. They simply stopped their tanks there, and then the French began to try to get their reserves up from the south where they were, but the Germans bombed all the railroads, all the roads, and all the bridges, and the French were never able to—then the Germans turned north, of course, to cut off the army up in Belgium—and when the French got their reserves up and tried to get through it was too late. They couldn't get them up there in time. That is the whole story.

The vital element in that picture was the plane, the bombing plane preceding the tanks in every place where the tanks have attacked, at least to my knowledge, and I have been told by the most competent

French generals. Where the tanks have attacked, not preceded by a wave of bombers, the attack has not been so nearly successful. Does that answer?

Mr. CRAVENS. That answers very well.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Ambassador, I think probably most of us agree with you and share your opinion that immediate action and hard work is necessary, but how do you think we can go about getting the American people to realize the danger and necessity of every man and every woman doing his utmost to contribute something to the defense of his and her country?

The CHAIRMAN. I think I can answer that. If everybody followed the example of the witness, who has been working at it—how long?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, ever since I came back. I haven't done anything else. As a matter of fact, since I came back last June, I haven't done anything else except try to make as many people as possible realize this country really is in danger. I might say I haven't had much success at it.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I hope you carry that out, but I also hope you can get assistance in your effort.

Mr. BULLITT. I do think this: I think there are a great many people now throughout the country who are really beginning to look at the whole thing much more seriously than they did 8 months ago. I think people are much more aroused. Perhaps I am wrong.

Mr. GUYER. You don't find any responsible parties in this country who are against defense; do you?

Mr. BULLITT. I do not.

Mr. GUYER. There was only one vote in the House of Representatives against these great preparations, and the appropriations for them. We have to find out what is the matter and what is holding it up.

Mr. BULLITT. I think it is merely a question of speed. As I said before, I think we are doing a very good job and a very honest job on the production of instruments of defense. I don't think it is going nearly fast enough.

Mr. GUYER. It isn't lack of knowledge. The question is to get to work and find the people that are stopping the work, if there are any.

Mr. HANCOCK. May I ask one question? Does the Ambassador recommend any specific legislation to stop strikes or facilitate production?

Mr. BULLITT. As I said to the chairman when he invited me to come here, I have made no special study whatsoever of the strike situation in this country. I have no objection whatsoever to offering anything I can say on subjects that I know about, but I don't think I am competent to speak on that subject, because I don't believe in giving an opinion on anything on which I have not made a special study. I really mean that; it is perfectly honest. It is not an attempt to dodge.

Mr. HANCOCK. Did the French have any legislation that was helpful prior to May 14?

Mr. BULLITT. They had. They had an absolute prohibition finally on strikes. It was forbidden absolutely.

Mr. HANCOCK. It was a criminal statute?

Mr. BULLITT. It was a decree gotten out. The French had put decree power in the hands of the Government. It was a decree gotten up by the Government. And you didn't have strikes during that later period in France, but you also didn't have on the part of the workmen, or the director of a factory, or the owner of the factory, the sense of urgency which made everyone think, "Have I today given everything I can give in order to get out these implements of defense?"

Mr. HANCOCK. So the decree was ineffective in speeding up defense production?

Mr. BULLITT. It was effective, perhaps, in this sense: That it stopped any big, spectacular strikes, but it was ineffective in getting the spirit into the people, which comes only with a sense of danger and the creation of knowledge which a sense of danger brings.

Mr. HANCOCK. Even prior to that did they have two great labor unions battling for control comparable to the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L.?

Mr. BULLITT. No; there was nothing of the kind whatsoever. They had one labor union, which they called the C. G. T., which was comparable to our American Federation of Labor, and within that union there were a great many Communists and Socialists, inside the union. There were battles between them inside the union, and the leader of the union was far from being a Communist. He was hated by the Communists. He is an able person, who has been in this country several times.

Mr. HANCOCK. Are the factories now closed- or open-shop?

Mr. BULLITT. There are a number of closed shops and a number of open shops. There are a great many small industries in France, little local industries, such industries as I referred to when I spoke about the way they had gotten the small plants to build planes in 1918. Many of those are open-shop, not organized.

Mr. HANCOCK. In the closed shops are the men required to pay tribute to the labor leaders to join the union, or to hold jobs, as they do here?

Mr. BULLITT. I can answer the first part of your question. I can't answer the second, because I don't know about it. The first part is whether they are required to do that. The answer is no, they are not.

Mr. HANCOCK. So we have a more serious labor problem in this country than they had in France. We have the problem of two labor unions fighting each other. We also have the problem of labor racketeers who are compelling men to join labor unions and pay exorbitant initiation fees, and in many cases to pay exorbitant fees to hold their jobs—as high as $2 a day to be allowed to work. None of those conditions prevailed in France.

Mr. BULLITT. Certainly not.

Mr. ELIOT. They pay membership fees, do they not?

Mr. BULLITT. They pay membership fees, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate your attendance, Mr. Bullitt, and thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MERRILL C. MEIGS, CHIEF OF THE AIR DIVISION, OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT.

Mr. MEIGS. My name is Merrill C. Meigs, Chief of the Air Division of O. P. M.

Yesterday your office called and asked me to come before your committee this morning at 10:30 to present facts relative to the effect of strikes in the airplane industry on production. The time to prepare this statement was rather short, but I will give you the salient facts in the situation. Any further information that you wish me to gather. I shall be very glad to get through our statistical department or the labor division of O. P. M. I will also try to answer to the best of my ability any questions you care to ask.

First, let me say that I hold no brief for either side in the controversies which bring about these strikes—I am only interested in the results. We have had but one strike in the plant of a company manufacturing a finished aircraft. This was of eight days duration in the Vultee plant, at Downey, Calif., which turns out Army trainers.

This resulted in the nondelivery of approximately 28 planes for the month.

The percentage of strikes in the entire aircraft industry is very small. However, an airplane is made up of so many parts and so many kinds of material, the loss of any one of which stops the delivery of a completed machine, that the percentage of strikes in this industry is not a true indication of the damage done.

The aircraft industry is expanding to its total mechanical and physical limits. That makes it necessary to bring along every one of its component parts as near to peak production as possible so that all the parts may be ready for assembly at the same time.

An airplane is made up of many pieces. In a four-motored bomber are approximately 20,000 separate pieces, which are made sometimes by as high as 500 or 600 small subcontractors. Any one of these pieces which is short holds up the delivery of the completed plane.

Following is a list of 15 companies which have had strikes or are now on strike. I list the number of workers, the items manufactured, and the duration:

Strikes in plants working on airplanes and airplane parts, March 17, 1941:

Aluminum Co. of America, Edgewater, N. J.: Number of workers, 3,000; defense materials for airplanes, etc.; duration, March 12, 1941, continuing.

Aluminum Co. of America, New Kensington, Pa.: Number of workers, 7,000; defense, basic aluminum, etc.; duration, November 22–28, 1940.

B. & H. Aircraft, Long Island City, N. Y.: Number of workers, 250; defense, airplane parts; duration, February 20–27, 1941.

Bethlehem Steel Fabricating, Los Angeles, Calif.: Workers, 100; defense, special steel; duration, March 10, continuing.

Condenser Corporation of America, South Plainfield, N. J.: Workers, 2,400; defense, condensers for airplane radios; duration, March 10, 1941, continuing.

Crucible Steel, Harrison, N. J.: Workers, 150; defense, propellers, etc.; duration, October 4–8, 1940.

Eaton Manufacturing Co. (Wilcox-Rich Division), Saginaw, Mich.: Workers, 600; defense, valve seats for airplane motors, etc.; duration, November 13–14, 1940, January 13–16, 1941.

Harvill Aircraft, Los Angeles, Calif.: workers, 350; defense, airplane castings; duration, March 13, 1941, continuing.

Motor Wheel Corporation, Lansing, Mich.: Workers, 3,500; defense, airplane brake drums, etc.; duration, February 13–25, 1941.

Pressure Castings Co., Cleveland, Ohio.: Workers, 120; defense, airplane castings, etc.; duration, March 4–6, 1941.

Ray Day Piston Co., Detroit, Mich.: workers, 110; defense, aircraft castings and pistons; duration, March 10, 1941, continuing.

Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation, Bridgeville, Pa.: Workers, 1,100; defense, steel for fuses and propellers; duration, February 20–24, 1941; March 2, 1941, continuing.

Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.: Workers, 225; defense, special steel; duration, February 10, 1941, continuing. Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Workers, 380; defense, special steel; duration, February 11–21, 1941.

Vultee Aviation, Inc., Downey, Calif.: Workers, 5,000; defense, airplanes; duration, November 15–26, 1941.

Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio: Workers, 500; defense, wind tunnel; duration, March 4, 1941, continuing.

I would like to comment on three of these strikes which will definitely stop the delivery of airplanes. One is the Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation at Bridgeville, Pa. Another is at the Harvill Aircraft plant, Los Angeles, Calif., and one at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

The Cyclops steel plant is one of the two principal sources of supply for special alloy steel for airplane propeller blades. It also makes special steel for parts of critical importance in plane production. The industry is desperately short of propellers. The supply of material for these propellers is low.

There happened in my office yesterday afternoon, the vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation. I asked him to dictate a statement as to just what effect the Cyclops Universal steel plant strike was having on his production. His statement follows:

"The strike at the plant of Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation at Bridgeville, Pa., has resulted in steel shortages which will completely stop delivery of steel-bladed propellers for one type of Navy single-seated fighter next week. Since propellers are now the bottleneck in production of that type airplane, delivery of airplanes will be immediately affected. Delivery of propellers cannot resume until approximately 60 days after delivery of steel from Universal Cyclops is again started. It will be impossible to make up the deficiencies of propellers for these airplanes for many months without creating corresponding deficiencies of propellers for other types of airplanes as the one remaining source of the special steel required for propeller blades has less than half the capacity required for our needs.

"April and May deliveries of propellers for other types of airplanes will also be considerably affected by the present strike and from June on badly curtailed. In these cases also several months will be required to make up the deficiencies caused by the strike because of the necessity of meeting the then current requirements in addition to the problem of catching up."

Mr. MEIGS. I could briefly discuss one instance, if you care to take 2 or 3 minutes. The material goes into a turbo supercharger, which is a very difficult steel to manufacture, and can only be manufactured by a few companies. This Cyclops Steel Co. makes the steel. The General Electric Co. cannot continue unless it can get this steel.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it make all the steel necessary, which goes into this thing to equip these superchargers?

Mr. MEIGS. I think that would be the case; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And it would mean you could not turn out one of these higher-type bombers if the strike continued?

Mr. MEIGS. That is exactly right.

These great planes cannot fly without this small part. However, this will not become apparent to the public until the time comes for the final assembly of the bomber. Then we will hear that it cannot be flown because of the shortage of this part. The Cyclops strike will be responsible for the delay.

Another example—Stewart-Warner is building fuses for bombs. Last week they had to stop production because Universal Cyclops could not deliver their required steel. Whether or not these fuses are for bombs to go into our bombers, I didn't have time to ascertain, so I cannot definitely state that this is holding up plane production. However, it is obvious that we will not do very well if our bombers are to go out with bombs which lack fuses.

The Harvill Die Casting Co., of Los Angeles, employs 350 men. It was closed on last Friday morning by a strike. This company has developed a particular technique in die casting. It furnishes castings to practically all of the Pacific coast airplane companies—Douglas, Boeing, North American, and Consolidated.

I called Donald Douglas, president of the Douglas Airplane Co., last night to ask him how soon this strike would stop production. He said that there were only two sources of supply for this particular type of die casting and that both were loaded to the guards with work.

He checked while I was on the phone and said that they would have to stop production of some of their planes this week and he thought the same situation would hold with other plants.

He said it was impossible for this manufacturer to make up his lost production.

Therefore I am sorry that I must tell you now to revise our schedule of deliveries on planes which carry these castings. After this week we will be late in delivery the number of days this strike continues.

I think that is a definite answer to your question.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean by that, that it is the same in its effect on the speed of production of planes as though all the parts of the planes were being produced there and the planes themselves were being assembled in that plant?

Mr. MEIGS. Yes, sir.

Die castings go into all parts of the internal structure of a plane. Their loss is more serious than a completed propeller, for instance, because all work must stop on the air frame until these die castings are available to put the different pieces together, while with a propeller the plane might be completed and waiting only to attach the propeller.

The California situation will definitely hold up production of a major part of our airplanes within the next few days.

The strike at Wright Field has been going on for 6 weeks and is still unsettled. I asked Maj. E. M. Powers, who is in charge of the engineering unit of the aircraft section, to give me a statement of its effect on production. He states:

"1. Congress appropriated money for the construction of certain buildings and laboratories at Wright Field, among which are wind tunnels, dynamometer laboratory, and other technical buildings.

"2. About 6 weeks ago all work on these projects was halted due to a strike. The program, as originally set up, contemplated the completion of this construction in time to test certain high-powered engines which are to be used in experimental airplanes as soon as they can be properly tested. One of these engines is now ready for test, and with the hold-up that has already occurred, it is estimated that the experimental program has been delayed from 2 to 3 months.

"3. Immediate remedial action is necessary to eliminate serious delay on the experimental engine and airplane program."

The Vanadium Co. has been closed by a strike for 5 weeks. Their product is used in the fabrication and processing of finished steel which goes into propellers and many parts of an airplane.

It is particularly vital in the manufacture of steel used for machine tools and cast armor plate for tanks. Machine tools are constantly wearing out. I didn't have time to get the exact figures, but I understand that there is a small supply of vanadium alloys still available; however, it will be only a short time until it is exhausted. I leave it to your good judgment as to how far-reaching will be the loss of machine-tool steel as well as other necessary materials which go to make up a completed plane.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get that straightened out. You say it will hold them up in the next few days. Do you mean there is not enough material on hand to put in planes for current assembly?

Mr. MEIGS. For 2 or 3 or 4 days, whatever that might be. After that with no more material there will be no more planes.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. MEIGS. I would like to cite one example of a situation that is very disturbing.

The propeller division of the Wright Corporation, at Pittsburgh, which employs 975 men, was closed for a day—March 4—by a strike.

The company reports, and I have not had time to check the union's side, that the union demanded that the company either force 25 or 30 employees to join the union or discharge them.

The company was unable to comply.

After a day's negotiating the union permitted the plant to reopen, but threatened a further strike at the end of 15 days if 100-percent union membership had not been obtained.

Every day this plant shuts down 10 propellers are short; 10 airplanes sit and wait. During this time, the organization has been upset, both management and men, by continued discussion of the issue. This materially affects and slows down production.

I have a telegram from the Rich Manufacturing Corporation, George R. Rich, president, Battle Creek, Mich., reading as follows—it is addressed to me:

"Unless we can obtain steel in finishing end at Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation, of Bridgeville, Pa., within next few days will cause a serious stoppage of motor production of all kinds during April. We are entirely drained of material due to length this strike. Haven't sufficient material to meet schedule for the rest of this month.

"RICH MANUFACTURING CORPORATION,
"GEORGE R. RICH, *President*."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is he talking about airplane motors?

Mr. MEIGS. He is talking about valves and valve-seat parts that go into these big motors.

And I have another telegram, received at my office before I came down here, from Stewart-Warner Corporation, which reads:

"CHICAGO, ILL., *March 17, 1941.*

"ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
"*Industrial Svc Prodn 1316,*
Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

"(Attention M. H. Pettit.)

"Referring to inquiry to Captain Aldis, Chicago Ordnance, concerning hours lost in production due to steel in Universal Cyclops steel strike Stewart-Warner lost on two parts 653½ hours.

"STEWART-WARNER CORPORATION,
"C. W. HOOPER."

That means 16 automatic machines were down for about 8 days

That is a statement, gentlemen, of facts, as nearly as I could get them in the time at my disposal.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you also have any records of any additional facts which are of the same general character as these are; or do these cover, in your judgment, the major part of the informative facts in your possession?

Mr. MEIGS. Yes; these are all the facts I have available.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not have any information with regard to the cause of these strikes? You merely come to indicate what has happened as the result of these strikes?

Mr. MEIGS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We are tremendously obliged for this information, and are sorry to have kept you all morning.

Mr. MEIGS. I am very glad to have been here. I would be glad to answer any questions you might have.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is anything along the line of your general statement which you think might be informative and help the committee, you can add it to your statement.

Mr. MEIGS The only other thing I wish to say is that the airplane is made up of so many parts and so many pieces that it will not fly and it will not operate without every one of those being in place, and that is particularly true now that they are going up to 300 and 350 miles an hour.

Any little thing throws it completely off. It is just as valueless sitting there on the line without one of these things made over here in a small factory by 100 men as it is without a wing.

The insidious thing about this is that they know the public won't stand for a strike in a great plane factory employing 4,000 or 5,000 men turning out completed planes.

The public doesn't get excited about some small plant turning out a minor part. Yet its closing has exactly the same effect as closing the big plane factory; namely, no planes.

The CHAIRMAN. As to the picture you give us, it is the same as though all these factories were at one place and a cessation of the work of producing one of the essential parts of a plane amounts in some degree, at least, to the closing down of all activities, because they cannot get the plane in the air unless they get all the things to make up the plane.

Mr. MEIGS. Not in some degree. It is in complete degree with all these parts.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York, Mr. Meigs, what was your business before you went into the O. P. M.?

Mr. MEIGS. I was publisher of a newspaper.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. You were not in the manufacturing business?

Mr. MEIGS. Yes, sir; before I got into that I was manufacturing tractors and automobiles.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very greatly indebted to you.

Mr. MEIGS. Thank you.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me today may be transferred to Monday next at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and such other special orders as have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two places in the RECORD and to include a certain editorial and a short speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. SULLIVAN, for 5 days, on account of business.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 1 week, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3575. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3575. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, March 28, 1941, to begin hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015, House Office Building, as follows:

Wednesday, April 9, and Thursday, April 10, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day—resume hearings on H. R. 3359 and H. R. 3360, relating to preventing publication of inventions and prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents, respectively.

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions) relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

380. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts; to the Committee on Claims.

381. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, including consideration of methods to prevent shoaling by the flow of lava, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

382. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on reexamination of Charleston Harbor, S. C., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 16, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 156); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

383. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Tulsa and West Tulsa Levees on Arkansas River, Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROMJUE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2985. A bill to prescribe the time basis for computing pay for overtime work performed by laborers in the Railway Mail Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DIMOND: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 1591. A bill relative to annual labor on mineral claims in the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3847. A bill to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. COPOZZOLI: Committee on Claims. S. 885. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 338).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 818. A bill for the relief of Lucia Humble; with amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1267. A bill for the relief of Russell Gauslin, Helen Gauslin, and Russell A. Gauslin, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCOTT: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1355. A bill for the relief of A. M. Garmon; with amendment (Rept. No. 341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of George H. Kerley; with amendment (Rept. No. 342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3399. A bill for the relief of Tom Gentry; with amendment (Rept. No. 343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3846. A bill for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Gettings; without amendment (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3860. A bill for the relief of Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4064. A bill for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4177) granting a pension to Mary Jones; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4091) granting a pension to Mary O. Lyman; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4202. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Big Sur River, also the Carmel River, and their tributaries, in the county of Monterey and State of California, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 4203. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the San Francisquito Creek, located on the county boundary line between San Mateo County and Santa Clara County, in the State of California; and also to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Matadero Creek, located in Santa Clara County, in the State of California, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; also to authorize that Matadero Creek, Dry Creek, and Adobe Creek areas be diked off and controlled by tide gates similar to the plan for San Francisquito Creek; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4204. A bill to provide that Federal grants for old-age assistance shall match State contributions 4 for 1 as to payments up to $30 and equal State contributions as to additional payments not in excess of $40; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4205. A bill to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4206. A bill to provide daylight saving between the last Sunday in April and the last Sunday in October in each year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 4207. A bill to provide for the establishment of a navy yard in or near the city of Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 4208. A bill to exempt certain local newspapers from the wage-and-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4209. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to defer payments of taxes and assessments and interest on, and principal or installments or amortization of principal of, mortgages upon small dwellings and to stay sales and actions and proceedings for sales of, or foreclosure of mortgages on, such dwellings by reason of the military service of certain persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 4210. A bill to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DITTER:

H. R. 4211. A bill to amend the act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved June 22, 1938; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 4212. A bill authorizing modification of the project for the control of floods, removal of debris, and improvement of Sacramento River, Calif.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-A-Chucky Dam site; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4214. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all navy yards and naval stations under the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 4215. A bill to provide for the exclusion of aliens who have been imprisoned or otherwise incarcerated in the United States or in a foreign country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 4216. A bill relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 4217. A bill to extend the obligation and privilege of service in the national defense to men up to 65 years of age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4218. A bill to provide for the reduction in expenditures of the Federal Government which are not essential to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 2788), independent offices appropriation bill, 1942; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Res. 158. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board to investigate and report on the need for constructing a bridge between Hunters Point and Bay Farm Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 159. Resolution to create a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to investigate the liquor distilling and wholesale liquor industries in the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 160. Resolution authorizing the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 258 of the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 10, with reference to Senate Resolution 82, with reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated February 17, 1941, with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 13, with reference to House bill 87, concerning the fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Memorial No. 1, with reference to legislation concerning the Organic Act; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 1, with reference to silver; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 1, House File No. 983, with reference to the Embargo Act of 1927, relating to the importation of meats from foreign lands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4219. A bill for the relief of Nora Snow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Snow; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Arrias, also known as Joseph P. Arrias; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

594. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Federal Government of the United States to make available from funds appropriated, or to be appropriated, for defense purposes a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

595. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Eugene Perry Post, No. 332, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Providence, R. I., for the establishment of officers' training school for Negro candidates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

596. By Mr. GERLACH: Resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania, voicing their opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

597. By Mr JOHNSON of California: Petition of Alice M. Ebright and 93 others, all residents of Long Beach, Calif., making an appeal to the President and the Congress of the United States, that legislation be adopted forthwith designed to make more effective the laws that will stop the shipment of any supplies to Japan which will in any way aid her in waging her war against China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

598. By Mr. JONES: Petition of the Piqua Townsend Club, No. 4, of Piqua, Ohio, A. L. Brooks, president, and Ed Stengel, secretary, favoring the enactment of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

599. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Resolution adopted, by the Legislature of the State of New York, petitioning the Federal Government for funds to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

600. By Mr. KEOGH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring Federal funds from funds appropriated, or to be appropriated, for defense purposes, a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State of New York and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

601. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to provide funds for defense purposes, a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

602. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Petition of Hugh Durham and approximately 2,100 other railroad employees of the Third Congressional District of Michigan, opposing St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

603. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend national-recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

604. Also, petition of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Upper Mississippi River harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

605. Also, petition of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to extending the Guffey-Vincent Act for 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

606. Also, petition of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national-defense work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

607. Also, petition of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defense construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

608. Also, petition of the Forward Trinity Valley Association, Romayor, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

609. Also, petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 81, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 220 and House bill 1057, with reference to establishing the principle of longevity pay in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

610. By Mr. MOSER: Petition of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, whose going forth is prepared as the morning, whose judgments are as clear as the light: Draw near unto us, we beseech Thee, and keep us faithful to the trust Thou hast imposed on us, lest our goodness be as the morning cloud and as the early dew that goeth away. Let the blessings of Thy wisdom and guidance be upon our President, Vice President, the Congress, the judiciary, and every servant of the Republic; give us grace sufficient not only to confess our sins but to forsake them; make us strong enough to overcome whatever difficulties may confront us; grant that our cheerfulness may gladden others; give to us faith that will make real the things of God, hope that will remove all anxious fears, and love that will conquer every form of hate.

Help each one of us to realize that life is made blessed, not in doing the things we like to do but in liking the things we have to do if we would help to heal the breaking hearts of those about us and bring courage to those who have been hurt almost beyond endurance by the dark inscrutable mysteries of life. So shall we be men in the highest and noblest sense, and grow stronger each day in the strength of God's spirit. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1941.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LISTER HILL, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

PAT HARRISON,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon, Mr. HILL took the chair as acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, March 27, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gerry	Radcliffe
Aiken	Gillette	Reed
Andrews	Glass	Reynolds
Austin	Green	Russell
Bailey	Guffey	Sheppard
Ball	Gurney	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hatch	Smathers
Barbour	Hayden	Smith
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Byrnes	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McNary	Tydings
Caraway	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Van Nuys
Connally	Murray	Wallgren
Danaher	Norris	Wheeler
Davis	O'Mahoney	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
George	Pepper	Willis

Mr. ADAMS. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr.

WALSH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4 and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3835. An act to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use;

H. R. 4125. An act to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members and certain members of the Reserve components thereof from selective training and service;

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4183. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

THE LATE SENATOR LUNDEEN OF MINNESOTA—RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have the honor to present two separate resolutions adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii expressing regret at the death of the Honorable Ernest Lundeen, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Almighty God, in His divine providence, on the 31st day of August 1940, did take from this life the Honorable Ernest Lundeen, a Senator in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas the Honorable Ernest Lundeen was an earnest and sincere friend of the Territory of Hawaii, having visited these islands on several occasions and having studied, at first hand, the affairs and conditions here, and advocating the passing of legislation beneficial to the Territory, and showing in every possible manner, his love and "aloha" for this Territory, and opposing most strenuously every effort to injure and to mitigate against the welfare and progress of this Territory; and

Whereas as a Member of the Senate of the United States, he was a sincere and forceful champion of peace, hewing to this principle in the face of ridicule and scorn; and

Whereas in his untimely death, the Territory of Hawaii has lost a sincere and loyal friend; the American Nation, a loyal and distinguished citizen; his native State, a loyal son, and his family, a kind and loving parent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, does hereby express its sincere and deep regret at the passing of the Honorable Ernest Lundeen; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the records of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1941, and that a certified copy be forwarded to the widow of the late Honorable Ernest Lundeen.

Whereas in the untimely death of the Honorable Ernest Lundeen, United States Senator from the State of Minnesota, the people of the Territory of Hawaii have lost a warm and constant friend, whose interest in the Territory was keen and always friendly and whose efforts in Hawaii's behalf were always genuine and helpful: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Twenty-first Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii that it hereby expresses its gratitude for the many kind services of the late Honorable Ernest Lundeen, and its profound sorrow in his untimely passing; be it further

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of this resolution be forwarded to the members of his family.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 36)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1941, amounting to $137,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 38)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1941, for the War Department, for the improvement of existing river and harbor works, amounting to $663,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 37)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1941, for the Federal Housing Administration, totaling $1,148,263, together with a proposed provision relating to the appropriation for administrative expenses of that Administration for the fiscal year 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DATA RELATIVE TO INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects for the fiscal year 1940 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PORTION OF GALLUP-DURANGO HIGHWAY ACROSS THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-first annual report of that organization (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore, or presented by Senators and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A memorial of sundry citizens, members of the Passaic County Units of the New Jersey State Music Project, remonstrating against the lay-off of musicians employed under the W. P. A. music project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A statement of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring an appropriation to provide for the extension of the Upper River Harbor from its present terminus to a point above the Falls of St. Anthony, including necessary and essential alteration of the bridges over the Mississippi River in that area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Tonawanda, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 1036, embodying the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Monongahela Valley Industrial Union Council (C. I. O.), Charleroi, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide more adequate and liberal old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of Local Union No. 1190, United Mine Workers of America, of Ellsworth, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide more adequate and liberal old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens, composing the Finnish Relief Committee, Abel Maki, chairman, of the towns of Chatham, Eben, and Rumely, Mich., praying that the United States grant a loan to Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of East Chicago, Ind., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the board of trustees of the Anti-Saloon League of Louisiana, in session at New Orleans, La., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of Local No. 81, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of Pittsburgh, Pa., endorsing the so-called Mead bill (S. 220) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa memorializing Congress for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs. (See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on the 27th instant.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to repeal or modify the Embargo Act of 1927, relating to importation of meats from foreign lands

"Whereas, as a result of repeated outbreaks in this country prior to 1927 of the dreaded cattle disease known as 'rinderpest,' or 'foot-and-mouth disease,' there was enacted in that year a congressional embargo upon the importation into this country of dressed meats and meat products from any country where said disease exists; and

"Whereas prior to the imposition of the embargo the spread of that disease in this country demoralized the domestic livestock industry, seriously jeopardized the public health and resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars by Federal and State Governments and by the livestock industry for the eradication of that evil; and

"Whereas the wisdom of that congressional embargo, embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, has been indubitably justified as attested by the fact that since January 1, 1927, there has been only one minor outbreak of that disease—in the State of California in 1929—which outbreak has since been traced directly to a violation of Federal regulations relating to the unloading of certain materials; and

"Whereas there is increasing evidence from authoritative sources that a serious attempt is now under way to influence the President of the United States and Congress to circumvent or remove the embargo upon the importation of dressed meats and meat products for the benefit of certain foreign nations in which the said livestock disease is prevalent; and

"Whereas any modification of that embargo would be inimical to the best interests of this Nation and would cause a recurrence of the evils existing prior to 1927 as enumerated above; and

"Whereas the agricultural and livestock industry of this Nation is playing, and must continue to play, a vital and indispensable part in the program of national defense, and nothing would more seriously affect that burden and the program of national defense than a relaxation of the existing barriers to the importation of infected livestock: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in regular session assembled, That we hereby respectfully and earnestly importune the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, for reasons herein stated, to resist any attempts and to refrain from any action designed to repeal, circumvent, or modify the Embargo Act of 1927, relating to the importation of dressed meats and meat products from foreign lands in which there is prevalent the livestock foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved March 24, 1941.

"HAROLD E. STASSEN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the Georgia House of Representatives, is interested in the farmers of the South;

"Whereas the cost of producing farm commodities has been raised;

"Whereas industry has been stepped up and has a bright future: Be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States of America support Senator BANKHEAD of Alabama's plan to put a floor under basic farm commodities including tobacco, to bring the farmer's income up to full parity.

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary Wickard, and both Houses of Congress.

"Read and adopted March 12, 1941."

"Whereas it is agreed that the farmers of Georgia are the most talked of group during elections and legislative sessions, and their welfare and plight discussed, and very little, if anything, ever done about the farmers' general welfare: Be it, therefore,

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States now in session take notice of the tillers of the soil, our farmers, and use their very best efforts to enact all legislation for the benefit of the farmers of our State and Nation, and to study the feasibility of enacting some form of legislation, embodying a pension plan for all farmers over 60 years of age who have been real dirt farmers for a period of at least 30 years.

"Read and adopted March 14, 1941."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 13

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the Honorable President of the Senate, and to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in the fifteenth regular session assembled, does most respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Honorable ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, has introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, now in session, H. R. 87, amending the act of Congress approved June 6, 1924, entitled, "An act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled 'An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes, approved June 6, 1924,' and providing particularly against seizure of boats and gear used in fishing, until the owner or operator shall have been convicted of illegal fishing; and

"Whereas we believe that this bill fairly reflects the views of a large majority of the people of this Territory upon the subject covered; and

"Whereas this subject has been before Congress for a number of years and the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska has memorialized Congress to change the fishing laws so as to permit a person charged with illegal fishing to have his case tried in court before his boat and gear are confiscated, since it is the practice for officers of the Bureau of Fisheries to arrest fishermen on the charge of illegal fishing, confiscate their boats, and then inform them that if they will agree to plead guilty and pay a fine their boats will be released; that the fine required to be paid is not the judgment of a court but is fixed by representatives of the Bureau of Fisheries, and the defendant is informed that, unless such a fine is collected, the boat will not be released; and

"Whereas, because of the very short fishing season in Alaska, it is possible to deprive the fisherman of his entire season's labor and revenue by tying up the said boat and gear during the open season and thereby again penalizing him without giving him an opportunity to be heard; and

"Whereas no good citizen wants—and fishermen, as a whole, are good citizens—to be branded as a criminal, and it is very unfair for any Government officer to, in effect, blackmail such citizens into being criminals by having them plead guilty, when the only alternative is that if they do not so plead they will be unduly penalized by not being permitted to follow their business during the short fishing season; and

"Whereas this question was considered by the Joint Committee on Marine and Fisheries in their investigation of the fisheries of Alaska, which was held during the summer of 1939, which committee has reported favorably to an amendment of the law in this respect: Now therefore,

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, most respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to enact the said H. R. 87, of the present session of Congress, into law.

"And your memorialists will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, March 3, 1941."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 1

"Memorializing Congress to initiate a movement to give silver a standing in the monetary system of the United States of America as a basic money, at a given ratio of silver to gold.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the people of this State and this Nation are interested in procuring some basic money which will freely pass current to help enlarge the trade of the United States with foreign countries; and

"Whereas some foreign countries are depriving the United States of its rightful share of world trade by a system of controlled and managed money and by the use of exchange and barter of the products of such various nations instead of the use of money; and

"Whereas, previous to now, discoveries of gold and silver deposits have been made only where surface indications gave unquestionable evidence of their presence; and

"Whereas if a proper price for these metals is provided through the monetization of

silver, deposits of gold and silver now hidden beneath the surface of the earth will be opened; and

"Whereas all efforts heretofore made in the direction of currency stabilization have been based upon the theories which failed to provide for the remonetization of silver; and

"Whereas in order to relieve the present world-wide depression it is necessary either to provide for extension of debt payments and moratorium on them, or to provide for a managed currency, or to provide coinage of gold and silver in some relation to each other; and

"Whereas the coinage of gold and silver is the best course; and

"Whereas it appears necessary for the purpose of acquiring or retaining trade with various countries by the United States that a system of money be adopted which is readily available to the various countries with whom the United States trades; and

"Whereas the United States of America, over a period of time, has purchased domestically mined silver at a fixed price pursuant to act of Congress; and

"Whereas the Congress has treated silver as a commodity instead of a monetary basis of metallic money; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has, through relief and welfare measures, attempted to alleviate the result of unemployment throughout the United States; and

"Whereas, because of the low price of silver, many mines in the United States have been unable to operate and consequently many thousands of miners have been thrown out of employment and their wives and children and themselves have become dependent on relief; and

"Whereas when the silver mines close down, the smelters, which are the largest consumers of coal within the State, curtail production which in turn materially affects the railroads and their employees. That the families of the coal, silver miners, and railroad employees become dependent upon relief. That local farmers who find a ready market among the miners and the railroad men lose their markets so that the closing of silver mines affects not only the silver miners, but also the coal miners, railroad men, the farmers, and the Nation in general. All classes then become at least partially dependent upon relief and the burden thereby is upon the entire State or States; and

"Whereas the making of silver as a part of the monetary system of the United States at a given ratio to gold would stabilize the mining industry and allow reemployment of miners, railroad men, and lessen the relief load: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That we earnestly recommend the enactment of legislation by Congress for the use of silver in our monetary systems as a basic money, thereby increasing the supply of metallic money for use as a circulating medium and as a base for currency and credit at a ratio to gold as hereinabove provided; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United Sates, the Congress of the United States, the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah, and to the Governors of the various States, with the request that the said Governors submit it for action by the legislators of their States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"To the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress for the Territory of Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in fifteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas the Niukluk River is a tributary of Fish River on Seward Peninsula, in the second division of the Territory of Alaska, and is north of 64° latitude and consequently frozen during the greater part of every year; that during the lesser period of the year, when it is open and running, the ordinary state is for the water to be low with numerous bars and shoals; that freight is transported up the river to the community of Council, which is situated on the banks of the Niukluk River about 12 miles above its point of confluence with Fish River; that for such transportation flat power scows are used, but traffic is possible only at certain stages of the water, and auxiliary horse or tractor power on shore is required to cross bars and shoals; and

"Whereas the bed of the Niukluk River, its benches, the beds of its tributaries and their benches, are in a highly mineralized zone and have been the scene of mining operations since the early days of gold discoveries on Seward Peninsula. From the bed and benches of Ophir Creek, a tributary of Niukluk River several miles above Council, Alaska, some of the most phenomenal gold recoveries in Alaska's history were made; and

"Whereas from the time of the first discoveries of gold in the vicinity of Council, Alaska, prospectors and miners have located and held by mineral location much of the area of the bed and benches of the Niukluk River and its tributaries and mined many portions in the firm belief that the locations were proper and the mining, extraction, and disposition of gold therefrom legal and proper; and

"Whereas in 1940 the United States Government, by and through the office of the United State attorney at Nome, Alaska, instituted an action in the district court at Nome to restrain and prohibit any further mining and extraction of gold from the bed of the Niukluk River from its confluence with Fish River to a point about 12 miles upstream; that is, as far as Council, Alaska. Such action is based on the contention that this 12-mile portion of the Niukluk River is a navigabie stream and is consequently not open for mineral location nor subject to mining or the extraction of gold therefrom. That as a result of the commencement of such action, or anticipating its commencement, owners and lessees of some mineral claims embracing part of the area concerned have been required as a reasonal business practice to alter their plans for mining; other owners have had their claims mined by third parties, ignoring locations; other owners have had options and agreements abandoned because of the uncertainty created; and other litigation has been instituted in the district court at Nome between claim owners and those ignoring their rights; and

"Whereas any curtailment of mining or avoidable interference with it in the vicinity of Council is to the immediate detriment of the residents of that section and of the Territory of Alaska. The single industry of the Council area is gold mining, and the residents and inhabitants are dependent upon it. The river area concerned has been under mineral location for more than 30 years, mining done thereon, and locaters have expended large amounts of money and much labor in the doing and performing of annual assessment work. That no action was taken by the Government until 1940 to indicate that the rights of locaters were nonexistent and their expenditures and labors futile. The shallowness of the ordinary water of the Niukluk River, the numerous sand bars, and the frozen condition of the river during the greater part of each calendar year makes it doubtful that the portion of the stream concerned is navigable in the sense intended by law: Now therefore

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that appropriate legislation be introduced and enacted by the Congress of the United States whereby the Niukluk River would be declared a nonnavigable stream.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 6, 1941."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 12

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to provide for payments to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax revenue resulting from the use of certain lands by the United States of America

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"Whereas the United States has acquired either by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, large areas of land in Montana that were once in private ownership and subject to taxation; and,

"Whereas the State and county governments have lost all tax revenue therefrom, while at the same time there have been substantially the same governmental expenses for the area of territory where the lands are situate since the taking of such lands off of the tax rolls; and,

"Whereas it is the belief of your memorialists that the United States should reimburse the counties for the loss of tax revenue on account of the taking of such lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, hereby does request and petition the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to reimburse each county of the State of Montana for the loss of all tax revenue on account of the use by the United States of all those lands which were once in private ownership and subject to taxation by the State and county governments, and which have been acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, by the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, and that they and each of them be and they hereby are requested to use all means within their powers to bring about the passage of such legislation.

"Approved, March 8, 1941.

"SAM C. FORD, *Governor*."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Library:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"To the honorable Legislative Assemblies of the State of Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, and the Congress of the United States:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully request and petition as follows:

"Whereas the year 1943 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of

civil government in the West, and the blazing of the Old Oregon Trail from Independence, Mo., to the Willamette Valley in the old Oregon Country by that historic covered-wagon train which won an empire for the United States; and

"Whereas the migration of 1843 and those which followed made imperishable history for America; and

"Whereas all of the States through which the Old Oregon Trail passed are rich in the history and traditions of that heroic period: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby respectfully request and petition that you join with the State of Oregon in a proper observance of the year 1943, that the heroic deeds of the intrepid pioneers who blazed the trail to the Pacific coast may not be forgotten, and that the name of the Old Oregon Trail may be enshrined forever in the heart of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon transmit copies of this joint memorial to the legislative assemblies and Governors of all Oregon Trail States, to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Member of the Oregon delegation in Congress."

A senate resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas the President of the United States of America has called upon all citizens to cooperate in the Government's program of national defense; and

"Whereas in order to carry on the said national-defense program the Government is now called upon to raise large and unusual sums of money other than by way of taxation; and

"Whereas a large portion of the defense program of the Nation must be paid for by the issuance of Government bonds, as heretofore announced by the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1941, That the Senate approves the national-defense program of the Federal Government and calls upon and urges all of the residents of the Territory to support any bond issue for national defense and to purchase said bonds so offered, to the end that the national-defense program may be carried on to its necessary conclusion and that thereby the liberties which we enjoy under a democratic form of government and the "American way" of life, may be guaranteed and secured to the people of the United States; and, be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 9

"Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, through House Joint Memorial No. 5, requested the President and Department of the Navy of the United States to perpetuate the name 'Battleship Oregon' by conferring upon a fighting unit the honor of such name; and

"Whereas the Department of the Navy of the United States has advised that names have been designated for all of the battleships of the United States now under construction and that the name 'Battleship Oregon' is not now available for use as the name to be conferred upon any battleship owing to the fact that a present unit of the naval force is now so named and is classified as a 'naval relic'; and

"Whereas in order that the naval traditions may be carried out by a naval fighting unit perpetuating the fighting name which has heretofore been associated with the name 'Oregon': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of these United States, the Congress thereof, and the Naval Department thereof be memorialized as follows, to wit:

"That the name of the old illustrious battleship *Oregon* be changed to the name 'Illustrious Oregon,' and that there be conferred upon the first available battleship not heretofore named the honor of bearing the name 'Battleship Oregon.'"

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable John M. Carmody, Federal Works Administrator, and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully submits that,

"Whereas that the large and increasing number of families coming to Alaska to establish permanent homes cannot be satisfactorily located, nor can the use of agricultural and other natural resources be adequately planned until the widely separated communities with their local roads which now characterize Territorial development, are joined together and thus given outlets to ocean shipping ports on the southern Alaska coast by means of a well-conceived system of trunk highways, and

"Whereas the lack of such a trunk system of highways has kept Alaska transportation costs of supplies and equipment used in mining, farming, and other enterprises at fantastic figures which seriously hold in check the settlement of the Territory and the utilization of its natural resources, and

"Whereas the extensive agricultural areas of the Matanuska Valley, the Kenai Peninsula, and the Tanana Valley should especially be supplied with trunk highway transportation that would promote the production of food supplies for use at nearby military bases, and

"Whereas the proposed transfer of the ocean terminus of the Alaska Railroad from Seward to Passage Canal and the abandonment of 66 miles of railroad line as a result of such transfer, will cut off the Kenai Peninsula with an area of 9,200 square miles from any land transport connection with other sections of the Territory and thereby cause a great loss to the town of Seward and other towns and villages, community centers, mining operations, farms, resorts, and miscellaneous enterprises of the Kenai Peninsula, and isolate a $2,000,000 system of local roads and discourage further settlement, unless provision is immediately made to replace the railroad with a highway connection, and

"Whereas a road connection about 30 miles in length in addition to a 2-mile rock fill across the head of Turnagain Arm, would join the system of the Kenai Peninsula to that of the Anchorage area and serve to ameliorate the bankrupting effect that will result as a loss of such railroad facilities, and

"Whereas a road about 180 miles in length to connect the Forty Mile Mining District with the Richardson Highway would not only give this old and important section of Alaska access by road to the other parts of the Territory, but would also traverse throughout its entire length a mineralized area whose development would undoubtedly add to the available mineral wealth of Alaska; and

"Whereas any proposed trunk highway program would contemplate the construction of the connecting links referred to and also take into account the advisability of having an ocean outlet at Haines or a connecting international highway to the States that would bind together the principal industrial area of Alaska with overland transportation: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States authorize and instruct the Public Roads Administration to make preliminary surveys and studies for a trunk highway that will link together the local roads serving the larger communities of Alaska so that they will be provided with one or more adequate highway outlets to ocean shipping ports on the south coast of the Territory and to the States and to make a report to Congress with a recommendation as to the manner of constructing such trunk system of highways by the United States in cooperation with the Territory of Alaska, in a manner similar to that now provided for in the construction of highways in the several States under the Federal Highway Act.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House February 10, 1941."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial of the State of New Mexico and the fifteenth legislature thereof, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, relating to the construction of livestock trails in the national forest

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the construction of well-defined livestock trails in and through the national forests of the State of New Mexico, and from and through the lands belonging to the United States leased for grazing purposes, to the public highways of the State is a necessity to the livestock industry, and to the preservation of the national forest and grazing lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the President of the United States of America and the Congress of the United States of America be and the same are very respectfully memorialized and petitioned in the name of the State of New Mexico and the fifteen legislature thereof to make provision for the construction of such trails as soon as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress.

"Signed by me this 25th day of March 1941.

"JOHN E. MILES,
"Governor of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Whereas there has been introduced before the Congress of the United States, S. Res. 82, by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado, which is a resolution to investigate the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission ordering the abandonment of the narrow-gage railroad between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex., known as the Chili Line; and

"Whereas said resolution authorizes the creation of an investigation into the acts and

practices of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Co. in its operation of said branch line; and

"Whereas the people of the southern part of the State of Colorado have protested vigorously the abandonment of said branch line; and

"Whereas the actions of any organization and organizations agreeing to, concurring in, or recommending the abandonment of said branch line is not representative of the true public opinion of the citizens of southern Colorado, but represents only the action of a small clique or group interested in said abandonment; and

"Whereas pending the adoption of said resolution, the original date for abandonment of said branch line has been extended for a period of forty (40) days: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-third General Assembly (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and urged to adopt Senate Resolution 82, to the end that a thorough and complete investigation may be had or the facts and circumstances surrounding the said abandonment order and its eventual cancelation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Senators and Representatives of the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A house memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the Honorable President of the Senate and to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in the fifteenth regular session assembled, does most respectfully submit that:

"Whereas the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska now consists of eight members, two from each of the four judicial divisions into which Alaska is now divided by act of Congress, elected biennially for terms of 4 years each at the regular election from each division; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska covers such a vast area, and the population of same is so very scattered, the number of senators now representing their respective judicial divisions is not adequate to deal with the legislation coming before that body; and

"Whereas it is now possible for 4 votes in the senate to defeat a bill, which may have been passed unanimously by the house of representatives, consisting of 16 members: Now therefore

"We, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully petitions that the Congress of the United States enact an amendment to the organic act, whereby the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska shall consist of 12 members, 3 from each of the 4 judicial divisions of Alaska; 1 member to be elected for a period of 2 years only, and 2 members to be elected as at present.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, March 13, 1941."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., favoring the enactment of the so-called General Welfare Act providing for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TAFT:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of members of the Official Board of Finksburg Methodist Church of Carroll County, and sundry citizens of Cumberland, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House resolution relative to the pollution of the Potomac River

"Whereas in the vicinity of Washington untreated sewage and other waste material are being dumped into the Potomac River, making said river insanitary and injuring its scenic and recreation possibilities; and

"Whereas these conditions should be remedied: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the health departments of the States of Maryland and Virginia and the proper authorities of the city of Washington be and they are hereby requested to take whatever steps may be needed to remedy the above-mentioned conditions; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress be and they are hereby requested to request the proper United States and District of Columbia officials to render any assistance possible for improving the insanitary conditions in the Potomac River; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of these resolutions to the State departments of health of Maryland and Virginia and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress."

(Mr. RADCLIFFE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., and signed by the mayor of that city on March 25, 1941.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Midwest is vitally concerned in a deep-water outlet to the high seas. The State of Wisconsin, having 22 lake harbors entering the inland oceans, known as the Great Lakes, has championed such a project for many years. The city of Milwaukee, having the largest harbor in point of water-borne commerce on Lake Michigan, has never ceased its efforts to secure the improvement of the St. Lawrence River as an efficient connecting link between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean.

The people of the Midwest are conscious of the fact that a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives them of an economical, expeditious, and free outlet for their factory and farm products to the markets of the world. The deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel, as advocated by successive Presidents of the United States, will prove an economic advantage to the Nation as a whole. It will bring the Midwest a thousand miles nearer the high seas and that much nearer to the markets of the world.

While the project must be regarded as one of the highest importance under normal conditions, it assumes a special significance at a time when the Nation is deeply concerned in the same as a defense measure. While the eastern section of the country is seeking more power service, the Midwest must have greater navigation freedom.

There can be no doubt that the great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region forms a vital part of an entire Nation, and therefore should not be hampered or hindered in rendering a maximum service. The shipbuilding industry in the Great Lakes region deserves encouragement. Such industries not only have their advantage in being centrally located, but at a time when the Nation is dealing with the matter of defense they are more secure if located in the midcountry.

Thus the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project does not only possess power potentialities, navigation advantages, but also forms an important factor as a defense measure: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee herewith formally and respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as outlined by the President of the United States and thus remove the economic barriers which now afflict the Midwest country and the Nation as a whole; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of the foregoing preamble and resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives of the National Congress, and to the mayors of the important sister cities throughout the United States.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROAD FUND—RESOLUTION OF THE IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GILLETTE. The General Assembly of the State of Iowa has memorialized Congress for the liberalization of regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the farm-to-market road fund. I present the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and printed in the RECORD under the rule.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 17

Whereas the forty-eighth general assembly passed an act creating what is known as the farm-to-market road fund and initiated appropriate legislation for the handling thereof, and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Roads controls the expenditure of the money allocated by the Federal Government to match State funds provided for the same purpose, and any roads so built must be constructed in harmony with their specifications. This has resulted in the feeling that our farm-to-market road program is not being advanced as fast as was originally hoped it would be: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring),

That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and the Federal Bureau of Roads to liberalize the regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the various States for the purpose of building farm-to-market roads and to particularly liberalize the rules limiting the highways upon which such funds can be expended for the improvement thereof; and

That the various States, through the appropriate authority created by them for that purpose and in Iowa particularly, the State highway commission, rather than the Federal Bureau of Roads; be given more authority to supervise the expenditure of such funds, as may be allocated to a given State for the construction of farm-to-market roads, than they previously have had; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Iowa Member thereof, and to the Federal Bureau of Roads.

I hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was duly adopted by the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa.

REQUEST THAT A BATTLE CRUISER BE NAMED "GETTYSBURG"

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I present a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the Past Presidents Association of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Adams County, Pa., signed by its district president and approved by the president and secretary of the main organization, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

WASHINGTON CAMP, No. 22,
PATRIOTIC ORDER SONS OF AMERICA,
New Oxford, Pa., March 24, 1941.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas within Adams County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, lies the hallowed field of Gettysburg, a battlefield upon which was decided on July 1, 2, and 3, 1863, the future destiny of the American Republic; and

Whereas it was here that the almost divine words from the lips of our great President, Abraham Lincoln, dedicated a portion of said field as a resting place for thousands of those who here gave their lives as a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom and liberty; and

Whereas these accomplishments having received world-wide recognition, it is then fitting and proper that the defense agencies of the United States of America should carry upon the high seas along with the Stars and Stripes the name of "Gettysburg": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Past Presidents Association of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Adams County, Pa., do hereby pray that one of the battle cruisers under contemplated construction be named "Gettysburg"; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS, Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, and Hon. HARRY L. HAINES, our Senators and Representative in Congress, urging them to use their influence to carry the provisions of this resolution into effect.

Fraternally submitted,

GEO. D. SHEELY,
District President.

Approved by the above organization.

JESSE C. SNYDER, *President.*
J. B. BUSBEY, *Secretary.*

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 27th instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on Friday, March 28, 1941, during adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3735. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 149).

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. R. 4124. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 150).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following reports were submitted from the Committee on Military Affairs:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 166. A bill to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 152);

S. 167. A bill to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 153); and

S. 658. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 154).

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 793. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 155).

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR (REPT. NO. 151)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. From the Committee on Education and Labor, pursuant to Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, I submit a report on Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, Part IV, the "Little Steel" Strike and Citizens' Committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That 4,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 151, a report of the Committee on Education and Labor submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong.), entitled "Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor," be printed for the use of the Senate Document Room.

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently, from the Committee on Printing, reported the foregoing resolution (S. Res. 92) without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. GILLETTE (for Mr. WALSH), from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy.

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1250. A bill to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce cotton of the 1940 and previous crops which is owned by the Government or which is pledged as security for Government loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BYRNES:

S. 1251. A bill to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULOW:

S. 1252. A bill to amend Public Resolution No. 127, Seventy-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1253. A bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1254. A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1255. A bill to provide for cheaper rail and bus transportation for officers, enlisted men, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard when on leave of absence or furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1256. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Snow;

S. 1257. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Snow; and

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of the Cold Spring Brewing Co. of Cold Spring, Minn., and the Schuster Brewing Co. of Rochester, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1259. A bill to amend section 12 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1260. A bill to establish a Division of Aviation Education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1261. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen cattle having a value of $50 or more in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders, and Henry G. Sanders, her husband; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1263. A bill for the relief of the surviving dependents of Ernest N. Brownfield; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1264. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the rights of the Otoe and Missouri Tribes of Indians to compensation on a basis of guardian and ward; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1265. A bill making it unlawful for any person to change his residence from one State to another for the purpose of avoiding the payment of any judgment for support of

minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1266. A bill for the relief of Etta Houser Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1267. A bill to provide for a study relating to the promotion of the sale and use in South America and Central America of tobacco produced in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1268. A bill to permit members of savings and loan associations and similar institutions to report and pay tax upon their earnings in such institutions in the taxable year in which such earnings accrue and to require such institutions to make an information return as to earnings of their members as is required for interest, rents, and salaries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1269. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Waters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1270. A bill for the relief of Auguste C. Loiseau; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1271. A bill granting a pension to Luther R. Drum;

S. 1272. A bill granting a pension to Rachel Melvina Ann Campbell Frum;

S. 1273. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lelia M. Marple;

S. 1274. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha L. E. Bromberg;

S. 1275. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah Roush; and

S. 1276. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1277. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 1278. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; and

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1280. A bill concerning the qualification of voters or electors within the meaning of section 2, article I, of the Constitution, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or general election for national offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1281. A bill to repeal the provision of law requiring recoupment by the United States of sums advanced by it for school-construction purposes to certain school districts furnishing school facilities to Indian pupils; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1282. A bill to reinstate in the Court of Claims the suits entitled "Eastern or Emigrant Cherokees Against the United States," No. 42077, and "Western or Old Settler Cherokees Against the United States," No. 42078; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. TOBEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 62, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and appears under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3835. An act to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4125. An act to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members and certain members of the Reserve components thereof from selective training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 4183. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. CONNALLY, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 169) to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SILVER LAKE HARBOR AND CHANNEL FROM MANTEO TO OREGON INLET, N. C.—AMENDMENT

Mr. BAILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place, under the heading, "Rivers and harbors," insert the following:

"For improvements at Silver Lake Harbor, N. C., and to provide a channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C., as authorized by the act approved October 17, 1940, $105,000."

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator BARKLEY on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner at Boston, Mass., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner at Indianapolis, Ind., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN ON INVESTIGATION OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the investigation of national-defense expenditures, delivered by Senator TRUMAN on March 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON IN HISTORY-MAKING DAYS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Republican Women of Pennsylvania, at the Barclay Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., March 24, 1941, on the subject, Washington in History-Making Days, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR PART IN PEACE—ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by former President Hoover regarding the part of the United States in peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the Massachusetts Committee of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, held at the Boston Chamber of Commerce on March 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GEORGE A. HILL, JR., ON OIL CONSERVATION

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by George A. Hill, Jr., at San Antonio, Tex., on March 21, 1941, on the subject of Oil Conservation Achievements Through the Medium of State Regulation, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIVATE FLYING OPERATIONS AND ACCIDENTS; AIR-CARRIER OPERATIONS AND SAFETY RECORD, 1936–40

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of private flying operations and accidents, and air-carrier operations and safety record, 1936–40, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER OF THE PRESIDENT TO EMPLOY THE NAVY TO CONVOY VESSELS IN TIME OF PEACE

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum which he had prepared concerning the power of the President of the United States, when the United States is at peace, to employ the Navy to convoy vessels bound to a belligerent, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNION WITH BRITAIN?—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Daily News entitled "Union With Britain?" which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON ON LIKELIHOOD OF UNITED STATES ENTERING EUROPEAN WAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hugh S. Johnson, published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

FINAL REPORT OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 35)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my privilege this morning to present to the President of the Senate the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee, with illustrations. I shall ask that one of the pages deliver the report to the clerk's desk.

The report presented by the T. N. E. C. represents the conclusion of 3 years of work by the committee, which was set up by Public Resolution 113 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. I have asked Mr. Totty to bring into the room the bound volumes of this report because I venture to say that within the compass of these volumes is to be found the substance of the reorganization for peace and democracy which must come after the war.

When this study began, back in 1938, it was commonly asserted by those who were commenting upon the program that the purpose of the study would be to harass, abuse, and destroy free private enterprise. That statement was made in spite of the fact that in the message in which the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, had recommended this study, he said that—

Generally over the field of industry and finance we must revive and strengthen com-

petition if we wish to preserve and make workable our traditional system of free enterprise.

I called the attention of the public to that declaration by the President when our public hearings began. I announced then, and on frequent occasions afterward, that it would be the purpose of the committee to assemble the facts with respect to the concentration of economic power and wealth which were evident to most observers of the national scene, and that this would be done without any "witch-hunting" or any desire to impede business. Our declarations were accepted as the statements of a person who had his tongue in his cheek.

In the first public announcement I made at the time the hearings were opened I said that whether this study would be fruitful of benefit to society, or altogether futile, depended upon two factors—one, the manner in which it would be conducted; two, the manner in which it would be received by the public. Now, after almost 3 years of study, I can say without fear that any person will contradict the statement, that the hearings were conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Before the distinguished chairman of the committee reports on the details of the great work in which he has been engaged, I desire to observe for the RECORD that I think the great statesmanship of the Senator who happens to be the chairman of the committee is the reason why we did not have a "witch hunt," but had a real constructive examination of conditions in the world and in this country. I have not seen the report, and therefore do not know what has been recommended, and I am not certain that I should be able to assent to what has been recommended; but I know that personally I am gratified over the manner in which this great research was handled by the committee; and to the chairman of the committee I pay my compliments and offer my thanks.

A DECLARATION FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind, and, of, course, I deeply appreciate his complimentary reference; but I should be lax if I were not to say that the attitude which he finds in the chairman was to be found also in all the members of the committee. I can say without any reservation whatever that from the beginning to the end the injunction which was made by the President—that we seek the means of reviving competition and free private enterprise—has been followed; and I am happy to say to the Senate that to my mind the outstanding recommendation of the committee's report is its declaration of faith in the system of free private enterprise.

Of course, I should not expect everybody to agree with what appears in the report, nor with what appears in the monographs which have been printed by the committee, nor with the statements made by members of the committee or by witnesses in the hearings; but one thing I do say—that on the part of everybody who was associated with the committee, so far as I have been able to observe, there was a sincere and deep purpose of preserving what we call the democratic way, the American way of life, to use a phrase which has been popularized during recent years.

I said that much would depend upon the way in which this report would be received by the public. We did not capitalize the headlines as we might have done. We did not seek to pillory witnesses as we might have done. We did not seek to obtain the sensational publicity which was quite possible in this study, but we have obtained a wider public notice than it seemed to me it would ever be possible to obtain when the study began. More than 230,000 copies of these monographs and hearings have already been circulated throughout the United States. Universities and high schools, business leaders, executives in the offices of big business, Government officials, Members of Congress in the House and in the Senate, all are sending letters day by day to the office of the committee asking for copies of the reports. The Superintendent of Documents tells me that more of these documents have been sold over the counter, as it were, by the Superintendent of Documents, than of any other Government publication.

Because of the reception which this work has had at the hands of the public, I am hopeful that deep and lasting results will be obtained from it. I feel that I should make acknowledgement here of the splendid cooperation we have received from all the Government departments, and from business and industry as well. The committee, at one period in its proceedings, issued an invitation to organized business to make its own showing. Some businesses responded to that invitation. The petroleum industry, for example, under the guidance of the American Petroleum Institute, gathered a tremendous amount of material, expended a large sum of money, and came before the committee at its public hearings and made presentation of the picture of the oil industry as those who are in charge of that industry believe that picture to be; and there has been a great demand for that picture. The steel industry likewise responded to our invitation, and not only came before the committee with a well-prepared story, but they also brought to us a motion picture to show the degree of development in the steel industry. I could mention others who have cooperated.

We have attempted to give an opportunity of expression to all who have in any way disagreed with any presentation that was made, and one of the monographs now on the press, which will be ready before long, will contain the statements prepared by various industrial groups in comment on or in answer to the statements which appear in the report. We have tried to go about this study in "the American way."

For example, take the insurance industry. The S. E. C. conducted a study of insurance, and presented for the committee, and the committee published, a report of the facts from the point of view of the S. E. C., developed at the hearings and from the questionnaires which were circulated among businesses. That has been printed as Monograph No. 28. Certain insurance companies took exception to some of the statements which were made in that monograph, and a group of them prepared their own statement, and that statement was printed in the record of the hearings. Another statement was made later—I received it only 2 weeks ago—commenting upon certain phases of Monograph No. 28, and the committee has ordered that to be printed as Monograph No. 28–A, setting forth the point of view of the insurance companies themselves.

The work of our committee started out under the direction, as executive secretary, of Mr. Leon Henderson, who later became a member of the S. E. C., and who is now occupying an important role in the national-defense program. When he became a member of the S. E. C. he had to retire from his post as executive secretary of our committee, and his place was taken by Mr. James Brackett, who afterward retired because a better opportunity was offered to him in private business. His place was then taken by Dr. Dewey Anderson. Upon Dr. Dewey Anderson has fallen a great deal of the burden of preparing this mass of material so that it is readily accessible to the public. I wish to pay here my tribute of appreciation to these three men for the splendid work they have done. Dr. Theodore J. Kreps, of the faculty of Stanford University, made a most effective contribution as economic adviser, and many others could be mentioned. All were primarily concerned in developing facts.

Members of the Senate will remember that when the committee was created it was composed of six Members of Congress, three from the Senate and three from the House of Representatives, and officials of six of the executive agencies. In other words, there were 12 members. The executive members had alternates. The late Senator Borah was one of the original members, and former Senator King, of Utah, was likewise one of the original Senate group. Both of them contributed materially to the work of the committee.

On the House side we had the honor of being associated with the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, who just now entered the door of the Senate, but when he realized that I was about to mention his great contribution to the work of the committee he retired, modestly, as is his way.

I ask unanimous consent that I may print as part of my remarks the list of the members of the committee and the alternates, as they served throughout the life of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERSHIP OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Representing the Congress

Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Senator from Wyoming, chairman.

Hatton W. Sumners, Representative from Texas, vice chairman.
William E. Borah, Senator from Idaho.
Wallace H. White, Jr., Senator from Maine, vice Borah.
William H. King, Senator from Utah.
James M. Mead, Senator from New York, vice King.
Edward C. Eicher, Representative from Iowa.
Clyde Williams, Representative from Missouri, vice Eicher.
B. Carroll Reece, Representative from Tennessee.

Representing executive departments and agencies

Justice Department:
Thurman W. Arnold, Assistant Attorney General.
Wendell Berge, Special Assistant to the Attorney General.
Hugh Cox, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, vice Berge.
Securities and Exchange Commission:
William O. Douglas, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.
Jerome N. Frank, alternate, and also vice Douglas.
Leon Henderson, vice Frank.
Sumner T. Pike, vice Henderson.
Federal Trade Commission:
Garland S. Ferguson, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.
Ewin L. Davis, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, alternate.
Department of Labor:
Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics.
A. Ford Hinrichs, chief economist, Bureau of Labor Statistics, alternate.
Treasury Department:
Herman Oliphant, General Counsel, Treasury Department.
Christian Joy Peoples, Director of Procurement, alternate.
Joseph J. O'Connell, special assistant to the General Counsel, Treasury Department, vice Oliphant
Charles L. Kades, special assistant to the General Counsel, alternate.
Department of Commerce:
Richard C. Patterson, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce.
Sumner T. Pike, vice Patterson.
Hon. Wayne Chatfield-Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce, vice Pike.
M. Joseph Meehan, Chief Statistician, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, alternate.
Leon Henderson, executive secretary.
James R. Brackett, vice Henderson.
Dewey Anderson, vice Brackett.
Dr. Theodore J. Kreps, economic adviser.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine, who succeeded Senator Borah upon the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to make a very brief comment in response to what the Senator from Wyoming has been saying.

I was appointed to the committee following the death of Senator Borah. At that time the committee had been functioning for nearly 2 years, and there had been accumulated a tremendous mass of testimony, running into thousands upon thousands of pages. It became clear to me early that by no possibility could I inform myself as to that vast record. I appreciated that even to keep current with the work that was being carried on after I became a member, in the absence of knowledge of what had gone before, was in itself an almost impossible task. I have done what I could, which was little, in the effort to familiarize myself with the proceedings.

Mr. President, I have risen at this time primarily to say that I did not join in the report which has been made, but when a few days ago I announced to the committee that I would not join in the report, I stated that that did not in and of itself indicate hostility to any of the recommendations which might be made. I refused to join in the report because I did not feel sufficiently familiar with the record to justify my expressing at the time either approval or disapproval.

I feel that at some appropriate time in the near future I should make a rather brief statement as to my views concerning the whole undertaking. At this moment I merely wish to pay my respect to the services of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He has shown amazing industry during the 3 years of the life of the committee. He has presided and has conducted the work of the committee with the greatest of fairness. He has shown high intelligence, and I believe he has made a most noteworthy contribution, in this work, to the study of the problems which were before the committee. I cannot speak in too high terms of praise of the service which the chairman of the committee has rendered, and I hope I shall find opportunity in the near future to express myself briefly about the work itself.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator is altogether too generous in his remarks.

I have asked the pages of the Senate to distribute to each Senator a copy of the catalog of the publications of the committee. This has been printed at the Government Printing Office, and contains a brief description of the 32 volumes of hearings and the 43 or 44 monographs which have been printed under the authority of the committee.

The final report, which is now being filed, consists, first, of an analysis of our situation, and the recommendations which are made by the committee. Each recommendation shows at its conclusion the names of those members of the committee who expressed dissent. This has been followed by separate statements which have been prepared by some members of the committee setting forth their personal points of view of the analysis of our economic problems. This will be accompanied by a brief history of the committee itself, and a financial statement.

It may be interesting for me to remark that the entire appropriation used during these 3 years amounted to $1,070,000. That is a large sum of money. The committee goes out of existence on the 3d of April, leaving a balance of something like $8,000, a portion of which perhaps I shall ask the Senate and House to allot so that inquiries which are now coming in may be properly answered. These letters asking for information with respect to this report and this study, are coming at the rate of at least 150 a day, illustrating, as I said a moment ago, the wide degree of public interest in the report.

In addition to the recommendations and the history of the committee, there will be also the verbatim record of the public sessions, beginning on January 15 of this year, at which the recommendations were publicly presented and publicly discussed. Many of the recommendations which were there presented have not been adopted, but in that verbatim record will be found a discussion from many points of view of the fundamental problems of our economy.

Finally, contained in this report, will be the report to the committee itself of the executive secretary and his staff. That will boil down, as it were, the facts which have been gathered throughout the long period of the study.

A CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY

Mr. President, I should like to add just a few more words with respect to the nature of this report. It is a challenge to democracy. It comes, I believe, at a time when the attention of the democratic governments and the democratic people of America should be concentrated upon this problem of living for people. If the war which is now raging in the world means anything, and if the enthusiasm which wells up in our hearts when we read of the valor of the Greeks and the courage of the Yugoslavs means anything, it means that as a people we recognize the fact that government and business have come into existence to serve men.

If the resistance of the people of America to the thought of agression means anything, it means that here in America the great mass of our people believe that individual men and women have the right to live their own lives without being regimented by any small group. That, Mr. President, is the essence of the problem which is presented not only to this country but to the world. It is a problem of fitting individuals into an organized economy.

We have pointed out that the organization here in Washington of this tremendous defense effort is the conclusive proof of the concentration of economic power and wealth which this committee was appointed to examine.

Mr. President, I had hoped to have here in the Senate today at the time I was making this brief statement, an enlarged copy of the map which appeared in the issue of Life, which is on the newsstands this week. Let me use these copies of Life. The map shows the "war babies" of the United States, to use the title of the editors of Life. It shows not only that the new plants are built by Government money, but also the location of all the war industries which have come into existence as a result of this all-out effort here in Washington. If Senators will glance at that map they will see that the tremendous sum of money which the Government of the United States is now spending for defense goes to those States and those communities in which industrial concentration first took place. Senators who have taken part in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee during the last few weeks have been impressed by the fact that from every corner of this land have

come pleas from the peoples of various States for the allocation to those States of Government funds to build up industries in those States. A glance at the map will show that the entire Middle West is practically without any allocation of Government funds for purposes of defense.

In the committees' report Senators will find a table prepared by one of the economists serving with the Council of National Defense, showing that three States in the Union have received no allocation whatsoever; that 50 percent of the States have less than half of the total expenditure; and that upon the other side of the scene, six States have received 52 percent of all the Government funds which have been distributed for the defense effort.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to ask the Senator if he can tell us who is responsible for that great concentration in the location of these war industries? Is it a matter of war strategy to put them all in one location, so that if the enemy landed here he could in a short time obtain control of all of them, or if enemy airplanes came over here they could perhaps put them all out of business in a day or in a night?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama is referring to one of the most difficult phases of the defense program. Our plane manufacture, for example, is concentrated in southern California, and that concentration has resulted in the fact that to the State of California has been allocated more than 11 percent of all the funds which have been contracted for under the defense program. That concentration of airplane manufacture in California has been due to a variety of factors, but the most important of them is that the executives in the aircraft industry have reported to the Council of National Defense, and to the War Department and the Navy Department, that they do not have the superintending personnel to distribute to various parts of the country.

I think a glance at the map will show that the Senator from Alabama has pointed to a very serious problem of military strategy. Airplane factories upon the Pacific coast are, of course, readily open to attack. If it be true that there is danger of Nazi penetration in South America, airplane attacks from below our southern border could easily concentrate on that Pacific coast area. Here, directly east of the Rocky Mountains, in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, we have an ideal area, right behind the rampart of the Rocky Mountains, to protect industrial plants of that type from attack.

STATES AND PEOPLE TURN TO WASHINGTON

Mr. President, I had not intended to make any reference to that matter until the Senator from Alabama arose and gave me the opportunity. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] was also kind enough to rise in his place, and in response to the suggestion in his eyes, I referred to my own State of Wyoming, which is an ideal location for plants of that kind.

Mr. President, that is not the point, however. To me it is one of the saddest things in our economy, and it is pointed out in the committee report that chambers of commerce, Governors of States, and mayors of cities have beaten a path to Washington asking the executive department to allocate to their States defense industries or Government projects of one kind or another in order to solve the local problem of unemployment, in order to solve the local problem of failing business. We turn to Washington for this. We, the people of America, turn to Washington now, because the self-impetus of local business has disappeared. For example, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], a member of the Appropriations Committee, has pointed out that many States are now being drained of their population. Mechanics of all kinds are being taken out of those States and transported to the concentrated plants of concentrated defense industries.

What this picture shows, Mr. President, is that the concentration of economic power and wealth in the hands of big business inevitably leads to concentration in big government. The report now submitted to Congress and to the people is a summons to Americans to restore free private enterprise so that it may spring from the grass roots, as it were. If that is not done, in my opinion there can be no hope of averting the continued erection of a tremendous concentrated structure.

What we must understand is that the modern economy is dominated by group activity, and not by individual activity. The Greeks and Yugoslavs in Europe are opposing their poor bodies to the mechanized instruments of concentrated government. We have seen the impossibility of individuals successfully opposing themselves to concentrated force; and that picture in industry is the picture which will be presented to us in peace.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that there may be in these volumes the last challenge to democracy, the last challenge for the establishment of an economic system which will protect the enterprise of the individual. When the Declaration of Independence was drafted and the Constitution of the United States was adopted, in both instances the founders of this Government declared to all the world and to all posterity that they were seeking to establish a government which would protect men in their inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But individuals cannot compete with highly organized modern industry. The mechanic of our day does not carry in his kit the tools with which he must work.

We wonder why strikes take place. Strikes take place because men on the side of labor and men on the side of business are looking too closely at the immediate problem, and do not see the distant view. They do not realize that in this country we are trying somehow or other to adjust individual lives to the large-scale economy under which we live.

To bring about the reestablishment of competition and the salvation of free private enterprise the T. N. E. C. has recommended, first, that we recognize that the fundamental purpose of government and business is to be of benefit to the people, and that our modern business is for the most part carried on by organization. We should undertake, by enforcing the antitrust laws, to break down the concentration which crushes business as well as individuals. Ever since 1890, when Senator Sherman, of Ohio, stood upon this floor and introduced the Sherman antitrust measure, so far as I know not a single candidate for the Senate or for the House of Representatives has gone before his electorate to urge its repeal, for it was a declaration of policy by the Government based upon the age-long conviction of our people that combinations in restraint of trade are against public policy. But we know that those combinations have gone on and on and on regardless of the law. The Sherman Antitrust Act has been honored more in the breach than in the observance. So the committee urges the strict enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Some will say that that is an old-fashioned idea. It is no more old-fashioned than our fundamental belief in the rights of human beings; and unless we can make it clear by enforcement of the antitrust laws that combinations privately effected shall not be permitted to crush out local business, we have no recourse except to see the Government establishment at Washington continue to expand.

REGULATION OR CONTROL

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think this is a good point to ask this question with respect to the report. On the point on which the Senator is now speaking, I have always felt that there is a vast difference between regulation and control by government. I ask the Senator whether this great committee came to the conclusion that we ought to change our theory in that respect, we having held as a Government up to this time that regulation should be our objective, maintaining the maximum degree of competition under the minimum degree of Government control. Are we advised by the committee to make a change in the degree of control by Government over private enterprise, a change which would amount to management on the part of the Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator has asked that question, because the answer is that in the view of the committee the desirable objective is not control, but regulation. There should be only that degree of regulation which is necessary to preserve the public interest and protect business and the citizens of the Republic from the unhappy and improper activities of those who have heretofore evaded the law. I think the statement just made by the Senator correctly represents the feeling of the committee. Only that degree of Government regulation should be put

into effect which is necessary to keep the door of opportunity open to the largest possible number. I think that is the feeling of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, the Senator is complaining of present conditions, but he says that present conditions grew up under a system which I presume the committee wants to change. Is there too much control, or too little? Does the committee offer any hope, for instance, that better enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act would bring relief? If the nonobservance of the Sherman Antitrust Act is responsible for the present dilemma, would its observance, rather than its breach, bring relief?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the belief of the chairman of the committee—and I think it is the belief of the committee itself, because of the recommendations which are to be found in the report—that the enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act would materially protect the public interest and materially alter the conditions of which we complain. Let me not be understood as saying that the Sherman Antitrust Act is responsible for this condition. It is not. I believe it is the lack of enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act which is responsible.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator to say that. I think I correctly understood him. Does the committee think the undesirable condition which has grown up has come about because of too much regulation or too little?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, because of too little regulation.

In my response to the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, I was attemping to develop the difference between regulation and control. The ideal of free enterprise, the ideal of democracy, the ideal of individual activity, is an ideal which calls for the least possble exercise of Government authority to direct and control. Speaking for myself, I say that regimentation by big business is responsible for the movement toward regimentation by government; and I will give the Senator an example.

In our hearings upon the patent industry, we had testimony—this story was told under the direction of the Department of Justice; and Mr. Hugh Cox, now the alternate member of the Department of Justice upon the T. N. E. C., was in general charge of the presentation of that story, and it was a perfectly magnificent job—the testimony there demonstrated beyond any possibility of dispute that an organization in Hartford, Conn., the Hartford Empire Co., holding certain patent rights, was effecting throughout the United States its own rules with respect to production and price. Milk bottles could be manufactured only to the degree that this organization at Hartford, Conn., would permit. I have a very clear memory of the day when a witness from Texas appeared before the committee to tell the story of how he had been closed out in his effort to establish a milk-bottle industry in a certain town in Texas. I have forgotten the name of the town. He was using a certain type of machine, not the machine upon which the Hartford Empire Co. had its patent, but a machine that was patented by an altogether different concern; but when he set up his factory and undertook to manufacture milk bottles, because he found he could manufacture them cheaper than they were being sold by the manufactories which held licenses from the Hartford Empire Co., he received an inquiry from Hartford, Conn., and presently an agent notified him that there was grave danger that he was infringing the Hartford Empire Co.'s patent, and asked if he would not be good enough to come to Hartford to discuss the matter. He went to Hartford. It is a long story, but the outcome was simply that he could not comply with the requirements which the Hartford Empire Co. laid down, and he had to close the doors of his factory because he could not afford to litigate the case.

I said to him, "Where did you get the capital with which you started this glass-bottle factory in Texas?"

"Why," he said, "that was Texas capital. My friends there in Texas raised the money."

I said, "Where did you get the labor?"

"Every man in our factory", he said, "was a native of Texas, save one"—and he had lived in Texas for 15 years, as I recall.

Then I said, "How about the material out of which you manufactured these glass bottles?"

His face lighted up, and he said, "Why, Senator, we have right there upon the borders of that town the greatest deposit of glass sand to be found in America."

So I said to him, "It turns out that Texas capital and Texas labor could not utilize a Texas resource without a certificate of convenience and necessity from a private corporation in Hartford."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to ask a question. In all the enforcement we have had during the past 4 or 5 years under the Sherman Act, has anyone been sent to jail, or have we always had consent decrees?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the Sherman antitrust law provides a penalty of $5,000. It is so inadequate that that is one of the principal reasons why the Sherman antitrust law has not been effective. The consent-decree device is the only alternative under the present law, because the misdemeanor provision has apparently been in effect unenforceable.

The committee has again recommended the remedy which was recommended in the preliminary report, and to carry out which I introduced a bill which went to the Judiciary Committee—a recommendation that the individuals, the officers and directors of a corporation, who knowingly direct any policy that is a violation of the Sherman antitrust law, shall be held personally liable.

When that bill was introduced, and when I appeared at a hearing held by the subcommittee of which the former Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Burke, was the chairman, the emissaries of big business appeared there and held up their hands in holy horror at the thought of what a terrible thing it would be to make responsible for violation of that law, in their personal capacity, the men who plot the violation. That is the reason why the Senator from North Dakota can rise here and ask if anyone has been sent to jail. I will welcome the support of the Senator from North Dakota in bringing about the enactment of a bill such as I have heretofore introduced and such as is recommended here.

So, Mr. President, the feeling of the chairman of this committee is that if the Sherman antitrust law is honestly and vigorously enforced, it will go far toward curing this difficulty. But more important than that, Mr. President—and this is one of the objectives the chairman has had in his mind throughout this study—more important than the enforcement of law is that there shall develop in the minds of the leaders of big business a comprehension of their social responsibility, and of the fact that to protect themselves and their businesses they must abandon forever the practices which have restricted production in order to maintain price, and which have resulted in denuding more than half the States of the Union of self-operating business.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In the light of the past, and judging the future by the past, does the Senator think or can he give expression to the faintest hope that in his day and mine we shall ever have an administration that will have the courage to take action under any law we can pass to stop these monopolistic practices by huge trusts and combinations?

RECORD OF PRESENT ANTITRUST DIVISION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's inquiry, it is only fair to say that under the direction of Mr. Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, the Antitrust Division has been very active and very successful in its enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Judging by the newspapers, I am inclined to believe it has been active chiefly in regard to labor unions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is wrong about that. That was only an incident. The Antitrust Division has brought antitrust suits in various parts of the country; and so effectively have those suits been brought that the persons who were indicted have walked up to the bar and pleaded guilty, or accepted the decree that was laid down. The antitrust prosecutions have been carried on, as the Senator will remember, behind the closed doors of grand juries, so that publicity has not been given to the perfectly splended record which the Department of Justice has made under the present administration.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, does the Senator know of any officers of any

great combinations that have ever gone to jail, as provided in the law, when found guilty of violating it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator asks a question which was just a moment ago asked by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The law does not effectively impose a jail sentence. Juries hesitate to convict. The report of this committee recommends the modification or amendment of the law so that effective penalties may be invoked; and if such penalties are invoked, I believe the time will not be far distant when there can be effective enforcement. But, more important than that, I wish to say that during these 3 years in my contact with the leaders of big business I have found a widespread disposition to recognize the problem, a widespread disposition on the part of business executives to do something to keep free, private enterprise free from big business as well as from government.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It has often occurred to me and I should like to have the Senator's view about it, that when the courts gave corporations the status of a person, enabling them to come before the law on the basis of equality with their creator, the individual citizen, they made the creature as respectable and powerful as its creator; and, so, from year to year over a long period of time, monopolistic combinations have arrogated to themselves more and more power, and to a greater and greater extent have indulged in practices by which they could rob the people, even to the extent of affecting elections and government, thus becoming often more powerful than the government that created them. Does not the Senator think that the courts have had a great deal to do with increasing the power of such combinations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is absolutely no doubt about that; the Senator is quite correct. When the amendment to the Constitution was so interpreted as to clothe the artificial corporate person with the privileges and immunities of a flesh-and-blood person, that was the greatest economic tragedy that ever took place in this country. Let me give the Senator an example.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, does the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Some time ago, during the course of this colloquy, the Senator from Minnesota asked whether or not the Senator from Wyoming thought we would ever have an administration which would have the courage to enforce the Sherman Antitrust Act against large monopolies. I should like to say, of my own personal knowledge, that at this very time the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has cases which are prepared and ready to be submitted to grand juries, but it is unable to proceed with them and to carry on the trial work necessitated by other cases that are going to trial because of the lack of sufficient appropriations from Congress. Congress must bear its share of the responsibility, at least so far as Mr. Arnold is concerned, that more comprehensive work has not been done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has called attention to that fact, because I think it is proper to mention here that Congress has given the present Department of Justice much larger appropriations than were ever given before, but the present administration has asked for more than any previous department ever asked. The President of the United States, in his message which initiated the Temporary National Economic Committee, asked for an appropriation, as I recall, of $250,000 to step up the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Congress has given more than $2,000,000 for that purpose, and every penny of it, and more, too, has been returned to the Treasury in the form of fines which have been paid by those who had been indicted and convicted under the law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will permit a further interruption, despite the record which he has just cited, if more money were today provided more cases could be brought to the attention of grand juries, and more important cases could be brought to trial than it is now possible to try under even the increased appropriations.

INDIVIDUAL HELPLESS BEFORE BIG BUSINESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is, of course, correct; and it is perfectly obvious that if we permit the continued concentration of big business, with which the individual cannot compete, for the individual is helpless before an organization which spans the country—unless we go a step further, we shall see government growing with the same degree that business grows. Then we will find it impossible to evade the final conflict between big business and big government, which is the very cause of the war in Europe.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make another remark for I have to leave the floor? I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator for the work he has been doing and for his remarks. Having watched the trend of the monopolistic practice of industry, and later copied as a national program for agriculture, toward the theory that to produce less and less would give us more and more, so far as industry is concerned, any system of production based upon that theory will destroy industry itself in the long run; but, before it does that, the large corporations—creatures of the Government—will have so much power that they will destroy the creator that created them—the Government itself. I wish again to express my appreciation to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right, and I was about to call his attention to one of the incidents which first aroused my interest in bringing about a study of this kind, which was before I became a Member of the Senate, as I recall, when Mussolini was preparing for the invasion of Ethiopia in the old days of appeasement. One day I picked up a copy of the New York Times, and there, on the front page, as I recall, I saw two stories, one of which came from Rome and the other from London. The story from Rome was that a representative of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was in Rome in negotiation with the government of Mussolini to supply oil from the Rumanian fields for the conquest of Abyssinia. The other story, which was from London, was to the effect that a representative of the Standard Co. of New York—the Socony Vacuum Oil Co., I think it was called at that time—was negotiating with the representatives of Haille Selassie in London for permission to exploit the prospective oil lands in Abyssinia, thus indicating that two great corporations, one of them created by the State of New Jersey and the other created by the State of New York, were entering into contracts of such importance that they affected the activities of two governments that were then at war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Two democracies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was reminded of the fact that the Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall, without the consent of the Congress, enter into any agreement with any other State or with any foreign government. Of course, that prohibition written into the Constitution was intended to govern political activities; it was never the intention of the drafters of the Constitution to prevent or to restrain business activity; but the point is that the great modern corporations are so big and so overshadow the States that they endanger the Federal Government itself.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? Then I shall have to leave the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not want the Senator to leave until I answer his question.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator referred to two governments that were influenced. I assume the Senator referred to the two great democracies of France and Great Britain, which sanctioned and had secretly agreed to the taking of Ethiopia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I was referring to the Government of Italy and the Government of Abyssinia.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then four governments were involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; four governments were involved. That is quite correct.

Before the Senator leaves, I desire to call attention to the chart before me, because it deals so clearly with the point he has in mind. These black lines represent the assessed valuation, real and personal, of the taxable property of every State in the Union. The red lines represent the assets of the thirty $1,000,000,000 corporations which were in existence in 1935. The 2 largest of these are the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. Senators will observe that each of these corporations has assets of about $5,000,000,000, and that there are only 10 States in the Federal Union whose taxable property is greater than the assets of either of these corporations. On the other end of the scale, down at the bottom, we find 16 or 18 States, each of which has taxable property with an assessed valuation less than the assets of the smallest of

these billion-dollar corporations; and I could have included in the chart the $500,000,000 corporations and have made this story much more effective.

There, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, is the picture which illustrates why it is necessary for Members of this body, for Governors and mayors, to come to Washington to ask for Government appropriations to try to stimulate local business.

Let me insert the following list in the RECORD to tell the story on the chart:

Total assessed valuation of States (1937) compared with total assets of 30 "billion-dollar" corporations (1935)

	Billion
New York	25.70
Pennsylvania	12.40
Ohio	8.80
California	7.80
Massachusetts	6.30
Michigan	6.20
New Jersey	6.20
Illinois	5.20
Indiana	5.10
Wisconsin	4.80
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.	4.23
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	3.99
Missouri	3.80
Texas	3.20
Iowa	3.20
Prudential Insurance Co.	3.12
Connecticut	2.90
Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	2.86
Kansas	2.70
Maryland	2.60
Kentucky	2.40
New York Central R. R. Co.	2.35
Chase National Bank	2.33
New York Life Insurance Co.	2.22
North Carolina	2.20
Nebraska	2.10
Minnesota	2.00
Standard Oil Co.	1.89
National City Bank of New York	1.88
Guaranty Trust Co.	1.84
Equitable Life Assurance Co.	1.82
United States Steel Corporation	1.82
District of Columbia	1.78
West Virginia	1.74
Allegheny Corporation	1.73
Southern Pacific Railroad Co.	1.67
General Motors Corporation	1.49
Tennessee	1.47
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.	1.38
Rhode Island	1.36
Louisiana	1.34
Bank of America	1.27
Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York	1.24
Oklahoma	1.22
Commonwealth & Southern Corporation	1.17
Great Northern Railway Co.	1.15
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., Chicago	1.14
Northern Pacific Railroad Co.	1.13
Associated Gas & Electric Co.	1.12
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	1.11
City Service Co.	1.11
Colorado	1.10
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Co.	1.09
Washington	1.08
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.	1.07
Union Pacific Railroad Co.	1.07
Georgia	1.06
North American Co.	1.04
South Dakota	1.03
Banker's Trust Co.	1.03
Alabama	.92
Oregon	.89
Maine	.66
Florida	.60

Total assessed valuation of States (1937) compared with total assets of 30 "billion-dollar" corporations (1935)—Continued

	Billion
New Hampshire	.58
Utah	.52
North Dakota	.49
Mississippi	.44
Arkansas	.43
Idaho	.38
Arizona	.36
South Carolina	.36
Montana	.33
Vermont	.32
Delaware	.31
New Mexico	.29
Wyoming	.28
Nevada	.18

Source: State figures from Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Corporation figures from hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, U. S. Senate, 75th Cong., 3d sess., on S. 10, pt. 4, ibid., pp. 768-773.

My point is, Mr. President, that unless we find a way honestly and actively to stimulate free private enterprise in the local divisions, we cannot possibly avoid the continued growth of government.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The purpose of my interruption is a possible correction. The Senator has stated once or twice that the Sherman antitrust law does not provide for any criminal punishment. That is not my understanding of the law, although the provision for imprisonment is not very severe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The law does make its violation a misdemeanor.

Mr. NORRIS. It makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by a year's imprisonment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have the law right here in my hands.

Mr. NORRIS. I have it before me.

Mr. LANGER. It provides for 1 year's imprisonment and $5,000 fine.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right; but it goes against the corporation, and not against the individual.

Mr. LANGER. No; it goes against the individual also.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood that. I interrupted only because I knew the Senator did not want to have any misstatement of facts in his remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Technically the Senator is quite right. I have been talking about the realistic picture. Of course, it is true that violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act is made a misdemeanor, and there is a punishment. The realistic fact, however, is that when defendants under indictment have appeared before juries and have been accused of some of these violations, which sometimes, it must be confessed, are rather vague, the juries have not found it desirable to invoke the criminal punishment, and the Department of Justice has been thrust back upon the civil penalty. I am very glad the Senator has called attention to that matter.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the jury would not decide whether the punishment was to be fine or imprisonment. That would be the function of the court.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. The jury would simply find the defendant guilty or not guilty; but is it accurate to say that the committee is of the opinion that if the courts, in administering the Sherman law, would send the guilty parties to jail instead of fining them, it would improve the situation?

NEW COMMON UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I think it would have had that effect; but my own personal opinion is that the time has come now to reorient ourselves and to bring about a comprehension in business and in Government and among the public generally that this sort of restrictive activity must come to an end. I feel that that comprehension can be brought about by a common understanding and agreement, because the manner in which the people of America and the business executives are now cooperating for purposes of defense leads me to believe that when the picture is made clear to them, we may expect them to cooperate to reestablish peace and prosperity likewise, because businessmen are coming more and more to realize that there can be no continued expansion of markets while almost one-third of the population are living on meager W. P. A. and other relief appropriations and are not able to buy the things that industry produces. Particularly now, when the leaders of great industries engaged in the manufacture of the products which we need for war are obtaining their appropriations out of the same deep deficit from which the W. P. A. fund was obtained, they must realize, as this report says, that business is on the same level as the reliefer who gets his check from W. P. A. There was a great deal of complaint about an unbalanced Budget when appropriations were being made for the farmer alone and for W. P. A. alone, but now that millions and billions of dollars are being appropriated for the purpose of expanding business and industry, there is no criticism of that kind.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate brought in upon the floor at the last session an appropriation of several million dollars to build a T. V. A. dam, the Cherokee Dam, in order that public money might be used to supply public power for the Aluminum Co. of America in defense—a very necessary and desirable thing. We have just brought in an appropriation, or are about to bring in an appropriation, to expand the Bonneville project in order to provide public power for the Reynolds Co., which is being set up as a competitor with the Aluminum Co. of America; but the Reynolds Co. could not possibly have entered that field if the R. F. C. had not loaned it some $20,000,000 with which to do it. In other words, concentration has come to such a point that private capital cannot enter the field.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, of course I entirely agree with the Senator; but, with his permission, I should like to add that it seems to me the failure of the Sherman antitrust law to help out in this situation has come about to a very great

extent from the lack of activity of the courts themselves in not administering jail sentences when the defendants were found guilty.

I am thinking now of a case decided a year or two ago in Madison, Wis., in which the Government, I understand, spent somewhere in the neighborhood of $250,000 or $300,000 in getting together the evidence and getting ready for trial.

They had indicted many corporations and many individuals who were officers of corporations. The jury found some 40 of them guilty, and the judge sentenced the corporations which were found guilty each to pay a fine of $5,000, and each individual to pay a fine of $1,000. It was just a tap on the wrist. It was merely a license which they would be glad to pay in order to continue in their unholy business. The prosecution did its duty and the jury did its duty; it seems to me the judge fell down in his duty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is quite right.

Mr. President, I have spoken much longer than I had intended, but Senators have been so interested and have asked so many questions, and, of course, I have been glad to respond.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Referring again to the amazingly interesting chart which the Senator exhibited to the Senate, I inquire whether the Senator's committee finds that these enormous corporations, let us say typified by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and the American Telegraph & Telephone Co., are a hazard because of their size per se, and must be dealt with on that basis alone.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President, the committee has made no such statement, and the chairman of the committee has repeatedly said that a big country needs big business. The problem which is posed to the people of the United States, including the business leaders, is how we shall develop a formula by which the necessary public definition shall be made of the duties and responsibilities of these huge organizations. It is with that in mind that the committee has recommended that the country and the Congress give consideration to the principle of national charters for national organizations, because it seems to me, at least, perfectly absurd to believe that the States which have no jurisdiction in the field of interstate commerce can continue to create the agencies which carry it on.

By reference to the list to which I alluded at the beginning, when I showed the map, Senators will find that the State of Delaware, which has created most of these great organizations, is one of the many States receiving a very small portion of the allocations. The people of Delaware do not profit from the big business organizations which Delaware creates to do the business of the entire country.

I remember very well that when the Committee on the Judiciary was considering the bill which Senator Borah and I introduced for the licensing of corporations I pointed out that the Anaconda Copper Co., in Montana, had as one of its subsidiaries the Butte Water Co., a company which supplied drinking water to the people of Butte, and the Butte Water Co. had a charter from the State of New Jersey to do business in Montana.

A NATIONAL RULE FOR NATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The committee recommend to the consideration of the Senate the desirability of establishing national rules to govern the nature of these corporations, because the unlimited charter which is granted by States like Delaware and New Jersey gives an opportunity to bring about this concentration. The idea is not mine, it is not the idea of the committee. It was suggested years ago. Practically every President since Cleveland who has given any attention to this problem has recommended Federal incorporation. President Taft sent a message to the Congress in 1911 recommending permissive Federal incorporation.

Senator John Sharp Williams stood upon this floor at the beginning of the Wilson administration and recommended the Federal licensing of corporations. The administration turned aside and did not adopt the idea. I have no hesitation in saying that if that idea had been adopted then we never would have had the concentration which is now draining the States of the Federal Union.

Mr. President, I am sorry to have trespassed so long upon the time of the Senate, but the matter is of such importance that I have felt it desirable to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the report of the committee and to its contents. I shall not burden the Senate longer now but I ask unanimous consent that I may append at the conclusion of my remarks the table of contents of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing were not present I might ask that the whole report be printed, but it is beyond the rules, so that I shall not ask that it be printed in the RECORD today. I urge the Members of the Senate to obtain and to read the report.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I was interested in a remark just made by the distinguished Senator, when he said that if some years ago we had had a Federal incorporation law requiring corporations such as the insurance companies to have Federal charters there would not now be the concentration of wealth about us. Will he not amplify that a little? Suppose these companies had Federal charters; would they not still have the wealth?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; the concentration has been the result of the fact that the holding company device has been permitted. The Senator knows that the historic point of view with respect to corporations was that they should be strictly limited in their activities. Under the common law, a corporation could not hold the stock of any other corporation. That was the law in the United States until the growth of the national petroleum industry.

If I remember the facts correctly, an attorney general of Ohio was undertaking to enforce the common law against combinations and trusts, and a brilliant lawyer in the East conceived a way around, and persuaded the State of New Jersey to pass a new corporation chartering law which permitted the holding company; and it was there, in that alteration of our fundamental historic attitude toward the corporations, that this great concentration of economic power and wealth emerged to life.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate the Senator's explanation; and I am sorry I have not been present during all his presentation, but I had to be in the Supreme Court to move the admission of a gentleman from my State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Which is one of our important duties.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator outline the character of the Federal statute which he would put on the books?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not do that. As long ago as 1935 I introduced a composite bill, drafted upon the basis of the bill which had been introduced by Senator John Sharp Williams, and based upon the bill recommended by President William Howard Taft. It contained other provisions, intended to bring it more in harmony with present-day conditions. The bill was introduced for the purpose of promoting study of this question and of directing attention to it. My own personal feeling is that I do not regard myself as wise enough to know exactly what such a law should provide.

The principle should be adopted, and the least we should do is to pass a law prohibiting to interstate corporations those powers which we all know are against the public interest.

A GENERAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

I have my own personal recommendation in this report, which I hope Congress may see fit to adopt. This is my recommendation only, not the recommendation of the committee. The committee had no opportunity to study the subject, we had no evidence on it, and therefore I did not ask the committee to act on the matter, but I have included in the report my own personal recommendation that the Congress by law call a conference of business, of labor, of agriculture, and of consumers, so that we may all get together and find a program upon which we can agree, instead of concentrating our attention upon the things with respect to which we disagree, and develop the means by which we may increase production, so that the abundance which nature provides may be distributed among the great masses who need them. I shall be greatly indebted, and gratified, and complimented if the Senator from Wisconsin will read the report, and read the record of the Judiciary Committee, which I shall be very happy to place in his hands, because from my observation of the Senator's actions upon the floor of the Senate, I feel that I may confidently rely upon his support.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one other question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. I came into the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] asked the question in relation to the life insurance companies, and I heard the Senator's reply. Of course, it is not contended, as I understand, that the life insurance companies have gone beyond their authority in relation to investments? I take it there is no such contention. Is there?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, if a Federal charter were granted to a life insurance company, we would have the same condition which now exists, unless investment were limited to the field where the premiums were obtained. That has been talked of. The Senator undoubtedly knows that perhaps that is one way of curtailing a great deal of concentration of wealth. For instance, if an insurance company were to take out of the Midwestern States many millions of dollars a year in premiums, it would be compelled under such a Federal statute to reinvest that money in the Commonwealths from which it was taken. I was wondering if the Senator from Wyoming had any other suggestion as to how there could be a decentralization of that power in case Federal incorporation were required of life insurance companies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the chairman of the committee would not venture to make any suggestions along that line now. Let me say that the committee has not made any recommendations for Federal control or regulation of life insurance companies. Such suggestions were made, but the committee did not adopt them. The committee has made no recommendations, for example, with respect to the investment of insurance company funds in so-called equity securities. The committee has avoided recommendations of that kind largely, I think, because it shared my view that such recommendations would divert attention from the central fact, which is that there must be cooperation among all the people, and among all our statesmen, whether they are in politics or in business, to solve this problem.

The committee did not feel that by bringing in a recommendation with respect to insurance we should terrify, as we would, great numbers of policyholders with the belief that it was the intention by some subtle and back-roads route to take over the assets of the life-insurance companies. That charge was made. It was made when the insurance study first started. The chairman of the committee stood upon the floor of the Senate and denied that there was any such purpose at any time. The report of the committee carries out the statement which was made at the outset. But the report does show the tremendous concentration of assets.

Let me call to the attention of the Senator that on December 31, 1938, the total assets of these life-insurance companies which we studied, amounted to approximately $27,650,000,000.

The magnitude of these figures—

I said in a statement which I released at that time—

will be better understood when it is realized that these assets amount to more than 85 percent of the total assets of all national banks; that they are far in excess of the total savings in all State and National commercial banks, and that they are greater by almost $10,000,000,000 than the combined assets of all the savings banks and all the building and loan associations in the country.

Mr. WILEY. Of course that picture shows one side. When we take into consideration that the assets referred to represent the investment of 70,000,000 policyholders, then we have the other side, which shows that they have selected their own managers, and, unless their managers are at fault, it seems to me the real issue is whether anything should or should not be done to interfere with the 70,000,000 policyholders' rights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, of course, nothing should be done to interfere with their rights, but insurance executives have told me that they, like other businessmen, now are finding it difficult to sell their insurance policies, because so large a proportion of the people of the country are not economically free. Freedom, I will say to the Senator, is not only political freedom, it is economic freedom. Economic freedom is the crux of this issue. It lies at the basis of the World War. It lies at the basis of our effort at national defense. Unless we have the good sense and the power to protect the economic freedom of the masses, I have no hesitation in saying that political freedom is in danger.

Mr. WILEY. I can agree with the Senator's conclusion.

EXHIBIT A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of transmittal.
Concentration of economic power—the challenge to democracy.
- Message from the President of the United States.
  - I. The growing concentration of economic power.
  - II. Financial control over industry.
  - III. The decline of competition and its effects on employment.
  - IV. Competition does not mean exploitation.
  - V. The choice before us.
  - VI. A program.
- General purposes and accomplishments.
- The lower third.
- Passing on the technological gains.
- Personal statement of Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.
- Decentralization of industry.
- The curtailment of production—the stimulating of competition.
- Price discrimination and price-fixing laws.

General economic problems.
- National standards for national corporations and economic organizations.
- Personal statements of Messrs. Reece, Pike, and O'Connell.
- Stimulating investment.
- A program for business and economic research.
- Foreign patent controls over American industry.

Maintaining a free market.
- Resale price maintenance laws.
- The basing-point system.
- Interstate trade barriers.
- Government purchasing.

Antitrust.
- Enforcement of the antitrust laws.
- Legislative changes in antitrust.
  1. Patent laws:
     - (a) Licensing of patents.
     - (b) Unrestricted licenses.
     - (c) Recording of transfers and agreements.
     - (d) Limitation on suits for infringement.
     - (e) Forfeiture of patent for violation.
     - (f) Single court of patent appeals.
     - (g) Limitation on period of patent monopoly.
  2. Trade associations.
  3. Corporate mergers.
  4. Penalties.
  5. Federal Trade Commission as a master in chancery.

Insurance:
- Personal statement of Commissioner Sumner T. Pike, Securities and Exchange Commission.
- Personal statement of Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.
- Personal statement of Senator O'Mahoney, chairman of T. N. E. C. recommending national economic conference.

Appendix A

Major defense contracts awarded by War and Navy Departments, June 1, 1940–February 28, 1941.

Appendix B

Major defense contracts awarded by War and Navy Departments, June 1, 1940–February 28, 1941.

Appendix C

Excerpt from address by Hon. Chester C. Davis, member, National Defense Advisory Commission, before the Southern Governors' Conference, in New Orleans, La., March 15, 1941.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will be received and printed as a document with illustrations.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON LEASE-LEND BILL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I report favorably Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on Senate bill 275, further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (S. 275) entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

PRINTING OF SPECIAL REPORTS ON DISEASES OF THE HORSE AND OF CATTLE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution No. 50, to provide for the

printing, with illustrations, and binding in cloth, of revised editions of the Special Reports on the Diseases of the Horse and the Diseases of Cattle. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) to provide for the printing, with illustrations, and binding in cloth, of revised editions of the Special Reports on the Diseases of the Horse and the Diseases of Cattle, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to have printed, with illustrations, and bound in cloth 20,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which 15,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 5,000 for the use of the Senate, and to carry out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed, with illustrations, and bound in cloth 35,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which 26,200 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 8,800 for the use of the Senate, and to carry out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $30,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if Senators will examine the agricultural appropriation bill at page 9 they will see that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has recommended that there be stricken from the bill an appropriation of $50,000 for printing the documents referred to in the joint resolution. The joint resolution which has just been agreed to takes care of the matter in the correct way. The provision made in the House bill did not properly divide the publications between the Senate and the House. The customary rule is that one-fourth of the number shall go to the Senate and three-fourths to the House. The provision in the appropriation bill did not divide the money between the two publications correctly, because it costs more to print one than the other. The way it is handled in the joint resolution is the proper way.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF AMERICAN VESSELS FOR CONVOYS

Mr. TOBEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire has a very important resolution to propose. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ball	Brooks
Aiken	Bankhead	Bulow
Andrews	Barbour	Burton
Austin	Barkley	Butler
Bailey	Bone	Byrd
Byrnes	Hughes	Shipstead
Capper	Kilgore	Smathers
Caraway	La Follette	Smith
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lee	Taft
Danaher	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Davis	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
George	Murdock	Tobey
Gerry	Murray	Truman
Gillette	Norris	Tunnell
Glass	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Green	Overton	Vandenberg
Guffey	Pepper	Van Nuys
Gurney	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Hatch	Reed	Wheeler
Hayden	Reynolds	White
Hill	Russell	Wiley
Holman	Sheppard	Willis

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in this historic Chamber an earnest and historic debate was recently held, culminating in the passage of the so-called lease-lend bill. That debate was conducted by Members of the Senate in a spirit of sincere and earnest presentation of the facts as they understood them. Many of those who spoke for the lease-lend bill in this Chamber during the several weeks of debate took the position that they were voting for the bill because in their conscientious judgment it was the best means to keep us out of participation in the World War.

In contradistinction, those of us who voted against the bill held that we should vote against it because we honestly believed that it was fraught with the grave danger of making us a participant in the World War. So, sincere men on each side voiced their contentions, the majority prevailed, and the bill became law upon being signed by the President. But from this statement of mine it becomes apparent that all of my colleagues on both sides of that question had in their hearts a hatred of war, a bitterness toward war, and a fear that this Nation might be drawn into the war, that they were opposed to our being drawn into war. As the debate progressed toward taking the final vote on the lease-lend bill, there was but one Senator in this Chamber who came out definitely in advocacy of the United States' forthwith going into war.

The gravest issue now before the country is the question of whether or not we will be involved as a participant in this World War. Dr. Gallup, who has been quoted from one end of the country to the other, recently took a poll, as a result of which he certified, I believe, that 83 percent of the American people were opposed to the United States becoming involved as a participant in the foreign war.

With that background I make bold to state that the gravest issue now before the country is the issue of whether we shall go into that war or not.

The factor which in my judgment is most certain to involve us in that war is the issue of whether or not we shall adopt the policy of using our ships and planes as convoys to merchant ships carrying materials to the aid of belligerents.

In section 3, subsection (e) of the lend-lease bill is the following language:

> (e) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of the entry of any American vessel into a combat area in violation of section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

Section 3, subsection (d) contains this language:

> (d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of convoying vessels by naval vessels of the United States.

While the lend-lease bill was being considered before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, there appeared before us many noted witnesses, not the least of whom was the present Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox. He was asked by one of the Senators, "You stand very much opposed to the idea of convoying merchantmen across the Atlantic?" His answer was tersely and definitely, "Yes."

"You do look upon it as an act of war?"

"Yes," he said.

He made a similar statement before the House committee, in answer to a question from Mrs. BOLTON, a Representative from the State of Ohio. His statement there was that he was very much opposed to the idea of convoying merchantmen across the Atlantic, that he looked upon it as an act of war.

The President himself in a recent statement given to the press made a similar statement. I think his words were:

> Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war.

In confirmation of that I read from a feature article by Frank L. Kluckhohn, appearing in the New York Times for January 22, 1941, in which he says:

> Sources close to the White House said it is obvious that if the United States Navy convoys ships, either under an American or other flag, into a combat zone, shooting is pretty sure to result, and shooting comes awfully close to war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TOBEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In connection with the authorities which the Senator is quoting on the subject, I think he has overlooked probably the most persuasive authority of all, so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned. If he will permit me to do so, I should like to call attention to the unequivocal statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 6, 1941, as reported at page 1892 in the RECORD. The very distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who piloted the lend-lease bill through the Senate, was speaking:

> As plainly as I can, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. That is a powerful indictment of convoys.

Mr. President, if it is our conviction that convoys mean war—and we have the eminent authority just cited, as well as the President of the United States and Secretary Knox and many other notable men in this country—we of the Congress having assured the American people that we will keep out of the war, as has the President and as has the distinguished candidate who opposed him in the recent election, then it logically follows that we of the Congress should take every step possible to keep us out of the war as a participant, and should use the powers vested in us by the Constitution to prohibit the use of our ships as convoys.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire mean that the simple act of convoying would be war, or does he mean that the adoption of such a policy would result in acts of war by the other side? Which does he mean?

Mr. TOBEY. I will take as my authority the President's own words, when he said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

Mr. CONNALLY. Evidently the Senator does not care to answer my question.

Mr. TOBEY. I have answered it; I have quoted an eminent authority, and no man should be more obedient to that authority than the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator did not answer my question. I wanted him to answer the question.

Mr. TOBEY. What is the question?

Mr. CONNALLY. The question is, Does the Senator contend that it would be an act of war if we should adopt the policy of convoying vessels; or does he mean that the adoption of such a policy would inevitably result in acts of war by an enemy?

Mr. TOBEY. I will answer the Senator by saying that, in my judgment, it is an act of war for a neutral country to convoy ships carrying supplies to a belligerent.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Texas, who propounded the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator asked a question and then turned his back. Does he desire to have an answer to his question, or not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had answered the question.

Mr. TOBEY. The answer to the Senator's question had been only half completed. More than that, with an abhorrence of war in my heart, an abhorrence which I hope is shared by the Senator from Texas, I think war will be a direct result of such convoying. As the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of our great committee, said, "If we convoy these ships, it means shooting, and that is tantamount to a declaration of war."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not attempting to pass upon the wisdom of attempting to convoy; but it seems to me that the mere act of convoying would not result in shooting unless the other side did some shooting. Regardless of what the President said, the shooting would depend entirely upon whether the other side wanted to shoot at the convoy, would it not?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me answer by propounding a question. Does the Senator agree with the President in his expressed utterance to which I have just referred?

Mr. BARKLEY. I may or may not. I am attempting to ascertain whether the Senator can elucidate what the President meant by mere shooting. The mere convoying of a ship does not mean shooting unless somebody shoots at the convoy. The convoy would not shoot at something just for the pleasure of having target practice.

Does the Senator mean or does he think the President meant that the mere convoying of a ship or of a group of ships across the ocean would automatically result in shooting?

Mr. TOBEY. No. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished majority leader, I will put it this way: It seems to me that what the President had in mind—and it is apparent to all of us—was that if we convoy a group of ships carrying supplies to a belligerent, obviously the enemy of that belligerent is going to take steps to put those convoys out of business; and when, as, and if that occurs, the shooting begins, and our ships are sunk, there will be a wave of wrathful indignation that will go over this country and that will arouse the people passionately and earnestly and perhaps necessarily to cry out and to say, "We will go to war and lick those fellows over there."

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I think that is a deduction that is not far-fetched; but when it comes to technical acts of war, the mere fact that one peaceful nation permits a belligerent nation to repair its vessels in its own shipyards would be regarded under what used to be international law as an act of war, the mere lending or leasing or furnishing of equipment for war use might be so regarded. But we recognize the fact that all international law has been thrown out, and, judging by recent events, we see that it is difficult now to draw a comparison between one act of war that occurred when international law had some force and another act of war. So what is the difference, except that one may be more provocative than the other? In legal effect, what is the difference between convoying a ship on the ocean in order to safeguard transport of facilities and supplies to another nation, and permitting that nation's warships to come into our harbors—as we have done by law—and permitting our Government to buy equipment and to furnish equipment and supplies to a belligerent nation, which we have done by law? What is the difference in international law between those two operations?

Mr. TOBEY. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the Senator answer my question first.

Mr. TOBEY. I will be glad to answer it if I understand the Senator correctly, but I will put it this way: The convoying of ships, in my judgment, is the greatest single factor which would bring us into war by its results. There are others that could do so, as I stated on the floor of the Senate when speaking against the lease-lend bill. I felt then, and still hold—I do not know whether the Senator recalls my statement at that time—that when we open our yards to repair belligerent ships, that might well involve us in war, as other things might, but standing out preeminently as a war danger, the danger of involving us in war, in my judgment, is the matter of convoys.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from New Hampshire or of any other Senator, because we have not as yet completed the morning hour and we are anxious to secure action on a couple of appropriation bills, but I wish to ask the Senator a question. Of course, it all depends on whether the nation against whom the operations are directed regards them as a sufficient breach of its rights to make an attack upon us or to declare war. It would have a technical right to declare war on us for allowing a British war vessel to be repaired in the United States; there is no doubt of that, and, under the old conception of international law, they would have the right to declare war against us because we loaned money to one of the belligerents in opposition to that particular country or do any of the things that we can do under the lease-lend bill we have authorized to be done and which are going to be done now——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, morning business is closed. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I was trying to elucidate for the Senator from New Hampshire when the gavel rapped and disturbed the continuity of my thought was that if a nation sees fit to take advantage of the technical violation of what used to be international law to declare war against us or any other nation similarly situated, it could have done so already on the basis of what we have already done in aid of England or Greece or China. Is not that true?

Mr. TOBEY. I cannot say that is true. Everything is relative in this world, as Mr. Einstein says. Let me ask the Senator is he defending convoys?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; the Senator knows that I am not.

Mr. TOBEY. I am asking the Senator in good faith.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I am answering the Senator in good faith; if we have violated international law in such a way as could result in a declaration of war against us by Germany, we have already done that, and the convoying of ships would be only an incident.

Mr. TOBEY. As I said a moment ago, the matter of convoys is the preeminent danger, in my judgment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be so.

Mr. TOBEY. And the President felt so when he made the statement to which I referred, and Frank Knox also said so.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Germany wants an excuse to declare war against us, she has already had it, and we know from her history with other nations that if it was to her interest she would have done it without any excuse.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were an admiral of the German Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a rank supposition.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were Admiral Raeder.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator, in his effort to make me a German admiral, will not give me a name.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were Admiral X, and suppose he knew that the United States was set upon convoying; that we were going to use the convoys to protect the ships carrying supplies and munitions of war, and so forth, to one of the belligerents, it would be natural for him to order submarines to hunt in packs for the convoy, and when they got sight of the convoy to torpedo some of our ships, perhaps carrying 2,000 American boys, and he would then probably expect that the American people would rise up in their wrath and declare war against Germany, would he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. That might result.

Mr. TOBEY. It is perfectly natural that it should.

Mr. BARKLEY. Probably so.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel that the matter of convoys presents a greater danger of involving us in war than anything else?

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be; I am not disputing that; but what I am trying to ascertain is whether the Senator from New Hampshire thinks that Germany would wait if Germany saw it was to her interest to declare war, or whether Hitler would wait, for I do not really like to associate Hitler with Germany, because I have great respect for the German people; I have none for Hitler, and I hope the time will come when they will themselves recognize the difference between the German people and Hitler.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that in that respect I agree with him 100 percent, but let me say further with reference to our colloquy here that there is always a straw that breaks the camel's back, and that straw, in my judgment, will be when, as, and if we send convoys to transport goods to belligerent nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. That will depend upon events that we cannot now foresee.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel so, too?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will express my views upon that subject when the occasion has arisen.

Mr. TOBEY. In the words of the advertisement, "If eventually, why not now?"

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it is possible for anybody today, even including the wise Senator from New Hampshire, to foresee conditions that may exist.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, the Senator is a past master of sarcasm that has no place in this Chamber, in my judgment. So I will proceed, if you please.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has my permission to proceed, but did the Senator suggest that I was a psychiatrist?

Mr. TOBEY. No; and neither did I say that the Senator need a psychiatrist.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am willing to acquit the Senator from New Hampshire of any such need.

Mr. TOBEY. I said the Senator indulged in sarcasm and possibly that that might be out of place at this time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. With reference to the point made by the Senator from Kentucky that these acts in contravention of what was once international law have given the opportunity to certain nations to declare war against us, and they have not done so, let me say that when we send our vessels into the belligerent zone it is going to make us declare war against them.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I am trying to avoid. It is not a question of their declaring war against us but it is the doing of those things which will force the American people to declare war against certain nations.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator; and the Congress and the President having assured the American people they were going to do all they could to keep out of war, then it logically follows that the Congress should take every step to keep this Nation out of war and use all the powers vested in it by the Constitution to prohibit the use of our ships of peace for war purposes. To that end I am introducing a joint resolution, which I will take the liberty of reading. It is as follows:

Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries

Resolved, etc., That, except in time of war, hereafter no part of the land or naval forces of the United States, and no vessel documented, or aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States, shall be used, directly or indirectly, beyond the limits of the territorial waters of the United States and its Territories and possessions, to transport or deliver, or in connection with the transportation or delivery of, or for convoy purposes in connection with the transportation or delivery of, any articles or materials to or for the use of any foreign country with respect to which the President has issued a proclamation under section 1 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, or which is engaged in actual hostilities with one or more foreign countries, even though a state of war has not been declared or recognized in any such proclamation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention to the language he has used in the joint resolution, "that except in time of war." Of course, this is a time of war. I assume that the Senator means a war in which we are associated?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is correct. I may advise him that I raised that question with the drafting agency of the Senate that helped draft the resolution this morning. They said it was the proper language to use, but I questioned it then, and will be very glad to change it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does not seem to me quite definite enough.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator, and I will change it.

Mr. President, since both groups in the Senate protest that they are opposed to our entry into the war, and since it is undisputed that convoying will definitely take us into the war, this joint resolution provides a means of affording Senators a vehicle to translate their public statements into specific legislation to keep the country from taking this fatal step into war. It presents the issue directly and without equivocation. The people have an opportunity to see whether the administration and the Members of the Senate mean business when they say that they are opposed to our country entering the war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 390) relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican; and

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4124, making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—War Department—Military Activities—Quartermaster Corps", on page 5, line 14, after the word "Army", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$12,400,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think a brief statement is necessary in the presentation of this bill. The amount it carries is extremely large. With a few exceptions it is limited, as its title indicates, to national-defense items. To me the amounts are somewhat staggering, although, as some Members of the Senate know, it is easier to stagger me with amounts than it is to stagger some other Members of the Senate.

The aggregate appropriations included in the bill as reported by the Senate committee for War Department military activities are $1,994,011,100. For the Navy Department the appropriations are $295,416,820. For the Federal Works Agency the appropriations are $4,100,000. For the civil functions of the War Department the appropriations are $2,303,000. In addition, there are recommended contract authorizations amounting to $2,093,453,254. The aggregate, as I have it figured, approaches $4,428,627,000. That figure is subject to some correction.

The items making up the bill are large. They are set forth in detail in the bill. The House committee had extensive hearings, which were printed. The Senate committee had hearings covering the major portions of the bill.

The War Department appropriations, in accordance with the statement of the War Department authorities, follow the necessary course of the authorization for the increased Army and increased defense appropriations. Amendments were submitted by the War Department and recommended by the committee amounting to $312,000,000 for the purpose of bringing the Air Corps up to the projected 30,000-pilots-per-year program. That, as I say, involved $312,000,000 in addition to the amount which came from the House.

It is very difficult for some of us—I speak only for myself in saying that—to comprehend these very large, and in fact, enormous figures. When the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Quartermaster General, and others come in and say to us that these amounts are needed for the military program, and they give us details, I have never been able to adjust myself to the figures on the one hand, nor, on the other hand, to set myself up as an authority to refute them. I think, in a measure, that is true of the committee which brings in this bill containing the recommendations of the War Department, supported by the estimates of the Budget Director, approved by the President, and supported by the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House and the action of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Are the figures available as to what the total national-defense appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, will be, including the pending measure?

Mr. ADAMS. I have a clipping as to the estimated and actual appropriations, purporting to be prepared by the Office of Production Management. It has been recently published; and it indicates that the total authorized and pending program, which would include this bill, is $39,177,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that for this fiscal year and the next one?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir. That is the amount of the additional fiscal-year appropriations and the 1942 bills now before Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Approximately $40,000,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We might perhaps provide the taxpayer with a convoy, instead of somebody else, pretty soon. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. May I ask the Senator what would be convoyed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will leave that to the Senator's imagination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the item "Clothing and equipage, Army," on page 5, line 19, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$70,048,000" and insert "$79,418,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 23, after the numerals "1941", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, after the word "transportation", to strike out "$137,630,000" and insert "$150,852,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 18, after the word "posts", to strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "including the acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein and temporary use thereof, without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 1136, and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 255; 31 U. S. C. 529), and the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles, $193,821,000,"; in line 25, after the word "until", to strike out "expended" and insert "June 30, 1942"; and on page 7, line 13, after the words "in all", to strike out "$1,249,506,059" and insert "$1,433,827,059."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 15, to insert:

Barracks and quarters, Army: For barracks and quarters, $2,366,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps", on page 7, after the word "Army", to strike out "$46,714,000" and insert "$49,807,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air Corps", on page 8, line 2, after the word "Army", to strike out "$888,236,000" and insert "$982,236,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department", on page 8, line 10, after the word "Department", to insert "Army, $2,876,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942, and, in addition,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers", on page 8, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$18,944,000" and insert "$19,074,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 16, after the word "with", to insert a comma and "and also including the acquisition of leasehold and other interests in land, and temporary use thereof"; in line 24, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$98,250,000" and insert "$94,450,000"; and in line 25, after the word "until", to strike out "expended" and insert "June 30, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department", on page 10, line 24, after the word "Army", to strike out "$82,039,000" and insert "$82,132,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Navy Department—Bureau of Yards and Docks", on page 14, line 6, after the word "officer", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$7,500"; in line 7, after the word "officer", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$5,000"; and in line 8, after the word "man", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Alterations to naval vessels", on page 14, line 12, after the word "until",

to strike out "expended" and insert "June 30, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to add a word here. It will be found that the bill as it came from the House in a number of instances provided that the appropriations should be made available until expended, and the Senate committee imposed a narrower limitation, so as to come within what we feel sure is the constitutional limitation on appropriations for the Army.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert:

TITLE III—CIVIL NATIONAL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Federal Works Agency

Public Buildings Administration

Construction of temporary office buildings: For the construction of temporary office buildings for general use on Government-owned land in or near the District of Columbia, including the construction of necessary heating plant, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, $4,100,000: *Provided*, That the contract or contracts for such construction may be entered into without advertising.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 2, to insert:

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, WAR DEPARTMENT

Corps of Engineers

Rivers and Harbors

For an additional amount for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of projects authorized by the act entitled "An act authorizing the improvement of certain rivers and harbors in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 17, 1940 (Public Act No. 868, 76th Cong.), including the objects and under the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1941, to be available until June 30, 1942, $663,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 15, to insert:

Flood Control

Local protection works at East Hartford, Conn.: For the completion of local protection works at East Hartford, Conn., as authorized by Public, No. 859, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 15, 1940, $1,640,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942.

This title may be cited as the "Civil Activities National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a technical amendment from the committee, on page 7, line 6.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Colorado refer to the amendment on page 16 relating to the Corps of Engineers, and tell me the purpose of the additional authorization for rivers and harbors?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the clerk state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 6, after the word "fund", it is proposed to insert "and shall remain available until June 30, 1942."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, whenever the Chair can find an opportunity for me to solicit an answer to my question, I should appreciate the courtesy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado had submitted an amendment on an entirely different proposition.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I gather that the inquiry is as to the portion of the text on page 16, beginning at line 6?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. That matter was presented to the committee by both the Senators from Maine, supplemented by one who I would say is a very shrewd, persuasive Yankee shipbuilder from Maine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This has not anything to do with Passamaquoddy, has it?

Mr. ADAMS. If it does, it was very carefully concealed from the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator from Michigan is quite satisfied.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am never entirely satisfied. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, on page 4, line 14, I wish to substitute for the date "September 3, 1939," the date "November 15, 1940."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, referring again to the provision which was stricken out at the bottom of page 5, lines 23 and 24 and 25, and continuing on page 6, the first 7 lines, I should like to bring up again for consideration for just a moment the same subject which was considered rather thoroughly the other day when the Navy bill was before the Senate.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest that the amendment was acted on rather hurriedly, and it might be better if the action were reconsidered. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 5, line 23, running to the end of the paragraph, was agreed to, be reconsidered. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in speaking briefly in defense of American agriculture today, I wish to start by quoting a few words from the 1940 Report of the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the heading, "Agriculture and the national defense," on page 8 of the report, appears the following:

Every loyal American recognizes the need to strengthen our defenses. Present world conditions threaten our safety and warn us to arm ourselves quickly and well not only with physical weapons but with the strength of national unity and morale. Farm people want to help. Preparation for defense is a task not merely for the Nation as a whole, with Congress and the Executive mainly responsible; it is a task for the country's different occupational groups, most of which have special responsibilities in the matter as well as reponsibilities common to them all. Agriculture, industry, labor, finance, and trade should severally analyze their relationship to the task. Then as a joint contribution toward national defense, they should compare and coordinate their views. Agriculture, particularly, should clarify and express its viewpoint, since the existing world situation affects it gravely. Agriculture has deeper roots in the world economy than any other large branch of our business life, and consequently a bigger immediate stake in the bearing of our defense program on our foreign relationships.

That, Mr. President, I think is a very fair statement of the situation which faces us today; and, in order that the contribution made by each group of our citizenry shall be fair and proper, I ask the inclusion in the pending bill of the provision that was deleted by the committee. I believe agriculture should make its fair contribution to the defense program, along with industry, labor, finance, and trade. I do not believe that agriculture, or any other division of our people, should be asked to make more than their fair share of the contribution. On page 13 of the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1940, under the general heading, "Agriculture and the national defense," the Secretary says, "We shall not bring South America's surpluses here."

That part of the annual report for 1940 must have been written rather early in the year, for now we are asked to give official sanction to the purchase of foreign surpluses which compete directly with our own burdensome surpluses. I refer not only to the grain and meat produced in my section of the Nation; I include every branch of agriculture, for no part of it can be free from the influence of imports from competitive areas if the protective clause is not replaced in the bill before us. As it now stands, the buying agencies of the Army can buy, where they will, not only meats but wool, cotton, tobacco, fruit, and dairy products. In fact, there is no limit placed on them at all. I insist it is unfair to ask the farmers of America to make this extreme sacrifice to the defense program when other sections of our citizenry are not asked to make equal sacrifice.

Does the Senate want to throw our labor market open to the world? Industry, finance, labor, and trade, representing the nonagricultural groups of our Nation, are not placed in such a compromising position. No, Mr. President; they

are on a cost-plus basis. Ever since the last Great War agriculture has been in a precarious position. It has not been even on a cost-of-production basis, to say nothing of cost-plus. Indications are that the farmers' cost of production will advance sharply. The farmers' sons are being taken to war—or at least are taken from the farm. The farmer will not be able to replace them at the wages his son gets in the Army. He can expect to pay even higher prices for farm machinery as a result of labor disturbances in factories making farm equipment. I do not think it is just that the American farmer be asked to take more than his proportionate share of the sacrifice for defense.

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

If there is any ground whatsoever to support the purchase and importation of competitive foreign farm products, food, or clothing it must be based on the good neighbor policy of the Government rather than on any economic basis. We cannot improve our own economic condition by hiring ourselves not to produce, and at the same time by hiring foreigners to produce for us. The idea of reciprocal trade agreements is just wonderful, and the agreements are a success when they increase our trade without admitting commodities which we already produce in excess of requirements. I commend any administration that fosters such agreements. The trouble is that some agreements have been made, such as the one under consideration now, by which we simply add to an already burdensome surplus of our own. We should increase in every way possible our imports of such items as rubber, tea, cocoa, camphor, tropical hardwoods and many other such items which we do not produce at home; but I see no reason for further pauperizing our farmers by importing grains, meats, dairy products, cotton, and other items which we already produce abundantly at home. We have already appropriated approximately $2,000,000,000 to assist our sister republics to the south in the development of their industries.

In reading the report of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1940 I note that many of our bureaus have sent delegations to South America to assist the South American countries in their problems. On page 25 of the report, under the heading of Inter-American Surplus Disposal, I read of the dire need that exists in South America for its own products, as follows:

> Wheat and corn lie unsalable or rot in Argentina, while citizens in Colombia or Mexico lack proper food. In the Caribbean islands and on adjacent coasts some of the densest populations in the world exist at a near-starvation level. Children suffer from lack of adequate carbohydrates, while Cuba has great surplus supplies of sugar. Brazil stores and destroys coffee, while a cup of coffee would be a rare treat to workers in many other countries.

Continuing the quotation from the top of page 26 of the 1940 report of our Department of Agriculture:

> Surplus beef is available from the Argentine at the same time that workers in many other South American countries and throughout Central America lack adequate proteins in their diet.

From the above quotations taken from a recent Government publication, I am sure it would be far more practical to assist our sister republics in the disposal of their surpluses among themselves than to bring the surpluses here into our own country, where they will break down the market of our farmer. Corn is being used as fuel in the Argentine. They have a tremendous surplus. They feed some of it to their cattle and swine, and the Government price on corn sold back to the feeder is 3 cents per bushel. Our commercial price is about 60 cents, and just a few days ago this body passed legislation to make effective a higher price. How can our farmer meet such competition? After furnishing his sons for service in the Army or the Navy, paying taxes to support the war, do you think, Mr. President, it is unreasonable that he should ask to be protected against the destruction of his domestic market?

THE CORN LOAN

I have just quoted the Secretary of Agriculture in his 1940 report, in which he mentioned the big surplus of corn that was rotting in Argentina while people in neighboring countries were without proper food. I agree with him 100 percent in the inference that such surpluses should be put to use as food for needy persons. But why go to South America to get such an example? Go with me to the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and I will show you farmers by the hundred, yes, by the thousands, who themselves are on short rations and have little or no feed for the livestock essential to the continuance of their farming operations. These poor people have for nearly a year been asking for a loan of some of the millions of bushels of corn locked up in the Ever Normal Granary so they may continue on their farms. Mind you, they ask for a loan, not a gift. Their proposal is to return bushel for bushel of corn. They borrow bushels and repay bushels. If loaned to them now, it can be returned later as a part of the Ever Normal Granary, in the meantime saving the Government storage charges that would almost cover the original cost of the grain. It seems somewhat strange that we must go to South America to learn how to dispose of a surplus.

LOSS OF EUROPEAN MARKETS

Some would infer that we are not now trading with South American Republics, but quite the contrary is true. Already there is a large increase in imports from the Southern Republics, both of competitive and noncompetitive articles. The trouble arises mostly because of the loss of the European outlet. That affects our people as directly as it does those of the southern hemisphere. I cannot see why we are under any obligation to take up the slack for our good neighbors when we are already in the same difficulty ourselves. We lost our sales to Europe. Last week, I received a letter from the manager of one of the largest cooperative creameries of the country, reading in part as follows:

> It does not seem right that the farmers of the Middle West should be sacrificed on the altar of South American friendship. While in New York, I noticed large quantities of butter from Argentina, which, naturally, does not help the butter market of our dairy farmers.

Newspapers of recent date indicate that unloading docks in Boston, New York, New Orleans, and elsewhere have been kept busy the past month unloading good neighbor produce, for instance, 70,000 cases of tomatoes from Cuba, and producers are wondering how to dispose of grapefruit and pineapples which formerly went to London. Argentina agrees to hold her shipment of pears to 300,000 boxes; Chilean nectarines, honeydews, plums, and grapes are selling fast and cheap in our eastern seaports; Brazil is asking to swap 800,000 cases of off-season oranges for United States apples.

On page 42 of the report of the administrative official in charge of surplus removal and marketing-agreement programs, I note that we had to buy and distribute as relief during the past season 850,000 boxes of Florida oranges. This report of the official in charge of the programs to the Secretary of Agriculture makes interesting reading. More than 30 different commodities were purchased and distributed as relief to assist in the disposal of burdensome surpluses. Practically every State in the Union produces some of these articles of food or clothing.

If it is necessary as a part of our good-neighbor policy or for defense purposes to take possession of the surpluses of South America, may I suggest that I think we should go the full way of being the good neighbor. Buy them and distribute them in South America. Why bring them to our shores to complicate further the problems of American agriculture? I cannot think it is reasonable to ask farmers of the United States to compete with imports from other nations having low-wage living standards any more than it is to ask American labor to meet competition of low-wage countries like Japan. Agriculture is our basic industry, and ultimately the strength of the Nation will be measured by the strength of agriculture.

OUR FARM MARKET WILL BE BEST IN POST-WAR ERA

Mr. President, the Government is already concerned about the post-war period and the problems that must then be met. Commissions have been appointed to study and prepare recommendations as to the way in which we will return from the defense program to one of normalcy. One thing is certain; the farm market of the United States will be the best market by far that is available to labor, industry, finance, or trade. To quote an outstanding authority speaking in Chicago last week:

> A foremost danger is that internationalist thinking will tend to center attention on the fifth-rate markets in other continents, to the neglect of the world's one first-rate market here in North America.

I repeat, the one real hope in the post-armament period will be the American farm market. Let us be fair with it now. Let us not give the farmer more than his share of the load.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to direct an inquiry to the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] in reference to the bill now under

consideration. I respectfully invite his attention to page 15, under title III. I am not asking for reconsideration of this section. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question. The language reads:

Construction of temporary office buildings: For the construction of temporary office buildings for general use on Government-owned land in or near the District of Columbia, including the construction of necessary heating plant, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, $4,100,000: *Provided*, That the contract or contracts for such construction may be entered into without advertising.

I wish to ask the Senator if he can advise us whether the buildings are to be constructed within the District of Columbia or on property owned by the Federal Government outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. ADAMS. I cannot advise the Senator on that question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There is no statement about it in the report. I have looked at the report.

Mr. ADAMS. I believe the language of the bill is "in or near the District of Columbia." So it might be possible to build them either within or without the District of Columbia.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation in that connection. From time to time I have heard that the Government of the United States will have occasion to construct additional edifices outside the District of Columbia, attributable to the fact that property is not available within the District.

I have traveled extensively over the District of Columbia, and I know of many available sites where we could find room for the construction of all the buildings which might be deemed necessary for occupancy by Government employees for the next quarter of a century. Among the areas of considerable acreage there is the area in the immediate neighborhood of the War College, on the river. Another area which has been called to my attention is the Soldiers' Home grounds, within the District of Columbia—as a matter of fact, almost in the center of the metropolis.

If we contemplate the construction of new buildings, I think they ought to be constructed in the District of Columbia. It might be well to give consideration to the removal of the Soldiers' Home to Government-owned land in the immediate proximity of the District of Columbia. I make that observation because I am interested in seeing public buildings erected within the District of Columbia rather than in the State of Virginia or in the adjoining State of Maryland.

I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very glad to yield to a friend of the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. In that connection, I think the Senator might very well point out that in the creation of the Federal city, the District of Columbia, Congress retained exclusive legislative authority over the District. The very purpose of having the District of Columbia was to have a territory wherein all public buildings would be erected and over which the Congress of the United States would exercise exclusive jurisdiction, rather than to have them in outlying areas where State sovereignties would exercise jurisdiction over them. When they are constructed outside the District of Columbia we defeat the purpose of the provision in the Constitution, which sets aside the Federal city and give the Congress exclusive jurisdiction over it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the able Senator for his contribution in reference to this particular subject. In other words, the construction of Federal buildings outside the District creates what might be called a distribution of authority, and that is one thing we desire to avoid.

I am prompted to make this observation by reason of the fact that I now see in the Chamber the very able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We have but recently constructed in Washington one of the finest airports in the world, if not the finest. It is not an airport merely for Washington. It is not what would be properly called a municipal airport. In every sense of the word it is a national airport. I am informed that a large portion of the property constituting the grounds upon which the structures now nearing completion are located lies in the State of Virginia. I hope that action may be taken through legislation by the National Congress to incorporate into the District of Columbia that portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia which embraces the national airport, because there we find a diversification of authority, and I am rather inclined to believe that as a result of the present situation eventually we shall run into some difficulties, perhaps of a legal nature, which, if they do not prove embarrassing, will certainly prove troublesome. I hope that, if and when such legislation is introduced to incorporate into the District of Columbia a very small part of the historic Commonwealth of Virginia, so ably represented by its fine Senators, they will show their usual generosity and their splendid grace by immediately assenting without opposition.

Having observed the smile presently sweeping over the handsome face of the distinguished junior Senator, I readily recognize that he is thoroughly and properly in accord with the suggestions I have been pleased to make for the benefit of the Government of the United States, without being to the detriment of the second most historic State in the Union.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I have not followed the labors of the District of Columbia Committee, presided over by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator is very unfortunate.

Mr. ADAMS. I should like to acquire a bit of information. Am I correct in my understanding, first, that if a Federal building is erected outside the District of Columbia, the Government pays no taxes on it; but if it is built within the District, under the formula the practical effect is that the Government has to pay taxes on it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If a Federal structure should be erected within the confines of the District of Columbia, naturally the 800,000 citizens and taxpayers of the District of Columbia would certainly be warranted in insisting that the Federal Government contribute its portion in lieu of taxes.

Mr. ADAMS. How about the citizens of Fairfax County?

Mr. REYNOLDS. They would likewise be entitled to consideration.

Mr. ADAMS. They could not legally tax Government property.

Mr. REYNOLDS. They would be privileged to make a request for taxes upon such structures, although, according to my understanding, Federal property is not taxable in the States.

Mr. ADAMS. I am not making any comment on the situation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Naturally, the people of the District of Columbia would welcome the erection of such structures here, because it would add more revenue to the District of Columbia; and according to the report of the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who has handled that matter with great credit to himself and satisfaction to the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia is really in need of increased revenue, particularly at this time, on account of the great numbers of people flocking here.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no question about that, Mr. President.

Will the Senator further yield, so that I may correct an impression?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to remove the misapprehension under which, strange to say, the Senator from Colorado is laboring. I say "strange to say" because he is usually so very accurate in his observations and conclusions.

The United States Government pays no taxes on its property in the District of Columbia; and if a building were erected by the Federal Government on land owned by the United States the Federal Government would pay no taxes upon such property. Under the terms of the bill which the Senate unanimously passed the other day, proposing a formula in order to fix the amount of the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia, no taxes whatsoever would be imposed on any building presently owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia or which may hereafter be constructed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I was not making any statement. I was merely asking for information. Is not this the situation: If the United States should buy a piece of property now in private ownership in the District of Columbia, and should erect a building on it, under the formula of the Senator from Louisiana the Government would be required to make an additional contribution to the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes?

Mr. OVERTON. On the value of the building?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not know what the basis is, but the Senator has a formula. Whenever the Government increases its

ownership of property it increases its payment to the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. The Federal contribution is based upon the landed area.

Mr. ADAMS. I was making an inquiry, and not making an observation or statement.

Mr. OVERTON. It is based entirely on landed area, and not on either the value of the land or the value of the improvements.

Mr. ADAMS. But every additional acre of ground the Federal Government buys in the District of Columbia involves additional payment on the part of the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That would be in lieu of taxes. In other words, we do not exact any tribute from the District of Columbia to the Federal Government in the form of taxes; but it is, it might be said frankly, in lieu of taxes.

Mr. OVERTON. In one sense that is true; but there are so many reasons why the Federal Government should make payment to the District of Columbia that I do not want to interrupt the debate at this point in order to state them. I have had occasion hereofore to indicate those reasons, and they are numerous. One of them is the amount of land owned in the District of Columbia by the Federal Government.

INVOLVEMENT IN WAR—RESOLUTION OF WOMEN OF GREENSBORO, N. C.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I say to all Members of the Senate that I am gratified indeed to learn that the people of my State of North Carolina—for the first time, I might add—to any great extent have become aware of the fact that the situation in the United States is quite critical. I may add that the people of North Carolina, and particularly the women of North Carolina, have but recently been aroused to the fact that this country may shortly find itself physically at war.

I recall that during the interesting discussion on the lease-lend bill I had many communications in reference to that bill from my constituents. Perhaps the great majority of those who spoke out, and certainly 99 percent of all the newspapers in my State, most emphatically favored the passage of that bill; and as a result thereof those who spoke and those who wrote led the others to believe that there was no danger of our becoming involved; that they need not be worried, and that it was all right for H. R. 1776 to pass. Of course, naturally I am thankful to be able to say—because I opposed with all my vigor that bill—that since the passage of the bill it has become apparent that innumerable people in North Carolina, particularly groups of women, are organized against our active participation, not in war—because we are already in war—but our actual physical participation at war.

I have before me a letter dated Greensboro, N. C., March 27, 1941, reading as follows:

GREENSBORO, N. C., *March 27, 1941.*

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: Enclosed you will find a photostatic copy of a set of resolutions drawn and signed by 527 women voters, women taxpayers of Greensboro and Guilford County, N. C.

As we see our country drawn step by step nearer to active participation in the European war, we wish to reaffirm our faith in the solemn promises made by both major parties last November not to send our sons to fight in foreign wars.

We think there can be no national unity unless this policy is adhered to. Eighty percent of our citizens expressed this sentiment in a recent Gallup poll.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. CARL I. CARLSON.
MRS. N. S. CALHOUN.
MRS. ROBERT R. KING, Jr.
MRS. WM. Y. PREYER.

I happen to know personally two of these ladies, particularly Mrs. King, whose husband was mayor of Greensboro for some time, and who is one of the most prominent lawyers there.

Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD the resolution adopted by these ladies of our Commonwealth who are interested in keeping our country out of war. The first clause of the resolution reads:

We are, first of all, Americans and we want to look at this whole situation calmly and without hysteria.

I pause to comment upon that. That one statement should provide inspiration for all Americans. When they say, "We are, first of all, Americans," by that they mean that their profound interest and first interest is the interest of their country, the United States of America.

Then they go on to say, "And we want to look at this whole situation calmly and without hysteria."

Mr. President, we all want to look at it calmly and without hysteria; but with the vast amount of propaganda that today is sweeping the country more fiercely, more viciously than ever before, it is an extremely difficult thing to do—at least it is for me. I cannot go to a single motion-picture theater, where occasionally I like to find myself for information and relaxation, without being disturbed—not somewhat, but greatly—by the projection upon the screen of pictures filled with propaganda. Those of us who attend the motion-picture theaters seek enjoyment and recreation; but we find that we are forced to see such propaganda because so much of it is projected upon the screens of the theaters of the country. If we are pulled into this war, I desire to state without hesitation that a great many of the producers of motion pictures in this country may certainly lay the fault at their own doors.

There is a theater here which I attend occasionally—a theater called the Trans-Lux, which has been turned into a house of propaganda and the pictures which are shown there elicit from the audience reactions which are calculated to be productive of hysteria. As a matter of fact, I almost wish that in this country, since we are declared legally to be a neutral Nation, it could be made unlawful to express one's opinion either favorably or unfavorably regarding a belligerent nation by way of applause when in attendance at a motion picture. I dare say that every one of the 20 republics south of the Rio Grande is actually and really more neutral than is the United States of America, regardless of the fact that all of us know that in every one of those countries a vast amount of propaganda and of subversive activities is carried on by the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese, who have millions of nationals in the respective 20 republics south of the Rio Grande.

For instance, in every motion-picture theater in Brazil one sees projected on the screen a statement, issued at the orders of the dictator of Brazil himself, to the effect that those in the audience are not to evidence their likes or dislikes for any nation or nations, reminding them of the fact that Brazil is neutral.

In that connection, for those who are interested in this all-important matter, it might be interesting to note that recently an edict has been issued by the dictator of Brazil to the effect that no publication—not a single newspaper, magazine, or periodical—will be permitted to be printed, published, and distributed unless it is printed in the Erazilian language, which of course, as we all know, is the Portuguese language, spoken by the 50,000,000 inhabitants of that country.

So I say that it is very difficult in this country today for the American people to give sound consideration to this all-important subject when they have drilled into their ears and forced upon their eyes from morning until night at every place where they may find themselves propaganda, propaganda, propaganda, which, unfortunately, though permitted in this country, is not countenanced in any other country upon the face of the earth.

I am very happy to observe by the report of the Dies committee, headed by that very able man, the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, that efforts have been successful to bring about the destruction of millions of pounds—actually millions of pounds—of propaganda that has been coming into this country by way of an arrangement that the Postal Service of the Nation has with other countries. I would that it were possible for us to stop propaganda, but the difficulty about it is that it is so astutely prepared that it is difficult, on the face of it, for one to ascertain whether or not it is propaganda. But, anyway, we are being swept forward, I believe into the cesspools of Europe and toward the abyss of death by propaganda. So I say to these ladies—these patriotic American citizens, mothers of North Carolina, 527 of whom have signed this resolution—that, although we appreciate what they have to say about considering the situation calmly, it is going to be a most difficult thing, in view of the propaganda that has been spread, and is spreading and will continue to spread, over this country.

The second clause of the resolution reads:

We want to keep our boys from fighting in foreign wars.

That is not at all surprising. I do not believe that American mothers desire to give their sons to fight and to hazard death for any nation upon the face of the earth except their own Nation—the United States of America.

Clause 3 continues:

We are firm in the belief that an America which keeps at peace can, in the long run, best rid the world of war and promote a just and lasting peace.

Clause 3 reads:

We heartily endorse our Government's preparedness for defense.

We all do.

Clause 4 reads:

We heartily approve of aid to Britain, but we do not want to see our own defenses weakened thereby.

We all, I am sure, share the same thought.

The fifth clause of the resolution reads:

We think the time has come for the United States to take the lead in formulating her ideals of what would constitute a just and lasting peace. We urge our legislators to consider this matter immediately.

I have great respect for these patriotic ladies of Greensboro, and I thank them for that suggestion. I apologize for saying to them now that we cannot give immediate consideration to the matter of peace, for the reason that we have said to the world we shall go "all out," that we will fight to the bitter end, until there has been a restoration of the rights of nations in continental eastern Europe. So we shall say to these ladies of Greensboro, whose petition and resolution we appreciate, that we cannot give consideration to peace, according to what we have said, until France shall have been restored to her feet, until Belgium and Holland and Luxembourg likewise shall have been restored; until Austria and Czechoslovakia, and, as a mater of fact, until Rumania and Bulgaria and perhaps Yugoslavia shall have been returned to the millions of people of those distressed and unfortunate countries. I might add there cannot be consideration of peace, in view of the words which we have held out to the world, until there shall have been restored to one-half the people of Poland their territory taken by the aggressor, Hitler. There cannot be, according to the things that have been said, any consideration of peace until Stalin himself shall have been taken to task and the people of the half of Poland which he controls shall have been returned to freedom; until there shall have been returned to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, their Governments; likewise until there shall have been returned to Finland the portion of her territory of which she was despoiled; and, finally, we shall have to say that Stalin must return Bessarabia to the people of Rumania after Hitler has been eliminated from the body of Rumania itself. So, as to that, we have to say "wait until Great Britain shall have reconquered the world and likewise has kicked Stalin loose from the two-thirds of China which is now under communistic rule.

The sixth clause of the resolution reads:

Resolved, That we pray and meditate each day for higher spiritual guidance to direct us in a just and lasting peace.

We all hope that peace will come and that it may be a just and lasting peace, but we who have given some attention to the pages of history know that always there will be wars upon wars, and they will come as the centuries follow.

This resolution, Mr. President, is signed by some 527 ladies of Greensboro, N. C. I shall not ask that the names be printed in the RECORD, but I shall hand the resolution to the clerk and retain the names in my files.

Mr. President, the people of North Carolina have become extremely interested in their country. Before I turn to that point, however, they make mention of provisions in the Democratic and Republican platforms. I have marked a portion of page 384 of the booklet entitled "Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1932 to 1940," and I respectfully invite attention to that page. Instead of reading it, I merely ask that the portion of the Democratic platform pertaining to our foreign policy and not sending troops abroad to participate in anybody else's wars may be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this juncture, and that from page 399 an extract from the Republican platform relative to the particular subject may likewise be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Democratic platform, 1941]

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

[From the Republican platform, 1941]

The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the people of North Carolina have become distressed and anxious about this matter within the past few days because they have read, according to communications I have had in the form of letters, that a British ship or British ships were on the way to Norfolk, Va., to be repaired. That matter was discussed when we had under consideration the lend-lease bill. The people are disturbed that there might be some danger in American waters if British ships are to be or are now being repaired in American harbors. They have become more disturbed since having read that we have recently seized a number of ships which belong to foreign nations and which are in our harbors, particularly since protests are to be made by foreign governments whose property was or is about to be confiscated, but, according to the press, it was seized only for the purpose of making preservation of the ships, themselves, and the machinery thereof.

They have become more thoroughly distressed on account of all they have heard recently pertaining to the subject of convoying ships. The citizens of North Carolina who have written me say that they are afraid if we undertake the convoying of ships some of our ships will be sunk, some of our men will be drowned, some of their blood will be spilled, and, as a result of the propaganda that is sweeping the country and the hysteria we find everywhere, that our country will be immediately swept into war. They naturally have a perfect right and every reason to be exercised about the matter, because I likewise am of the opinion that if, unfortunately, we should undertake the convoying of ships it would lead to physical combat. If we convoy those ships, and if, in protecting the merchant marine by our battleships, our cruisers, our destroyers, and our planes, we should shoot down some German bombers or should sink some German submarines or battleships or cruisers or destroyers, German blood would be spilled, and the probabilities are that Germany would declare war upon the United States. If that should happen it would not be necessary for the United States to declare war upon Germany, because our acts would have been perhaps the necessary procedure for bringing about a state of war under H. R. 1776.

Mr. President, I hope nothing of that sort will take place. I have read many articles recently in regard to convoying ships; and I was told today by some of my colleagues of a very interesting discussion which took place over the air waves of America last night in one of the debates at the Willard Hotel over a forum that is conducted there from week to week.

I see in an article before me something that is quite startling. It is not only in reference to convoying ships, but it is in reference to our actually having sent a propagandist to London aboard a bomber. The article, which I clipped today out of the New York Daily Mirror, is entitled:

United States must get ships to Britain, McCrary says.

There is a picture here of Mr. McCrary; and right under the picture it says:

We must guarantee delivery.

The article reads:

J. Reagan McCrary, chief editorial writer of the Mirror, was heard here yesterday in a broadcast from London.

Mr. McCrary is in London.

He was introduced by Edward B. Murrow, Columbia Broadcasting System's chief correspondent abcard, and his words were rebroadcast here by Columbia.

His talk follows:

"A bomber made in California brought me across the Atlantic to Britain."

When I finish reading the article, you can very easily acertain the fact that this gentleman is certainly a propagandist; and the thing that surprised me was that he, a propagandist, was taken to England on an American bomber.

He continues:

I was going back to America on a freighter in a convoy, but I lost my nerve.

If he had wanted to get back to America on a freighter or a passenger ship, if he was an American, he could not have gotten back, because all our freighters

and all our passenger ships are filled to the brim with refugees, aliens, noncitizens of the United States, while American citizens, mothers and their children, are left in various foreign ports.

I hope to be provided the opportunity of speaking tomorrow for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Members of this body some of the things which have been occurring about leaving American citizens on shore while refugees, noncitizens, aliens have the ships to themselves, and Americans cannot get aboard.

The battle of the Atlantic is on. Remember that in World War No. 1 Britain had help from Japan in the Pacific, from France and Italy in the Mediterranean, and from America in the Atlantic. And remember, also, that last time Germany had no long-range bombers out over the Atlantic.

Says Mr. McCrary:

But this time there are both bombers and surface raiding cruisers loose in the Atlantic.

The R. A. F.'s, those gritty boys in blue, have beaten Hitler's Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain. I know. I've been safe on this island fortress for 60 days.

Hitler's bombers haven't been able to knock out the docks in the Battle of Britain. But the Battle of the Atlantic is quite a different story. It is true that the R. A. F. has kept Hitler from crossing the channel, but it is also true that Hitler may keep American aid to Britain from crossing the Atlantic.

Americans must know the whole grim truth about the Battle of the Atlantic, they must know—

Says this gentleman with authority, who himself evidently has been the subject of a good deal of propaganda.

They must know how much of their aid to Britain is being bombed and shelled and torpedoed before it gets to Britain to help beat Hitler.

Britain's shipping losses during the next 12 months may average 100,000 tons a week at the present rate. Britain must be prepared to lose 5,000,000 tons of shipping in the ominous year ahead. But Britain cannot build and repair ships at half the rate of loss.

The American people—

Says this gentleman—

must decide now.

Decide what? Decide upon the question of convoys.

Says he:

The American people must decide now—and I speak as an ex-isolationist—that it is not enough for us to produce guns and food and bombers for Britain. We must guarantee delivery; we must guarantee victory for this island airdrome in the battle of the Atlantic. There are ways to help—ways safely short of sending our conscript Army of young Americans into this bloody struggle.

But he does not say that there are ways short of sending our seamen into a watery grave.

There are, for instance, half a million tons of foreign shipping idle in American ports. Those ships can be wangled into the battle of the Atlantic on the side of Britain. There are 1,000,000 tons of American shipping on coastal trade that could be safely diverted into Britain's life lines in the Pacific and South Atlantic, feeding arms and supplies to different ports.

I read that article merely because it is in line with some of the paragraphs of the resolution passed by 527 ladies of Greensboro, N. C. I desire to take this opportunity publicly to congratulate those ladies of my Commonwealth for their interest in keeping America out of war and thereby keeping their sons from dying on foreign battlefields.

Mr. President, I desire to bring just one more thing to the attention of the Senate. I know that all of us want to keep our country out of war. None of us want American sons to die abroad and be returned to their poor, distressed, unhappy mothers in little pine boxes around which are wrapped American flags. None of us ever want to witness again the scene of American mothers standing by the side of graves prepared for the remains of their sons—graves to keep the bodies of boys who died in Europe. I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which I clipped from the Washington Daily News of today in regard to a survey which was recently made by the magazine Fortune as to the number of persons who are against our sending men to Europe to fight again in the war over there, which action is being protested by these ladies of Greensboro, N. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

POLL SHOWS UNITED STATES AGAINST AN A. E. F.

NEW YORK, March 31.—Fortune magazine announced today that its latest survey of public opinion indicated 6 percent of the American people believe "the chances are 50–50 or better" the United States eventually will send a naval and an air force to Europe.

Only about one-third of the people favor sending an expeditionary force to Europe, the poll indicated.

"By parts of the country it is the west North Central States that are most opposed to war, with two-thirds opposing the use of ships and planes, and three-quarters against using any army," Fortune said.

The survey showed the Southern and Western States have the highest expectancy of war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "History Shows More War Than Peace," and an article entitled "Hutchins Says War 'Suicide' for America," both of which appeared in the Washington Daily News of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The articles are as follows:

HISTORY SHOWS MORE WAR THAN PEACE

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.—Prof. Walter C. Langsam, of Union College, checked history from 1496 B. C. to A. D. 1861 and found that of 3,357 years the civilized world enjoyed general peace for only 227 of them—but there

"There is sufficient evidence of general progress during the past 2,000 years in man's relations with man to encourage me to take an optimistic view of the future," he said.

"As I have pursued my studies, one thing has become ever clearer to me, namely, that the history of the future may well have much less of the grim to record if only more persons within each country would learn to acquire, early in life, certain simple habits—only a half-dozen elementary and fundamental and, therefore, highly important attitudes to govern their relations with their fellow men."

They are:

1. Tolerance for the views and conditions of others.

2. A tendency to hold or advance strong personal opinions only upon subjects on which one is relatively well informed.

3. A critical ability to differentiate, at least in a general way, between propaganda and verifiable fact.

4. A willingness to cooperate and compromise on one's dealings with other people.

5. Recognition of the importance of having a sense of humor.

HUTCHINS SAYS WAR "SUICIDE" FOR AMERICA

CHICAGO, March 31.—The United States still has a chance to remain at peace, President Robert Hutchins, of Chicago University, said yesterday in a chapel address.

He referred to war for this country as "national suicide" and "a counsel of despair."

The United States, he said, has a task to work out, "a new order in America, not, like Hitler's, based on slavery and degradation, but based on the premise that society exists to promote the happiness of its members and that happiness consists in the development of the highest powers of men."

"The war to which humanity calls America is the war against poverty, disease, ignorance, and injustice," Mr. Hutchins said.

He pictured America's fate, after a long war, as "millions unemployed," "an enormous debt," "no middle class," and "maintenance of order by a government scarcely distinguishable from those which we went forth to fight."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me under date of March 28, 1941, by Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, President of "Americans United," and Chairman of the Women's Mediation Committee, together with an open letter to the President, and a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 20 of the present Congress.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS UNITED, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We women are deeply concerned over an article appearing in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., under the date of March 27. The heading of the article is, "Donovan calls for convoys." Col. William J. Donovan, the administration's unofficial observer in Europe, states in this article that the United States has no choice as to whether or not we will be attacked. He states that the United States has done two things in passing the war-aid program which could be considered acts of war. Colonel Donovan states them as follows in his release to the public press:

"One is to authorize the building of fighting ships to be delivered to England. The other is the provision for the refitting and repair of British ships in our yards."

Colonel Donovan goes on to make the following statement in the same article which I enclose herewith:

"Germany has ignored those acts, as she has many others the past year and a half. But we must not delude ourselves into thinking that she hasn't stored it up against us. We'll have to pay for it."

Now, we women ask why have these things been done when we women, mothers of American men, do not want war. And furthermore many of the young men of draft age do not think it is our war and do not want this country to get into the fighting. One of the recent Gallup polls showed that the great big majority of the people of the United States are against our fighting in this war.

I am the president of an organization of women belonging to both political parties. We are incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. This organization called Americans United is nonprofit and nonpartisan.

On Saturday, February 8, 1941, I, as president of Americans United, was invited to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in its hearings on the lend-lease bill. On that day I presented the negotiated-peace plan of Americans United. It is constructive. It is practical. I attach a copy hereto.

The women leaders who came to Washington to fight the lend-lease bill organized the Women's Mediation Committee here in Washington the day after the lend-lease bill passed. They elected me the chairman of this committee. The organizations associated together in this committee have a membership of about 100,000 women from all parts of the country. The activities of these women are known to millions of American women. The women went back to their respective home States to work for the passage of the peace resolution of 1941. It is House Concurrent Resolution 20, introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, on February 27, 1941. The resolution provides that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world. I enclose a copy herewith. The women ask that you use your good influences to get this resolution out of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and that you give this resolution as much publicity as possible, so that patriotic and alert citizens may do all in their power in requesting Representative SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and other Representatives on his committee to get this important resolution out of committee and onto the floor of the House of Representatives.

Before the women left Washington City for their home States some of the national officers with power to act signed and delivered an open letter to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. Mrs. Rosa M. Farber, acting national chairman of Mothers of the United States of America, and I took a copy to the White House for the President's information. I enclose a copy of this letter to the Congress, together with a copy of our letter of transmittal.

The officers of these national women's organizations who sent the letter to the Congress respectfully request that you have the letter to Congress published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I respectfully ask that you also include our open letter to the President, since it contains the following promise made to the American people by the President during the campaign, which is as follows: "Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." The information that I am receiving from women in the different sections of the country is to the effect that the women intend to hold the President to his promise.

It seems a great pity that during this crisis in the life of our Nation, there is no woman student of international affairs in a policy-making position in the Department of State, or as an advisor to the President. We women feel that if the woman's viewpoint could be heard in the high executive circles of our Government at this time, there would not be such a great danger of our getting into the fighting. The women of the United States do not want war.

We are at present unprepared to wage a victorious war, and would have but few allies in this second World War if we entered. But we women do not think that it is our war.

* * * * * * *

A close study of the New Testament shows that Jesus did not advocate fighting. He preached a religion of love. As Christians who feel sorry for the suffering people of all nations and creeds we should send food, clothes, and materials for the rebuilding of homes and cities where it is needed and requested. But it does not seem right to me to send equipment which prolongs this terrible holocaust. I, as one Christian, say it is positively heartless. There should be a negotiated peace now.

I, a southern-born woman, desire at this time to commend you, a southern Senator, for the gallant fight which you made against the lend-lease bill.

I happen to be the daughter of a primitive Baptist preacher. In my girlhood, my father took me with him when he went on preaching tours in your great State. Recently, some of the children of my father's intimate North Carolina friends have been in communication with me. I have told them how grateful the women of the country are to you for your stand on the lend-lease bill. I am looking forward with great pleasure to a visit to North Carolina in the near future.

Assuring you again of the very high regard in which women throughout our country hold you because of your courageous and patriotic stand against the lend-lease bill, H. R. 1776, I am, in deepest patriotic sincerity,

Most cordially yours,
(Mrs.) CECIL NORTON BROY,
President, Americans United, and Chairman, Women's Mediation Committee.

MARCH 14, 1941.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have repeatedly asked for unity in our country. We therefore send for your information a copy of a letter addressed to Members of Congress, because this letter is a concrete example of unity.

You will see by the signatures on the letter which we transmit herewith that the women of the United States of America have joined forces and are coordinating their activities to keep out of war. We women actually represent over 50 percent of the total national vote—49,000,000 cast for you and Mr. Willkie—less those whom Senator HATTIE CARAWAY claims she speaks for.

We state this with assurance because we know why people voted for both major-party candidates. Mr. President, the vote was not an endorsement of the foreign policy. On the contrary, of all the campaign oratory, one promise, very close to the hearts of our people, stood out clearly and was accepted literally. This promise was as follows:

"Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Mr. President, that was the mandate from the people.

Sincerely and cordially yours,
AMERICANS UNITED, INC.
MOTHERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By ROSA M. FARBER,
Acting National Chairman.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

House Concurrent Resolution 20

Whereas it is the overwhelming desire of the American people that the United States shall remain at peace with the world and free from foreign entanglements, while it faithfully performs its duties as a good neighbor; and

Whereas, if the world ever needed a peacemaker, it needs one now; and

Whereas, with war engulfing a large portion of the globe and threatening to draw other nations into its vortex, there is a real opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its sincerity as a good neighbor by assuming the role of a peacemaker; and

Whereas there is a possibility, faint though it may be, that the New World, under the leadership of the United States might be the means of freeing the Old World from the miseries of war and reestablishing peace and tranquility on earth: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world.

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution shall be known as the Peace Resolution of 1941.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4124), making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to take much time at this late hour in a discussion of the problem we have been considering. I should like to inquire what the question now before the Senate is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment at the bottom of page 5 of the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, the committee proposes to strike out beginning with line 23, the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, one of the last acts of a previous administration, on March 3, 1933, was the adoption of an amendment, which I think I will read at this time so that the Senate may get the full purport of it. It provided:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States and only such manufactured articles, material, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles,

materials * * * shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply to articles, etc. * * * for use outside the United States.

In this connection I may say that I think that has been the policy of the Government since the time of the adoption of that language until just recently. In my opinion, it is a reasonable policy, and the House provision, which the amendment now pending would strike out, is a reenforcement of that policy.

I am assured by the proponents of the bill that they have no desire to change the present law, which we call the "buy-American" law. What causes the question to be raised at this time is the fact that recently one of the departments of the Government has seen fit to go to South America to buy some Argentine meat, and only this week a contract has been let for a large quantity of wool for the Government, and nearly 50 percent of it has been awarded to foreign wool. Those are the reasons why we from the farm States are so much interested in clarifying and reenforcing, if possible, the Buy-American policy to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I have discussed the matter of purchases by the Army under the provisions of this act with General Corbin and the officers who are associated with him. I hope nothing I say will be taken as critical of the manner in which they are conducting their job. I know that these men have a very difficult task, and I appreciate that they are merely following a purchasing policy which is laid down for them. I do believe, however, that it is highly important that Congress give this matter its most careful consideration, to the end that a policy consistent with the welfare of our Nation may be adopted.

I wish to call attention, Mr. President, to the language of the provision now included in the bill. It specifies "that no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States, except articles or food not produced in sufficient quantities" to supply the demand. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the broad scope of that language. It means all articles of food and clothing.

The provision is of extreme importance to the farmers of this Nation, who produce the mass of the raw materials which will be needed.

I can see no logical or justified reason why the Government should, in buying materials and supplies for its military forces, go outside the boundaries of the Nation for articles, either food or clothing, so long as there is an abundance produced and available in the United States.

Farmers of our Nation have not been prosperous for many years, Mr. President. Even Government subsidies in the form of parity payments have failed to bring farm incomes to a basis of economic equality. Our raw-materials markets are admittedly cluttered with surpluses.

Under these conditions it is, in my opinion, the obligation of the Government to buy at home as long as there are sufficient stocks of domestically produced goods. I do not believe we should send our defense dollars, which must be raised by taxes, to foreign markets until American farmers and producers have had a chance to supply our needs.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the many articles produced by our farmers which would be affected by this provision. Not only are beef producers affected; also those who produce mutton, pork, and poultry are concerned. Under the general classification of foods are such items as potatoes, beans, wheat, vegetables, fruits, cereals, sugar, flour, lard, butter, cheese, dairy products, and other commodities which are produced in abundance in our own Nation.

Under the classification of clothing are wool and cotton materials, thus making the pending proposal of great importance to all sections of the United States. With our present supply of wool, the huge surpluses of cotton, and all kinds of foodstuffs in this country, it seems utterly foolish to go elsewhere to purchase these materials.

I am reliably informed, Mr. President, that commencing with June 1941 there will be a sufficient quantity of domestic wool available to supply all our demands. The wool growers of my State have operated for many years on a very slim margin of profit—if they did not suffer actual losses. I believe it is their right to have the first chance to fill the Government's orders for blankets and clothing.

I may say, digressing from my prepared statement, that that has been the policy of the Government from the year 1933 to November 6 last, on which date it appeared to the Quartermaster General that he might be short of some grades of wool. The matter was taken up with the secretary of the National Wool Growers' Association. He was told that the Department desired to include in its bids a bid for some foreign wool; and that was done without objection.

This appropriation contains large sums for the purchase of wool, and there is plenty of wool in this country. Our wool is just now being sheared. But we find that the Government agencies refuse to limit their bids to domestic wool, but include both foreign and domestic wools. This is depressing wool prices right at shearing time, when the producers are selling.

The condition of the American farmer has been so desperate for more than a decade that we have tried to devise ways and means of helping him, even to the extent of granting him Government subsidies. Now, for the first time during that period, we have a situation that will assist the farmer to regain his financial feet. There is a way in which these surpluses of farm products which have been accumulating may be put to beneficial use. Our Government needs these materials for immediate consumption. Could anything be more fitting, or more right, than for the Government to go to its own citizens for these articles rather than securing them from foreign sources?

According to figures from the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the income of the 32,000,000 farmers in this country for 1939, the last year for which figures are available, was $5,635,000,000, or 8.1 percent of the total national income for that year. In other words, 25 percent of the population was receiving only about 8 percent of the national income. The same Government source reveals that national income in 1939 had recovered to 83.7 percent of the 1929 total. Farm income was only 77.6 percent of the 1929 total. This was in spite of the fact that in 1929 business and industry were in the midst of boom times, while the farmer, even then, was in a depression.

Translate these figures into terms of the farmers' standard of living, and we find that the situation at present is simply intolerable. If we are to yield now to the advice of those who say we must abandon the farmer, Mr. President, if we give in to those who tell us we must stop the pitiful relief we have been giving him, we shall be betraying our own people.

Figures show that in addition to the abundance of domestic wool that will soon be available, our stocks of livestock on the farms and western ranges are at a high level. I think that at only one time in history have we had more cattle in the country than we have today. The number of beef cattle has increased from 66,789,000, in 1939, to 71,666,000 at present. The number of sheep now totals 55,880,000, as compared with 53,783,000 in 1939. In view of these increases, I cannot see any logic in the Government going abroad for purchases of beef and mutton.

If it were not for the defense program, the present situation would not be so favorable. Without the tremendous amount of purchases being made for defense, the market for both beef and mutton would be in a depressed condition.

With such an ample supply of cattle in this country, it would be a serious mistake to adopt a policy that would encourage the purchase of Argentine canned meats. As I understand, the packers have perfected a process for canning choice cuts of meat for the Army and Navy needs. This process can be utilized in this country. We need not go to South America to make use of it.

Mr. President, the only argument which has been given to me for voting for the committee amendment is that beef can be canned in Argentina much cheaper than in our own country. That argument can be applied to any farm product produced in South America, because, with the cheaper labor and lower standards of living, almost all farm commodities can be produced there at less cost.

Let us consider the Government's policy on wool purchases since 1933. Up to November 6, 1940, the War Department bought wool of domestic origin only, in accordance with the terms of the "Buy American" Act. Since November 6, 1940, however, the Department has been asking for bids on both foreign and domestic wool, or mixtures of the two. On March 5, 1941, representatives of the growers were informed that it was not the intention of the Quartermaster to restore the rule requiring all domestic wool in future contracts.

The wool growers of America feel that when they have an ample supply of wool they should be entitled to the opportunity of supplying the Government's demand. That is the object of the provision now under consideration, as far as wool is concerned. It would require the use of domestic wool in Government contracts only so long as the supply of the necessary grades of domestic wool was readily available.

I believe the "Buy American" policy was a good policy in 1933, and I believe it is an equally good one today. The financial condition of the American farmer is still serious. Our producers are just as essentially in need of assistance now as they were in 1933. They need the added protection given to them by the provision which the committee is seeking to strike out.

The present international emergency has not mitigated the emergency at home. On the contrary, it has intensified it. I do not believe it is wise for our Government to become so absorbed in international affairs as to forget the emergencies which exist at home. So long as American producers can supply our needs they should be given the preference.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the committee amendment to strike out this protection of the American farmer will be defeated. As I have already stated, it has been the policy to give the domestic producers of wool the market so far as it could be supplied, and all we are asking is that that policy be continued. But the Quartermaster General has given the information to the secretary of the National Wool Growers' Association and others who have called upon him that they expect to continue the same policy of dividing the bids. The provision merely directs the Army officials that they must "buy American"; that is all we are asking.

Mr. President, before I conclude I ask that there be printed at this place in the RECORD a statement in support of our proposal which has been prepared by the Secretary of the National Wool Growers' Association.

I also have another memorandum on parity wool prices which I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

I also have a memorandum furnished me of comparison of bids and awards for foreign and domestic wool by the Army, which I wish to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE "FOOD AND CLOTHING" IN PROVISION OF H. R. 4124, REQUIRING THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS TO PURCHASE MATERIALS OF DOMESTIC ORIGIN

Respecting the purchases of wool for the Army, the situation is briefly as follows:

During the calendar year 1940 the War Department purchased wool materials representing the equivalent of 248,000,000 pounds of grease wool. Until November 6, it was required in accordance with the terms of the Buy American Act of 1933 that all wool entering into Army purchases should be of domestic origin.

Late in October officials of the Defense Commission called representatives of the growers into conference to discuss reports that had been received by the Commission to the effect that there was an insufficient supply of some grades of domestic wool available for the contracts which it was intended to make for woolen goods in December. The spokesmen for the growers agreed with the situation, and while they did not approve the suspension of the former rule, they did state they would make no complaint or objection so long as the situation continued in which the available supplies of domestic wool were insufficient for Army requirements.

On November 6 the Defense Commission issued a statement saying that it would not be permissible for woolen manufacturers to bid on fabrics to be composed of all foreign wool, all domestic wool, or mixtures of the two.

Under that arrangement large contracts were let in December. Additional contracts representing the equivalent of 90,000,000 pounds of grease wool have been made or are being made in the present month.

In consultation with officials of the Quartermaster Corps on March 5, representatives of the growers were informed that it was not the intention of the Quartermaster to restore the rule requiring all domestic wool in future contracts when ample supplies of all grades of wool (domestic) would be available.

The provision under consideration by your committee would require the use of domestic wool in Government contracts only so long as the supply of the necessary grades of domestic wool is readily available. The invitations for bids of woolen materials sent to prospective bidders stated that some differential in favor of domestic wool would be allowed. However, the amount of such differential has never been disclosed except to the extent that may be done from examination of previous awards.

A differential for domestic wool was supposed to be allowed in contracts made last week for the purchase of 2,000,000 blankets. Bidders who were proposing to use all domestic wool received contracts for 405,000 blankets. Bidders proposing to use all foreign wool received contracts on 220,000 blankets. The remainder of the awards went to concerns bidding on mixtures of foreign and domestic wool. The average price of blankets to be made from domestic wool was $6.51, and for blankets to be made of all foreign wool, the price was $6.29. The proportion of these blankets going to domestic wool users was gratifying. However, it is possible and more than probable that more extensive bids would have been submitted on the basis of domestic wool if it had been possible for the bidders to know the amount of the differential that the Quartermaster would have approved in favor of domestic wool.

The average of awards made on domestic wool blankets was $6.51 each and on foreign wool $6.29—a dierence of 22 cents per blanket or 4.4 cents per pound of scoured wool.

On March 17, bids were opened on 4,900,000 yards of 18-ounce dark serge, 5,000,000 yards of light serge, and 10,200,000 yards of flannel shirting weighing 10½ ounces per yard.

Again the bidding mills were not informed as to the amount of the price differential that would be recognized on cloth to be made from domestic wool. Here, the extent of bidding on all domestic wool was much less than in the case of blankets. Some firms bid as low on all domestic wool as others did on all foreign wool. The bids on domestic wool were from 16 cents to 20 cents per yard more than on all foreign wool. At the outside, the difference for the small amount of domestic wool bid on was 12 cents per scoured pound. We know nothing as yet about the awards.

Plainly, the inability of the mills to know the amount of differential for domestic wool caused them to bid cheaply upon foreign wool. The American grower was deprived of the opportunity to furnish, at a fair price, any considerable amount of wool to be used in the manufacture of uniform cloth.

PARITY WOOL PRICES

The parity prices as now published respecting wool by the Department of Agriculture have no value. The reason is that the base period employed for wool is the same as for other agricultural commodities, namely 1909 to 1914. This was one of the lowest periods of wool prices on record, and largely because of the fact that during that period the agitation for free wool was rife, and, subsequently, wool was put on the free list.

The Department of Agriculture recognizes that the customary base period is not fairly applicable to wool. Officials of the Department of Agriculture Adjustment Administration have signified their intention of sponsoring an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, under which the base period for wool would be changed from 1919 to 1929.

On this basis the present parity price of wool would be about 37 cents.

COMPARISON OF BIDS AND AWARDS FOR FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC WOOL BY THE ARMY

On the awards for dark-shade serge, the average price for all domestic wool was $2.87604. On all foreign wool the average price was $2.83423. On the combination of foreign and domestic wool the average was $2.8185, and on a blend of foreign and domestic wool $2.84255.

In the case of dark-shade serge, the all-domestic wool was 1½ percent higher than the all foreign. The combination was lower than the all foreign, and the blend one-third of 1 percent higher than the foreign.

On the light-shade serge, the award for all domestic wool was $2.88418 on the average, for all-foreign wool $2.82241, on the combination of foreign and domestic wool $2.86340, and on a blend of foreign and domestic wool $2.8540.

On the light-shade serge made from all domestic wool the price was 2 2-10 percent higher than that made from all foreign. That made from the combination was 1½ percent higher than the all foreign, and that made of a blend of foreign and domestic was 1 1-10 percent higher than the all foreign.

On the light-shade elastique the average bid on all domestic wool was $3.05562. No awards were made to the all-domestic wool bidders, but awards were made on all-foreign wool at an average of $3.03866, and on a combination of foreign and domestic wool for $3.0630.

In this case the bids on the all-domestic wool was ½ of 1 percent higher than the bids on the all-foreign wool, and the combination of foreign and domestic wool was 8-10 of 1 percent higher than the all-foreign wool.

On the shirting flannel, the average bid on all-domestic wool was $1.80817. No award made on the all-domestic bids. A large award was made on all-foreign wool at $1.77414, and on a combination of foreign and domestic wool at $1.83010, and on a blend of foreign and domestic wool at $1.8340.

In this case, the offer on the all-domestic wool was 2 percent higher than the award on the all-foreign. The award on the combination of domestic and foreign wool was 3⅓ percent higher than the all-foreign wool, and the award on the blend of foreign and domestic wool was 3⅓ percent higher than the all-foreign wool.

These awards required 9,717,357 pounds of domestic wool and 12,118,364 pounds of foreign wool. All of these are, of course, in clean weights. Converted to a grease basis, this would mean somewhere between 65 and 75 million pounds of wool.

Figuring another way on the dark-shade serge, the difference between the all-foreign and the all-domestic was 0.04181 cents. That is, the all-domestic wool was that

much higher than the foreign wool per yard. Using the Army's figure of 1.4 pounds of clean wool per yard of 18-ounce serge, this difference amounts to 3 cents per pound of clean wool.

On the light-shade serge, the difference between the domestic and the foreign was 0.06177 cents per yard higher than on the all-foreign wool. Using the 1.4-pound figure of clean wool per yard of 18-ounce serge, we find that the difference in the value of the clean domestic wool would be 0.0441 cents higher than the all-foreign wool.

On light-shade elastic, that manufactured from all-domestic wool was 0.01696 cents per yard higher than goods manufactured from all-foreign wool. Using the 1.4 pound of clean wool to make a yard of 18-ounce elastic, we find that the domestic wool was 0.012 per pound higher.

On the shirting flannel, the price of all-domestic wool per yard was 0.0277 higher than the all-foreign. On the basis of the 1.4-pound figure of clean wool, domestic wool would figure 0.0185 cents per pound higher.

Scoured-wool requirements, fiscal year 1941

Item	Type	Scoured wool		Grade
		Yards	*Pounds*	
Woven fabrics:				
A. Elastique	Worsted	835,000	1,169,000	64
Serge:				
Dark	do	10,038,750	14,082,250	64
Light	do	12,966,950	18,153,730	64
Shirting:				
Flannel	do	13,822,500	9,122,850	60
Worsted	do	1,751,200	1,435,984	60
Total		39,434,400	43,963,814	
B. Overcoating		7,882,500	18,129,750	44
		Units		
Blankets	Worsted	4,346,250	20,383,913	56
Total			38,513,663	
Knitted fabrics:				
C. Drawers, woolen	Merino yarns	4,925,193	2,260,220	60
Undershirts, woolen	do	4,376,018	2,345,570	60
Socks, woolen	do	17,217,222	1,440,789	64
Total		26,518,433	6,046,579	
D. Gloves, wool	Carded woolen yarns	2,008,938	441,966	56
Aggregate total of 88,966,022 pounds scoured wool which by grade is—			34,845,769	64
			15,164,624	60
			20,825,879	56
			18,129,750	44
			88,966,022	

This would require about 233,000 to 240,000 of territory grease wool.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a statement which I made to the Committee on Appropriations as to the parity prices of various farm commodities.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to give some figures that will illustrate the economic condition of the farmer. Let us consider some of the crops which are produced and the prices that are being received for them. We will consider these figures on the parity-price basis that has been established by Congress. As you well know, this indicates the prices which the farmer should receive for his products in order that his purchasing power will be on an equality with other industrial groups.

Potatoes, for instance, on February 15, 1940, sold for 87 percent of parity. On February 15 of this year the price was only 62 percent of parity. And potatoes do not share in the parity program. The same is true of a great number of other farm-produced commodities.

Eggs, on February 15, 1940, were selling at 82 percent of parity. Last February 15 they brought only 68 percent of parity. Rye last year sold at 61 percent of parity. On February 15 of this year it sold at 45 percent of parity. The price of wheat on February 15, 1940, was 75 percent of parity. A year later it was 60 percent of parity. Similarly, the price of oats on February 15, 1940, was 74 percent of parity. By February 15, 1941, oats had fallen to 64 percent of parity. The price of sugar beets in December 1939 was 70 percent of parity. In December 1940 this price was 67 percent of parity. The price of dry beans in December 1939 was 70 percent of parity. By December 1940 the price of dried beans was only 62 percent of parity.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I realize that the same provision was voted out of the naval bill by the Senate a few days ago, and I understand the conference committee has taken it out, with the principal argument of the good-neighbor policy, but the first group of neighbors we should satisfy is the American farmers. I am willing to go along in an effort to help the South American countries as well as we can. We are lending them money now, and doing everything to further the good-neighbor policy, but they ought to be given to understand now that the good-neighbor policy does not include the surrender of the American farmers' market to other countries.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to take the time of the Senate for a few moments in relation to the amendment which has been the subject of discussion here for the last hour or so. As I recollect, the situation as it now stands is that the House wrote into the bill the language:

That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States.

And so forth. The Senate recently approved that amendment. The conferees now have gotten together and have stricken it out.

Mr. President, I realize that we are living in a period when the Executive branch of the Government may consider many external factors which may affect our domestic economy, but I agree with the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who just spoke, that the American market should be for the American producer.

At present, if we want to import 199 pounds of beef there is a protective rate of only $2.98, but if we want to import 199 pounds of peanuts there is a protective rate of $9.95. In other words, we now say to the man on the ranch and the man on the farm, the man who has invested his life—and I mean that literally—in clearing the trees from the fields and then breaking up the land, "We are not going to protect you. We are going to buy our products outside this country with taxpayers' money."

The other day when this matter first came up I read the amendment, and I thought to myself, "Well, that is going to hit the dairy industry in my State pretty strong." Then I got to thinking afterward that when we discussed it here in the Senate, and the statement went out through the newspapers that this amendment simply related to corned beef. So I asked Representative MURRAY, who is from my State, and who is a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, to obtain a few figures for me to confirm my conclusion as to what was taking place. In the $7,000,000,000 appropriation measure, $1,300,000,000 is provided for agricultural products. If this amendment is stricken out those who are going to do the buying will be given the discretion to spend anywhere in the world this hard-earned money which we are spending allegedly for defense. The American farmer is overlooked in that arrangement.

As I stated, I have had a chance to look into this matter and I find that my State of Wisconsin is one of the greatest beef-producing States in the United States. Of course, it is generally known that we produce a great number of dairy cattle but usually we are not identified as a great beef-producing State.

Mr. President, at this point I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks a tabulation showing the total number of cattle and calves on hand on January 1, 1940, in all the States of the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tabulation is as follows:

Cattle and calves on hand Jan. 1, 1940

Maine	238,000
New Hampshire	126,000
Vermont	452,000
Massachusetts	193,000
Rhode Island	30,000
Connecticut	182,000
New York	2,116,000
New Jersey	203,000
Pennsylvania	1,543,000
Ohio	2,091,000
Indiana	1,748,000
Illinois	2,915,000
Michigan	1,708,000
Wisconsin	3,406,000
Minnesota	3,341,000
Iowa	4,688,000
Missouri	2,802,000
North Dakota	1,337,000

Cattle and calves on hand Jan. 1, 1940—Con.

South Dakota	1,630,000
Nebraska	3,084,000
Kansas	3,063,000
Delaware	54,000
Maryland	338,000
Virginia	913,000
West Virginia	600,000
North Carolina	684,000
South Carolina	359,000
Georgia	1,009,000
Florida	821,000
Kentucky	1,243,000
Tennessee	1,228,000
Alabama	1,080,000
Mississippi	1,273,000
Arkansas	1,174,000
Louisiana	1,131,000
Oklahoma	2,247,000
Texas	6,677,000
Montana	1,107,000
Idaho	775,000
Wyoming	787,000
Colorado	1,404,000
New Mexico	1,276,000
Arizona	898,000
Utah	432,000
Nevada	364,000
Washington	826,000
Oregon	1,012,000
California	2,161,000
United States	68,769,000

Mr. WILEY. I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, a table which shows the amount of cattle products, in pounds, produced during 1939, and the cash income of the products for each State in the Union.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cattle products, 1939

State	Production in pounds	Cash income from sales
Maine	33,925,000	$2,106,000
New Hampshire	18,630,000	1,304,000
Vermont	62,640,000	3,856,000
Massachusetts	24,330,000	2,587,000
Rhode Island	3,050,000	517,000
Connecticut	24,725,000	2,020,000
New York	352,060,000	23,297,000
New Jersey	32,270,000	3,614,000
Pennsylvania	278,470,000	26,056,000
Ohio	458,010,000	41,457,000
Indiana	438,615,000	41,855,000
Illinois	771,460,000	93,409,000
Michigan	359,955,000	26,960,000
Wisconsin	683,420,000	41,215,000
Minnesota	777,845,000	60,323,000
Iowa	1,321,995,000	161,402,000
Missouri	712,585,000	63,956,000
North Dakota	299,980,000	15,546,000
South Dakota	379,600,000	29,074,000
Nebraska	770,460,000	75,698,000
Kansas	807,780,000	80,886,000
Delaware	7,355,000	636,000
Maryland	51,600,000	4,135,000
Virginia	164,160,000	10,866,000
West Virginia	126,965,000	8,585,000
North Carolina	93,215,000	4,981,000
South Carolina	56,145,000	3,089,000
Georgia	110,090,000	5,154,000
Florida	69,845,000	3,415,000
Kentucky	238,275,000	20,292,000
Tennessee	219,080,000	14,447,000
Alabama	145,075,000	6,648,000
Mississippi	191,670,000	9,810,000
Arkansas	198,440,000	10,458,000
Louisiana	162,460,000	8,083,000
Oklahoma	550,020,000	42,163,000
Texas	1,429,730,000	108,319,000
Montana	265,400,000	15,469,000
Idaho	166,285,000	9,460,000
Wyoming	219,325,000	18,128,000
Colorado	377,720,000	40,970,000
New Mexico	276,435,000	22,130,000
Arizona	174,090,000	15,964,000
Utah	97,820,000	6,727,000
Nevada	77,415,000	5,075,000
Washington	160,960,000	10,261,000
Oregon	229,690,000	14,600,000
California	484,415,000	57,711,000
United States	14,955,485,000	1,274,714,000

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention specifically to the fact that the States of New York, Wisconsin, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and California, or 25 percent of the States, produce over one-half the cattle of the country. Note the enormous amounts of beef produced in Iowa, Kansas, Texas, Nebraska, Illinois, and Wisconsin. It is significant to note, as one reads this table, that the annual value of this beef is twice the value of the cotton-fiber crop of 1940, which was only $595,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD also a table showing the total amount of cattle marketed by each of the States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table showing the total number of cattle marketed by State, 1939

State	Shipped out	In-shipments	Number shipped out less number shipped in
Maine	69,000	1,000	68,000
New Hampshire	54,000	5,000	49,000
Vermont	186,000	10,000	176,000
Massachusetts	104,000	25,000	79,000
Rhode Island	21,000	7,000	14,000
Connecticut	79,000	11,000	68,000
New York	797,000	10,000	787,000
New Jersey	110,000	27,000	83,000
Pennsylvania	258,000	118,000	140,000
Ohio	750,000	152,000	598,000
Indiana	727,000	227,000	500,000
Illinois	1,447,000	745,000	702,000
Michigan	511,000	75,000	436,000
Wisconsin	1,424,000	40,000	1,384,000
Minnesota	1,465,000	190,000	1,275,000
Iowa	2,240,000	1,097,000	1,143,000
Missouri	1,152,000	414,000	738,000
North Dakota	356,000	30,000	326,000
South Dakota	506,000	67,000	439,000
Nebraska	1,076,000	389,000	687,000
Kansas	1,241,000	744,000	497,000
Delaware	9,000	1,00	8,000
Maryland	98,000	17,000	81,000
Virginia	277,000	14,000	263,000
West Virginia	125,000	2,000	123,000
North Carolina	109,000	2,000	107,000
South Carolina	35,000	1,000	34,000
Georgia	134,000	8,000	126,000
Florida	70,000	1,000	69,00
Kentucky	478,000	118,000	360,00
Tennessee	380,000	55,000	325,000
Alabama	207,000	25,000	182,000
Mississippi	344,000	5,000	339,000

Table showing the total number of cattle marketed by State, 1939—Continued

State	Shipped out	In-shipments	Number shipped out less number shipped in
Arkansas	274,000	13,000	261,000
Louisiana	231,000	19,000	212,000
Oklahoma	936,000	241,000	695,000
Texas	2,560,000	261,000	2,299,000
Montana	248,000	53,000	195,000
Idaho	131,000	6,000	125,000
Wyoming	316,000	32,000	284,000
Colorado	671,000	190,000	481,000
New Mexico	595,000	122,000	473,000
Arizona	319,000	124,000	195,000
Utah	106,000	14,000	92,000
Nevada	72,000	5,000	67,000
Washington	117,000	17,000	100,000
Oregon	184,000	8,000	176,000
California	1,128,000	423,000	705,000
United States	24,723,000	6,161,000	18,562,000

Mr. WILEY. I ask that it be noted that one-third of the cattle marketed are produced in four States—Texas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa.

We were talking about beef as an import. It is a significant thing to note that from 1900 to 1904 we imported 100,000 head of live cattle, but from 1934 to 1938 we imported 359,000 head. In 1940 we imported 631,000 head. It is significant to note that in 1940 we imported 11,216,000 pounds of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, and 62,000,000 pounds of canned, pickled, or cured beef or veal.

It is significant to note that our exports fell correspondingly. In 1940 we imported 631,000 live cattle, and exported 3,000. In the same year we imported 11,000,000 pounds of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef products, and exported 7,000,000 pounds. In the same year we imported 62,000,000 pounds of canned and pickled or cured beef, and exported 8,000,000 pounds.

I ask that the table showing the imports and exports of beef from 1900 to 1938, in 5-year periods, and for the calendar years 1939 and 1940, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cattle and beef: United States imports and exports, annual averages by 5-year periods, 1900–1938, and for calendar years 1939 and 1940

[U. S. Tariff Commission, March 1941]

Period [1]	Imports			Exports		
	Live cattle	Beef and veal		Live cattle	Beef and veal	
		Fresh, chilled or frozen	Canned and pickled or cured		Fresh, chilled or frozen	Canned and pickled or cured
5-year average:	*Head*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Head*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1900 to 1904	100,000	398,000	[2]	448,000	307,405,000	115,276,000
1905 to 1909	64,000	212,000	[2]	426,000	222,060,000	95,807,000
1910 to 1914	399,000	36,918,000	[2]	88,000	29,453,000	42,265,000
1915 to 1918	414,000	74,083,000	[2]	14,000	242,216,000	118,359,000
1919 to 1923	319,000	35,208,000	8,131,000	61,000	2,628,000	23,422,000
1924 to 1928	301,000	28,692,000	29,842,000	39,000	2,451,000	29,068,000
1929 to 1933	185,000	11,696,000	47,250,000	5,000	2,477,000	13,824,000
1934 to 1938	359,000	3,911,000	77,130,000	5,000	4,735,000	10,373,000
1939	774,000	2,529,000	88,035,000	3,000	6,214,000	8,949,000
1940	631,000	11,216,000	62,743,000	[3] 3,000	[3] 7,265,000	[3] 8,207,000

[1] Fiscal years 1900 to 1918, inclusive; 1915–18 is a 4-year average; calendar years 1939–40.
[2] Not separately reported.
[3] 11 months.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the foregoing tables depict the cattle situation in the United States. It will be noted that cattle are found on a large percentage of the farms of this country. Any legislation beneficial to the cattle industry ultimately benefits a large percentage of the farmers of the country. On the other hand, any adverse legislation in connection with beef products causes a very general loss to a large percentage of the farmers of this country.

When I originally spoke on this matter I spoke in relation to the dairy industry. Bear in mind that this money may be spent to buy millions of pounds of butter and beef for the soldiers located in America. I do not have the information, but what has been said here today indicates the possibilities in this connection.

Who constitutes this country? Is it made up only of a few bureaucrats, or a few people on the eastern seaboard? As has been said many times, the farm section is the real backbone of this country. We now have an opportunity, through this very provision, to demonstrate that we have some consideration for the farm section. It has been stated all over the country that the provision relates to corned beef. A team of horses could be driven through this section. The language refers to clothing and products grown or produced in the United States. That language is so all-inclusive that it could even include shoes. If there is a disposition to disregard the implications of this provision for the farmer, possibly those in the East who manufacture shoes and other products will realize what it may mean, even to them.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that since 1913, when the tariff was removed by the Wilson administration, this country has been on a beef-importing basis. A study of the preceding tables will show the large importations of cattle during the past 2 years, amounting to 774,000 head in 1939 and 631,000 head in 1940, or a total of 1,405,000 head for the 2 years.

I ask the following questions:

Why should we continually import such large amounts of beef when the United States is one of the greatest livestock-producing countries in the world?

Why should we appropriate $500,000,000 annually to control our agricultural production and import from $500,000,000 to $860,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products?

If the Walsh-Healey Act is a desirable act for certain labor groups—and I subscribe to its objectives—why are not the farm-labor groups entitled to equal legislative protection?

If the Guffey Coal Act is desirable for coal miners, why is not farm labor entitled to equal legislative protection?

If the Miller-Tydings bill affords business protection to certain business groups, why is not the American farmer entitled to the same legislative protection?

If one group of farmers, representing 29 percent of the milk producers, is entitled to the legislative protection afforded by price fixing in the milk-marketing agreements, why are not the majority of farmers entitled to the same legislative protection?

Let me say at this point, because I want to get it into the RECORD, that it is a significant thing, which the country ought to know, that in 1939 New York produced 7,465,000,000 pounds of milk, and received $2 per 100 pounds for it. Pennsylvania produced 4,622,000,000 pounds, and received $2.40 per 100 pounds. Massachusetts produced 804,000,000 pounds, and received $3.29 per 100 pounds; but Wisconsin, which produced 11,973,000,000 pounds, received only $1.23 per 100 pounds.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the milk production in certain States in 1939.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Milk, 1939

States	Total production on farms	Value per 100 pounds	Value of production	Number of milk cows
	Pounds			
New York	7,465,000,000	$2.00	$149,300,000	1,355,000
Pennsylvania [1]	4,622,000,000	2.40	110,928,000	882,000
Massachusetts	804,000,000	3.29	26,452,000	137,000
Wisconsin	11,973,000,000	1.23	147,268,000	2,108,000
Minnesota	8,160,000,000	1.08	88,128,000	1,600,000
Iowa	6,519,000,000	1.08	70,405,000	1,393,000
Texas	4,227,000,000	1.81	76,509,000	1,342,000
Tennessee	1,936,000,000	1.64	31,750,000	553,000
Mississippi	1,373,000,000	1.62	22,243,000	522,000

[1] Note the wide price variation in the eastern area.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, who would suggest that we build a battleship in some foreign country because we can secure cheaper labor there? Who, in fairness, can suggest that we import foreign beef, and say that such meat is infinitely better than that produced in this country, when the facts will not justify the assertion?

While the farm people represent only 25 percent of the population, and receive less than 10 percent of the national income, many authorities believe that they have 40 percent of the purchasing power of the country. Many groups are dependent upon the farm groups, not only for food, but also for commercial materials and for their economic contributions. Why continually ask the American farmer to be the good neighbor of the good-neighbor policy? Certainly in our domestic economy we have not been such good neighbors to the farmer.

The foregoing tables show where the meat of this country is produced. Can Louisiana, Colorado, Utah, and Florida farmers demand the American sugar market for their farmers and at the same time fairly subscribe to a program which gives away the American beef market of the beef-producing States?

How can the peanut producers of Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, and other States expect to maintain a protective tariff of 7 cents a pound on their products and at the same time expect Congress to give away the American beef producers' market? The tariff on peanuts is two and one-third times the cost of producing the peanuts, while the tariff on beef is low in comparison.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a schedule showing the tariff rates on peanuts, together with the tariff rates on beef cattle and beef products under various tariff acts since the act of 1897.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tariff rates on beef cattle and beef products since the Tariff Act of 1897

[U. S. Tariff Commission, Washington, Mar. 10, 1941]

	Cattle	Beef		Tallow	Hides raw or uncured
		Fresh or frozen	Canned		
Tariff Act of 1897	$2 per head,[1] or $3.75 per head,[2] or 27½ percent ad valorem.[3]	2 cents per pound	25 percent ad valorem	¾ cent per pound	15 percent ad valorem.
Tariff Act of 1909	do	1½ cents per pound	do	½ cent per pound	Free.
Tariff Act of 1913	Free	Free	Free	Free	Do.
Tariff Act of 1921 (emergency tariff)	30 percent ad valorem	2 cents per pound	25 percent ad valorem	do	Do.
Tariff Act of 1922	1½ cents per pound,[4] or 2 cents per pound [5]	3 cents per pound	20 percent ad valorem	½ cent per pound	Do.
Tariff Act of 1930	2½ cents per pound,[6 7] or 3 cents per pound.[8 10]	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound, but not less than 20 percent ad valorem	do.[9]	10 percent ad valorem

[1] If less than 1 year old.
[2] If 1 year old or over and valued at not more than $14 per head.
[3] If 1 year old or over and valued at more than $14 per head.
[4] Weighing less than 1,050 pounds each.
[5] Weighing 1,050 pounds each or more.
[6] Weighing less than 700 pounds each.
[7] Under trade agreement with Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936, cattle weighing less than 175 pounds each were dutiable at 1½ cents per pound on entries not in excess of 51,933 head in any calendar year. Under the new Canadian agreement, effective since Jan. 1, 1939, the reduced rate applies to cattle under 200 pounds each and the tariff quota is increased to 100,000 head per calendar year. Entries in excess of tariff quotas are subject to original tariff act rate of 2½ cents per pound.
[8] Plus 3 cents per pound import excise tax (sec. 2491 (a), Internal Revenue Code).
[9] Weighing 700 pounds each or more.
[10] Beef cattle weighing over 700 pounds each were dutiable under the first Canadian trade agreement at 2 cents per pound on entries not in excess of 155,799 head in any calendar year. Under the new Canadian agreement, the tariff quota was increased to 225,000 head and the rate reduced to 1½ cents per pound. Entries in excess of tariff quotas are subject to original tariff act rate of 3 cents per pound.

Tariff rates, peanuts

	Not shelled	Shelled
Tariff Act of 1909	½ cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
Tariff Act of 1913	3/8 cent per pound.	¾ cent per pound.
Emergency Tariff Act, 1921.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
Tariff Act of 1922	----do----	4 cents per pound.
Presidential proclamation, sec. 315, Tariff Act, 1922 (effective Feb. 18, 1929).	4¼ cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
Tariff Act of 1930 (effective June 18, 1930).	----do----	7 cents per pound.

Mr. WILEY. The much-criticized Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act appears to be very acceptable to the peanut interests of the country. Does anyone want to foster increased peanut importations? Again I say, please remember that the tariff on peanuts is more than twice the cost of producing the peanuts. While 199 pounds of beef cattle may have a duty of $2.985, 199 pounds of peanuts may have a duty of $9.95. I am sure that my distinguished friends from South Carolina, Virginia, Louisiana, and Maryland do not desire to harm the beef industry. I noted the desire for an increase in the Smoot-Hawley rates asked by Representatives of those States before the United States Tariff Commission on January 9, 1941, when the question of increasing the tariff on crab meat was under consideration. Our colleagues from those States believed in the American market for the people of their States and districts. Why not the American market for all farmers? It will be remembered that the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, said in his testimony before the Commission:

> We are vitally interested in protecting anything pertaining to the canning of any of our fish or shrimp or anything of that nature.

The livestock farmers of this country would be apprehensive of this legislation if they realized the millions of dollars of their money being used to subsidize a sectionally produced crop, and if they realized that some favored crop is the beneficiary of an annual subsidy of one-third of the annual value of the crop.

Mr. President, I hope the committee report now striking out the original provision will not be adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Byrd	Gurney
Aiken	Byrnes	Hatch
Andrews	Capper	Hayden
Austin	Caraway	Hill
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Holman
Ball	Connally	Hughes
Bankhead	Danaher	Kilgore
Barbour	Davis	La Follette
Barkley	Ellender	Langer
Bone	George	Lee
Brooks	Gerry	McCarran
Bulow	Gillette	McNary
Burton	Green	Maloney
Butler	Guffey	Murdock
Murray	Shipstead	Tunnell
Norris	Smith	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Stewart	Vandenberg
Pepper	Taft	Van Nuys
Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Russell	Tobey	Willis
Sheppard	Truman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the issue involved in this question seems to me to be the perfectly simple one of whether we will be satisfied with the preference for domestically produced articles carried in the general law, or whether we shall substitute for that a complete, ironclad ban against the purchase of certain articles produced outside the United States.

In ordinary circumstances, if there were no danger of war, and if we were not engaged in raising and supplying a very large Army and Navy, I should be taking today the same position that I took with respect to this matter in a previous session of Congress. But in view of the circumstances my feeling is that it is unnecessary and, indeed, unwise to impose the absolute ban which is provided by the amendment.

The act of March 3, 1933, in section 2 of title III, which, I understand, has already been read to the Senate, provides:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use.

And so forth.

That places it, of course, within the discretion of the executive bureaus which acquire supplies for the United States to determine whether or not the price is unreasonable.

The amendment which the committee has stricken out provides:

> *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto.

It became obvious more than a year ago, when the defense effort was initiated, that difficult problems would arise with respect to the supplying of our armed forces. It also became obvious that unless the defense efforts were carefully managed there might be discrimination against American producers. After consultation with various representatives of the agricultural producers of the country, I had several conferences with members of the Advisory Council of National Defense, particularly with Hon. Chester C. Davis, member of the Federal Reserve Board, who is on the Advisory Council and who, as members of the Senate will recall, was at one time administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. No person, I assume, in the whole Government has a clearer idea of the producer's point of view than has Chester C. Davis. He was appointed to the Advisory Council because he did have that point of view. In numerous conferences which were held he demonstrated that to be the case.

Our first conferences had to do with the purchase of wool. I was particularly anxious that wool should not be acquired in great quantities from sources outside the United States in such a way as to endanger the interests of the American producer of wool. The Government of Great Britain wanted to make arrangements for the importation into the United States of Australian wool, but as to that the Council of National Defense was so careful that arrangements were made whereby such importation was to be handled in such a way as not to affect adversely the price of wool. The records for the past year demonstrate that effort to have been successful. Producers of wool are receiving a very satisfactory price.

With respect to beef cattle, I am satisfied that the result will be exactly the same, and, as I had occasion to remark on this floor when this amendment was under consideration only a few weeks ago, the officers and directors of the American National Livestock Association came to Washington to hold conferences with the Council of National Defense in order to make certain again that the interests of the producer would be taken care of. They left here entirely satisfied that that would be done. Their satisfaction was based upon the fact that the Purchasing Division of O. P. M., headed by Mr. Donald Nelson and his assistant, Mr. MacKeachie, agreed to change the specifications for the purchase of fresh meats. The weight of the carcass of beef cattle has been reduced from 500 pounds to 450 pounds, and with respect to lamb, the weight of the carcass has been increased from 45 pounds to 60 pounds. Thus assurance was given that the Council of National Defense had in mind the essential interests of the producer. So the officers and directors of the American National Livestock Association left Washington satisfied that the livestock business would not be injured by the rejection of the House provision.

We should not blind ourselves to the fact, Mr. President, that in this all-out effort, to use the popular phrase, and in the expenditure of the huge sums which have been appropriated for national defense, there is grave danger that prices may get out of line. If prices for agricultural products or for any other products should get out of line the producers of such products would, in my opinion, stand in great danger of suffering from the effects of inflation.

We are now engaged in a momentous defense effort in which complete cooperation of all factors of the population is

necessary. When we consider that there are now considerably more than a million men in the Army, and that these men on active field duty will need meat products which can easily be transported in the field, I think we can understand that there is not much danger from the importation of canned meat. The Purchasing Division of O. P. M. has made the statement that it does not contemplate the purchase of more than 20,000,000 pounds of canned meat; and 20,000,000 pounds is a small amount when one considers the total quantity consumed. Importations of canned meat from South America have been greatly reduced during the past year.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I am very much interested in the Senator's statement, for I know he has given very much attention to this matter and has been very helpful in trying to work out this problem. He mentioned a limitation of 20,000,000 pounds of canned meat. To what period does that limitation apply?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand it applies during the next purchasing year.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Does the Senator mean to the 1st of July 1941, or a year from that date?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it is a year from 1941.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I understand, from reading the newspapers and from conversations, that the Government would be glad to get canned meat for peacetime purposes, and if they can purchase 20,000,000 pounds up to July 1, 1941, was there any agreement about future purchases? That is the point I am making.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it was for the present emergency; that is correct; but, Mr. President, I am satisfied that the Defense Council is making a sincere and honest effort to handle a tremendously difficult problem in a way which will serve the best interests of the producer, the producer of agricultural products particularly, and that we may rely upon them to continue to make that effort. I am sure the agricultural interests of this country will not suffer. They may rely upon the good faith of the O. P. M. in carrying out this understanding.

Mr. BUTLER rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Kentucky will pardon me just a minute, I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who was on his feet.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the inference from the Senator's remarks seems to be that the restrictions to be placed on importations affect all the purchases the Nation may make from Argentina or other South American countries. Is it not true that this restriction pertains only to the purchases made by the Army under this bill, and that imports are still admissible and coming in at the rate of hundreds of millions of pounds, in the case of all the articles which are admitted regularly by law from season to season? We are considering only the spending of tax-collected money by official representatives of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the news which is coming to us every day on the radio and the announcements made in the press with respect to the condition of shipping upon the surface of the ocean certainly make it clear that within the next 6 months or a year we are likely to have a tremendous reduction of the amount of tonnage that will be available for the importation of products of any sort, including agricultural products. It was only on Saturday night that the United States Coast Guard seized Italian and Danish and German vessels in various American ports. What is the significance of that action? I certainly do not anticipate that there is going to be any increase of shipping to bring increased imports into the United States. On the contrary, I feel that our problem will be one of finding ships in which to export our products for defense, and we know now that food and agricultural products will be among our exports. I feel that there is every likelihood that the people of America and the Government of America are about to realize that the biggest market we are likely to have is the market right here at home, which is promoted by increasing the purchasing power of the masses of the people.

It is said that one-third of our people are living below the line of poverty. We have had to circulate food stamps in order to dispose of surplus commodities, and primarily to enable persons with deficient purchasing power to acquire these things. We are moving men into the Army. We are providing men with more food materials than many of them have had in their homes. I feel that the time is coming when we should understand that the way out is to build up the purchasing power of those who are in the lower income brackets. When that is done, there will be a new opportunity for agriculture.

The agricultural appropriation bill, which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will have on the floor of the Senate within a short time, contains large appropriations, the purpose of which is to guarantee parity to the farmer. Those appropriations have been sustained by the Senators upon the Appropriations Committee who represent the area from which the Senator from Nebraska comes. I have supported those appropriations, and I feel confident that he may rely upon the disposition of Congress and of the Defense Council adequately to protect the interests of agriculture. Our danger lies in such a policy of restriction that we may bring about an increase in price which will be perilous to all concerned.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator please yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to say first that I, for one, am certain that American agriculture is as anxious as anybody else in the Nation to see that the cost of living does not go beyond reason; but as yet the commodities which the farmers sell are away under parity, as indicated by the parity appropriation about which the Senator is speaking. I know that the farmers of America will do their bit and do more than their part; but I do not think we should be quite so much worried about a high price for beef and other farm products until we are more nearly in that situation.

I should like to ask the Senator another question. I believe there is some sort of a legal regulation for the prevention of the employment of foreigners in defense work here in America. If that is the case, is it logical by action of this kind to employ foreigners in the production of our food products? It does not seem to me very logical.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The expert upon that question, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], tells me that there is no such ban upon the employment of aliens in defense work; certainly not such a ban as he would like.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I may say that my information is that in order to get work in defense activities today a man must show his birth certificate, and it must have originated at the right place, or he does not get work.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina will state the inquiry.

Mr. SMITH. This is a vote on whether or not we will allow Argentine canned beef to come in, is it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from South Carolina that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH. It is a parliamentary inquiry. I do not know, and the Chair ought to know.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator that the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment proposing to strike out, on page 5, beginning at line 23, all language, words, and verbiage down to the end of the first paragraph on page 6.

Mr. SMITH. A parliamentary inquiry: That includes the Argentine-beef section, does it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator that that is the so-called meat section.

Mr. SMITH. A vote to permit the purchase of Argentine beef will be "yea," and a vote to keep it out will be "nay"?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An affirmative vote is to strike out the limitation now contained in the bill. A negative vote is opposed to striking out the limitation.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BONE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. GILLETTE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. I am informed that, if he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and vote "yea." I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. My colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained by illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announced the following pairs upon this question:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pair:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

All Senators referred to are necessarily absent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I inquire how am I recorded?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—29

Andrews	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Hughes	Stewart
Caraway	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
George	Murdock	Truman
Gerry	Murray	Tunnell
Green	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Guffey	Pepper	Wallgren
Hatch	Radcliffe	

NAYS—34

Adams	Capper	Sheppard
Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Shipstead
Austin	Connally	Smith
Bailey	Danaher	Taft
Ball	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Holman	Tobey
Brooks	La Follette	Van Nuys
Bulow	Langer	Wheeler
Burton	Lee	Wiley
Butler	McCarran	Willis
Byrd	Norris	
Byrnes	Reed	

NOT VOTING—32

Bilbo	Gillette	Mead
Bone	Glass	Miller
Brewster	Harrison	Nye
Bridges	Herring	Overton
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Chandler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lucas	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh
Davis	McKellar	White
Downey	McNary	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot conclude the consideration of the bill this afternoon. I, therefore, move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky, that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. For what purpose?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A motion to recess is not debatable.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Let us have a yea-and-nay vote.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement concerning my pair as before, I will say that if at liberty to vote I should vote "nay." The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and let my vote stand. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. ELLENDER. My colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], is detained because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following pairs upon this question:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pair:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

All the Senators named are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—37

Andrews	Guffey	Reynolds
Bailey	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Sheppard
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lee	Truman
Connally	Maloney	Tunnell
Ellender	Murdock	Tydings
George	Murray	Van Nuys
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Gillette	Pepper	
Green	Radcliffe	

NAYS—28

Adams	Capper	Shipstead
Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Smith
Austin	Danaher	Taft
Ball	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Holman	Tobey
Brooks	La Follette	Wheeler
Bulow	Langer	Wiley
Burton	McCarran	Willis
Butler	Norris	
Byrd	Reed	

NOT VOTING—30

Bilbo	Glass	Mead
Brewster	Harrison	Miller
Bridges	Herring	Nye
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Chandler	Lodge	Smathers
Chavez	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Wagner
Davis	McKellar	Walsh
Downey	McNary	White

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and only Saviour, Thine arm make bare and Thy righteous will be done; may we join with Thy children in heaven above and in earth beneath in giving praise and glory to Thee forever and ever. As each day we live in the network of divine mercy, Thou who art vast to create and uphold, interpret to us more and more of Thyself, leading us along dim-lit paths, opening into larger vision, clothing us with the completeness of Christian faith. As the branches of the Tree of Life are stretched above our enchanted gaze, let us see a new day in the night of the world's misery, sweeping up in unleashed love and brotherhood of man. This is the greatest and the chiefest of heavenly favors, gracious Father; when Thou dost grant them our souls will cry "Abba, Father." We pray for our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, that they may be wisely directed in the sacred trusts committed to them. Cause us, O God, each evening to lie down in peace and each morning to awaken in new strength. In the name of our glorified Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt; and

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Monroe Short;

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries;

S. 390. An act relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks;

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 941. An act for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, J. T. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock;

S. 994. An act to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other dispositions of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to prevent depletion of the stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes;

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of William A. Wheeler; and

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2082. An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1692) entitled "An act for the relief of William F. Kliewe," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. BREWSTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3836) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes."

SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL-DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 113

Resolved, That the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens, authorized by House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, be continued for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, with all powers granted to it under House Resolution 63, House Resolution 491, and House Resolution 629 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and that the said committee be known as the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

That the said select committee be authorized to further inquire into the interstate migration of citizens, emphasizing the present and potential consequences of the migration caused by the national-defense program, the effects of this migration on the various agricultural programs, and the development of economic conditions creating stranded communities and areas of potential migration.

The said select committee may report to the House with recommendations for legislation at any time, but in no event later than January 3, 1943.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist

the select committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services or facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

MARCH 28, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to submit to you my resignation from the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
ANDREW L. SOMERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein information from the Office of Production Management with relation to strikes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Mr. R. R. Gardner, of Glenrock, Wyo., delivered before the national convention of the Izaak Walton League.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on April 18, 1941, after the reading of the Journal, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] may be permitted to address the House on Wednesday next for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may be permitted to address the House on Thursday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE COFFEE BILL

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means be permitted to file separate views on Senate Joint Resolution 43, known as the Coffee bill, which is to be considered Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I state that there is a light calendar for tomorrow and if possible, we will bring up the Coffee bill tomorrow. I am glad the gentleman has submitted this request, as I wanted to make that announcement for the record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Official Court Record of New Orleans on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a paper in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two short resolutions on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter to me from Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

STRIKES AGAINST THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just placed in the hopper a bill to make strikes against the United States and against the national-defense program during the present emergency constitute treason.

There is no question but that this country faces a grave emergency. Further, there appears to be no difference of opinion among military and naval men that time is one of the most needed things in this connection today, and therefore it appears to me that the wasting of this precious time, if we have been told the truth by our President and the heads of our governmental departments, does constitute treason and may eventually result in the loss of our Nation.

This bill provides for a 25-year prison penalty, without parole or reduction of sentence for good behavior, and in addition, where a death is involved, either directly or indirectly, as a result of a strike, this bill carries the death penalty.

So far as general labor is concerned, constructive, patriotic labor need not fear this bill, as this group has already said that in their group of unions there will be no strikes where national defense is concerned. This patriotic group has already placed the safety and welfare of this Nation before anything.

In connection with the second group, there is no reason why the provisions of this bill should not apply if they continue in their unpatriotic, un-American, treasonable attitude of destruction of the defense program of the United States. There is no reason, either, why a person guilty of treason should not be immeately taken into custody.

This country is fed up with that un-American, European, communistically inclined group attempting to destroy the national-defense program. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of farm parity prices and to include a letter from farm leaders at home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of strikes, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short letter from a constituent with regard to taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has arrived for Congress to take some definite action in regard to strikes in national-defense industries. We are not justified in saying that it should be left to public opinion any more than we should leave kidnaping, bank robbery, and piracy to public opinion.

Not everyone who shouts "Aye! Aye!" to the demands of some of our labor leaders is a friend of the man who works. I want to see the people who toil hold and retain every just right that they have, but I also feel that unreasonable, unfair, and unpatriotic action on the part of a few of the leaders is doing more at the present time to jeopardize the welfare of the working people of America than anything else.

We must also bear in mind that in some instances labor leadership is under the domination of Communists and radicals whose purpose is not to assist labor but to destroy this Government.

The executive branch of our Government, and especially the Labor Department, have aided and abetted the radical left-wingers, many of whom are constantly plotting to destroy this Government and our system of free enterprise. We cannot expect the administrative agencies of government to pursue any labor policy other than one of dilly-dallying and appeasement. If we are going to improve the national defense and preserve this Government and its system of free enterprise, Congress, and Congress alone, must act, and act now. The Judiciary Committee should forthwith report a bill to this House for action before the Easter recess begins. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a concurrent resolution of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa urging that appropriate legislation be enacted to make Federal aid available to farm tenants on the same basis as that afforded to urban residents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief statement by the Milk Industry Foundation of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GEYER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and to include articles on the poll tax and extracts of addresses at a dinner in honor of Judge J. Warren Madden.)

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an interview between Harold John Adonis, director of the New Jersey State Government Bureau of Research, and George E. Stringfellow, president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood, in one of the forum broadcasts over station WINS, on March 29, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARRIS J. BIXLER

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce this morning the death of a former Member of this House, Harris J. Bixler, of the old Twenty-eighth District of Pennsylvania, which is now the Twentieth District, which I have the honor to represent. Mr. Bixler was accidentally killed last Saturday at Johnsonburg, Pa., and his funeral will be held Tuesday, April 1.

Mr. Bixler served in the House from 1921 to 1927, and was an active member of the Ways and Means Committee. He was a man who was liked by everybody and I know he will be greatly missed. In his passing I have lost a real friend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an analysis of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty of 1938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Board of the County Commissioners of Buell County, Mont., with reference to the Townsend plan; the other, to insert an editorial from the Daily Missoulian, with reference to the Office of Internal Revenue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks concerning war veterans in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Alma (Mich.) Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a resolution of the California State Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, after the legislative business of today is disposed of, and other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the consideration of the legislative business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on the subject of the income tax, and also to include a brief resolution which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article by Richard L. Neuberger, recently appearing in the magazine section of the New York Times, in reference to the Grand Coulee Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a brief editorial from the Dallas News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial on the President's Jackson Day speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, one in respect to farm exports and the other a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY PERKINS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I received in the morning mail the front page of the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express of March 26, a newspaper with large headlines stating "Secretary Perkins, in Los Angeles, says defense strikes not serious." The article goes on to state:

Madam Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, arrived here on the Southern Pacific today from Arizona and expressed herself as unworried by strikes in defense industries.

She planned, however, to confer with her staff of labor conciliators in this area and to "get the background of the whole situation."

"Our record for strikes in 1940, and even in 1941, is going to be good," she said. "There haven't been many strikes, not many man-hours of labor have been involved, and they have been easily settled."

It seems to me if Frances Perkins would stay in Washington and attend to her job, she would find out what is going on in the many large strikes all over the country, and then she would be able to judge what the people of this country think about the great number of strikes that are occurring now against defense industries. Miss Perkins is doing what she can to keep on with the strikes instead of trying to get them settled. Why does she do it? Why does she not advocate a 30-day period before strikes are called so that the radical labor leaders can be controlled before they break down our defense program? I hope we will not have any more strikes in defense industries, and that this country will now prepare for any eventuality. Our weak link in national defense is in our Department of Labor. Does not Miss Perkins realize that?

The President could control them and cause them to be settled if he would just say the word, but he says nothing. Why? If the manufacturers refused to manufacture the defense items, the President would take them over. Why does he permit the radical labor leaders to prevent those who want to work from doing so? Seems strange at such a time as this, when he wants to put forward our program of national preparedness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PURCHASE OF PULPWOOD, ETC.

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 61

(Report No. 351)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of House Joint Resolution 15, a joint resolution to investigate the apparent monopolistic purchasing of pulpwood by pulp and paper mills under a contract purchase system from farmers and other owners, price fixing of paper and other pulp products under trade practice rules and regulations, including cost of distribution. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resoluion shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

4-H CLUB IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks by including a short article from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. PATRICK was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.

FOREIGN ACCOUNTS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND INSURED BANKS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 390), relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill. The House Committee on Banking and Currency has reported a bill unanimously which is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object. I simply wish to reiterate, in substance, my position on this bill as it was stated before the committee. I realize the necessity of the provisions of this act for insuring and protecting the banks. I am still not quite satisfied with the other features of this bill, because I think these may have far-reaching and serious implications. I wish we could have had a little more time to consider the bill, but, under the circumstances, I shall not object.

Mr. STEAGALL. The bill simply provides a method by which Federal Reserve banks and insured banks may discharge their liabilities to foreign governments and central banks. As matters are now, there might be more than one effort to assert the right to collect, and the banks could only risk a guess or refuse to pay and issue suits for collection. The bill provides that such claims may be paid to any authority certified by the State Department as the proper authority entitled to receive payment and that remittance to such authority would constitute defense to such suits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 14 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "or for foreign banks or bankers, or for foreign states as defined in section 25 (b) of this act".

SEC. 2. Section 25 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"Whenever (1) any Federal Reserve bank has received any property from or for the account of a foreign state which is recognized by the Government of the United States, or from or for the account of a central bank of any such foreign state, and holds such property in the name of such foreign state or such central bank; (2) a representative of such foreign state who is recognized by the Secretary of State as being the accredited representative of such foreign state to the Government of the United States has certified to the Secretary of State the name of a person as having authority to receive, control, or dispose of such property; and (3) the authority of such person to act with respect to such property is accepted and recognized by the Secretary of State, and so certified by the Secretary of State to the Federal Reserve bank, the payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such Federal Reserve bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of the Federal Reserve bank for or with respect to such property.

"Whenever (1) any insured bank has received any property from or for the account of a foreign state which is recognized by the Government of the United States, or from or for the account of a central bank of any such foreign state, and holds such property in the name of such foreign state or such central bank; (2) a representative of such foreign state who is recognized by the Secretary of State as being the accredited representative of such foreign state to the Government of the United States has certified to the Secretary of State the name of a person as having authority to receive, control, or dispose of such property; and (3) the authority of such person to act with respect to such property is accepted and recognized by the Secretary of State, and so certified by the Secretary of State to such insured bank, the payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of such bank for or with respect to such property. Any suit or other legal proceeding against any insured bank or any officer, director, or employee thereof, arising out of the receipt, possession, or disposition of any such property shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States and the district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction thereof, regardless of the amount involved; and any such bank or any officer, director, or employee thereof which is a defendant in any such suit may, at any time before trial thereof, remove such suit from a State court into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for the removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

"Nothing in this section shall be deemed to repeal or to modify in any manner any of the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (ch. 6, 48 Stat. 337), as amended, the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (ch. 674, 48 Stat. 1178), as amended, or subdivision (b) of section 5 of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, or any actions, regulations, rules, orders, or proclamations taken, promulgated, made, or issued pursuant to any of such

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following pairs upon this question:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pair:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

All the Senators named are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—37

Andrews	Guffey	Reynolds
Bailey	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Sheppard
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lee	Truman
Connally	Maloney	Tunnell
Ellender	Murdock	Tydings
George	Murray	Van Nuys
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Gillette	Pepper	
Green	Radcliffe	

NAYS—28

Adams	Capper	Shipstead
Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Smith
Austin	Danaher	Taft
Ball	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Holman	Tobey
Brooks	La Follette	Wheeler
Bulow	Langer	Wiley
Burton	McCarran	Willis
Butler	Norris	
Byrd	Reed	

NOT VOTING—30

Bilbo	Glass	Mead
Brewster	Harrison	Miller
Bridges	Herring	Nye
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Chandler	Lodge	Smathers
Chavez	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Wagner
Davis	McKellar	Walsh
Downey	McNary	White

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and only Saviour, Thine arm make bare and Thy righteous will be done; may we join with Thy children in heaven above and in earth beneath in giving praise and glory to Thee forever and ever. As each day we live in the network of divine mercy, Thou who art vast to create and uphold, interpret to us more and more of Thyself, leading us along dim-lit paths, opening into larger vision, clothing us with the completeness of Christian faith. As the branches of the Tree of Life are stretched above our enchanted gaze, let us see a new day in the night of the world's misery, sweeping up in unleashed love and brotherhood of man. This is the greatest and the chiefest of heavenly favors, gracious Father; when Thou dost grant them our souls will cry "Abba, Father." We pray for our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, that they may be wisely directed in the sacred trusts committed to them. Cause us, O God, each evening to lie down in peace and each morning to awaken in new strength. In the name of our glorified Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt; and

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Monroe Short;

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries;

S. 390. An act relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks;

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 941. An act for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, J. T. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock;

S. 994. An act to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other dispositions of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to prevent depletion of the stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes;

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of William A. Wheeler; and

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2082. An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1692) entitled "An act for the relief of William F. Kliewe," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. BREWSTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3836) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes."

SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL-DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 113

Resolved, That the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens, authorized by House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, be continued for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, with all powers granted to it under House Resolution 63, House Resolution 491, and House Resolution 629 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and that the said committee be known as the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

That the said select committee be authorized to further inquire into the interstate migration of citizens, emphasizing the present and potential consequences of the migration caused by the national-defense program, the effects of this migration on the various agricultural programs, and the development of economic conditions creating stranded communities and areas of potential migration.

The said select committee may report to the House with recommendations for legislation at any time, but in no event later than January 3, 1943.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist

the select committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services or facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

MARCH 28, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to submit to you my resignation from the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
ANDREW L. SOMERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein information from the Office of Production Management with relation to strikes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Mr. R. R. Gardner, of Glenrock, Wyo., delivered before the national convention of the Izaak Walton League.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on April 18, 1941, after the reading of the Journal, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] may be permitted to address the House on Wednesday next for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may be permitted to address the House on Thursday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE COFFEE BILL

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means be permitted to file separate views on Senate Joint Resolution 43, known as the Coffee bill, which is to be considered Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I state that there is a light calendar for tomorrow and if possible, we will bring up the Coffee bill tomorrow. I am glad the gentleman has submitted this request, as I wanted to make that announcement for the record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Official Court Record of New Orleans on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a paper in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two short resolutions on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter to me from Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

STRIKES AGAINST THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just placed in the hopper a bill to make strikes against the United States and against the national-defense program during the present emergency constitute treason.

There is no question but that this country faces a grave emergency. Further, there appears to be no difference of opinion among military and naval men that time is one of the most needed things in this connection today, and therefore it appears to me that the wasting of this precious time, if we have been told the truth by our President and the heads of our governmental departments, does constitute treason and may eventually result in the loss of our Nation.

This bill provides for a 25-year prison penalty, without parole or reduction of sentence for good behavior, and in addition, where a death is involved, either directly or indirectly, as a result of a strike, this bill carries the death penalty.

So far as general labor is concerned, constructive, patriotic labor need not fear this bill, as this group has already said that in their group of unions there will be no strikes where national defense is concerned. This patriotic group has already placed the safety and welfare of this Nation before anything.

In connection with the second group, there is no reason why the provisions of this bill should not apply if they continue in their unpatriotic, un-American, treasonable attitude of destruction of the defense program of the United States. There is no reason, either, why a person guilty of treason should not be immeately taken into custody.

This country is fed up with that un-American, European, communistically inclined group attempting to destroy the national-defense program. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of farm parity prices and to include a letter from farm leaders at home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of strikes, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short letter from a constituent with regard to taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has arrived for Congress to take some definite action in regard to strikes in national-defense industries. We are not justified in saying that it should be left to public opinion any more than we should leave kidnaping, bank robbery, and piracy to public opinion.

Not everyone who shouts "Aye! Aye!" to the demands of some of our labor leaders is a friend of the man who works. I want to see the people who toil hold and retain every just right that they have, but I also feel that unreasonable, unfair, and unpatriotic action on the part of a few of the leaders is doing more at the present time to jeopardize the welfare of the working people of America than anything else.

We must also bear in mind that in some instances labor leadership is under the domination of Communists and radicals whose purpose is not to assist labor but to destroy this Government.

The executive branch of our Government, and especially the Labor Department, have aided and abetted the radical left-wingers, many of whom are constantly plotting to destroy this Government and our system of free enterprise. We cannot expect the administrative agencies of government to pursue any labor policy other than one of dilly-dallying and appeasement. If we are going to improve the national defense and preserve this Government and its system of free enterprise, Congress, and Congress alone, must act, and act now. The Judiciary Committee should forthwith report a bill to this House for action before the Easter recess begins. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a concurrent resolution of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa urging that appropriate legislation be enacted to make Federal aid available to farm tenants on the same basis as that afforded to urban residents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief statement by the Milk Industry Foundation of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GEYER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and to include articles on the poll tax and extracts of addresses at a dinner in honor of Judge J. Warren Madden.)

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an interview between Harold John Adonis, director of the New Jersey State Government Bureau of Research, and George E. Stringfellow, president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood, in one of the forum broadcasts over station WINS, on March 29, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARRIS J. BIXLER

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce this morning the death of a former Member of this House, Harris J. Bixler, of the old Twenty-eighth District of Pennsylvania, which is now the Twentieth District, which I have the honor to represent. Mr. Bixler was accidentally killed last Saturday at Johnsonburg, Pa., and his funeral will be held Tuesday, April 1.

Mr. Bixler served in the House from 1921 to 1927, and was an active member of the Ways and Means Committee. He was a man who was liked by everybody and I know he will be greatly missed. In his passing I have lost a real friend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an analysis of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty of 1938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Board of the County Commissioners of Buell County, Mont., with reference to the Townsend plan; the other, to insert an editorial from the Daily Missoulian, with reference to the Office of Internal Revenue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks concerning war veterans in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Alma (Mich.) Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a resolution of the California State Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, after the legislative business of today is disposed of, and other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the consideration of the legislative business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on the subject of the income tax, and also to include a brief resolution which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article by Richard L. Neuberger, recently appearing in the magazine section of the New York Times, in reference to the Grand Coulee Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a brief editorial from the Dallas News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial on the President's Jackson Day speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, one in respect to farm exports and the other a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY PERKINS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I received in the morning mail the front page of the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express of March 26, a newspaper with large headlines stating "Secretary Perkins, in Los Angeles, says defense strikes not serious." The article goes on to state:

Madam Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, arrived here on the Southern Pacific today from Arizona and expressed herself as unworried by strikes in defense industries.

She planned, however, to confer with her staff of labor conciliators in this area and to "get the background of the whole situation."

"Our record for strikes in 1940, and even in 1941, is going to be good," she said. "There haven't been many strikes, not many manhours of labor have been involved, and they have been easily settled."

It seems to me if Frances Perkins would stay in Washington and attend to her job, she would find out what is going on in the many large strikes all over the country, and then she would be able to judge what the people of this country think about the great number of strikes that are occurring now against defense industries. Miss Perkins is doing what she can to keep on with the strikes instead of trying to get them settled. Why does she do it? Why does she not advocate a 30-day period before strikes are called so that the radical labor leaders can be controlled before they break down our defense program? I hope we will not have any more strikes in defense industries, and that this country will now prepare for any eventuality. Our weak link in national defense is in our Department of Labor. Does not Miss Perkins realize that?

The President could control them and cause them to be settled if he would just say the word, but he says nothing. Why? If the manufacturers refused to manufacture the defense items, the President would take them over. Why does he permit the radical labor leaders to prevent those who want to work from doing so? Seems strange at such a time as this, when he wants to put forward our program of national preparedness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PURCHASE OF PULPWOOD, ETC.

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 61

(Report No. 351)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of House Joint Resolution 15, a joint resolution to investigate the apparent monopolistic purchasing of pulpwood by pulp and paper mills under a contract purchase system from farmers and other owners, price fixing of paper and other pulp products under trade practice rules and regulations, including cost of distribution. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resoluion shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

4-H CLUB IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks by including a short article from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. PATRICK was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.

FOREIGN ACCOUNTS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND INSURED BANKS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 390), relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill. The House Committee on Banking and Currency has reported a bill unanimously which is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object. I simply wish to reiterate, in substance, my position on this bill as it was stated before the committee. I realize the necessity of the provisions of this act for insuring and protecting the banks. I am still not quite satisfied with the other features of this bill, because I think these may have far-reaching and serious implications. I wish we could have had a little more time to consider the bill, but, under the circumstances, I shall not object.

Mr. STEAGALL. The bill simply provides a method by which Federal Reserve banks and insured banks may discharge their liabilities to foreign governments and central banks. As matters are now, there might be more than one effort to assert the right to collect, and the banks could only risk a guess or refuse to pay and issue suits for collection. The bill provides that such claims may be paid to any authority certified by the State Department as the proper authority entitled to receive payment and that remittance to such authority would constitute defense to such suits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 14 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "or for foreign banks or bankers, or for foreign states as defined in section 25 (b) of this act".

SEC. 2. Section 25 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"Whenever (1) any Federal Reserve bank has received any property from or for the account of a foreign state which is recognized by the Government of the United States, or from or for the account of a central bank of any such foreign state, and holds such property in the name of such foreign state or such central bank; (2) a representative of such foreign state who is recognized by the Secretary of State as being the accredited representative of such foreign state to the Government of the United States has certified to the Secretary of State the name of a person as having authority to receive, control, or dispose of such property; and (3) the authority of such person to act with respect to such property is accepted and recognized by the Secretary of State, and so certified by the Secretary of State to the Federal Reserve bank, the payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such Federal Reserve bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of the Federal Reserve bank for or with respect to such property.

"Whenever (1) any insured bank has received any property from or for the account of a foreign state which is recognized by the Government of the United States, or from or for the account of a central bank of any such foreign state, and holds such property in the name of such foreign state or such central bank; (2) a representative of such foreign state who is recognized by the Secretary of State as being the accredited representative of such foreign state to the Government of the United States has certified to the Secretary of State the name of a person as having authority to receive, control, or dispose of such property; and (3) the authority of such person to act with respect to such property is accepted and recognized by the Secretary of State, and so certified by the Secretary of State to such insured bank, the payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of such bank for or with respect to such property. Any suit or other legal proceeding against any insured bank or any officer, director, or employee thereof, arising out of the receipt, possession, or disposition of any such property shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States and the district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction thereof, regardless of the amount involved; and any such bank or any officer, director, or employee thereof which is a defendant in any such suit may, at any time before trial thereof, remove such suit from a State court into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for the removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

"Nothing in this section shall be deemed to repeal or to modify in any manner any of the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (ch. 6, 48 Stat. 337), as amended, the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (ch. 674, 48 Stat. 1178), as amended, or subdivision (b) of section 5 of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, or any actions, regulations, rules, orders, or proclamations taken, promulgated, made, or issued pursuant to any of such

statutes. In any case in which a license to act with respect to any property referred to in this section is required under any of said statutes, regulations, rules, orders, or proclamations, notification to the Secretary of State by the proper Government officer or agency of the issuance of an appropriate license or that appropriate licenses will be issued on application shall be a prerequisite to any action by the Secretary of State pursuant to this section, and the action of the Secretary of State shall relate only to such property as is included in such notification. Each such notification shall include the terms and conditions of such license or licenses and a description of the property to which they relate.

"For the purposes of this section, (1) the term 'property' includes gold, silver, currency, credits, deposits, securities, choses in action, and any other form of property, the proceeds thereof, and any right, title, or interest therein; (2) the term 'foreign state' includes any foreign government or any department, district, province, county, possession, or other similar governmental organization or subdivision of a foreign government, and any agency or instrumentality of any such foreign government or of any such organization or subdivision; (3) the term 'central bank' includes any foreign bank or banker authorized to perform any one or more of the functions of a central bank; (4) the term 'person' includes any individual, or any corporation, partnership, association, or other similar organization; and (5) the term 'insured bank' shall have the meaning given to it in section 12B of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar bill (H. R. 4216) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address made by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL-DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 113

Resolved, That the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens, authorized by House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, be continued for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, with all powers granted to it under House Resolution 63, House Resolution 491, and House Resolution 629 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and that the said committee be known as the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

That the said select committee be authorized to further inquire into the interstate migration of citizens, emphasizing the present and potential consequences of the migration caused by the national-defense program, the effects of this migration on the various agricultural programs, and the development of economic conditions creating stranded communities and areas of potential migration.

The said select committee may report to the House with recommendations for legislation at any time, but in no event later than January 3, 1943.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist the select committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services of facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes, being one-half the time, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the continuation throughout the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress of the so-called Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens, which was set up during the last Congress, and that it shall hereafter be known as the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

The committee, as provided in the resolution, may report to the House with recommendations for legislation at any time, but in no event later than January 3, 1943.

This committee, with the work of which I believe most of us are familiar, is headed, as you all know, by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHN H. TOLAN]. Other members of the select committee are the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS]. Recently there has been added to the committee to fill a vacancy since the beginning of this session, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD].

The committee, I believe, has commanded the respect not only of all Members of the House but also of all citizens throughout the country who are interested in the serious problem of interstate migration of destitute citizens. The committee has not sought any great publicity. They have been conducting, in a very courteous manner, a careful and thorough investigation. They have been doing a good job. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

The gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] has issued a statement concerning the work of the committee of which he is chairman, which statement is as follows:

The select committee was created by the House on April 22, 1940, and began its first hearings July 29, 1940. In the 8 months since our first hearings opened we have completed a comprehensive study of the movements of destitute families across State lines, their causes and effect during the last decade.

In the midst of this study a great new movement, that of defense migrants, began. It is with this whole new pattern of problems that the committee now concerns itself and asks for continuation, under the title of the Committee to Investigate National Defense Migration.

By order of the House the report of our committee on work accomplished to date is due next Thursday, April 3. I am happy to inform you that the report will be released on time.

Outside of interested Members of the House, the following individuals and public groups request continuation: Chester C. Davis, Defense Commissioner on Agriculture; Harriet Elliott, Defense Commissioner on Consumer Protection; Paul V. McNutt, Administrator, Federal Security Agency; Charles P. Taft, Assistant Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Related Defense Activities; William Green, president, American Federation of Labor; Mrs. Saidie Orr Dunbar, president, General Federation of Womens Clubs; National Travelers Aid Association; Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America (Home Mission Council of North America); National Catholic Welfare Conference, as well as leading newspapers and periodicals.

It gives me pleasure at this time to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the author of this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can say much to you about the work of this committee or the continuation of the committee in 5 minutes, but I do want to sketch very briefly some of the things we have been doing and some of the things that have prompted us in asking for the continuance of this committee during the Seventy-seventh Congress.

This committee was set up last summer upon a resolution introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN]. When members were appointed apparently it was the purpose of the Speaker at that time to place someone on the committee from each of the major sections of the United States. You will notice that the five members pretty well cover the different sections of the United States.

We started with our first hearings in New York in the latter part of July or the first of August; then we went to Montgomery, Ala.; then to Chicago; next to Lincoln, Nebr.; then to Oklahoma City, San Francisco, Los Angeles; and then back to Washington, D. C.

While we were in California, we made a 2-day trip down through the central part of the State visiting a good many of the largest farming areas, visiting many of the private labor camps, and also some of the Farm Security Administration migrant camps. We came back to Washington the first part of December and started our hearings in Washington. We heard from a great many of the various governmental agencies, as well as private agencies, interested in this problem.

Let me say to you very frankly that had it not been for the changed conditions that came before us in Washington—that became apparent to us at that time—we would not be here today asking a continuation of this committee. So far as our primary interest has been concerned—agricultural migration—I believe we have pretty well completed that work for the present, and our report will be filed within the next 2 or 3 days covering our work up to this time and making recommendations based upon those hearings.

But by the time we got to the Washington hearings in December the na-

tional-defense program was well under way, and it became apparent that this migrant problem was being greatly accentuated as a result of our defense program. People were rushing to the sites of these various defense projects in search of work without apparently any previous consideration of housing, sanitation, schools, and various other things we usually think of as being necessary for proper living conditions. We also started wondering what was going to happen not only to these workers who were engaged in the construction part of the program but to those who were going to operate the plants. A great many of these plants, of course, are bound to be of a temporary nature. Their operation is bound to be temporary, and when this emergency is over a great many of the plants are bound to close down with a suddenness that will give to us, unless we study it ahead of time and plan and prepare for it, a terrific shock.

Mr. Chester Davis, of the Defense Commission, was one of the first to ask us to continue the work of this committee, with particular emphasis upon the defense migration. Mr. Paul McNutt likewise asked that we continue it. Miss Harriet Elliott, another member of the Defense Commission, Monseigneur Ryan, head of the Social Welfare Organization of the Catholic Church, and various other persons and organizations interested in this problem asked us to continue the work of this committee. As a result of these various requests our committee discussed it, considered it carefully, and the consequence was the introduction of this resolution that is before us at this time. I believe there is a great work to be done and that the committee should be continued. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from Vermont complained that I did not yield him time on a certain piece of legislation. I now yield him as much time as he may desire.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes from the Rules Committee with a recommendation for its adoption. I think it should be adopted, although I have some misgivings as to just what it may accomplish because, after all, the thing it seeks to reach, if I understand it correctly, is part and parcel of a major over-all problem that is the primary concern of the Congress as a whole.

You will recall that the so-called Tolan committee was set up some time ago to study the problem of interstate migration. It had come to the attention of Congress in many ways that destitute people living in areas where they could no longer make a decent living for one reason or another were migrating from those areas into other areas where they hoped to find employment. Many of the areas to which they went unfortunately were areas where there was not sufficient employment to take care of them, and as a result the relief loads on those areas became terrific. Suffering and destitution was on every hand. It was said to be a problem for the Congress to consider because the migration was across State lines and because it was a national problem. In an effort to determine what the causes of that migration were and what might be done to alleviate some of the distress and suffering that flows from such migration the Tolan committee was set up.

In considering this proposal for the extension of the committee I believe we should bear in mind that the problem which I understand this resolution seeks to deal with is a different problem from the one originally sought to be dealt with by the Tolan committee.

In other words, the migration that was in mind when the committee was first set up was migration from an area where there was no work to another area where there likewise was no work. The migration that is presently taking place all over the country is a migration to areas where there is employment. If I understand this proposal correctly, it contemplates a coming of the time when the war will end, when the tremendous war or defense effort that is presently going on the country will come to an end and when the workers who have migrated to these areas of defense effort will find themselves out of employment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said with reference to the purpose of the committee, and I am in agreement with him. A different type of problem has arisen in the Middle West recently as a result of the defense program. That is a problem that results from an exodus of persons engaged in labor in the Middle West to places where defense plants are established. It is a well-known fact that there are not a great many defense plants in the Middle West. The section of the country which lost the greatest amount of population during the last decade is now being more greatly denuded of its labor by an exodus of labor to points along the seaboard or to the industrial sections where people are seeking work.

May not that problem be considered by this committee as well as the problem to which the gentleman has addressed himself up to this point?

Mr. HALLECK. The resolution does provide that the committee shall study the facts of this migration; that is, with reference to defense-work migration and the various agricultural problems, and, knowing the gentleman's intense interest in agriculture, I take it he has that in mind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would it not be possible for this committee to give consideration to the question of the balancing of our national economy by recommending that a reasonable number of these defense plants be located in the Middle West, which has suffered so drastically from the ravages of nature, from drought and from crop failures? Would it not be within the province of this committee to give consideration to the question of recommending that this unbalancing be offset to the advantage of the Middle West, which has suffered so badly, by the location of some of these defense plants in the Middle West? That would have an additional effect of decentralizing industry, which is one of the objectives of the defense program, and it would also greatly benefit the Middle West, which needs this sort of a program.

Mr. HALLECK. Under the resolution I think clearly the committee could make such a recommendation. As to whether or not it would be followed by those in authority in respect to the location of further defense industries, I do not know.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I realize the gentleman cannot commit himself as to what the committee may do, but I believe it would be well, when we vote to continue the committee, that the Congress indicate, and those who are interested in the problem of the Middle West should indicate to the committee, that it give consideration to that question.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Right along that line, I may say that the committee has given that consideration, particularly since the Washington hearings held last December. We have quite a little testimony from Chester Davis and others in reference to the placing of defense industries and its effect upon the movement of people and the dislocation of people; however, we are without authority other than to get these facts and deliver them to the House.

Mr. HALLECK. The committee would be permitted under this resolution to make a recommendation?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and that is one of the things we expect to do.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, if I might proceed for a moment, in order to conclude my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give this note of warning to the committee as it enters upon its work. I said a moment ago that the resolution clearly contemplates the potential problem of migration that will follow the end of the war effort, because many of the industries are highly temporary in their nature and will be closed down after the war is over. I am one of those who believes that a man going from his home in Nebraska, Indiana, or any place else to take one of these high-paid defense jobs should understand, know, and realize that it is incumbent upon him to think a little bit ahead and to begin to make some preparation for his resettlement after this

emergency is over. I for one would not want to go on record here today by supporting this resolution as putting the Government in the position of saying to these workers: "You can spend every dime you make, you can live high, wide, and handsome, while this job holds, and after it ends the Government will step in, assume the problem of your resettlement and undertake to see to it that you are put back to some place where you will again have a job."

I just do not want these people who are going to these jobs to have any idea that the Congress of the United States, rather than expecting them as individuals to make some provision for their own future security, is going to immediately, even before the time comes, when there is a problem, undertake to carry the responsibility for them. I think that is one danger that is implicit in the extension of this committee's life.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad the gentleman emphasizes that point and the committee, if its life is extended, should take note of that so that one of the fruits of its work might be to give this kind of warning to these workers who are migrating.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I suggest again that the problem of migration, as it is referred to in the pending resolution and in the work of this committee, is part and parcel of the whole problem? There is no question but what we are now living under another illusion of prosperity created by the tremendous deficit financing of defense work. One of these days we will be back with our old problems of continuing economic depression and the necessity of working out ways and means to bring about economic recovery.

I wish I could feel in my heart that we had solved the problems of economic depression before this latest phase came upon us, but I am one of those who are very much afraid that we have not solved them, and that one of these fine days those problems will be back upon us with ever-increasing fury.

Therefore, as this committee works along and as all of us work along in a spirit of unity for the preservation of our country and for its defense against the threat of dictators from without, let us constantly have in mind the coming of a day when we will again be suffering the ravages of unemployment, depression, distress, and suffering, and let us, as far as we can, build our program to the end that when this is over we can so revitalize our economy as to provide real work opportunities for our men and women who want to work. Let us not be willing to say, "Oh, well, just have another public works program and continue with more of our deficit financing," because one of these days, whether we like it or not, we are going to get to the bottom of the sock.

There is only one solution for the general problem and that is to provide real work opportunities for the people who want to work. If this committee can perform any real service in that direction, I think it should do it. It should develop in these defense workers a recognition of their individual responsibility to take care of themselves and their families. It should be constantly shaping policies and views and preparing programs that may be adopted by Congress to the end that we bring about real economic recovery. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when I accepted a place upon this Select Committee for the Investigation of Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens I had two very definite notions in mind with respect to that committee. One was that we should finish our work on time and the other was that we should keep our expenditures within the allotted money that was given us by the Committee on Accounts. Our report that is due on April 3 will be filed by that time, and I understand there will be a few dollars left in the fund after we have finished our work.

This committee has called the attention of Congress and the Nation to a rather serious condition that exists in this country. It seems to me that it has uncovered a situation that is far more serious than mere relief, that is, that we are witnessing the development in this country of a gypsy population of about 4,000,000 people. It is my understanding of our Constitution that every citizen of the United States is also a citizen of the State wherein he resides. We have about 4,000,000 people who at this time are not residents or citizens of any State.

I agree with everything the gentleman from Indiana has said in regard to the work of this committee. I hope that it does not, and I am sure that it will not, become a mere instrument whereby more and greater relief is provided when all this national-defense industry is over.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman feel that rather than have this problem develop by concentrating the defense industries in the thickly populated sections of the country, it would be better to prevent the rise of the problem by distributing defense industries through the Middle West and pushing them back from the seaboard so that this concentration of defense population will not take place?

Mr. CURTIS. I very much agree with the gentleman, and the committee has done considerable along that line. Of course, we are without authority to tell the Defense Commission, or anyone else, where they shall locate industries, but we have placed in our records and brought to the attention of several members of the Defense Commission the situation that is arising by reason of the congestion of these defense industries.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentleman's committee is doing a good piece of work in that connection, and I hope you will continue to call that to the attention of the country, because up to date at least there has been altogether too much of a tendency to concentrate these industries in the large cities and thereby aggravate the problem the committee is attempting to alleviate. I believe the attention of the country should repeatedly be called to the fact that throughout the Middle West, where there are so many unemployed people, there are splendid places to locate defense industries without aggravating the migrant problem.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. If the gentleman will read our Washington hearings, particularly the testimony of Chester Davis, he will find that we have gone into that matter and have shown what a potential labor supply there is in the agricultural area. I may say that the decentralizing of defense industries and placing them in the agricultural areas has been opposed by certain organized labor groups, which wanted those industries established in the industrial "ghost towns" in industrial States.

Mr. MUNDT. I may add that Chester Davis has been very friendly to that kind of movement. I only wish more of our dollar-a-year men came from the Middle West.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Dakotas, Montana, Wyoming, and western Nebraska, as the gentleman knows, are being drained white of our skilled labor, for these men are going elsewhere. The result is that our unemployment situation is just as bad as it has ever been. The defense program has not helped it at all. In addition none of the States I have mentioned has any of the industries we are speaking about developing to carry out the defense program.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I assure him that I am very much in sympathy with the decentralizing of defense industries.

Coming back to the situation with regard to these migrants, as I said earlier, perhaps somewhere between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 people who are citizens of the United States are not citizens of any State. What happens to them? They travel from one State to another trying to find work or relief or what not.

They are given a little temporary relief and told to move on, and the result has been a contest between States over settlement laws. In the last few years the legislatures of a number of States have increased the settlement requirements for persons seeking relief. This has meant that the burden has fallen upon the private charities in our large cities and created a tremendous problem. Regardless of what is ultimately done from the standpoint of relief in connection with these people, I believe and I hope this committee will be able to bring forth recommendations that will again place these people in the communities where they belong, where they can have their homes and their friends and their neighbors.

I stated in the beginning of my remarks that we wanted to finish this investigation on time. There were several things that happened in 1940. One of

them was the starting of the European war and of our defense program. For the first time in the history of our Republic Congress remained in session until the new Congress came into being, and whether some of you recall it or not, it was also an election year. In spite of all these obstacles the committee traveled several thousand miles, heard hundreds of witnesses. Our hearings will include about 14 volumes. With the stress of all these things, I feel that we have not been able to go into the problem as well as we should.

In addition to this, the whole picture of the movement of people and their dislocation has become more accentuated by reason of the defense program itself, but, after all, I am not so very much worried about the problems facing these people who are going to these defense industries. They are all going to get a job and those who get on the pay roll will somehow get along. The various agencies will muddle through in some way and everybody will be taken care of, but I am thinking of that day when all this defense industry stops very abruptly. I, for one, hope that our economy will be such and that these individuals will have planned for themselves to such an extent that mere relief is not the only answer when that time comes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How are they going to plan for themselves when there are not any defense industries to go to and they are growing poorer every day? How are they going to know where to find jobs?

Mr. CURTIS. I wish you would not discourage this committee by emphasizing how tremendously difficult the job will be.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I only hope you tell us what answers you have thought of along these lines.

Mr. CURTIS. It has been definitely talked of in our committee, although there have been some witnesses who have disagreed with the proposition that there might be some enforced saving on the part of people engaged in national-defense industries, so that when the emergency is over they are not dependent upon public relief. The details of that have not been worked out and there is opposition to it, but that is one of the lines we have been trying to pursue. We want to do exactly the thing that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] called to our attention and that is not make everyone dependent upon relief when this defense program is over.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am interested in the statement of the able Representative from Nebraska that some means should be devised to force saving for the evil day so that these people may not be left stranded when a condition of unemployment comes about, and I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Nebraska what he thinks about the farmer in the South whose income is less than $200 a year. What does the gentleman think about forcing that man to save out of his meager earnings when he cannot make enough or does not make enough for the bare necessities of life, to say nothing about any of the comforts of life?

Mr. CURTIS. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman. In the first place, the gentleman has misunderstood my statement. I simply cited that as an illustration of the type of thing we were trying to follow through on, and, in the second place, I do not feel that the farmer the gentleman refers to, if he is making only $200 a year, would be an employee in a national-defense industry. We are referring to those people who are receiving wages that would justify following such a plan. And, again, I am not advocating that as a recommendation of the committee. I simply cite that as one of the things called to the attention of the committee in regard to national-defense migration.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If the gentleman will yield for a further question, I will call his attention to the fact that these people represent about ten or fifteen millions of the inhabitants of this country and are a very substantial part of our population. I wonder if the gentleman has thought about trying to suggest some means of raising the income of these people so that the conditions would be different in these communities?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I am glad to inform the gentleman that, so far as my interests on this committee are concerned, or until this whole war emergency came along, were primarily with the agricultural people of the United States, because I felt that was the source of most of our outward migration, both in the areas of the South that are problem areas, and the area I know the best—the Great Plains States—where the drought and the dust storms have made conditions almost unbearable for the people there. This committee has gone into the problems of farm prices, soil problems, water needs, mechanization, and other farm problems. I may say that my own State of Nebraska has had a percentage loss in population second in the entire Union. Half of those people have gone from my own congressional district. I believe the plight of agriculture is the source of a great deal of this migration. While many of those people did not take to the road and become "oakies," or the individuals referred to in John Steinbeck's book, they did leave the farm unwillingly and went to the city and perhaps got a job, and may have displaced someone who did become a migrant.

I wish this Committee of Five could provide the solution of all our agricultural ills, I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]. That is one of the problems that we are working on, but, after all, we cannot do what this entire Congress up to date has failed to do. I do believe our report will contain some worth while suggestions toward that end.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman is familiar with our section of the State. Will the committee make some recommendations to take care of our territory?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; there will be recommendations dealing with the drought area, involving water conservation, farm ownership, and related items. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL].

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of transient unemployed is a very serious one not only from the standpoint of cost to the community, but from the standpoint of permanent rehabilitation to any metropolitan district such as mine. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that it will be extremely important after the present emergency.

The city of Minneapolis, part of which I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives, is vitally interested in the problem of the transient unemployed workers or the transient unemployed and his family. In cities of the population group of 250,000 to 500,000, Minneapolis ranks second in the number of transient cases handled. A study of this problem in Minneapolis shows that the average unemployed transient family consists of a man and his wife and four children. Their care under the department of public relief costs the city of Minneapolis approximately $115,000 annually. In addition to this fund private agencies expended a considerable amount of money in meeting the direct needs of families following the expiration of the regular 15-day public-relief period.

For instance, during the month of June 1940, 176 transient cases were dealt with in varying degrees by private agencies in Minneapolis for which there are no funds for this purpose. Although the cost to Minneapolis is approximately $115,000 per year, the expenditure of this amount of money is meeting only the bare necessities of livelihood for these transient unemployed, and is in no way helping to permanently solve this problem or to offer any means of stabilization.

In Minneapolis a transient service was set up by all agencies for homeless persons and families. At the present time relief is given to employable transient couples for only 15 days and only emergency medical care is furnished. Most other cities have somewhat similar rules and regulations regarding the care of these transients. The very fact that they are transients and that no city is willing or financially able to let down the bars and class them as residents compels them to remain transients and condemns them to a floating existence finding temporary employment where they can and moving from place to place in order to come under short periods of direct relief.

Without Federal leadership and Federal financial aid the problem of the transient unemployed seemingly must always remain such a problem with the consequent heavy drain on relief funds of various cities. It is a problem that I believe not only my district, but every other district will be interested in seeing it solved.

I believe the work of this committee in making an investigation of facts and attempting to work out a permanent solution is one to be commended and its continuation should be supported.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that this resolution will be adopted. I think the gentlemen on this committee have done a mighty good job.

I think there is the greatest importance in what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said about the tremendous importance of solving fundamentally the economic problem that will confront us in the future, but I cannot expand on that in 2 minutes. I should like to say to this committee that I hope very much, since its scope has been somewhat broadened to consider defense migration, that that does not mean that the committee will in any way neglect the splendid job done up to now in studying the more basic problems of migration of homeless people about our country and the destitution of a large number of our farm people. I doubt very seriously that those problems will be very much mitigated by the business of the defense program, and as I have said many times on the floor, I feel that those people who have in the past throughout the history of America been the tillers and owners of the soil are the backbone of our Nation. I hope the committee will continue its work in that field just as vigorously as it has done it up to now, and I hope this resolution will be agreed to. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is really in the spirit of gratitude that I address the House today rather than in a spirit of appeal for a continuation of my own committee. I have lived with this problem for about a year, and it is the most interesting investigation and the most interesting matter I was ever connected with. During our entire national existence we have spent millions of dollars for the regulation and protection of interstate commerce, the passing of iron and steel through the States. Congress has appropriated during the last five sessions for the regulation and control of the migration of birds $7,500 each year; but we never, up until this investigation, have spent any money for the study of human migration.

As a committee we have paid no attention to partisanship. The finest gentlemen I have ever been associated with in my life are the members of this committee, Congressmen OSMERS, PARSONS, CURTIS, and SPARKMAN, and we have an able new member, Congressman ARNOLD, of Illinois, succeeding Congressman PARSONS. We traveled throughout the United States and never issued a single subpena. Neither did we ever attempt to cross-examine any witness.

What constitutes migration? We have always had it in the United States. In the early days of this country we welcomed migration. Lincoln was a migrant from Kentucky and he always referred to how well the Ohio people took care of him.

But when the depression came along all sorts of barriers are raised against human migration from State to State. I would like to say to you that everyone has a constitutional right in this country to move from one State to the other. The migration of people between States is caused by many things—wornout soil, unemployment, mechanization, and other factors. Therefore there is no single solution to the migration problem in this country.

We started out in New York. Mayor LaGuardia was our first witness. He said this is a national problem. We heard the Governors of the States. We heard the leaders of most every State in the Union. They all agree that it is a national problem.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] referred to his State. Please ponder these figures: One-half of his congressional district had to migrate to other States. Eight years of steady drought in his district caused them to move.

In all of our travels—and we examined nearly 400 witnesses—we never met one of them who did not want to stay home if he could stay home. But there comes a time when you have got to move. In other words, our own American people will not starve standing still.

Now what are you going to do about it? We certainly can do better than we have been doing. They leave their farms. They go on the road. The first thing they run into is the private employment agency that offers them jobs when there are no jobs across the State border. We have contractors, who transport migrants from Southern States all the way up into Michigan. No rest; no nothing.

Under the laws of this country, you know, there is the Interstate Commerce Commission watching carefully every railroad, requiring the unloading, feeding, and watering of cattle every 24 hours. We have been paying more attention to cattle than we have to human beings.

I have introduced a bill that will put these private employment agencies out of the business of sending these people across State lines, promising them jobs when there are no jobs. What is the solution to it? What are we going to do about it? Are we going to remain idle like we have in all the years of our history?

Nearly every State in the Union has laws making it a misdemeanor to transport a destitute citizen across State lines. One State law makes it a felony, a penitentiary offense to transport a destitute person across the State line. They have raised barriers in every State in the Union, making a residence qualification from 1 year up to 5 years. In other words, when you leave your home in one State now you lose your residence there and you do not acquire a new one. You become a homeless, Stateless wanderer in this country of ours. If we can fix a status for iron and coal and steel in this country we ought to be able to fix a status for a good American citizen who has to move on account of circumstances over which he had no control. [Applause.]

Now, about the farmers. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] mentioned the farmers. There is not an acre of farming ground in my district. There are no migrant camps or anything like that in my district. One of the solutions of this problem is to keep them at home. The Farm Security Administration appropriation was cut this year. We are making a fight to restore it. Those people do not want to leave their homes. I want to make this one point to you. We have to make this country worth fighting for and dying for and we cannot do this by kicking around millions of our migrant people. We must watch the morale of our people. You had 4,000,000 of these migrants on the road last year that were just kicked around. What are we going to do for them? It seems to me when we have standing committees and the Interstate Commerce Commission watching over the entire interstate transportation system, protecting the free flow of commodities in this country, and appropriate thousands for the regulation and protection of wildlife, it is about time we address a little attention to the human equation in this country. [Applause.]

I would like to point this out to you—that each of you are citizens of your respective States, and under the Constitution you are citizens of the 48 States. You go broke or lose your farm and try to negotiate the 48 States, or some of them, and see what you are up against.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I do not raise any opposition to the spirit or principle of this resolution. I agree that the committee is wrestling with a very important problem, and the work thus far accomplished is largely attributable to the able and sincere leadership of the gentleman from California. I do wish to call attention, however, to the language of the resolution in line 9, page 2, that "the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage"—and I labor those three words "and/or engage"—personnel temporarily to assist the select committee upon the request of the chairman. I am mindful that it is too late to approach this angle by an attempted amendment, but I would like to have the RECORD reflect the intention of the committee with regard to the administration of that particular language in the resolution, to the end that we are not throwing the door wide open to a vast increase in Government personnel for the functions intended.

Mr. TOLAN. Has the gentleman ever had any experience with the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have not. I have not been here long enough.

Mr. TOLAN. You will find out there is not much trouble about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEAVY. There is some considerable contention made that since the national-defense program is absorbing so many unemployed there no longer exists the necessity for the continuance of a committee such as the gentleman has so eminently headed and been so well supported by the membership of the committee; but is it not a fact that just the contrary is true—that the national-defense program is causing a migration of unemployed people far beyond the needs and its ability to absorb them?

Mr. TOLAN. Yes. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That was brought out by several witnesses last week at our hearings. The defense program has augmented the migration; not only augmented it, but there are four or five people waiting for each and every job.

Mr. LEAVY. This committee therefore ought to be continued, for its need is even greater than it was a year ago.

Mr. TOLAN. I thank my good friend the gentleman from Washington Congressman LEAVY.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On that particular point I have in my hand an article from the most recent number of the Daily Argus Leader, which deals with the question of men migrating from small communities to the shipyards and other places seeking employment. Later in the day I shall ask permission to extend the article in the RECORD.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I should like to get the gentleman's reaction for the benefit of those on this side who are going to support the resolution as to what the future of this legislation will be; how much it will cost.

Mr. TOLAN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that it is nearly a year now since our committee was set up. We spent $23,000 and will have some small amount to return. As to the cost, we have been working on our final report and have not had time to complete our break-down on the appropriation to be asked for. Let me say, however, that we never spent a dime on publicity and that we borrowed every bit of help we could. I can allay any fears that any unreasonable sum of money will be asked.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman expect to ask for more money than he had originally?

Mr. TOLAN. I do not know about that; I have no idea. The resolution was offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and will be presented to the Committee on Accounts for action.

Mr. FISH. I shall support the continuation of the committee. It is one thing if the gentleman expects to ask for the same amount or not more than the same amount his committee had last year but quite another if he expects to ask for $50,000 or $100,000.

Mr. TOLAN. As I say, I have no idea at this time just what amount of money will be requested from the Committee on Accounts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that if there are idle factories in the cities with thoroughly competent workers in the immediate neighborhood who could work in defense production the gentleman's committee will consider having a defense industry put in such factories. For instance, in my own city of Lowell there are vacant factories and there are highly skilled labor in that city also.

Mr. TOLAN. Absolutely. That is within our jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, let me in conclusion say again that I am deeply grateful for the assistance we have had from the leadership of this House—and that means on both sides of the House—the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the assistance we have had from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, and every member of the Rules Committee which reported the resolution out favorably—and to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS]. I again say to you I close in a spirit of gratitude. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the membership were informed as to the splendid services and valuable work this committee has rendered to the House and to the country there would not be a single vote cast against this resolution, which proposes to extend the time of this committee.

I may say to the gentleman from New York in answer to his objection or question, that it merely means the committee may have the right to request aid from the departments so they would not be obliged to spend any more money than absolutely necessary. To my colleague, a member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], let me say that during my many years of service I have never seen a committee more economical than this so-called Tolan committee.

The gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], chairman of this committee—yes, and each and every member of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], have shown themselves to be sincere, honest, and hard-working men, and although the committee is composed of these very conscientious and active members, I know it will be materially strengthened in its work by the appointment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] as a member to fill the existing vacancy who, as the House knows, is an exceptionally able and diligent member.

I do not know of a committee of the House that has devoted its time and energy to a greater degree with a desire to be of aid in bringing about or eliminating unfortunate migration conditions that might develop after the preparedness or defense program is out of the way than has this committee. The work they have done up to now entitles them, as I say, to the thanks of the House; but I must not omit to say that some preliminary investigations of the problems of migrant workers were originally made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], in cooperation with about 40 other Members. They began working on the problem of unemployment, and I am sure that this group, which is composed of members of both parties will cooperate with this committee in continuing its splendid work in the future.

This committee, unlike certain Members of the House, does not brand anyone who tries to improve the conditions of labor as being a Socialist, a Communist, or a person dangerous to the community. They view these men as men who are entitled in this great Nation of ours to provide themselves and their families with the necessities of life. Due to conditions that existed a few years ago, millions of people, unfortunately, were unable to find employment, and they were obliged to migrate to other parts of the country. Because of this condition many agencies in this country took advantage of these unemployed by charging them exorbitant fees for temporary positions, and in many instances misrepresented the work that was to be given them in the place to which they were lured in search of employment. I hope we have put an end to that, and with the bill now pending, which I hope will be enacted shortly, we will put all of these cutthroats and dishonest men out of business.

We all must recognize that the defense program will bring about a dislocation of labor, not only in the farming sections, but also in those centers of the Middle West which have been shorn of thousands of skilled mechanics and skilled laborers. Consequently, in view of conditions, I feel it is timely that a thorough study be made so that when these activities cease and legislation is most needed, we will have before us the results of the committee's investigations and its recommendations upon which we can act intelligently.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt the fears entertained by the gentleman from Indiana as to the after-effects of this defense migration, as I feel that there will not be a recurrence of the conditions which confronted the country in 1930, 12 years after the World War. Thanks to its creation, the Securities and Exchange Commission will serve to prevent in the future any orgy of inflation similar to that which took place in 1928 and 1929, which resulted in the financial crash and subsequent depression.

In conclusion, I want to say once more that this committee is entitled to the appreciation of the House and the country for the splendid work which it has done. I know they will continue with the same determination and sincere effort to help the cause of the migrant workers. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY], who is ill and unavoidably absent on account of illness, may have permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BEAM]?

There was no objection.

NET WEIGHTS IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TRANSACTIONS IN COTTON

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 136.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 136

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 968, a bill to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and pending that I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY].

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, this net-weight cotton bill has been before the Congress many, many years. We usually pass it in the House but it always fails to pass the Senate. I am going to state briefly what the bill does, its purposes, then try to give you a picture of conditions, and finally draw the conclusions that I deem are reasonable and logical why this bill, if enacted into law, will help the cotton farmer. He is the man I am endeavoring to help, and I think we all agree that the majority of those opposing this legislation are the people who are interested in the jute industry. We all know the farmer always pays the bill, and losses are usually passed on to him by those higher up.

This cotton net-weight bill simply authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the handling and the transportation of cotton, and, further, to investigate the wrappings that cotton is wrapped in when it is ginned. After investigating the materials that wrap the cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish a standard known as United States official cotton tare standard, which means prescribing the type of bagging or material with which the baled cotton will be wrapped when ginned.

The bill goes further and provides that the Secretary of Agriculture in establishing this standard has to prescribe that the material used for wrapping the cotton shall not exceed the maximum weight of 14 ounces per square yard; that the patches put on the baled cotton will not weight over 20 ounces each. After he promulgates these standard tares or establishes standard tares, which this bill provides shall be done by January 15, 1942, then every bale of cotton ginned after July 15, 1942, shall be sold on a net-weight basis. This simply means the cotton shall be sold on the basis of the weight of the cotton in the bale. In other words, less the weight of the wrappings and the ties.

What condition does that bring about that is different from the present condition? Briefly, the present condition is, as evidenced by the two bales of cotton out in the lobby and as evidenced by various pictures that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], will show you, for he has given years and years of thought and study to this bill and this type of legislation, as well as the result that will naturally follow to the farmer. I do not think there is a Member of this House but who will say that the American ginned bale of cotton today is the most unsightly, the most disgraceful, and the most uneconomic package that is put on the market today by any business at all. Cotton is the only agricultural commodity that is today sold on a gross-weight basis. Of course, if you consider cattle an agricultural commodity, some of them are sold on the hoof.

A number of you Members perhaps have never seen a bale of cotton or possibly do not know how it is ginned. Here is what is happening today and here is what this bill is endeavoring to remedy: The farmer knows that the cotton he produces will about one-third itself. In other words, he puts up 1,500 pounds of seed cotton in his wagon or vehicle and carries it to the gin and knows it will gin around about 500 pounds, or one-third. There the ginner usually charges him about $5. This $5 is not altogether for ginning. The ginner usually sells him the jute. That is this open-weaved stuff that you see out here on the bale of cotton on exhibit. On the average, that costs the farmer about 50 cents, and it takes about 6 lineal yards of jute to cover a bale of cotton. The farmer pays for it about 50 cents, and the jute that he puts on that cotton will weigh around 14 pounds, or at least that. The ties will weigh about 1½ pounds apiece, and there are 6 ties to a bale, which is a total of about 9 pounds. You get, then, about 23 or 25 pounds of bagging and ties to a bale of cotton that weighs 500 pounds, including wrapping, ties, and so forth.

Of course, the farmer pays for that at the gin. Then the farmer takes his cotton and sells it to the ginner or the cotton buyer or whoever it is that buys his cotton—possibly a merchant. If that bale of cotton weighs 500 pounds, he is paid for a weight of 500 pounds. The farmer knows, you know, I know, and everybody else knows that the farmer is getting paid for that jute bagging and those ties, and that fact has always appealed to the farmer. That fact enables the jute interests to keep the cotton farmer from knowing what really does happen in the buying of the farmer's cotton.

You will find that those who oppose this bill now will say that if you pass this bill the farmer will lose that money. That is the crux of the situation. That is the argument of the jute people. To my way of thinking, the farmer will benefit. He will not get paid for the bagging and ties, it is true, if it is sold on the net-weight basis, but he will have a different type bale of cotton; he will have a bale of cotton that is wrapped economically, neatly, and nicely. Whereas the jute will cost 50 cents, the cotton bagging may cost $1.50. The ties will be the same. But the farmer knows when he sells to the cotton buyer that the buyer cannot use the cotton himself, as all cotton is raised to be ultimately milled and manufactured, and he knows that the miller or manufacturer never uses the bagging or ties for any purpose. They are a total waste.

The farmers know that there are anywhere from 23 to 26 pounds of tare on the bale of cotton. Even if the farmer gets 10 cents a pound for his cotton, bagging and ties, he loses in the long run. By the time the buyer and the warehouseman have to handle that large, raggedy, disgraceful bale of cotton and pay the extra warehouse charges, because the bale takes up more room than it should, and also pays the large increase in the insurance cost, because it is absolutely inflammable, as well as extra transportation charges, there will be considerable additional cost in the use of the present type of cotton bales, and the farmer pays it. Go out in the lobby and see how quickly the jute on that cotton there will burn. Not only the insurance rate but the transportation rates are reflected in the price paid to the farmer who produced that bale of cotton, together with all the other expenses. Everybody knows the mills cannot handle the bagging and ties and have no use for them. Furthermore, they take off more for tare because the old jute absorbs moisture and cotton clings to it, so that the mills lose a good many pounds of cotton when they unwrap the bale.

The Liverpool market always takes off 6 percent of the gross weight of the cotton for tare, and that is usually 30 pounds. All cotton is sold at Liverpool on the net-weight basis when we export it.

When that is done, and we know that to be the fact, even though the farmer gets paid for his bagging and ties that is reflected back in the price the mill, or the buyers, or the export marketers are willing to pay for the cotton. Therefore, just as a practical proposition, if the farmer gets 10 cents for his cotton including the bagging and ties in that old package that belongs way back in the horse and buggy days, he is no better off. There has not been any progress in the

ginning or the looks of a bale of cotton generally in the last 75 years. It is today just as it was when it was ginned by the press, packed by hand, and drawn by the mule tied to a pole. If we can get a neater package, it will be reflected back to the farmer and he will be entitled to the benefits and will get them. That is what those of us who advocate the passage of this bill want, and I hope the bill will be passed, for I sincerely believe that our cotton farmer now pays these extra charges and not the trader.

(Here the gavel fell.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This bill requires net weight?

Mr. DOXEY. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is there any requirement compelling the ginners to put on cotton bagging or any other type of bagging unless the cotton is sold by net weight?

Mr. DOXEY. No type of bagging is absolutely prescribed. You can put on any type of bagging that will come within the weight limit and standards set by the Secretary of Agriculture if the cotton is sold by net weight, but you cannot put on this jute that we import from India duty-free because it weights more than 14 ounces to a square yard. Either cotton, or burlap, or something of that kind will have to be used as bagging. This bill does not provide that cotton bagging must absolutely be used, but we hope it will be used because it will use up around 250,000 bales of cotton a year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this bill prohibit the use of jute?

Mr. DOXEY. It does—that is, the jute that is now being used—because the prescribed bagging cannot weigh more than 14 ounces to the square yard, and the present jute bagging used weighs much more than that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute so that he may be interrogated by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DOXEY. I thank the gentleman for the additional minute. I shall be delighted to answer any questions I can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman answer this question? First, let me say that I am in favor of this bill.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate that. The gentleman's help is valuable. The gentleman has studied this question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we can enact this bill into law and get it into operation, will that not be a step toward bringing about the high-density compression of cotton at the gin?

Mr. DOXEY. I certainly hope so, because it should come, and come quickly. A high-density bale would be a wonderful benefit not only to the cotton trade but to the cotton farmer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that should happen, then, in the gentleman's opinion, will it make this program more acceptable to the whole cotton industry than it is at the present time?

Mr. DOXEY. It certainly will.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who hopes and trusts and believes that although our export trade in cotton has gone now, we will get it back some day. The passage of this bill, in my opinion, will be a great step in that direction, and thereby benefit our cotton farmers. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader on the subject of migration of workers along the lines on which I interrogated the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] earlier in the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I think the answers to the last questions indicated practically what this bill amounts to. It is an attempt on behalf of those who manufacture a certain grade of cotton goods to secure control of a market at the expense of northern industries and southern industries that have been established for over 100 years. In other words, instead of putting the weight on the kind of baling which can be used in connection with cotton, which would permit the use of the present-day bagging, they see to it, as the last speaker pointed out, that the weight shall be of such an amount that no jute bagging can be used. This is the whole thing involved. They make it 14 ounces to the square yard, knowing that the present bagging weighs not less than 18 ounces to the square yard.

The cotton industry certainly deserves to be protected and the cotton growers deserve to be protected, but I do not feel they are entitled to have a protection placed around them that prevents other persons in the United States in established business from continuing in business. Jute manufacturers would certainly have to go out of business under that plan.

I think another evidence of privilege is a bill which has been introduced by the same gentleman who introduced this bill. It provides that if you are making wood pulp, for instance, for paper, if you put cotton into the wood-pulp machine and come out with a cotton grade of wood pulp, then you will not have to pay any processing tax, but if you are making paper and you are making it out of wood pulp and the wood pulp does not have any cotton content, then you will have to pay a processing tax. The tax, presumably, is going to be used to buy cotton from people down south to put into the cotton pulp. In other words, it seems to me we are going very far with this legislation, and I think we ought to look into it very carefully.

This bill, for one thing, should be considered as one which will result in revolutionary changes in the commercial handling of cotton and the methods and materials for covering it, which will be required.

The bill proposes criminal penalties applicable to every cotton farmer, to every cotton merchant, to every cotton exporter, and, indeed, to anyone who handles a bale of such cotton hereafter in commerce.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. The statement was made by the gentleman from Mississippi at the conclusion of his remarks that a great part of the jute now used in bale coverings was imported from India. It is not a fact that very little new jute is imported each year, the fact being that the jute which is used as covering is used over and over again, is rewoven by these jute mills, and that the principal source of their supply year in and year out is not new exports but the reweaving and reassembling of the former bale coverings?

Mr. CLASON. It is my understanding that the gentleman's statement is correct. If this bill should be adopted, those persons who have supplies of bagging on hand, either new or second-hand, are not given any time hardly, or perhaps only a few months, in which to dispose of this bagging, and therefore will suffer the loss of its total value.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can the gentleman tell us something about the difference in cost of these two coverings?

Mr. CLASON. I can tell the gentleman that at the present time mills which manufacture the kind of cotton bagging which it is apparently determined they would like to have used on these bales of cotton have only covered in any one year not more than one-twelfth of a crop, and that the cotton bagging so used in the baling of those crops has been subsidized to the extent of 60 cents on the dollar of their selling cost by the United States Treasury. I think this shows that the cost of the cotton bagging today is at least twice as great as the jute bagging which is being used and which has been used for more than 100 years. I doubt if many of us realize that the cotton bagging which has been used up to the present time has been subsidized in part by the Federal Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Following up the effect of this bill on the jute mills, is it not true, according to the gentleman's information, that the jute mills now are not being called on to manufacture any material part of the present requirements for national defense in the textile field?

Mr. CLASON. That is true, and if they are not allowed to go ahead with their present commitments and with their present lines of production, their people are going to be thrown out of work.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. And by the same token, is it not true that the cotton mills to which all this new business would go are now busily engaged, some of them on a 24-hour-day basis, handling national-defense contracts and that, as a matter of fact, they are not in need of this new business which would naturally inure to them by the passage of this bill?

Mr. CLASON. That is true and I think it should be pointed out further that in all probability in order for the cotton mills to turn out cotton bagging to cover a large crop—the largest proportion of a crop up to the present time having been one-twelfth of a crop—it would be necessary for them to get a great amount of new machinery. There is not a person on the floor of this House who does not know that one of the great bottlenecks in our present national defense is the inability of our machine-manufacturing corporations to turn out the necessary machines for our national defense.

This bill is going to make it a criminal offense, as I pointed out, for practically every person who handles cotton hereafter to do so unless he does it in the manner prescribed by law. The extent of the authority granted to the Secretary is unlimited. He can determine on the size, the weight, the construction, and other factors for any such bale covering, and the use of any other kind is made a misdemeanor. He can change these requirements at any time. In other words, if it was possible for any competitor to get into the picture, along would come the Secretary of Agriculture and change the picture again so as to force out that competition. I think that type of work and that type of legislation is un-American.

The cotton farmer has been selling cotton on gross weight and he knows that he has been paid on the gross weight basis. He knows what his crop calls for, and what he can get for it. If they pass this bill, they will add this cotton baling to it, and they are going to sell at net weight. The farmer of the South, before he gets through, will find himself in a position where he is going to get paid for cotton, and he himself will pay for the cotton baling, and he will pay twice as much as the cost of the jute baling or bagging at the present time. There is no question about that, and the person who will lose will be the cotton farmer, who has to pay twice as much in the future for the covering for his bales of cotton.

Let us look at some other things. We are in a war-torn world.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not probable that the cost of this cotton will be charged to the farmer on practically the same basis as the storage of his cotton?

Mr. CLASON. He is certainly going to pay for it. I do not know on what basis, but you can bet the grower will pay for that cotton baling before it goes onto the market and is sold to the consumer. The consumer is going to see to it that he does not pay for it. If we add this additional price on the bale of cotton the result is that he has to meet competition a little bit keener in every world market, and American cotton today is having plenty of difficulty in getting used in any foreign market.

Mr. DOXEY. Is there any American cotton sold in any world market that is not sold on weight? All the American export is sold on net weight.

Mr. CLASON. It may be, between the warehouseman and the person abroad, but, as I understand it, the cotton grower knows when he sells his bale of cotton that he is going to be paid for every pound there is in this bale. That cotton has been wrapped in jute bagging for 100 years and has gone into every world market and has been successful in every world market until you start in adding to its cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the House in the closing days of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress with hardly any consideration whatsoever. It is interesting to note that in this bill brought in today they apparently have brought it in with so little consideration that they have left practically the same dates in the bill for carrying it into effect, as in the 1939 bill, with the result that it is impossible to conceive that the mills which make cotton baling would be in a position to furnish bagging in order to bale the cotton within the time this bill, in its present form, sets forth. There have not been any hearings on the bill before the committee at this session of Congress, and if gentlemen will read the report which accompanies the bill, they will see it refers to four other bills, heard at other sessions of Congress, and every one of them defeated. It is also interesting to note that in this report they have a lot of letters and arguments in favor of the bill, and they very wisely left out the dates that went with the letters and the communications, and the answer to it is this. The only date they left in here was for Secretary Wallace in 1939–40, and I understand from members of this committee that every other one of these letters or communications is at least 5 years old and was written at a time when there was not a world upset in trade and when the whole country was not involved in this great war issue with our great national-defense program. In other words, the arguments which they are using are based upon what was happening more than 5 years ago.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I would not trust myself against a technical man like the gentleman, but I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the former legislation was defeated?

Mr. CLASON. It certainly never became law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that this particular bill passed the House and the gentleman himself made a motion to recommit, and his motion was defeated by a vote of 137 to 22?

Mr. CLASON. I spoke of that a moment ago.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. On June 8, 1939.

Mr. CLASON. Yes; and it died in the Senate; and I think this ought to die in the House today.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the gentleman stated it never passed the House. I wanted to correct the gentleman.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Is it not true that this bill is cotton against jute, and is it not true that if this bill is enacted into law the jute mills throughout the Nation will close their doors?

Mr. CLASON. They will have to.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Is it not also true that the farmer will lose by the enactment of this bill, due to the fact that the covering of these bales will be subjected to further use as draperies, curtains, and even wearing apparel?

Mr. CLASON. There is no question about that.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Do they not realize that?

Mr. CLASON. It ought to be brought home to them if they do not.

As a matter of fact, when you get down to this cotton baling, they talk about how pretty it is when it comes out, all white and all of one color and everything is fine; but the moment anyone puts a hook into it to sample it, they have to put a patch or a tear on it or whatever mending they do on this bagging, and you will likely find some of your old last year's shirts—pink, orange, or any color. By the time it gets into the buyer's hands or the consumer's hands it will look like a galaxy of all the dress suitings or coatings they could find in the United States.

Now, the present bagging costs far less than that which would be required by the terms of this bill which, stripped of generalities, tells the American public that, if this bill is once adopted, thereafter cotton can only be sold when wrapped in cotton cloth. I have already told you that those who are interested in cotton are trying to place cotton in wood pulp, so that every paper mill in the United States that makes its paper out of pulp has to put cotton in with it. But if this law is good for baling cotton, why is it not just as good as a container for potatoes, or for candy, or for anything else? In other words, cotton has got to serve its purpose and be served, and paper and jute and everything else has to go out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman withhold his point for a moment?

Mr. COOLEY. I will withhold it for the moment.

Mr. FULMER. I would like to state to my colleague that the only thing we can do is to delay this until tomorrow. It will come up immediately tomorrow.

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman mean, "It will come up immediately"?

Mr. FULMER. Tomorrow this will be the first thing. You will simply lose this afternoon, lose that much time.

Mr. COOLEY. Do you contemplate permitting this discussion to go over until tomorrow?

Mr. FULMER. If there is no quorum, this bill will come up the first thing automatically tomorrow, and you will simply lose this time.

Mr. COOLEY. But I am making the point of no quorum at the present time.

Mr. FULMER. I say if there is not a quorum, this will come up tomorrow. I understand a great many Members are away, and the leaders no doubt have some arrangement about that. The only thing you do is lose this afternoon, and immediately we come back to the same thing tomorrow.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not understand what the gentleman means when he says we will lose this afternoon. It is now 2 o'clock. There is no quorum present, and I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of order for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the same argument just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] more than a hundred times, always made by some person engaged in the processing of jute or by somebody who had a jute manufacturer in his district.

This is one bill that does not cost the Government a dime. It is a bill that is offered in the interest of regulating the sale of cotton. It is a bill in which the cotton growers are particularly interested. The controversy has been referred to as a contest between the manufacturers of jute, on the one hand, and the manufacturers of cotton on the other. I happen to be interested in neither the manufacture of jute nor the manufacture of cotton. I am tremendously interested in the people who stir the soil and make it produce the commodity which we know as cotton.

The Ludlow people, who have a monopoly on jute, have been able to dominate this whole question for 50 years. They have thus far succeeded in misleading many Congressmen and many farmers. Their interest is in profits and not the farmer.

The jute manufacturers do not want this legislation. Why? Because it takes away from them their market in supplying the cotton grower with the coverage for his cotton. The adoption of the bill would not mean that they would go out of business. If their looms are such that they cannot be readjusted to the spinning of cotton, they can buy other machinery or supply themselves with other machinery, which is not costly and which will do so.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be so kind as to yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DOXEY. Is it not a fact that cotton bagging takes only about one-tenth of the jute imported into this country?

Mr. COX. That is correct. I wish I had time to discuss this question somewhat fully. The whole vegetable fiber schedule of the Tariff Act as passed 25 or 30 years ago was written by the jute people and it is the only illogical schedule in the Act. For instance, the raw commodity carries a higher duty than the jute which has been processed two or three stages along the line to the finished fabric.

The custom has grown up in the cotton trade of deducting 30 pounds from every bale of cotton that is sold. The growers of cotton, of course, have been interested in using a coarse and heavy fabric which costs less money, because it more nearly enables them to make up for that 30 pounds of tare. At present they are able to put on as high in some instances as 21 pounds of tare. When his cotton is sold 30 pounds is deducted for tare and there the trader grabs 9 pounds of cotton out of the grower's bale. To overcome this situation many of the farmers have agitated for a system of net weight sales, and they have come here with this legislation which means that when the cotton is sold the 7-pound tare that it carries is deducted. This is objectionable to the trade because they have accustomed themselves to deducting 30 pounds. In other words they will have to reform their rules of practice, they will of course have to meet the law. Where could objection come from except somebody interested in maintaining the status quo, somebody interested in the manufacture of jute or jute products, or somebody who has such manufacturing interest in his district? The bill should be passed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Andersen, H. Carl	Domengeaux	Jenks, N. H.
Andrews	Douglas	Jennings
Bender	Duncan	Johns
Bishop	Eberharter	Keefe
Bloom	Fellows	Kelley, Pa.
Boehne	Fitzgerald	Kelly, Ill.
Bolton	Flannagan	Kilburn
Bryson	Flannery	Kirwan
Buck	Fogarty	Kocialkowski
Buckler, Minn.	Ford, Thos. F.	Kramer
Camp	Gamble	Kunkel
Cannon, Fla.	Geyer, Calif.	Lambertson
Casey, Mass.	Gifford	Lanham
Celler	Green	Lea
Chiperfield	Hall, Leonard W.	LeCompte
Clark	Harrington	Ludlow
Cluett	Hart, N. J.	McArdle
Cochran	Hébert	McGehee
Courtney	Heidinger	McGranery
Delaney	Hinshaw	McGregor
Dickstein	Hoffman	Maciora
Dingell	Holmes	Magnuson
Dirksen	Howell	Martin, Iowa
Disney	Izac	Mitchell
Ditter	Jarman	Moser
Myers	Scanlon	Murdock
Nichols	Schaefer, Ill.	Thomason
Norton	Schuetz	Tibbott
O'Brien, Mich.	Scott	Treadway
O'Brien, N. Y.	Shannon	Wadsworth
O'Day	Sheridan	Wasielewski
O'Leary	Smith, Conn.	Weiss
Osmers	Smith, Pa.	Wheat
Pearson	Smith, Va.	Whelchel
Ploeser	Stearns, N. H.	White
Poage	Sullivan	Wilson
Reece, Tenn.	Sutphin	Wright
Robsion, Ky.	Sweeney	
Rodgers, Pa.	Taber	
Rutherford	Taylor	
Sacks	Thomas, N. J.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eleven Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. COLMER, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

NET WEIGHTS IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TRANSACTIONS IN COTTON

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] 5 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order on a very important matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, there should be no partisan politics in national defense. Yet, as Americans, it is high time for 22,000,000 people, called Republicans, to wake up and, as both Republicans and Americans, insist that action shall be had by the party in power at once with respect to our national defense and your safety and mine.

If those to whom we have delegated authority are incompetent or unwilling to attempt to cope with the situation or do not have the intestinal fortitude to defy the saboteurs, the racketeers, the "fifth columnists," laborers and employers, and all those who are determined insidiously to wreck the United States, then let Congress, without respect to partisan politics, in 36 hours take the matter into its own hands and outlaw these strikes.

Calvin Coolidge said:

> There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time.

It was never more true than it is today. Why not make it so?

Let us repeal, if necessary, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and any other act, by which we pay strikers while they strike and induce them to stay out against us. Let us invoke the provisions of a hundred different statutes to penalize and punish employers who seek to interfere with the progress of our defense production. This is not an antilabor but a "for us" suggestion.

We have laws enough. For God's sake, and for yours and mine, let us get busy; let us get some action, and before it is too late.

Are we too dumb to learn anything from the experience of others?

The vital life spark of this country is involved and is being smothered and choked to death at the Allis-Chalmers plant by those who are inspired by foreign influence and paid to do it and know

what they are doing and where and why. Let us wake up, America.

If—and I feel it is so—incompetency to deal with our national peril has been sufficiently evidenced by those to whom we have delegated authority, let us stop talking. Let us do something now.

This morning's papers carry the story that the soft-coal miners and employers and others engaged in other essential defense industries are either in or involved in a strike or are contemplating a strike. Who knows what will happen next?

Are we here in Congress as helpless as we look? Let us show the world that democracy and a republican form of government can function.

The Republican Party should be known as something other than the party of oppositionists. It should have a constructive suggestion that it is ready to offer. It has one and is ready to help make it a reality. It is 100 percent, or approximately so—or should be so—for the outlawing of these strikes against its own safety, individual and national. Let us get going before it is everlastingly too late. [Applause.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, because of my admiration and affection for the distinguished chairman of my committee, the author of this bill, I am, frankly, somewhat reluctant to speak in opposition to it. I have actually tried to bring myself to his way of thinking about this measure; and if I could be convinced, as I am sure he is sincerely convinced, that this measure is in the interest of the cotton farmers of the Nation, I most certainly would be here advocating its approval, rather than speaking in opposition. But I am not convinced that it is in the interest of the farmer. The fact is, I am convinced that this legislation will have the effect of adding tremendously to the burden now being carried by the cotton farmers of the Nation.

The purpose of this bill is to force cotton farmers to abandon the use of a cheap bagging, which they now use, and force them to use a more expensive bagging. I challenge anyone to deny that that is the effect this bill will have.

Jute is far cheaper than cotton. It is cheaper than burlap, which is made of jute. The jute bagging now being used has probably been in use for more than a hundred years. The cotton farmers have been accustomed to selling on a gross-weight basis. They believe, whether true or not, that they are actually paid by the cotton buyer for the bagging and ties used on the cotton. We pass this bill, and immediately the weight of bagging and ties must be deducted at the place where the cotton is offered for sale. Immediately the farmer wonders why this deduction is being made. Why are the cotton buyers no longer paying me for my bagging and ties? The answer comes back, "Because of an act of Congress, a Federal law, which makes it a crime, a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of $500 for its violation." If it is well for cotton farmers to use cotton bagging, that material is already available.

The Federal Government, in an effort to encourage the use of cotton bagging, in 1939 subsidized cotton to the extent of $280,000, in 1940 the subsidy amounted to $250,000, and for the current year $300,000 will be used by the Federal Government to subsidize the manufacture of cotton bagging. Even with all of that effort on the part of the Government to encourage the use of cotton bagging, the farmers do not actually want to use it.

Strangely enough, the first witness who appeared before our committee in opposition to this bill, was a gentleman from Georgia, Mr. C. D. Redwine. Who was he? "I am a businessman from a small Georgia town. I grow cotton, I gin cotton, I warehouse cotton, and I merchandise cotton."

The next witness called was Dr. F. V. Taylor, president of the North Carolina-Virginia Ginners' Association of Stanley, N. C. Dr. Taylor referred to the use of cotton bagging. He said that they had tried to encourage the use of cotton bagging and here is what happened: "We liked to have lost all of our ginning because the farmers would not handle it any more, even if we allowed them 7 pounds extra tare." Further in his testimony he said, "We could not get any farmer to allow us to use it any more."

Here we come, by Federal law, and force the cotton farmer to use it whether he wants to or not. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is not any precedent for this type of legislation. Of course, we have regulations in interstate commerce with reference to sanitation and other things, but no one would be foolish enough to suggest that there is anything inherently vicious, vile, unhealthy, or unsanitary about the use of jute bagging. Now we undertake under the commerce clause to pass a law, the effect of which is to say to the potato growers, "You may use jute," to the vegetable and fruit growers, "You may use jute bagging," to those who ship furniture and crate their furniture with burlap, "You may use jute." Everybody else in America is perfectly free to use jute in any form they want to use it, but the poor old cotton farmer by Federal law is required to use a more expensive wrapping on his commodity.

I submit it is a ridiculous proposition. If $2.25 a bale is deducted from every bale of cotton at the cotton yard at the time of sale, representing the cost of the bagging and ties, with a crop of 12,000,000 bales of cotton, there will be approximately $27,000,000 deducted from the small income of the cotton farmer only in the hope that by some manipulation of the market he will be able to recover that $27,000,000.

I submit it is an unsound proposition. I know my good friend will bring before this House perhaps a bale of cotton wrapped in cotton and one wrapped in jute. I ask you to notice the bale wrapped in jute. It is obviously a stronger bagging and better in many respects than the cotton bagging. The gentleman mentions the fire hazard. The Bureau of Standards reports that jute from the standpoint of being a fire hazard is far less so than cotton. It does not burn as easily as does cotton.

Then the gentleman will bring here a picture of a ragged bale of American cotton which he says is a disgrace in all the markets of the world, but that bale of cotton of which he will have the picture is one which the buyers with long, sharp knives have slashed from one end to the other in withdrawing samples. If they were to give the same treatment to the other bale of cotton which he has sitting in the hall, that is wrapped in the very delicately woven cotton bagging, it probably would not have any bagging on it at all.

I have here a cotton bagging which has been on a bale of cotton and has been ripped off, and I will just show it to you. This is the bagging that was on a bale of cotton and it was given to me by a distinguished Member of this House this morning. There is the cotton bagging, and that is a perfect indication of what American cotton will look like in the markets of the world, wrapped up in this sort of a rag.

There is no reason to believe that the farmer is going to use cotton when it is more expensive than jute. Here is another sample of jute. This is made in India. This is jute bagging, a very neat, closely woven jute bagging, that is far cheaper than cotton and far stronger, and not as likely to burn.

Mr. SOUTH, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. NORRELL rose.

Mr. COOLEY. I prefer not to yield now.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman has a sample of used jute bagging.

Mr. COOLEY. It is out in the hall. If the gentleman would be kind enough to bring it in here, I should be glad to exhibit it to the House. It is much stronger than this cotton bagging.

Mr. COX. I am talking about used bagging that came from the same source.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know where that out there came from, but I know it is cheaper than cotton bagging.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this particular jute bagging come within the specified weight in the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand it does come within the weight.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. This is the disastrous effect this bill will have on an industry in this Nation. It actually outlaws jute. They talk about the Ludlow jute trust. I do not know anything about that, but I have a jute mill in my district that employs about 600 people. I have here a letter, which I shall place in the RECORD, indicating that if this bill passes the mill involved must close its doors, because the machinery now used cannot be used in weaving this type of bagging.

The question is whether we are going to pass a bill forcing the cotton farmer to do something he does not want to do and, by the same bill, lock up the jute industry

in this Nation and drive it back to India, and let this stuff be manufactured there and imported into this country to be used in wrapping American cotton.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why would it not be a good idea to put a tariff on these articles so that we can manufacture everything in this country?

Mr. COOLEY. I suppose all the people who are interested in this would vote for the highest sort of a tariff on jute or would vote for quotas on jute imported into this country, and keep it all out.

Mr. COX. What is the gentleman's attitude?

Mr. COOLEY. I would be perfectly willing to vote for a tariff or a quota on jute—anything I could do to give this market to cotton—but I am not willing to force the use of cotton on the cotton farmer and not force it on anybody else.

The argument being made is that it will substantially increase the price of cotton, but who is foolish enough to believe that you are going to increase the use of cotton because of the nature of its wrapping, or that you will advance the cost of cotton because of the nature of its wrapping, when we all know that the wrapping does not go into the processing of cotton? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram from Phil Murray to me, and my reply, together with a statement in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH].

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. R. 968, for I believe the passage of the measure would bring no good results, but would instead cause untold harm due to the revolutionary changes in the methods of sale of the entire American cotton crop which passage of the bill would signify. It would be particularly harmful to the jute bagging industry, an industry which has been developed by American capital, manned by American labor, and which has even through the lean years of depression afforded work with good wages to many thousands of Americans.

The proponents of the measure state that the bill does not prohibit the using of any kind of material for bale covering, if the material comes up to the standards which the bill specifies for all covering. The question, however, is not that it specifically prohibits any type of material, but that through the standards set up it would outlaw all existing kinds and types of bagging that the cotton trade itself has chosen and used for covering cotton bales, for the better part of the century. The bill provides that no such bagging could be used after July 15, 1942; thus the entire jute industry would have to get rid of this bagging in the present cotton season, for after the effective date of the act it would become absolutely worthless. It also means that in the 6 months between January 15 and July 15, 1942, an entirely new kind of bagging of less than one-half the weight of that used at present would have to be made to the tune of approximately 72,000,000 yards. This is virtually impossible.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be a fine thing if 12,000,000 bales of cotton were raised and could not lawfully be wrapped and protected for handling in commerce because there was no lawful bagging available? The export situation being what it is, this is hardly a time when a tried and universally accepted type of bagging should be outlawed by the Congress in favor of theoretical and, up to now, experimental cloth of so much less weight, no greater strength, and much higher cost.

Let me remind you as to what jute means to the United States and to the cotton growers of the South. The United States purchases directly and indirectly from one-quarter to one-third of all the jute and jute products exported from India. This amounts to $78,000,000 per year. India purchases directly and indirectly from the United States a yearly average of $87,000,000 worth of American products. India consumes one-third of the cotton goods produced by England, our second-best customer for raw cotton. Bengal, India, the province which produces jute, takes 40 percent of all the cotton goods imported into India.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues, why should not the cotton producers in the South use jute to wrap and tie their bales of raw cotton?

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am against the passage of H. R. 968. I can see no benefit to the cotton farmer in the measure; in fact, I sincerely believe he would suffer rather than benefit. I can see in this proposal, which has been debated for many, many years, only one thing—discrimination against an industry which employs American labor in America, an industry which would be forced to curtail production if this bill were passed, and in doing so would be forced to remove thousands of American men and women from jobs and relegate them to the ranks of the unemployed.

If this bill is passed and the baling of cotton is completed with cotton bagging, the cotton farmer has been loaded with the burden of the additional cost. If the bagging is done with burlap of light weight, the employment has been given to workers in foreign lands, for the burlap is not an American product. But if the bill is not passed, we will keep the American jute industry working full time for the benefit of all America. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to vote down the measure.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had the privilege of hearing the debate on this measure, although I understand it has been before the Congress in several previous sessions. It is my observation that if there were compelling reasons for the rejection of legislation of this kind in previous Congresses, those same reasons are more compelling and more cogent in connection with the pending bill; and why do I say this? Because, entirely aside from the doubtful benefits which might accrue to the cotton farmer by reason of the use of a small additional amount of his product for the making of cotton covering for his bale of cotton, we should face the fact that in this day, when the purpose and spirit of the country is to conserve our economic resources and hold economic dislocations to a minimum, this bill would undoubtedly not only cause many well-established and long-functioning businesses to go out of business, but its adverse economic effects on the employees, not only of the mills but of the factors and merchants dealing in jute, would be enormous. I do not have in my district any manufacturers of byproducts of jute or any other textile, but I do have in my New York constituency numerous dealers in textile byproducts, and these men have been in business for decades, for generations, if you please, and they have been building up their stocks of jute, and they reweave it every year for use in the baling of cotton. It is a process that has stood the test of time; and let us see what would happen to the cotton farmer in the event jute were eliminated as a bale covering. I am authoritatively informed that the maximum requirement under this bill annually would be in the neighborhood of 500,000 pounds of cotton out of an approximate yearly crop of 11,000,000 bales. This would simply mean that a mere scintilla of the cotton crop would be devoted to this purpose, and against that you would have the putting out of business of these long-established and flourishing enterprises of which I spoke a moment ago.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. If the amount of cotton that would be used is insignificant, the amount of jute that would be used would be insignificant too, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question for the reason that the amount of jute that is used represents the very essence and substance of the business of these small concerns that are dealing in jute, whereas cotton has any number of other uses.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman does not mean to convey the idea that cotton bagging is the principal use of jute in this country?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. No; but I do wish to stress the fact that that is one of the principal uses of jute in this country.

Mr. PACE. It is only a very small percentage.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. But the fact is that some mills in this country are geared up in such a way they cannot produce anything else except that cotton bagging which is now made out of jute.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. That is true, and has been true for many, many years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the question is whether or not the House will adopt this resolution to provide for the consideration of this bill which passed the House on June 8, 1939, on a motion to recommit by a vote of 137 to 22. The concrete question is whether or not, in an effort to provide for jute mills, we are going to legislate against the interests of cotton producers.

It is universally acknowledged that cotton tare is an economic evil. The cotton trade has not been able to eliminate the tare, and William L. Clayton, a large cotton buyer, as disclosed by the report, states that only legislation will do the job. There is a tare on foreign exports of 30 pounds, and a domestic tare of 21 pounds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be that under the system that would obtain initially the farmer would have to pay a little more for his bagging, for his coverage, but the fact remains that he knows and the trade knows that the trade is not going to pay him for 30 pounds of something that they do not get. When this bill is passed, when Congress does for the cotton grower what we have done for the wheat grower, and what we have also done for the cotton grower in providing for the regulation of cotton exchanges, he will get paid for the 30 pounds of cotton and will get better prices; and that is not all.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for new uses of cotton. The Congress appropriates every year hundreds of thousands of dollars for this purpose and what will Congress do if we provide here for the use of 200,000 bales of cotton? Do not take my statement for it. Mr. Cheatham, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, says that the level of prices will rise and I quote:

> Economists tell us this would amount to one-half percent a pound, or $2.50 a bale; or, on an average crop of 12,500,000 bales, $31,250,000.

The cotton farmer, whether he knows it or not, will get on the average, in the long run, $2.50 a bale more than he is getting for his cotton now, and he will get paid for 30 pounds when he sells in a foreign market and for 21 pounds when he sells in a domestic market. He is not getting that pay now.

What about elimination and change of machinery? They tell me that automobile plants are being converted into airplane plants and that National Cash Register plants are now being converted into gun plants, and it is idle and absurd to say that any textile plant cannot be converted, within a reasonable time, from jute to cotton.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have only 4 minutes, and the gentleman had a much longer time. The testimony in the hearings shows that there may be a reasonable conversion from one kind of a textile plant to another kind, and I say, in the long run, that will benefit American industry in the factory and on the farm, as shown by the hearings and arguments on June 8, 1939, the only time this bill was ever considered by the House. The jute influences were able through their power to prevent it from being brought on the floor of the House before 1939, and the jute influences have been very powerful for 100 years in preventing a tariff on jute. The only time that the Congress ever considered this matter it passed by a vote of 6 to 1.

Are we for the few thousand employees in the jute mills of the country that now, when other mills are being converted, can be more easily converted than ever before in our history, or are we for the hundreds of thousands of cotton laborers in the South who will be benefited as shown by the hearings on this bill if we provide for 200,000 bales in new usages of cotton, and thus remove the disgrace of jute bagging that you can see by observing the photographs of cotton wrapped in jute in the Speaker's lobby? They show that the American bale of cotton is the most disgracefully wrapped bale of cotton in foreign markets. Every country save the United States provides for the sale of cotton by net weight as we provide for the sale of it in this bill.

The bill in the long run will be of benefit to the cotton producer and the cotton manufacturer. It is favored by the Department of Agriculture, and it is supported by the Texas Cooperative Council, the American Cooperative Cotton Association, the North Carolina Cotton Growers, the American Farm Bureau Federation, by cotton mills, by cotton shippers, by spokesmen for insurance and transportation and by cotton growers.

It is opposed by jute mills, and by those whom jute mills can influence or convince.

It provides for net weight in the sale of American cotton just as foreign cottons are sold by net weight. At present American cotton is sold by gross weight. Net weight will eliminate marketing costs, insurance hazards, transportation costs, and it will simplify trade practices. The cotton trade should itself provide for net weights but the jute influences have prevented.

The bill only applies to cotton that will be ginned in the future. It does not apply to Government-owned cotton, or to other cotton that has already been ginned. In the long run the bill will provide a better price to the grower. It should be considered and passed by the House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in discussing the rule by inserting a brief statement by members of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 968, to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 968, with Mr. ROBINSON of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] is entitled to one-half hour, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to one-half hour.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. It is very interesting to me to listen to some of these gentlemen who have preceded me on this bill speak of their interest in the farmer, when as a matter of fact in a great many instances there are no cotton farmers in their districts. The attitude of my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is very interesting. He has a jute mill in his district, and like all the other jute interests, it is very powerful. In North Carolina they have thousands of cotton farmers, many of them going into tenant farming and many are migrating from his State and my State.

What about the agricultural commissioner of the gentleman's State? He certainly is interested in the cotton farmers in North Carolina. I am quoting from a telegram received from him today:

> This is to further assure you that I endorse cotton net-weight bill and sincerely hope you succeed with its adoption.

Everybody knows about the Progressive Farmer, a real farm paper, edited in North Carolina. This paper has been fighting all these years in the interest of the cotton farmer. Listen to the editor of this paper, Dr. Roe, in a letter just received from him:

> I am delighted to know that you hope to get the cotton net-weight bill up for consideration in the House of Representatives next week, and I hope you will leave no stone unturned in your fine fight to secure its adoption. The whole South ought to back you up in this contest. I shall be disappointed if any Congressman from the Carolinas fail to do so. On behalf of all southern growers I want to thank you again for your continuing interest in this matter and hope next week will bring to a successful conclusion the long fight you have made.

Now, my friends, this bill has for its purpose two things: First, to bring about net weight. During all these hundred years, referred to awhile ago, cotton has been sold on gross weight, and for no other purpose than to be able to use this

old, heavy, wasteful, and disgraceful jute bagging.

The other is to standardize cotton tare—cotton bagging. Every other container has been standardized and every other farm product in this country and every other country, except cotton in this country, is sold on a net-weight basis.

This bill will become effective in 1942 and will not affect any of the cotton that will be baled this year or that is carried in warehouses. As stated a moment ago, this is the only cotton country in the world that sells cotton on a gross-weight basis. This is the only cotton country in the world that uses this old heavy, wasteful, disgraceful jute bagging; not even India, where jute is grown, uses this heavy bagging. They use only 15 pounds of bagging and ties, and they use a neat burlap.

My friends, one of the charges against the farmers' price is when the cotton mill takes off this jute bagging they have to pay for the picking of the jute fiber out of the cotton. When you pull off burlap, the type used in India and every other cotton country in the world except the United States, it is like peeling a banana.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not your bill permit the use of that lightweight burlap if they want to do so?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely. My bill does not outlaw any material, provided they comply with the uniform standard coming within the weight allowed under net-weight selling.

Now [showing a picture], there is cotton covered with cotton in Brazil. In fact, every bale in Brazil is covered with cotton and every bale is compressed at the gin. Why do you not do it in this country? It is because the jute interests will not permit it. They put on this heavy bagging, and when the cotton leaves the farmer with 18 pounds, 21 pounds, or 24 pounds, and goes to the compress, they patch on the difference between that and 30 pounds, and when that bale of cotton goes to any market in Europe they knock off 30 pounds and settle for it on a net-weight basis. You can put 100 bales of compressed cotton in 1 freight-car box, but it takes 3 box cars to hold our type bale. Look at the freight our farmers are losing.

You have heard about the United States losing foreign markets. The reason for it is because of the type of bale we are putting up—the most wasteful, the most disgraceful, bale of any country in the world. If you only knew about the complaints coming from Europe and the claims against our exporters all coming out of cotton farmers. It comes right out of the price of cotton.

I have some photographs here. Look at the jute bale out in the corridor and then take a look at this picture where they are unloading our jute bales in Europe. Now you can understand what I mean about waste and a disgraceful bale. If you will notice the difference between that and the cotton bagging, all of that comes out of the price of the cotton farmer. Brazil is selling her cotton today to Canada. Why? Because of the type of baling. There is no knife put in the Brazilian bale. Every bale is properly graded and proper bagging is put on at the gin and every bale is compressed at the gin.

Someone made a remark about whether the farmer would get any difference in price. Here is where the farmers are losing: This excess weight (bagging) is being shipped all over this country, and to Europe. The farmer pays the freight. It comes out of his price. It is the greatest waste of any bale in the world. The American bale carries the highest insurance of any bale in the world, and it all comes out of the farmer's price. When they settle in Europe they knock off 30 pounds for the bagging and ties, and settle on a net-weight basis. Why put on this excess weight? They have asked this country to do something about improving the baling and covering of American cotton but it cannot be done unless we can pass this bill. Someone said awhile ago that the farmers did not want to make this change. That is pitiful. I can remember when I was a boy my father belonged to the Farmers' Alliance. They put on cotton bagging 15 pounds, including ties, but they had to settle on the basis of 30 pounds. They lost the difference between the 15 pounds and the 30 pounds, so they had to go back to heavy jute. Every State in this Union has got a different tare rule. Some of the States 19 pounds, some 21 pounds, 23 pounds, and 26 pounds. Then the buyers patch on to make up 30 pounds. I could take the time to read you letters from cotton mills all over the country. They make this statement: "When the cotton comes in we strip a certain percentage of bales to get the total average amount of tare so as to know how to fix our price, and the price is made gross weight less all of the waste, bagging and ties, insurance, and everything else."

Now when the cotton is sold it is cut. That bale of cotton shown on the picture is still in a warehouse at this time, and you will note it has been cut seven times, and every time a buyer cut that bale he took a nice sample out of it. You would be surprised to know the number of thousands of bales of cotton that this practice takes out of the cotton farmer.

Listen to this: Oscar Johnson is one of the largest cotton growers in the United States, producing 15,000 bales. He was in my office the other day. He said, "Congressman, I use 2½-pound bagging. It gives me 24 pounds. I know that they take off 30 pounds, but the farmer who uses only 18 pounds, which is one type generally used, or 21 pounds, another type generally used, loses that difference."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

What about Anderson Clayton, the largest cotton buyer in the world and a large producer? Every gin that Anderson Clayton owns has a high-density compress. He uses this light burlap bagging, and his cotton is sold on a net-weight basis all over this country. If old, heavy jute is good for farmers, why does not Mr. Clayton use it at his gins in this country and in Brazil?

Now, it is a joke to think that farmers get a price for old, disgraceful jute and ties equal to the price of lint, for that which cotton mills cannot spin in their mills. Last year the Commodity Credit Corporation took the farmers' cotton in on loans on a net-weight basis, and they put the price up 40 points—$2 a bale—but what happened when the farmer took his cotton out of the warehouse? It was sold gross weight and it went back to the average old price, losing his $2.

We had before our committee a man who represented the cotton shippers and the cotton buyers of the country. Let us see what he had to say about it. He was Mr. Lockie. He said:

Mr. FULMER, my point was specifically directed to the point that the cotton merchant does make a profit on his tare, but it is a profit that is absolutely essential since it is necessary to put a patch on a bale.

Answering the point that you bring up I quite agree that in the final analysis when the mill buys a bale of cotton they know that they are not going to consume the tare and they figure accordingly.

Mr. FULMER. And when the farmer gets a gross price naturally he is getting a price less the amount figured on by the mill for the tare?

Mr. LOCKIE. Yes, sir.

I have a letter here from Mr. Comer, one of the largest textile-mill operators in the country and a man who has been fighting for all these economical changes that would mean millions annually to the farmers; he said—

Congressman, naturally, as buyers and spinners of cotton, our concern when we buy a bale of cotton is how much cotton we get out of the bale. If the bale weighs 500 pounds and has 12 pounds of jute bagging on it and 8 pounds of steel ties, we know that we are only getting 480 pounds of cotton and we make our calculations and prices accordingly. If that same bale of cotton had 24 pounds tare on it instead of 20, we would pay less per pound than if it had just 20 pounds. If it had cotton bagging on it weighing only 5 pounds instead of jute bagging weighing 12 pounds, we would make our calculations in price accordingly. Every other buyer of cotton would do exactly the same thing. So far as I know now, cotton is one of the few commodities that is not sold net weight. In most cases the law requires that the information as to the net and gross weights appear on every package or parcel.

Until we have a net-weight bill, our mills are among those who have signed up to allow 7 extra pounds for every bale that we buy that comes to us covered in 5 pounds of cotton bagging. The very day that your bill becomes a law and trading on the exchanges shifts from a gross-weight to a net-weight basis, you will see immediately a change in the quoted price that will fully reflect this difference in the weight of the tare.

The Department sent up a strong report for this bill, setting out the reason why we should not use this type of bagging.

Let me quote from the Secretary's letter:

The three chief defects of the American cotton bale are: (1) Its ragged and unattractive appearance; (2) the waste and damage to which the contents are subjected because

of the inadequate protection afforded by bagging materials which are chosen on the basis of cheapness and weight, but which in many instances fail to withstand the wear and tear of shipment; and (3) the lack of even approximate uniformity in weight of bales and weight of tare.

Fire-insurance rates in European cotton markets are materially higher for cotton in American bales than for bales of other cotton-producing countries.

In brief, the gross-weight system of trading has the following disadvantages: (1) It encourages the use of unsuitable bale-covering materials; (2) it involves unnecessary costs for bale-covering materials in excess of those needed for the protection of the bale contents. This is particularly true in the case of patches added to bring the weight of tare up to the maximum allowed under trade rules. This is encouraged under the gross-weight system because of the fact that the per-pound cost of bale-covering materials is less than an equivalent weight of cotton; (3) this extra weight involves increased transportation costs; and (4) the accompanying system used for tare determination and for the assessment and collection of claims for excess tare adds materially to marketing costs.

Under a system of net-weight trading and standardized tare marketing agencies would no longer be able to exact a profit by adding patches to cotton bales, but would realize definite advantages in the way of freight savings, simplification of trading practices and price calculations, elimination of risks associated with uncertainties as to weight of tare, possible savings in insurance, savings in customs duties in certain instances, and in the sales advantage of a neater package.

The annual economic loss entailed in the present system has been variously estimated at figures ranging up to $20,000,000.

This morning you passed a resolution extending a congressional investigation of migration from the farms. You have poured millions of dollars out of the Treasury trying to make landlords out of tenants; but the thing that is making tenants out of landlords, the thing that is causing migration from the farms is the price that farmers receive for their products, and the thing that we propose to remedy under this bill, that is costing cotton farmers millions annually.

You talk about farmers doing it. Unorganized farmers have not got a chance in dealing with the jute interests. They have been flooding Members with telegrams and letters in the name of the farmer, just like many of the arguments we have heard here this afternoon in the name of the farmer.

Now let me show you a picture showing how American cotton looks in a warehouse. There you have the American cotton stored in a warehouse in Europe, and I can show you the record that practically every fire that starts in Europe in warehouses begins in American cotton. That is why they charge higher insurance rates. Do you know that a great many of the foreign countries charge a duty of 40 cents a bale because of excess bagging?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if a farmer is shrewd he will put this type of jute bagging on his cotton. It weighs 3 pounds to the yard, or 27 pounds bagging, and this because he knows he is going to lose 30 pounds. The ginner is the fellow who puts it on and the ginner, in a great many instances, gyps the farmer when he puts on a 1½-pound bagging or 2-pound bagging.

You are stacking up millions of bales of cotton in warehouses. In the meantime we are permitting India to ship into this country enough jute, pound for pound, used in this country, to take the place of a million and a half bales of our cotton.

I want to say that unless we commence consuming more cotton in this country we are going to have to further cut the production of cotton in the South to the extent of at least 3,000,000 bales below the amount we now produce. When we do that we will be forced into dairying, wheat raising, hogs, and cattle, and I shall regret to see all of these sections of the country competing with each other. I am fearful that the time is coming that the same gentlemen who occupy this Chamber now will see something in this country that we should not have, and the only way to remedy this situation, the only way to stop the landowners from losing their farms and to stop migration from the farms is to do something for that class of people that every other class of people seems to be able to do or have done for them by Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there anything in this bill that would prevent cotton buyers from slashing up the bales of cotton like it is now?

Mr. FULMER. You heard one or two of the speakers a while ago state that they believed this would lead up to cotton being combined with wood pulp. It is a shame so far as the Congress of the United States is concerned that we have gone along all of these years and have not had high density gin compression down at the gins like they have in Europe. Then you would have every bale properly graded, and the farmer would get the benefit of proper grading, like in Brazil and other countries where they have high-density compression and proper grading. One gentleman stated that he was fearful we would get to that point where we would use cotton mixed with pulp. All right. We import into this country duty-free, newsprint, wood pulp and pulpwood, with all the forest resources we have in this country, with millions of unemployed people, and with millions of bales of cotton in the warehouses. Cotton can be used with wood pulp, rayon, and other fibers. They are doing it in some of these other countries. No doubt you are fearful about it, but if we want to solve the problem that is holding down agriculture, employment, and business, we have to do some of these things for the farmers which they are not able to do for themselves and that every other group has been able to do or get done for them in the passage of legislation by the Congress.

If you will take a look at the report and the numerous letters and telegrams that I have here in my hand you will find that this bill is endorsed by all of the agricultural commissioners of the South; textile mills; many of the legislatures of the South by resolutions; Mr. Oscar Johnson, who produces 15,000 bales of cotton annually; Mr. T. O. Walker, president of the Agricultural College of Texas; Cotton Growers' Cooperative Association for the Southern States; Anderson Clayton, the largest buyers of cotton in the world who operate many cotton gins in the United States and in Brazil; Texas Cooperative Council; the Voice of Texas Agriculture; Cotton Textile Institute of New York; the President's committee appointed to investigate the complaints of New England and southern textile mills; the World's Cotton Congress; Various State farm bureaus; and the State and National granges.

Listen to a telegram just received from Mr. Harry B. Caldwell, master of the North Carolina Grange:

State and national granges passed resolutions last November endorsing the principles of your net-weight bill. Glad to reaffirm our position.

I am quoting from a telegram signed by Harry D. Wilson, president, Association of Southern Commissioners:

The Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture are 100 percent for net-weight cotton bill. Said association has passed resolutions on several occasions urging Congress to enact legislation requiring that cotton be sold at net weight. This is the only cotton-producing country where cotton is not sold at net weight. We appreciate your efforts on this most important progressive legislation, and hope committee will give favorable consideration to your bill.

A telegram from W. B. Parker, California Director of Agriculture, states:

Have been advised your bill, H. R. 968, re net-weight cotton trading and standardization bale covering scheduled for hearing March 31. Desire advise you said bill will mean huge saving American cotton producer and entire cotton industry. Will put United States cotton on equal trading basis abroad, and will expand domestic use of cotton, thereby decreasing dangerously large surplus. Strongly urge endorsement this bill by committee, and passage by Congress for benefit of entire American cotton industry. Bill favored by farm bureau, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture Association, and many leaders in cotton industry, including California interests.

L. M. Walker, Jr., commissioner of agriculture, Richmond, Va., states in a telegram:

Appreciate your energetic support of net-weight cotton bill for benefit of cotton growers in Virginia and other States.

I could go on and on quoting letters and telegrams, all of which should clearly indicate to every Member of this House that, apparently, all farmers, farm organizations, in fact, everyone interested in cotton farmers, are for this legislation. I hope that the bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, we must remember during the course of this debate that if you shift from jute bagging to cotton bagging, somebody is going to pay additional sums of money. Today those additional sums of money come out of the United States Treasury to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and

still that money is not sufficient to permit this cotton bagging to be made in this country and sold in competition with jute bagging. That is the fact as it stands today.

By passing this bill you are going to make it just that much worse for the taxpayers and the consumers of the United States. Somebody is going to pay the bill. The jute industry has been in existence in the United States for more than a century. To say at this late date that there is any fault or any reason or cause for throwing out jute bagging at this time for any other reason than to help the sale of a few bales of cotton is quite beside the point, unless the purpose is to help a certain group of mill owners manufacturing this cotton bagging, because they are the only persons who are really going to profit. They are going to profit at the expense of other mill owners who have already put millions into their plants right here in the United States. That can be the only change.

Let us look at this cotton proposition from the standpoint of the use of cotton. You were led to believe that there is going to be a tremendous use of cotton by virtue of this bill, when, as a matter of fact, we are told that the first year, assuming that there is no cotton bagging in the country today, they would use 120,000 bales, and in every successive year they would expect to use not more than 20,000 bales. On a 12,000,000-bale crop that would be a small fraction of 1 percent of the cotton crop of the United States.

The bill states that anybody can use any kind of bagging he wants to use to bale a bale of cotton after the passing of this bill. Of course, that is a specious statement. The reason it is so is that they do not leave the number of ounces to be determined by the Department of Agriculture for each square yard of the bagging. There is not a person in favor of this bill who does not know that jute bagging weighs more than 14 ounces per yard.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. Not now; I do not have the time. The last time I yielded about 10 minutes out of my 15, and this time I should like to go ahead.

By putting it down to 14 ounces as your standard you wipe jute bagging out, and that means not only the northern mills but the mills in Savannah, Ga., and all over the South which make this bagging that covers the bales of cotton.

The men who are in these mills have been brought up in that industry and are entitled to have their jobs looked out for just as much as the mill owners and the employees of the cotton mills making cotton bagging. I want to say a word for them, because they have been in these mills for generations and they are entitled to have their interests protected also.

It was stated in the debate on the rule that the United States Treasury is not called upon to pay a cent in connection with this cotton bagging. That statement is not correct, and it has been confirmed since we started this debate. Of course the United States Treasury is paying a subsidy, and it plans to this year, of 15 cents a pattern, on every pattern made up of this cotton bagging. Yet giving the cotton producers and the cotton-mill owners this advantage of a subsidy, they still cannot sell in competition with jute.

The cotton people tell me that in normal times cotton bagging costs almost twice jute bagging for each bale of cotton. I want everybody who is here just to figure that one out. They would have us believe that this extra cost is not going to be paid for by anybody, it goes up in the air and nobody pays for it, but of course the answer is that it is going to be paid by the farmer. The person who is going to kick the most if this bill should become law is the cotton farmer of the South, because he will have been sold down the river by the persons who vote for this bill.

Then let us look at the bill itself. Apparently not much consideration was given to it in committee this time. Let us also look at the bill that we had before us last time. This bill provides that within 9 months the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate the official cotton tare standard. He must complete the tests by January 15, 1942. Within 7 months thereafter these standards become effective, and it is a criminal offense to use bale covering which does not comply with them.

If you will look at the law we had before us previously, and which was presented in 1939, you will notice that the dates were practically the same; in other words, 2 years have gone by, but the change-over in the industry is going to take place within even a shorter time than was the case in the bill of 1939. At that time the bill stated that the standards should finally become effective on January 1, 1943, and under this law it will be in the middle of 1942. That is ridiculous on the face of it. Changing over this great industry in the course of such a short time cannot be done.

Further, unless the President, or some high authority, shall decide that cotton bagging has become part of our national-defense program, it will not be possible for the cotton mill owners to get machinery with which to turn out this additional bagging. Anybody who has been in the manufacturing business and has tried to get machinery out of some of these machinery companies, or to get tools from the tool-machinery industries knows just what a job that is. For any cotton mill man to come in now and say that he can go to any big manufacturer of machinery or machines or tools and get what would be required to build up a cotton-bagging industry 10 times as large as that of today is pretty farfetched.

I feel that if this bill is ever put into effect, instead of having the dates brought forward, as under this bill, they ought to be put back at least 3 more years. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is a little difficult for me to understand this plea that is being made for the cotton farmer. This is a rather simple thing. A cotton pattern costs $1, aside from the subsidy of 15 cents. In the first instance the cotton farmer is charged for wrapping that cotton. When he takes his cotton to the gin he is charged for the cost of that wrapper, which is $1. In the case of the jute he is charged 72 cents. That is just a plain fact. So how could the cotton farmer possibly save by paying a dollar when he can get the jute for 72 cents?

The jute pattern weighs about 6½ pounds more than the cotton pattern. When the cotton is sold to the spinner, it is true that the spinner pays 71 cents more at the present market price of cotton than he would if the bale were wrapped in cotton, but the farmer does not pay that. That is paid by the trade. So where is your argument for the cotton farmer in the South in this bill?

Even assuming that it costs more to the trade, not the cotton farmer, for the jute, what is the purpose of this program? The Department of Agriculture has informed me that the object is to find new uses for cotton. They said nothing about the cost of the cotton, the price of the cotton, either to the farmer or the public. If the purpose is to find new uses for the cotton, then of course the question of cost drops out altogether. This cannot be a new use for cotton because it is merely a replacement.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SOUTH. As a matter of fact, the cost of shipping this excess weight of the jute throughout the country and then shipping it abroad is a substantial item itself and the producer must ultimately pay that. And in the second place, it is idle, it seems to me, if not foolish, for the cotton farmer to import an article for the purpose of wrapping cotton, the very character of which lends itself so admirably to the same purpose. And now, if the gentleman will permit me just briefly——

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Let me answer your first question before you ask another.

I believe I have already answered the gentleman's question. Is the purpose of this bill to meet prices?

Mr. SOUTH. It is both to meet prices——

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If it is for the purpose of meeting prices, then the purpose of your bill again is to fix prices.

Mr. SOUTH. No.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What other conclusion can you come to? If the purpose is to meet prices you certainly have to fix a price lower if you cut under, or higher if you intend to go above, or equal to the prices of jute if you intend to equal it, and in any of the three cases you are fixing prices.

Mr. SOUTH. The Department of Agriculture favors this bill and states it would be in the interest of the farmer and of the merchant and of the manufacturer, and the State departments of

agriculture throughout the South are for it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Let me answer your other question. You say the Department of Agriculture is advocating this?

Mr. SOUTH. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What difference does it make who is advocating it, in face of the fact that under this bill the cotton farmer is charged $1 and an additional charge of 15 cents is made to the taxpayers of the United States for every bale of cotton, and in the other instance, when jute is used the cotton farmer is charged 72 cents.

Mr. SOUTH. If the gentleman will permit, the 15 cents the gentleman is talking about is being paid now and the bill is not passed; therefore that cannot be charged to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not know what you mean.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman spoke of 15 cents now being paid in the form of a subsidy.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will be paid.

Mr. SOUTH. No; it is being paid now.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. All right.

Mr. SOUTH. The bill is not a law and therefore that expense cannot be charged to the bill which is now under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman means by that we already have this machinery, this subsidy machinery, going, but leaving out the 15 cents you still have $1 as against 72 cents the cotton farmer must pay for wrapping his cotton.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee referred, in his opening remarks, to a telegram in support of this bill from the very distinguished Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of North Carolina. The first telegram I see in the RECORD is one from Dillon, S. C., from the Carolina Milling Co., and it reads as follows:

> Passage of Fulmer net-weight cotton bill will cost farmers of South Carolina thousands of dollars. As practical cotton farmer and ginner we vigorously oppose any change cotton covering at this time.

I also notice telegrams and messages placed in the RECORD by the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Jones, of Texas, from Columbia, S. C.; Orangeburg, S. C.; Sycamore, S. C.; Seward, S. C.; Cameron, S. C.; Bamberg, Chester, and from all over South Carolina, North Carolina, and other States, from people opposing this measure because it is not in the interests of the farmer.

Now, because by chance I happen to have a little jute mill in my district, employing about 600 people, all of whom will be affected adversely by this measure, the suggestion is made here that perhaps I am unduly and very greatly influenced by that fact. I am, of course, interested in the welfare of those people employed in that industry. I am the only Representative they have here, but I would frankly say I would be willing to sacrifice that little industry if that were all that was at stake and if by doing that we could greatly benefit the cotton farmers who are in much distress; but when it comes to the question of what can be done, here is a letter from a very reliable constituent of mine, and in speaking in behalf of this little industry in one of my counties he says:

> This bill will destroy the business of every American manufacturer of jute bagging, as they now operate.
>
> Since talking with you I have verified my understanding of the matter of converting machinery with the president of the Carolina Bagging Co. and he tells me that the machinery now in use for manufacturing jute bagging cannot be so converted as to make a bagging within the limits of the Fulmer bill and that most of the machinery now in use will be worthless under the terms of the Fulmer bill.
>
> In the open market the farmers would naturally use a light-weight burlap in preference to a cotton bagging on account of the price. As between the two the price of cotton bagging would be prohibitive.
>
> All burlap is made abroad and the business of covering bale cotton would go to the foreign manufacturers.
>
> The machinery necessary for making light weight jute covering is obtainable only in England, and it is not probable that such machinery could be obtained at all under present conditions.
>
> On account of prohibitive price, farmers would buy cotton bagging under only two conditions:
>
> 1. Under compulsion.
>
> 2. Under a Government subsidy that would enable them to buy it at a price comparable or cheaper than imported burlap.
>
> If cotton bagging were subsidized and used it would require only 120,000 bales to cover a 12,000,000-bale crop the first year; and very much less in subsequent years, because the cotton in cotton bagging can be reclaimed, rewoven, and so used over and over. Some tests show as high as 90-percent reclaimed.
>
> On account of the inability of American manufacturers to obtain necessary machinery to make a lightweight jute under war conditions the farmer would either buy cheap foreign-made burlap, or be forced to buy high-priced cotton bagging.
>
> Under the present system the farmer buys cheap jute bagging and sells his bale of cotton at gross weight.
>
> Under the net-weight bill the farmer would have to sell at net weight, deducting from the sale the weight of the bagging and ties.
>
> If net weight results in the compulsory use of cotton bagging, it would force the cotton farmer to buy the cotton bagging and give it away. If the farmer uses the cheaper foreign-made burlap, he would be giving the business to foreign manufacturers and giving the bagging to the purchasers for the purpose of putting the American manufacturer out of business.
>
> In any aspect of the case it is hard to see where the American cotton farmer comes in, and it is very easy to see where the American manufacturer of jute bagging goes out.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman stated that burlap comes from England. It really comes from India.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think there is any argument about that. At present I understand that the reason we cannot change the machinery is because there is not any machinery in this country, since all of the mills are located in Calcutta, India. As I stated, to sum this thing up, much can be said in opposition to it. I cannot for the life of me understand how we can by Federal law provide that a cotton farmer has no right to ship his cotton in any kind of bagging that weighs more than 14 ounces per square yard. Does anyone know of any precedent for any such thing? Yet that is what this bill does, and if a farmer ships his cotton in any heavier bagging than that, he is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. One gentleman stated that the cotton bagging used to wrap this cotton is sometimes in a deplorable condition. Does the gentleman mean to say that this bill would make it a criminal offense for any cotton grower to tie up his bale of cotton with a stronger and better cotton wrapper than the 14 ounces to the square yard?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what the bill will do. The cotton farmers have used this jute bagging for 100 years. This bill requires them to use a lightweight bagging, cotton which is not as strong, or burlap, which is imported.

Mr. MICHENER. Would it prevent him from using a heavier cotton wrapper, and using more cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. It limits the weight of the bagging. It limits to that extent the use of the cotton that the farmer can use. He could not even wrap it up in his own cotton if the bagging weighed over 14 ounces.

Mr. MICHENER. And, of course, he would not want to do that.

Mr. COOLEY. I think not. Some of these pictures which have been exhibited show fire hazards in the cotton after the bale has been cut to pieces by the buyer. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent that practice. That has been going on for years. The only way to solve that is to do what was suggested awhile ago, and that is to draft a law to provide for an American standard bale of cotton and have the cotton graded so that the public will buy and sell on that grade. Then you would prevent the cutting of the bale. Other suggestions are made here about selling on net weight. If I understand the contentions of the proponents of this bill, they contend that cotton is now sold in the world market on net weight, so what is to be accomplished? The only thing to be accomplished is just to force the cotton farmer to use cotton when it costs him more than the bagging he is now using, and I, for one, from a cotton country, am unwilling to do that.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SOUTH. But the farmers want to use it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely in error.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not a fact that three out of every four or more of the Representatives here who represent the cotton districts are in favor of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I have not undertaken any poll of the House, but the record shows that the farmers do not want to use it, and they would not use it when the Government subsidized it to the extent of 28 cents a bale.

Mr. SOUTH. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The record shows it, whether the gentleman agrees with me or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill interests me very much because of several fundamental things that have taken place during the last 10 years, among which we find an enormous number of bills which have been enacted by Congress having to do with the commodity cotton.

It may be true that for a hundred years or more cotton has been bagged with burlap, but it is not true that for a hundred years or more the Federal Treasury went to the assistance of cotton growers as it has during the last decade. Therefore, in my opinion, in discussing bills that have to do with cotton, it is quite proper for us to think in terms of the last decade.

The Federal Government today holds almost six and one-quarter million bales of cotton which it owns outright. We have stocks of cotton on hand altogether of close to fourteen and one-quarter million bales. Unless through new legislation, which is now being considered in the other body and which will be considered here shortly, we reduce the production of cotton, there is a fair chance that the Government will soon move into the position of holding in excess of 10,000,000 bales of cotton.

We are spending enormous sums out of the Federal Treasury in buying cotton in the market, and through the stamp plan, the mattress production and distribution plan. I am in favor of this bill because it is another way of getting some of the cotton now on hand unsold actually used. If we are going to subsidize cotton and other crops, I think it is well for us to insist, where the situation operates as in this case, that the raw material which we are subsidizing be used as a container in which to carry the balance of the product to market. That is exactly what this bill proposes. To me it is sheer common sense to support legislation of this kind. That is one reason.

I am in favor of this bill for another reason: I am absolutely satisfied that it will not hurt the American cotton farmer and that it will protect him to a considerable extent, as far as bagging and ties are concerned, against a little racket which has been operated against him down through generations on the part of the gin operator and the purchaser of the cotton from the cotton grower.

If you will set a standard and sell cotton on a net-weight basis I think that will be very beneficial to the cotton grower. This bill moves in that direction. So those are the two main reasons why I would support this legislation. It does not prevent the use of jute if the jute manufacturer wants to bring it down to a certain weight basis. Even if it did prevent the use of jute and caused cotton to be used instead, I still contend that would be a highly constructive program so long as the Federal Treasury is forced, for many reasons, to subsidize cotton production and operation as at the present time.

If a Federal law is enacted which in some way interferes with the old-established operations of many of our lines of industry—and that is taking place every day—those old-established industries have to adjust themselves to the new conditions set up by the new Federal legislation. Here is a case where that rule would continue to apply. It is not anything new at all. Any man who has had business experience knows that statement to be true.

So I hope the House will pass this bill. I hope when it goes to the other body it will be approved and I shall be very delighted if it becomes law, because I want to see us move farther in the direction of using cotton as bagging for the bundling of the raw product. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute, the remainder of my time, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield he remaining time on this side, 9 minutes, to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot hope to add very much to the very instructive and constructive argument that has just been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. He spoke to the bill, and he spoke by the record. His arguments are really unanswerable.

As he suggests, the primary purpose of this bill is to provide for new uses of cotton and thus to provide for a more adequate price for cotton, thereby relieving the public Treasury from some, or much, as the case may be, of the appropriations that have been made from time to time, the purpose of which is to give to the farmer a better price for his crop.

In response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, I would say that the only way for the farmer to get a better price for his cotton or a more adequate or a fairer price is for the trade to pay it. By this bill we are proposing probably the most effectual method concretely suggested that would enable the farmer to benefit from the prices actually paid by the trade.

Mr. Chairman, I think I noticed a few of the objections that have been made to the bill in my argument in favor of the rule. I have high regard for the views of my agricultural friend, the gentleman from Springfield, Mass. [Mr. CLASON]. He is really an authority on cotton growing. I esteem him. I admire him. But I am inclined to think that looking through the glasses of the jute manufacturers of Springfield, Mass., he rather sees the side of the jute manufacturer than the side of the cotton grower.

It is said there will have to be a readjustment, that the substitution of cotton for jute will necessitate the substitution of machinery in jute mills. That is a fair statement, but let me call your attention to the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina, with all deference to his very able argument, rather overspoke himself. He said we were dependent upon a foreign country for the machinery, that it would be necessary to provide for the substitution, but in the next breath he said that the passage of this bill would provide for the use of burlap manufactured in a foreign country and would not result in the use of cotton. I respectfully submit that if we can import burlap during these war days we can import some machinery that may be necessary for textiles; and I interject at this point the suggestion that our factories that cannot replace their machinery, either by repair or replacement by machinery that is manufactured in the United States, had better make arrangements to use domestic machinery, because we are in an emergency that is likely to continue for several years. I cannot believe that the United States is dependent upon England for machinery with which to manufacture cotton, or for cotton machinery to replace jute machinery.

It has been said in opposition to this bill that it will be expensive to the farmer. This argument is advanced by my good friends who have jute mills in their districts. I find no fault with them, but I am inclined to think now that the gentlemen who speak in opposition come here with facts and statistics furnished them not by cotton growers but by jute operators and jute manufacturers as they tell us how the replacement of machinery will affect the situation.

I make the suggestion that according to the hearings in this case—and I believe it is fair to say regardless of what any manufacturers may think—it will be practical to provide machinery that can go from the manufacture of one textile to another. There are those who believe that the manufacturers of machinery in the United States, whether it be for textiles, for munitions, airplanes, or motors, exceed the manufacturers of similar equipment or machinery in any other part of the world, and it is rather passing strange to me that if England is dependent upon us for improved machinery for munitions and airplanes that the only type of machinery now that would provide for the manufacture of jute can be bought in England or India. It must, if that be true, be rather antiquated machinery, as the United States is the greatest industrial country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated on the rule, this bill has been reported out numbers of times. It never came to the floor but once, but that once, in June 1939, it was passed by an overwhelming vote substantially in the form it is now. It is well to keep in mind that it has no reference to cotton that has been previously ginned or processed, and all of the Government stocks and all of the cotton now owned by textile operators or cotton dealers is exempt, because the bill applies only to

cotton hereafter processed or ginned, and the bill will not go into operation until 1942. No one will be done an injustice. Everyone will have an opportunity to dispose of existing stocks, and there will be ample opportunity to provide machinery that will give employment to American workmen in the manufacture of an American product, and in that way we are able to provide for the manufacture of an American product, rather than a product that would be imported. Surely of all times this is the most propitious. It is time to recognize that the tare evil is a disgrace in the sale of cotton.

My good friend from North Carolina brought in a piece of cotton bagging used many times. The testimony shows, the hearings disclose, that cotton bagging is more lasting. If the gentleman had brought in a piece of jute that had been used as many times as that piece of cotton bagging, in all probability it would look like the bagging on the cotton in the pictures exhibited by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], in his able presentation.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOXEY. Knowing the gentleman's great experience in the cotton-raising business I ask the gentleman if he ever saw a better ginned bale using jute wrapping than the jute-covered bale on exhibition in the lobby? Are not 98 percent of the jute bales more disgraceful and uneconomical and disreputable looking than that jute bale out there in the Speaker's lobby?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think so unquestionably.

Now let me say with respect to the telegrams from South Carolina— and you can get them from my district, too, Mr. Chairman—no matter what appeals are made to Members of Congress, a bill should appeal to our judgment and to our common sense if it is in the interest of the farmer. We have a few or some selfish or thoughtless people in all of the districts. There may be the ginner or the merchant interested in his profits on the jute that he has on hand or that he has handled through the years, but those people should remember that the bill does not go into operation for a year and a half.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. According to the gentleman's understanding of the operation of the bill will it apply to this year's crop of cotton?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not. It does not go into effect for 1 year, and may not go into effect for either the 1941 or 1942 crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It goes into effect in 1942.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unquestionably.

Mr. Chairman, the growers, the buyers, the traders, the cotton factors, the transportation agencies, the insurers all recognize the evils of the cotton tare. No better way has been proposed than that which we have under consideration to prevent the use of a foreign product in competition with American cotton, and that is all this bill does. For that reason the weights are prescribed, and the farmer, in the ultimate analysis, will get the benefit of it. Let me say that is the view of cotton buyers, too. I read from page 6 of the report, the testimony of W. L. Clayton, who probably handles more cotton than any other buyer in the United States:

> As stated to you in Washington, I am strongly in favor of legislation to correct the tare evil. I have read your bill twice, and, so far as I can tell, it should accomplish this purpose.
>
> The cotton trade has been seeking for many years to bring about the necessary reform in the tare evil, but has made practically no progress in doing so, and due to the fact that the interests involved are so widely scattered and divergent it probably never will succeed in doing so except through legislation.

If that be the opinion of the cotton buyer, and that is the opinion also of the insurance agencies, the cotton growers' associations and so forth, I submit that the real interest of the cotton grower in common sense will be promoted in the long run by the passage of the pending bill. The tare is most expensive to cotton growers. It is a great disadvantage to them.

It has been stated that the evil should be remedied by the cotton trade. I agree that the cotton trade should remedy the evil. They should have remedied gambling in cotton futures, but the trade did not eliminate this evil, nor will it eliminate the evil of cotton tare. Congress provided legislation to regulate cotton exchanges, and Congress must provide legislation to provide for the net-weight bale.

Congress has made many efforts to increase new uses of cotton. The pending bill is probably the best avenue for this purpose.

I know the influences behind the cotton merchants and the cotton buyers who have asked us to oppose this bill. These influences have been able to influence the cotton trade, and the exchanges in cotton trade. The average farmer does not write to the Member of Congress who represents him. He depends upon that Member to analyze legislation and to vote for the bills that will promote his welfare.

Jute is cheaper than cotton, but when cotton is cheapest, jute is often highest. If cotton is sold on a net-weight basis, in the long run it will provide a better price to the grower. Those who favor the promotion of cotton and the increase of cotton and other agricultural products should support this bill. I trust it will be agreed to by the Committee. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act shall be known by the short title of "Cotton Net Weight Act."
>
> The word "person," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to import the plural or singular, as the case demands, and shall include individuals, associations, partnerships, and corporations.
>
> The words "in interstate or foreign commerce," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean from any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District or to or through any foreign country, or within any Territory or District.
>
> The words "bale covering" shall be construed to mean bagging, ties, and patches.
>
> The word "cotton" shall be construed to mean cotton of any variety produced within the continental United States, including linters.
>
> When considering and enforcing the provisions of this act, the omission or failure of any official, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any association, partnership, or corporation within the scope of his employment or office shall in every case also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such association, partnership, or corporation, as well as that of the person.
>
> SEC. 2. That in order to provide for the more adequate covering and protection of the American cotton bale and to facilitate net-weight trading in cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to investigate the handling, inspection, and transportation of cotton in interstate and foreign commerce; to study the materials used for bale covering; and from time to time to establish standards for materials to be used for bale covering, which such standards shall include specifications and tolerance as to sizes, weights, constructions, strength, and any other factors of quality that he may find to be necessary; said standards, when established, to be known as the "United States Official Cotton Tare Standards": *Provided*, That the official cotton tare standards first established hereunder shall be promulgated on or before January 15, 1942, and shall become effective on July 15, 1942: *Provided further*, That any change or replacement of such standards shall become effective only on and after a date specified in the order of the Secretary of Agriculture establishing the same, which date shall be not more than 1 year from the date of such order, but pending such effective date of new or revised standards any bale covering material conforming with such new or revised standards may be used in lieu of any bale covering material embraced in the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards theretofore promulgated. The maximum weight of any fabric or material standardized under this section as bagging for the covering of cotton bales shall not exceed 14 ounces per square yard, and the maximum weight of any fabric or material standardized for patches shall not exceed 20 ounces per patch; and no such fabrics or materials standardized for bagging or patches shall be composed of any material previously used for covering cotton bales unless the same shall have been reprocessed and rewoven.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: Page 3, line 5, strike out "January 15, 1942" and insert "January 15, 1943," and in line 6, strike out "July 15, 1942" and insert "July 15, 1944."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is in order to bring the bill in line with a bill that was offered in 1939 and passed the House. You will recall that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] stated a few minutes ago in answer to a question by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that this bill could not probably apply to any crop within the next 2

years. Yet here it is the 1st of April 1941, and this bill, by the wording of it, is to become effective on July 15, 1942, just a little over 1 year from now.

On the face of the argument made by the proponents of this bill, it is absolutely impossible for it to become effective on the date indicated in the bill. In 1939 the bill was so framed that the standards were to be promulgated on January 1, 1942. You will note here that they have extended the time for setting up the standards to January 15, 1942, or exactly 2 weeks. Under the previous bill the law was to become effective on January 1, 1943, 1 year later, but here they have cut down the time. It was January 1, 1943, back in 1939, but today in this bill it is advanced to July 15, 1942. In other words, we are 2 years later in the consideration of the pending bill, yet they have moved up the date when it shall become effective by 6 months.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a list of about 50 mill owners, manufacturers, and processors of this bagging, who are vitally interested in this bill. They employ thousands of men. Thousands upon thousands of persons have been engaged in this business for many years. They are located in North Carolina in one instance. You people should not get the idea that this is a northern proposition. These mills extend all over the Gulf country, the east coast, Texas, Louisiana, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Virginia, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Tennessee, and New Jersey. This is not one little, isolated plant in Ludlow, Mass., or some other particular city or town. This is a business which is country-wide. It covers one of the largest crops produced in the United States of America, and it seems to me that my amendment should be adopted in order that these mills employing thousands of Americans may be given a decent length of time in which to work out their problem.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that it would be quite difficult to obtain the necessary machinery to convert these mills?

Mr. CLASON. I am told it will be absolutely impossible, unless it is decided that this is a national-defense measure. We are greatly in need of airplanes, shells, rifles, and everything else, and this in inconceivable.

Mr. COOLEY. Likewise, if this bill passes may we not anticipate that the cotton mills will find it difficult to install the necessary machinery to weave the cotton bagging, which would be the only bagging available?

Mr. CLASON. I agree with the gentleman. I do not see how this can become effective in 1 year after this date or 15 months after this date, when a man who has had such experience as the gentleman from Mississippi says it could not possibly become effective for 2 years, in his opinion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I said only 2 years, and, frankly, my reason for saying it is this: The pending bill may be passed by the House. If it is passed, it goes to the Senate. It may be considered there in this session or later. I had in mind that contingency. Frankly, I think the figures inserted in the bill are reasonable.

Mr. CLASON. What about the bill of 1939, which had an effective date of January 1, 1943?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I had that in mind in making the response. When that bill left the House it provided that it should become effective in 1 year. It went over to the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture reported the bill with the date July 15.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not let the House fix it, then? There is no reason why we should not agree to the amendment.

Mr. CLASON. This is 2 years after we talked about the 1939 bill. It seems to me only fair that these mill owners and these employees should be given the time that they were given back in 1939.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in fixing these dates we took into consideration just what the gentleman has been talking about. I had a number of these jute people a year ago come to me and ask, "Do you expect to pass this bill in time to interfere with us in this year's crop, 1941?" I said, "No."

This bill becomes effective in January in promulgating and working out the standards, but it does not go into effect so far as covering the cotton is concerned until the crop of 1942. I call to the attention of the gentleman that because of the lack of shipping space it is impossible to get jute, burlap, or even this type of jute over here to be manufactured into cotton covering. The cotton textile mills of this country, however, are ready to manufacture all the cotton covering we want on any notice, because it does not take any special change of the machinery.

Unless we are able to put this bill into effect in 1942, you will have subsidized cotton bagging, because I doubt seriously that you have enough jute in this country to do the job. There is not shipping space to bring it in. They have been cutting down on the purchase of waste jute during the last year or two because they expected this bill to pass sooner or later. While we will be in position to put this bill into full operation in using cotton bagging in 1942, it would not interfere with those mills, and no doubt would be very helpful in carrying on the proper baling and selling of cotton.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If that is the case, then why have this bill at all? Why do you not let the cotton farmer then raise the cotton to make these bags? If they cannot get jute in here, we will use cotton.

Mr. FULMER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. This is the reason. This bill makes the sale of cotton on a net weight basis and standardizes the bagging. If you do not pass the bill and if you do not have the jute available, they can put anything on from fertilizer sacks to cotton sheets or any kind of waste. There is nothing today to prevent them from putting anything on, but they are putting the heavy bagging on because they know that 30 pounds will be knocked off and if they do not have 30 pounds on they will lose that difference. If you do not have this bill, there is no limit, and you can put on anything, from fertilizer sacks to cotton sheets or anything else.

Mr. RICH. Let the cotton farmer sell his cotton with the idea that they are going to take only the net weight, whatever it is. If the tare is only 10 pounds, there is no reason the farmer should pay for 20 or 30 pounds, when he gets only 10.

Mr. FULMER. I agree with the gentleman, but all the farmers cannot do that. You heard the gentleman awhile ago quoting Anderson and Clayton, the biggest cotton buyer and the biggest cotton farmer, that they never would do that until we pass the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not the very purpose of this bill to make the net weight compulsory so that would be done? And if the gentleman will yield further, may I say that when this bill passed the House on June 8, 1939, there was a provision that it would be effective 1 year from date? It was the following April before the Senate committee reported the bill, and they substituted language so as to make it the year following the date that they reported it. Therefore, if the argument be true that you cannot get the machinery at all except from abroad, there would be no occasion to postpone the date to 1943 or any other date.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Has not the situation changed since 1939?

Mr. FULMER. Changed how?

Mr. COOLEY. Have not the international and the shipping situations changed? This machinery must come from Great Britain, Calcutta, or some other place. I believe it would be only reasonable to ask that a reasonable length of time be given to these mills to make the necessary changes.

Mr. FULMER. Our mills do not need any time to make changes to manufacture cotton bagging. Because of not being able to ship any jute or jute bagging of any type, certainly we ought to have the bill, so we can go ahead and sell on net weight and set up proper standards.

Mr. COOLEY. People who are in a position to know—and I know they are reputable citizens—advise me that they would experience difficulty in getting the necessary machinery.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman from California, who represents a great cotton section in California, was telling me about the trouble in shipping jute; that he had a letter from his people stating that it would be impossible to get the jute in this country, because they have absolutely cut out importing it, because of the lack of shipping space, and they are not going to permit any jute to go out of this country because they want to use it for other purposes—bags and things like that. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my observation, in trying to help the cotton farmer, and goodness knows we have been trying to help him in the last few years, that if you fellows had not passed the Bankhead cotton bill about 6 or 8 years ago you would not have put the cotton farmer out of business. When you passed that bill you tried to raise the price of cotton so high in this country that you could not sell it abroad. When you passed that legislation you thought everybody would have to come to America to get the cotton, but you just ruined the cotton farmer in this country. It seems to me that the only way you are now trying to help the cotton farmer is by bringing in all kinds of legislation that will make us use cotton for everything under the guise of national defense. It seems to me we will have to start eating cotton pretty soon if we are going to really help the cotton farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Not being able to get the world to use our cotton we are now attempting by this bill to force the American cotton farmer himself to use it.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me if we would try to do something to really help the farmer instead of always taking the bull by the tail and then allowing the bull to carry us all around in a circle all the time, we should really think about what we are doing here.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. Does not the gentleman think that the tariff which has protected his section of the country and its manufacturing industries, might have had something to do with impoverishing the cotton farmer?

Mr. RICH. Yes; if we would put a tariff on the jute right now would we not help the cotton farmer? That is the way we ought to do it so as to enable the people of the country to use cotton instead of using jute that comes in here free. I am for a tariff for the American farmer, for the American manufacturer, and for American labor, and I always have been and always will be because I think that is the salvation of our country.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not true that about the only help the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given the cotton farmer has been in the sense of criticism? The gentleman has not sponsored any legislation to help the cotton farmer.

Mr. RICH. I do not have any cotton farmers in my district, but I know that if we do not help the cotton farmers they are going to raise everything that our farmers raise up in Pennsylvania, and then we are going to have that competition. I want to help you, but I want to see some good legislation brought in here.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman ought to be for this bill.

Mr. RICH. I want to see some good business legislation and not a lot of legislation that proposes that we go around Robin Hood's barn all the time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman has stated he is very strong for the principle of protection. If we pass this bill today, it will accomplish for cotton by keeping out jute just what a tariff on jute would accomplish, and does not the gentleman think that in this way we can help preserve the American market for American cotton and at least the gentleman will be preserving the principle of protection? It seems to me the gentleman ought to support this bill.

Mr. RICH. I want to help the cotton farmer because I believe that is something we have got to do.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman can do that by voting for this bill.

Mr. RICH. The way you fellows want to help the farmer is by paying him for not raising cotton, and then you get him to raise a lot of stuff that the northern farmer raises. That is not going to help this country and it is not going to solve your problem, because that is not going to get them to use more cotton. Put a tariff on the jute——

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This bill has nothing to do with the control of the production of cotton; this is an attempt to preserve the American market for the American cotton farmer, and the gentleman is for that principle.

Mr. RICH. Yes, surely; but the gentleman says this bill is not for the cotton farmer. What is it for if it is not to make them use cotton?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is right.

Mr. RICH. And you are going to bring in another bill here within a week compelling them to use cotton to make pulp and paper, so the farmers cannot sell their pulpwood.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman think that this bill will do what he has been contending for in preserving the American market for the American farmer?

Mr. RICH. Go back and put a tariff on them. This good-neighbor policy you fellows have established here of permitting farmers in foreign lands with peonage labor to come in here and compete with our farmers is going to have the effect of destroying the cotton farmer and you are going to destroy the wheat farmer and the buckwheat farmer if you do not put on a tariff. Put the tariff on, I tell you. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULMER) there were—ayes 32, noes 36.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. FULMER and Mr. CLASON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were ayes 59, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: Page 3, line 15, strike out the words "the maximum weight" down to and including the words "20 ounces per patch" in line 20.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to have final determination if there are to be any proper standards established, after hearings, by the Secretary of Agriculture. By the wording of this bill, once standards are set the Secretary of Agriculture can change them as he sees fit, without any further consideration from Congress. That being so, and it being evident that the purpose of the wording in this statute is to rule out jute and to put in cotton, regardless of the cost that has been given in debate, my amendment is offered that everybody would have a chance to come in with any kind of bagging. The purpose of my amendment is to lay that wide open. If we are to have regulations set up by the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department, let us permit him to do it. Why put in 14 ounces to the square yard? Why not leave that to the Secretary and let him determine what it should be. Perhaps we will find a year from now that it is not possible to have cotton bagging, so why put this law on the statute book which rules out jute, when the Secretary may say at that time it is impossible to have enough cotton bagging on hand to cover the 1942 crop or any other crop? Why not let the Secretary of Agriculture decide that and not have it decided by this nonhearing legislation, because there was not a single hearing on this bill before the Committee on Agriculture.

That is the situation. We are near war. The whole country is disturbed over the defense program. Why put in jeopardy every business, whether it is cotton or the jute bagging business, or any other bagging. Why not give everybody a fair chance, with the Secretary of Agriculture determining what we ought to have in the way of standards and not have one isolated clause put in here, the purpose of which is to bite out jute and shove in cotton, in exclusion to every other known fabric? If you do that, the cotton farmer will be the one who will suffer. He will pay twice as much for the bagging on his cotton as he would otherwise have to pay, and the United States Treasury is paying 15 cents in subsidies for every cotton patch that is used on cotton today. Let us

cut out that type of work, if we are going to play fair. Let us be fair, and not have legislation like this bill so that everybody in the United States can have fair standards set up by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the language in lines 20 to 23, as follows:

And no such fabrics or materials standardized for bagging or patches shall be composed of any material previously used for covering cotton bales unless the same shall have been reprocessed and rewoven.

With that language there it does not make any difference whether the material formerly used is in good shape or not. It may be in perfect shape, but this bill prevents the farmer from using it again until he takes it back to a mill and has it rewoven.

Mr. CLASON. I agree with the gentleman. I feel as though my amendment should be amended to carry out those words also, because it is obvious, if cotton has been around a bale and has not been damaged, it is right to use it on another bale, and it is silly to make anybody put that through another process in another mill at great expense. That is wasting the farmer's money, just as this bill is going to do from the first page to the last.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to announce that I have just received a telegram from Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Louisiana, announcing that the southern commissioners of agriculture are all supporting this bill, and by permission of the House I place the telegram in the RECORD at this point:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *March 28, 1941.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Congressman FULMER has introduced a measure whereby cotton must be sold at net weight. This bill has endorsement of southern commissioners of agriculture and shall appreciate your support of said bill and also contact other members of our Louisiana delegation.

HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts and what he had to say with reference to his amendment, I submit the following: Everybody knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] has given much thought to this bill and is just as much opposed to it as I am in favor of it. If his amendment carries, that will take out the heart of the bill. I say that because of this pertinent fact: Many crimes have been committed in the name of trying to benefit the farmer. The argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the observation of the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. COOLEY], is that we are preventing the farmer doing what he wants to do. If you do not prescribe the type of wrapping that is to be used, you might just as well not have any bill. If that is cut out, the purpose of this bill is lost. The purpose of the bill is to have an economical package, to have a package that will not have this 30 pounds tare taken off. It will be a package that will have a tare of about 14 pounds. It will be a package that is nice in appearance. That is the purpose of submitting what we know from the hearings before the Department of Agriculture to be a type of wrapping that is desired; not any particular wrapping, but with reference to the weight. If this language goes out of the bill you can put old sheets or tow sacks or anything else that might be forced upon the farmer under the guise of telling him he has to pay less for it than something that is marketable and material that we know will enable him to get a better price for his cotton.

When you say you are interested in the farmer that is the interest we should manifest; that is, to get a better price for the cotton. That is what those of us who are advocating this net weight bill feel it will do, on account of the economical packaging and the attractive packaging. When you say we are heaping any imposition upon anybody by providing that the weight of the material shall not be greater than 14 ounces per square yard, and that the many patches which will be put on it will not exceed in weight 20 ounces each, I say if you cut that out you will have an unsightly bale of cotton, even more so than the disgraceful bale that is marketed now. That is one of the reasons why we cannot get a fair price for the material that is produced by the farmer. It is on account of the appearance. I say the gentleman's amendment should be defeated. If it is carried it will take the heart out of this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The language that is proposed to be stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] is the very heart of the bill that provides for a net-weight bale. If this amendment carries, it goes to the very heart of this bill and destroys the very purpose for which the legislation is offered.

Mr. DOXEY. Yes; the gentleman is exactly correct. Let me say that other gentlemen, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, think this is entirely a fight over wrapping. This is a twofold bill. It not only endeavors to make a nicer package and a more economical package, but it is to get baled cotton sold on a net-weight basis, so that the farmer will not be charged with all this unnecessary tare that is put on a bale of cotton and charged to the farmer. The net-weight feature is something that my friend from Pennsylvania and others may have lost sight of in the beneficial results that will accrue to the farmer as a result of enacting this bill.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why do we have to legislate in order to determine what the net weight of a package is that is on a bale of cotton?

Mr. DOXEY. We have to legislate because the trade has adopted as a practice the gross-weight system that certainly works against the farmer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were ayes 37 and noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 3, line 20, strike out all words commencing "and no such" to the end of section 2.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It strikes out the following words:

And no such fabrics or materials standardized for bagging or patches shall be composed of any material previously used for covering cotton bales unless the same shall have been reprocessed and rewoven.

It seems to me we go pretty far in this legislation; we go back to the pig-killing days, the burning of wheat, the plowing under of cotton, and the destruction of our crops. If this is not what this bill means, I do not understand it. If second-hand jute is available and is still fit to be used, why should it not be used a second or a third time, or as many times as it is capable of being used, without having to be reprocessed each time? I would like to ask this simple question: Will anyone in this House stand up and tell us why jute covering for cotton should not be reused?

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I cannot tell you why that should not be reused, but I will say that in the woolen industry they use bags over time after time after time. They are made of substances other than cotton. They could use those. If they use woolen bagging, they would want to use it more than once, would they not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question: The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] told me why we had to legislate in order that the farmers should not be charged the net weight that was on a bag of cotton. Now, do we not have cooperatives in the South among the cotton farmers?

They make their rules and regulations. Should not they say that the farmer should be charged for only the net weight of the bagging? Then again why cannot those cooperatives insist that this be done instead of our coming in here and trying to legislate that bags must weigh 12 pounds? A farmer naturally does not want to be charged 18 pounds for a bag that weighs only 8, but why cannot the cooperatives insist that cotton be sold on the net weight basis, that only the actual weight of the bagging be deducted?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman from Ohio will yield I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if a farmer puts any kind of covering on cotton that weights more than 14 ounces he is liable to arrest for violating the law, be charged with a misdemeanor, and have a fine of $500 imposed on him.

Mr. RICH. Where is that provision?

Mr. COOLEY. It is in this bill.

Mr. RICH. That is crazy legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I want to make just one point further: There would be just as much reason in bringing a bill into this House to prevent people from rehabilitating their shoes, clothes, or anything else they possess as there is for this clause in this bill. If the Members of this House believe such restriction is proper legislation then vote for it, but vote against it if you believe it is not.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; not now. If you do not believe that is a proper restriction then of course you will vote against such legislation. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he voted for a bill at the last session which eliminated the use of soiled wool scraps in the manufacture of blankets, and so forth? And whether or not the gentleman saw the sample the gentleman from North Carolina had, a ragged, torn-up piece of bagging which he exhibited to the House a short time ago? Would the gentleman want to see that used on a bale of cotton?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe that is up to us. The gentleman is not handling cotton; he is a Congressman. Let those people who handle cotton take care of that end of it. Why do we have to meddle in all these things all the time?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The piece of bagging the gentleman referred to that was exhibited a while ago one could not pick up, for it was nothing but holes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentlemen from Ohio is conscientious about the statement made awhile ago. May I state to the gentleman that even jute bagging is never used a second time until it is rewoven because as a rule when you put old bagging on you start a bale out looking like the picture I showed you awhile ago. Think what bale covering would look like after it has been cut seven or eight times. Certainly you could not use any of it unless it is reprocessed. If you adopt that amendment then they would come in with any old type of bagging or sacking that would be even worse than this old jute. You would leave the type of bagging wide open. The poor appearance of our baled cotton is one reason we are losing our foreign markets. This provision in the bill simply states that the bagging must be reprocessed before being reused so as to insure a proper appearance for the American bale, so it will stand up in comparison with any other country's cotton. Brazil uses cotton bagging and Brazil has taken our Canadian and other markets away from us. Japan is buying from India. We used to sell to all these countries. All the complaints coming from Europe deal with the type of bale we ship there.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I wonder if the Committee on Agriculture has ever given consideration to the proposition that it might be well to ship some of our surplus cotton to India? There are plenty of people there who are not clothed at all but who would wear cotton clothing and be sold on the idea of importing some of our cotton if they could get it cheap enough.

Mr. FULMER. I shall be pleased to answer the gentlewoman's question. We are getting all kinds of jute from India. In making trade-treaty arrangements to give away our own markets in lots of things besides jute, we should put in these agreements with India and other countries that if we take their jute they should take our cotton. But they do not do that. We buy the jute from India, but the American farmer's cotton goes into the warehouses in this country. Brazil is shipping her cotton to Canada and Canada is shipping into this country, duty-free, millions of dollars' worth of apples, newsprint pulp, wood, and wood pulp. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that I am introducing a bill to put a tariff on jute, on oil, and on starches; and I hope when we get it before the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman will assist me in securing favorable consideration thereon so that we can give the cotton farmers our market which India is now getting.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Brazilian cotton industry, which is increasing by leaps and bounds, is sending its surplus cotton to Canada?

Mr. FULMER. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. And it is coming into our country free of charge?

Mr. FULMER. No; not into our country but into Canada.

Mr. STEFAN. It is going to Canada. Canada is not buying our cotton?

Mr. FULMER. That is right.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. In addition to the reasons given by the gentleman, is it not true that the wrapping which often stays on a bale of cotton 2 or 3 years gets damp, that the fabric rots, and it will be unfit for wrapping further even though it has not been slashed up with a knife?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true one of the reasons assigned by the opponents of this legislation is the fact that jute bagging generally is rewoven and that you are only requiring that the rewoven bag be used for patches just as it is used in covering the original bale?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that Mr. Lockie, of the American Cotton Shippers' Association, replied that the use of this bagging that is not rewoven is for the benefit of the merchants and buyers and comes out of the pockets of the farmers?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely. When it leaves the farmer it may have 18 pounds on it. Then they patch up to 26 pounds and to 30 pounds for export. They usually make from 50 cents to $1 profit on each bale. Those are the fellows who are against this bill because it interferes with their profit.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman see any difference in passing a law preventing the use of second-hand jute and in passing a law preventing the use of second-hand automobiles, hats, or anything else?

Mr. FULMER. That has not anything to do with this problem. All other commodities have rules and regulations, you have standards, and the net weight is marked on practically everything that the gentleman buys except cotton. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio), there were—ayes 39, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That except as provided in section 2 of this act, it shall be unlawful for any person to ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce any bale of cotton ginned after the effective date of the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards on which the bagging, ties, or patches do not conform with such United States Official Cotton Tare Standards.

No person shall be prosecuted under the provisions of this section when he can establish a guaranty signed by the manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, or other party residing within the United States by whom such bagging, ties, or patches were sold, to the effect that the same conform with said United States Official Cotton Tare Standards. Said guaranty, to afford protection, shall contain the name and address of the party or parties making the sale of such bale covering materials, and in such case such party or parties making such sale shall be amenable to the prosecutions, fines, and other penalties which would attach in due course to the shipper under the provisions of this act.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to examine and test bale covering materials and samples thereof for the purpose of determining whether such materials conform with the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards, and to promulgate regulations for

submitting samples of bale covering materials for examination and testing.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of this bill, and I will vote against it. I oppose it reluctantly, because, generally speaking, I favor and have voted for all legislation for the benefit of the farmer. However, I am more cognizant of the effects of this bill because in my own city we have jute mills, and I know there will be men and women thrown out of employment if this cotton net weight bill passes.

The gentleman from Mississippi stated that it would be possible for the manufacturers of jute bagging to install new machinery and to go into the manufacture of cotton bagging. That is quite true, and at other times that argument might have more weight with me than it has at the present time. I realize—and I think everyone here who has any intimate knowledge of our defense program realizes—that it is impossible at the present time to secure machine tools or new machinery. That means that those of us who have these jute mills in our districts or in our home cities will have to contemplate a situation wherein they will be unable to secure new machinery for installation in order to go into the manufacture of cotton bagging.

It is for the reasons stated above that I will have to oppose the bill. I cannot understand why at this time we have to ruin an industry that has only grown up and developed in the last 100 years because the farmer himself has demanded jute bagging. Jute bagging has not been forced upon the farmer. He has purchased jute bagging because it has been more economical to do so.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. I appreciate the fact the gentleman has usually gone along with the farmers and I have not any quarrel with him in this instance, but may I suggest to the gentleman that the farmer has never demanded jute bagging. It may be that the ginner has put it off on him. I grew up in a cotton country and I never heard of a cotton farmer demanding jute to wrap his cotton in.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the farmers themselves will decide? Does not the gentleman think if the cooperatives, for instance, through their members wanted to use cotton bagging that they would use it?

Mr. SOUTH. That is possible, but this is a situation that has worked down from the top. The top has been the Jute Trust and it has worked on down through the ginners and the processors. The farmer has had nothing to say about what his cotton is to be wrapped in.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman, however, that I have some knowledge of the marketing of cotton? I have always been sympathetic to the problems of the cotton farmer because I know he has always been made to pay for anything that took place in the nature of a loss in the cotton industry. I would be glad to go along on this bill, but we have to protect our own industries.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say that cotton bagging is now available to the cotton farmer if the cotton farmers want to buy it. Cotton bagging is subsidized this year to the extent of $300,000 of Federal funds for the purpose of encouraging its use.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is quite true.

Mr. COOLEY. This subsidy as granted by the Federal Government is, of course, already at the expense of the industries in the gentleman's district, in my district, and in other districts that are manufacturing jute.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What the gentleman says is quite true.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that in the passage of this bill they will work irreparable harm to an American industry and to thousands of manufacturing plants which are located in various parts of this country, and that we have to protect the interests of the workers in those communities to the same degree that we have to protect the interests of the cotton farmers in the South.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. In answer to the gentleman from North Carolina, may I state that the trouble now is that this is still on the gross-weight basis, and the buyer will not give the farmer an advantage. The year before last I put all my cotton in cotton bagging to help out, but when I went to sell it I did not even get the 7 pounds back that some of the mills stated they would give back, since it is still on a gross-weight basis. We never will get that until we get the net-weight basis.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand that what the gentleman says is correct, but we are still faced with the necessity of protecting American industries and American communities. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That from and after the effective date of the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards it shall be unlawful for any person to buy or sell or to offer to buy or sell any American cotton ginned after such effective date for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce except according to the net weight of the cotton involved, excluding in each instance the weight of bagging, ties, and patches.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cause such investigations and tests to be made as he may find to be necessary in order to determine practical means for the permanent identification of different types of bales of cotton by the use of markers, tags, and other devices which will facilitate the effective administration of this act, and by public notice to prescribe standard specifications for such markers, tags, and other devices. Such standard specifications or any change or replacement thereof shall become effective on and after a date specified in the order of the Secretary establishing the same, which shall be not less than 1 year after the date of such order, and thereafter it shall be unlawful for any person to ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce any bale of American cotton ginned after such effective date which does not bear a tag, marker, or other device conforming with such standard specifications.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 5, in line 9, the words "of different types" be stricken. They are perfectly useless, in that a different type is not mentioned in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That for the purposes of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be promulgated such regulations, may cause such investigations, tests, demonstrations, and publications to be made as he shall find to be necessary; and he is hereby authorized to cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivisions thereof, or any person, in carrying out the provisions of this act, and he shall have the power to appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees not in conflict with existing law, and to make such expenditures for printing, books of reference, technical, newspapers and periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, travel, and other supplies and expenses as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

SEC. 7. The duties developing upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this act may with equal force and effect be executed by such officers and agents of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate for the purpose.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee if the word "developing", in line 14 of page 6, should not be stricken out and the word "devolving" inserted in its place.

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 6 in line 14 the word "developing" be stricken and the word "devolving" inserted in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. Any person who shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this act or of any regulation made in pursuance hereof; or any person who shall knowingly represent by misbranding or otherwise that any bale-covering material sold or offered for sale or shipped or delivered for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce conforms with the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards when in fact such bale-covering material does not conform with such standards; or any person who shall forcibly assault, impede, resist, interfere with, or influence improperly, or attempt to influence improperly, any person

employed under this act in the pursuance of his duties, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500.

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This act shall become effective January 1, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 968, to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 136, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 75, noes 58.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold that so I may submit a unanimous-consent request that the vote go over until tomorrow?

Mr. CLASON. To be frank, we have had this discussion this afternoon, and I do not know what will be gained by going over until tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was understood last week that if the question of a roll call were to come up today, we would, if possible, postpone it until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit, I would say that the agreement was made concerning the Hobbs bill, which we thought would be up for consideration today.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but I construed the agreement as being a little bit broader than that. I believe that specifically what the gentleman from Massachusetts says is correct; but on the other hand, the general impression was that there would probably be no roll call on any bill that might come up today, and that every effort would be made to put any roll call over until Tuesday. Of course, I want to keep my part of the agreement.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask if the request is that the vote go over until tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Chair finds that a quorum is not present, I should assume that to be the situation, to protect the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. Is that as the Speaker understands it? We are suggesting that if the vote goes over until tomorrow it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Massachusetts includes that in his request, when the vote is taken tomorrow it will be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the Speaker will permit, for the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts may I say that if by any chance a Member should make a point of no quorum tomorrow, that would come ahead of the fulfillment of the gentleman's request, and then his request would not be carried out unless sufficient Members would support the demand for the yeas and nays that such a vote would be ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn, in order to bring this matter to a head.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was rejected,

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to make a statement. The Chair has told 20 or 30 Members, both on the Republican side and on the Democratic side, that if he could prevent it there would not be a roll call today on any bill, so may the Chair suggest that the request be made that when the House meets tomorrow and this vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It would relieve us of any difficulty here if the gentleman from Massachusetts would include in his request that the vote go over until tomorrow and that it then be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. I want the gentleman from Massachusetts to have his rights fully protected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I believe that would protect him.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, and I had a gentleman's agreement with reference to the alien-deportation bill, but I may say to the gentleman that I construed the agreement to be broader than that and to apply to any bill that might come up today because so many Members had acted upon the assumption that there would be no roll-call vote today. The gentleman from Massachusetts was perfectly within his rights, but in view of that understanding of mine I think it applies to this bill so far as I am concerned. Naturally, I do not want to take the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] off his feet or deprive him of any of his rights, because, according to the vote just announced by the Speaker, evidently a quorum is not present and on tomorrow the gentleman might be taken off his feet, and that should be kept in mind with respect to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but I think if we yield too much we are liable to get into further trouble.

Mr. FULMER. I would simply like to state that it is my understanding that the Speaker and the majority leader had spoken to a number of Members and it was for that reason we did not want to have a record vote this afternoon, but so far as I am personally concerned I would be perfectly willing to have the vote this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this one statement, if I may. The gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, always acts in good faith toward Members on both sides of the aisle and while we could get a roll-call vote if he wanted to, yet inasmuch as the gentleman has requested that the vote go over until tomorrow, in order that it may be fair to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], I would suggest that the gentleman include in the request that the roll-call vote be taken tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the motion to adjourn prevailed I would undertake to protect the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sure the gentleman would.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the taking of the vote on this bill be postponed until tomorrow and that when the vote comes on the final passage of the bill the vote shall be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, when we were in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union I asked unanimous consent to file in the RECORD at a certain point designated by me a telegram from Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture of Louisiana, in reference to the bill we had under consideration today. I would like to ask unanimous consent to include the telegram at the point mentioned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 170

Resolved, That Joseph C. Baldwin, of New York, be and he is hereby, elected to the following committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Labor, Committee on the District of Columbia, and Committee on Pensions.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD by including an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a concurrent resolution in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill under consideration in Committee of the Whole House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by the former Postmaster General on Jackson Day, in New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Senate report concerning primary voting irregularities in New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution passed by the Forty-ninth Assembly of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem entitled "The Forgotten Man," by A. P. Taplett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of New York with regard to the highways of the State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would not claim the time if I did not think the matter I want to speak about is one of paramount importance. I shall speak about the labor situation.

I think that everyone will agree, and I know the rank and file of the labor movement will agree, that by every possible means strikes should be avoided and prevented at this time. Thoughtful labor leaders will agree, I know, because they know that in the present state of the public mind the one thing that would be best for the labor movement would be a complete avoidance of all strikes. I hope also that employers will agree that strikes should be avoided and prevented at this time. And I say that because there are causes for strikes and the burden of these causes of strikes is not always, or even most of the time, on the workers regardless of what antilabor publicity may attempt to indicate. The question is how to accomplish that purpose. For it must be accomplished in such a way that fairness and justice is done all around—in such a way that the spirit of cooperation and loyalty is increased, not diminished.

These are times that try men's souls. They are times when unjust judgment and the bitterness it may cause is far more serious than in ordinary times.

It is of basic importance to be fair; it is of basic importance to know the facts; and we must always remember that what we are seeking to accomplish is the promotion of a spirit within the Nation which will make possible a successful carrying forward of the national-defense program in the best possible way. This can only be done if we win the hearty response of all groups, and labor is just about the most important one of all. It will do no good just to pass some piece of antilabor legislation than to have a large group of our essential workers feel that we have not understood or dealt fairly with them. That would be destructive of morale, and morale is all-important. We do not just want people to keep on working. We want them to keep on working with a will to produce. We can have both these things if we are fair and if we are wise. We will get neither of them if we start treating labor as if we thought they were disloyal. They are not.

Someone in this House, from time to time, has to speak on behalf of and in interpretation of the point of view of labor. It is not going to be popular to do it, but someone has to do it, for once the indispensable skilled workers of America get the idea that they cannot expect understanding of their point of view—that no voice is raised to give their side of the question—then we shall have lost the thing on which we must ultimately completely depend, and that is the spirit of the men who must produce the planes and ships—yes—and the food and clothing. As has been done so well in England, we must make our workers feel that they are partners, and partners not without honor in this great effort.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE

A few weeks ago Mr. Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor in the Churchill cabinet of Great Britain was addressing a group of important and prominent bankers and businessmen. In the course of his remarks he said, "England could spare every man in this room better than she could spare one man who knows how to make an airplane propeller." He was right. And this is something for us to think about. I doubt if we think about it enough.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about France and very little about England in connection with this strike problem. We have been told that it was strikes that ruined France. But we have not been told why and how British labor has been cooperating completely with the government, how and why there has not been a single strike, although no law has been passed forbidding them. To say that strikes were an important cause of the downfall of France is only a half truth. It is only part, not all of the story. Another part of the story is that having neglected constructive measures, having neglected to arouse their people to the necessity of united action to save the nation, the French finally clamped on a dictatorship, swept away practically all the rights of labor and the people generally, and imposed sharp and drastic regulations upon some of the people. But from what I can discover, at no time were sacrifices demanded of the 200 families or the directors of the Bank of France who were the people who controlled most of the French economy, and the greater part of the munitions industry. France tried to have business as usual, almost up to the very end.

And while they were attempting to securely control labor, at the same time labor knew that in France there were groups of French industrialists and other people of that character who were going on with business as usual and profits as usual. I am not unmindful of the work of Communists and "fifth column" agents. I just do not believe they were any more dangerous on the whole to France than were the men who thought maybe Hitler was not so bad, and that they could continue to carry on their businesses without being bothered by labor if Hitler conquered France. Indeed, it is true that when Leon Blum in 1936 asked twenty billion francs for national-defense expenditures, French capital replied by shipping to America half enough French gold to have paid for the proposed defenses on the Belgian frontier. The Blum government fell, and Chautemps followed. He asked fifteen billion francs for defense. Promptly there was another flight of capital, and the franc fell to its lowest point since 1926. Daladier came in—and held on. And one reason he did so, apparently, was that he did not ask an increase in the expenditures of the Government. Indeed, the national-defense budget of France in 1938 was only 1 percent above that of 1934. No wonder the French people did not respond. The point I want to make is that one main reason they did not respond was because the people at the top politically and economically never acted as if they felt it necessary to make any sacrifices themselves for the sake of the nation. Meanwhile the French chamber of commerce was warning against the danger of overexpansion. Yes; there is more than one lesson to be learned from France.

But in Great Britain, on the other hand, what happened? What was the difference between Chamberlain and Churchill. The fundamental difference was that Chamberlain, on the one hand, stood for the preservation of privilege that then existed. But Churchill said, "No; it has got to be a great national effort to which every group shall make

their full contribution." He called in the leaders of labor themselves, told them he had to have their cooperation, showed them that there were actually to be no great profits allowed to be made, said he was ready to ask his own group to make sacrifice. Would they help? They would. They did. They are now. England is standing as one man. That was the difference, and I think I could state, without fear of being wrong, that if he should feel the occasion warranted it and the President of the United States called upon any group of American workers and said to them, "Your work cannot be spared. I am asking you men to stay on the job, and I am telling you that if you do stay on the job your right to recognition, to a fair agreement, to fair settlement of grievances will be fairly handled by an impartial board," he would get quick response without any shadow of doubt.

BUT THERE MUST ALSO BE JUSTICE

But the thing you cannot do is to fail to say the second thing. The thing you cannot do is just to say to labor, "Labor has got to keep working, no matter what anyone else does. If it does not, it is unpatriotic." You cannot do that, because there are certain things that labor has a right to expect, and one is that it will be treated as a partner in industry, and that it will be bargained with; that it will have a chance to make agreements; that it have a chance to find its place in this national-defense picture, just the same as any other group. Just as soon as you are ready to do that, then I am positive you will get response. Indeed, if we went over all the strikes that have taken place, we would not find very many that have been against employers who have done these things. There are exceptions, of course, and they have to be dealt with in other ways. Jurisdictional strikes, for instance, seem to me almost inexcusable at a time like this. But up to date, although we have preached to labor long and hard, we have not really acted as though we felt that the situation was one that demanded sacrifice from top to bottom. We have placed no limitation on profits. We have not even effectively curtailed a lucrative commerce in gasoline with Japan, or in machine tools with Russia. We have not passed a tax bill that was in accord with general sacrifice in proportion to ability. We have not even taken steps to end the waste of unemployment once for all. We have not said to other groups in the population that we expect sacrifice. Indeed, the same men that want to put labor in jail if it offends have been telling us we must restore confidence if we are to expect the cooperation of business. The Congress itself enacted legislation last fall which was for the explicit purpose of meeting the demands of the manufacturers and of business management in order that they might have security against any losses in the future. I voted for that legislation. But I ask you now what would we do today if we took a similar point of view toward labor?

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

SUCCESS OF MEDIATION BOARD

Mr. HEALEY. Apropos of something the gentleman just said about the settlement of these strikes through proper mediation, I call to the gentleman's attention the fact that newspaper statements of today reveal that the four strikes that were certified to the Mediation Board only last week have now all been settled. That is the Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation at Bridgeville, Pa.; the Condenser Corporation, South Plainfield, N. J.; the Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.; the International Harvester Corporation, four plants, Richmond, Ind., Chicago, Ill., two plants, and Rock Falls, Ill., one plant, all in the course of a few days, indicating that the gentleman's views are correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman; and his list includes every single dispute that has been submitted to the National Defense Labor Mediation Board up to date.

Mr. HEALEY. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I want him to know I had planned to use the information he has given to demonstrate that the American method of working things out by agreement between employers and workers has not failed. We are only beginning to try it, only I hope we are getting a new spirit—a spirit of saying it has got to work—both sides have got to be both fair and reasonable.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I only have a few minutes. I would rather proceed if I may. I wonder if the gentleman would let me do that?

TWO METHODS

There are two ways in which we can get the kind of spirit and cooperation which we want in America today. One way is by inspiring mutual willingness to give and take and cooperate in the national interest; to inspire that by means of such national leadership, both in Congress and out of it, as will impart the great need in which we stand today, as will put shame upon any group which will attempt to profit out of this situation for their own benefit; as will lead to the bringing together of all efforts, capital, labor, and everybody else, so that you get the kind of an inspired democracy that is the strongest society in the world. This is the best way. It is the way in which most of our basic values can be saved.

But if it does not work—

Well, there is another way you can use if you cannot get it that way. This first way is typified by agreements voluntarily made between employers and workers, by National Defense Mediation Board, by bringing people together and settling difficulties as they arise. The other way is by requiring in the name of all the people equal sacrifice in proportion to ability to make sacrifice, from every group, beginning at the top; beginning first with possessors of idle wealth; second, prosperous and favored industries that are getting almost all the big orders; third, the well to do, including Members of Congress; fourth, labor; fifth, the farmers; sixth and last, W. P. A. workers, and the unemployed. The second method is for all these groups to know that the Nation is in so difficult a position that everyone is being asked to do all he can. We have not done this. But if you say that from every group we are going to ask everything they can give and then show labor this is the kind of program we have got, we will get a response that will put some gentlemen to shame. You have to get response, under those circumstances.

YOU CAN DRAFT MEN FOR SERVICE TO THEIR COUNTRY, BUT YOU CAN'T DRAFT THEM TO HELP MAKE PRIVATE PROFIT

A gentleman came in today and said he had introduced a bill so that if any strike took place "against the United States" severe penalties would be imposed. He spoke about strikes "against the United States." I wonder if the gentleman really meant strikes "against the United States," because if he did I can understand him. If he meant a strike on the part of people who are working for the United States Government, if he meant a strike on the part of Government civil servants or people working in a plant that belongs to or has been taken over by the Government of the United States, I think he is right. I do not think there can be such a thing allowed as a strike against the Government. But if he means he is going to punish a group of employees of a private company because they make a protest, and if he proposes that Congress should say to labor, for example, "We are going to drive you under any circumstances to work for 'Little Steel,' no matter what 'Little Steel' does," then I say he is wrong. In other words, the Members of Congress have got to understand that once they abandon the method of improving our machinery for avoiding strikes by means of fair settlement and adopt, instead, the method of using the power of Government to compel labor to work, then, at the same time, we must compel industry to expand and we must see to it—really and actually—that not one penny of profit results to any private person or agency or corporation. When we have to take over industries or plants for the sake of national defense, then we can be responsible for right conditions of labor and we can, and, of course, would be in duty bound to, prohibit strikes completely in such plants. Until that time comes, we must use the methods of preventing strikes by improving the machinery of adjustment, conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration. I hope most earnestly these methods will be adequate.

This thing has to work both ways. I have heard it argued in the House that there cannot be a limitation on profits now because we have to give "incentive" to the owners of industry. We have been told that the manufacturers have to have an incentive or they will not produce necessary defense materials. Incidentally I don't believe that about most American manufacturers. But if we are going to start on that premise then it is equally true that we have got to have an incentive for other groups, and labor, for example, has got to believe that they can expect to improve their condition. The same thing applies all the way down

the line to every group, or it does not apply at all.

I have said that I believe labor should do everything in its power to avoid strikes in defense industries. Indeed, I fear for the future of our organized-labor movement unless this is done. For there will not be many speeches like this one in the House. But neither do I believe that conditions ought to be imposed that would cause labor to strike. And I beg the House to remember that there are employers in America—not many, I hope, but some—who would not hesitate to do things that are in the nature of an attempt to get labor to strike and thus incur the wrath of public opinion. I believe there is a lot of the story that has not been told. For instance, in the case of Bethlehem Steel you have a corporation that is in violation of the laws of the United States and has been so held by duly constituted authority. Bethlehem Steel has never, so far as I know, recognized or bargained with a labor organization. Moreover, this corporation, during the first World War, not only paid a bonus of close to a million dollars in 1 year to one of its officials but it was called upon by the War Labor Board appointed at that time to grant a wage increase and refused to obey that order and never did obey that order. The men had continued at work on the agreement that meanwhile negotiations would continue and a decision would be made which both sides would accept. Finally, Congress passed a bill on March 4, 1925, and appropriated $1,600,000 of the public money to make good the award of that War Labor Board. William Howard Taft, Chairman of the War Labor Board, at that time was outspoken in his condemnation of the action of Bethlehem Steel.

Now, I know that simply to explain the causes of strikes does not in itself help to remove their danger to national defense. But to know their causes does enable you to act intelligently in preventing them. All I am asking is that we be fair. All I am asking is that we see that because it is labor that commits the overt act does not mean that labor may not be attempting to protect its basic and fundamenal rights against subtle attack. There are always two parties to every controversy.

DESTRUCTIVE FORCES NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF AMERICAN LABOR OR EMPLOYERS MUST BE ROOTED OUT

I would not be telling the whole story here if I did not say that there are in the ranks of labor and in the ranks of industry some men whose attitude is actually destructive. Their interest is not in the success of our democracy. Indeed, Communists in the labor movement and Fascist-minded people on the other side have a common interest. Both of them would no doubt be pleased if a situation could be brought about where we would have American workmen and American Government forced into antagonism to one another. To prevent that, primarily, I am speaking this afternoon.

Let me say here with emphasis that the one thing that would do more than anything else for labor's cause today would be a genuine housecleaning of such Communists as remain in its ranks. Nor do I think a man who says this or who tells who they are—if he is sure of his facts—is speaking against labor; on the contrary, he is doing the labor movement a genuine service. And my appeal to labor would we that they clear their ranks of that small fraction of Communists. I know it is not easy, but it has been done already by the A. F. of L. and by most of the substantial C. I. O. unions. The task can be completed. There are good, patriotic men at the head of labor in this country, and this is their job. For the kind of strikes that may result from the work of Communists are going to be awfully, awfully bad for labor in the long run, as well as in the short run, and to temporize with this matter any longer is to court disaster.

But there is another job that needs doing by another group. I have heard sound labor men criticize pointedly and publicly the destructionists in their ranks. But I have seldom, if ever, heard one industrialist offer open criticism of a fellow industrialist who may hate democracy as much as any Communist hates it, and who may admire Hitler because, as he will put it, "After all, Hitler put the labor unions out of busines: and enforced the rights of property." There are men in positions of economic power who have that attitude and who do not wish us well in our defense program for their reason. They, too, need to be exposed.

INITIATION FEES

I am speaking in defense of labor, and especially of those tested organizations of American workers which through the years have been as loyal and true as any groups in America. But I am going to try to tell the whole story. I do not think that when a man goes in on a job, one which is known to be temporary, especially a temporary national-defense job, he should be charged a big initiation fee. At the very least, special arrangements ought to be made for a very moderate fee on those temporary jobs; the fee ought to be nominal, and then if the man holds the job and wants to become a full-fledged union member, it ought to be made possible so that he could pay it over a period of time. But I honestly believe the situation with regard to this matter is not so bad as it has been painted. For example, the president of the California State Federation of Labor wrote me as follows:

> I note your suggestion relative to permitting applicants to pay the initiation fees over a period of time while working on the job. For your information, that is exactly the system which is being used by practically all the unions in this part of the State.

And the recent action of the executive council of the building-trades department of the American Federation of Labor regarding this whole problem of initiation fees, dues, and employment of nonunion men should have been blazoned across every newspaper in the country. No one unfamiliar with the problems of labor can fully appreciate how far these men went toward solution of these problems. Of course, the various international unions and the locals will have to cooperate. But I believe they will, and I think these problems, too, are going to be fairly worked out. I believe they must be. And while we are speaking about initiation fees we must remember that their purpose is to make possible the payment of sick and death benefits and other means of protection for union members. I would only add that, in my belief, this should be the whole purpose of such fees, and that any practice of permitting organizers to retain a portion of such fees as part of their compensation should be ended.

WHAT THE LABOR MOVEMENT MEANS

Members of the House, we must remember that the labor movement through the years has been the one basic means of enabling the toilers of the world to put themselves in a position of somewhere near economic equality with their employers. To cripple that movement in the name of democracy should be unthinkable. Are we actually to consider in a moment of passion the sweeping away of any basic features of that movement? But for these organizations for mutual aid among wage earners we should indeed have conditions in our Nation that would mean that millions of our people living in misery and degredation would have little indeed to defend. This is something to think about.

Labor must have the right to share in the gains of industry. I have inserted figures in the RECORD comparing the increase in profits on the one hand with the increase in wages on the other in the last year. In steel, which is one that I carry in my mind, it was 93.9 percent increase in profits and 2.8 percent in wages. In machinery profits increased 90 percent in 1940 over 1939 and wages only 3.8 percent. Adjustment of things of this kind has got to be made, but it is something that not all people understand. We must recognize the right of the men who labor to a position of partnership. We must recognize the right of the American laborer to work under agreements with his employer and we must recognize his right to be treated as though he had a rightful place in our economy. These things are labor's basic rights. Labor must defend them.

And may I remind the House at this point that every dictator on earth as one of his very first acts has destroyed the organizations of labor. One of the greatest differences between dictatorship and democracy lies here. And we seek to defend democracy. Furthermore, even in Fascist countries, after labor was destroyed the owners of industry came next. Which is also something for American industrialists to remember. And Members of Congress.

ON STAYING ON THE JOB DURING NEGOTIATION AND SETTLEMENT

Then we have other problems connected with this great question which do not involve basic rights of labor. For example, the public is not going to have much patience with jurisdictional strikes. It ought, it seems to me, to be possible to get rid of thos disputes without carrying them out into the open where they tie up defense industries. In this case I should think it ought to be possible to submit all such disputes to the National Labor Relations Board or some similar body for final and definite determination.

And now I want to make a proposition, based on the assumption that we

have established a body which will be fair and which will prevent any advantage being taken by one side over another. It occurs to me that it should be possible for the work of defense to continue while grievances and wage and other adjustments are being negotiated and ironed out. Suppose that labor would say, "We will stay on our jobs; but here is our case, here are the things we believe should be adjusted. We ask that the employers meet and fairly negotiate with us. We only expect to see justice done to us." That is a constructive policy labor can pursue, in my opinion, just so long as a fair mediation board is used and just so long as employers are willing to meet and treat with the men. This problem can be solved, gentlemen, if we keep our heads.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Does not the gentleman believe that if contracts were entered into between labor and industry to the extent that there must be conciliation or mediation and arbitration before there would be any stoppage of work, there would not be a stoppage of work and that during this mediation there be a retroactive clause that any agreement made would be retroactive to the date of the expiration of that agreement, the same kind of an agreement that has been entered into by organized labor with the United States Steel Co. under which there has been no stoppage of work at all?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. I agree with the gentleman. I think that is the way to do it. We should perhaps say that until the good offices of this Mediation Board have been exhausted there shall not be a stoppage, and neither shall there be a change on the part of the employer in the conditions of work. But I must hasten to add that just as most all labor trouble arises because of lack of an agreement between employers and workers, so the necessary condition of doing what the gentleman suggests is the willingness of employers to treat with labor and make fair working agreements with it.

I would like to say that in at least one or two cases I know of labor organizations have asked that work continue while the negotiations lasted, and in at least the case of one industry, one of our greatest industries—namely, coal—the employers refused.

NO SPECIAL GROUP CAN BE BIGGER THAN THE UNITED STATES

I do not think that labor should have the right to dictate to the country, but neither do I think any other group should have that right. I am asking for a square deal this afternoon. I am asking that Members of Congress take pains to know the facts before they speak. I am asking that as we go forward we take the attitude that nobody—not the owners of the monopolistic industries, not the C. I. O., not international finance, not the A. F. of L., not anyone shall be bigger than the United States of America. I am asking that all the people in the United States of America shall know that at the hands of Congress, the Executive, and everybody connected with government there will be a square deal on the basis of the facts for all concerned, and that no great humane movement like the labor movement is going to be deprived of its fundamental basis by an act of Congress taken in an ill-considered fashion.

I want to say one word about union membership. For that is pretty close to the heart of the matter, after all. You cannot blame a labor organization for emphasizing the importance of membership, because, after all, only the members have borne the burden and heat of the day; only they have helped establish the improved conditions in the industry; and it is hardly fair, is it, to expect them to permit anyone who wants to to come in and enjoy the improved conditions without making any contribution? I have almost exhausted my time, Mr. Speaker. But I have barely scratched the surface of this great human and national question. If I have shown the Members of the House one thing, however, I am content. That one thing is this—the action of the Congress in this hour must be such that it will bind the American people together rather than raise barriers of misunderstanding between any group of them and their Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. My question does not really fit at this time, but I am going to ask it just the same. The gentleman stated awhile ago that he was opposed to the union charging enormous fees at these defense projects.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I am.

Mr. RUSSELL. I take it the gentleman means he thinks it is all right for them to charge a small tribute in order for the American boys to go to work on defense projects. Is that correct?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Where we have an opportunity on the part of people to get a better rate of pay because the union has established a rate of pay, the man who gets the advantage of that can, it seems to me, hardly expect not to make some contribution toward this work.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I simply say I have not lost faith that our American way of solving all these problems will succeed. I believe even now a new spirit is growing among all groups in our country. Labor has been severely attacked. Some of the criticism is justified. We have got to avoid these strikes, and we can do it by the application of common sense, appeals to patriotic action by all parties, and above all, by being fair.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the House should create a special committee, similar to the special committee created by the Senate, for the purpose of investigating the need of further legislation to promote our national-defense program. Some time ago we established a sane policy of full and complete preparedness. In the interest of our own peace and security we also decided to become "the arsenal of democracy." We are seeking to substitute economic force for military action. We are seeking to rely upon preparedness and production for peace and security. The die is cast. There is no turning back. To fail to make maximum use of our enormous economic and productive capacity with all possible speed is to commit a crime not only against ourselves but against posterity. Under authorizations and appropriations already made, we will have expended some forty billions of dollars by the end of 1942 in the cause of national defense. Time may greatly increase this amount. To do a half job or a poor job in this matter will be to waste this money and to place in jeopardy what is of far greater value—American manhood.

The American people are willing, even anxious, to buy total defense and an "arsenal for democracy," but they insist on getting what they pay for and they do not want anyone getting rich out of their sacrifices. They rightly and strenuously object to profiteering by industry, labor, or others. They object to any slowing or stoppage of production for any reason. They insist that all interference with the defense program be immediately reduced to an irreducible minimum. They want and should receive maximum production at maximum speed with reasonable economy.

Some weeks ago the House Judiciary Committee inquired of the executive branch of this Government, through responsible executive departments, if there was any need of further legislation to deal with the strike situation. The committee was told that no further legislation was necessary, that the executive branch of the Government had full and sufficient authority to deal with the situation. Yet we find strikes in vital defense plants slowing down our production at a time when we seek to step it up. Testimony has been given to the Congress that as many as 200 factories in this country make different and essential parts of certain airplanes. In one instance, at least, a strike in one of these plants materially reduced our plane production. The Congress and the people have a right to know of all such instances and the causes therefor. Because a man works in some strategic plant whose continued operation is essential to the continued operation of other plants and to the final completion of planes, shall he be permitted to strike, and demand, and receive almost as much money per day as the best young men in America receive per month when drafted into the Army? There can be but one answer to that question.

Again the owners and operators of this plant have no right to take the same advantage of the same situation by demanding exorbitant profits or by imposing unreasonable conditions on labor. Labor has struck, in some instances, for its share of a supposedly big profit melon. Because some industry has a monopoly on some commodity essential to defense production, as for example aluminum, shall such industry be permitted to profiteer out of our country's peril and to

exact unreasonable prices for their product? Further, because some plant is equipped with tools or machinery necessary to use in vital defense production, shall such plant be permitted to place its own price on work done? Again, there can be but one answer to these questions. The boys training at $21 per month, Mr. Taxpayer, Mr. Average Citizen, Mr. John Q. Public, have a right to a square deal out of every person under the protection of the American flag. If and when they are not getting it they are entitled to know the reasons why.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of these individuals and in the interest of national defense I have today introduced a resolution to create a special committee of the House to consist of nine members. The purpose of the committee being more fully disclosed by the following part of the resolution:

The committee is authorized and directed (1) to investigate all cases and forms of profiteering in the defense program; (2) to investigate causes and cures of shut-downs and slow-downs in defense production; (3) to investigate reports of industrial, labor, or other alleged racketeering in the defense program; (4) insofar as possible, to investigate all cases wherein the committee has reason to suspect corruption, inefficiency, or neglect of duty in the prosecution of the defense program; (5) to make periodic reports of its findings; (6) to recommend any needed legislation in connection with its findings and investigations.

We have great hopes that the President's newly created Mediation Board will successfully mediate. But simply to take over an industry and to settle a dispute at the expense of the public or at the cost of efficient operation will not be successful mediation.

It has been but a short time, as goes the lives of nations, since the cry of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" inspired a young French Republic to toil and sacrifice in the building of a great nation. But sordidness and selfishness too soon submerged that spirit of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Today France is reaping the natural and inevitable fruits of social and moral decay. Nations, as surely as men, reap whatsoever they sow. Let America beware. It can happen here. Almost too late England listened to the voice of a dynamic and aggressive statesman as he shouted to his countrymen: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." Mr. Roosevelt now asks Americans for sacrifice, relatively small sacrifice, in order that "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" may not become necessary to save or to rebuild our country. Surely we are not going to permit the selfishness of the few to defeat the sacrifices of the many.

Someone has said a grafter is one whose income exceeds his service to humanity. We have too many grafters in this country, and the way of such transgressors must be made exceedingly hard. We must control and use the tremendous power that is ours or be destroyed by it.

The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee last week expressed the sentiment of every patriotic American when he declared that those who cannot be persuaded to do their duty in this time of our Nation's peril should be treated as the enemies of a great republic. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time simply to have the RECORD show that industry in one very important case has refused to continue, pending negotiations, the conditions existing under the contract which has expired, namely, in the coal-mining industry the operators have refused to continue the conditions under the agreement which had expired pending negotiations. This is very, very important for the Congress to know, particularly because we may be faced with a very serious situation in the coal industry and we ought to know where the responsibility for being obdurate and unreasonable lies, that is, on the operators. If a coal strike should take place, I hope that Congress will realize that the coal operators and not the United Mine Workers of America are to blame.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN COORDINATION IN NATIONAL-DEFENSE EXPORT EMBARGO—RUSSIAN SHIPPING IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on March 27 I spoke briefly but earnestly to thank the Philippine government for its expression of readiness and eagerness to cooperate with our Government in making more effective our national-defense scheme insofar as it relates to the Philippine sector.

The Philippine expression was made public on March 25 by Mr. ELIZALDE, the Philippine Resident Commissioner, following press dispatches from Manila that copra and coconut oil, vital materials usable for war purposes, have been moving in increasing quantities from the Philippines to Vladivostok, Russia, thence presumably by the Trans-Siberian Railway to Central Europe.

While the matter of how effectively to implement the Philippine-American cooperation and coordination is under consideration, I wish to inform the House today that abaca or manila hemp is being shipped to Vladivostok where it was hardly seen before and Japan is taking much more than its normal imports of the fiber. Manila hemp, according to our Government, is one of the twenty-odd strategic raw materials. It is the basic component of rope which is used in our Navy. The Philippines has a natural monopoly on it, and since we do not produce it the President has not listed it in the export-control proclamations.

As I consider this matter urgent at this time, I asked for a memorandum on it from a leading authority on Philippine-American economic matters, Mr. Vicente Villamin, who is also well informed on many other economic questions. Working on my request yesterday, Sunday, he was able to assemble the following interesting data which, although he himself says is incomplete, is enough to give a good clue to the situation. He writes:

Two days ago, March 28, the Russian steamer *Smolni* sailed from Manila for Shanghai and Vladivostok with a cargo of more than 5,000 bales of hemp.

In the first half of February, last month, the Japanese steamer *Asama Maru* took directly to Vladivostok 500 bales from Manila.

During the last half of January the Japanese steamer *Kamo Maru* had a cargo of 964 bales for Vladivostok.

In the calendar year 1940 Japan imported from the Philippines 106,138 bales more than she did in 1939.

There are regular steamship services between Japanese ports and Vladivostok, Dairen, Manchukuo, and other ports on the northern littoral of east Asia.

For the purpose of comparison, the Philippines in 1940 exported a total of 1,344,004 bales, of which 471,790 went to the United States, 387,747 to Japan, and 307,639 to the United Kingdom.

It is logical to expect that during the current year exports to the United States will decrease substantially, while exports to Japan will increase enormously.

The United States Navy is buying some of its rope requirements in Manila, and it is generally understood that the plan is to have a stock pile of that strategic commodity.

There is a Philippine government-owned corporation dealing in hemp and, in harmony with the government-directed cooperative system, is trying to improve the quality of the product and to support and extend the participation of Filipinos in the industry, particularly since the Japanese are becoming stronger and stronger in that field.

The natural monopoly of the Philippines on manila hemp has not been broken despite the intensive scientific efforts in various countries.

Cooperation in a practical manner between the Philippines and the American rope manufacturers seems highly advisable, even urgent, in view of the Japanese inroads and advantage due to their position of vertical integration in production from raw material to finished product and in transportation and marketing.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize some of the points in the memorandum, to wit, that manila hemp for the first time in the past few months, is going in sizable quantities to Russia, and that Japan in 1940 imported over 100,000 bales more than she did in 1939 and that the prospects are that the shipments to Japan and Russia are bound to increase very appreciably.

In the fall of 1935, I visited the hemp-producing Province of Davao in the southern part of the Philippine archipelago. I was deeply impressed by the natural beauty and fertility of that vast region and the predominance of the Japanese in agriculture and commerce. I must confess I came away from Davao filled with anxious thoughts as to the future of the Philippines under its own flag.

Mr. Speaker, if the Philippine government should place an embargo on certain commodities in its desire to cooperate with our Government in national defense, such action would naturally involve a sacrifice on the part of the Philippine producers and exporters of those commodities. Of course, such

sacrifice would precisely be the same as the sacrifice that producers and exporters in the United States make, of the hundreds of commodities placed under export control. We are all facing an international emergency that requires us to make sacrifices in order that our greater interests might the better be protected and conserved. Nevertheless, in token of our appreciation of the good will and cooperation of the Filipinos in these stirring times and to bolster their morale and strengthen their economic sinews, I very earnestly hope that our Government will explore sympathetically all possibilities of making the sacrifice as light as possible, if it cannot be entirely avoided, to all our people and the Filipino people. Upon this vital point I shall quote in the latter part of my speech from a statement by Mr. Villamin which, I think, is worthy of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, not only manila hemp, copra, and coconut oil are being shipped to Japan and Russia, but manganese and iron ore and other vital materials are moving in that direction. In 1940 more than 1,000,000 tons of good quality iron ore were shipped from the Philippines to Japan. The bulk of chrome, however, comes to the United States.

As the situation stands today, with the Philippines not having a coordinate export-control law, with our own law not in operation there, and with the President's proclamation issued thereunder excluding the Philippines from the list of banned countries, there is no way, so far as I am informed, of stopping the importation into the Philippines of the embargoed commodities from the United States and other countries and their reexportation to Japan and Russia and points beyond. This phase of the situation has not been touched upon before and I suggest to the Governments of the United States and the Philippines that it be looked into without delay. No part of our export-control program should be permitted to be defeated, weakened, or circumvented by any lack of comprehensive examination of all its ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, a convinced and confirmed Republican, I am an American first and foremost, and when it concerns national defense, particularly during an international emergency, my partisanship gives way to my nationalism as it is wisely interpreted and faithfully implemented by the adverse party in power. The subject I am discussing today commends my fundamental Americanism and my willing nonpartisanship and I give the Roosevelt administration my cordial cooperation in the formulation of a program of export control that would bring the Philippines within the circle of effective cooperation with the United States as the Filipinos so laudably desire.

Mr. Speaker, reverting to the question of copra and coconut oil which accelerated the movement toward the coordination of Philippine and American actions under the export-control program, I wish to give the basic facts as gleaned from a study made by Mr. Villamin to form as a guide for our future action. Among other things he says:

On November 5 last the steamer *Margaret Johnson* with 5,018 tons of copra, and on November 17 the steamer *Colombia* with 5,355 tons of copra and 338 tons of coconut oil sailed from Cebu, P. I., to Vladivostok, Russia. I have not looked up the registry of these vessels.

On February 3 the Russian steamer *Uelen* carried 5,800 tons of copra from Cebu to Vladivostok. (Note: The average extraction of coconut oil from copra is 63 percent.)

The Japanese soap industry normally uses only about 13,500 tons of coconut oil a year to produce about 200,000 tons of soap, but she is importing much more than that quantity from the Philippines, the Japanese Mandated Islands, and various other sources.

It is believed, although even approximate figures are not available, that Japan ships coconut oil to Vladivostok in sizable amounts.

Just before the war Germany imported a total of 172,000 tons of copra from all sources, of which 104,000 tons came from the Netherlands East Indies. In 1940 Germany was able to import only about 15,000 tons from the Netherlands East Indies. Hence the efforts with the aid of Japan and Russia to bring in copra and coconut oil from the Philippines and other sources.

The Netherlands East Indies as a wartime measure are keeping copra from going to Russia or Germany. It is reported that copra accumulating in the Netherlands East Indies can and will be stored in those Holland possessions for as long as 5 years. When peace comes and this copra is released on the world's markets it will affect the international structure of fats and oils. This situation bears watching closely.

Russian ships in unknown numbers are scouring the South Seas and the ports of countries on the rim of the Pacific Ocean for copra, sugar, and other foodstuffs as well as minerals and take them to their home port of Vladivostok, paying for their purchases in cash.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to state that on March 10 the President of the United States, by proclamation, acting under section 6 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," placed 12 commodities under export control, among them being copra, coconut oil, fatty acids, glycerin, palm-kernel oil, and palm kernels.

The effect of this proclamation is to stop the shipments of these commodities from the United States to Japan and Russia. But—and let me make this clear—shipments from the Philippines are not barred because there is no Philippine embargo law and our Export Control Act is not effective in that country.

What precipitated this proclamation was, I understand, the shipment of 25,199,332 pounds of coconut oil from a port in California to Vladivostok last February. Let Mr. Villamin tell that story that carries the tang of mysterious ships from far-away places laden with strategic cargoes and manned by strange persons. He writes:

Early this February, out of the thick fog that enveloped the Golden Gate, the Russian steamer *Aserbaidjan* dropped anchor in San Francisco Bay and unloaded at the port of Oakland a cargo of copra; and after it was converted into coconut oil at a nearby oil mill, the same steamer pumped the oil, about 8,000 tons, into her tanks and then she set sail for Vladivostok.

Soon after another Russian steamer, the *Minsk*, arrived, and, after following the experience of the first vessel, sailed for Vladivostok with 14,000 drums of coconut oil. It was reported that she also took on 500 tons of coffee, 2,000 barrels of palm oil, and from the port of Portland, Oreg., a shipment of platinum worth $500,000.

These are tramp ships manned by Soviet men and women, the women not being restricted to the jobs in the steward department, but function as mechanics, radio operators, deck hands, and navigators. The ships look weather-bitten, dirty, disheveled, and disreputable, but they must have sturdy engines and resourceful crews to cross and recross the broad expanse of the restless and turbulent Pacific.

I raise the query: What about the lifting of the "moral embargo" on Russia in an effort to detach that country, if possible, from the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis? If this "moral embargo" is still lifted, strictly speaking, Russia could still get coconut oil and copra and other things from the United States. It is my belief that priorities, local needs, and such like will prevent Russia from continuing her purchases of commodities under embargo in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, very pertinent to the present subject and discussion is the signing by President Roosevelt a few days ago on the yacht *Potomac* in the Florida waters, to go into effect on April 15, of another proclamation placing under export control the entire catalog of commodities in the field of fats and oils, numbering more than a hundred.

While this action has been expected by the trade all along, it was accelerated, according to Mr. Villamin, by the heavy and significant shipments of lard and glycerin to Japan from the United States which a year ago, or even 6 months ago, were negligible. During the last 3 months the United States shipped to Japan over 7,018,000 pounds of lard and more than 3,686,000 pounds of glycerin. Over 1,000,000 pounds of lard were sent to Russia. I am informed by him that our Government experts are alive to these things and are grappling with the problems that arise with skill and patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, as I intimated in the first part of my speech, I shall, after quoting him factually, quote Mr. Villamin, giving his personal opinions and suggestions, and before doing so I wish publicly to thank him for making available to us a connected, clear, and careful exposition of the subject of export control and its relations to the Philippines. Mr. Villamin says:

In applied economics I like to consider myself a fundamentalist. I am interested in the maintenance and expansion of Philippine-American trade. But over and above that, I am interested in the coordination and strengthening of Philippine-American efforts to render more effective the cause of national defense. The Philippines, out of gratitude and loyalty to America and as a measure of national self-preservation, should respond cheerfully to any sacrifice that America may ask or hint. The President of the Philippines has advised the National Assembly that he has "assured the Government of the United States in behalf of the Commonwealth that the entire Philippines—its manpower and material resources—are at the disposal of the United States in the present emergency."

I understand that there is under consideration by the American Government, at the suggestion of President Quezon, that some $50,000,000 may be appropriated by Congress to promote Philippine national defense. This sum is made up of two items, the dollar-devaluation profit and the sugar-processing tax, whose payment to the Philippine Gov-

ernment was authorized several years ago when and if appropriated by Congress. As the maintenance of the economic welfare of the people is a factor in national defense, it is respectfully suggested that if the Philippines is to stop shipping a part of its exports to certain countries under a local export-control law some sort of compensatory plan be devised to minimize the sacrifice. That's all I desire to say, and I wish to stress that I consider that plan as a secondary, even tertiary, consideration in the present emergency. The first consideration is an all-out cooperation with the United States by the Philippines with all the sacrifices that it requires.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the spirit that permeates Mr. Villamin's statement, above quoted, and I think his suggestion deserves our most earnest attention.

Before concluding, I wish to repeat the point I made on March 27, that if the Philippine government desires on its own initiative and volition to pass an export-control law it could and should act under the Tydings-McDuffie Act by passing the enabling act, and then sending it to the President of the United States for his approval. Such an act would, I think, be approved by the President. Yes; he would welcome it, and thank the Filipino people for it.

By that method the Philippines, on the one hand, would be acting voluntarily, and, on the other, the American Government would not be infringing upon the local autonomy of the Filipino people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes more to bring up the matter of Russian shipping in the Pacific, which I dare say may have more significance in the present international situation than we may attribute to it. The Russian ships, numerous and mysterious, are active around the Pacific Ocean gathering foodstuffs and industrial materials. No one knows how many ships enter Vladivostok, whether it has not actually become one of the busiest ports in the world today, and how heavy is the traffic on the Trans-Siberian Railway, which connects directly with Polish and German railroads.

The subject matter is worthy of immediate study by our Government. Japanese shipping, of course, is in some manner connected with it, and both of them are material in the survey of comparative naval and maritime positions in the Pacific.

I wish, therefore, to quote from the notes of Mr. Villamin who said that he found some intriguing information about Russian ships and shipping in the Pacific in the course of his examination of Philippine and American trade matters. He states:

> Last year there was an average of one Russian ship a month that called at the ports of Washington, Oregon, and California and before that Russian ships were rarities.
>
> But during the last 3 months more than a dozen Russian ships called at Pacific coast ports. Some of them were reported to be the following with their Lloyd's tonnage ratings: *Smolni*, 3,767; *Minsk*, 5,949; *Kim*, 5,114; *Batum*, 6,236; *Transbalt*, 11,439; *Michurin*, 3,908; *Tbilisi*, 7,169; *Dekabrist*, 7,363; *Angarstroi*, 4,761; *Aserbaidjan*, 6,100; *Voroski*, 4,000 (?); *Askhasbad*, 5,000 (?); *Donbass*, 5,000 (?).
>
> According to conservative estimates, based on statements of the proper Soviet Commissar in 1938, the Russian merchant marine today has a total tonnage of about 1,500,000. It is believed that some 400,000 tons of that are on the Pacific side with Vladivostok as the principal rendezvous.

Mr. Speaker, I wish again to suggest that our Government look into the matter of Russian shipping in the Pacific for it may turn out to be essential to our commercial and strategic interests. Pacific Ocean affairs and things are very entrancing and the poems and stories of Robert Louis Stevenson have endowed them with the inexpressible mysticisms of life; and who knows if these ghostly Russian tramp ships gallivanting from isles to isles and from atolls to atolls with crews of men and women have not gilded the saga of the Pacific with new mysteries and new challenges? [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke on the floor of the House on the question of coordination of effort of the United States Government in handling the defense program. Since then I have had occasion to talk at length with Commissioner ELIZALDE, member of the Insular Affairs Department of the Government, and the Department of Commerce, and I have been thoroughly convinced that Commissioner ELIZALDE and Mr. Rojas, one of the Philippine officials who is carrying great responsibility during the illness of President Quezon, are doing everything in the world they can to coordinate their efforts and cooperate with the President of the United States in handling the very serious problem of Philippine exports, especially as they relate to fats and oils in the form of copra and refined coconut oil, and manila hemp, or what is known in the trade as abaca.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOEHNE, for 1 day, on account of important business.

To Mr. RANDOLPH, for 1 day, on account of important business in West Virginia.

To Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. GILCHRIST), indefinitely, on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. LECOMPTE (at the request of Mr. GWYNNE), for 3 days, on account of the death of a relative.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 317. An act for the relief of Monroe Short; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lieut. J. B. Edgar, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 941. An act for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, J. T. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 994. An act to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other dispositions of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to prevent depletion of the stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes, to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1104. An act for the relief of William A. Wheeler; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican; and

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican; and

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 1, 1941. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 2500 and S. 324, relating to a bridge over the Wabash River at New Harmony, Ind.

There will be a meeting of the petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 1, 1941, to resume hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, April 3, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1037, to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families. Open hearing.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Wednesday, April 9, and Thursday, April 10, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day—resume hearings on H. R. 3359 and H. R. 3360, relating to preventing publication of inventions and prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents, respectively.

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions), relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

384. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment" (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 30), as amended June 2, 1939 (Public, No. 109, 76th Cong.), so as to provide compensation for donors of blood for persons entitled to treatment at Government expense whether or not the donors are in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

385. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indiana Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor," approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 606); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

386. A letter from the chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a copy of the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America (H. Doc. No. 17); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

387. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of awards for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

388. A letter from the vice chairman, Temporary National Economic Committee, transmitting the final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMTTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TREADWAY: Committee on Ways and Means. Part II, minority views to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the inter-American coffee agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 330). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4216. A bill relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. (Reported March 28, 1941, pursuant to the order of the House of March 27, 1941.)

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 113. Resolution for the continuation of the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 15, a joint resolution to investigate the apparent monopolistic purchasing of pulpwood by pulp and paper mills under a contract purchase system from farmers and other owners, price fixing of paper and other pulp products under trade practice rules and regulations, including cost of distribution; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the construction and maintenance of overhanging walks on the highway bridge, route No. 36, at Highlands, N. J., for public use; without amendment (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4105. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character; with amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4107. A bill to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Marchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4167. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3809. A bill for the relief of Stephen Kelen; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3730) granting a pension to Homer H. Haws, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4223. A bill to make strikes against the United States and against the national-defense program during the present emergency constitute treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4224. A bill relating to the manning of certain vessels of 500 gross tons and less; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4225. A bill relating to the manning of certain sail vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 4226. A bill to provide for the construction of a Coast Guard cutter designed for ice breaking and assistance work on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4227. A bill providing for an appropriation and payment to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, for money for highways and bridges in aid of national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 4228. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section authorizing, for the purpose of detecting or preventing certain crimes, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, when specifically authorized by the Attorney General of the United States, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications; and making such authorizations and communications, and testimony concerning same, admis-

sible evidence; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARRABEE:

H. R. 4229. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4230. A bill to give persons honorably separated from the military and naval forces and the Coast Guard preference in appointments to civil-service positions concerned with the national defense; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4231. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4232. A bill to amend paragraph 757 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase duty on filberts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4233. A bill to authorize flood-control works on Tombigbee River and tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 4234. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to January 1, 1930; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4235. A bill to change the name of Santa Fe Dam, Los Angeles County, Calif., to the Duarte-Azusa Dam; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 4236. A bill to provide for and promote the general welfare of the United States by supplying to the people a more liberal distribution and increase of purchasing power, retiring certain citizens from gainful employment, improving and stabilizing gainful employment for other citizens, stimulating agricultural and industrial production and general business, and alleviating the hazards and insecurity of old age and unemployment; to provide a method whereby citizens shall contribute to the purchase of and receive a retirement annuity; to provide for the raising of the necessary revenue to operate a continuing plan therefor; to provide for the appropriation and expenditure of such revenue; to provide for the proper administration of this act; to provide penalties for violation of the act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 4237. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River near Nolan, Mingo County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4238. A bill to prescribe fair standards of duty and procedure of administrative officers and agencies, to establish an administrative code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 4239 (by request). A bill to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. R. 4240. A bill to repeal the provisions relating to compulsory removal from the rolls of Work Projects Administration workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4255. A bill to amend Public Act No. 505 (H. R. 24145, approved March 4, 1911); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution for the relief of the Indians in California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 162. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 163. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the export of certain materials; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. Res. 164. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the national-defense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 165. Resolution authorizing the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 258 of the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 166. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. Res. 167. Resolution authorizing the expenses to conduct the investigation authorized by House Resolution 113; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to make H. R. 970, a bill to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activities a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 169. Resolution to make H. R. 971, a bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 1, relating to the construction of livestock trails in the national forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 12, with reference to Executive Order No. 905; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 14, with reference to silver and the Silver Purchase Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8, with reference to a special stamp in commemoration of the memory of the late Senator Key Pittman; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated March 13, 1941, with reference to a program of military highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated March 24, 1941, with reference to legislation concerning Aerovias Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 2, house file No. 1319, with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, with reference to establishing a seaplane training base at American Falls Lake; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution 17, with reference to building farm-to-market roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, concerning the Niukluk River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 9, that the name of the old illustrious battleship *Oregon* be changed to the name *"Illustrious Oregon"*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4241. A bill granting jurisdiction to the United States Board of Tax Appeals to reopen and readjudicate the case of William B. and Madeleine B. Haffner; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of the Corbitt Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4243. A bill for the relief of Berl F. York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4244. A bill to place David J. Gilmer on the retired list of the Army with rank of captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of the Lawson Coffee Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late Hugh McGlincey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Helen Mary Nichols; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of William Frank Coman Nichols; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 4250. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to Roland Boucher, in recognition of his bravery and heroism in rescuing

five children from drowning in Lake Champlain; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4251. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. R. 4252. A bill for the relief of Raymond Trammell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. O. Danneberger; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

611. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 1, relating to the construction of livestock trails in the national forest; to the Committee on Roads.

612. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N. Y., urging immediate consideration by the Congress of the Townsend national recovery plan as set forth in House bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

613. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Federal Bureau of Roads to liberalize the regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the various States for the purpose of building farm-to-market roads and to particularly liberalize the rules limiting the highways upon which such funds can be expended for the improvement thereof; and that the various States through the appropriate authority created by them for that purpose and in Iowa particularly, the State highway commission, rather than the Federal Bureau of Roads, be given more authority to supervise the expenditure of such funds as may be allocated to a given State for the construction of farm-to-market roads than they previously have had; to the Committee on Roads.

614. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Bronx Woman's Club, Bronx, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to free postage franking privilege to the armed forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

615. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., urging the Federal Government to appropriate funds, for defense purposes, for military highway construction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

616. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Assembly and Senate of California, memorializing the Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

617. Also, resolution of the City Council of Los Angeles, memorializing the Congress to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, October 11 to be General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

618. By Mr. GAVAGAN: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, concerning the building of military highways; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

619. By Mr. HOUSTON: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, condemning discrimination practiced by certain employers in Kansas, who are now or hereafter engaged in industries essential to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Labor.

620. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Memorial of the Ninety-fourth General Assembly of the State of Ohio, directed to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives, asking that the social security law be amended so as to secure for the blind more adequate relief than is granted to the blind in the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

621. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Detroit Board of Commerce, Detroit, Mich., concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

622. Also, petition of the Citizens Committee for Government Arts Projects, New York City, concerning continuance of the arts projects of the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

623. Also, petition of the Maritime Commission of the Port of New York, concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

624. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the California Stripper Well Association, requesting Congress to so amend the Venezuelan Trade Agreement Act so that petroleum excise taxes should be excepted from its operation and the authority of Congress over these excise taxes and imports be resumed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

625. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, stressing the need for additional highways and traffic arteries in and around Los Angeles city because of the defense activities and asking the President and Congress to make available money for immediate construction of such roads, highways, and arteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

626. By Mr. LEWIS: Senate Joint Resolution 10 of the senate and house of representatives of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, urging that the Congress of the United States adopt Senate Resolution 82, to the end that a thorough and complete investigation may be had of the facts and circumstances surrounding the order for the abandonment of the narrow-gage railroad between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex., and the eventual cancelation of this order; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

627. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of the General Assembly of Iowa, urging early consideration and passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

628. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., urging the Federal Government to appropriate funds, for defense purposes, for military-highway construction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

629. Also, petition of the Virginia Dare Extract Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support and passage of House bill 3383, to amend section 2800, chapter 26, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

630. By Mr. TALLE: Memorial of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa, urging that the Congress of the United States amend the Federal Housing Act or enact new and appropriate legislation to make available to farmers, and especially to farm tenants who are without farms, governmental aid equal to that afforded to urban residents, in order that they may be able to obtain sufficient land and decent homes in which to live and maintain their families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

631. By Mr. WELCH: California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, memorializing Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

632. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Monongahela Valley Industrial Union, Charleroi, Pa., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

633. Also, petition of the State board of agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to a study of the migratory labor problem from a national viewpoint; to the Committee on Rules.

634. Also, petition of the Board of county commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. Also, petition of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. Also, petition of the University of Richmond, Va., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 929 and House bill 1640, concerning a youth reference service in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

637. Also, petition of the Baptist Bible Institute, New Orleans, La., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for the control of conditions in the vicinity of training camps for soldiers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

638. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, Pennsylvania, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to our military and naval trainees from exploitation in the vicinity of the Army and Navy Establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, March 31, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who art ever patient with us, even though we do but bring to Thee the story of our years stained with sin and failure, and as we contemplate the disorder of our lives, we can but dread the piercing look of Thy holiness: Draw us unto Thee by a longing which no fear can chill, no sin can wither, and do Thou abide with us as Master of our conscience, Strengthener of our will, Fulfiller of our hope, that henceforth we may be wholly Thine.

Suffer us not to sink in blank dismay before the greatness of our debt to Thee and to our fellow men, but summon, Thou, our powers, enabling us to serve and count no sacrifice too great, no burden too heavy, if thereby we can be a benediction to all with whom we come in contact, even the humblest of Thy children.

We ask it in His name who said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me," even in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, March 31, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Overton
Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Glass	Reed
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Russell
Bankhead	Gurney	Sheppard
Barbour	Hatch	Shipstead
Barkley	Hayden	Smith
Bilbo	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Byrnes	Lodge	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Murdock	Wallgren
Danaher	Murray	Wheeler
Davis	Norris	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DECEASED SENATORS AND UNVEILING OF HUEY LONG STATUE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a number of Senators have passed away since we held the last memorial service for deceased Members of the Senate. I shall not list the number of Senators who have died since that time; but it is obvious that the time has approached when we ought to set aside one day for the purpose of holding a memorial service for the Members of this body who have died during the past 2 or 3 years. I have consulted with Senators who are interested in the matter; and I give notice that unless something unforeseen intervenes, we shall hold a memorial service for deceased Senators in this Chamber on Friday, the 25th of April.

In that connection, the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON and Mr. ELLENDER] desire me to state that on the same day the State of Louisiana will unveil a statue of the late Senator Long in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, and that they hope to be able to deliver in the Senate Chamber on the occasion of the memorial service the addresses which they otherwise would have delivered in Statuary Hall.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Lions Club of Fairfield, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to place a definite ceiling on profits made by national-defense industries, also legislation to eliminate strikes in the defense industries by protecting workers who desire to work by employment of the armed forces of the United States, if necessary, in the interest of the Nation; to the Committee on Finance.

An assembly joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Assembly joint resolution relative to memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact legislation giving to draftees and others entering the military and naval service of the United States adequate insurance protection for themselves in the form of permanent total disability insurance as well as life-insurance protection

"Whereas from 1919 up to and including October 8, 1940, persons entering the military and naval service of the United States were given the privilege of applying for United States Government (converted) life insurance, including the permanent total disability features thereof, which protected the soldier himself; and

"Whereas Congress in the passage of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, provided in section 611 of said act that 'no United States Government life insurance shall be granted hereafter to any person under the provisions of section 300 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended'; and

"Whereas the National Service Life Insurance Act does not provide permanent total disability benefit features or protection for the soldier himself and protects only the dependents and near relatives of the soldier; and

"Whereas it is estimated that 90 percent of those hereafter entering the military and naval service will be without dependents, and therefore not in need of such insurance but are in need of insurance with permanent total disability features protecting the soldier himself; and

"Whereas experience during and since the World War has adequately proved and demonstrated the merits of permanent total disability features of Government insurance, particularly as relates to the so-called misconduct cases, which are noncompensable for both compensation and pension, thereby taking care of those unfortunates who would otherwise be thrown upon the local communities for care and sustenance; and

"Whereas it appears that in the passage of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, including section 611 thereof which prevented further application for United States Government life insurance with total permanent disability features thereof, those persons, including National Guard units entering Federal service after October 8, 1940, were discriminated against and were denied the privilege of taking out United States Government (converted) life insurance with permanent total disability features thereof, whereas those persons, including National Guard units entering Federal service prior to October 8, 1940, were allowed and permitted to take out such insurance; and

"Whereas we believe in order to give to every commissioned officer and enlisted man and every member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and the Navy Nurse Corps (female) when employed in active service under the War Department or Navy Department, proper protection for themselves and their dependents, the United States should again permit such persons, including draftees, the opportunity to apply for and be granted either national service life insurance or United States Government (converted) life insurance with permanent total disability features as now constituted: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby memorializes and petitions Congress to enact legislation which will provide that such persons so entering the military and naval service of the United States, including draftees, shall be given the opportunity of taking either national service life insurance or United States government (converted) life insurance, including the permanent total disability features thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved* that a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Nevada in Congress be urged actively to support such legislation.

"STATE OF NEVADA EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

"Approved March 24, 1941.

"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor*."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Government in Congress assembled; to the Secretary of the Navy and to the Civil Aeronautics Authority:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas there is located in Power County, State of Idaho, American Falls Lake situated near the town of American Falls; and

"Whereas the transcontinental line of the Union Pacific Railroad runs through said town and across Snake River at the site of the American Falls Dam; and

"Whereas the said American Falls Lake is adequate in size and depth for a seaplane training base of the United States Navy, having the transportation and power facilities needed for such a base; and

"Whereas said American Falls Lake, American Falls Dam, and American Falls power plant can be used as a refueling base for

emergency landings of seaplanes on transcontinental flights; and

"Whereas American Falls Lake, together with the transcontinental railroad and power site is adequate for the establishment and maintenance of a naval training base for seaplane pilots and is ideally located for such a base, having such natural and other advantages, and that the construction cost would be comparatively small and that the strategic value in the defense program of such a base established at American Falls Lake would be invaluable: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Navy and the Civil Aeronautics Authority to establish a seaplane training base at American Falls Lake; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho, be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward a certified copy of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Civil Aeronautics Authority."

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A Senate joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Senate joint resolution memorializing Congress to provide that all silver, whether newly mined, domestic, or secondary, should be purchased under Silver Purchase Act and proclamation made thereunder

"Whereas the Federal Government has established a policy of purchasing newly mined silver which has proved beneficial to the Federal Government as well as to the silver-producing States; and

"Whereas confusion has arisen as to the construction and interpretation of the term 'silver mined from natural deposits in the United States or a place subject to the jurisdiction thereof'; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of miners and mining producers that such congressional acts and proclamations issued thereunder should be construed to include silver obtained from mine dumps, tailing ponds, from ore taken from abandoned mines, and silver obtained from slag dumps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That Congress be memorialized to amend the Silver Purchase Act so as to clarify the same, and that the term 'silver mined from natural deposits in the United States or a place subject to the jurisdiction thereof' shall be construed to mean any silver obtained from mine dumps, tailing ponds, slag dumps, and silver ore taken from abandoned mines; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each of the United States Senators from Nevada, and to the Nevada Representative in Congress.

"STATE OF NEVADA EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

"Approved March 26, 1941.

"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor*."

An assembly joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact amendments to the Social Security Acts to require that all costs of public assistance furnished to the members of the several Indian tribes be paid by the Federal Government, and to adjust the matter of relieving Indian-owned property in the State of Nevada from taxation

"Whereas the western movement of the American and increase in population of the United States has forced and caused the American Indians to give up their homes in the Eastern and Middle Western States and to migrate to the several Western States, including the State of Nevada, and as a result the several Indian tribes are no longer a national problem, but have become a problem peculiarly applicable to the Western States wherein they reside; and

"Whereas the American Indians have always been considered wards of the Federal Government and have been protected and regulated by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the American Indians in the State of Nevada are classified, considered, and determined to be citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas as such citizens of the United States they are entitled to all the benefits, privileges, and immunities of laws of the United States, and in particular those certain congressional acts relating to social security; and

"Whereas the Indian Service has purchased lands throughout the State of Nevada for the use and benefit of the American Indians domiciled in this State, which said lands are exempt from taxation; and

"Whereas the amount of taxable property in the several counties has been materially reduced, as a result of such purchases by the Indian Service in the amount of 1,000,000 acres, which said acreage constitutes a very large percentage of the best agricultural land in the State of Nevada, resulting in the withdrawal from the tax rolls of the State of Nevada of something in excess of $2,000,000 of taxable property; and

"Whereas the American Indians in this State do at the present time contribute but a small proportion of their just share of taxes in this State; and

"Whereas an unjust burden has been placed upon the people of the State of Nevada through their being required to contribute to the support of the American Indians, as required by the Social Security Act; and

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Board has recognized the unjust burden which has been placed upon the peoples of the several States, in that it has recommended to the Congress of the United States that all public assistance, which includes the aged, dependent children, and the blind, insofar as it deals with the American Indians, be paid wholly by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to amend the Social Security Acts so as to provide that all costs of public assistance which includes the aged, dependent children, and the blind, insofar as it directly affects American Indians, be paid by the Federal Government, but that all matters relating to the administration of such Social Security Act shall be detailed to the State welfare department, heretofore created for the purpose of administering such acts, and that the Federal Government pay to the State welfare, departments of the several States a sum equal to 10 percent of all funds so disbursed to the American Indians, as and for costs of administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That the people of the State of Nevada feel that this inflicts a hardship upon the taxpayers that was not intended by the Government of the United States, and that an adjustment between the withdrawal of revenue and the payment of pensions to Indians would be fair to the taxpayers of the State of Nevada and the Government of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to our Senators and Congressman at Washington, D. C., and that copies of this resolution, certified by the proper officers of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, be transmitted to the several Western States.

"STATE OF NEVADA EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

"Approved March 26, 1941.

"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor*."

By Mr. KILGORE:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"House Resolution 38

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act

"Whereas the chief industry of West Virginia is the mining and producing of bituminous coal; that more people are engaged in and dependent upon this industry for a livelihood than any other industry of the State; and

"Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States House Resolution No. 101 and Senate Resolution No. 32, the object of which is to extend for a period of 2 years from the expiration date thereof, April 26, 1941, the terms and provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act, commonly known as the Guffey Act; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the membership of this House that the terms and provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act should be extended in order to promote the bituminous coal industry: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That we recommend to the Congress of the United States that the terms and provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act be extended as provided by said Resolution Nos. 101 and 32, and that we respectfully recommend that the Members of Congress from the State of West Virginia support the terms and provisions of said resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; to the table:

"House Resolution 39

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass House Resolution No. 2082, providing for a system of Federal inspection of coal mines

"Whereas the leading industry of the State of West Virginia is the mining and producing of coal, that more people are engaged in and dependent upon this industry than any other industry in West Virginia, that there is now pending before the House of Representatives of the United States House Resolution No. 2082, the object of which is to establish a system of Federal inspection of coal mines; and

"Whereas we believe that the enactment of this resolution will save the lives of many coal miners who are engaged in the hazardous employment of mining and producing coal; and

"Whereas this measure was originally introduced, sponsored, and passed in the United States Senate through the efforts of Hon. Mansfield M. Neely, now Governor of West Virginia, while a Member of the United States Senate: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That it is the sense of this body that House Resolution No. 2082 be enacted into law, and therefore we recommend its passage. Also that we commend the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of West Virginia for their earnest efforts in trying to promote the passage of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens, employees of the Annapolis (Md.) post office, praying for the enactment of the so-called Mead bill (S. 220) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the States of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed St. Lawrence River development plan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions of the Board of Commerce and the Retail Merchants Association, both of Detroit, and the City Commission of Gladstone, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the adoption of the proposed St. Lawrence River development plan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of sundry citizens and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tuscola County, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the Townsend district council for the Second Congressional District of Kansas, Fort Scott, Kans., favoring the enactment of pending legislation embodying the provisions of the Townsend recovery plan for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Salina, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ALLEGED RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES — RESOLUTION OF KANSAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask consent to have printed in the RECORD House Resolution No. 43, adopted by the Kansas State House of Representatives on March 21, 1941, together with a letter of transmittal from the secretary of state of Kansas protesting against alleged discrimination against colored people by North American Aviation, Inc., at its bomber-assembly plant in Kansas City, Kans.

I wish to state that I share entirely the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and greatly deplore discrimination as apparently is the policy of the company, as set forth in the resolution.

It has been declared to be the policy of the Government, in handling national-defense projects, that workers shall not be discriminated against because of age, sex, race, or color. There are no more loyal, patriotic, and industrious citizens in the United States than the colored people. It is little less than a crime for any management receiving Government contracts, and consequently receiving money furnished by the taxpayers, to lay down a policy of discrimination against the Negro. I also express the hope that the Senate of the United States will take early and positive action to end this unfair, unpatriotic, and un-American discrimination on all defense and other Government work.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Topeka, March 25, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor to send you an engrossed copy of House Resolution 43, as passed at the regular session of our house of representatives and which is self-explanatory.

Believe me, Senator, in addition, I am conveying to you my best wishes and highest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

FRANK J. RYAN,
Secretary of State.

House Resolution 43

Resolution condemning discrimination practiced by certain employers in Kansas who are now or hereafter engaged in industries essential to the national-defense program

Whereas it is a fundamental principle of the American democracy that all American citizens are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas it is essential, in order to pursue happiness properly, that every American citizen be given an equal right to work so that he may support himself and family; and

Whereas it is the declared policy of the Defense Commission of the United States of America that "workers shall not be discriminated against because of age, sex, race, or color"; and

Whereas, contrary to such announced policy on the part of our National Government, the president and general manager of the North American Aviation, Inc., which company is to have control and management of the Government-owned bomber plane assembly plant, to be located in the Fairfax district of Kansas City, Kans., did publish in the daily papers of Kansas City, Kans., on March 17, 1941, the following statement, to wit:

"Regardless of Negroes' training, we will not employ them in the North American plant. It is against the policy of the company to use Negroes as mechanics or aircraft workers. We intend to maintain the same policy in Kansas City, Kans.": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we go on record as condemning the unfair and un-American practice intended to be invoked against our Negro citizens of Kansas by the North American Aviation, Inc., at Kansas City, Kans., or any other city in Kansas; and further condemning any and all other discriminatory acts by any employer of this State, now or hereafter engaged in any phase of the national-defense program; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and request the President of the United States to investigate and to correct any and all such abuses; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to have copies of this resolution engrossed and to send a copy of the same to the President of the United States and a copy to each member of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States of America.

Adopted March 21, 1941.

CLAY C. CARPER,
Speaker of the House.
W. T. BISHOP,
Chief Clerk of the House.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 165. A bill to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization; with an amendment (Rept. No. 156).

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 198. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain land located within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation, Mont., for certain land owned by the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, of Missoula Mont.; with amendments (Rept. No. 157).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1200. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; without amendment (Rept. No. 158).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1283. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1284. A bill granting a pension to William Ravenscroft; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1285. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of D. X. Sanders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1286. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1287. A bill to protect American citizens and facilitate their evacuation from countries now at war or within the zone of active hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1288. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria and Washington Railway Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1289 (by request). A bill authorizing the Copper River and Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska, for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 1290. A bill to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to

the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment" (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 30), as amended June 2, 1939 (Public, No. 109, 76th Cong.), so as to provide compensation for donors of blood for persons entitled to treatment at Government expense whether or not the donors are in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution relating to the Temporary National Economic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Jackson Day dinner address delivered by the President on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day dinner address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at Milwaukee, Wis., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day dinner address delivered by Senator TRUMAN at Louisville, Ky., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL JACKSON BEFORE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States, at the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association held in Habana, Cuba, on March 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY HON. MATTHEW F. McGUIRE

[Mr. HUGHES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Jackson Day dinner address delivered by Hon. Matthew F. McGuire, Assistant to the Attorney General, at Wilmington, Del., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA AND THE WAR—ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID A. REED

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former Senator David A. Reed on March 23, 1941, before the Hungry Club, Pittsburgh, Pa., on the subject Is This Our War? which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1941, entitled "Help Greece Now," which appears in the Appendix.]

RETURN OF FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION" TO BALTIMORE

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix an editorial published in the Baltimore Sun of March 20, 1941, and an article published in the same newspaper of March 22, 1941, dealing with the proposal to return the United States frigate *Constellation* to Baltimore, which appear in the Appendix.]

GALLUP POLL ON STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Public Blames Union Leaders for Strikes in Defense Industries, Gallup Survey Reveals," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S VICTORY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Robert F. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, on March 30, 1941, on the subject of President Roosevelt's program for total victory, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA AND THE WAR—EDITORIALS FROM BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Buffalo Evening News of March 20, 1941, entitled, respectively, "No Convoys," and "Watch the Drift," which appear in the Appendix.]

FARM AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS—EDITORIALS FROM WILLISTON DAILY HERALD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald, as follows: March 12, 1941, entitled "A Farmer Writes"; March 19, 1941, entitled "Build for the Future"; and March 20, 1941, entitled "No Jobs for These," which appear in the Appendix.]

RECONCENTRATION OF COTTON, ETC.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, Senate bill 262 was passed by the Senate and sent to the House. The House agreed to an amendment to the bill, and the bill is back here with the House amendment. It has been agreed by the interested parties that the amendment was not aptly stated, so I wish to move to concur in the House amendment with an amendment.

I submit the amendment, which is agreeable to the Members in the House who are interested in the bill. Let the amendment lie on the table for the present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the request made by the able Senator from Alabama?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama has asked that a message from the House, together with a House amendment to Senate bill 262, be laid before the Senate, but as the Chair understands, has withdrawn his request temporarily.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

Mr. REYNOLDS obtained the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to submit an amendment to the pending bill so that it may be considered when the Senator shall have concluded his remarks?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield for that purpose?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not desire to have the amendment considered at once, but I present it so that it may be available, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 1, after the word "possessions", it is proposed to strike out "except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed", and insert in lieu thereof: "except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the House text.

TREATMENT OF AMERICANS ABROAD AND IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am really encouraged and inspired this lovely spring morning to see so many of my colleagues present, and I am happy that I am provided the initial opportunity of reaching their respective ears. I believe that that which I have to say will be of interest to those who are present; certainly I feel that it should be of interest to them, because it is of interest to our country. I desire to address myself now to a subject pertaining to the treatment of Americans who are abroad, and I desire to pursue that subject to the extent of touching upon the subject of restrictive immigration.

I am today introducing a bill (S. 1287) to protect American citizens and to facilitate their evacuation from countries now at war or within the zone of active hostilities. I, of course, am of the opinion that every Member of this body will be interested in this bill, because naturally, without hesitation, I assume they are all interested in American citizens, many of whom are in embarrassing positions in foreign countries. I am particularly imbued with the idea that I shall have the interest of Members of the Senate whether they hear my voice today or whether they read my printed words, because no doubt all have read from time to time articles pertaining to the embarrassing situations in which American citizens have found themselves in Europe, in Asia, and elsewhere, which embarrassing situations have been occasioned by our shipping lines which have refused to bring American citizens to their home shores, and thereby have shown their preference, as a result of pecuniary interest, for transporting to our shores thousands upon thousands of aliens.

I read the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the enactment of this act, it shall be unlawful for the captain of any ship of American registry to take or to retain on board as a passenger to the United States, any subject or citizen of a foreign state unless the United States consul at the port of departure shall certify that at the date of sailing there were no citizens of the United States evacuated from countries now at war, within his jurisdiction, desirous of obtaining passage to the United States and able to pay for such space as may be necessary for their accommodations.

SEC. 2 The Secretary of State shall, upon the passage of this act, instruct all diplo-

matic and consular officers of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and for the communication of its purposes to American citizens residing abroad and seeking an opportunity to return to the United States.

SEC. 3. Any person who shall violate, attempt to violate, or connive at the violation or evasion of any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000, for which sum the vessel shall be liable, and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the offense.

Mr. President, I refer to the bare fact that for many months, surely since the outbreak of war in Europe on September 3, 1939, American citizens themselves, those who have American citizenship, native-born citizens of the United States of America, have in innumerable instances found it absolutely impossible to secure transportation aboard ships flying the American flag, whereas aliens, citizens of other countries, have been able to procure passage, to the detriment, I might say, of American citizens.

I ask that I may be permitted to make a personal reference initially in endeavoring to explain to the Senate just what I mean. I recall very well that in 1939 I was in Paris, and at 11 o'clock in the morning of September 3, Great Britain declared war against Germany, and in the afternoon of the same date the Republic of France followed suit by declaring war at 5 o'clock. I spent approximately 10 days in the city of Paris, the greater portion of which time was spent in the lobby of the American Embassy talking with American citizens, fathers and mothers, and their sons and daughters, who were very much exercised in reference to the condition then existing in Europe, and who were most desirous of returning immediately to their native shores in America.

After several days I finally succeeded in securing passage aboard a ship flying the American flag, and from Paris I drove to Le Havre, where I waited several days more in order that I might be able to board the ship upon which I was to return to the United States. At Le Havre I met many and saw hundreds of American families, fathers and mothers and sons and daughters, some of the families with young children. They were naturally very much disturbed and distressed at finding it impossible to secure accommodations upon the ship flying the American flag, having been advised by the officials of the shipping line that there was no space available aboard the particular ship for their return to their respective homes in the United States.

I was advised, and can without hesitation certify, to the accuracy of the information, that that condition was attributable to the fact that space aboard that ship had been purchased, prior to the sailing of the ship itself, by noncitizens of the United States, by aliens, by refugees. I must confess in perfect frankness that the shipping line was not actually in position to bring about the cancelation of those passages, which had been paid for, and consequently there were aboard that vessel plying across the Atlantic to the harbor of New York in our country several hundred aliens, 90 percent of whom could not speak the English language, persons who came here as refugees, and many who were coming to escape what they thought was going to take place in Europe during the ensuing war.

Mr. President, I think that Americans who are abroad, regardless of the port in all the world at which they may be assembled at this hour seeking return to their native land should be provided preference by the Government of the United States through a mandatory instruction to the effect that where there are Americans anywhere seeking return to the United States aboard a ship flying the American flag, they shall be first accommodated and that the passage of aliens or refugees shall be canceled.

In view of the fact that we are providing subsidies of millions of dollars to shipping lines flying our flag, I certainly think American ships should be caused to provide space for American citizens in preference to providing space for refugees and aliens, who are flocking to this country by the thousands upon thousands every single month of the calendar year.

Mr. President, I believe that certainly this body and the other branch of the Congress of the United States should pause to give just a little attention to the interest and the care and the protection and the accommodation of American citizens. If we can pause long enough to give a little attention to citizens of the United States, whether they are native born or naturalized, I believe that the American people will appreciate it. They recognize that a great deal of our attention has been centered and concentrated upon saving the inhabitants of other countries of the world, and I am sure that if we would take just a little interest in American citizens, and provide a little legislation in their behalf, the American people would be grateful.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the proper committee, and I sincerely trust that it will be given immediate consideration, for if not given consideration at this time, in the months to come it will be too late, because perhaps by then by some means these persons will have been returned to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the introduction of the bill out of order? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in reference to the bill, I have before me a clipping, and judging from the type it looks as though it were from the columns of the New York Herald Tribune. It is entitled "Alien Refugees First?" and is signed by Mr. Daniel J. Mahoney. Dated New York City, March 14, 1941, it reads as follows:

Americans in Lisbon complain of preference to foreigners.

That complaint has been extremely general, and I state without hesitation that, in my opinion, it is well founded. This communication is addressed to the New York Herald Tribune, and I continue reading from it:

If you were an American abroad, calling at your country's consulate or Embassy, and were received, say, by a French doorman, referred to an English clerk, and transacted your business with a former Russian general, you might know something of the minor irritations of life which the average United States citizen has to face in Europe today, besides the larger problems of war, money, and repatriation.

Nearly every returning American usually has some kind of a complaint to register. It may be against the alleged slowness of our Foreign Service, or a branch of a large American business concern, or against some social or welfare organization.

Many of these complaints are probably without serious foundation—the result of war-jarred nerves and general tenseness. Wherever the human element enters into the picture, occasional errors and injustices are impossible to avoid.

That we all, of course, recognize. The letter to the New York Herald Tribune continues:

Yet one complaint frequently made, which this writer has had a personal opportunity to substantiate, is the apparent preference accorded United States-bound refugees over returning American citizens at the bewildered and war-inflated city of Lisbon.

Aboard the steamship *Excalibur*, on which this writer returned from Portugal this week—

That was less than 2 weeks ago—

American repatriates were crowded in dormitories—but immigrants had no trouble in obtaining the best cabins on the ship, even—in one case at least—in preference to a prominent returning United States physician who had been living in London for years and was paying his own way home at the full rate.

Pressure from relatives in America and, sometimes, from official friends in Washington, is frequently given as the reason for such preferential treatment. Yet many Americans feel that an American-owned line, at a time like the present, should not permit political influence to gain shipping priority for immigrants over returning native-born citizens, many of them veterans of the last war.

Scattered in and around Lisbon today are hundreds of Americans awaiting transportation home. Their cost to the American Red Cross—which is doing its work in a magnificent way—must be well in excess of $2 a day a person, for food alone.

It would seem logical, therefore, that the Red Cross and United States Government officials should be anxious to repatriate these Americans as soon as possible to points in the United States where most of them have either funds or friends, and where they can again become self-supporting.

Instead of that, hundreds of Americans continue to live on Red Cross funds in Portugal for weeks, while a large proportion of the berths on west-bound ships is given over to European refugees, hopefully bound for the New World.

The average number of passengers on a west-bound sailing of American Export Line ships is about 200, of which only some 50 are likely to be repatriated Americans. The remainder may be made up of a small number of returning, self-supporting United States businessmen, a few Government officials and anywhere from 80 to 100 foreign refugees.

Now, the representatives of our Government abroad are as fine and upstanding a group of men as can be found anywhere.

I am in thorough accord with that statement.

They are doing an exceedingly difficult job under next to impossible circumstances.

Some Americans feel, however, that while the standards of our Foreign Service are extremely high and satisfactory the same cannot be said of some of the members of the native staff.

To be sure, many of these employees are considered indispensable because of their knowledge of local languages and conditions. But with our consular officers forbidden, as they are, to marry foreign women lest they succumb to foreign influence, it seems odd that such a large part of the routine work in our offices abroad should be confided to foreign hands.

Many Americans feel that this preponderance of native personnel in consular and shipping offices is, in part at least, responsible for the preferential treatment which they claim is accorded at Lisbon to United States-bound foreigners.

In other words, at Lisbon, where today there are certainly hundreds upon hundreds of Americans desiring to secure passage home, preference in the matter of transportation aboard American ships flying the American flag is given to the foreign-born, to the alien refugees who are flocking to our shores, and who are daily taking the jobs which belong to American citizens. I shall briefly return to comment on that last statement during the course of the observations which I shall be pleased to make.

Mr. President, in many ports of the world, particularly in some of the larger Asiatic ports, such as Hong Kong and Shanghai—and I am informed the same situation prevails in Saigon, Indochina—there are today collected thousands upon thousands of refugees, some from Russia but principally from Poland, some from Bessarabia, some from Rumania, and some from parts of the Asiatic continent, who are remaining in those ports for the sole purpose of trying to find an opportunity in some form or manner to reach the United States, where they look for protection during these war days, and where they will seek opportunities which I claim should be preserved for American citizens.

We find today in the metropolis of Shanghai many thousand Polish refugees who are crowding every single vessel upon which it is possible to secure passage bound for a port or ports in the United States of America.

It was my opportunity only last week to talk with a man from Shanghai, who for many years had been engaged in missionary work in the Republic of China. He told me that the ship upon which his party came home to the United States from China was literally packed and jammed with Polish refugees who were coming to the United States. Naturally he made mention of certain conditions aboard the ship. He made reference to the fact that not one of the whole number of Polish refugees could speak the English language, and he spoke also of the inconveniences occasioned as the result of the crowded and, I might add, unsanitary conditions which existed as a result of the packing in of Polish refugees aboard that ship as though they were sardines.

Mr. President, not only do we find this condition existing in the Asiatic ports, but we find it particularly so at Lisbon, for it is my understanding that the only European port from which one may gain steamship passage homeward today is Lisbon, since crossing the Atlantic there now exists but one airship line flying the American flag. Therefore, at Lisbon there has been a concentration of refugees endeavoring to escape from Europe, many of whom have come to the United States only for the duration of the war, to escape any participation in the war, and as a result as I have stated, Americans are left there awaiting the time when all the refugees shall have been brought here, and then Americans may be sufficiently fortunate to secure the passage which they now desire and which they have so long desired.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In reference to the instances to which I have called attention, after yielding for a question I desire to read some clippings which have been furnished me by persons interested in this most unfortunate situation, which has resulted in inconveniencing many American citizens.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question.

Mr. DANAHER. I believe the Senator said that the only port in Europe to which American passenger ships now can go is Lisbon.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I mentioned Lisbon.

Mr. DANAHER. Did not the Senator say that it is the only port to which American passenger ships can go?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is the only port I know of at which refugees and American citizens have been embarking. Recently I heard about a ship having lifted anchor in the harbor of Marseilles, but I have not heard of any other. Marseilles is the only port in the Mediterranean of which I have heard from which ships have come with passengers. As a matter of fact, the ship to which I refer was not on a regular run. I have been told that the one trans-Atlantic American line flying the American flag has ceased regular runs to the Mediterranean ports of Marseilles, Genoa, and Naples.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Did the Senator take up with the Maritime Commission the matter of whether or not there are adequate accommodations for Americans seeking to return?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator that last year upon the floor of the Senate I mentioned the fact that I had directed a letter to the State Department in reference to the preference which had been given to aliens and refugees over American citizens.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr REYNOLDS I am very much obliged to my colleague for directing that inquiry to me, because, as a result thereof tomorrow I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD the correspondence which took place between the State Department and myself in that connection.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to recur to the question which I asked the Senator. Has he taken up with the Maritime Commission the matter of whether shipping in sufficient quantities is available to Americans who want to come back?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I have not taken it up with the Maritime Commission, because I rather felt that it was a matter for the State Department to issue an order to our consular and diplomatic representatives that no alien or refugee who is given a visa shall be permitted to board a ship in preference to an American citizen with a passport.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thought the Senator might like to know that I took the matter up with the Maritime Commission.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very happy to learn that fact, and I should very much like to hear what the Commission had to say with reference to the condition which I have described today.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. I was interested not only in having shipping facilities available to Americans who might like to return, but also in providing transportation facilities for refugees who might seek refuge in this country, which so often and for such a long time in the past has proved to be a haven of refuge. Because I was interested in the situation I wrote to the Maritime Commission to ascertain what facilities were available, and I was advised within less than a week that:

A regular weekly passenger service is being maintained by the American Export Lines, Inc., in the trade in question—

That is from Lisbon to the United States—

while the vessels of the line are being occupied to capacity, as are those of the foreign-flag lines, in view of the general tonnage situation it has not been felt up to this time that the condition was such as to warrant the engagement of additional passenger ships which are now being otherwise employed.

As you are no doubt aware, a number of passenger vessels have been taken over by the Navy Department, as well as by the War Department, and there remain in commercial service but a limited number of ships which would be suitable for the Lisbon service. It might be added that practically all of these ships are also freight carriers and are being utilized for the carriage of strategic commodities from various foreign countries.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does the Commission mention the fact that many of the freight bottoms are being utilized for the purpose of bringing refugees to this country?

Mr. DANAHER. Only in the sense indicated by the reply of the Commission, which I have read to the Senator.

Does not the fact that the Maritime Commission does not see fit to add additional ships to provide additional service practically dispose of the question the Senator has raised?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In that connection I have before me only newspaper clippings. I have nothing of an authentic nature, such as the letter from the Maritime Commission, which has been brought to my attention by the able Senator, in which mention is made of the fact that many refugees have been com-

ing to the country aboard freighters. All the information I have had, either by word of mouth or by letter, from persons who have actually made the passage, is to the effect that in innumerable instances aliens and refugees have been given preference. I can speak personally with reference to one trip. That was the trip I mentioned a moment ago, at the time I came back from Le Havre in September 1939. I happen to know that thousands of American citizens were left there. They could not obtain passage on that ship because passage had previously been engaged by aliens who had paid for their passage. The steamship line advised me that it was powerless to cancel such reservations. As a result, immediately upon my return to the United States, or shortly thereafter, I took the matter up with the State Department, as I have said to the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. My difficulty arises—and perhaps the Senator can dispose of it—from my inability to reconcile the Senator's bill and his argument with the statement of the Maritime Commission that there is no need for additional service, and therefore they will not order it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; the Commission makes that statement. I am very grateful to the Senator. Up until several days ago I received complaints about the conditions which I have mentioned. I shall forthwith take the matter up with the Maritime Commission. If it is not true that there are now in Lisbon Americans who cannot secure passage to the United States, I should very much like to know it; and if it is not true that there are American citizens in other ports, such as Shanghai, which I mentioned a moment ago, with insufficient facilities to bring them home, I should like to know that.

Regardless of that situation, if there is any question about it, why should there be objection to my bill, which proposes that wherever American citizens are in foreign ports they shall be given preference on American ships flying the American flag?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator must not construe anything I have said as opposition to his bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I quite understand that.

Mr. DANAHER. I am trying only to state facts.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. There may be a distinction between stating the facts and opposition.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. I know the Senator wants to provide accommodations, convenience, and preference for American citizens over refugees.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator feel that his discourse is of such interest that he will yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I hardly think so. I am about to conclude my statement. I appreciate the suggestion, but I should rather not yield for that purpose. I thank the Senator just the same.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator has spoken of refugees. I believe the Senator stated that he was interested in refugees. Did I correctly understand the Senator to state that he directed his inquiry to the Maritime Commission in the interest of bringing refugees into the country?

Mr. DANAHER. I do not know what the Senator understood; but what I said was that I am interested in bringing to this country not only American citizens, if they seek passage, but also refugees, particularly those who as political refugees may seek refuge and haven in our country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, right there is where the Senator and I differ. I desire to be perfectly frank in stating that, so far as I am concerned, I am 100 percent against permitting to come to this country the thousands upon thousands of refugees who today are in Europe. I am against letting them continue to pour into this country from month to month, because the first thing we know we shall wake up and find aliens and refugees taking our country away from us as we took it away from the Indians.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am informed—and, I believe, authoritatively—that there are approximately 450,000 refugee Communists in France, whom France does not want, and who desire to come to America, and that persons high in authority in our Government are conniving and planning to bring them to America and, eventually, to the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, nowadays one can hear anything; but I have heard that there is an effort on foot and under way with a view to bringing to the United States several hundred thousand alien Communists in the guise of refugees who are now in southern France. In that respect I have been informed that there are in certain localities in France hundreds of thousands of refugees, a large number of whom are out-and-out rank Communists who came from Russia, from Czechoslovakia, and from Spain, who have been seeking admission to the United States of America. In one of the newspapers I recently read of an organization that was devoting its time and attention to bringing Communist refugees from France into the United States.

That reminds me that in my home town I know a man who participated in World War No. 1, and who emerged as one of its heroes of the air. Participating with him in the World War, and after whom one of the air squadrons was named, was a brother who, unfortunately, was killed while fighting in the World War. The brother, who now lives in my home town of Asheville, N. C., recently returned from France, after its fall; and he advised that the fall of France was largely attributable to its destruction from within, which in turn was largely attributable to the fact that, unfortunately, France had permitted an influx of alien enemies from virtually every section of Europe.

Speaking of refugees, the Senator knows, and those who are desirous of ascertaining the facts know, that every month thousands upon thousands of alien refugees are coming into the United States, and that many of them are coming here under the smoke screen of being visitors or tourists; and the Senator knows as well as I do that we shall never be able to get them out of the United States and get them back to the places from which they came. Why? The answer is simple. The answer is that today in this country we have 4,000 aliens under arrest, under observation, ready to be picked up—those who have not already been arrested—and we cannot deport them because the countries from which they came will not take them back. I have been told that the Senator from Oregon himself has in mind a bill that touches upon that very point.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLMAN. The bill has already been introduced, and has been referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very glad to know that. I think it is high time that we in this country do something about protecting America from within. In making that statement I recall that Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, once said that if this Nation is ever destroyed it will be destroyed from within.

If the American people today are not aware of the danger which surrounds them because of aliens who have come here from every country of the world, who are not in accord with our form of government, who are bent upon the destruction of the United States of America, they will shortly have their eyes opened to the deplorable situation that exists here. I hope that some time the American people as a whole will rise and demand of their Representatives in Congress that the Congress of the United States take action that will clean house, within the confines of our portion of the Western Hemisphere. Any man who interests himself in the preservation of the nationals of other countries of the world gets the attention of the National Congress; but when it comes to deporting alien criminals, alien Communists, alien bundists, alien Nazis, and alien Fascists, when it comes to protecting our own country from destruction from within, it is the hardest thing upon God's green earth to do. My cry in the Senate Chamber, as I have cried for 5 long years—I admit almost with shame—has been but comparable to the voice of a canary chirping in a vast Siberian wilderness.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. I desire to make an observation before I ask a question. I think the Senator is quite wrong about the sound of his voice.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is kind of the Senator to say that. I know, however, that I have talked about the deportation of aliens; that for years I have tried to stop their importation into this country, so that Americans could hold their jobs; that I have tried time and time again to deport alien Harry Bridges, who has caused more trouble in labor circles in this country than has anybody else, and who has almost ruined the west coast, and that my voice has been no stronger, nor has it been heard any farther than the chirp of a canary in the vast Siberian wilderness.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, having in mind the many speeches the Senator has, as he said, made on this subject, many of which have been very interesting, and, I think, worth while, and many which have had my sympathy, as the Senator knows——

Mr. REYNOLDS. The only thing I can do is to continue to try, and I am merely trying to do my part as an American citizen. If I do not succeed, it will not be any fault of mine.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator remember the figures that were made public after the completion of the registration of aliens this year?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I saw those figures, and, as I recall, the actual number who were registered exceeded the estimates which were made by the Labor Department about a year and a half ago when the Senator's bills were being considered by the Immigration Committee by, perhaps, four or five hundred thousand.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The excess was really more than that.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator have any idea how many there are in this country that might not have been registered?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should say that there are today in this country approximately 6,000,000 aliens, that is to say, 6,000,000 noncitizens. In reference to what the Senator has just stated, it is true that when we were fighting during the years to bring about the registration of aliens in this country, the immigration division of the Labor Department stated, as the Senator has just observed, that there were only about 3,200,000 aliens in the United States.

Mr. STEWART. My recollection is that the number was 3,800,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That may be, but it was over 3,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. Perhaps six or eight hundred thousand of that group were in process of being naturalized.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. Then, as the Senator stated, after the registration was completed and it was completed in December, was it not?

Mr. STEWART. As I recall, it was in the month of December.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It showed many thousand more aliens in the United States than the Labor Department had said there were. Those at the head of that division of the Government should have certainly been in a position to have ascertained definitely the number of aliens here.

Therefore, if those who were possessed of the statistics said there were only 3,800,000, then I argue that the other million who registered, and whom they knew nothing about, came into the country illegally.

Mr. STEWART. Since the hearings were held on the Senator's bills, which was about 18 months ago, would it have been possible for that many aliens to have entered this country during that period of time unless they entered surreptitiously?

Mr. REYNOLDS. A million aliens?

Mr. STEWART. I understood the Senator to say a million. I do not have the figures.

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; my argument was—and it is subject to be refuted, of course—that since the Immigration Division of the Labor Department that had their fingertips on the official statistics as to the number of aliens in the country, missed it by about a million, the other million they did not list came into the country illegally. That should not be true; but that is my argument.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly that many could not have entered legally during the last 18 months.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly not. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much for his contribution by way of inquiries and observations, particularly for the reason that I know that, as junior Senator from Tennessee and an able representative of his State, he has for many years been interested in the question of immigration.

To show that I am not biased, let me say that some of our outstanding, finest American citizens are naturalized Americans. There is no difference, as I have explained innumerable times on the floor of the Senate, between an American who is naturalized and one who is born here. I am simply trying by my feeble voice to bring to the attention of the American people the fact that of all times in the history of our country when we should take some action against permitting millions to come into this country from foreign shores, it is now. Why? The war is on; we are in the war; we are a part of the great war machinery that is fighting in Europe today. We have been in that war since we lifted the arms embargo. As the result of our entering the war in October 1939, when we lifted the arms embargo, we expanded industries engaged in the manufacture of war materials and accessories to war, textiles, and all that sort of thing, and, as a result thereof, thousands of structures have been completed in this country since October 1939, when we lifted the arms embargo for the purpose of manufacturing war materials, and so forth. I argue that when the war ends, the thousands of plants and factories in the country today engaged in the manufacture of war materials and accessories will fold up overnight as rapidly as folds up a morning glory when first struck by the sun, the result of which will be what? That there will be walking the streets of America not 15,000,000 people out of employment, as was the case a few years ago, but there will be walking the streets of America, looking for work, between twenty and thirty million American citizens. What will be the condition then? Their trials and tribulations will have been added to, because in competition to them will be millions of aliens and another million in the form of refugees competing and trying to take the jobs of American citizens. That is why I am arguing this question now.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Unless the Senator has already done so, or unless someone else has done so, does not the Senator think it would be worth while to put into the RECORD the figures showing the result of the registration—the figures which were made public by the Immigration Department recently?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I think it would be well; and at this point I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD the estimate made by the Immigration Division before registration and fingerprinting was completed, and immediately thereafter a statement by the Alien Registration Division as to how many they actually found.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXCERPT FROM HEARINGS BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, MARCH 21, 1939

Senator REYNOLDS. The junior Senator from the State of Tennessee a moment ago brought to my attention a letter which he received from the witness.

Senator STEWART, do you have with you the letter which you brought to my attention a moment ago?

Senator STEWART. Yes.

Senator REYNOLDS. This letter is written with particular reference to the number of aliens in the United States, and I would like to ask him this question at this juncture, since an estimate has been made. This letter is dated March 16 and contains this statement:

"In the absence of the Commissioner, I wish to advise you that the Department now estimates approximately 3,800,000 aliens in the United States at the present time."

That is over your signature?

Mr. SHAUGHNESSY. Yes.

STATEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Attorney General Robert H. Jackson today announced that Earl G. Harrison, former Director of Alien Registration, had transmitted to him a report covering the work of the Alien Registration Division from July 15, 1940, to January 15, 1941.

Mr. Harrison resigned as Director of Alien Registration on January 15, but has since been serving as a consultant on a voluntary basis.

Summarizing the activities of the Division during the 6 months of its existence, the report stated:

1. The first complete inventory of America's noncitizen population was successfully completed with a minimum of hostility and embarrassment, thus marking another cooperative effort by the Federal Government and local communities to avoid hardship and misunderstanding in the application of a new law.

2. During the 4-month registration period, August 27 through December 26, 1940, there were registered 4,741,971 aliens in continental United States and 100,511 in the territories, exclusive of 48,620 alien seamen and 23,038 foreign consular officials and employees.

3. Although the total number of persons who registered was over a million in excess of the original estimate of 3,600,000 noncitizens, the report points out that thousands of persons registered either because of doubt as to their citizenship status or because of difficulty in proving their citizenship. All such persons had been advised to register for their own protection.

4. In Mr. Harrison's opinion, the number of aliens who failed to register "is not substantial."

5. A complete index of all noncitizens will be available around July 1, 1941.

6. The tremendous task of getting receipt cards to registrants is rapidly being completed. Cards are now being mailed at the rate of 80,000 a day, while the F. B. I. is clearing fingerprint forms, which it examines for acceptability, at the rate of 50,000 per day.

7. Friendly cooperation of the American and foreign-language press, radio, periodicals, motion pictures, social agencies, and patriotic, business, fraternal, and labor organizations throughout the country was largely responsible for completion of the registration program with a minimum of misunderstanding and hardship.

A map in the report, showing a preliminary break-down of the noncitizen population as revealed by the registration figures, indicates that approximately 37 percent of the Nation's alien population is concentrated in two States—25.7 percent in New York and 11.1 percent in California.

The break-down also shows that 3,891,478 noncitizens, or 82 percent of the total alien population, reside in the following 10 States:

		Percent
New York	1,212,622	25.7
California	526,937	11.1
Pennsylvania	361,475	7.6
Massachusetts	356,028	7.5
Illinois	319,385	6.7
Michigan	290,730	6.1
New Jersey	270,973	5.7
Texas	204,450	4.3
Ohio	196,214	4.1
Connecticut	152,664	3.2

In discussing the number of persons who registered because of doubt as to their status, the report points out that already the Department has been requested to remove registration cards from the files because citizenship has been, or is claimed to have been, established and that unquestionably more such requests will be received. Mr. Harrison's opinion that "the number of aliens who failed to register is not substantial" is based on reports received from social and other agencies as well as official estimates.

Plans for a thorough, detailed check-up of the registration are now in process. The follow-up will include a careful check of information given by registrants, particularly as to the legality of entry into the United States. For this purpose, the report explains, it is planned to check each registrant's name against port-of-entry records. This work is being mapped out in cooperation with the W. P. A., and the first verification project, in New York City, is now getting under way.

Although no complete index of noncitizens will be available before July 1, according to the report, there has already been begun an examination of 200,000 forms as a sample statistical break-down. This may provide typical preliminary figures before that date.

The report discusses the tremendous difficulties encountered at the beginning of the program and outlines some of the problems created by the Nation-wide registration. With only 6 weeks of preparation, a new division was organized within the Department, space and equipment provided, and 40,000,000 forms of all types printed and mailed to post offices before actual registration began.

The report discloses that as of January 15, 1941, approximately 2,500,000 receipt cards had been sent out from Washington to registrants. This phase of the program is expected to be completed by March 1, at which time every registered noncitizen will have received his receipt card as evidence of registration. Cards are now being mailed at the rate of 80,000 per day.

Another major problem discussed in the report is the clearance of fingerprint forms by the F. B. I., which examines them for acceptability. Because of the lack of experience on the part of many post-office clerks in handling the fingerprinting, the rate of unacceptable forms was highest at the beginning of the registration period. Through January 14, 1941, the F. B. I. cleared the tremendous total of 2,338,000 fingerprint forms, returning only 110,000 as unacceptable. At present, the report reveals, the F. B. I. is clearing more than 50,000 such forms a day, with complete examination and clearance of all such forms expected by April 1, 1941. Meanwhile the rejected fingerprint forms are being returned to post offices and the aliens affected are being called in for new prints.

In connection with the registration and fingerprint clearance phases of the program, the report gives full credit to the Post Office Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for their excellent cooperation. In an introduction to the report, appreciation is also expressed for the assistance rendered by the Government Printing Office, the Census Bureau, the Treasury Department, the Office of Government Reports, and the Work Projects Administration.

The report points out that a great deal of emphasis was placed on public relations, so that every noncitizen would be informed about the Alien Registration Act and so the program could be carried out in a friendly, American spirit. Great credit is due, the report says, the American and foreign-language press, periodicals, radio, motion pictures, social agencies, and patriotic, business, fraternal and labor organizations for the success of the program.

Mr. STEWART. The figures disclose, I believe, as the Senator said a moment ago, that there were at least several hundred thousand aliens in the country more than the estimates disclosed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; several hundred thousand more.

Mr. STEWART. My recollection is that in the city of New York alone there are about a million and a quarter aliens, which is a rather startling figure.

Mr. REYNOLDS. New York City, the metropolis, was once described as the "melting pot of the world," but it is no longer a melting pot, because assimilation has been impossible, attributable to the tremendous and phenomenal influx of aliens. I am taking the time of the Senate today to talk about this matter because I do not know of any subject of more importance to our country than the subject relating to the protection of the American citizen.

Now that we have given billions and billions of dollars to the protection of people upon foreign soil, why am I not privileged at least to consume a little time and to ask for a little attention to the poor Americans who have to pay for every bit of it? That is the way I feel about it.

I do not feel called upon to apologize to anybody. I am merely taking up a little time on a matter which I think is in the interest of the people of the United States, and why should I not do so? All our interest has been focused over yonder, on the poor people of England and France and Czechoslovakia and Rumania, and every other alien upon the face of the earth away over in Asia; and I am trying for once, just for this brief period during the afternoon of April 1, to return our attention to our people at home. The American people say that now that we have given all our money to the peoples of other countries, they wish we would at least think and talk a little bit about them. We still have people living in America. Not all the people of the world are in Europe; not all of them are in Asia. I say that this is the time for us to consider this matter, for we shall have a tough proposition on our hands when the war in which we are now participating is over.

I repeat, from twenty to thirty million citizens of the United States are fighting for jobs; and what are we doing? We are contributing to their sorrows. We are daily contributing to their difficulties. Why? Because every single alien whom we permit to enter this country will be right here fighting for a job in competition against an American citizen.

One of the Senators a moment ago said there was enough water transportation for American citizens. Let us see about that. Here is a clipping that I have, sent to me by somebody who believes about this question as I do. It is headed:

Georgic—

That is the name of the ship—

Georgic slips in; has 587 refugees.

My heart goes out to the refugees; but if they do not stay over in Europe and fight, why do we in the United States have to take care of all the refugees of the world? There are other countries. Why cannot the refugees go to South America? Why can they not go down into South Africa? There are cities there, such as Cape Town and Johannesburg, and other great metropolises, which are as large and have as gorgeous edifices as the cities in America. Why does everybody have to come to the United States?

I see in the Chamber at this moment the very able and distinguished Delegate from the vast frontier of Alaska. There is a bill pending now to do what? To permit the refugees to take charge of Alaska. I am against the bill. I was against it last year. I am thankful that I was on the committee which held public hearings on the bill. I am thankful that I had something to do, I hope, with defeating the bill. There is another bill pending that would permit the refugees of the world to take over the 590,000 square miles of Alaska. I am against that bill, because I want to save the vast Alaskan Territory, which is almost as large as all the States east of the Mississippi River, for the present and oncoming generations. That is our last frontier.

I am simply pro-American. I feel that I should endeavor to take care of the citizens of the United States, and to preserve opportunities for them before I endeavor to take care of the peoples of

other nations of the world and to give to the peoples of other nations of the world the opportunities that belong to American citizens and their children. I am ready and willing to debate that question with anybody, anywhere, at any time. I believe the American people are getting sick and tired and disgusted with our giving all our attention to saving the people of other nations of the world, and giving all our money to the people of other nations of the world, when we ought to be looking after the people of the United States. I am thinking about what is going to happen to them immediately when this war is over.

Let us see how aliens are now coming into the United States. I continue with this article:

The gray shadow that slipped out of the fog at quarantine yesterday morning was the Cunard-White Star liner *Georgic*, first British passenger vessel to arrive since the *Western Prince* was sunk off the Irish coast on her return voyage last November 21.

The 27,759-ton luxuary liner left Liverpool January 31 with 587 passengers, a crew of 449 and a convoy of 4 destroyers and a light cruiser. The convey stayed with her 3 days.

SHIP HAS CHARMED LIFE

Since her last visit here in April, the *Georgic* has led a charmed life in the British transport service. She evacuated soldiers from France and Norway, carried troops to Iceland and Egypt, crosse' the equator four times.

Twice she was bombed by German air fleets but each time she escaped unscathed.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. STEWART), whose attention I have now, that he convenience and serve us both by securing the figures to which he referred, so that they may be inserted in the RECORD at the point suggested a moment ago.

Mr. STEWART. I think I can do that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very much obliged to the Senator if he will do so.

The article continues:

Among the passengers were Ernest Cunningham, a survivor of the *Western Prince* disaster, and Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Fulton, who had a similar experience on the *Napier Star* in December. Cunningham is going to Brazil, and the Fultons home to Australia.

MANY JEWISH REFUGEES

Most second- and third-class passengers were Jewish refugees who had been waiting a year or more to get here. There also were a number of seamen brought here to man ships purchased by Britain.

On board, too, were 13 American aviators returning from Bermuda, where they had flown American-built bombers to be loaded on freighters for the R. A. F.

A moment ago I spoke about the refugees from foreign countries assembling everywhere to get into the United States. They want to come here. The article I am about to read is from some newspaper. The type looks like that of the Washington Evening Star. It is entitled:

HABANA CALLED WAITING ROOM FOR REFUGEES—SPANISH LINER BRINGS SOME WHO STAYED 3 YEARS BEFORE GETTING UNITED STATES VISAS

Habana has become the waiting room for the hundreds of refugees fleeing German persecution who await visas to live permanently in the United States, according to passengers arriving yesterday on the Spanish liner *Marques de Comillas*.

They want to live here, not temporarily but permanently.

There were 181 passengers debarking from the liner, of whom 150 were Jewish refugees, including scores who had waited 6 months to 3 years before they obtained quota visas to live here permanently.

There were elderly bearded refugees who had tearful reunions with mature children and grandchildren when they debarked at the Columbia Street State barge pier in Brooklyn. There were younger refugees eager to take out first citizen papers so that they could enlist in the United States Army.

They are coming over here to fight. Why did they not enlist over there to fight?

Many of the refugees had boarded the ship at Vigo, Spain, and at Lisbon, but the greater number embarked at Habana.

The potential American soldiers included a former Hungarian tank corps lieutenant, who is a great-great-grandson of Felix Mendelssohn, the composer. He is George H. Mendelssohn, 36-year-old composer of jazz music and a wood pulp expert, who hopes to enlist soon. He fled Budapest 4 months ago because of the absolute domination of Hungary by the Nazis, he said. His father, Dr. Alfred Mendelssohn, is an American citizen living in Budapest, and by virtue of his father's nationality, Mr. Mendelssohn formerly was a citizen of the United States. He lost his citizenship when he remained in Hungary and served in the Hungarian Army, he said.

THINKS ARMY WILL BE NEEDED

"I shall declare my intention of becoming an American citizen so that I can enlist," he said. "It is good that your Army is expanding, for I think you will have need of your Army. I also think that a person has to do his duty for the country that offers the possibility to live as a freeman."

He explained further that he believed Hungary would enter the European war and that he could no longer stay there under the growing Nazi domination.

He fled from Hungary to Bombay, India, where he was not permitted to debark because of a technicality. Later he sailed from Piraeus, Greece, to Lisbon via Gibraltar on the Greek steamer *Eleni*. This ship was torpedoed several weeks ago, he said. He saw no damage at Gibraltar. There were 60 British merchant ships there while the *Eleni* was refueling, he said. He boarded the *Marques de Comillas* at Lisbon.

One of the refugees from Habana was Osso von Eyss, Viennese Jewish playwright, who arrived with his blond wife. He had fled in 1933 from Austria to Paris.

CALLS HABANA WAITING ROOM

Mr. Von Eyss, who is Otto Eisler in private life, was in a French internment camp for 6 months. By employing various disguises he escaped, fleeing to North Africa and thence to Cuba. He had waited 6 months in Habana. He will become an American citizen, he said.

"Habana is the waiting room for America," he said, pointing out several refugees on the ship who had waited there 3 years. They would not discuss their experiences. A few months ago there were at least 3,000 refugees from Nazi-conquered countries in Cuba seeking admission to the United States, he said.

Also among the refugees were Professor and Mrs. Ernst Broeur, who said that Pope Pius XII had assisted them to come here. Mrs. Broeur is a novelist.

Professor Broeur is of German-Jewish ancestry, and his wife is a gentile. When the present Pope was Papal Nuncio to Poland he had visited Professor Broeur's parents several times at their estate in Silesia, Mrs. Broeur said.

Others arriving on the *Marques de Comillas* included Miss Ellen Straus, 19-year-old German-Jewish student of dentistry, who was interned in France for many months, and 10-year-old Juliette Mizraki, arriving with relatives to join her father in Columbia. Miss Mizraki came from Casablanca wearing a blue hat with a band marked "Dunkerque" on it. She said that thousands of these hats were being sold in Casablanca.

Mr. President, there is a young gentleman in the city of Washington who writes most fluently and most knowingly and informingly in reference to this refugee question. I shall read extracts from a couple of his articles relative to immigration and deportation; afterwards I shall ask unanimous consent that they be printed as a whole in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my notations. Let us see what he says. This is an article by Mr. Igor Cassini, who writes daily for the Times-Herald. I read:

Of all the plagues which are now afflicting this country, one of the worst, I fear, is that of the refugees who have come here "for the duration." Most of these refugees are not poor, shiftless immigrants, but people with enough cash to live in de luxe hotel suites, buy costly clothes, and spend their nights in the most fashionable haunts, eating delicious viands and gulping champagne. With their own stomachs well filled, these elegant refugees are the first ones to shout and protest that no food should be sent to the starving peoples of Europe. How magnanimous! How charitable! How brave! It is easy for a fellow who has just had a succulent meal to tell his friend, who is begging for a piece of bread, that for the sake of humanity he (the friend) should tighten his belt one more inch and not eat for the day.

With due and notable exceptions, most of these refugees are all active members of the notorious clique of international opportunists. They have no country or faith, and are ready to swear allegiance to a new flag and credo at the first opportunity. When they saw that Europe was collapsing, they did not stick to their guns or to their words, but fled in a hurry, duly preceded by their fat bank investments and accounts. Now they have come to this country, where they vociferously air their views and their indignation at Americans, because the Yankees have not yet gone to Europe to save the interests of that decadent European caste.

The nerve. The gall.

For America most of these refugees feel no faith or love. They just are here because they find it the most comfortable place to be. They are outspoken in their criticism of us dopes. But if they saw that this country was becoming too hot for them, they wouldn't stick and fight. As they did from Europe, they would flee—probably to South America.

When I speak of these refugees I don't mean the poor but honest, freedom-loving immigrants who have come from Europe to these hospitable shores since the country was founded. For of all people, who would I be to speak? But I mean the members of royal families who could not stand with their people, the politicians who could not face the responsibilities, the bankers and industrialists who could not stand to see their fortunes cut, and the cowards who could never stick to their own country. For the poor, unhappy people of Europe I have only the deepest, most sincere sympathy.

I now read another quotation from the column of the same gentleman:

Personal observations: When they lock up Nazi agents or send "fifth column" suspects away from the United States, it's fine. It's even understandable why they handcuff two

German officers who have escaped from a Canadian prison camp and give them back to the Canadian authorities—although it is actually against all international law rules. But if all this is comprehensible in today's state of affairs, it is not comprehensible why noted Communist agents are left free to operate, though both State Department and the Justice Department know well about their activities. After all, there is no reason why we should like Stalin better than Hitler.

Jan Valtin, alias Harry Krebs, for instance, stays in this country unmolested. He is the man who wrote that spine-chilling best seller, Out of the Night, in which he tells of his harrowing experiences as a revolutionist paid by Moscow, and how he got the beating of his life at the hands of the terrible Gestapo. In that book Krebs openly confesses that he tried killing a man in this country, for which he was sentenced for several years in prison; that he entered the United States illegally; and that he was a member of the Communist Party, a party pledged to spread revolution all over the world and to overthrow this Government by force.

He is referring to that great intellectual, that author, who is even now in this country. The article continues:

These are three reasons for which Valtin should be deported. There are three or four more reasons which entitled Valtin either to deportation or to a long jail sentence. But Valtin, or Krebs, is still here, going freely from place to place. Reportedly, he is now absorbed in the writing of another book, which a noted New York columnist said recently would be an "even stronger" weapon for democratic defense than Out of the Night.

What? Is Valtin now working for democracy? For me he's nothing but an ex-Communist. His presence here is considerably more suspicious, I believe, than that of the ex-Princess Stefanie Hohenlohe-Schillingsfurst, a silly, gossipy woman, yet Valtin is supposed to have been given a special certificate with the signature of Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

Mr. President, I have another clipping to which I wish to refer. It reads:

REFUGEES CROSS OCEAN IN SPACE USED FOR CATTLE

Two holds usually occupied by cattle or other cargo were the accommodations for more than half of the 640 refugees who arrived yesterday on the overcrowded Portuguese ship Serpa Pinto, which docked at Stapleton, S. I.

Among the arrivals were Edith Jungmeier, Berlin textile designer, and American-born Joy Hanon-Saxl, violinist, who has been abroad for 11 years, most of the time in Germany.

Many of them voiced loud complaints, although the captain produced a scroll signed by 200 of the arrivals attesting to their satisfaction.

Those who brought pets kept them tied to the iron supports of the double-deck bunks, they said. During fair weather most of the passengers slept on deck.

Each hold was divided into three compartments, accommodating 132 passengers each. At the entrance, plaques read:

"Certified for 132 fourth-class passengers when not occupied by cattle, cargo, or other encumbrance."

Despite the crowding, 170 persons who had booked passage had to be left behind by orders of the Portuguese Government. Some of the passengers said they had paid bribes to get aboard.

My friend from Connecticut a moment ago stated that on inquiry at the Maritime Commission he was informed there was plenty of accommodation for people coming to the United States; yet this article says that—

"Despite the crowding, 170 persons who had booked passage had to be left behind by orders of the Portuguese Government."

Mr. President, I have taken the time of the Senate to discuss certain matters. A moment ago I made mention of my interest in the American workingmen and the people of this country generally, because I felt that after the end of the present war there will be twenty to thirty million people out of employment, and it is my personal opinion that we should try to help Americans before we help any others. Is it true that it is difficult to obtain a job now in the United States? Even today, while we are engaged in the most gigantic defense program that any country in the history of all the world has ever known, people are actually fighting for jobs in the United States. Is that true? Let us see. I have in my hand a clipping from the New York Daily News, of which Capt. Joe Patterson is the editor and publisher. That newspaper has the largest circulation of any newspaper in the world. The issue from which I read is of date March 7, 1941. I read from it as follows:

At 9 a. m. yesterday, Charles Rubin got the chance for which he had been waiting 21½ hours. A chemist and C. C. N. Y. graduate, he was allowed to apply for a $15-a-week city job as a laundry helper.

Behind him—

Listen to this, Mr. President. Behind that chemist and New York City College graduate who sought a $15-a-week job, which is about as much as a plumber or an electrician gets per day now—

Behind him were 2,500 men and women, many of whom had been waiting almost as long.

It was 11:30 a. m. Wednesday when Rubin, who lives at 1844 Crotona Avenue, Bronx, arrived at the fire department repair bureau at 38-12 Queens Boulevard, Long Island City—sometimes called the Fire College.

1,000 JOBS OPEN

There, the civil service commission was to receive applicants for 1,000 jobs in 3 classes—hospital laundry helpers at $780 a year; hospital cleaners, who get maintenance and $480 a year; and hospital kitchen helpers, who work 4 hours a day and get $360 a year.

It was first come, first served.

The article then goes on to tell about the long lines of people extending for blocks and blocks waiting for an opportunity to get a job. The closing paragraph is as follows:

Although current jobs are limited to 1,000, the list will remain open 4 years, so that even those in the 5,000's may have a chance.

Think of it, Mr. President, 5,000 persons seeking those jobs.

Mr. President, I wish to say in conclusion that I sincerely hope the bill I have introduced today will receive some consideration, and that the committee to which it will be referred will give it immediate attention, for it is my belief that American citizens, refugees in foreign ports who are seeking return passage to the United States, should be given preference, insofar as homeward passage is concerned, over aliens and noncitizen refugees who are seeking admission into this country.

Mr. President, we hear much about Nazi activities in the Central and South American countries. Last fall I was in every country of Central and South America studying hemispheric defense, hemispheric solidarity, and endeavoring to ascertain what our opportunities were for increase in trade from now on, or certainly after the end of the war, and making inquiries in regard to subversive activities as conducted by agents of the Axis Powers, German, Italian, and Japanese.

I found that the people of the Central and South American countries have placed about their respective countries a band—almost a steel band—so securely welded that very rarely do they permit any aliens to enter their countries. That band, recently welded more securely than ever, is attributable to the fact, as I was told, that 1 out of every 25 refugees, aliens who had been coming into the respective Latin-American countries south of the Rio Grande, was a Nazi or Fascist agent. I have heard it said in the United States that 1 out of 25 or 50 persons coming to the United States from other countries is a Nazi, Fascist, or Communist agent. That is something which most certainly we must guard against for our protection.

Of course, in the Western Hemisphere, where we are endeavoring to create solidarity, endeavoring to bring about hemispheric defense, we are interested with our brothers south of the Rio Grande in seeing to it that no persons shall come to the ports or the shores of the Western Hemisphere who are not in accord with our fundamental ideas of democracy.

Mr. President, all I ask is that some legislation be enacted which will protect the American people against inroads being made by the great hordes from Europe who are flocking to this country and with whom American citizens will unquestionably be called upon initially to compete, and finally to contend.

Another reason why we should guard the entrances to our portion of the Western Hemisphere is because we are now engaged in the construction not only of adequate national defense but the construction of a perfect national defense and in order to be able to do that without interruption, without experiencing sabotage, it will be necessary not only for us to guard those who are engaged in that work against any subversive activities, but to see to it that no foreign agents from now on may enter our portals so they may be provided the opportunity of disrupting our national-defense program.

Mr. President, I am delighted at the opportunity, therefore, of registering my words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I shall continue in my feeble way from time to time to consume the time of this body to speak my sentiments, which I believe to be in the interest of the American people, with the prayer and the hope that some day the American people themselves may awaken as to what is happening to them, before they are destroyed by the foreign elements who are seeping gradually but surely, daily and nightly, into our country.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a most timely, informative and interesting article by the pen of Mr. G. Allison Phelps of Hollywood, Calif., entitled "Immigration and America's European Complex."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND AMERICA'S EUROPEAN COMPLEX

Recently, while lying in bed a great number of hours each day, with an ice pack over my appendix, I had the opportunity to listen to many radio programs. And I was not only surprised but a bit alarmed to hear the propaganda being broadcast to encourage the American people to accept into this country a flood of refugees from the war-stricken nations of Europe. The propaganda has slopped over now from the radio into many of our newspapers.

To hear, or read, some of this propaganda you'd think there didn't exist within our ranks one citizen who was a natural-born American.

To hear some of this propaganda you'd think the only bright men and women existing in the United States today, were men and women who had been shipped over here from Europe on cattle boats when they were sweet little boys and girls.

To hear some of the propaganda you'd think the only men and women who had become great humanitarian leaders in America, great painters, great musicians, great merchandisers, great writers, great picture stars, great comedians, were those who had come to America as persecuted refugees, fought through poverty and despair and ridicule as they learned to speak English, and achieved success because of the high caliber of their characters and the noble quality of their European ancestry.

"Hooey!" says one who has a bit of red, American Indian blood in his veins. And he further says: "Down with this movement to propagandize gullible and supersympathetic Americans into a willingness to permit those with a virulent European complex to admit hordes of refugees into this Nation."

Let us look at this matter from a cold-blooded business standpoint instead of from under the pressure of emotional heat.

For 10 years there has been an average of 10,000,000 unemployed men and women and young people in America, existing on a measly dole. During these past 10 years the population of the United States has been increased by 10,000,000 inhabitants. It is estimated that some 2,000,000 aliens hold jobs in the United States. Other hundreds of thousands are being supported by our taxes. And more and more aliens are pouring in as fast as the law allows.

Why, with the citizens of America struggling with a terrific economic problem, unable to properly care for their own destitute, should they be forced to supply free room and free board and free clothing to hundreds of thousands—yes, millions of the citizens of other nations who have had billions of dollars with which to prepare for and with which to wage war, but not a cent to pay their debts to us? Why should American men and women and boys and girls be vainly walking the streets looking for jobs, while aliens occupy the jobs they need? Why is it that Americans should be called upon to pour more hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of supplies to Europe again, especially when millions of our own citizens are living like half-starved animals in circumstances and conditions in which a decent man wouldn't expect a mangy dog to be able to exist?

Why is it that some of our elected, or officially or self-appointed leaders are so anxious to pour millions of dollars' worth of merchandise, donated by already heavily burdened Americans, into certain European countries, and to have the United States extend millions and millions of dollars' worth of credit to those nations? Could it possibly be that those self-appointed American leaders and big businessmen have financial interests in those countries, financial interests which mean more to them than does the welfare of their own Nation and the welfare of their own fellow citizens?

We are told that it would be awfully nice if a lot of us would adopt foreign-born children at this time, and thus get them away from the European carnage and the famine which is to come, and which we are told we must take care of with food we must raise to control it. In the meantime how about our own hundreds of thousands of American-born American children who are half-nourished, ill-clad, existing in poverty-stricken homes, victims of the indifference of those who have this strange European complex which makes them look right over the heads of the sufferers in their own neighborhood and extend generous help to strangers? Or are they strangers? Perhaps they are relatives that these Americans suffering with the European complex would like to get over here to give American jobs or to support with the money of American taxpayers.

Have refugees from Europe been brought to the United States and given jobs in American concerns? When we ask that question of some American businessmen we know are using alien laborers, we are told, "Oh, a few." It would be interesting to know exactly how many they mean when they say, "A few."

And as far as I am concerned, I don't believe even one alien refugee should be given a job in this country until every single citizen of the United States who can work, and needs work, has work. I don't know how you feel about it, but that's the way I feel about it.

As we Americans have staggered under this load of unemployment and misery for 10 years (this time), the people of Europe have laughed at us, and sneered in our faces, and told us how well they have done, and how they have kept all of their workers supplied with jobs, while our millions were suffering poverty and want on a dole. Perhaps, if we had not been so generous 20 years or so ago with the braggarts of Europe; perhaps if they had paid us what they owed us; perhaps if their citizens who ran away from their shores and found jobs on ours had remained at home, where they belonged and where we should have forced them to remain by tightening our immigration laws; perhaps if we had not had so many Americans with European complexes among us, we would not have had 10,000,000 unemployed to support and there would have been no depression in America.

Because America was established by refugees, by immigrants from across the Atlantic, some 320 years ago at Plymouth and because we are proud of the independence our forefathers won and of the Republic they founded, it is taken for granted that we will accept into the structure of our present-day America any and all breeds of humans from the gutters of European nations, or from the castles of European "collusionists," who have made themselves so unbearable with their greed and vulgarity to the inhabitants of those nations that they must run to this great land of the free or perish.

And it is to be noted, and not just as a passing thought, that, though they have called us fools and Shylocks and incompetents, those in power in Europe, they always come "bellyaching" to us for help when their own greed and stupidity and intolerance have gotten them into trouble and they are so busy cutting each other's throats that they don't have the time or the wherewithal to take care of their own dependents.

Thousands and thousands of American boys and girls have been graduated from American schools this year and now are in need of work. Where can they get jobs? How are they going to establish themselves so that they can get married and found homes and live normal, happy lives?

Don't you think it would be much smarter on our part to solve this problem of our children before shipping the children of foreigners to our shores and trying to solve theirs? Or are you, too, a victim of the European complex? Or have you a tenth cousin over there to whom you can give a job if you can get him over here (with his wife and European children) and discharge an American father to make room in your business for the alien?

And speaking of bringing European children into the United States—are those who are so anxious that America's immigration laws be scuttled so that refugees can pour in here from Europe just as anxious to bring in refugees from the war-stricken areas of China? And if not, why not? I've never heard of any great Nation-wide movement among bankers and motion-picture producers and stars, and other representatives of moneyed interests, directed to evacuate Chinese children from regions in China that have been bombed by the Japanese. Aren't little Chinese boys and girls worthy of the Christly mercy and generosity of these sympathetic, warm-hearted American humanitarians who have suddenly popped up in our midst?

What kind of hypocrites are these we have among us, anyway?

But this is not a question of whether or not it is right to evacuate children from war zones. We know it is both human and right to do so, whether they are the children of rich Europeans or the children of poverty-stricken Asiatics. The question is, When their own fatherlands have colonies and possessions to which to send them, should our immigration laws be scuttled and such refugees be permitted to pour into the United States, a nation already deeply in debt, with millions unemployed and hundreds of thousands of its own children living miserably, dependent upon charity which has been totally inadequate to care for them properly?

No. Let's not add to our own heavy burden. Let's keep out of this country hordes of refugees from either Paris, Palestine, Portsmouth, or Peking.

Anyone who says I do not sympathize with the European men and women and boys and girls who have been afflicted by the wars of their masters, is speaking an untruth. But I am wholly, completely, and utterly opposed to having America used as the soup kitchen of the world, especially when the soup we are feeding our own hungry masses has been so badly diluted that it contains little nourishment now for American citizens who must eat it or perish.

Recently in a grocery where we have traded some, a new clerk came to work, and a young American who had held the job a long time was let out. The new clerk was unable to speak one word of English. He was used to keep counters filled as goods were taken from them by customers. Following inquiry, I discovered he had arrived in New York from a foreign country less than 2 weeks before he was put to work in this grocery store, and the fellow who had held the job the alien was given was let out. I wondered if an American boy went to England, or to France, or to Germany, or to Italy, or to Palestine would find a company willing to give him a job in less than 2 weeks after he landed among foreigners, especially if one of their own citizens had to be discharged in order to make room for him. Multiply this incident of which I have spoken thousands of times and you will have a faint idea of what is going on in America, what has been going on for some time, and what we are being prepared to accept in ever-increasing size. It is my opinion—and this is not an humble opinion, but a very hard, cold, analytical, and definite opinion—that the American people should put a stop to such proceedings and register their complaints in no uncertain terms with

those engaging in such activities. In my opinion—and again this is not an humble one—the American people should demand a tightening of immigration laws and insist that they be rigidly enforced. It is high time we started shipping undesirable aliens out of this country, back to the lands from whence they came, rather than opening our doors wider to the entrance of more aliens to gobble more American jobs and more American food and clothing and money.

We have plenty of talent in America to create enough high-class comedians and musicians and architects and motion-picture producers and motion-picture actors and actresses and writers and store clerks and delicatessen owners and radio broadcasters and dress and suit and shoe and cheese and bologna manufacturers to keep us going for a while without importing such geniuses from Europe to educate to the decent American way of living and conducting business, which way 99 percent of them never do come to understand, even though they are privileged to live in free America the better part of their lives.

Perhaps when the people of the Unitd States are made sick enough at their stomachs by the activities of these foreign importations, and their own American Judases who suffer from the European complex as well as from greed and hypocrisy and international vulgarity, the American people will regurgitate and get rid of this mess that is becoming coagulated in the American stomach and causing grief in the entire American body, social and politic.

The flying of the American flag and outbursts of patriotism manufactured to fool the American public, and hypocritical appeals to their sympathies and to their sense of justice, cannot long camouflage traitorous purpose. For though the American people are broadminded and friendly, they are not as stupid as some foreigners and some with the European complex imagine them to be. And I, for one, do not believe they are going to stand for this continued importing of aliens who are coming in here to take the jobs of Americans, to eat the food of American taxpayers, and to further corrupt our Americanism with the fever of fanaticism, the rash of racial hatred, and the gangrene of greed.

Never has this Nation been so deeply in debt as it is today. This is no time either to adopt a horde of European war orphans whose own parents have relatives and colonies to which to send them, and as much ability to support them as we have, or to permit the dumping on our shores of more hundreds of thousands of refugees who will take the jobs of American working men and women, reduce the American standard of living, and contribute more of misery than of mirth, more of ignorance than of intelligence, more of viciousness than of virtue to the structure and to the character of American life.

Why should we accept the responsibilities of nations in Europe when we can't even take care of our own decently?

I am considered to be an impractical idealist by many hardheaded, commercial-minded individuals. But it seems to me that if we go into debt some $40,000,000,000 attempting to prime the old spark plugs of our engine of industry, and fail to end unemployment in this country, fail to properly care for our own destitute, then it is far from practical to bring more starving hordes into America to support, and plain criminal stupidity to give American jobs which are available in American business concerns to alien refugees at the expense of American working men and women. And if it is the last thing I ever do, I want to go on record as being utterly opposed to such a proposal and to such a system.

The Alien Registration Act, signed recently by the President, is a step in the right direction. This act compelled 5,000,000 aliens in this country to register and be fingerprinted. But why not go a step further? Why not pass a law compelling all business concerns, manufacturers, retailers, all storekeepers to post, in conspicuous places, the names of aliens employed by them? The American people have a right to know what aliens are doing in this country and what concerns are employing them to the exclusion of American citizens who need jobs. I'll wager that a lot of Americans now unemployed would be given jobs in a hurry if such a law was passed and aliens were dropped from pay rolls to protect the concerns hiring them from the boycotts that such un-Americanism deserves.

Immigration. Let's keep it under the control of Americans who are not afflicted with the European complex to the detriment of their own fellow citizens.

Overseas they look with longing on America. "Land of the free and home of the brave," they breathe. And they want to come over here. Why? Because they have failed in their own countries? Because they have made themselves obnoxious to others in their own lands? Or because they have permitted themselves to be lead by greedy, hate-inspired intolerants and have sustained, with their own toil and their own stupidity, systems which have kept them enslaved and filled with religious, racial, and political hatred?

When they get to America do many aliens shed their inbred greed and hatred, their inbred lust for the scalps of those they consider to have been their oppressors, their inbred lack of respect for the principles which have made this a great nation and without which this Nation cannot continue to be great? Do they melt into our pot, or do they gather into groups and continue their blood battles and their racial wars and their political and religious controversies on our soil, upon which soil such battles and wars and controversies should not be permitted to be carried on? Then from whence came Nazi, Fascist, and Communist organizations in America, and all their off-shoots, both pro and anti?

And where lie the sympathies of our foreign born, or those who have friends or relatives or commercial interests in Europe? Are they working industriously to raise money to care for America's afflicted and destitute, for America's dependent senior citizens and America's orphans and children of the poor, or are they sweating to get money to ship to foreigners? Are they using their financial wealth to help create more jobs for Americans and to raise the wages of Americans which their condescending attitudes suggest they have somehow favored with employment, or are they scheming to bring more aliens into America with whom they have ties of blood or ideology, to give refugees jobs, and to kick Americans out of work onto a pridebreaking system of dole and thus reduce the American standard of living to the European level?

I love America. I have enjoyed living my life in America. And I want my children, born of American parents on American soil, to also love this country and to enjoy life on its soil as I have. Further, I do not wish to have my American children robbed of the rights for which I have fought, nor of the joys of freedom I have known. And I do not intend, if I can do anything to stop it, to have jobs my children need to sustain themselves and build their homes and raise my grandchildren, occupied by newcomers who came to America as public charges, were supported by my taxes and the taxes of other American citizens, then proceeded to squeeze my children and their children out of industry into indolence and despair.

And so I say: "Lock our gates. Keep out the foreign so-called 'cultured' who sneer at us, as well as the parasitical riffraff of Europe. Solve our own problems of unemployment, as well as our own problems of housing and feeding and clothing and educating our citizens, before we accept the responsibility of solving the similar problems of others."

Let us watch the trend of immigration very carefully. Let us watch, with eagle eyes, those who are supposed to enforce the immigration laws already in existence, and let us add new and more potent rules and regulations concerning the admittance of aliens into this country. And, by all means, let us eliminate from our system this European complex with which some of our people are afflicted, in order that we may remain free of European hatreds, free of European entanglements and European wars, and be able to sustain a nation that is truly indivisible, where liberty and justice may continue to exist for all who are true Americans.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Overton
Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Glass	Reed
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Russell
Bankhead	Gurney	Sheppard
Barbour	Hatch	Shipstead
Barkley	Hayden	Smith
Bilbo	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Byrnes	Lodge	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Murdock	Wallgren
Danaher	Murray	Wheeler
Davis	Norris	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 390) relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks, and it was signed by the Vice President.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4124), making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment which I desire to have restated, and then I wish to explain it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ADAMS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. I did not know that the amendment was before the Senate at this time. I thought we had finally disposed of that matter yesterday by a

vote. I should think the proper procedure would be to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected before we start to amend the amendment. Otherwise, Mr. President, we shall be discussing something that is not before the Senate.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if I may clarify the situation, my amendment is directed to a provision which is now in the bill. Yesterday the Senate voted on an amendment which proposed to strike that provision from the bill. That amendment was lost. Therefore, the provision in the bill is now open to amendment.

Following the rejection of the amendment to strike out the provision, the Senator from South Carolina made a motion to reconsider that vote. I am not an expert on parliamentary procedure, but I believe that my amendment is now in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may correct the able Senator from Colorado, a motion to reconsider was not made by the Senator from South Carolina, although I think he has it in contemplation. For that reason the Senator's basis is not correct at this time.

Mr. ADAMS. If not, I wish to clarify my position regarding the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that the Senator from North Carolina had the floor. I did not understand that he yielded the floor for the purpose of permitting the Senator from Colorado to offer an amendment, unless it was simply to be read for the information of the Senate, because such a procedure automatically would have taken the Senator from North Carolina from the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have the floor; and if there is any question about my having the floor, I desire to offer the amendment at this time, and not to have any discussion regarding a technicality of this kind.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ADAMS. No, Mr. President; I desire to have read the amendment which I offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out, on page 6, line 1, beginning with the word "except", down to and including the word "needed" in line 4, page 6, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I continue to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Chair should hold, as it probably will hold, that the amendment is now in order, I should have no objection to its being offered at this time, although I think that, in all regularity, it should come after the motion is made and decision is had with regard to the motion about to be made by the Senator from South Carolina. But in order to defer to the pleasure of the Senator from Colorado, I am willing that he should discuss his amendment at this time.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. Since the Senator from Colorado has the floor, I will not now make my motion. I intend to make a motion to reconsider. I wanted to ask the Senator from Colorado if he would not permit me at this time to make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. ADAMS. I will state to the Senator that I do not think he will desire to make the motion if the amendment is adopted. Of course, he may wish to do so in the course of carrying out his declaration.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator knows, of course, that the Senator offered his amendment in the committee and it was not adopted.

Mr. ADAMS. No, Mr. President; the amendment has never been offered in this form.

Mr. BYRNES. I may be wrong in my reading of the amendment; but as I read it hurriedly it seemed to me that it did not differ very much from the former amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. It differs quite materially.

Mr. BYRNES. Certainly, if the Senator will let me make my motion, then the bill will be open to amendment, and the Senator could offer his amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. I would much prefer to discuss the amendment as it is, and then allow it to be disposed of.

Mr. President, in the bill as it now stands is this provision:

> That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed.

Mr. President, before the committee there were certain objections presented, among them one presented by the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson. I was very much impressed with his presentation. I think he put his finger upon an objection to the provision which was correct. He pointed out that under this provision, to which we may refer as the Scrugham amendment, coming from the House, the War Department would be compelled to buy American goods, regardless of what the price might be. In other words, there was no protection in the amendment against the exorbitant prices being paid for American products. Further, that it put upon the purchasing agents a burden to ascertain questions of quantity, without any machinery for the decision as to whether or not adequate quantities existed.

The amendment which I am offering does not differ in its substantial effect from the existing buy-American law. It contains three provisions, in substance. One that the Government shall not be compelled to buy American goods unless they exist in reasonable quantities as needed; second, unless the quality of the goods available is satisfactory; and, third, unless the price is reasonable.

Personally I do not wish to compel the Government to buy if the quantity is not available, if the quality is not satisfactory, if the price is not reasonable. But, on the other hand, if American goods are available in substantial quantity, of proper quality and at reasonable prices, the American Army and the American Navy should buy American goods. We should not send the soldier and the sailor to fight garbed in foreign clothes or have him fed with foreign food if he can get within his own country proper food and clothes.

I have gone a step further than that, following the buy-American law, and provided that the conditions shall be determined by the head of the Department concerned. In other words, under my amendment the determination of these three conditions is left to the War Department. I ask what more could be desired? Is it desired to go to the extent of saying that the Government shall buy nothing in the United States if it can obtain the goods abroad?

The amendment eliminates what I thought, and what the Under Secretary of War thought, was an unreasonable and harsh provision and permits foreign purchases only upon conditions to which I think no American citizen should object. Certainly we prefer to buy the wool produced in Idaho or Washington to wool produced in Australia and in the Argentine, if it is available in proper quantities, in proper quality, and at reasonable prices. If the Senate votes down an amendment of this kind, to the people of the West, from which I come, it is saying, "We do not want you to buy American goods; we have swept away the limitation which sought to require you to buy American goods if they are available under proper conditions."

The amendment meets the objection which the War Department made. I think it is a fair and reasonable provision; I think it compromises the two extreme positions, one the embargo position under which foreign goods could not be purchased under any condition, and the other which would turn the Department loose to buy foreign goods, regardless of the existence of adequate qualities and quantities of American goods.

Of course, prices in America are higher than they are abroad. Beef can be bought in the Argentine cheaper than in America; wool can be bought in the Argentine or in Australia cheaper than here; copper can be bought cheaper in Chile and in South Africa than here; but this land has established a policy of protecting the American market and endeavoring to maintain a higher standard of living. Should we start in to break down that policy in the case of our Army and our Navy?

It seems to me that this rather simple amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator read the provision as it would appear if his amendment were agreed to?

Mr. ADAMS. I will be very glad to do so. The proviso which begins on line 23 of page 5 reads:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act—

It is limited to this act—

shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except—

At that point comes the exception which I am seeking to write into the provision—

except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed—

Then the provision adopted by the House and appearing in the bill proceeds—

and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto.

In other words, an American force of any kind, if it should be in some foreign port, would not be bound by this limitation but would be free to buy in the market where it happened to be. The limitation applies within the United States and its possessions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator referred to the fact that our Government could go to Chile and buy copper cheaper than it could buy American copper. I agree with him that that is so. But does the Senator mean to imply that American copper would be protected under this amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. No, sir. I pointed out that the Buy American Act is broader than this, because the Buy American Act would include copper. This provision puts clothing and food in the class of the goods referred to in the Buy American Act.

Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Arizona. Then I will yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator provides three qualifications—one of quality, one of quantity, and one of price. If any one of those three qualifications should be out of line, the Senator would be willing, would he not, that the War Department should make purchases abroad; that is, if the Department could not find in this country the articles in proper quantity, or if it could not find them here in proper quality, or if the price were unreasonably high?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. As the amendment reads, all three conditions would have to exist, because the words are connected by "and"—"quality and quantity and price." It seems to me the restriction should not apply if the Secretary of War could not find in this country satisfactory quantity, or if he could not find here satisfactory quality, or if he could not find here satisfactory price; but the Senator has the proposal written so that the three conditions are coupled together.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the Senator allow me to submit the matter to my legislative expert for study, and then answer him a little later?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if he is going to say that the Secretary may buy abroad if the price is lower, then of course he will be permitted to buy in Australia, because wool can be bought cheaper in Australia, or elsewhere to the south, than it can be bought in the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. But that is not the idea of the Senator from Colorado. If the article can be bought in the United States at a fair price—which, under the buy-American rule, means if it can be bought here at not more than 25 percent above the foreign price—it will have to be bought here.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I promised to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I yield first to him. Then I will yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to say that I think the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is a very fair compromise of the differences between the original amendment and whatever other amendment might be offered. So I think, as a matter of good judgment, good business, and good common sense, and to shorten the controversy over this matter, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado should be accepted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I should like the attention of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I ask his attention because, having just read over the amendment which the Senator from Colorado has offered, I think, from the cursory examination I have given it, that the Senator from Arizona is correct. I think the amendment would require the meeting of all three conditions, and that would not be wise. I think the word "or" should be used in the amendment instead of "and."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the words are separated by a disjunctive conjunction, any one requirement failing, the Secretary would be at liberty to buy abroad.

Mr. HATCH. That is exactly the point.

Mr. SMITH. Suppose there were plenty of quantity and plenty of quality in this country, but the price were a little out of line, then the Secretary could go elsewhere.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; if the disjunctive were used.

Mr. WHEELER. Then, if the Government could buy Argentine beef cheaper than it could buy American beef, no matter how much there was in the United States, the Secretary would be free to go to the Argentine to buy it. If the proper quality and quantity are to be found in the United States, we ought to purchase the product in the United States, providing the price is a fair price and not a hold-up.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I said.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with the Senator from Montana, except that I think there should be such a protection as the Senator from Colorado has been arguing for. I think that should be included in the bill. For the life of me I cannot understand why this amendment, as offered by the Senator from Colorado and as corrected as he is going to correct it, should not be acceptable to everyone concerned. It certainly would protect in a measure all those in the West who are interested in this question. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not read the amendment, and I am wondering if it would protect those of the West. If the proper quality and quantity can be found here in the United States it seems to me the purchase should be made here.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I will say that the amendment will not give the measure of protection which is included in the bill as it now stands; but I think the provision now in the bill is a very bad one. I voted against it yesterday, and I shall vote today to reconsider the action of the Senate on it if it stays in its present form. I think it is entirely too strict, and never should be written into the law; but with the amendment of the Senator from Colorado I do not see how anybody could object to it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am very reluctant to differ with the judge to my right. What we are endeavoring to do is to say to the War Department, "You may buy foreign goods, unless"—what? "Unless you are able to find proper quality and proper quantity and proper prices in the United States." In other words, we are limiting the Department's right to purchase.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator want to make all three conditions?

Mr. ADAMS. Does not the Senator from New Mexico think they should be made?

Mr. HATCH. I am trying to ascertain what the amendment means.

Mr. ADAMS. That is what it means; in other words, that the Secretary of War is permitted to buy abroad unless he finds that all three conditions can be met in the United States. That is, the amendment broadens rather than narrows his right to purchase abroad.

Mr. SMITH. Then, Mr. President, if I may be allowed to interrupt, it would be necessary to use the word "and" in place of "or."

Mr. ADAMS. I have "and" in the amendment, and I think "and" is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand the Senator, he intends that if any one of these three elements is lacking the Secretary may purchase abroad.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct. In other words, we do not want to say to the Secretary of War, "Notwithstanding there is satisfactory quality and satisfactory quantity, if the price is exorbitant you still must buy the article in the United States."

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly; but, while I have not a copy of the Senator's amendment, it seems to me there is the same question that the Senator raised as to whether the word "or" or the word "and" should be used. The amendment can be framed so that it will be perfectly clear if it is not now in such form. As I understand the Senator, he wants the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to be permitted to buy abroad only when one of these qualities is lacking.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; if any one of them is lacking. In other words, all three of them must concur in order to restrict the Secretary's right to purchase abroad.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator puts the matter in that sense, yes; if he says that must be done before the right can be limited.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct. The question is as to the extent of the limitation put upon the War Department. I am proposing to say to the Department that even though quantity exists and quality exists, they may not buy at home if the prices are exorbitant. They must find reasonable prices, adequate quantity, and proper quality.

Mr. CONNALLY. I so understood the Senator. The difficulty arises purely by reason of the fact that we start out with a prohibition instead of a permission.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct. The Senator recognizes that we were not drawing a new section of the statute, but we were trying to amend an existing section.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood the Senator, but I wanted to make the matter clear in view of the questions of other Senators, because it is his purpose that if any one of these factors is lacking the Secretary may proceed to buy abroad.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. President, the War Department and the purchasing agencies of the Government have said to the committee, "We propose to allow proper differentials between domestic and foreign prices." They have said to us, "In minor purchases, when the amounts are small, we may make a differential as high as 100 percent. As the amount of the purchase increases, we think the differential should be reduced." They said to us, "In the case of wool," which is one of the large items, "we are allowing a differential of from 5 to 9 percent," as I remember. That is the differential. They said that it was impossible to fix a flat differential, since it depended upon so many conditions, and they had certain regulations. This leaves in their hands, in their discretion, the right to protect the American consumer, with the statement by Congress that it desires the preference to be given to the American producer.

Let me state what I conceive to be the danger if this provision of the bill shall be stricken out. The country as a whole does not know of the Buy American Act. The people will say Congress has let the bars down and said to the War Department and to the Navy, "Buy whereever you can buy the cheapest." That will be the impression. It seems to me the Senate would make a mistake by merely wiping out this provision, when it can be restricted in the way I suggest, so that the purpose of Congress will be made clear, and yet discretion will be left in the purchasing department to do the fair thing by American industry.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The provision in the bill as it came from the House is a prohibition. About the only prohibition is as to the matter of quantity.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. Otherwise, it is merely a question whether the article is produced in the United States. Under the proposal of the Senator from Colorado, we would find it necessary to set up an agency, an authority, some officer of the Army, who would have to pass judgment. He would have to exercise his discretion as to whether price and quality and quantity all met. How would we check his discretion? Suppose he made an order and said, "I find that these three qualifications exist." He could do almost anything under that provision, unless we set up some agency to check his discretion. He can say, "These three conditions coexist, and I shall buy." Who could check him? The Senator will understand that I am not trying to be critical.

Mr. ADAMS. I have always appreciated the Senator's comments, even though they were critical, because they are very helpful.

Mr. BONE. Some officer who is the head of a department may say, "I find these conditions to exist; therefore I will buy the stuff." Who is to check him? The matter will be out of our hands.

Mr. ADAMS. I think the answer to that is very obvious. There must be somebody to make the decision. The amendment provides it shall be the head of the department. Naturally those at the head of the departments are men interested in the welfare of their Government. We must trust someone. If we ask, "Who is to check him?" and appoint someone else, then who is going to check the fellow who is to check the other fellow, and who is to check him? We are compelled, in our scheme of government, to point out legislatively what we want done and to say who is to do it. If those we designate disregard their orders, we can make our appeal to the head of the executive department, and he can remove them. We must leave the decision to someone. What we have sought to do in this amendment is to provide someone who can make the decision. We say who is to decide it. We say the head of the department shall make the decision, and his decision shall be final; just as in a battle, someone has to command the troops.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it not a matter of fact that in respect to all commodities which are purchased in quantity, whether copper, or wool, or cotton, or anything else which the Army needs, there is a close association between the purchasing authorities in the department and the industry? For example, with respect to copper, when it developed that there was not enough copper in the United States to meet the demands, as happened not long ago, the representatives of the copper-mining industry and the national defense sat down and figured out how much had to be imported, and importations were made. The same thing applies to wool; there is the closest contact between the purchasing officers of the Government and those who represent the wool-growing and wool-manufacturing industry. They agree on what is available in the United States and what is a fair price. In all matters of that kind there can be consultation and contact to see that no injustice is done. It is represented to the Senate over and over again that the same condition exists with respect to many industries.

Mr. ADAMS. I venture to say that we have appropriated not less than a billion and a half dollars, as the Senator knows, to be expended by the Quartermaster General. We have to rely upon his judgment and upon his integrity in all these matters. We in the Congress cannot sit down and decide how much is to be paid for woolen blankets, we cannot decide how much a yard is to be paid for wool, how much a pound is to be paid for this or that. We must leave the determination to some individual or group. What I have sought to do in this amendment is to put the determination in the hands of those most responsible in the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what the Buy American Act does. The Senator is repeating that phase of the Buy American Act.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Buy American statute, so that it will be available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 1. That when used in this title—

(a) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof;

(b) The terms "public use," "public building," and "public work" shall mean use by, public building of, and public work of, the United States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Philippine

Islands, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, and shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, or if articles, materials, or supplies of the class or kind to be used or the articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality.

SEC. 3. (a) Every contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States growing out of an appropriation heretofore made or hereafter to be made shall contain a provision that in the performance of the work the contractor, subcontractors, material men, or suppliers, shall use only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States except as provided in section 2: *Provided, however,* That if the head of the department or independent establishment making the contract shall find that in respect to some particular articles, materials, or supplies it is impracticable to make such requirement or that it would unreasonably increase the cost, an exception shall be noted in the specifications as to that particular article, material, or supply, and a public record made of the findings which justified the exception.

(b) If the head of a department, bureau, agency, or independent establishment which has made any contract containing the provision required by subsection (a) finds that in the performance of such contract there has been a failure to comply with such provisions, he shall make public his findings, including therein the name of the contractor obligated under such contract, and no other contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or elsewhere shall be awarded to such contractor, subcontractors, material men, or suppliers with which such contractor is associated or affiliated, within a period of 3 years after such finding is made public.

SEC. 4. This title shall take effect on the date of its enactment, but shall not apply to any contract entered into prior to such effective date.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to get clear, if I can, the legislative as well as the parliamentary situation, in view of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. I think it will be agreed by every one that, whether the amendment which the committee adopted striking out the language at the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6 shall be agreed to or not, the Buy American Act is untouched by the proposed legislation, it will still be in force, as fully in force as if the bill were not passed, except that the language put in the bill by the House does place a restriction upon the operation of the Buy American Act.

Mr. ADAMS. It provides a restriction in addition to the Buy American Act, somewhat different in its design.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. In other words, as the Buy American Act has been administered, the departments have worked out a sort of formula, ranging up to a 25-percent differential between the cost of the domestic and the foreign product, depending on the price of the foreign product as compared with the domestic product. In some cases the differential goes as high as 25 percent, so that a department will pay as much as 25 percent more for a domestic article than the price for which it can buy an identical article in a foreign country, depending on the price, and in some cases the range is from 5 to 8 to 10 to 12 or 15 percent.

I am not certain, but I believe that in the case of certain wool products the differential is from 5 to 9 percent, because wool is already bringing on the market from 25 to 50 percent above parity. Based upon that situation, the departments which have dealt with the Buy American Act have fixed a differential somewhat in harmony with the prices at home and in foreign countries. The Buy American Act is not repealed by the proposed legislation, but it would be modified by the language in the House text.

The Buy American Act reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest—

The Senator has left out of his amendment the provision with respect to the public interest.

or the cost to be unreasonable—

That is, if the head of the Department determines that it is not in the public interest, or that the cost is unreasonable, he is required to buy the products in the United States, or to buy products which are manufactured out of products produced in the United States.

The language will read, in this particular provision at the bottom of page 5:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be secured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto.

I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado why he left out the provision in the Buy American Act relative to the public interest. I should also like to have him elucidate a little further, because I certainly had the impression that was entertained by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], that the use of the conjunctive there hooked all these alternatives together, so that in order that a department might buy anything outside the United States provided for in this appropriation, all these conditions must exist; in other words, that the price is unreasonable, that the quantity is not sufficient, and that the quality is not up to standard. If I am mistaken about that simply because this happens to be a prohibition instead of a positive act, I should like to be enlightened on the subject.

Mr. ADAMS. I shall endeavor to elucidate, as I say, the obvious.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, it would be an obvious elucidation, I presume.

Mr. ADAMS. No. What is in the amendment is a limitation. If "or" were used instead of "and," there would happen just what the Senator does not wish. In other words, what we are saying is that the head of the department may not buy abroad unless all these conditions coexist. As the Senator from Kentucky wants it now the head of the department could not buy abroad if any one of these conditions existed. In other words, if the price were reasonable he could not buy abroad, if the quantity were satisfactory he could not buy abroad, if the quality were satisfactory he could not buy abroad, regardless of the price. I think the fault lies with the draftsman in not making a little clearer what the purpose is. That is, it is a limitation on the Secretary of War and not a grant of power.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I was going to say to the Senator that when his amendment was first read I thought I agreed with what the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HATCH) said, but as I read the amendment now I am satisfied that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] is correct.

The amendment provides:

Except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be procured of satisfactory quality—

If the articles are not of satisfactory quality then he can purchase them elsewhere; if they are not in sufficient quantity or if not obtainable at a reasonable price, then he can purchase elsewhere, If any one of those situations exist, then under this amendment in my judgment the Secretary can buy elsewhere.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that I think he can somewhat modify the language so as to make it absolutely clear and satisfy Senators who are complaining. The provision starts out with a prohibition, that the department head shall not buy anything but American food and clothing "except" so and so. If the Senator would change the language, so as to read—

Except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be procured of satisfactory quality—

If the head of the department should find that satisfactory quality could not be procured, then he could go ahead and buy elsewhere, or if he found that he could not get the quantity or quality at reasonable prices, then he could go ahead and buy elsewhere. It would be necessary to change the language a little, but the change I propose would make it absolutely clear.

I think I understand the Senator entirely, but the confusion arises by reason of the fact that this is a limitation; the amendment starts out by prohibiting something, and then it makes an exception within the prohibition. The Senator wants to provide that all three conditions must be concurrent, and then the purchasing agent may buy abroad.

Mr. ADAMS. No; it is just the reverse. If those conditions concur, the purchasing agent cannot buy abroad.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I mean. That restores the prohibition, but if the amendment can be amended along the line I have indicated I think it would be absolutely clear.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator does not want to say to the purchasing agent, "You may buy abroad if you find a satisfactory quality of merchandise regardless of price and regardless of quantity." That is what would happen if we changed the "and" to "or."

Mr. CONNALLY. But that is exactly what the Senator says he wants to do.

Mr. ADAMS. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says that if one of these factors fails the purchasing agent should be permitted to buy abroad.

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, no.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to make an observation. I still adhere to the original views which I expressed about "and" and "or." But in either event, whether it is "and" or whether it is "or," the amendment of the Senator from Colorado definitely improves the bill as it is now written. I shall vote for it either way the language reads.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado to answer a part of my question asked a while ago which may have escaped him? In the Buy American Act, the question of the public interest is specifically set out. The Senator from Colorado has eliminated that particular language from his amendment. I assume he has undertaken, in effect, to reenact substantially the Buy American Act. Why did the Senator eliminate that particular provision or part of the act?

Mr. ADAMS. I think I can answer that question. I was not dealing with the Buy American Act. I was dealing with the provision in this bill. I was seeking to improve that provision of the measure as it is now before us, which, having been adopted, and the motion to strike having been rejected, compelled the purchasing agent for the War Department to buy here if the quantity was available, regardless of quality and regardless of price. I sought to put in the three elements—price, quality, and quantity.

If those three did not coexist then the purchasing agent would be permitted to go abroad where price, quality, and quantity did exist. So far as the public interest is concerned I think those three items themselves are adequate to protect the public interest.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. A great deal has been said here about the question of corned beef, and it was proposed——

Mr. ADAMS. I am not talking about corned beef.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but I want to ask the Senator's interpretation of the language with respect to that matter, because, as I understand, it was suggested and generally agreed in the hearings, between the War Department and the procurement department, that not to exceed 20,000,000 pounds of corned beef might be purchased by the Army or the Navy or both—I believe it was by both. We all know there is no corned-beef industry in this country. Our beef is sold as steaks or roasts. The only corned beef made in the United States is made really upon the order of the Government of the United States to furnish corned beef to the War Department or the Navy Department. One can go into almost any restaurant in the United States and order corned beef, and if he were to go back into the kitchen he would see on the can out of which the corned beef was taken that it came from the Argentine, or from one or two other countries in South America. There is no such product made in the United States, speaking generally. Would the Senator's amendment be interpreted to mean that if there was an insufficient quantity of this particular commodity in the United States the War Department and the Navy Department could purchase it from any foreign country?

Mr. ADAMS. Has not the Senator's statement of fact answered his own question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to get the Senator's confirmation of that suggestion.

Mr. ADAMS. I am always delighted when I can agree with my leader, and, of course, with the statement of fact which the Senator makes, that there is no corned beef in the United States. Of course, the requirements that there must be quantity and quality would not be met.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator about wool. We all know that we do not produce in this country enough wool for our own demands. I have the figures on that matter before me. While it is true that beef is selling at this time at 25 percent above parity in the United States, wool is selling even higher as compared to parity.

Mr. ADAMS. All those figures are contained in the Senate hearings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but I have them here on a single sheet of paper, which will make it unnecessary for Members to peruse the entire hearings in order to get the figures. Wool is now selling at 143 percent of parity in the United States. We do not produce enough wool to supply our domestic demand; and the proportion of wool which we produce to supply our domestic demand has grown smaller as a result of our defense program. From 1935 to 1939 the mill consumption of wool in the United States was 636,000,000 pounds. In 1940 it was 683,000,000 pounds, and for 1941 it is estimated at 850,000,000 pounds. In order to consume that much wool, which is now selling at 143 percent of parity, we must import wool from other countries. Whether it comes from South America, Australia, or any other country does not matter. If those figures are accurate, would the Senator's interpretation of his own amendment permit the War Department, the Navy Department, or any other Government agency to buy the required poundage of wool from other countries, if necessary, in order to supply our domestic demand for the Army and Navy?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator's statement of facts again answers his own question. The amendment provides that if there is not an adequate quantity in the United States the Secretary may buy abroad. The Senator says in his statement of facts that there is not a sufficient supply in the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is the general situation, which we all recognize to exist.

Mr. ADAMS. Therefore, under this amendment the Secretary would be permitted to buy abroad.

I know that the Senator is interested in protecting the producers of wool, cattle, and all the various other agricultural products of the United States. The Senator does not mean that the foreign markets shall be open to purchases if the domestic markets can make reasonable provision. As the Senator knows, there are those in the United States—very few in number, I think—who seem to be more interested in getting a dollar's worth of business from abroad than $5 worth of business within the country. I am one of those who have been up against the problem a number of times. Some persons would rather import something from some other country than buy it or permit it to be produced in the United States. If something is produced in the United States, every dollar is spent within the United States. However, in the case of a dollar's worth of imports we are lucky if we receive back 25 cents on the dollar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I am not one of those, either inside or outside this body, who prefer to encourage the purchase of commodities from abroad when we have the commodities in the United States for our own supply. However, I think we should consider the possibility that with respect to certain commodities we may take such action here as to stimulate artificially the prices and leave the consumer out of the equation. In the years to come we may find ourselves in such a position that we will be harmed in the long run by the narrow, short-sighted policy which I have in mind.

Take the cattle situation as an example. As I said a while ago, beef cattle are bringing 25 percent above parity. Because of that fact heifers are being withheld from the market for breeding purposes. In a few years—certainly not more than 7, and perhaps within 2 or 3

years—there may be an overproduction of beef cattle in the United States which may drive down the prices to the point where they were in 1933 and 1934. While it might now seem as though it were a wise thing to encourage overproduction because of the price, we know that, in the long run, over a period of 5 or 7 years, when the price is boosted the result is overproduction, and later the price is driven down to the point where it is less than the cost of production.

Looking at the matter from the long-range standpoint, while we all prefer the purchase of products in the United States when they are available, I doubt the wisdom of encouraging that policy by law to such an extent as to bring about overproduction of any commodity so as to drive the price down within the course of a few years. When the emergency shall have been terminated we expect to go back to normal supply and demand with respect to the consumption of commodities, as well as the prices which the farmers are to receive. The thing which I fear is overproduction. Nobody can look into the future and see what will happen. We should all like to see American farm life strike a level at which it would not be subject to fluctuations up and down to the extent that the farmer can never know as much as a year ahead what he may depend upon.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, as he knows, because of the prices we have in this country an increasing production of cattle and wool. Are the cattle producers and the sheep raisers to be advantaged by lessening their American market or by increasing their American market? Every pound of beef and every pound of wool which is bought from abroad lessens the American market and has a tendency to bring about a condition of oversupply in this country. The very thing of which the Senator is apprehensive, and of which I am apprehensive, would be hastened by unreasonable foreign purchases.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize the force of what the Senator says. I do not think that by any legislative policy, however advantageous it may appear temporarily, we ought to encourage such an overproduction of any commodity as to bring about a debacle in the price and the ability of the farmer to sell his production a year or two from now, which would more than offset any advantages he might now receive in the way of price of ability to sell what he produces.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator will concede that the amendment which I have offered improves the language of the bill as it stands, will he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am frank to say that I think it does improve the language of the House bill.

Mr. HATCH and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorato yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to my neighbor [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am still interested in the language of the amendment. Judging from the discussion which has taken place, I do not think there is any difference between the intention and purposes of those who offer the amendment and of those who desire to support it. I think they are in agreement as to intention, but there is a disagreement as to language. I have never been one of those who have approved the "and/or" policy in writing legislation. However, I am wondering whether or not the Senator from Colorado would be willing to say "and/or" instead of merely "and."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it happens to be my great privilege to serve as a member of the Appropriations Committee under that distinguished statesman, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I could not get along with him and I would not be permitted to serve on his committee if I were to consent to writing "and/or" in an amendment which I offered. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. We have listened to discussion by able Senators on both sides of the question. It seems to me that we ought to be able satisfactorily to work out the problem and obtain a vote on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader for a moment in connection with parity prices.

The wool growers have exactly the same problem as have the tobacco growers. On two occasions the parity price of tobacco has been changed by legislative action for the reason that it was not considered that the parity price was a fair price. The parity price of wool was fixed, together with the parity prices of other commodities, with the years from 1909 to 1914 being the base period. Senators who remember the situation and the fight over the Underwood tariff bill will recall that wool was put on the free list in 1913. For a year prior to that time wool growers were hardly able to sell their wool at any price. The war broke out in 1914, and the price of wool went up. Following the close of the war, the price of wool dropped until sheep were worth hardly 50 cents a head. That matter has been repeatedly discussed with representatives of the Department of Agriculture. The representatives of the Department of Agriculture entirely agree with the position of the wool growers that the parity price of wool is not based on the proper kind of computation. In the Department it has been inferred that a bill would be passed—and such a bill is now being drafted by the Department of Agriculture—changing the parity period for wool.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that one can hardly draw a parallel between the respective situations of two agricultural products.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. That is quite true.

Mr. BARKLEY. From time immemorial a certain type of tobacco grown in the United States has found its market in Europe. Now that market has been cut off. We passed a law changing the basis of parity for tobacco. We did not do it in an appropriation bill. We did not do it in a provision prohibiting any department purchasing anything from a foreign country. We passed a substantive act changing the basis of parity for tobacco.

I do not recall that that has been done with respect to wool, and I do not believe it has been done within the past year or two. The parity price for wool is now 23.4 cents a pound, whereas wool is actually bringing 33.4 cents a pound; but even if we were to pass a law raising the parity price for wool, I doubt very much if Congress would go beyond the price of 33.4 cents a pound, which wool is now bringing.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Idaho concluded?

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I have not yet concluded; I desire to occupy the floor for a further moment.

With reference to the question of the parity price and the fact that it is 23 cents, as the Senator from Kentucky says, that is true as fixed on the basis of the Underwood Free Tariff Act.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the Underwood Free Tariff Act has not been in effect since 1921, and the bill providing for parity for wool and all other agricultural products was passed in 1933 or 1934; so that it could not be on the basis of the Underwood Tariff Act.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I desire to state that the base period on which the parity price was paid was from 1909 to 1914.

Mr. BYRNES. Nineteen hundred and nine was 4 years before the Underwood Act passed, and 1914 was only about 6 months after the Underwood Act became effective.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. But the agitation on the Underwood bill had resulted in a decrease in the price of wool before the bill was actually enacted.

There is no contention by the Department of Agriculture regarding what the parity price of wool should be. The representatives of the Department of Agriculture admit that at the present time the parity price is not a fair price. We are not trying on an appropriation bill to change the parity price at all. If the parity price is to be changed it will be changed through congressional action, standing on its own merit and on nothing else.

The point I desire to make is that if the Senator will take a period from 1920 to 1929, or any other period of equitable prices, he will find that the parity price of wool today would be 37 cents instead of 23 cents. I have placed all that material in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado if he has a copy of his amendment before him?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; I have.

Mr. BYRNES. I call the Senator's attention to the language:

> Except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed.

Judging from what the Senator had in mind, I imagine he would not have any objection to adding, after the word "procured," the words "within the United States."

Mr. ADAMS. Entirely so; I think those words should be in the amendment. As a matter of fact I had intended to include them.

Mr. BYRNES. I am sure that is what the Senator intended.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from South Carolina asks if the Senator from Colorado will agree that after the word "procured" there be inserted the words "in the United States"?

Mr. BYRNES. That is all.

Mr. ADAMS. I will modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. BYRNES. I think the insertion of the words "in the United States" after the word "procured" will make clear what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; so that it will read:

Cannot be procured in the United States of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to state to the Senator from Colorado that, like many others on the floor of the Senate, I am in doubt as to whether the word "and" or the word "or" should be used. The Senator from Arizona first suggested it.

Mr. ADAMS. I suggest that I am quite clear that the word "and" is what the Senator from South Carolina would desire to have in the bill; but I will say further to the Senator—and he is in a position where he can help carry out my suggestion—that if this amendment is adopted, and if it stays in the bill, the matter will go to conference, and we shall be able to sit down and very carefully study the effect of it.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I was about to say in the time of the Senator from Colorado that the question is one which can be determined only when we sit down at the committee table quietly to consider it, instead of in discussion upon the floor of the Senate.

As I read the amendment, it differs from the buy-American law only in the elimination of the words "when inconsistent with the public interest."

Mr. ADAMS. No; there are a number of things in the buy-American law that are not in the amendment I offer. That deals with manufactured products of various kinds. My amendment is limited to food and clothing. The Buy American Act has a much wider scope. However, I think that probably the amendment covers some things that the Buy American Act does not cover. I have not attempted to set them down. The Buy American Act deals primarily with manufactured articles. As I recollect, the Buy American Act contains two categories.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if there were an absolutely essential article which could not be obtained in America, then would we have to do without it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado and I are in accord on the proposition that no part of the funds provided by this particular bill could be used for the purchase of foreign canned corned beef, "except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles * * * cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices" in the United States.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado a practical question. He and I both represent States where beef is produced and where wool is produced. What the wool grower is interested in is in obtaining a market this year for the spring clip of wool. Last year we made large appropriations in the latter half of the year; but purchases were made in the fall of the year when the clip belonging to the growers had been sold, and the speculators or middle man got the profit or the benefit of the increase in price.

Recently we appropriated $165,000,000 to the Army to permit them to begin the manufacture of wool cloth a year ahead, and that will make the clip of wool now being taken from the backs of the sheep available ahead of the coming fiscal year, into the blankets that have been authorized by the bill.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator will remember that we advanced one appropriation in order to have the money available to go into the new clothing and so that the grower might have the advantage of the purchase, by knowing that a large sum of money was available for purchasing woolen goods.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then the effect of the Senator's amendment would be that the purchase of wool and of woolen cloth, and the advertisement for bids for those commodities, would make it possible for those who are manufacturing the cloth that is to be purchased with the money authorized by this bill to use the present spring clip of American-grown wool; and the inclusion of the Senator's amendment in the bill would require that that source of supply be looked to first, as against a foreign source?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the present American spring clip of wool can be obtained in sufficient quantities to supply the orders that will be made available by this money, and of good quality and at a reasonable price, the American wool will be used as against the foreign wool?

Mr. ADAMS. I think the Senator has stated the whole matter. The purpose of the amendment is to see that the American producer has the preference, and at a time when it will do him the most good, and yet at the same time not to put shackles on the defense departments in making their purchases and make it possible for them to be held up.

Mr. HAYDEN. That clears up the wool situation. Now as to canned corned beef, let us be specific about that.

Mr. ADAMS. May I tell the Senator something about canned meat? A few years ago a Republican candidate for Congress was campaigning and he had two cans of corned beef of foreign origin and was denouncing the Democrats because of such importations. I thought that it was all "phoney," that somebody at the national headquarters had sent him the cans of corned beef. So I rather ridiculed the man trying to campaign all over a district on two cans of corned beef. When I myself went to the store I had to withdraw all the things I had said, because I found a good deal of difficulty in getting cans of American corned beef.

Mr. HAYDEN. If in truth and in fact there is no corned beef canned in the United States except upon order from the Army or the Navy or the Civilian Conservation Corps—and it is my understanding that there is no canned corned beef manufactured in any material quantity for general public sale in the United States—that is one thing.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. HAYDEN. Another is that if there is a difference in price as much as has been stated to our committee, of between 20 and 30 cents a pound, or over 33⅓ percent, that again would make it possible to buy the foreign article.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. ADAMS. I am very much impressed with the anxiety of Senators to vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand, and I am just as anxious to come to a vote as is any other Senator in the Chamber, but it is important, I think, to make this matter clear in the RECORD. I feel that the contribution the Senator from Colorado has made by his amendment is characteristic of him; it is a substantial enlightenment and illumination of the situation. But I want to make it quite clear that, while I believe his amendment greatly improves the language which the committee struck out, we should be careful in this matter to preserve the gains which have already been won. It is always difficult to devise language which will accomplish the real intent.

Mr. ADAMS. I hope the Senator is not doing, as some judges do, namely, complimenting an attorney in his court and then deciding against him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Colorado knows well that I do not do that with him or anybody else, but I desire the Members of the Senate, and particularly those who represent the livestock States, to know that the Office of Production Management has displayed a completely satisfactory disposition to protect the interests of the producers. Those representatives of the organized livestock industry who have presented themselves to the Office of Production Management and who have talked with Mr. Douglas MacKeachie and with Mr. Donald Nelson, came away from those conferences perfectly well satisfied that the Defense Council intends to deal fairly with the producers of America.

As long ago as the middle of February I received a letter from Mr. Nelson, Director of the Division of Purchases. The letter was addressed to me after a conference with the officers and directors

of the American Livestock Association. The letter reads:

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1941.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: When you informed me last week that your recent discussions with representatives of our cattle producers indicated that they would have no objections in the present emergency to the purchase of necessary Army and Navy supplies of canned corned beef in South America if such purchases are made in such a way as not to be injurious to the American cattle producers, you inquired concerning the plans of the Government. I have investigated this matter, and I can inform you that it is not contemplated to purchase more than 20,000,000 pounds of canned corn beef from South America for defense purposes for the fiscal year 1941, and with respect to the purchase of fresh meat for the armed services that no change is contemplated in the present plans of the Government to obtain such supplies from domestic sources.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD M. NELSON,
Director, Division of Purchases.

I confirmed that letter by telephone with Mr. Nelson today, who assured me that his whole purpose is for the fiscal year beginning in July. That is what he meant in this letter.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does Mr. Nelson understand it, as I do, and as the Senator from Colorado indicated he did, that under the terms of the Adams amendment the proposal to buy 20,000,000 pounds of corned beef can be carried out?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be my impression that it could be carried out under that amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly my impression.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, of course, the language of this amendment has not been presented to Mr. Nelson.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Nelson has not acquired membership in the body as yet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; but the Senator from Arizona asked me if Mr. Nelson understood what this would mean.

Mr. ADAMS. And I intimated that it had not been submitted to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I gave that answer. I am sure that if I were to ask for information as to a certain proposal from any person, the proposal would have to be presented to any such person. That would be perfectly logical.

Now, I desire to read another letter from Mr. Nelson, because it has to do with wool, with respect to which the Senator from Arizona was asking a question a moment ago. The letter is also addressed to the Senator from Wyoming and reads:

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1941.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: We had a very pleasant meeting this afternoon with Mr. Marshall, Mr. Fawcett, and Mr. Wilson, representing the wool growers, to discuss our purchases of wool goods.

They told me that the thing they were most interested in was to get information out to the wool growers as to how much wool the Government was going to buy, and, if possible, to place the tender of bids with the mills during the time when the wool growers were marketing their clip. They felt that when the Government ordered after the clip was marketed the growers did not get the benefit they should from the Government program. I agreed with them, thought their position was fair, and we determined upon the following course:

1. That we would get out from this office a publicity release telling the wool growers that we were going to place Government requirements about the middle of June and to tell them definitely the amount we were going to buy.

2. We agreed to put out tenders of bids at that time for the requirements of the armed services so that the mills would be able to arrange for the domestic wool they were going to use while the wool was in the growers' hands.

3. We agreed that we would, after conference with them, set a method of determining a fair price for domestic wool at the time that the bids were being placed.

4. We agreed that at the time the bids were being placed we would discuss with them the differential between foreign and domestic wool which would, in our combined judgments, bring about the fair price for the domestic wool grower.

They were in full accord and seemed to be tremendously pleased. They felt that if this program was carried out the domestic wool grower would get a fair break out of the Government purchases.

I want you to know that as far as this office is concerned we want to do everything we can to help the domestic wool grower get a fair price for his clip. The quartermaster, represented by General Corbin and Colonel Hardigg, agreed with the program 100 percent.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD M. NELSON,
Director of Purchases.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman referred to appeared before the Senate committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he felt that the amendment which he has offered would in any way interfere with carrying out the program outlined in these two letters?

Mr. ADAMS. No; but I think it will tend to remind the gentlemen referred to that the purpose of Congress is to have the American producers protected so far as it is possible to do so without injury to the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, in addition to the letters which I have read, one which I have received from Mr. J. B. Wilson, secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers' Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
April 1, 1941.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
232 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I have read the letter from Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Director of Processing, Office of Production Management, under date of March 31 regarding conference held with Mr. Nelson and his associates by representatives of wool growers, cooperative-marketing agencies, and wool dealers. Mr. Nelson's letter to you sets forth a clear understanding of the agreement reached between Mr. Nelson, representing the Office of Production Management, and the representatives of the wool growers. Mr. Nelson was most cooperative and very fair.

Sincerely yours,
J. B. WILSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to present to the Senate a telegram I have received from Mr. Will J. Miller, head of the livestock industry of the State of Kansas, and secretary of the Kansas State Livestock Association, in which he says:

We urge giving American food and clothing a preference in Army bill for the protection of the livestock producers of America.

I also present a telegram from R. A. Willis, president of the Kansas City Livestock Exchange, which reads as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate:

Think Senate vote 34 to 29 restoring provision in H. R. 4124 giving preference to American producers of feed and clothing purchases by the Army should stand as voted for the protection of the livestock producers of the United States.

R. A. WILLIS,
President, Kansas City Livestock Exchange.

Mr. President, I should like to see language prohibiting the purchase of foreign-produced foodstuffs and foods for the Army and Navy retained. It seems to me the language of the prohibition, which has been carried in these appropriation bills for years is sufficiently broad to protect the Government in purchasing necessary supplies outside continental United States.

I believe that the American farmers are still entitled to the American market, to the extent they are able and qualified to fill demands, both as to Government purchases and private purchases. The farmers of this country will have to carry a heavy share of the national-defense costs, which are running into billions of dollars. It is peculiarly unfair, it seems to me, to use taxpayers' money to buy from foreign producers when our own farmers can meet all demands.

For years the Senate has refused to meet heavy pressure to allow imports of Argentine beef and other products to wreck prices for domestic producers, for American farm products in American markets. Now a flank attack is being attempted in the name of national defense. I am fully sympathetic with the plight of farmers of other nations, but I still am for the American farmer first. It is most unfair to keep the restrictions on manufactured imports, thus raising higher and higher the prices of things the farmer must buy, and then turn around and bring in imports of foreign-produced commodities to lower the prices of American farm products on the American market. Let us not put on the American farmer so great a part of the sacrifices which must be borne. I am against the original committee amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have a telegram which I should like to have put into the RECORD to express the opinion of the president of the United States Livestock Association that the farmers and producers of America are in position to produce what is required in

the way of food and clothing for the Army. Representing the farmers, we are perfectly willing to leave the matter to the judgment of those on whom the responsibility is placed. If this provision goes through, we will accept it.

I ask to have the telegram to which I have referred inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEWARD, NEBR., *April 1, 1941.*

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Office Building:

The farmer and livestock producer can supply the Navy and Army with all the food and clothing needed. We are asking Congress to protect the American markets for our American producers.

D. M. HILDEBRAND, *President,*
United States Livestock Association.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to say just a word.

As the bill came over from the House, it operated as an absolute prohibition against the purchase of quantities of things that have been discussed here for the Army and the Navy. It has impressed a good many of us that that was a mistaken policy, especially in dealing with our Western Hemisphere situation.

We have received almost universal cooperation among the South and Central American nations in trying to bring about what we have been pleased to call hemispheric solidarity. There was a time when people in the United States and in Latin America regarded that purely as a selfish American doctrine. It may have originated in a certain degree of selfishness when James Monroe issued his original doctrine in 1823, declaring that any effort on the part of a European nation to gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere would be regarded by this country as an unfriendly act because it might endanger the stability and the safety and undermine the foundations of our own American democracy. We have gone a long way from that selfish idea, however. While we have not in any way withdrawn from the obligations imposed upon us in the establishment and maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, we have come to a more general conception of the idea that the solidarity of the American republics in the Western Hemisphere is of interest to all of them, in addition to the interest which it may hold for the people of the United States.

Conferences have been held in the Western Hemisphere, and cooperation, coordination, and a sympathetic approach to these problems have been worked out by the United States in collaboration with the Latin-American nations; and it seems to me it is a happy omen for peace and stability of democracy in the Western Hemisphere. In dealing with these domestic problems of ours I believe it to be essential for us to keep that situation in mind, because it seems to me it is infinitely more valuable to us as a Nation and to our fight for the maintenance of democracy, not only in the United States but throughout the Americas and throughout the world, that we should have and be able to maintain the confidence of the smaller nations in the Western Hemisphere than for us to reap some temporary advantage by a restriction requiring the purchase of some infinitesimal quantity of commodities in the United States rather than affording a market to some of the people who are dependent upon us and upon whom we are dependent.

I do not wish to take the time to show the advantage we are now obtaining in our trade with South and Central America; but I wanted to make this brief statement, because under the interpretation of the Adams amendment as I have been able to understand it, and as the Senator from Colorado himself has interpreted his own amendment, it improves the language of the House bill. It takes away the rigidity of the language of the House bill. Under the conditions set out in the amendment, it authorizes the War and Navy Departments, and any other agency of the Government, to buy these things in other countries if the quantity available in the United States is not sufficient, or the quality is not up to standard, or the price is unreasonable; and, in my judgment, it enables the War and Navy Departments and other agencies of the Government to do practically what they might have done if the language of the House bill had been stricken out.

In view of the fact that the bill must go to conference anyway with this language in it, and that the conferees will have more time to work out the meticulousness of language required, it seems to me that under the circumstances there can be no objection to the acceptance of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 2, it is proposed to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Improvement and maintenance, irrigation systems, Crow Reservation, Mont.: For operation and maintenance of the irrigation systems on the Crow Reservation, Mont., fiscal year 1941, $2,000, to be added to the $35,000 appropriated for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941.

Natives in Alaska: For an additional amount for education of natives in Alaska, fiscal year 1941, including the same objects and limitations specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, $80,000.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Owyhee project, Oregon: For an additional amount for operation and maintenance, from the reclamation fund, special fund, fiscal year 1941, $55,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment is in conformity with a Budget estimate which was submitted to Congress yesterday. I have submitted it to the chairman of the committee, and it is agreeable to him.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall object to these items. It seems to me strange, however, that they are offered as amendments at this time, when the appropriation bill for the Interior Department will come along within 10 days. This procedure may be in order, but it seems to me quite out of order. The items involve reclamation and some matters on Indian reservations. I must be advised of the insistent demand and the reason of the emergency that brings them into this bill. The amendment is clearly out of the usual practice, and does not conform to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it entirely conforms to the rules of the Senate. This is a deficiency bill.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. HAYDEN. And this estimate was submitted as a deficiency estimate. Let me explain it.

As to the Owyhee project in Oregon, the Department says:

This estimate is to provide necessary funds for the operation and maintenance of this project for the remainder of the present fiscal year. There are approximately 600 miles of canals and laterals on this project and a series of heavy slides during the past year has resulted in unexpected heavy maintenance costs.

Because of the landslides, an appropriation of $55,000 is necessary for the maintenance of the project for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

The $2,000 in Montana has already been collected from the settlers, and sufficient funds are available in the account covering collections from water users to provide the amount requested.

The item for education of natives in Alaska, the Department says, is due to the fact that the ships sail up there in the spring, and it is impossible to wait until the first of July for the regular appropriations.

These are all emergency appropriations requested in a Budget estimate, authorized by law, and entirely appropriate on this bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not mean literally that the amendment is in violation of the rules of the Senate; but there is a clearly established practice which is attempted to be evaded each year by placing specific projects, which belong to some regular annual appropriation bill, in an emergency deficiency bill, and rushing them through without the committees having general jurisdiction having an opportunity to be heard. I am not fond of the practice; and the mere fact that one of the amendments deals with a project in my State has no effect whatever on me. I am quite willing, as a resident of that beautiful State, to wait until the Interior appropriation bill comes along; but that is not an answer to the problem, by any means.

I am helpless to object, but I desire to point out the bad practice involved in a proceeding of this kind. I would not object if the Interior Department bill had been completed, or it would be 60 or 90 days before it came in, but it is only a

week or 10 days off, and rushing in on the floor of the Senate, after consulting with the chairman of the subcommittee having charge of the deficiency bill, and attempting a thing of this sort, is very poor practice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator from Arizona how it came about that the Budget Bureau sent up the estimates?

Mr. HAYDEN. My information came from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who said there were three emergency matters, and that a Budget estimate had been submitted. The estimates were sent up yesterday and printed this morning. In each instance the emergency is one in which the Department is vitally interested, because it is important to make the shipment to Alaska in the spring and not wait until the first of July. Landslides have occurred in the Oregon project, and the canals have to be cleaned out. The $2,000 for the Crow Reservation has already been collected, and the amount carried in the bill is needed to carry on the work.

These are all legitimate deficiencies which should be carried in this bill, and not postponed for inclusion in the regular Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is always very persuasive, both on the floor of the Senate and in the committee, but no one knows better than does the Senator from Arizona that Budget estimates for reclamation have been greatly reduced for the next fiscal year.

Mr. HAYDEN. They are for maintenance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the reason why I rose to make the inquiry. The Senator has satisfied me by his answers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590–592), shall be applicable to the Public Works project mentioned in this title.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the Navy Department advised me after the bill had been reported that there was an omission. The language, now suggested, was not in the bill at the place indicated, and they stated the result would be that the Department would be unable to proceed with two projects, one at San Diego and the construction of the marine project, without advertising for bids. It is necessary to include this language in order to enable them to proceed as they have with all other projects. I, therefore, offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado what the total amount appropriated by the bill is.

Mr. ADAMS. My figures indicate that the appropriation will be about $4,430,000,000. That would have to be divided into appropriations and contract authorizations. The appropriations as recommended by the bill, as reported, amount to $2,295,830,000, and contract authorizations to $2,093,453,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this merely emphasizes the comment which I made yesterday when I was discussing the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. Many Members of the Senate were kind enough to remark to me that they were very much interested in the map from the magazine Life, which I used to illustrate the distribution of the appropriations which are being made for national defense. Because of that interest, I had an enlargement of the map made, which Senators will find hanging upon the wall of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4124) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRNES submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,886,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$79,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 5, and 23.

CARTER GLASS,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JED JOHNSON,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FRANCIS CASE (with reservation as to No. 5),
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2788, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 27, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "for any purpose for which the Congress has previously made appropriation or authorization and without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service, such as section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws, and any waiver hereunder of the provisions of any law regulating such expenditure or such employment shall not be exercised by any agency unless the allocation to such agency or subsequent action of the President in connection therewith permits any such waiver to be availed of."

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3735, the annual Agricultural Department supply bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks on the item "Forest influences," contained in the pending bill. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point the item appearing in the bill from line 20 on page 42 to and including line 2 on page 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover characteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water conservation, flood control, streamflow regulation, erosion, climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for developing preventive and control measures therefor, $135,000.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the need for an increase of $47,000 in the forest-influences item has been evident to me. Additional work at the Allegheny Forest Experiment Station will well repay the increase. However, after talking with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Senate Appropriations, which has in hand the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, H. R. 3735, I have agreed not to press for the increase in that bill because I have been informed that the subcommittee has not had sufficient opportunity to examine the request. The proposed work is primarily to determine the effect of forests on stream behavior, especially the effect that forests may have on mine water and on floods.

The mine-water problem is a serious one in the coal region of Pennsylvania, as it is in the other coal sections of the country. Flooding has shut down mines, endangered the lives of miners, and caused heavy losses to the operators. In the past 10 years one company alone has spent $10,000,000 merely for pumping equipment, to say nothing of the cost of operation.

Shut-downs of the mines due to flooding increases the unemployment situation as miners who otherwise might be employed are thrown out of work. The State of Pennsylvania spent $600,000 last year in dewatering closed mines in an effort to alleviate the unemployment situation.

Most of the forests in the mine region have been very badly abused. They have been cut over and burned repeatedly so that there now exists only a scrub forest. Many believe that by forestry and supplemental forestry engineering measures it will be possibly greatly to decrease the amount of water which gets into the mines. If this is so, considerable values will accrue to everyone—the mine owner, the miner, and the public at large.

In addition, low-water flows in such streams as the Allegheny River are believed to be a result of destructive forest practices. This low-water flow appears to last longer than formerly, and the available water supplies appear to be decreasing. Such decreased flows result in greater pollution, concentration of industrial acids in the streams, and heavy industrial losses. For example, steel mills must have large amounts of relatively pure water for maximum production. Losses due to pollution and to decreased flow cost industry in Pennsylvania approximately $1,000,000 annually.

Along with the decreased summer flow is the interruption to navigation. Sand bars and other such obstacles, largely the result of land mismanagement and forest abuse, become a real deterrent to navigation during the summer months. Proper forestry measures, some believe, would increase the summer flow largely through the reduction of flood run-off.

Floods appear to be increasing in magnitude and number. In part this is due to the impoverished forest conditions which favor rapid snow-melt and early run-off. Flood damages in Pennsylvania alone amount to about $5,000,000 annually.

A study of the relations between forests and water is needed. Such a study would determine how far we could utilize the forest in controlling surface flow so as to keep water out of the mines. It would determine how forestry could be utilized in maintaining higher summer flows, and what could be done through various forestry measures to delay rapid snow-melt and prevent floods.

It is estimated that such a study would cost $47,000. It would cover the forest region served by the upper Ohio and Susquehanna Rivers and their tributaries and probably would have application elsewhere in the mining sections of the country and in the Northeast.

Land is available for the study without additional cost, and many facilities have been proffered by mining companies of the region which have offered to cooperate fully if the Federal Government takes the lead. The State of Pennsylvania has indicated a willingness to cooperate, and it is to be expected that forestry agencies in New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and West Virginia will also aid.

The need for the study has been recognized by the Department, which has included it as one of the outstanding projects in its national program of work under this appropriation.

No work of the kind contemplated is under way by any agency, and, so far as is known, no similar work has been proposed.

The proposed research is Federal rather than local. The problem transcends State boundaries. It involves considerable federally owned lands, and the problem of unemployment is now recognized as reaching out beyond State lines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Salaries", on page 2, line 5, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$601,424" and insert "$609,424."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture", on page 4, line 19, after the word "advertising", to strike out "and press clippings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 3, after the words "total, office of the Secretary", to strike out "$700,765" and insert "$708,765."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the Solicitor", on page 7, line 17, after the word "involved", to insert a colon and the following additional provisos: *"Provided further,* That the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may transfer to this appropriation, from the funds available for the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration, such sums as he may determine are properly allocable to the cost of providing legal services for these agencies, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including clerical and other necessary expenses incident thereto: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be used to pay any salary for legal services in excess of that authorized by law for the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a few questions in regard to this amendment. Did the committee hold any hearings and hear anyone representing the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. We had hearings in which representatives of the Rural Electrification Administration appeared, but no hearings were had as to this particular amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Was the Administrator heard, and was he asked anything about this amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Administrator appeared before the subcommittee, but I do not recall that any question was addressed to him with reference to this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Why was it that the committee inserted this amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can explain that to the Senator. A year or two ago the Congress passed what was known as the Reorganization Act, giving the President the power to reorganize and regroup the several departments of government. By virtue of the authority carried in that act the President, by a proclamation, placed the Rural Electrification Administration, which had theretofore been an independent agency, under the Department of Agriculture. He likewise placed the Farm Credit Administration under the Department of Agriculture. While these two agencies have been a part of the Department of Agriculture for some years, due to some feeling within the agencies, the legal department of the Rural Electrification Administration and the legal department of the Farm Credit Administration have never been in anywise connected with the office of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, that being the legal department of the Department of Agriculture. The House this year inserted in the bill the proviso which is found in line 13 of the Senate print of the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. That is on page 7?

Mr. RUSSELL. On page 7, line 13, the proviso reads:

That there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed the total amount set up in the Budget schedules for such fiscal year for such purpose under the several appropriations herein involved.

The effect of the House language, according to the representations made to the committee by the Department, is to merge the legal departments of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration with the legal department of the Department of Agriculture.

I may say that the subcommittee handling the bill thought very properly that these three legal departments within the Department of Agriculture should be consolidated and joined into one, if the reorganization was to be a reorganization in fact, and not merely one in name, after having brought the agencies together.

The Department was of the opinion that there might be some question whether the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to transfer the funds from the Rural Electrification Administration and from the Farm Credit Administration to pay the attorneys who were brought into the legal department of the office of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. They therefore suggested the language which is found in the first proviso—

That the Secretary of Agriculture in his discretion, may transfer to this appropriation, from the funds available for the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration, such sums as he may determine are properly allocable to the cost of providing legal services for these agencies, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including clerical and other necessary expenses incident thereto:

There was some doubt in the minds of the committee as to whether that language was necessary, but, inasmuch as it was insisted upon by the Department to clear up any question of the authority of the Secretary to pay the attorneys, that language was added. It developed in the hearings that under the law creating the office of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, his compensation was limited to $9,000. Under the act creating the Rural Electrification Administration, and perhaps the Farm Credit Administration—I do not know whether it was in the act—the Chief Counsel of the Rural Electrification Administration was receiving the sum of $10,000 per year. The chief counsel of the Farm Credit Administration was receiving $10,000 per year. The effect of the action of the House would have been to bring the legal force of the Rural Electrification Administration and of the Farm Credit Administration under the supervision of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, and to have two of the subordinates drawing more in compensation than the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture drew.

The committee was without any authority to increase the compensation of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, because that would have been legislation on the bill, but we did deem it proper to place a further limitation, so that the Chief Counsel for the Rural Electrification Administration and the Chief Counsel for the Farm Credit Administration should not draw more compensation than the Solicitor for the entire Department of Agriculture. That is what the committee sought to do by this language.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think this language accomplishes that, and nothing else?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, I am quite confident that is all it accomplishes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me what the Senator from Georgia has said clearly demonstrates that either this language is unnecessary, and therefore has no business to be in the bill, or it is subject to a point of order. If the Secretary does not have authority to perform an act which the amendment seeks to permit him to perform, then legislation is necessary to give him that authority. I understand the Senator from Georgia contends that is what the amendment provides, and that it does nothing else.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the understanding of the committee—of course, I can be mistaken and the members of the committee can be mistaken—that all it does is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain funds.

Mr. NORRIS. That requires an act of Congress, and therefore this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. It may be possible it is; but I do not think it is. There are a number of transfers of appropriations contained throughout this bill, and there have been such transfers contained in similar measures ever since I have been familiar with appropriation bills.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems clear to me that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. Personally I feel very much opposed to the amendment whether that is so or not. But I believe the point of order ought to be made first and passed on anyway.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry of the Senator. Does the Senator object to the provision because it would reduce the pay of the Chief Counsel?

Mr. NORRIS. No. The purpose of the provision is to fix the amount that some gentleman will get as a salary. I submit to Senators that the salary cannot be fixed except by direct legislation. Here an attempt is made to do it in a roundabout way by legislation. That is frankly admitted by the Senator to be the object of the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will, out of his long experience, remember that time and again we have practically abolished offices by refusing to appropriate money to pay salaries.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we can refuse entirely to pay, we certainly can say that the amount of money to be paid shall not be more than so much.

Mr. NORRIS. Why not say that in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what is said.

Mr. NORRIS. My complaint about this amendment does not arise because of the reasons which have been given by the Senator from Georgia. I realize that unless there is some particular reason which I do not think exists here, an inferior official should not receive a salary which is higher than that which his superior officer receives. I am not questioning that. I should like to see that change which is sought brought about. I do not know how these salaries were established, but it is possible they can be changed by a simple order. I do not think Congress ever passed a law fixing the salary of the Solicitor at $10,000. If it did, it will require the passage of another law to change it, I should think. We cannot get around it by an indirect method.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are two subjects. First, the section starts by providing that all legal services in the Department shall be paid out of this appropriation and that for all legal services in the Department $209,535 shall be appropriated. The question arose as to whether, under that limitation, those in the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration could be paid at all, because the sum of $209,535 is not sufficient to pay all the salaries in the Department and also those in the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration. So, in order to be sure that all the employees would receive their salaries, there was included the first proviso, suggested by the Department, providing that there may be a transfer of appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration and for the Farm Credit Administration to the general fund from which all the salaries are paid, sufficient to pay them. That clears up a doubt that was in the minds of members of the committee. The committee simply adopted the Department's suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. If we wish to accomplish that, why not do it directly? It could be done in an appropriation bill, and we could appropriate only sufficient money to pay the salaries at the reduced rate.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point I am trying to make is that $209,535 would not take care of the transfer of the attorneys from the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration and pay for all the legal services thus included, as provided in the bill. So we allow a transfer of sufficient funds to pay whatever the salaries may be. I think that is entirely in order.

The second proposal was a committee proposal. The first one which I mentioned was a departmental proposal designed to make the situation clear.

Mr. NORRIS. That is in the House language.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The second proposal is that—

No part of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be used to pay any salary for legal services in excess of that authorized by law for the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture.

That is a committee recommendation in order to equalize the salaries. It means that the two gentlemen who are

now receiving $10,000 a year will hereafter receive $9,000 a year, the same salary as that of the Solicitor. That certainly is in order, beyond question.

Mr. NORRIS. That is only part of the amendment. If part of the amendment is subject to the point that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, the whole amendment goes out.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am pointing out that there are two substantive propositions and two provisos.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand; but the Senator is not pointing out this language:

That the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may transfer to this appropriation, from the funds available for the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration, such sums as he may determine are properly allocable to the cost of providing legal services for these agencies in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including clerical and other necessary expenses incident thereto.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator is correct in his contention that that language is subject to a point of order, certainly the remainder of the proviso is not. The further proviso limits the amount that may be paid out of this appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. The further proviso is:

Provided further, That no part of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be used to pay any salary for legal services in excess of that authorized by law for the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture.

I submit that if the point of order against the first proviso is sustained, and the point of order is made against the amendment, since there is only one amendment, the whole amendment goes down.

As I see it, I should have no objection to the proviso which the Senator is defending if the first part were eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think the amendment is subject to a point of order, because, in the first instance, the House wrote the legislation into the bill, and therefore that legislation would be amendable by the Senate.

I think I see the point of the Senator from Nebraska. While I do not think any difficulty would be likely to arise, there might be some confusion. The Senator from Nebraska apprehends that the Secretary might transfer from the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration more money than was set up for the cost of the legal departments of those two agencies, which are transferred. That situation could very readily be cured by striking out in the amendment the words "such sums as he may determine are properly allocable" and inserting the words "such sums as are set up in the Budget schedule." I think that would cure the situation.

Mr. NORRIS. I am sorry, but my attention was distracted and I did not hear the latter part of the Senator's statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. The fear of the Department which prompted the Department officials to suggest this amendment was that they could not spend any more money on the combined legal department than was carried in the Budget schedule for the Solicitor's office before the legal services of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration were merged. If this language were amended to provide that the Secretary may not transfer any more money for legal services than was already set up in the Budget, it could not have any effect upon the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration or the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not yet quite understand. What does the Senator propose?

Mr. RUSSELL. I propose to limit the Secretary's power of transfer of funds to the amount that was already set up in the Budget for the legal departments of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator frankly that I was troubled when this language was called to my attention last night. I feared that what was going to happen would be very injurious to the Rural Electrification Administration. I may be mistaken in that fear. I am made a little suspicious by the fact that the inquiry which I have made on the floor of the Senate discloses that when the committee wrote in this amendment it made no inquiry of the Rural Electrification Administration, the agency which is directly affected. I understand that the head of the Rural Electrification Administration was before the committee and that he testified at some length, but that no question was asked him about this particular amendment, and that he was given no opportunity to be heard; also that the legal department of the Rural Electrification Administration was given no opportunity to be heard.

I know that when the Rural Electrification Administration was transferred by order of the President there was much dissatisfaction and fear in the minds of those in the Rural Electrification Administration, from the top down, that when their independence was taken away by that order the effect upon the Rural Electrification Administration would be very serious. I have been acquainted with some of the troubles they have had. They have been serious troubles. The legal officers of the Rural Electrification Administration were often called upon to settle questions of law which were very doubtful. They made various trips into the field. Their activity covered the entire United States. The Rural Electrification Administration was in its infancy. To some extent it was experimental. There had never been a law similar to that creating it in the United States, or, so far as I am aware, in the entire world. Many questions arose, as to which there was serious doubt; and in all its trials and tribulations the Rural Electrification Administration always had to contest with an entrenched monopoly that was ready to take advantage of any difficulty that might arise anywhere. So there was built up in the Rural Electrification Administration a legal department, as it might be called, which I thought was very superior. The attorneys in that department had become experts in the law as it applied to rural electrification possibilities in the United States; and there was not in the United States any other such legal organization, or any organization of any kind that equaled it.

What I was afraid of and, frankly, what those at the top of the Rural Electrification Administration were afraid of, was that when the transfer took place the organization of lawyers that had been built up in that Administration would be destroyed and disseminated and would disappear from the face of the earth, and that the questions which they had mastered—or which I think they had mastered—with a great deal of difficulty would be turned over to another man, the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. However able he might be, however sympathetic he might be, he would be taking over en masse an organization confined to the particular legal field embraced in the activities included under the Rural Electrification Act.

The fear that ultimately the greatest damage would result to the rural electrification of the United States caused much sorrow and anxiety. I shared that anxiety. I share it now. I do not desire to take any action, even if I could, that would be unreasonable or unfair; but at this time, while rural electrification is still practically in its infancy, I should dislike to disrupt the great legal organization which has grown up within its bounds. I fear that that is what the amendment would ultimately lead to.

However, Mr. President, it is clear to me that, first of all, the amendment is subject to a point of order. I have no objection to the latter proviso, commencing in the last line of page 7, which reads—

That no part of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be used to pay any salary for legal services in excess of that authorized by law for the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture.

I do not think that any of the subordinate lawyers should receive a greater salary than that of the Solicitor. However, that is only one provision. If my point of order should be sustained, the Senator could offer that proviso as an amendment; and so far as I am concerned, I should make no objection to it.

However, under all the circumstances, Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the point of order made by the Senator from Nebraska, that the amendment proposes general legislation on an appropriation bill, well taken?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think the language about which the Senator from Nebraska complains is at all subject to a point of order, because, in the first instance, the House added the language contained in the bill from line 13 to line 17. The language is not contained in the Budget schedules, and, so far as I know, is not contained in any legislation. If the House amends the bill in the first instance by bringing certain lawyers into the Department of Agriculture's legal staff, unquestionably we have authority further to amend the bill to provide that lawyers shall be paid

when they are brought into the office of the Solicitor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to ask the Senator from Georgia a question regarding the language on page 7 of the bill, from line 13 through line 17. Does the Senator from Georgia regard that language as legislation, or is it merely a limitation imposed on the appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it is in the form of a limitation; but the language in line 16 is "for such purpose under the several appropriations herein involved," which I think is very clearly a limitation.

The limitation to which the Chair refers is a limitation pure and simple, but the language goes further than that, and undertakes to merge the legal staffs of the several departments for which appropriations are made throughout the bill. That is the purpose of the House, and it appears in the report of the House committee that it is proposed to merge the several legal services. The purpose of the language added by the Senate committee at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture himself was to make clear his authority to pay the lawyers who were brought in by the House language.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the proviso against which I have made the point of order were necessarily connected with the proviso contained in the House text, I think there might be some reason in the argument the Senator is making. However, I call attention to the fact that the language of that proviso could be put anywhere in the bill. It does not need to be here. The proviso to which I am objecting, which is a Senate amendment, is not necessarily a part of the language that is quoted from the text of the bill. It could have been put in anywhere, and it would have had the same legal effect that it has here; so the application of the rule the Senator seeks to invoke could always be brought about, if it were so desired, by way of a proviso to put into the bill something which would change existing law. If it had no connection with anything else in the bill, it could be added to any language in the bill, thus always avoiding a point of order being made against it in the Senate.

I do not think there is any connection whatever between the two provisions. I am not attempting to pass on that question. We cannot make a point of order against House language and we are not seeking to amend it. If we were, we should have a different question. An independent matter is provided by the Senate committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule XVI of the Senate, subsection 4, states that—

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate. * * *

Under that provision of the rule the Chair will submit to the Senate the question of whether or not, in the opinion of the Senate, the proviso commencing in page 7, line 17, is germane to the proviso written into the bill by the House of Representatives, beginning in line 13.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, no question of germaneness has been raised. The point is that the amendment is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia to make the argument that the proviso beginning in line 17 is germane to the language written into the bill by the House of Representatives.

Mr. RUSSELL. It pertains to that part of the language and clarifies it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators who believe the amendment is in order will say, "Aye." [A pause.] Those who do not believe the amendment is in order will say, "No." [A pause.] The Chair is in doubt.

Those who believe the amendment is in order will kindly raise their hands. [A pause.] Those who believe the amendment is not in order will kindly raise their hands. [A pause.]

The Senate holds the amendment to be in order. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on that question I desire to be heard. I hope the amendment will be rejected, and, because I have no objection to the latter part of the language, I shall bring the question before the Senate by a motion. I move to strike out the proviso beginning in line 17, page 7, down to and including the word "thereto" in line 24, so that the first proviso only would be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 7, beginning in line 17, it is proposed to strike out the proviso which reads:

> *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may transfer to this appropriation, from the funds available for the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration, such sums as he may determine are properly allocable to the cost of providing legal services for these agencies, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including clerical and other necessary expenses incident thereto.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate, which is already impatient at the long delay and the little progress which has been made during the last few days; but I feel very deeply about this amendment. The Rural Electrification Administration, in my opinion, does not deserve such treatment. I am not questioning the motives of the committee or of any Senator who favors the amendment, because I know how deeply they all feel, and I know how I have felt about what I thought was any effort to injure one of the greatest social undertakings in which this country has ever engaged.

The Rural Electrification Administration extends all over the United States. It has, I think, brought one of the greatest, if not the greatest, one blessing that has ever been brought to agriculture by legislation. Going back over a long series of years, the farmer has been stumbling along almost in darkness, bending his back always to toil without limit while producing the food which all must have and the material out of which the clothing of the human race has been made. He has been the backbone of civilization itself.

He has not enjoyed the comforts and happiness which have come to others under ordinary circumstances. He has not enjoyed the privileges which have come to his brethren in the cities. He has been, to a great extent, an outcast. We have bothered ourselves for years about the disagreeable fact that agriculture was losing the younger part of its great army, that there was too great an inclination for the boys and girls as soon as they grew up to leave the farm, that the farmer did not have educational and social advantages that others had, that he lived a life of drudgery and hard toil, and for the last 10 or 20 years in this country we knew that, to a great extent, he was producing the necessaries of life to sustain all of us at a loss to himself and that he had often mortgaged his own home for the purpose of staying on, and continually fighting the poverty and all the other evils against which he must fight.

Rural electrification came to the farmer as a blessing; it came to him as manna from heaven. It was one of the greatest blessings he had ever received. Especially is that true of the farm wife. It relieved her of the drudgery to which she had theretofore been subject. It made it more attractive to the growing generation of boys and girls to stay on the farm. It has added other blessings as it has developed.

Many of the most remarkable inventions in the electrical field have come through the Rural Electrification Administration. They have done away with some of the old conditions which existed under what was supposed to be a scientific control of electricity. They have revolutionized the cost of electric meters. They, for instance, have made it possible for every farmer to read his own meter. They have brought about blessings that avail to those in the city as well as to those on the farm. They have reduced construction costs almost everywhere and improved the methods, scientific and otherwise, which control not only the farm use but the general use of electricity throughout the land.

So, as one of those who believe in rural electrification, I look with some apprehension, Mr. President, when, little by little, one piece at a time, it is sought to take away the foundation upon which it was built.

As I remember, when it was first started authority was given to the administrator to fix salaries, for instance. Now it is complained that some of the salaries of subordinates are as great as those of their superior officers. That condition ought to be remedied. As the work goes on, we will discover other conditions that ought to be remedied, but in the contest that has been proceeding for 40 years between what I have so often called the

Power Trust and the users of electricity, rural electrification has gone forward and improved the methods of applying electricity to the homes, the factories, and the farms of America more than has any other one agency connected with the electrical industry.

I do not believe I am violating any confidence when I say that before Mr. Cook, who was the first administrator, resigned, or at the time he resigned, and Mr. Carmody was appointed, and, later on, when, after the reorganization bill was passed, there was talk about the Rural Electrification Administration being transferred to the Agricultural Department, the Rural Electrification Administration would have been without a head if that transfer had taken place while he was in charge, a man whose efficiency I think no one doubts who has had any experience with him. I know I pleaded with him that there would not be much difference anyway after this transfer took place, but I never got anywhere with that contention; and he referred particularly to the legal department. That department, to a great extent, was built up by him; at least, it was greatly improved by him; and he thought he had the best legal organization in the United States for that particular work. He bent his energies to it, and he said, "These men cannot be under a solicitor in the Agricultural Department. The solicitor may be just as good a man, and all that, but he has a thousand other things to do. These men have had only one thing to do"; and I knew what they had had to contend with, and how they had had to work, and how they had gone to nearly every part of the United States to avoid some technical legal objection that they were very anxious to see properly taken care of.

Mr. President, that transfer was made, nevertheless. A new administrator was appointed; and there would have had to be a new one even if the transfer of the old one had not taken place just before the new one was appointed, because under that order the one who was then in service would not have served, though not because of any objection to the particular department involved. I do not want anyone to get that idea. So far as I know, that objection does not exist. If this activity should have been transferred to any department it ought to have been, of course, to the Agricultural Department. I concede that. I think it was a great mistake, however, when the President tied it up with any department. It started out as an independent organization. With the work it had to do, it ought to have remained independent. Now we are asked to take, in legislation, one of the first steps to put the camel's nose under the tent, a procedure which I fear will eventually bring almost ruin to what, in my judgment, is one of the greatest advances in social matters that this country has ever taken.

I hope the Senate will agree to this amendment.

GOVERNMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, what I want to say for a moment has no relationship whatever to the statement the able Senator from Nebraska has just been making, nor has it any specific reference to the particular appropriation now pending; but before we get too far away from the charts presented yesterday by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] from his Temporary National "Economical" Committee, I desire to draw one significant and ominous analogy from the figures presented by him. I am referring to the figures reported on page 2761 of the RECORD which show the total assessed valuation of the various States of the Union; and I want to make a brief reference to a comparison between the assessed valuation of the States of the Union and the appropriation bills which the Senate is passing from day to day this spring with an almost hopeless abandon as respects the possibility of ever footing the bill.

This afternoon we passed the fifth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, containing about $4,000,000,000 of direct appropriations and authorizations. Four billion dollars is more than the assessed valuation of all except 10 states of the Union. That is what we appropriated this afternoon in the fifth supplemental defense appropriation bill—more than the assessed valuation of 38 States of the Union individually.

When we passed the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease appropriation it was more than the assessed valuation of any State in the Union except New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and California—all except four States.

Sometimes it is asked, "How much is a billion dollars?" In the hope that the average American citizen may be brought to some conception of the utterly staggering fiscal burden which his Government and his Congress are putting on him at breakneck speed at the present time, I ask, how much is a billion dollars? It is more than the assessed valuation of Alabama, Oregon, Maine, Florida, New Hampshire, Utah, North Dakota, Mississippi, Arkansas, Idaho, Arizona, South Carolina, Montana, Vermont, Delaware, New Mexico Wyoming, and Nevada. I am referring to the assessed valuation of any one of them.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Carrying the illustration a little further, perhaps a more graphic one would be to say that if we should take a dollar for every minute of every day of every week of every month of every year in the past 2,000 years since Christ was on earth, we should still have slightly less than $1,000,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his observation. That still is rather academic and objective, however. What I am trying to do is to relate a billion dollars to the tangible things of life in American practice at the present time.

In the course of the debate on the last appropriation bill I asked the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] what our total defense appropriations were for the present fiscal year, and he announced that they were just short of $40,000,000,000. That is $40,000,000,000 for one fiscal year for defense. That represents the entire assessed valuation of the great State of New York, plus the great State of Pennsylvania, plus the great State of Connecticut.

Mr. President, I confess that these mathematics give me very solemn pause. We are devoting ourselves to the national defense with great fidelity. I am not complaining or criticizing anyone for voting these appropriations, because I am joining in doing it. I am trying to say that I think it is about time we had some slight conception of what it is, in an economic sense, with which we are about to confront the American people; and I am very respectfully saying that since the preservation of the national credit is the preservation of the first line of national defense, I think it is about time administration leadership asked us to think very constructively about the national solvency in terms of paying these bills as well as in terms of making the appropriations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

ONLY PRODUCTION WILL PAY NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question with which the Senator has just concluded his remarks is one which I think every Member of the Congress and, indeed, every citizen should ask himself. It is quite obvious that we cannot begin to pay the bill which is being incurred for purposes of defense unless we make up our minds to make it possible for the people as a whole to produce the goods with which these bills will be paid.

I am glad to note that the Senator has referred to the chart which I put in the RECORD yesterday. I have asked Mr. Totty to hang on the wall of the Senate the map taken from the March 31 issue of the magazine Life which I used yesterday. This map shows the distribution among the States of the defense contracts for which the funds we are appropriating here are to be expended. More than $13,000,000,000 in defense contracts have already been authorized. Thirteen billions equal the assessed value of almost 13 States of the rank of the State of Colorado, so ably here represented by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], who has been in charge of most of these appropriation bills.

To me it is very significant that since these appropriations began we have heard very little talk about balancing the Budget. These appropriations are going to the concentrated industries of the United States. One could go over the map which is here on the wall and refer to one plant after another constructed with Government funds, and it could be pointed out that in almost every instance the entire burden of constructing these plants is borne by the Government. R. F. C. makes the loans, the operating companies receive the contracts and do the work. If after the present emergency these buildings are no longer needed, the burden will fall upon the Government of the United States.

The degree of concentration, or, rather, perhaps the group character of modern industry is well illustrated by one fact which has come to my attention. A con-

tract for the operation of a powder factory has been awarded to the Coca-Cola Co. Procter & Gamble are operating another powder factory.

This is all because of a fact which is so clear to us, so near to us, that we pay no attention to it, that modern industry is a group activity; it is not an individual activity. Organizations are needed to do the work of the world. We have not succeeded in so adjusting the group activity necessary in modern business as to protect the economic life of the masses of the people. That is the reason why Members of this body in the committees and elsewhere wonder why their particular States, in many instances, are being denuded of mechanics and workmen who are being taken away to other communities where the new defense facilities are being constructed. There are many cities in the United States in which this work is being carried on which are altogether unable to provide for the people who are gathering to do the work. I have known of cities where the workers brought in from other States are living in trailers. I know of one town where a large stable was reconstructed in order to permit families to live in it and when the emergency is over the little partitions which were put in will be withdrawn and the horses can go back into the stable.

The point to which I am calling attention is that the economic life of the people of the United States has so completely changed that individuals are dependent for their living upon organizations over which they have no authority. There can be no such thing—let it be stated over and over again—there can be no such thing as political freedom without economic freedom upon which to base it. We are dealing with these tremendous astronomical figures, $4,000,000,000 appropriated in the Senate today, $7,000,000,000 a day or so ago, other billions another day. We have had to raise the debt limit to $65,000,000,000, a figure so great that no one can imagine it. All this must make us realize that it is absolutely essential to the preservation of our institutions that we give thought to the fundamental problem of making it possible for people to support themselves. These huge economic organizations which inevitably terminate in great government organizations must be adjusted to the individual lives of the people if we hope to maintain the political principles of freedom on which this Government was founded.

I am happy the Senator from Michigan has called attention to the significance of these appropriations. It inspires me to hope that Members of the Senate will read the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee which was filed yesterday and which will soon be printed. As I stated yesterday, I do not believe that that report contains a solution of our problems. Not at all. But it does point the way. It does describe an economic structure. If we indulge the presumption that the Congress represents the people who elect the Members, and the States from which the Members come, particularly the Members of the Senate, then we must consider how it comes about that this very serious dislocation of economic life has taken place and both our people and our States have become so dependent on central power.

When I call attention to this I do not want anyone to understand that I am in any degree whatsoever criticizing the Army and the Navy for what is being done. The Defense Council and the Army and the Navy are not responsible for this maldistribution. This concentration of industry took place long before this crisis came upon us, and if the War Department and the Navy Department wanted to have defense material manufactured they had no recourse except to award the contracts to the organizations which could deliver the goods that are needed.

We wonder why it is that Members of Congress from various parts of the United States come into this body and into the House of Representatives and ask for appropriations for relief for agriculture, and for this local project, and that. It is because this tremendous concentration which has been in progress for years has undermined the economic freedom of the individuals who constitute our society. The studies of our committee revealed the fact that most of the national income which is received by most industries goes to corporate organizations, and not to individuals. Agriculture alone is an industry in which individuals still receive most of the income. Only 7 percent of the national income which goes to agriculture goes to corporate enterprise. Ninety-three percent is received by individuals. There was testimony before the Committee on Appropriations a few days ago while the agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration that even that has been so concentrated that a very large proportion of it goes to a very small proportion of the farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the hearings before the committee not only showed that 25 percent of the people living on the farms in this country receive only about 9 percent of the total income, but that 11 percent of the farmers receive over 50 percent of the total farm income, leaving 89 percent of the farm population to enjoy a very small share of the total national agricultural income.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMAN in the chair). The Senator from Michigan has the floor. To whom does he yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to conclude.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming, and I shall be very happy to permit the Senator from Ohio to interrogate the Senator from Wyoming if he wishes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming referred to Procter & Gamble. The Procter & Gamble Co. has been given the job of managing a government shell-loading plant in the State of Tennessee. It has no relation to any place the Procter & Gamble Co. has been before. It has no relation to their main plant in Cincinnati. Simply because they have a large organization they have been asked to set up a large manufacturing plant. It is not easy to find an individual and say, "Go along and set up a manufacturing organization." So, at least in the case of that contract it does not seem to have any particular reference to the question of concentration of economic wealth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does, Mr. President, and I am thankful to the Senator from Ohio for making that remark, because I think it only strengthens the statement I was making. I am merely calling attention to the character of the economic system under which we are operating. I am not criticizing the War Department for going to Procter & Gamble. Not at all; I am only pointing out that Procter & Gamble has the kind of organization needed, that individuals do not fit in, and that apparent incongruities result.

Mr. TAFT. But if it were not an emergency, the Government would set up and manage its own plant. It happens that only organizations of certain size can manage that kind of a plant, so, of course, you go to an organization of that kind. The fact that there are such organizations, it seems to me, is of very great advantage in the present situation, rather than any reason for decrying the concentration of economic wealth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask who is decrying it? Certainly not the Senator from Wyoming. I am glad that Procter & Gamble are taking this contract. I acknowledge that nobody else probably could have handled the contract. I have expressly said that the War Department was doing the best it could. But the point of it all is that the sort of industry which is necessary in defense, the sort of industry which is necessary in peace, is the sort of concentrated organized industry that makes it impossible for individuals to find a secure place. Our problem, our great problem is to develop such a formula to make it certain that individuals shall have a place in the economic life. They do not have that place now.

I hope the Senator from Ohio and others who feel that whenever a statement of fact is made it means criticism will read the report of the committee headed by Representative TOLAN, of California, on the problem of the "okies," the migratory farmers, who are being driven from their homes because they have no place in organized society.

Mr. President, we shall not begin to solve this problem until we put out of our heads the thought of criticism when somebody points to the existence of our condition. We have to work this out with tolerance and with broad-mindedness.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for being so patient with me while I have been imposing on his time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not interpret the Senator from Wyoming's statement with

reference to the Coca-Cola Co. as being a criticism of the Coca-Cola Co.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all.

Mr. GEORGE. No; but I did rise merely to get the Senator's facts straight. The Coca-Cola Co. has not been invited to build a powder plant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I said "operate."

Mr. GEORGE. No; not a powder plant. Let me correct the Senator. The Coca-Cola Co., or certain of its managers, have been invited by the War Department to build a powder-loading plant—that is, to manufacture silk bags for the purpose of loading the powder for artillery purposes in the silk bags. In that instance, let me say, Mr. President, that undoubtedly the Coca-Cola Co. did not seek any contract with the Government. It was invited substantially for the reasons the Senator from Wyoming points out—that it had a large organization, it had management of superior and tested qualities; the company therefore was invited to go wholly outside its regular and usual business and undertake a job for the Government.

I may say also, Mr. President, that another Georgia concern—though the Coca-Cola Co. is not a Georgia concern, it had its origin there, but it is a Delaware corporation—another concern operating likewise in Georgia, Johnson & Johnson, perhaps the largest manufacturers in the world of surgical textiles and dressings, Red Cross dressings, and so forth, has been invited to do identically the same thing, to wit, to manufacture and to pack powder in silken bags for the use of the Army and Navy.

I should like to say also, Mr. President, that in both instances—certainly in one—there was no seeking of contracts by the parties themselves, but they were requested to do the work as a public duty, and I dare say the War Department will itself approve the statement that in one instance the company, when asked to undertake a titanic job, offered to do so upon one condition, to-wit, that it not be paid anything whatever for doing the job. The War Department declined upon the ground that the United States could not make a contract upon that basis. Therefore one of these corporations is forming a subsidiary solely for the purpose of meeting the requirements and the request of the Government, and the sole obligation which it has is to furnish the managerial force with which to operate and to meet the requirements of Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the discussion has gone far afield from the text which I presented about a half hour ago, but, of course, it has been important and instructive.

I rose only for the purpose of using this exhibit from the T. N. E. C. to try to visualize what a billion dollars is in terms of real value in the United States, and I am content to resume my seat with one further final reiteration of the matter.

The pending agricultural appropriation bill, for example, probably one of the worthiest of all the bills we shall have from the Appropriations Committee this year, appropriates the equivalent of the total assessed valuation of the State of Rhode Island, or the State of Louisiana, or the State of Oklahoma. I repeat, that the $40,000,000,000 which the Senator from Colorado told me yesterday were embraced within our defense appropriations for this fiscal year, represent the entire assessed valuation of the State of New York, plus the State of Pennsylvania, plus the State of Connecticut.

What I am saying is not in derogation of the appropriation. What I am saying is simply to illustrate the extent of the burden which the American people will have to carry as the result of these essential appropriations. I am saying again that I think it is about time that more voices were raised plainly to say to the country, as did the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] the other day, that if we are to escape national insolvency there is no escape from a tremendous tax burden which touches the whole mass citizenship of the United States.

THE PRESERVATION OF ECONOMIC FREEDOM (S. DOC. NO. 39)

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, the final statement of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee at the closing public session to consider recommendations, dated March 11, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAINING OF DEFENSE LABOR BY CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have appear at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Post of March 23, 1941. This article is headed "C. C. C. Impeded in Training Defense Labor—Lack of Equipment and Funds Holds Back Courses for Thousands." I have personally been in a number of C. C. C. camps and am familiar with the exceptional and practical training opportunities they can offer. In my belief the corps, under present regulations, without additional funds, and under some handicaps, has reshaped itself into an increasingly effective training field for defense activities. However, it is also my conviction that a still fuller use of the training opportunities of the corps should be made in connection with national-defense activities.

We are repeatedly told of shortages of skilled workers in many fields. In a great number of these fields the C. C. C., with additional funds, could furnish speedy, practical training to thousands and thousands of young men. This holds with particular force for all activities connected with the operation, maintenance, and repair of automotive units and all types of internal combustion engines, including those used in tanks and airplanes.

In using the C. C. C. as a more fertile field for defense training activities no new organization need be set up. The corps is already operating. All that is needed is greater emphasis on training for specific defense jobs and the funds to carry out that training.

I recognize that increased training activities cannot be conducted without some sacrifice of the present huge conservation work programs of the corps. At this time, however, I think such a sacrifice should be made. I think a considerable part of the work programs can and should still be undertaken, not only because of the value of the work in itself, but also because of the value of practical production work in the training of men.

Between 70 and 80 percent of the work carried on by the corps has an almost identical military counterpart. The roads, bridges, buildings, telephone lines, and many other items constructed by the corps for conservation purposes are also work items which present day mechanized armies require in vast quantity.

Another considerable advantage in using the C. C. C. to a greater extent for training in specific skills is the fact that the men who come out of the corps not only attain skills, but by their method of living they also obtain rugged health, safety habits, and a fine sense of discipline along with practical work experience.

Employers all over the country are becoming increasingly aware of the desirability of C. C. C. boys as employees, and numerous Army officers have testified as to the value of the former C. C. C. boys in specialists' jobs in the armed forces. Probably no reasonable estimate could presently be made of the number of cooks and bakers, signal men, radio specialists, hospital orderlies, mechanical specialists, clerical specialists, and numerous other specialists now serving with the Army who received their training in the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I am delighted with the results which are already evident from the training activities of the corps. Yet I am convinced that if, in their present limited degree, these training efforts are productive of such excellent results, it is important and imperative to remove present limitations and to increase substantially training activities.

From the article which I am asking to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks and from numerous contacts over a period of years with C. C. C. officials and enrollees I know that the corps would quickly and enthusiastically expand its training work if it were so directed. Enrollees in the corps would welcome additional practical instruction.

I am sure that all of us can subscribe to the declaration that the C. C. C. has been managed with great earnestness, patriotism, and application to the duty which is entrusted to it under the law. The Director, Mr. McEntee, is a man of sterling quality and great ability, and I think it only fair to say that perhaps in large measure he has contributed to the uniform popularity that is enjoyed by that organization. This plea, which I have made before, is awakened by the article which I have asked to have included in the RECORD. I am simply trying to renew my hope that a different emphasis may be placed on the work of

these boys rather than that any change may be made in the type of organization, in the interest of what they can do in a nonmilitary sense toward national defense in the present emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Without objection, the article referred to by the Senator will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 23, 1941]

C. C. C. IMPEDED IN TRAINING DEFENSE LABOR—LACK OF EQUIPMENT AND FUNDS HOLDS BACK COURSES FOR THOUSANDS

(By Alfred Friendly)

Despite pressing need for skilled workers to meet a serious impending labor shortage, the potentialities of the Civilian Conservation Corps to supply defense industries with an estimated 300,000 to 500,000 trained craftsmen each year are relatively untapped.

This was admitted to the Post yesterday by James J. McEntee, C. C. C. Director. Although he pointed out that thousands of enrollees are given training during their leisure time in a few skilled trades so that they quickly find productive jobs when they leave the camps, he acknowledged that only an expanded program could give similar employment equipment to the great majority of the C. C C.'s present 300,000 men, enrolled for a 6-month period.

McEntee added that the C. C. C. has announced its willingness to revamp or extend its training programs to meet whatever requests the Army or O. P. M. might make for trained workers in specified trades. So far, however, he said no requests have been received for a broad-scale reorientation of the C. C. C. program directed toward easing present and prospective labor shortages.

COURSES HANDICAPPED

Present training and vocational education courses in almost all the camps, McEntee said, are able to equip thousands of enrollees with some skill in radio operation and repair, automotive mechanics, welding, metal, and woodworking and other trades. These courses, however, are handicapped by lack of funds, instructors, and equipment and can be taken by the enrollees only a few hours a week, after their regular weekly 40 hours on the work project.

Nevertheless, he pointed out, the defense program has so stepped up industrial demand for even partially trained labor that the camps have been encountering great difficulty in holding sufficient tractor operators and garage and repair mechanics to keep the camps in operation.

In the few camps where more intensive training has been given, industry is "snapping up" the boys and "asking for more," McEntee reported. In a California camp, where leisure-time instruction is given in aircraft mechanics, the Consolidated Aircraft Co. has hired 120 boys and promises jobs to all others who complete the 200-hour camp training program. The Hercules Powder Co. hired all available enrollees trained in camp as tractor operators and repair mechanics for the construction of a new plant at Roanoke, Va. More than 200 boys who received mechanical training in the central repair shops of camps near Schenectady, N. Y., have been hired by General Electric Corporation, McEntee said.

THREE THOUSAND MECHANICS IN 6 MONTHS

He revealed that some months ago he submitted estimates to the Defense Commission, showing that with the expenditure of about $20,500,000 for equipment and instructors the present after-hour training programs in the camps could turn out in 6 months' time 90,000 motor-vehicle operators, 3,000 skilled mechanics, 6,000 cooks and bakers, 3,500 skilled dispensary attendants and medical orderlies, 2,000 map makers and surveyors, 10,000 photographic technicians, and 20,000 radio men. In a year's time he promised 1,000 airplane-motor mechanics, and in 3 months' time some 7,500 to 10,000 maintenance men could be trained, he said.

"There is no reason why 10,000 airplane mechanics could not be trained as easily as 1,000," McEntee declared. "The corps is equipped to do any type of training it is asked to."

However, no action was taken on his estimates and no request for such training was filed, he said.

Even without such requests, however, the corps has intensified its training program and is emphasizing courses such as radio operation, welding, and machine working in order to equip enrollees for skilled jobs in defense industries and even for specialized services in the Army, the director reported.

No plans have been made or even proposed, McEntee asserted, to relinquish the C. C. C.'s present work program. Asked whether this would be possible, in order to convert the corps into a training, rather than a work, organization, McEntee admitted that this could be done with all but a few camps, now working on construction of Army air and training fields and cantonment grounds.

The result of such a change, McEntee said, would be the abandonment of the conservation work program now being carried on, but would enable the corps to supply a steady stream of skilled operatives into whatever industrial fields the Government directed.

C. C. C. enrollees are eager for such training, other officials reported, and strive for admission to the after-hour courses, given either at the camps or at nearby vocational high schools, and taught either by camp technicians or instructors hired from neighboring communities.

ORGANIZATION AT HAND

The basic organization and procedure for an expanded program is on hand, McEntee said, and needs only funds for additional equipment and teachers.

The growing critical shortage of labor for certain defense industries, and the need for immediately intensified-training programs has been emphasized recently by the O. P. M., the War and Labor Departments, and the United States Employment Service. The latter offices estimated last week that there were current shortages in 30 defense-labor classifications and implied that at the present rate of employment, labor reserves for many other categories would be quickly exhausted.

Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson told a conference here last week that a serious labor shortage was imminent, and earlier the conference heard O. P. M. Director General William S. Knudsen forecast a 60-percent increase in labor requirements.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on the pending question.

It is always unpleasant to find myself on the opposite side of any question from that taken by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. However, in this instance I must differ with his interpretation of the effect of the committee amendment. If any committee of Congress has evinced great solicitude for the Rural Electrification Administration, it has been the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. This year the committee approved a request for funds of $60,000,000 in excess of those set up in the Budget for the Rural Electrification Administration for the purpose of carrying out its great program.

I have repeatedly made the statement that in my opinion no program has been brought into existence during this administration which will make a more profound impression upon the life of the people of the United States than that of the Rural Electrification Administration. I heartily applaud the genius of the Senator from Nebraska in bringing this organization into being, and I second all he has said about the magnificent work it has done since it was created by legislation.

But that is not the issue here, Mr. President. The question is whether or not we shall repeal the reorganization law with reference to the legal department of the Rural Electrification Administration. All that the Senator from Nebraska has said was brought out when the President, by proclamation, made the Rural Electrification Administration part of the Department of Agriculture. It has been constituted one of the parts of the Department of Agriculture. If the position taken by the Senator from Nebraska were to prevail, we should have two legal departments within the Department of Agriculture—one serving all the bureaus and agencies of the Department of Agriculture except the Rural Electrification Administration, and another separate legal department for the Rural Electrification Administration. Certainly that would not be consistent with the theory of reorganization of the departments, nor would it be consistent with sound administration within the departments.

The Senator referred to the fact that no member of the committee had asked the head of the Rural Electrification Administration whether or not he approved of this language. Under the reorganization order, the Rural Electrification Administration is under the Secretary of Agriculture. This language was suggested to the committee by the Secretary of Agriculture, and was therefore written into the bill by the committee at the request of the Department of Agriculture and of the Rural Electrification Administration. I think the Senate should vote down the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to strike out the proviso on page 7, line 17. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. What was the ruling, Mr. President? Did the Chair say not enough hands were raised?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An insufficient number of hands was raised.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to remind the Chair that it takes only one-fifth of those present to order a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that it must be assumed that a quorum is present in considering the number of hands raised.

Mr. NORRIS. No, Mr. President; if that is the decision of the Chair, the Chair is counting on Senators who are not here. The Constitution of the United States says the yeas and nays shall be ordered "at the desire of one-fifth of those present."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is a precedent on that subject. The Senate has acted on it before. The presumption is that we have a quorum, which is 48; and to order a yea-and-nay vote it must be requested by one-fifth of 48, which would be 10 Members.

Mr. NORRIS. That is not what the Constitution of the United States says.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has passed on this question two or three times.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we are ready to suspend now, if the Senator from Nebraska will agree to that course.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well, if the Senator desires to have the Senate take a recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I am about to move a recess.

Mr. NORRIS. My amendment has not been voted on.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it has not been voted on except by a viva voce vote. Then the Senator from Nebraska demanded the yeas and nays, and they were not accorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Chair ruled that the amendment had been rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not hear the Chair state that. The Chair stated that the "noes" appeared to have it, and that is when I interrupted the proceedings. If the Chair kept on, he prevented any Senator from asking for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question, then, is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. If the majority leader desires to have the Senate take a recess at this time, I have no objection. If he does not, I shall call for a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we might as well rise now.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader will move a recess. I think the amendment should be rejected; but certainly I do not desire to deny the Senate an opportunity for a full and free expression of opinion on the question.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is desirable to have the Senate suspend the consideration of this bill until tomorrow; and therefore I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EDWARD MACAULEY

Mr. HILL. From the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably the nomination of Edward Macauley, of California, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1938. A vacancy exists at the present time, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the nomination on the calendar?

Mr. HILL. The nomination is not on the calendar. As the Senator will recall, we did not have an executive session yesterday. The Senator also will recall that the Senate was in recess over Friday and Saturday. A vacancy exists on the Maritime Commission. Mr. Macauley is here in the city of Washington, waiting to take the oath of office. The committee has made a favorable report on the nomination. The nomination is agreeable to both the Senators from the State of California; and, if possible, we should like to have the nomination confirmed today.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the nomination was not considered by the full committee. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. HILL. There was not a regular meeting of the full committee, but the different members of the committee were consulted as to the nomination.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, it is one of the polled approbations. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Nevada is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object, and ask that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and placed on the calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the same request as to the Navy nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 31), 1941:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Ernest L. Patch, July 1, 1940.
Gordon W. Nelson, July 1, 1940.
John I. Hale, July 1, 1940.
William I. Causey, February 1, 1941.
Roy Dudley, February 1, 1941.
Herbert K. Fenn, February 1, 1941.
Henry M. Briggs, February 1, 1941.
Paul Cassard, February 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of July 1939:

Richard McK. Rush	DeWitt C. Redgrave, Jr.
Irving B. McDaniel	Philip Lemler
Harold Larner	Roswell B. Daggett
George W. Henderson	Floyd A. Tusler
Wendell P. Roop	

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Richard M. Watt, Jr., July 1, 1940.
Ralph E. McShane, July 1, 1940.
Charles D. Wheelock, July 1, 1940.
Andrew P. Lawton, December 1, 1940.
Harold L. Meadow, January 1, 1941.
Raymond D. Tarbuck, March 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the dates stated opposite their names:

James O. Banks, Jr., November 1, 1939.
William T. Jones, July 1, 1940.
Heywood L. Edwards, August 1, 1940.
Fondville L. Tedder, December 1, 1940.
John G. Foster, Jr., December 16, 1940.
Joseph H. Willingham, Jr., January 1, 1941.
Ranson Fullinwider, January 1, 1941.
John K. Reybold, January 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1941:

Henry D. Sturr
Philip W. Garnett

Medical Inspector Charles S. Stephenson to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 1st day of July 1940.

Passed Assistant Paymaster William A. Gerth to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 5th day of January 1941.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Paul L. Weintraub, Jr., July 1, 1940.
Alfred T. Magnell, December 16, 1940.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the date stated opposite their names:

John W. Rogers, December 2, 1939.
Truman O. Moore, January 10, 1941.
Ernest Maltby, January 10, 1941.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 2d day of February 1941:

Robert Fisher
Hampton L. Outlaw

The following-named radio electricians to be chief radio electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 2d day of February 1941:

Gordon O. Denzin
Donald L. Dickson

Machinist James E. Ross to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of November 1940.

Carpenter Francis J. May to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of January 1941.

Pay clerk David E. Fay to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of January 1941.

The following-named captains to be captains in the Navy, from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Edmund W. Burrough, July 1, 1940.
Robert W. Hayler, September 1, 1940.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy, from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Ed B. Billingsley, November 1, 1939.
Thomas G. Warfield, November 22, 1939.
Lawrence W. Smythe, December 8, 1939.
Francis E. Nuessle, December 29, 1939.
Reynolds C. Smith, January 1, 1940.
John P. Lunger, January 29, 1940.
Robert E. Coombs, Jr., February 1, 1940.
John W. Ramey, February 12, 1940.
George L. Bellinger, February 20, 1940.
Dennis S. Crowley, April 1, 1940.
George L. Hutchinson, April 13, 1940.
Allan A. Ovrom, May 1 1940.
Clare B. Smiley, May 29, 1940.
John J. McCormick, June 1, 1940.
Thomas E. Chambers, June 21, 1940.
Albert D. Kaplan, June 26, 1940.
James G. Franklin, July 1, 1940.
Enrique D. Haskins, July 9, 1940.
John A. Tyree, Jr., July 13, 1940.
Hayden L. Leon, August 1, 1940.
Theodore R. Vogeley, August 16, 1940.
Frederick H. Wahlig, September 1, 1940.
Lester C. Conwell, October 1, 1940.
Charles L. Moore, Jr., November 1, 1940.
Raymond B. Jacoby, November 10, 1940.
Harry C. Maynard, November 23, 1940.
Clarence M. Caldwell, January 1, 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 20th day of March 1941:

Arthur L. Schultz	Marion T. Martin
Edward A. Kearney, Jr.	Clement C. Chesko
James N. DeLamater	Glen G. Passmore
Donald W. Gressly	Robert H. Williams
Christopher Mamonas	John W. Albrittain
William G. Langston	Fred A. Butler
Knox Pittard	Robert A. Mount
Mark H. Young	Wait R. Griswold
Robert F. Robertson	John H. Bergman
William J. Grace	John B. Rowe
John C. Hart	John P. Dobson
Horace L. Jones, Jr.	James H. Bunn
James T. Fowler, Jr.	George S. Rader
Harry S. Etter	Gerald H. McAteer
Everett J. Olenick	Francis M. Burns
Joseph P. Pollard	Gerald W. Hurst

Lt. Comdr. Wallace R. Dowd to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July 1939.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Lysle W. Cease to be a paymaster in the Navy, with rank of lieutenant commander, from the 23rd day of November 1940.

MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Clayton B. Vogel to be a major general in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941.

The following-named lieutenant colonels to be colonels in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Charles I. Murray	Gilder D. Jackson, Jr.
Samuel C. Cumming	Graves B. Erskine

The following-named majors to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Merton J. Batchelder	George R. Rowan
George E. Monson	Theodore H. Cartwright
William J. Wallace	
Amor L. Sims	

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

John S. E. Young	Ward E. Dickey
Arthur H. Butler	William D. Saunders, Jr.
Nels H. Nelson	
Russell N. Jordahl	David M. Shoup
Elmer H. Salzman	Thomas G. McFarland
Thomas A. Wornham	John R. Lanigan
Earle S. Davis	Raymond E. Hopper
Roy M. Gulick	

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of August 1939:

Arnold F. Johnston	Michael S. Currin
Gordon E. Hendricks	Earl A. Sneeringer
John J. Cosgrove, Jr.	Robert T. Stivers, Jr.
Richard D. Hughes	

First Lt. Charles T. Tingle to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of August 1939.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1939:

Wallace M. Nelson.
Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1939:

Herman Nickerson, Jr.	Wesley M. Platt
Richard H. Crockett	George A. Roll

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April 1940:

Kenneth F. McLeod.
Robert E. Stannah.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1940:

Stanley W. Trachta	Kenyth A. Damke
William J. Van Ryzin	Kenneth A. Jorgensen
Joe C. McHaney	Alexander B. Swenceski
Donn C. Hart	
Eugene F. Syms	Hoyt McMillan
John W. Stage	

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940:

George H. Brockway.
Thomas F. Riley.

First Lt. William A. Rygg to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1940, to correct a mistake in his name as previously nominated and confirmed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 31), 1941:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

George S. Lawson, Boonville.
Thomas F. Gladwill, Harbor City.
Elizabeth C. Bavier, Truckee.

COLORADO

Michael C. Huber, Palisade.

MINNESOTA

John S. Stensrud, Canby.
LeRoy S. Burnett, Hewitt.
Hjalmer H. Moe, Milan.
Edward J. Mendick, Oslo.
Dolpha E. Johnson, Strandquist.
Jennie M. Wurst, Watkins.

NEVADA

Vevia B. Eckley, Mina.

NEW JERSEY

Harry Marvin Riddle, Jr., Asbury.
Kathleen M. McKenna, Fairview.
Samuel Munyan, Gibbstown.
William P. Kern, Jersey City.
George Stack, Lindenwold.
Thomas D. L. Menchion, Oradell.
Carlton F. Elwell, Toms River.
J. Philip Ryan, Warren Point.

NEW YORK

William T. Storm, Hopewell Junction.

WISCONSIN

Arthur J. Brill, Kiel.

WYOMING

Ivan R. Daugherty, Baggs.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

NOTE.—For a list of the names of all persons whose nominations for promotion or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army were confirmed today, see Senate proceedings of March 24, 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 2523.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

NOTE.—For a list of the names of all persons whose nominations for promotion in the Navy were confirmed today, see Senate proceedings of March 13, 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 2218.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Guide us, O Thou great Jehovah, and let us never forget that this is our Father's world. We praise Thee that Thou art a sanctuary of never-failing love. We pray that Thy truth may inspire knowledge, fidelity, and obedience, that all our people may be less and less separated through selfishness and more and more united in true brotherhood. Heavenly Father, subdue those defiling passions which estrange men, setting the example not of worldly comfort but of nobility, generosity, and sacrifice, until our democracy finds its brotherhood and justice its throne. We beseech Thee that the riches of Thy spirit, which in times gone by have been so glorious, may be resplendent in these tragic times of clashing strife. Consider and hear us, blessed Lord: If we have forgotten the instructions of our childhood and their early faiths, if we are moving in the world of today, careless and unbelieving, we pray Thee to bring us once again to the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. We pray in the name of Mary's holy Child, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to provide for the printing, with illustrations and binding in cloth, of revised editions of the Special Reports on the Diseases of the Horse and the Diseases of Cattle; and

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the bill (S. 275) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD pertaining to the social security, and also to include a resolution from the Senate of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a statement by Mr. James Truslow Adams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Mr. Wyatt W. Lipscomb, of Albany, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I wrote to the Knickerbocker Press in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST-EMERGENCY PROBLEMS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DONDERO addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES H. BURKE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, April 1, 1941, happens to be the eightieth birthday of a former Member of the House, who comes to visit us every once in a while. I refer to the Honorable Charles H. Burke, for many years a Member of this House. He served from the State of South Dakota for 14 years as a Representative. He was one of the most effective Members of his time and was Republican whip under the leadership of the honorable James R. Mann, of Illinois. After his service in the House, he was Commissioner of Indian Affairs for more than 8 years. Later Mr. Burke served in a diplomatic capacity as a special representative from the United States Government to the Paris Exposition. During the past winter he was sick for a time, but with traditional Irish pluck he pulled through and is back with his family in this city. So, on this, his eightieth birthday, I rise to extend to Charlie Burke the good wishes and felicitations of his many friends in the House of Representatives, that he may read them in the RECORD tomorrow. He always reads the RECORD. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill H. R. 968.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio speech I made in regard to labor and national defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short resolution from the Oregon Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper statement by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson in connection with Colonel Lindbergh.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three particulars and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars and in one to insert an article with reference to Gutzon Borglum and in the other an editorial on the problem of pollution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a short article on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech delivered by me under the sponsorship of the Central Council of Irish Associations of Boston.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the legislative program of the day and any other special orders that may have been entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today I have introduced the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas the Democratic Party in convention assembled on July 15 to 20, 1940, at Chicago, Ill., adopted the following plank in its platform:

"The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

"We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

"The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and maintenance of its peace"; and

Whereas the Republican Party, in its national convention held from June 24 to 29, 1940 at Philadelphia, Pa., adopted the following plank in its platform:

"The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

"We are still suffering from the ill effects of the last World War—a war which cost us a $24,000,000,000 increase in our national debt—billions of uncollectible foreign debts, and the complete upset of our economic system, in addition to the loss of human lives and irreparable damage to the health of thousands of our boys"; and

Whereas the overwhelming majority of our people are opposed to our involvement in the European-African-Asiatic war now being waged; and

Whereas the convoying of supplies to Great Britain by vessels of the United States is imminent and will be followed by open warfare in the judgment of all competent observers: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the people of the United States through their duly elected Representatives in Congress assembled declare their unalterable opposition to the use of vessels of the United States for the con-

voying of supplies, materials, or ammunition of war to any country now engaged in war.

SEC. 2. The President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy shall each be furnished a copy of this resolution.

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent Mr. McGREGOR was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.

NET WEIGHTS IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TRANSACTIONS IN COTTON

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business of the day is the vote on the bill H. R. 968. Before the House adjourned yesterday unanimous consent was granted for a yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 145, nays 168, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—145

Allen, La.	Gossett	Pace
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Patman
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala.	Patrick
Arends	Gregory	Patton
Arnold	Guyer, Kans.	Peterson, Fla.
Bates, Ky.	Gwynne	Pierce
Beckworth	Harrington	Pittenger
Bland	Harris	Plauché
Boggs	Hart	Priest
Bonner	Hendricks	Ramsay
Boren	Hill, Wash.	Ramspeck
Brooks	Hobbs	Rankin, Mont.
Brown, Ga.	Hook	Rees, Kans.
Bryson	Hope	Richards
Buck	Houston	Rivers
Burch	Hull	Robertson, N. Dak.
Burdick	Imhoff	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Carlson	Jackson	Rogers, Okla.
Case, S. Dak.	Jacobsen	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Ill.	Sanders
Clevenger	Johnson, Luther A.	Sauthoff
Cluett	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scrugham
Coffee, Nebr.	Johnson, Okla.	Secrest
Collins	Kee	Sheppard
Colmer	Kefauver	Sikes
Cooper	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Kilday	Smith, Wash.
Cox	Lanham	South
Cravens	Larrabee	Sparkman
Crawford	Leavy	Spence
Creal	Lesinski	Steagall
Curtis	Lewis	Stefan
Davis, Ohio	Ludlow	Sumners, Tex.
Disney	McIntyre	Tarver
Doughton	McLaughlin	Tenerowicz
Doxey	McMillan	Terry
Edmiston	Mahon	Thill
Elliott, Calif.	May	Thomason
Ellis	Mills, Ark.	Tolan
Ford, Miss.	Mills, La.	Vinson, Ga.
Fulmer	Monroney	Ward
Gathings	Murdock	Whelchel
Gearhart	Murray	Whittington
Gehrmann	Nelson	Winter
Gibson	Norrell	Worley
Gilchrist	O'Connor	Young
Gillie	Pace	Zimmerman
Gore		

NAYS—168

Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Cole, N. Y.
Andrews	Bulwinkle	Connery
Angell	Burgin	Cooley
Baldwin	Byrne	Costello
Bates, Mass.	Canfield	Crosser
Baumhart	Capozzoli	Crowther
Beam	Carter	Culkin
Beiter	Casey, Mass.	Cullen
Bishop	Chenoweth	Cunningham
Blackney	Clason	D'Alesandro
Bolles	Claypool	Day
Bradley, Mich.	Coffee, Wash.	Dewey
Bradley, Pa.	Cole, Md.	Dickstein
Dondero	Jarrett	Rodgers, Pa.
Downs	Jenkins, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Drewry	Jensen	Rolph
Durham	Johnson, Ind.	Romjue
Dworshak	Jones	Rutherford
Eaton	Jonkman	Sacks
Eberharter	Kean	Sasscer
Edelstein	Keefe	Scott
Eliot, Mass.	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer, Mich.
Elston	Kennedy, Martin J.	Shanley
Engel	Keogh	Smith, Conn.
Faddis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Fellows	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Fenton	Kirwan	Snyder
Fish	Knutson	Somers, N. Y.
Fitzgerald	Kunkel	Springer
Fitzpatrick	Landis	Stevenson
Flaherty	Lea	Stratton
Fogarty	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Folger	McKeough	Sutphin
Forand	McLean	Taber
Ford, Thomas F.	Maas	Taile
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Thom
Gamble	Mason	Thomas, Tex.
Gavagan	Merritt	Tibbott
Gerlach	Meyer, Md.	Tinkham
Geyer, Calif.	Michener	Traynor
Graham	Moser	Van Zandt
Grant, Ind.	Mott	Voorhis, Calif.
Haines	Mundt	Vorys, Ohio
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton	Vreeland
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Hara	Wadsworth
Hancock	Oliver	Walter
Harter	Paddock	Weaver
Hartley	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Welch
Healey	Pheiffer, William T.	Wheat
Hébert	Plumley	Wigglesworth
Heffernan	Rabaut	Williams
Hess	Reed, Ill.	Wilson
Hill, Colo.	Reed, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Holbrock	Rich	Wolverton, N. J.
Holmes	Rockefeller	Woodrum, Va.
Hunter		Wright
		Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—116

Andersen, H. Carl	Halleck	Osmers
Andresen, August H.	Hare	O'Toole
Barden	Harness	Pearson
Barnes	Heidinger	Peterson, Ga.
Barry	Hinshaw	Ploeser
Bell	Hoffman	Poage
Bender	Howell	Powers
Bennett	Jarman	Randolph
Bloom	Jenks, N. H.	Rankin, Miss.
Boehne	Jennings	Reece, Tenn.
Boland	Johns	Rizley
Bolton	Johnson, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.
Boykin	Johnson, W. Va.	Sabath
Buckler, Minn.	Kelly, Ill.	Satterfield
Buckley, N. Y.	Kilburn	Scanlon
Camp	Kleberg	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Kocialkowski	Schuetz
Cartwright	Kopplemann	Schulte
Celler	Kramer	Shannon
Chiperfield	Lambertson	Sheridan
Clark	LeCompte	Short
Cochran	Lynch	Simpson
Copeland	McArdle	Smith, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	McCormack	Smith, W. Va.
Delaney	McGehee	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	McGranery	Stearns, N. H.
Dingell	Maciejewski	Sullivan
Dirksen	Maciora	Sweeney
Ditter	Magnuson	Taylor
Domengeaux	Mansfield	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Marcantonio	Treadway
Duncan	Martin, Iowa	Wasielewski
Englebright	Mitchell	Weiss
Flannagan	Myers, Pa.	Wene
Flannery	Nichols	West
Ford, Leland M.	O'Brien, Mich.	White
Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolcott
Green	O'Day	Woodruff, Mich.
	O'Leary	
	O'Neal	

So the bill was not passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Hare against.

Mr. Johnson of West Virginia for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Poage for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Cannon of Florida for, with Mr. Bennett against.

Mr. Wene for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Cartwright for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Mr. Mansfield for, with Mr. Kocialkowski against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rankin of Mississippi with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Boland with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Green with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Johns.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Powers.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Durham with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Schulte with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Flannery with Mr. Englebright.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Pearson with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Howell.

Mr. West with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Maciora with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McArdle with Mr. Barnes.

Mr. Scanlon with Mr. D'Alesandro.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Shannon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ANTONE AND MARY LIPKA

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 224, for the relief of Antone and Mary Lipka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Antone and Mary Lipka, of Whitehall, N. Y., the sum of $4,000 in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damage by fire to their property caused by employees of the Works Progress Administration who were burning brush on a road near their barn on May 16, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the con-

trary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULA LIEBAU ANDERSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 327, for the relief of Paula Liebau Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paula Liebau Anderson, formerly a resident of the Territory of Alaska, and now residing at Litleriver, Calif., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for compensation for damages sustained by her on account of the unlawful construction by the Alaska Road Commission of a road across her land, and the destruction of buildings on the property occasioned by the negligence of Government employees, which sum shall include full and complete settlement of any and all claims of Paula Liebau Anderson allegedly arising out of the extension of the boundaries of the Mount McKinley National Park by the act of March 19, 1932 (47 Stat. 68): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELLA B. BIRNBAUM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 336, for the relief of Della B. Birnbaum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Della B. Birnbaum, whose husband, the late Andrew P. Birnbaum, is alleged to have died as the result of illness incurred in the performance of his duty as an employee of the Works Progress Administration in Hamilton County, Ohio, on or about July 27, 1936, and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That said claim shall be filed with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 90 days after the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATHAN AND AMELIA RICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 517, for the relief of Nathan and Amelia Rice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. COSTELLO objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CHARLES DANCAUSE AND VIRGINIA P. ROGERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 785, for the relief of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, which reads: "*Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by a department or other independent establishment unless presented to it within 1 year from the date of the accrual of said claim", shall be waived in favor of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers, and the Works Progress Administration (as successor to the Civil Works Administration) is authorized and directed to consider under the remaining provisions of such act the claims of the said Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers on account of damage done to their houses in Lowell, Mass., by employees of the Federal Civil Works Administration in 1933 and 1934.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA HEALY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 789, for the relief of Barbara Healy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LITTLEFIELD-WYMAN NURSERIES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 819, for the relief of Littlefield-Wyman Nurseries.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Littlefield-Wyman Nurseries, of North Abington, Mass., the sum of $1,057.57 in full satisfaction of the company's claim against the Government of the United States for nursery stock furnished the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department under contract No. ER-Tps-14-4931, dated May 5, 1936, and in accordance with reclaim invoice for payments, dated December 23, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,057.57" and insert in lieu thereof "$870.67."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. HAZEN G. CHAMBERLAIN AND CUBA MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 926, for the relief of Hazen G. Chamberlain, doctor of medicine, and Cuba Memorial Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Hazen G. Chamberlain the sum of $95 and to Cuba Memorial Hospital, Cuba, N. Y., the sum of $99.50, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for medical and hospital services rendered to Otis C. Bialock, Joseph S. Roddy, Tyler R. Thomas, Jesse A. Napper, Andrew J. Stewart, and Hansel R. Worley, enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. P. HARRIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1250, for the relief of J. P. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. P. Harris, Mystic, Iowa, the sum of $10,000, such sums to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said J. P. Harris as the result of personal injuries received when struck by a Federal Civil Works Administration truck on December 20, 1933, in Mystic, Appanoose County, Iowa.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert "$3,500."

Line 6, strike out the word "sumh" and insert in lieu thereof "sum."

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated

in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNIE BROWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1349, for the relief of Annie Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Annie Brown, of Rockport, Maine, the sum of $1,300. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said Annie Brown on account of personal injuries received on July 7, 1937, in Lincolnville, Maine, when she fell into an unlighted and unprotected ditch made in connection with a National Park Service project.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$1,300" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "$1,000."

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JAMES A. HENDERSON, DECEASED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1362, for the relief of James A. Henderson, deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

WILLIAM H. DUGDALE AND WIFE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1647, for the relief of William H. Dugdale and wife.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to William H. Dugdale and wife, of Springfield, Ohio, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for injuries and damages received by them on October 30, 1930, caused by being struck by a car driven by Lyndo Myers, an employee of the United States at the airport at Patterson Field, Fairfield, Ohio: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and that the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$2,500 each."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "and", insert "his", and after "wife", insert Ellen Dugdale."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "claim" and insert the word "claims."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Lyndo Myers" and insert "Lyndo Meyer."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA MATTIL ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2209, for the relief of Anna Mattil and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anna Mattil, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $20,000; to Mildred Reed, Coldwater, N. Y., the sum of $10,000; to John A. Mattil, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $4,000; to John H. Mattil, Sr., Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,500; to Edward Kolb, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000; to Anna Fritz Starr, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,000; to Deloris Clow, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000; to Julia Valentine, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $3,000; to the legal guardian of Betty Jane Mosher, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $10,000; to the legal guardian of Mary Ann Theeing, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000; to the legal guardian of Marjorie St. John, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $20,000; to the legal guardian of George Mattil, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $20,000; and to the legal guardian of Susie Spier, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all their claims against the Government of the United States for personal injuries sustained by them as the result of an explosion and fire caused by agents of the Bureau of Prohibition during a raid in the city of Rochester, N. Y., July 7, 1933: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$20,000" and insert "$1,250."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$300."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$300."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$250."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$300."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$300."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$300."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$100."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$750."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$500."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "$20,000" and insert "$1,500."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "$20,000 and" and insert "$1,000."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$750."

Page 2, line 17, after "1933; provided", strike out the balance of line 17 and lines 18 to 25, and page 3 strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert the following: "That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETHEL RAY SOWDER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2376, for the relief of Ethel Ray Sowder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $200 to Ethel Ray Sowder, of Baltimore, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of personal effects in the explosion at Lake Denmark (Dover), N. J., on July 10, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. W. MAREK, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2646, for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to L. W. Marek, Jr., of Cameron, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by said L. W. Marek, Jr., as a result of personal injuries sustained by him, occasioned by the negligent act of an employee of the United States of America while said L. W. Marek, Jr., was likewise employed and working at a gravel pit about 4 miles south of Pettibone, Tex., on the 6th day of March 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "negligent", strike out lines 10 and 11 and line 1 on page 2 down to the word "Texas" and insert "operation of a tractor in the service of Works Progress Administration work project No. 2485, Milan County, Tex."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF DISBURSING OFFICERS, ETC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2991, to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees in respect of certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate bill S. 433 will be substituted for the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding provisions contained in the several appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1939, 1940, and 1941 prohibiting the payment of compensation therefrom to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts, and relieve certifying officers of liability, for such payments for services rendered by noncitizen officers and employees as are otherwise correct and legal, as are made in good faith, and as are found not to be due to any lack of good faith on the part of the payee: *Provided*, That this act shall only affect such payments as were made prior to January 1, 1941.

SEC. 2. If credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts in accordance with section 1 of this act, the officer or employee, or former officer or employee receiving the payment shall not be required to refund the amount thereof; and any such amount which has been collected from an officer or employee, or former officer or employee, may be refunded to him.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2991) was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3005, for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate bill, S. 441, will be substituted for the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following disbursing officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Capt. Arthur G. Alexander, Finance Reserve, $100; Lt. Col. Stephen R. Beard, Finance Department, $585.68; Maj. Roy J. Caperton, Finance Department, $307.60; Lt. Col. J. D. Chambliss, Infantry, $29.80; Lt. Col. Samuel F. Cohn, Infantry, $39.05; Lt. Col. Edward T. Comegys, Finance Department, $162.55; Lt. Col. Walter D. Dabney, Finance Department, $956.51; Lt. Col. William M. Dixon, Finance Department, $87.81; Maj. Charles G. Dobbins (deceased), Finance Department, $758.64; Capt. John H. Doherty, Finance Department, $15.56; Maj. Charles F. Eddy (deceased), Finance Department, $279.23; Lt. Col. Leroy M. Edwards, Finance Department, $106.08; Maj. Grady D. Epps, Infantry, $25.38; Lt. Col. Eugene M. Foster, Finance Department, $204.44; Lt. Col. Horace G. Foster, Finance Department (now retired), $2,643.53; Maj. Clarence A. Frank, Finance Department, $11.20; Lt. Col. Carl Halla, Finance Department, $71.13; Maj. John B. Harper, Finance Department (now retired), $200; Maj. John H. Harrington (Coast Artillery Corps), Finance Department, $42.65; Capt. John B. Hess, Finance Department, $21.55; Maj. William T. Johnson, Finance Department, $25.74; Lt. Col. W. H. Kasten, Finance Department, $32.25; Maj. Richard K. Lebrou, Finance Department, $57.49; Maj. Columbus B. Lenow, Finance Department, $52; Capt Charles K. McAlister, Finance Department, $126; Lt. Col. Cherubusco Newton, Jr., Finance Department, $72.43; Maj. S. C. Page, Finance Department, $81.09; Lt. Col. Frank E. Parker (deceased), Finance Department, $526.84; Maj. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, $68; Lt. Col. Walter O. Rawls, Finance Department, $1.64; Maj. E. F. Rea, Finance Department, $98.85; Lt. Col. Bickford E. Sawyer, Finance Department, $88; Maj. Oliver T. Simpson, Finance Department, $19.61; Maj. Wallace C. Steiger, Finance Department, $11.92; Lt. Col. John P. Tillman, Finance Department, $315.64; Lt. Col. Irvin V. Todd, Finance Department, $63.50; Lt. Col. Thomas P. Walsh, Finance Department, $52.77; Lt. Col. Hugh Whitt, Finance Department, $123.68; Capt. Ernest W. Wilson, Finance Department, $5; Capt. Harold F. Chrisman, Finance Department, $61.64; Lt. Col. Montgomery T. Legg, Finance Department, $316.78; and Maj. Millard F. W. Oliver, Finance Department, $53.66; the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in the computations of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, enlisted men of the Regular Army, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, members of the citizens' military training camps, civilian employees, and commercial firms or individuals from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Walter D. Dabney, Finance Department, the sum of $71.90, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him by check to certain former members of the National Guard for armory drill pay, and which checks were later discovered to have been endorsed by other than the rightful payees.

SEC. 3. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. J. A. Dorst, Corps of Engineers, the sum of $92.38, representing part of a disallowance made by the Comptroller General of the United States on account of a payment to the A. B. C. Transfer Co. for uncrating the household effects of an Army officer: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any part of the sum credited in the disbursing officer's account under the authority of this section.

SEC. 4. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. M. H. Forbes (then major), Finance Department, the sum of $327.70, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum has been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States on account of payments made to soldiers who were not at the time citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 5. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Horace G. Foster, Finance Department (retired), the sum of $12.50, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum was paid to Alvin Schlosser, upon the certification of Capt. Harry E. Cantner, Infantry Reserve, and was disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Capt. Harry E. Cantner, Infantry Reserve, the sum of $12.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was paid by him to Lt. Col. Horace G. Foster, Finance Department, as reimbursement for public funds erroneously paid to Alvin Schlosser.

SEC. 6. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Montgomery T. Legg, Finance Department, the sum of $10.50, public funds for which he is accountable, and which were paid by him as a result of the falsification of a soldier's deposit record.

SEC. 7. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts

of Lt. Col. Charles Lewis, Finance Department, the sum of $4,412.14, public funds for which he is accountable, and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers prepared by a trusted employee.

SEC. 8. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. A. J. Maxwell, Finance Department, the sum of $9,521.60, public funds for which he is accountable and which were embezzled by his agent officer at Fort Dix, N. J.

SEC. 9. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Basil M. Parks, Field Artillery Reserve, the sum of $126.55, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of a like amount withheld from his pay on account of the loss of public funds, for which Captain Parks was responsible as agent officer for Maj. Leonard H. Sims, Finance Officer, Fort Benning, Ga., and which public funds were stolen during the night of August 31-September 1, 1937, from a Government safe by a person or persons unknown.

SEC. 10. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Capt. Robert E. Quackenbush, Infantry, the amount of $72, public funds for which he is accountable, which amount was paid to the Hillcrest Water Co. for drinking water and disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. H. M. Tague, Infantry, the amount of $20, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was paid by him for advertising for and in the interests of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 12. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following disbursing officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Lt. Col. J. A. Marmon (then major), Finance Department, $9; Lt. Col. A. J. Perry (then major), Finance Department, $1; Lt. Col. Paul S. Beard (then major), Finance Department, $17; Lt. Col. D. W. Morey (then major), Finance Department (now retired), $231.07; and Lt. Col. Thomas P. Walsh (then major), Finance Department, $53.20; said amounts being public funds for which they are accountable and which were paid by them on fraudulent vouchers prepared by former warrant officers of the One Hundred and Seventh Cavalry Band, Ohio National Guard.

SEC. 13. That payments for per diem allowances heretofore made to personnel in and under the jurisdiction of the War Department which have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army, and, as to payments heretofore made, would be disallowed in said accounts except for this act, on the ground that per diem allowances for temporary duty in excess of 30 days are not authorized by law, are hereby ratified and validated, and, if otherwise correct, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army for and on account of all such payments: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to any person a sum equal to the amount collected from such person on account of disallowed payments which are herein validated, as well as any amounts which would have been paid except for rulings of the Comptroller General on per diem in excess of 30 days, upon presentation of a valid claim therefor to the Comptroller General of the United States, who is hereby authorized and directed to certify such claims to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment at the rates prescribed in the order directing the travel, or in the absence of a prescribed rate, at the rate of $5 per diem for the period of temporary duty involved.

SEC. 14. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Cherubusco Newton, Jr., Finance Department, $65.30, and in the accounts of Lt. Col. Edward T. Comegys, Finance Department, $186.70, public funds for which they are accountable and which were paid by them by check to certain former members of the Texas National Guard for armory drill pay, and which checks were later discovered to have been endorsed by other than the rightful payees.

SEC. 15. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. William S. Keller, Finance Department, the sum of $84.13, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum represents erroneous payments due to minor errors in computation of pay and allowances of former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps and enlisted men of the Regular Army, from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, said erroneous payments having been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 16. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. F. E. Parker, Finance Department (deceased), the sum of $5,072, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers prepared by his deputy.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3005) was laid on the table.

ERVINE J. STENSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3081, for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the bill (S. 432) will be substituted for the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the official accounts of Ervine J. Stenson, formerly senior clerk and special disbursing agent at the Southern Navajo Indian Agency, for disallowances in the amounts of $125.29 and $5.60 under certificates of settlement of accounts by the General Accounting Office Nos. G-107520-Ind and G-108188-Ind, dated September 22, 1939, and February 2, 1940.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to refund, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any payments made by the said Ervine J. Stenson on account of the disallowances in question.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer the usual attorney's fee amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: At the end of the bill, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and that the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3081) was laid on the table.

MATTIE E. BAUMGARTEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3082, for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate bill (S. 429) will be substituted for the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mattie E. Baumgarten, widow of L. E. Baumgarten, the sum of $1,346.05, in full payment of all claims against the United States for the amount transferred from his credit in the retirement fund and deposited in the Treasury of the United States because of disallowances by the General Accounting Office of certain payments made by L. E. Baumgarten while he was superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Lac du Flambeau Indian Agency, in behalf of P. D. Southworth, a former employee at that agency: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on acccunt of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3082) was laid on the table.

MARIE B. NEALE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3089, for the relief of Marie B. Neale.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected and, under the rule,

the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

PROVIDING FOR THE REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL AND FORMER NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL AND CERTAIN FEDERAL CIVIL EMPLOYEES FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED AS A RESULT OF THE HURRICANE AND FLOOD AT PARRIS ISLAND, S. C., ON AUGUST 11–12, 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3097, to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $23,334.42, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUGUSTA BRASSIL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3194, for the relief of Augusta Brassil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Augusta Brassil, Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by her when a car in which she was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck which had been allocated to the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, on June 24, 1937, on Central Avenue, 1 mile west of Davidsonville, Md., said accident being due to the negligence of the driver of said truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of service rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LAWRENCE CHLEBECK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3234, for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck, of St. Paul, Minn., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained when she fell on the slippery stairway of the United States Customhouse Building, St. Paul., Minn., on March 2, 1922: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY FORTUNE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3269, for the relief of Mary Fortune.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Fortune, of Saranac Lake, N. Y., the sum of $1,610.40, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained when she fell as a result of the icy condition of the steps at the entrance of the Saranac Lake, N. Y., post office on March 6, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS J. BANDERET

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3309, for the relief of Louis J. Banderet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis J. Banderet, of Bay St. Louis, Miss., the sum of $83.82. Such sum shall be in full settlement of his claim against the United States for compensation for service rendered as temporary carrier on Rural Route No. 1, Bay St. Louis, Miss., from March 24 to April 6, 1938, inclusive, which payment has been denied due to the fact that at the time he was a star-route contractor.

SEC. 2. The said Louis J. Banderet is hereby released from any liability to refund to the United States the sum of $251.07 received by him as compensation for service rendered as temporary carrier on Rural Route No. 1, Bay St. Louis, Miss., from June 16 to June 30, 1937; from August 1 to August 15, 1937; from December 1 to December 15, 1937; from December 16 to December 31, 1937; from January 1 to January 15, 1938; from January 16 to January 31, 1938; and from February 1 to February 15, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUSTAV SCHMIDT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3520, for the relief of Gustav Schmidt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, the sum of $2,500 to Gustav Schmidt, of South San Francisco, Calif., on account of injuries sustained on July 24, 1926, when struck by a United States Army touring car: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORTH GALLAHER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 86, for the relief of Worth Gallaher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as limited by the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), the United States Employees' Compensation Commission be, and the same is hereby, authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Worth Gallaher, of Knox County, Tenn., for disability alleged to have been incurred by him while enrolled in the Civilian Conservation Corps, Camp 1458, Gatlinburg, Tenn.: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months after the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEIRS OF JESUS LEYVAS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 246, for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Leyvas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $569, to the heirs of Jesus Leyvas, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of Jesus Leyvas as a result of his being struck by a Government truck on May 6, 1935, said truck having been driven by Julio Francisco, a Pima Indian: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSOULA MERCANTILE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 304, for the relief of the Missoula Mercantile Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Missoula Mercantile Co. of Missoula, Mont., the sum of $904.40, in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for the remission of liquidated damages assessed against such company under the provisions of contracts Nos. A1s–14981 and A1s–14996, entered into by such company with the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, under date of June 3, 1937, for the delivery of certain quantities of jam to the United States Forest Service at Missoula, Mont., the delivery of such jam having been delayed as the result of a jurisdictional strike with a subcontractor of such company and without the fault or negligency of such company: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY H. DENHARDT, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 417) for the relief of the estate of Henry H. Denhardt, deceased, of Bowling Green, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of Brig. Gen. Henry H. Denhardt, formerly of the Kentucky National Guard, in the sum of $2,976.66, which said sum represents checks drawn by said Henry H. Denhardt, as property and disbursing officer for the Kentucky National Guard, in the years from May 1, 1932, to January 27, 1936; and which sums were paid by said Henry H. Denhardt on properly presented vouchers for the services of Richard James, George James, Herman H. Reed, James R. Howlett, and Raymond Barnett, as members or employees of the National Guard of Kentucky; and which payments were first approved when made, and after the death of said Henry H. Denhardt were ordered reopened and disallowed by the Comptroller General in the accounts of said Henry H. Denhardt as such property and disbursing officer.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ADDIE MYERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 430) for the relief of Addie Myers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Addie Myers, of Gallup, N. Mex., widow of L. A. Myers, the sum of $2,094.68, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred in connection with the development of a coal mine on the Navajo Reservation, Ariz., and for the use of the equipment installed in the mine by L. A. Myers, deceased, and as full payment for said equipment. Said equipment shall become the property of the United States upon the acceptance by Addie Myers of the amount appropriated by this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MABEL FOOTE RAMSEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 431) for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Mabel Foote Ramsey, widow of William R. Ramsey, Jr., a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, who was killed near Danville, Ill., on May 3, 1938, in the line of his official duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

M. SELLER & CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 790) for the relief of M. Seller & Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to refund to M. Seller & Co., Portland, Oreg., certain penalties in the amount of $5,210.36, paid to the collectors of customs at Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash., on April 28, 1927. Said penalties were incurred under the customs laws in the entry of certain merchandise from Germany at a less value than that returned upon final appraisement, such entry having been made without any intention to defraud the revenues of the United States or to conceal or misrepresent the facts of the case or to deceive the appraiser as to the value of the merchandise: *Provided*, That no part of the amount refunded in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BLANCHE W. STOUT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 706) for the relief of Blanche W. Stout.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Blanche W. Stout, widow of Kenneth S. Stout, late American vice consul at Lisbon, Portugal, the sum of $3,000, such sum representing 1 year's salary of her deceased husband who died while in the Foreign Service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WILLIAM G. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 198) for the relief of William G. Sullivan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William G. Sullivan, of Miami, Fla., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries he received and has suffered by reason of being run into by a United States Government-owned truck, driven and operated by an employee of the Works Progress Administration of the Federal Government in the regular and customary service of the Works Progress Administration, on the public streets of the city of Miami, Dade County,

Fla., on the 21st day of December 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", in line 6, strike out all the language down to the word *"Provided"* in line 3, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on December 21, 1936, when he was struck by a truck of the Works Progress Administration, while standing on the west sidewalk of Northeast First Avenue, Miami, Fla."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

HUGHEY PARSLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 438) for the relief of Hughey Parsley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hughey Parsley, the sum of $5,250 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States on account of injuries to said Hughey Parsley and his property on August 2, 1939, received when struck by a National Youth Administration truck operated by an employee of the National Youth Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,250" and insert "$350."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "injuries to said Hughey Parsley and his property" and insert "personal injuries sustained."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PAUL T. WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 513) for the relief of Paul T. Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul T. Ward, of Hollidaysburg, Pa., the sum of $96, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for loss of time from his employment as a result of a car he was driving having been struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps ambulance on Pleasant Valley Boulevard, at its intersection with Union Avenue, Altoona, Pa., on March 27, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JULIUS SPRINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 682) for the relief of Julius Springer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $10,000 to Julius Springer as compensation for injuries sustained when he was knocked down at the intersection of Thirteenth Street and Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., by a truck owned and operated by the Post Office Department making an improper left turn.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof: "the sum of $2,250 to Julius Springer, of New York City, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, for personal injuries sustained when he was struck by a Post Office Department truck at the intersection of Thirteenth Street and Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., on February 19, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

FAIRCHILD AERIAL SURVEYS, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 694, for the relief of the Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc., New York, N. Y., the sum of $3,239.22. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by such corporation for compensation for mileage aerially surveyed in Kings, Kern, and Fresno Counties, Calif., in 1937, under contract with the United States, in excess of that mileage erroneously specified by the United States in invitation for bids in connection with such contract.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "contract", insert:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. K. LOVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 696, for the relief of J. K. Love.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. K. Love, Columbia, S. C., the sum of $50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for his loss as a result of the payment of a money order issued on a form stolen from the post office at Olmstedville, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be find in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE WARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 794, for the relief of Catherine Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Catherine Ward, of Lowell, Mass., the sum of $100. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the injury sustained by the said Catherine Ward as the result of a fall on the steps of the post-office building at Newark, N. J., on February 21, 1932: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOT'S TRANSFER & STORAGE CO., LTD.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1151, for the relief of Foot's Transfer & Storage Co., Ltd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Foot's Transfer & Storage Co., Ltd., the sum of $750. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for compensation for the handling of additional mails through the San Pedro (Calif.) Post Office by reason of the longshoremen's and seamen's strike during 1938 and 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "1938 and 1939" and insert "1939 and 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. SAMUEL AZER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1375, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

W. A. FACHT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1678, for the relief of W. A. Facht.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. A. Facht, of Red Bluff, Calif., the sum of $200, the same being for reimbursement for loss sustained bay riding horse, being ridden by W. J. Brokenshire, forest ranger, United States Forest Service.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6 strike out "$200, the same being for reimbursement for loss sustained" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$150, in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Line 9, after the word "Service" strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "on October 12, 1939."

At the end of the bill, add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEULAH BELL NOLTE AND GEORGE C. NOLTE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1731, for the relief of Beulah Bell Nolte and George C. Nolte.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Beulah Bell Nolte, of Baker, Calif., the sum of $4,561, and to George C. Nolte, of Baker, Calif., the sum of $1,472. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage received when the vehicle in which they were riding was struck near La Verne, Calif., on United States Highway No. 66, in Los Angeles County, Calif., about 10:30 antemeridian, November 3, 1936, by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck bearing United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck No. 3771: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, after the word "Treasury", strike out "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps" and insert in lieu thereof the following "not otherwise appropriated,".

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$4,561" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,082.11".

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$1,472" and insert in lieu thereof "$76.75".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES R. WOODS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2569, for the relief of Charles R. Woods.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Woods, formerly a first lieutenant in Company A, Twenty-first Regiment United States Engineers, the sum of $288.78, in full and final settlement of all claims against the United States for loss of personal property in a fire which occurred at Camp Gerard, Sas, France, on March 10, 1918.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after "1918", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2990, to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,747.16, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe pursuant to the provisions of the act approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212), Private Law No. 373, Seventy-fourth Congress, the persons hereafter named, in sums not exceeding the amounts set forth, for losses of and damages to reasonable and necessary personal property resulting from the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931: Col. Robert L. Denig, United States Marine Corps, $491.88; Maj. Herbert Hardy, United States Marine Corps, $120.80; Capt. Robert S. Viall, United States Marine Corps, $150.25; Master Technical Sgt. George J. Boyle, United States Marine Corps, retired, $231.75; Master Technical Sgt. Clarence B. Kyle, United States Marine Corps, $53.75; Quartermaster Sgt. Frank P. Manley, United States Marine Corps, $477.23; Paula V. Snyder, widow of the late Quartermaster Sgt. Harry C. Snyder, United States Marine Corps, $221.50; in all, $1,747.16: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3160, to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum, not to exceed $597.84, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal effects lost as a result of a fire that destroyed buildings No. 239 and 243 at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN L. ALCOCK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3773, to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John L. Alcock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. CLYDE THATCHER ET AL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3827, for the relief of Mrs. Clyde Thatcher and her two minor children, Marjorie Thatcher and Bobby Thatcher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Clyde Thatcher, and the legal guardian of her two minor children, Marjorie Thatcher and Bobby Thatcher, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by them when struck by a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps at the intersection of Beech Street and Grand Avenue, Beaumont, Tex., on August 1, 1936.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Mrs. Clyde Thatcher, Beaumont, Tex.; the sum of $500 to the legal guardian of Marjorie Thatcher, Beaumont, Tex.; and the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of Bobby Thatcher, Beaumont, Tex. Said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries and expenses sustained by the said Mrs. Clyde Thatcher and her two minor children, Marjorie and Bobby Thatcher, when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps at the intersection of Beech Street and Grand Avenue, Beaumont, Tex., on August 1, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOPHRANIA HOLMES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3828, for the relief of Sophrania Holmes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sophrania Holmes, of Jasper County, Tex., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries received as a result of a collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck and the private car in which Sophrania Holmes was a passenger on November 28, 1935, on Highway No. 63, in Jasper County, Tex.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$179."

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. J. E. PURTYMUN AND MRS. B. H. RUSSELL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 245, for the relief of Mrs. J. E. Purtymun and Mrs. B. H. Russell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. J. E. Purtymun the sum of $500 and to Mrs. B. H. Russell the sum of $3,304.80, in full settlement of all claims for personal injuries arising out of a collision between an automobile driven by Mrs. B. H. Russell and a Forest Service truck on October 13, 1939, on the Oak Creek Highway in Arizona: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER LINDRUD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 282, for the relief of Elmer Lindrud.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $261 to Elmer Lindrud, of Carrington, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damages to his truck, which was under lease to the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, for use in connection with the Prairie States forestry project, such truck having been wrecked while being operated by Everett L. Johnson, an employee of the Department of Agriculture, on May 11, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLPH MUNDT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 283, for the relief of Rudolph Mundt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,227.17 to Rudolph Mundt, of Casselton, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him and for compensation for the permanent loss of sight in one of his eyes as the result of his being struck by pellets from a shotgun shell fired by an employee of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, during a rabbit drive which was conducted by the Forest Service near Buffalo, N. Dak, on February 21, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGINIA BOWEN ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 319, for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named persons the following sums: To Virginia Bowen, Lawrenceville, Va., $1,048.25; to Willie W. Hudson, La Crosse, Va., $403.75; and to John L. Walker, La Crosse, Va., $58.25. Such sums represent the amount of uncollected judgments recovered by the above-named persons in the trial justice court for Brunswick County, Va., against Samuel Mason, operator of a truck attached to the Civilian Conservation Corps Camp No. 22 in Mecklenburg County, Va., on account of damages suffered when the automobile in which they were riding collided with a truck in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps driven by the said Samuel Mason on June 22, 1940. Such payment shall be conditioned upon the filing by such persons of a discharge and satisfaction of such judgments: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in conection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$1,048.25" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$403.75" and insert in lieu thereof "$401.25."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "$58.25" and insert in lieu thereof "$57."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLENTOWN AIRPORT CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 701, for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Allentown Airport Corporation the sum of $277.44, representing an additional charge for electric service furnished the Bureau of Air Commerce, Department of Commerce, during the period May 1, 1938, to March 6, 1939, in excess of the amount agreed upon under contract No. Ciba-1855, dated April 21, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the phrase "Department of Commerce", insert "and the Bureau of Federal Airways, Civil Aeronautics Authority."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM C. REESE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 773, for the relief of William C. Reese.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BEN TORIAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2006, for the relief of Ben Torian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury appropriated or allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Works Progress Administration and/or out of any other money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ben Torian, of Weldon, Ark., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for the fatal injuries sustained by his daughter, Fannie Lou Torian, in a collision of the Newport, Ark., public school automobile bus, in which the said Fannie Lou Torian was an authorized student passenger, and an automobile truck owned and negligently operated by the Works Progress Administration on Arkansas State Highway No. 17, near Weldon, Ark, on April 26, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Treasury", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "not otherwise appropriated, to Ben Torian, of Weldon, Ark., the sum of $3,500, and to Joe J. McDonald, of Weldon, Ark., the sum of $3,500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for fatal injuries sustained by their children Fannie Lou Torian and Joseph Johnson McDonald, in a collision of the Newport, Ark., public-school automobile bus, in which they were authorized student passengers, and an automobile truck operated by the Works Progress Administration on Arkansas State Highway No. 17, near Weldon, Ark., on April 26, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Ben Torian and Joe J. McDonald."

HOWARD BURKETTE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2709, for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Howard Burkette, of Knoxville, Tenn., the sum of $7,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a truck used by the Civil Works Administration, driven by C. H. Naugher, in Knoxville, Tenn., on February 5, 1934; such payment to be conditioned upon the release of said C. H. Naugher from all liability for the payment of damages for such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$7,000" and insert "$4,037.75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILLIP CHRISTIAN HOLT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2742, for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Phillip Christian Holt, 205 George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va., the sum of $450 for services rendered to the Treasury Department from June 12, 1933, until September 11, 1933, inclusive, at the rate of $1,800 per annum.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the words "per annum", insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. UTTAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4026, for the relief of S. Uttal.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HERBERT M. GREGORY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4063, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Herbert M. Gregory.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim against the United States of Herbert M. Gregory, of El Dorado, Ark., for damages alleged to have been sustained by him as a result of the loss of and on certain property owned by him in Los Angeles, Calif., due to liens filed against such property, in the year 1931, by the collector of internal revenue at Los Angeles, Calif., without proper notice to the said Herbert M. Gregory, for the collection of taxes erroneously adjudged by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to be due from him and with respect to which said Commissioner failed to grant a hearing, as requested, within the time required by law. The court shall, if it renders judgment for the claimant, allow interest at the rate of 6 percent on the amount of damages found, from the time such damages were sustained until the date of such judgment. Such suit shall be brought within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to pay the amount of any judgment rendered pursuant to this act. The amount of such judgment shall be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the presentation of a duly authenticated copy of the judgment of the Court of Claims.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "California", strike out lines 2 to 9 inclusive and the words "such judgment" in line 10.

Page 2, line 10, strike out "1 year" and insert "6 months."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAUDE WILCOX

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 6, for the relief of Maude Wilcox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maude Wilcox, of Reno, Nev., the sum of $557.15, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage, sustained by her on November 14, 1938, when her automobile collided with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck at Reno, Nev., at the intersection of West Street and West Third Street: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOY MONTGOMERY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 97, for the relief of the legal guardian of Joy Montgomery, a minor.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. COSTELLO objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOHNSON FLYING SERVICE, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 192, for the relief of the Johnson Flying Service, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Johnson Flying Service, Inc., of Missoula, Mont., the sum of $5,150, in full satisfaction of all its claims against the United States for the replacement value of its airplane which was destroyed on August 22, 1939, while being used to assist the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture to control a forest fire in the Bitterroot National Forest: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HILDA C. ALLSTROM

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 247, for the relief of Hilda C. Allstrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hilda C. Allstrom the sum of $200 in full settlement of the claim of her late husband, Erik W. Allstrom, against the United States growing out of damage to his automobile between January 2 and January 16, 1937, while such automobile was being used for the benefit of the Navajo Indians: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAYTON W. CURTIS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 302, for the relief of Clayton W. Curtis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clayton W. Curtis, of Great Falls, Mont., the sum of $100, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damages sustained by him as the result of his automobile having been struck by a Bureau of Reclamation truck, operated by a Civilian Conservation Corps enrollee, on September 4, 1937, near Augusta, Mont.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. H. REDDING, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 307, authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc., for refund of a marking duty paid under protest to the collector of customs at the port of New York, on July 26, 1937, under free entry numbered 304106, and to allow in full and final settlement of such claim an amount not to exceed the sum of $999.40. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $999.40 for the payment of said claim: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be

deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST H. STEINBERG

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 527, for the relief of Ernest H. Steinberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of section 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended and supplemented, are hereby waived in the case of Ernest H Steinberg, of Athol, Mass.; and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim filed with the Commission, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, by the said Ernest H. Steinberg for compensation or other benefits under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended and supplemented, for disability due to injuries alleged to have been sustained by him on June 28, 1934, in the performance of his duties as a clerk in the post office at Athol, Mass.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOLLIE C. PICHETTE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 717, for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the payment of awards under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, to Dollie C. Pichette, of Grand Ronde, Oreg., the sum of $30 per month from the date of enactment of this act until her death, as compensation for the death of her husband, John B. Pichette, who was killed on March 21, 1937, while working in a sand pit in connection with Indian Emergency Conservation Work project No. 87 at the Warm Springs Indian Agency, Warm Springs, Oreg.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAN A. TARPLEY, ERNEST H. TARPLEY, AND PEARL TARPLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 791, for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley, Ernest H. Tarpley, and Pearl Tarpley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dan A. Tarpley, the sum of $1,945.83; to Ernest H. Tarpley, the sum of $500, and to Pearl Tarpley, the sum of $1,000, all residents of Rickreall, Oreg., in full satisfaction of all their claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by them when a 37-mm. shell exploded in the home of Ernest H. Tarpley on May 29, 1938, at Rickreall, Oreg., such shell having been shot onto the farm of Dan A. Tarpley by National Guardsmen in carrying out an artillery problem, but which remained unexploded until Dan A. Tarpley, not realizing its dangerous character, carried it into his parents' home where it was inadvertently dropped and exploded: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF DR. JO M. FERGUSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 819, for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOHN McALISTER, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 933, for the relief of John McAlister, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $200 to John McAlister, Inc., of Charleston, S. C., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered in connection with the burial of Pinckney A. Allison, deceased, who was employed by the Work Projects Administration at the Santee-Cooper clearing and grubbing project in South Carolina: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLEN E. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 957, for the relief of Glen E. Robinson, doing business as the Robinson Marine Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Glen E. Robinson, doing business as Robinson Marine Construction Co., of St. Joseph, Mich., the sum of $900, in full settlement of all claims against the United States growing out of a contract for the construction of two gasoline motorboats furnished to the United States district engineer, Cairo, Ill., in accordance with a proposal dated August 31, 1931, and accepted under date of September 10, 1931 (3328-motorboat-Memphis D. O.-11), which sum represents a penalty of $10 per day per boat, for 45 days of alleged delay in delivery of said motorboats, after completion, said delays being due to causes unforeseeable and beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the said Glen E. Robinson as contractor: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF ROBERT LEE WRIGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1033, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Lee Wright.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CERTAIN CLAIMANTS WHO SUFFERED LOSS BY FLOOD IN, AT, OR NEAR BEAN LAKE, MO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 885, for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HANCOCK objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LUCIA HUMBLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 818, for the relief of Lucia Humble.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lucia Humble, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $125.65, in full settlement of her claim against the Government of the United States as reimbursement of the amount heretofore paid by her under contract No. J5-PB-580 with the Procurement Division, Treasury Department, on the purchase price of certain abandoned Government property sold to her at public auction: *Provided*, That the said Lucia Humble shall be relieved of any additional payments which may be due or become due under the terms of the aforesaid contract.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, strike out "her claim" and insert in lieu thereof "all claims."

Line 9, strike out the letter "J" and insert in lieu thereof the letter "T."

Line 10, after the word "Department", strike out "on the purchase price of certain abandoned Government property sold to her at public auction" and insert in lieu thereof

"accepted on March 14, 1939, for the purchase of the Fenwick Island Light Station, Sussex County, Del.:."

At the end of the bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSELL GAUSLIN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1267) for the relief of Russell Gauslin, Helen Gauslin, and Russell A. Gauslin, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Russell Gauslin, Helen Gauslin, and Russell A. Gauslin, Jr., the sum of $2,603. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Russell Gauslin, Helen Gauslin, and Russell A. Gauslin, Jr., against the Government for personal injuries and/or damage sustained by them on September 15, 1938, when the automobile in which they were traveling was struck by an Army ambulance at Detroit, Mich.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out "to Russell Gauslin, Helen Gauslin, and Russell A. Gauslin, Jr., the sum of $2,603. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Russell Gauslin, Helen Gauslin, and Russell A. Gauslin, Jr., against the Government for personal injuries and/or damage sustained by them" and insert in lieu thereof "to Russell H. Gauslin, of Dearborn, Mich., the sum of $2,603, in full settlement of all claims of Russell H. Gauslin, Helen Gauslin, and Russell H. Gauslin, Jr., against the United States for personal injuries sustained."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Michigan", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Russell H. Gauslin."

A. M. GARMON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1355) for the relief of A. M. Garmon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. M. Garmon the sum of $2,500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries suffered and sustained by him as the result of the carelessness and negligence of a driver of a truck of the Work Projects Administration while engaged within the scope of his duties and in his said employment as follows: At about 4:15 postmeridian on the 13th day of February 1939 on Madison Pike, in Kenton County, Ky., the said driver of the Work Projects Administration truck operated same in such careless and negligent manner that it was caused to and did collide with a truck driven by the said Garmon whereby the said Garmon received severe painful and permanent injuries to his damage in the sum of $2,500: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated" in line 5, strike out all the language down to and including the figures "$2,500" in line 7, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "to Adam M. Garmon of Independence, Ky., the sum of $1,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the truck he was driving was struck by a Works Progress Administration truck, on the Madison Pike, in Kenton County, Ky., on February 13, 1939:".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Adam M. Garman."

GEORGE H. KERLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2710), for the relief of George H. Kerley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $900.30 to George H. Kerley, for damages sustained by his truck, contents thereof, loss of wife's services, and doctor bills sustained as the result of a collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the remainder of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, and 8, and insert: "the sum of $750 to George H. Kerley, and Mrs. George H. Kerley the sum of $4,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred, and personal injuries sustained on July 29, 1938, in Kinzel Springs, Tenn.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley."

TOM GENTRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3399) for the relief of Tom Gentry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Tom Gentry, of Marion, Ill., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Tom Gentry on account of personal injuries sustained by him when the car in which he was riding collided with an automobile in the service of the Works Progress Administration on November 18, 1939, on the Illinois State Highway No. 3, near Marion, Ill.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,008", and on page 2, line 1, strike out the words "the Illinois State Highway Numbered 3, near" and insert, "West Main Street, Marion, Illinois."

At the end of the bill strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF DISBURSING OFFICERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3846) for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for payments made in good faith on behalf of the Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation, or any of its subsidiaries, notwithstanding the failure to comply with the requirements of existing law or regulations: *Provided*, That the Comptroller General shall find that such payments appear to be free from fraud or collusion on the part of the disbursing officer making the payment.

SEC. 2. No charge shall be raised against the certifying officer for the amount of any payment for which credit shall be allowed under the preceding section where the Comptroller General finds that the payment appears to have been made without fraud or collusion on the part of the certifying officer.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MARTIN F. GETTINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4065) for the relief of Martin F. Gettings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Martin F. Gettings, postmaster at Rahway, N. J., with the sum of $47,027.92, representing the amount of money and postage stamps lost in the burglary of the post office at Rahway, N. J., on January 21, 1938, such loss having resulted from no fault or negligence on the part of said postmaster, as determined by the Postmaster General under a provision in title 39, United States Code, section 49.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONVERTIBLE DOOR MANUFACTURING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3860) for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co. for the value of material furnished the Federal Mill & Cabinet Co. for use by the latter company under contract ER-W-6407-qm-39, entered into August 29, 1939, with the War Department, for furnishing and installing door and window screens in bakers' and cooks' school and barracks and in 500 barracks at Fort Sheridan, Ill., which material was not used by the Federal Mill & Cabinet Co. due to its default under the contract, but was used by the Government in the completion by it of a part of said contract and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim a sum not to exceed $587.53. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $587.53, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of said claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

W. R. LARKIN AND DORA LARKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4064) for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acts of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 1363), and June 11, 1940 (Private, No. 362, 76th Cong.), for the relief of certain individuals named therein in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, are hereby supplemented and further amended by authorizing payment, pursuant to the provisions of said acts, of the sum of $4,000 to W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in lieu of the payment of the sum of $2,000 to W. R. Larkin, as therein authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

STEPHEN KELEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3809) for the relief of Stephen Kelen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Stephen Kelen as of January 18, 1921, the date on which he entered the United States, at the Port of Laredo, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Hungary when such quota number becomes available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

NONRECOGNITION BY UNITED STATES OF TRANSFER OF ANY GEOGRAPHIC REGION IN THIS HEMISPHERE FROM ONE NON-AMERICAN POWER TO ANOTHER NON-AMERICAN POWER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 7), affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state that the agreement had by the Chair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would not obtain, because this joint resolution is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution in the identical form in which it is now presented passed the House at the last Congress on June 18, 1940, by an almost unanimous vote. The Senate at the last Congress passed the same resolution with this single exception: The House resolution referred to "this hemisphere." The Senate resolution designated it as "the Western Hemisphere." Two separate resolutions having been passed, the bill never went to conference and therefore it did not become a law. At this session of Congress the Senate has passed the resolution again in the same form in which it passed the House at the last session, using the designation "this hemisphere," and the resolution we are now asking you to vote upon is the same identical resolution, in the same form that it passed the House at the last Congress.

The resolution is brief. Excluding the preamble it covers not more than 10 lines. Its purpose is to reaffirm at this critical time in world affairs the long-standing policy of this Government with reference to the extension in this hemisphere by non-American states of their systems and political institutions. This is done by the first paragraph of the resolution which states:

That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power.

This paragraph would apply not only to an actual transfer or attempt to transfer a region, but also applies to the exercise of control over such region.

The second paragraph states:

That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with the other American republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests.

This latter provision is in conformity with the convention that our country has had with the other 20 American republics in the conference at Buenos Aires in 1936,

at Panama in 1939, and in the declaration of Lima in 1938.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks and to quote therein from various historical references and statutes and also from authorities of other persons upon that question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the reason our Government has always maintained the traditional policy expressed in section 1, that we would not recognize the transfer of any geographical region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, is, as expressed in the preamble, that we have always regarded such acts as dangerous to the peace and safety of this country. That was the basic reason for the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated by President Monroe in his message to Congress on December 2, 1823, but contrary to popular belief, our country had already assumed that position long before President Monroe delivered his historic message.

The policy expressed in section 1 of this resolution is as old as the Government itself, because it is based upon our own defense, and we have always realized, even when the Republic was very young, that any change of sovereignty in this hemisphere by any non-American power was a menace to our peace and security.

I shall cite several instances in support of this statement.

On a number of occasions during our early history, this Government announced that it would be unwilling to see territory in this hemisphere in the hands of European states transferred by them to other European states.

In 1801 the American Minister to England, Rufus King, reported to the Secretary of State that he had had a conversation with Lord Hawkesbury with reference to the reported cession of the Floridas by Spain to France, and that—

> The purport of what I said was, that we are contented that the Floridas remain in the hands of Spain, but should not be willing to see them transferred, except to ourselves.

On February 29, 1808, President Jefferson made a similar statement with respect to Spanish possessions in this hemisphere. He stated that we would be—

> very unwilling to see them in that (the possession) of either France or England, politically or commercially. We consider their interests and ours as the same, and that the object of both must be to exclude all European influence from this hemisphere.

I refer now to an instance of greater significance, and it is a direct precedent for the enactment of this resolution. I refer to the action taken by Congress on January 15, 1811, 11 years before the Monroe Doctrine was declared, when Congress, after deliberation on a message sent to Congress by President Madison on January 3 of that year, with reference to the situation of the Floridas, passed a resolution which I quote:

> Taking into view the peculiar situation of Spain, and of her American provinces; and considering the influence which the destiny of the territory adjoining the southern border of the United States may have upon their security, tranquillity, and commerce: Therefore
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled,* That the United States, under the peculiar circumstances of the existing crisis, cannot, without serious inquietude, see any part of the said territory pass into the hands of any foreign power; and that a due regard to their own safety compels them to provide, under certain contingencies, for the temporary occupation of the said territory; they, at the same time, declare that the said territory shall, in their hands, remain subject to future negotiation (3 Stat. 471).

If the crisis of 1811 justified the passage of the resolution which I have just read, the world crisis of today certainly justifies the passage of the pending resolution.

The Axis Powers, composed of Germany, Italy, and Japan, are threatening, not only the peace of the world, but have openly declared their opposition to democracies throughout the world, and have, by words and deeds, indicated their intention to subjugate the world and place all peoples under their domination. This resolution is to give notice to them and all other non-American powers that the United States stands where it has always stood, and that we will not tolerate or permit any non-American power to take 1 inch of American soil, either in North or South America, because so to do would be, not only in violation of our traditional policy, but would threaten the peace and safety of our Republic.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman states that in the event of a threat, the resolution provides for consultation with other Western Hemisphere powers. Does that carry with it the meaning that this Nation could take no action at all until after such consultation is had?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. It would not prevent the United States unilaterally from taking such measures as it may see fit to take under the circumstances obtaining at the moment. The United States, with or without the adoption of the proposed resolution, is, of course, a free agent and may, whenever circumstances require, take such steps as may be necessary to prevent foreign inroads in this hemisphere.

Mr. PACE. Then, should not the language say that the United States "may" consult rather than "shall" consult?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is simply to comply with the conferences mentioned. It will not affect our rights, I will say to the gentleman. The first section is to reaffirm our traditional policy and to give notice that it will be maintained, and, second, to tell these other 20 American republics we will consult with them about these matters; but it does not jeopardize our rights so far as our individual action is concerned.

Mr. PACE. Although the resolution uses the word "shall"?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. "Shall" is sometimes directory. It is not always used in the sense in which it appears. There is no question but what the intention is that our country does not surrender any of its rights to act unilaterally if the circumstances require.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Has the State Department officially determined what countries are included in "this hemisphere"?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The State Department, so far as I know, has not officially determined what countries are included in this hemisphere, but I have a list of the various foreign countries which are without question in this hemisphere, which I shall shortly name. The only foreign countries that have possessions in this hemisphere are the British, French, and the Netherlands in the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea; and then in the Eastern Hemisphere the possessions of Great Britain and France in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Would that include Iceland, do you think?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Iceland is not included.

The possessions that non-American powers have on this hemisphere, and about which there is no doubt that they are embraced therein, are as follows:

BRITISH, FRENCH, AND NETHERLANDS POSSESSIONS IN THE WESTERN ATLANTIC AND CARIBBEAN AREA

British:
- Newfoundland (including Labrador).
- Bermuda.
- Bahamas.
- Jamaica (including Turks Island, Caicos Islands, Cayman Islands, etc.).
- British Leeward Islands (British Virgins, St. Christopher, Dominica, etc.).
- Windward Islands (3 colonies) (St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Grenada).
- Barbados.
- Trinidad and Tobago.
- British Honduras.
- British Guiana.
- Falkland Islands.

French:
- St. Pierre-Miquelon.
- Guadeloupe (with Marie Galante, etc.).
- Martinique.
- French Guiana.

Netherlands:
- Curacao (including Aruba, Bonaire, etc.).
- Surinam (Dutch Guiana).

WESTERN HEMISPHERE POSSESSIONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN

British:
- Fiji Islands.
- Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony.
- Solomon Islands.
- Tonga Islands.
- Nauru (mandate).
- Pitcairn Island.

New Zealand:
- Union Islands.
- Cook Islands.
- Kermadec Islands.
- Western Samoa (mandate).

French:
- Marquesas.
- Tuamotu Islands.
- Society Islands.
- Tubuai Islands.

French—Continued.
New Caledonia.
Horn Islands.
New Hebrides (French-British condominium).

It will be noted that neither Germany, Italy, or Japan has any possessions at this time upon this hemisphere, and it is the will of the American people that they shall not hereafter acquire any. However, France has possessions in both the Atlantic and Pacific, and the Netherlands in the Atlantic Ocean. Both of these countries are now under the military domination and control of Germany, and while a treaty of peace has not yet been determined, it is conceivable that Germany, when it does terminate the war, insofar as those countries are concerned, may claim or demand that their possessions in this country, or some of them, be transferred to Germany.

England has many possessions, both in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and Germany is now and has for 18 months been fighting with a demoniacal power to try to destroy England, which God grant that she may not do, and which I do not believe she can do, and yet, if Germany should defeat England, then it is easily conceivable that Germany might demand that some of the British possessions in this hemisphere be transferred to her.

If it was dangerous to our peace and safety 150 years ago for a non-American power to gain any territory upon this hemisphere, it is infinitely more dangerous now, for then it required weeks to cross the ocean, and now the world has become smaller, and trans-Atlantic flights are made in 7 hours, and the danger to our country has multiplied, not only because of the strength of the Axis powers but because the world has grown smaller, and any invasion or subjugation of any part of any country on this hemisphere would cause great danger to our safety and our security.

This resolution cannot be considered as provocative of war, but it is merely a reiteration of our traditional policy and a notice to the world that that policy shall be maintained, regardless of the cruel and despotic will of any power, no matter how great or powerful.

Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes some years ago, when he was Secretary of State, made this statement, which I quote:

> The Monroe Doctrine is not a policy of aggression, it is a policy of self-defense. It still remains an assertion of the principle of national security. As such, it is obviously not exclusive. The decision of the question as to what action the United States should take in any exigency arising in this hemisphere is not controlled by the content of the Monroe Doctrine, but may always be determined on grounds of international right and national security as freely as if the Monroe Doctrine did not exist.
>
> The Monroe Doctrine rests "upon the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself."

The motive actuating much of the legislation which we have passed during this crisis has been to prevent a condition of affairs in which it will be too late for our country to protect itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the passage of this bill. A similar bill passed the House during the last session of Congress, just about 6 months ago. The Senate amended the bill last session by changing one word, but since then, at this session, the Senate has seen fit to pass the bill containing the exact wording of the original House bill. It now comes to us in the form of a Senate bill for our action.

This is a very important piece of legislation, particularly at this critical time. We have just acquired a number of leases on islands off our coast belonging to Great Britain for the purpose of building naval stations and air and submarine bases. All we have on those islands are 99-year leases. If, for example, the German blitzkreig against England should be successful and the Nazis overrun England a new government would probably come into power there which would want to bring about peaceful relations with Germany under the best possible terms for Great Britain. It might be Germany would claim these islands off our coasts, or all of the possessions now owned by Great Britain in this hemisphere, including those islands upon which we have 99-year leases.

This bill is a declaration or statement of policy by the Government of the United States that extends the Monroe Doctrine. In this resolution we simply say we are opposed to the transfer of any possessions in this hemisphere belonging to non-American countries to other non-American countries. We establish a declaration of definite policy. We serve notice upon all the world, including Germany, that no matter what happens, even if Germany is victorious, we are opposed to the transfer of these islands owned by France, Great Britain, and Holland in this hemisphere to Germany or any other non-American country.

I am heartily in favor of the proposal. I believe we ought to reiterate and keep on reiterating the Monroe Doctrine so the other nations of the world will know exactly what the Monroe Doctrine is and that we are a united country, Republicans and Democrats, in upholding the Monroe Doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine states that we are opposed to the invasion of any part of the American Continent by any foreign nation. Those of us who have heard all this war talk and the possibility of invasion have been told that there is very little fear of invasion of the United States but that the Axis Powers might possibly invade South America, that they might invade South America by acquiring air bases there and would use these air bases against us and the Panama Canal.

Let me say again that this bill is nothing but an affirmation of policy by the Government that we will oppose any transfer of these islands or any of the possessions of Great Britain, France, or Holland to any non-American nation.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Is the gentleman of the opinion that the issue between non-American powers was included in the original Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. FISH. I believe it was, but there has been some discussion and dispute as to whether this specific question of transfer was included. Many former Secretaries of State have held that it was included by interpretation and have so stated officially. There should be no quibbling about it. The Members of Congress ought to know exactly what they are doing. Everybody ought to know what this does; and the language of the resolving clause explains it in a few words.

I do not worry at all about the question of consultation. We merely say that we will consult, but we do not have to abide by the final decision after the consultation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Referring to the second resolving clause, there is nothing in that language and in what has gone before that would obligate the United States to not proceed to action if the other American republics should decline to go along with us.

Mr. FISH. Entirely so, and it specifically says so in those words.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Is not the real purpose of this resolution to make this affirmation of the Monroe Doctrine the act of Congress? In other words, that Congress speaks and affirms something which is nebulous, which never has been affirmed by Congress, as suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]? Is not that the real purpose?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This is a statement by Congress and it will be approved by the President. That will make it an act of Congress and of the administration combined endorsing a definite policy and showing that Republicans and Democrats alike are united in upholding not only the Monroe Doctrine but this interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine against any transfer of property from one non-American country to another.

Mr. MICHENER. May I say to the gentleman that this is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine as originally understood.

Mr. FISH. I do not know whether it would be as originally understood, because every Secretary of State has interpreted the Monroe Doctrine along similar lines. But this makes it definite. In view of the fact we are discussing the

Monroe Doctrine, I call attention to one part of the Monroe Doctrine that is often overlooked, and that is the part which reads as follows:

Our policy in regard to Europe remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers, to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.

The Monroe Doctrine, therefore, not only applies to that part which we Americans know as opposing any interference or invasion by foreign governments of our continent, but we at the same time state that we will not interfere in European affairs. That part is often overlooked.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What was the effect of the World War on that? Did that change our policy?

Mr. FISH. That is what I am about to bring up. We have overlooked this part of the Monroe Doctrine which is still a part of it and we are now interfering in European and Asiatic affairs and seeking to quarantine the whole world in spite of the specific statement contained in the Monroe Doctrine.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Would not the gentleman say that part of it had been abrogated?

Mr. FISH. I would say it was obsolete and is not practiced at the present time by the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact we are united in trying to protect our country from invasion and keeping foreign nations out of America, I want to call attention to House bill 3855 to provide for hemispheric control of airways operating in Latin America. I presented this bill on March 6, 1941, and it reads as follows:

That the Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Board, be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire by purchase or other appropriate methods, with the consent and approval of the South American nations concerned, the ownership of air lines now operated by Axis interests in Latin America in order to establish all-American control and hemispheric defense.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is further authorized, in cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Board, to provide financial aid to South American countries to acquire control of Axis air lines, to investigate possibilities of extending the present service and increasing existing schedules of American air lines now operating in the respective Latin-American countries, to establish new bases and airports, and to cut down time of travel between the United States and South and Central American nations, bringing them closer together and extending the good-neighbor policy and hemispheric defense.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amount or amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

I understand that the State Department is now acting on this proposal. I do not know anything more effective, if we want to protect ourselves from any possibility of an air attack from the Axis Powers. We are spending $100,000,000 on a single battleship. For less than one-half of that sum we could buy up every single Axis air line with their airports in South America. We could probably buy them all up for $10,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Axis Powers have air lines in all but two countries in South America, Colombia, and Venezuela and control about 20,000 miles of air lines. If we are really serious about wanting to protect ourselves from any possibility of attack by air, we ought to buy those lines immediately, and if the Axis lines will not sell to American interests or to our Government, then we ought to lend the necessary money to acquire them to each one of the Latin American countries in order to acquire them for themselves and cooperate with us for hemispheric or all-American control of the airways throughout South America.

I hope the administration will act immediately. If it fails to do so, I hope the Congress will put through this bill. I have talked the matter over with Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, and I believe the administration will act within the next 30 days to acquire these Axis air lines in South America. If that is done, then we can put an end to all this talk and fear of invasion, that we are about to be attacked from South America by the Axis nations from air bases and airports owned by them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the chance to speak on Senate Joint Resolution 7, in which "this hemisphere" is inserted without limits or definition. As one who has watched the use of the phrase "Western Hemisphere" with interest, I am glad that expression has been abandoned here and a resort to the original wording of the Monroe Doctrine employed.

At this time it is my humble thought that it would be a dangerous practice to set out the limits of the Western Hemisphere. I am convinced that other nations would attempt to creep up snugly to those longitudinal brackets. Our experiences with the naval treaties of 1922 and 1930 prove that Japan took advantage of every chance to build her fleet close to the ceiling while the British and we lagged behind. Certainly, too, the happenings in Iceland are indicative of what will occur when we say that certain lanes are not within our sphere of influence. If we had said that we termed Iceland within our orbit and then had protested the British and Canadian action we would have avoided the German counter methods in the shape of blockades. It would be better for us if we had shielded it originally for today it has a Nazi blockade around it and that does not help the Lease-Lend Act.

There is a constantly increasing practice in the Congress to use the phrase Western Hemisphere, which by itself would not be harmful, though in its entirety there may soon be worked out limits which might be embarrassing.

The evident attempt to make the phrase serve as a block for feared Executive abuse is not a healthy use of legislative prerogatives as that employment may necessitate a decision on metes and bounds later.

The present resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 7, states:

Joint resolution affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely

Whereas our traditional policy has been to consider any attempt on the part of non-American powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to the peace and safety not only of this country but of the other American republics; and

Whereas the American republics agreed at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace held in Buenos Aires in 1936, and at the Eighth International Conference of American States held in Lima in 1938 to consult with one another in the event that the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic should be threatened; and

Whereas the Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics at Panama October 3, 1939, resolved, "That in case any geographic region of America subject to the jurisdiction of any non-American state should be obliged to change its sovereignty and there should result therefrom a danger to the security of the American Continent, a consultative meeting such as the one now being held will be convoked with the urgency that the case may require": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., (1) That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and

(2) That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with the other American republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interest.

It passed the Senate March 10, 1941.

In his historic address to Congress on December 2, 1823, President Monroe warned the European powers against trying "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere." The terms of the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Rehabilitation, and Reestablishment of Peace, adopted at the Inter-American Conference of Buenos Aires in 1936, were to apply to the "American Continent." Secretary Hull, in a letter of June 4, 1940, to Representative BLOOM discussing a joint resolution then before Congress, used the expressions "Western Hemisphere" and "the Americas" interchangeably.

Let us look at the modern Executive usages:

In his message to the Congress, July 22, 1940, President Roosevelt uses the term "Western Hemisphere" twice, but there is no definition other than a reference to the "other countries of the West-

ern Hemisphere" or "the other republics of the Western Hemisphere."

However, the President's address to the Western Hemisphere, October 12, 1940, opens:

It is no mere coincidence that this radio broadcast to the entire Western Hemisphere—North America, Central America, and South America—should take place on the anniversary of Christopher Columbus' discovery of the New World.

Later he talks about the formation "here in the Western Hemisphere" of "a new human reservoir." He constantly refers to the New World and the Old World. Like Monroe, he sets up the broad contrasts without definitive details.

Still later he said:

When we speak of defending this Western Hemisphere we are speaking not only of the territory of North, Central, and South America and the immediately adjacent islands but we include the right to the peaceful use of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. That has been our traditional policy.

Therefore, where President Monroe in his message of December 2, 1823, referred to "this hemisphere" President Roosevelt adds "this Western Hemisphere." He then adds "oceans" when he asserted:

We of the Americas still consider that this defense of these oceans of the Western Hemisphere, against acts of agression is the first factor in the defense and protection of our own territorial integrity. We reaffirm that policy, lest there be any doubt of our intention to maintain it.

Secretary Hull speaking on "Foreign Policy" October 26, 1940, said:

There can be nothing more dangerous for our Nation than for us to assume that the avalanche of conquest could under no circumstances reach any vital portion of this hemisphere. Oceans give the nations of this hemisphere no guaranty against the possibility of economic, political, or military attack from abroad. * * * As an important means of strengthening our own defense and of preventing attack on any part of the Western Hemisphere, this country is affording all feasible facilities for the obtaining of supplies by nations which, while defending themselves against barbaric attack, are checking the spread of violence and are thus reducing the danger to us.

In his fireside chat the President on December 29, 1941, used the phrase three times without additional implications, though Secretary Hull in his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee on January 15, 1941, adds "high seas" asserting that—

control of the high seas by law-abiding nations is the key to the security of the Western Hemisphere in the present-day world situation.

In a legislative sense a few examples will display our employment of the word. It ought to be remembered that in many instances abortive attempts have been made throughout all the neutrality hearings, debates on the Export-Import bank, discussions on defense and kindred subjects to use the phrase as an obstacle to executive encroachment. Unfortunately, that attempt, as we have said, may backfire to our own disadvantage. Certainly, it seems that a logical development of the separation of powers ought to remove that type of check and balance.

In Congress, too, we have examples of the phrase. I have selected a few of the most recent acts.

[United States Code Congressional Service. Acts of 76th Cong., Aug. 16–Sept. 16, 1940]

ACTIVE MILITARY SERVICE—NATIONAL GUARD, RESERVE, AND RETIRED PERSONNEL

[S. J. Res. 286, Public Resolution No. 96, 76th Cong., ch. 689, 3d sess.]

Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to authorize the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service

Resolved, etc., That during the period ending June 30, 1942, the President be, and is hereby, authorized from time to time to order into the active military service of the United States for a period of 12 consecutive months each, any, or all members and units of any or all reserve components of the Army of the United States (except that any person in the National Guard of the United States under the age of 18 years so ordered into the active military service shall be immediately issued an honorable discharge from the National Guard of the United States), and retired personnel of the Regular Army, with or without their consent, to such extent and in such manner as he may deem necessary for the strengthening of the national defense: *Provided*, That the members and units of the reserve components of the Army of the United States ordered into active Federal service under this authority shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

[H. J. Res. 306, Public Res. No. 54, 76th Cong., ch. 2, 2d sess.]

Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests

COMMERCE WITH STATES ENGAGED IN ARMED CONFLICT

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

* * * * *

(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. Issuance of a bill of lading under which title to the articles or materials to be exported or transported passes to a foreign purchaser unconditionally upon the delivery of such articles or materials to a carrier, shall constitute a transfer of all right, title, and interest therein within the meaning of this subsection. The shipper of such articles or materials shall be required to file with the collector of the port from or through which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that he has complied with the requirements of this subsection with respect to transfer of right, title, and interest in such articles or materials, and that he will comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated from time to time. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials if such citizen had knowledge of the filing of such declaration; and the exportation or transportation of any articles or materials without filing the declaration required by this subsection shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, if such citizen had knowledge of such violation. No loss incurred by any such citizen (1) in connection with the sale or transfer of right, title, and interest in any such articles or materials, or (2) in connection with the exportation or transportation of any such copyrighted articles or materials, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

* * * * *

(g) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels (other than aircraft) of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (1)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of 35° north latitude, (2) to any port in the Western Hemisphere north of 35° north latitude and west of 66° west longitude, (3) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays, or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean or its dependent waters south of 30° north latitude. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such vessels.

(h) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (1)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such aircraft.

[United States Code Congressional Service, acts of 76th Cong., August 16–September 16, 1940]

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

[S. 4164, Public, No. 783, 76th Cong., ch. 720, 3d sess.]

An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the personnel of the armed forces of the United States and providing for its training.

* * * * *

SEC. 3. (A) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien residing in the United States who has declared his intention to become such a citizen, between the ages of 21 and 36 at the time fixed for his registration, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

* * * * *

(E) Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under this act shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

As a practical problem, few men have set out the limits of the geographical hemispheres as has Col. Lawrence Martin, of the Library of Congress. Even he recognizes that these hemispheres are either political or geographical, and he urges the caution of the trained scholar in this dual field.

Geographically, you can go to any atlas and obtain a definition of the phrase—more than that, you will even view the world divided actually into two parts, called a Western and Eastern Hemisphere.

Yet it is possible for so many definitions of what actually constitutes the hemisphere in the matter of details that a hundred different ideas might be rampant. One might include Iceland, the Azores, Cape Verde Island, New Zealand, Guam, or the many other frontier islands or areas in the shadowland. From a governmental standpoint we might well have complete variance from an executive and congressional point of view unless actual areas were set out. Yet when those areas are set out they become a precedent and a shackling cloak of indisputable political and diplomatic embarrassment.

Add to these difficulties the use of the international date line as a Pacific Ocean limit. That line shifts, too, and in its shifting we discover a variable, though for all practical purposes those shifts might be neutralized in the hands of competent authorities.

I add Colonel Martin's conclusions in a letter to me dated February 3, 1940, in which he said:

The attached map, as printed, shows the conventional mathematical limits of the Western Hemisphere on the meridians of 20 west longitude and 160 east longitude. Most American, British, German, and Italian maps represent it this way.

The red pencil lines upon this map present a defendable representation of the actual limits of the Western Hemisphere with relation to political geography. It will be observed that the use of the international date line as the western limits of the Western Hemisphere solves the problem concerning Siberia, New Zealand, etc., and that the four departures from the meridian of 20 west longitude take care of the situation with respect to the Cape Verde Islands, the Azores, and northeastern Greenland as well as the view of Stefansson with respect to Iceland. A large proportion of the part of Antarctica in the Western Hemisphere was discovered and explored by Americans. Wilkes Land, however, lies entirely in the Eastern Hemisphere.

In the Pacific it puts eastern Russia (Siberia as well as New Zealand and adjacent islands) in the Western Hemisphere, although they are generally regarded as parts of the Eastern Hemisphere.

Nevertheless, no other meridians—

He adds—

can be chosen as limits of the hemispheres without similar minor departures upon the basis of political geography.

In another extension of the same map of Colonel Martin's, I note to the south the section of Antarctica in the Western Hemisphere map includes Byrd-Ellsworth Land, while Wilkes Land is in the eastern sphere. It would be interesting to pursue this further and speculate on the importance of these additions to the Western Hemisphere spheres of influence.

The distinguished Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] has written very cogently about some of the misapprehensions about the physical limits of the phrase. He pointed out that one Member felt that Hawaii was in the Eastern Hemisphere, and he asked that a clear-cut definition be made and accepted by Congress and the American people as a sphere of defense.

Few men can speak more authoritatively than he from personal inspection and knowledge about the Pacific; hence, his views are important. He asserted:

No restrictive legislation, under any possible interpretation of the term "Western Hemisphere" could possibly exclude the incorporated Territory of Hawaii as a part of the responsibility of the United States toward the Western Hemisphere, and there are no grounds for the apprehensions expressed in the colloquy to which I have referred.

I am, however, concerned that, in the uncertainties of the future, we may overlook the importance of the middle Pacific area, particularly that part of which, lying east of the one hundred and eightieth meridian, is likewise within the Western Hemisphere. Islands and island groups within this area could conceivably be a menace to our security and to our trade and commerce with Australasia. These islands are today a part of the British and the French Empires. If no change in sovereignty occurs, it would be unnecessary for the United States to assert its dominant interest as to their disposal. If the democracies of Australia and New Zealand, with whom some of these island groups have close economic and political ties, are in a position to maintain themselves we may view with equanimity their control of the islands in this area.

In his letter to President Roosevelt he goes into detail to this effect:

Perhaps of first importance is the question of the sovereignty of the so-called America or Line Islands—Christmas, Washington, and Fanning, especially in view of the establishment of a naval air base at Palmyra, which is at the western end of this group of islands. Christmas Island is the largest atoll in the world, ideal as a base for sea or land planes. Fanning Island is now a cable station for the British cable from Canada to Australasia, while Washington Island is of minor importance except for its proximity to these other islands. Possession of these isles by a possibly inimical foreign power would be very detrimental to the interests of the United States.

Of next importance, perhaps, is the question of the sovereignty of the Gilbert, Ellice, and Phoenix Islands and of the Union or Tokelau group. Of these groups the Gilbert Islands are practically all west of the one hundred and eightieth meridian, but American control there would be a valuable offset to foreign control of the Marshall Islands, which are just northwest of the Gilbert Islands. The Ellice Islands straddle the one hundred and eightieth meridian, but whichever power controls this area of the Pacific should, almost necessarily, include them as well as the Phoenix and Tokelau groups within its jurisdiction. The United States has at present an informal agreement with Great Britain for the joint occupation of Canton and Enderbury Islands, in the Phoenix group; but such joint possession would probably be impracticable if a power other than the United States should succeed to Great Britain's interests there, and it would most certainly be to the advantage of the United States to exercise sole control over the entire group.

Transfer of sovereignty over British Samoa to some other foreign power would be hardly tolerable in view of the interests of the United States in American Samoa. The more natural development would be for the whole Samoan group of islands to come under United States sovereignty.

All of the islands so far mentioned, together with the scattered isles due south of the Line Islands, sometimes called the Northern Cook Group, are a part of the British Empire. The islands comprising French Oceania are equally the concern of the United States. The Marquesas Islands in particular are important because of their geographical relationship to the Panama Canal. It would be unfortunate to have them fall into hostile hands. Of only slightly less importance are the Tuamotu Archipelago, the Society Islands, the Tubuai Islands, and the many other islands in this vicinity under French sovereignty.

It is more of an open question whether or not the Cook Group, the Fiji Islands, and the semi-independent Tongan Group should be included in any consideration of American interests in the Pacific, but I do feel that the disposition of those islands in this area close to the Equator or to the one hundred and eightieth meridian is a matter of vital concern to the United States. In our primary occupation with matters closer to the American continents, I hope that these islands will not be allowed to fall into other foreign hands without full deliberation on the possible consequences of such a realinement. The acquiescence of the United States in the occupation of the Palau, Marianas, Caroline, and Marshall Islands by a foreign power at the conclusion of the World War is now generally conceded to have been an error. Even if there are still good reasons for our then Pacific policy, certainly different considerations should apply with respect to the islands east of the one hundred and eightieth meridian, so that a repetition of the 1918 policy would be unthinkable. Claims by foreign powers such as have been reported in recent news releases of a dominant interest in the South Seas should not apply to the southeastern Pacific.

S. W. Boggs, geographer of the State Department, has said in a letter to Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS that—

The necessity of precise demarcation of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres chiefly concerns cartographers rather than geographers or political scientists. Two hemispheres, exactly equal in area, are usually mapped within two circles. Map makers begin by selecting a meridian in the Atlantic Ocean somewhere between Africa and South America, which bears a simple relationship in the number of degrees of longitude east or west of the prime meridian which they prefer to use, and which serves their purpose best with reference to Greenland, Iceland, and other islands in the North Atlantic Ocean.

Within the last century the meridian of Greenwich has been increasingly used as the prime meridian in various countries, and map makers who use Greenwich as the zero meridian usually take the meridian 20° west of Greenwich as their line of demarcation in the Atlantic Ocean. In order to make a map of the Eastern or Western Hemisphere, comprising exactly one-half of the area of the earth, cartographers must therefore take the opposite meridian, namely, 160° east of Greenwich. In the Atlantic Ocean the meridian 20° west of Greenwich serves remarkably well, as it places all of Greenland, except a very small area in the northeast, within the Western Hemisphere, and the larger part of Iceland within the Eastern Hemisphere. It has the minor disadvantage of placing the Azores and the

Cape Verde Islands in the Western Hemisphere, contrary to their historical association with the Old World. In the Pacific Ocean, however, the meridian 160° east of Greenwich is anomalous in that it places New Zealand in the Western Hemisphere (whereas Australia is in the Eastern Hemisphere), and that it places the eastern portion of Siberia in the Western Hemisphere.

Many map makers, however, use zero meridians other than that of Greenwich. For example, the meridian of Ferro, the westernmost of the Canary Islands, was adopted at a scientific conference in Paris in 1630 as the prime meridian. The meridian of Ferro, subsequently found to be almost 20° west of Paris, or approximately 17°40' west of Greenwich, has been used very widely and has been employed on maps published in Germany, Austria, and Yugoslavia, even within the last 20 years. French maps of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres today frequently use the meridians 20° west of Paris and 160° east of Paris as the line of demarcation between the hemispheres.

Although maps of these two hemispheres differ slightly in their limiting meridians, depending partly upon the selection of a zero meridian, they almost invariably agree in placing all of Europe and Africa and most of Asia in the Eastern Hemisphere, and all of the American continents in the Western Hemisphere.

Your interest in a line of demarcation between these two hemispheres is related, in part, if I understand correctly, to an interpretation of the policy which was enunciated by President Monroe in his message to the Congress on December 2, 1823. In that message, as you will recall, reference was made to "the American continents," to "this hemisphere" (mentioned twice), to "either continent" (North America and South America), and to "their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic." This geographical concept evidently related to the New World as distinguished from the Old World, and there appears to have been no thought at that time of laying down a pair of meridians, placed diametrically opposite each other, on one side of which one policy was to be followed and on the other side of which an entirely different policy was to be followed.

Except for purposes of making maps comprising exactly one-half of the earth's surface, it therefore seems better to regard this hemisphere in which we live, in relation to the land areas of the world, as comprising North America (including Central America and the West Indies, and also Greenland) and South America, together with all islands appertaining to the two continents. In order to include the westernmost islands of the Territory of Alaska and to embrace an area roughly approximating one-half of the earth's surface, it is necessary to include a considerable portion of the Pacific Ocean. For convenience the international date line might be regarded as a provisional western limit of this hemisphere. The vast areas of the high seas in both the Atlantic and the Pacific have no bearing upon the practical problem of delimiting the hemispheres, except as it affects the map maker. Otherwise we are concerned only with land areas—with continents and islands, large and small.

There is no dispute regarding the continents and related islands which are embraced within the Western Hemisphere. The limits of the conventional hemisphere of the map makers differ but slightly, depending largely upon the zero or prime meridian on which the map is constructed. The geographical or historical Western Hemisphere is not quite so extensive, and its limits are defined neither by Nature nor by common agreement.

Very sincerely yours,

S. W. Boggs, *Geographer.*

Vilhjalmur Stefansson has given his definition of the Western Hemisphere in an article in the current Foreign Affairs. He asserts:

First of all, we may eliminate the idea that a meridian of longitude can serve as such a line, for no meridian makes a logical division between the two hemispheres. Let me cite a couple of examples to show what I mean. All geographers concede that Greenland is in the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, in order not to exclude any part of Greenland from this hemisphere, the dividing line would have to be pushed eastward to the eleventh meridian. But that meridian, we find, cuts across west Africa and would thus include in the Western Hemisphere a thousand miles of African shoreline. Obviously, it would be impossible to uphold any such division on grounds of geography; nor would such a frontier be readily defensible. However, the use of any more westerly meridian as a demarcation line would put parts of Greenland and Iceland into the Eastern Hemisphere, to which the strategists would naturally raise strong objections. Take for instance the thirtieth meridian which has long served as a rule-of-thumb line to separate the hemispheres. This meridian misses Africa, but it cuts Greenland in such a way as to leave its best aviation territory to Europe. Some have contended that it is a matter of no great importance "because the Greenland east coast is inaccessible to ships except during midsummer." But that was not the view of Jean Charcot after his numerous explorations of the east Greenland Sea; nor is it the common view among Norwegian explorers who have done good work on the northern east coast in the last few years. Nor does it seem to be true, as recent press dispatches have reported, that the part of Greenland east of the thirtieth meridian is topographically and climatically bad for flying. The topography, in fact, is no worse than on the southwest coast of Greenland, which the dispatches have described as good for aviation and, therefore, a desirable base for Western Hemisphere defense. As for the atmospheric conditions, so far as we know, the average flying weather is a good deal better in east Greenland around Scoresby Sound, and north thereof, than it is on the southwestern coast. Furthermore, air bases on one side of Greenland could easily be attacked by planes operating from bases on the other side, since the Greenland ice cap offers no obstacle to passage by air.

Clearly then, we must apply some principle other than that of the straight line—one which, without being arbitrary, answers the demands of both common sense and high strategy. This brings us to my suggestion, which briefly is that the de facto boundary between the two hemispheres should be the middle of the "widest channel." In other words, a line should be drawn through the Atlantic Ocean in such a way that it would be equidistant from the European and African continents on one hand and from the American continents on the other. As part of the continents I include the large islands adjacent to them, such as Svalbard, Greenland, Iceland, the British Isles, Newfoundland, and the Greater Antilles, but not minor groups like the Faroes, Azores, Bermudas, Cape Verdes, etc.

As I have already indicated, objections against such a division might come from those who doubt that Greenland and Iceland may rightly be regarded as appendages of the American land mass and, therefore, like Newfoundland, as parts of the Western Hemisphere. Nevertheless, the United States Government has upon several occasions acted on the assumption that Greenland is in the Western Hemisphere, and recently President Roosevelt has given his express support to this view. In regard to Iceland the official American stand has not been so explicit. However, as long ago as 1868, the State Department published a study entitled "A Report on the Resources of Iceland and Greenland" in which the author, Benjamin Mills Peirce, declares, in reference to Iceland, that "it belongs to the Western Hemisphere and is an insular dependency of the North American continent." There are several good reasons for taking this position. For instance, Iceland does not extend so far east as Greenland. Thus, to put it in the Eastern Hemisphere would be, from a purely geographical point of view, quite illogical. Furthermore, Greenland is visible from the mountains of northwestern Iceland, whereas no land to the east, southeast, or south is visible from any part of Iceland. Iceland is only about 180 miles away from Greenland, but is 300 miles distant from the Faroes, over 500 miles from Scotland, and more than 600 miles from Norway.

We, therefore, in my opinion, are thoroughly justified in holding that Greenland and Iceland belong to the North American Continent rather than to the European, and hence that they form part of the Western Hemisphere. It is upon this assumption that I am suggesting that the line between the two hemispheres should be as indicated on the accompanying map. This line is drawn midway between such points as the northeast corner of Greenland, and the westernmost cape of Svalbard, easternmost Iceland and northwest Scotland, Cape Race (Newfoundland) and Cape Finisterre (Spain), the "bulge" of Brazil and the nearest point to it in Africa, and Cape Horn and the Cape of Good Hope.

This middle-of-the-channel line is not only rational from the standpoint of geography, but offers the United States the best rampart behind which to defend this hemisphere, for it puts the maximum possible distance between us and any potential aggressors in Europe.

The Evening Star in a timely editorial recently said:

DELINEATION OF A HEMISPHERE

An announcement by the German Government to the effect that British-occupied Iceland and the waters surrounding the same are to be included in operations intended to constitute a counterblockade of England raises again the question of the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere.

The problem, it is well to recall, has been discussed at intervals during several centuries. Long before the beginning of the present war, geographers and other students were at variance in their views concerning the meaning of the phrases "this hemisphere" and "the American Continents," occurring in the text of the Monroe Doctrine as set forth in its sponsor's message to Congress, December 2, 1823.

Within the lifetime of scholars living on the date last mentioned, Benjamin Mills Pierce, son of Prof. Benjamin Pierce, Superintendent of the United States Coast Survey, prepared for the State Department A Report on the Resources of Iceland and Greenland, which was published in 1868. This document, a monument of a sort to its gifted young author, who died in 1870 aged only 26, declares with reference to the former territory: "This large island * * * is 130 miles east of Greenland and 850 miles west from Norway. By location, then, it belongs to the Western Hemisphere and is an insular dependency of the North American Continent." Further, the same writer affirms: "It (Iceland) * * * seems to be rather American in its connections than European, especially as we may add that its most important and most populous coast is the western."

The position of Mr. Peirce is endorsed and supported by Col. Lawrence Martin, Chief of the Division of Maps in the Library of Congress, who, in the Geographical Review for July 1940 submits "one geographer's individual view of the extent of the Western Hemisphere," accepting the proposition, "convincingly" shown by Vilhjalmur Stefansson, that "Iceland is a part of the Western Hemisphere."

But Samuel Whittemore Boggs, geographer of the State Department, is not entirely convinced. Addressing Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, on June 8 last, he said, "It * * * seems better to regard this hemisphere in which we live, in relation to the land areas of the world, as comprising North America (including Central America and the West Indies, and also Greenland) and South America, together with all islands appertaining to the two continents." The omission of specific stipulation of Iceland may be assumed to be intentional; yet there is room for argument as to the meaning of the concluding words of the quoted sentence.

Meanwhile, Admiral William V. Pratt sums up the basic issue in Newsweek as follows: "Geographers place the Atlantic boundary of the Western Hemisphere at 20° west longitude. Old German atlases put it at 17°40′ west. * * * As the Lease-Lend Act does not define the limit, it is up to the President to choose among the many definitions which have been offered."

A decision, obviously, ought not to be reached in haste. It must be remembered that a scientific conference in Paris in 1630 adopted the meridian of Ferro, subsequently found to be almost 20° west of Paris or approximately 17°40′ west of Greenwich. In fairness, it has to be conceded that the maps of France as well as those of Germany for more than three centuries have been faithful to this rule.

It certainly ought to be apparent that while the rugged fundamentals of that area we call the Western Hemisphere are clear-cut, its frontiers are a matter of dispute but unfortunately it is in these frontiers that our dangers most certainly lie and any attempt to demarcate our longitudinal line of national interest might lead to serious consequences.

It is certainly apparent that in the Pacific Ocean the international date line has much favor but Guam is outside this and since Guam has been the recent subject of authorizations for fortifications it would be foolhardy to exclude Guam from our best national interests.

There is, of course, no more fascinating study in the field of debatable geography than the international date line. I am taking the liberty of including under my extension the definitions given over this phase in the Encyclopedia Britannica and the Americana.

[Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 12]

INTERNATIONAL DATE LINE

If a voyager travels eastward to the Antipodes and thus "anticipates the sun," his timing will be 12 hours in advance; if another travel westward, then his will be as much in arrears. There will thus be a difference of 24 hours when they meet. To avoid confusion mariners chose the 180° meridian as a convenient line (known as the international date line), as the crossing of which they changed the name of the day, forward if going west; backward if going east. The international date line, largely consequent on American initiative, while retaining the 180° meridian in the Pacific, is arranged so as to bring the Aleutian Islands and Alaska into the same dating as America, and certain of the South Sea Islands into the same dating as Australia and New Zealand.

[The Americana, vol. 15]

INTERNATIONAL DATE LINE

The imaginary line at which dates change, being made later by 1 day by those who cross the line from east to west and earlier by 1 day by those crossing it from west to east. It is a somewhat irregular line drawn through the Pacific Ocean in a general northerly and southerly direction and separating the islands of the Pacific Ocean in such a manner that all those lying to the east of it carry the same date as the United States, while all those on the west of it carry the same date as Japan and Australia. If a person start at midday, that is, when the sun was shining perpendicularly on the meridian that passes through the place of starting, and travel westward, keeping pace with the sun, thus keeping the sun directly over the meridian of the place at which he might be, he would make a complete journey around the globe in 24 hours, and return to his place of starting at noon the next day. Twenty-four hours would have passed, but to the traveler the sun would have been shining perpendicularly as at noon all the time; and the question arises, when or at what point did the traveler change from noon of one day to noon of the next? For instance, if he should start at Monday noon and keep the sun in the zenith, he would arrive at the place of starting Tuesday noon—it would be noonday to him during the whole journey of 24 hours. Monday noon would change to Tuesday noon without an intervening night; where would the change occur? It is to him apparently still Monday noon and to obtain the correct date he must drop a day. The reason for dropping a day can be more fully shown as follows: Remembering that the earth makes one complete revolution on its axis in 24 hours and thus the sun in its apparent diurnal revolution moves over 360 degrees of space in 24 hours, it thus moves over 15 degrees of space in 1 hour, from which it is evident that the difference in longitude which causes the difference in the relative time, may be estimated in time, allowing 15 degrees to an hour, or 1 degree to 4 minutes. Therefore, suppose a man starting from any given point travel 1 degree west, his watch, instead of marking 12 o'clock at noon, according to the correct time at that place, would mark 4 minutes after 12. Let him travel west 15 degrees, and he will find that 1 o'clock by his watch will be noonday by the sun. Let him go on to 120 degrees and when the sun is in the zenith his watch will indicate 8 o'clock p. m. Completing his journey around the globe, he will have gained, in this manner, 24 hours. From this it will be seen that in order to obtain the correct date 24 hours must be subtracted from his time. On the other hand if a person could travel eastward at the same speed with which the sun apparently travels westward (the same rate of speed with which the earth revolves on its axis), if he should start on his journey at noonday, he would meet the sun when exactly on the opposite side of the earth from the place of starting and continuing the journey would again meet the sun at the place of starting, thus seeing three noondays within the 24 hours, or apparently gaining a day. This we know to be impossible, since only 24 hours of time have passed, while in reality an extra period of light has been gained and thus to obtain the correct local date a day must be added to your time. From this we see that, for every time a person travels around the earth in either direction there is a difference in time of 1 day and the result is the same regardless of the rate of speed. To avoid the confusion of dates which must necessarily result from this constant gain on one side and loss on the other, it has been proposed to determine upon some line at which eastward-bound travelers shall add 1 day and westward-bound travelers shall drop a day from their reckoning and thus prevent a disagreement in regard to the day of the week. The line at which this addition or subtraction shall be made is what is meant by the date line.

The dates in use upon most of the Pacific islands and groups of islands are those which result from those carried by the first European or American colonists, these dates differing according as the colonists came from the east or the west. But this is not true universally, because arbitrary changes are known to have been made in a number of cases, such as Alaska, the Philippines, etc. When Alaska was first colonized by the Russians it had the Russian date. When American settlers moved there, they carried with them the date of the United States which led to considerable confusion, the Sunday of the Americans being the Monday of the Russians. In 1867, when the United States purchased Alaska from Russia, the date in use there was made to conform to that used in the United States.

I am in possession of a very instructive letter from Capt. G. S. Bryan, United States Navy, an outstanding hydrographer, whose statements ought to be of interest in this connection. In addition the National Geographic News Bulletin of the National Geographic Society of Washington has some interesting facts incorporated in a release called What Does the Western Hemisphere Include?

The letter and release follow:

MY DEAR MR. SHANLEY: Your letter of March 11, 1941, requesting information regarding the international date line is acknowledged. As far as our information goes there has never been any international agreement covering what is known as the international date line or simply the date line. The use of these terms began, however, in 1884, when the International Congress on World Standard Time, meeting in Washington, adopted the meridian of Greenwich, England, as the standard meridian.

When it is noon at Greenwich, the sun will naturally be directly overhead. If an observer (a) could move instantaneously westward, he would find that for each 15° of longitude the time would be an hour earlier. For instance, when it is noon on a Wednesday at Greenwich, it would be 7 a. m. Wednesday in New York, 4 a. m. Wednesday in San Francisco, and when he arrived at the one hundred and eightieth meridian it would be midnight Tuesday night. In the same way, if another observer (B) would proceed instantaneously to the eastward, he would find that for each 15° of longitude it would be an hour later. When it was noon Wednesday at Greenwich, it would be 2 p. m. Wednesday in Moscow, 8 p. m. Wednesday in Shanghai, and when he arrived at the one hundred and eightieth meridian it would be midnight Wednesday night. It will thus be seen that with both observers on the one hundred and eightieth meridian at the same instant, one would reckon time as midnight Tuesday and the other as midnight Wednesday.

In order to reconcile this difference, it has always been customary for mariners on crossing the one hundred and eightieth meridian to skip 1 day when going west and to repeat 1 day on going east. As observer (A) continued westward beyond the one hundred and eightieth meridian, he would change his time from midnight Tuesday to midnight Wednesday, thus skipping Wednesday entirely, while observer (B) would change from midnight Wednesday to midnight Tuesday and have 2 Tuesdays during that week. It is interesting to note that a few years ago one of our naval tankers unfortunately found itself obliged

to skip Christmas Day on a trans-Pacific cruise.

As navigators used the one hundred and eightieth meridian for the change of date, they naturally referred to it as the date line. The term "international date line" is also used, although there has never been any international agreement of any kind covering this.

Some years ago Prof. George Davidson, of the University of California, conducted an investigation to determine the dates used by the inhabitants of the various islands or groups of islands situated generally along the one hundred and eightieth meridian. As a result of this investigation, the date line has since been plotted so as to arrange all islands keeping one date on one side of the line and those keeping the other date on the other side. There was no agreement on the subject; the line was simply drawn to show how the islands themselves had settled the date question.

I am sending you, under separate cover, a time chart issued by the Hydrographic Office (H. O. No. 5192), which shows the various times kept throughout the world and also indicating the date line which, you will note, follows generally the one hundred and eightieth meridian.

As regards the question of the Western Hemisphere, there is no standard definition of this term on record, nor is there any agreement as to what it means. Strictly speaking, a hemisphere means one-half of a sphere and any division of the globe into two equal parts would make two hemispheres. When we speak of the Northern or Southern Hemisphere we are on solid ground, as these include, respectively, the areas of the globe lying north or south of the Equator. However, when we speak of the Eastern or Western Hemisphere, the terms are indefinite as the question will naturally be asked, "east or west of what?"

It has been the usual custom of map makers to divide the world into two hemispheres limited by the meridians 20° west of Greenwich and 160° east of Greenwich, respectively. This arbitrary division is simply based on the fact that it places the land areas in a generally central position in each hemisphere. It is done simply in a geometric or cartographic sense and was not intended to have any political significance. The term "Western Hemisphere" has been used extensively, but no precise definition has ever been given to it, and anyone is free to form his own opinion as to what it includes. I might suggest as a comparison the term "Middle West" as used regarding the United States. Few people will agree as to where the Middle West starts and ends, and nowhere, to my knowledge, is it actually defined.

In using the limits mentioned above for dividing the world into two hemispheres, it will be noted that this will include in the Western Hemisphere part of Iceland, the Azores, and the Cape Verde Islands in the Atlantic, while we include in the Pacific part of Siberia, all of New Zealand, and a large number of the island groups of the Southern Pacific. There have been many arguments as to whether or not Iceland should be included in the Western Hemisphere. Most geographers include Greenland. In the absence of any authoritative decision as to what the term "Western Hemisphere" includes, each country will naturally decide the question according to its own interest.

I trust this brief discussion will give you the information you desire. If there is anything else I can do to assist you, I shall be very glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

G. S. BRYAN,
Captain, United States Navy,
Hydrographer.

Hon. JAMES A. SHANLEY,
House of Representatives.

WHAT DOES THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE INCLUDE?

The question, "Just what is a hemisphere," has suddenly ceased to be of interest to map makers only. A Senate resolution has put the world on notice that the United States will not recognize transfers of possessions "in this hemisphere" from one non-American power to another. And efforts have been made to legislate against the sending of United States soldiers outside the Western Hemisphere. The resolutions have been silent on the boundaries of these hemispheres.

"A hemisphere is a relatively new invention, as human history goes," says a bulletin from the National Geographic Society. "In Biblical days men knew no terrestrial sphere to divide into halves. The earth they thought of was something like a platform supported on pillars, with the heavens as a canopy above it and dark waters beneath it.

"WHO INVENTED THE HEMISPHERE IDEA?

"The Greek sages of Homer's time, too, considered the earth to be flat, circular as a dining room table, with oceans washing its dim outer edges. Their divisions of this flat earth were not hemispheres but 'climates' or zones, classified according to the plants and animals they contained.

"It was Egypt, indirectly, that made the world a sphere. In the library of Alexandria, a thoughtful astronomer of the third century B. C., Eratosthenes, concluded that the earth is a ball and even computed its circumference. He made what is believed to be the earliest division of the earth into hemispheres, but by a north-south classification. His pioneer Equator was a line extended through the Mediterranean and across Asia, called the parallel of Rhodes, because that island marked its center. It was about 2,500 miles north of the true Equator. Europe, Asia, and Africa were the only continents Eratosthenes made room for on his sphere.

"It was more than 1,700 years later that Columbus, Cabot, Vespucci, and their followers revealed two new continents, and Balboa unveiled a new ocean. While struggling to crowd the vast new regions on a chart of the world in 1512, an obscure map maker of Cracow, Stobnicza, dared to split the globe into two hemispheres for the first time. He let half of Asia lap over into the New World circle. The celebrated cartographer Mercator in 1538 used a scheme for showing the world in two heart-shaped hemispheres, northern and southern, divided along the Equator.

"LAND MASSES CANNOT BE EQUALLY DIVIDED INTO HEMISPHERES

"Since then, geographers have encountered increasing difficulty in slicing the sphere into east-west halves. The only division about which they can be positive is that into the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, with the respective pole as the exact center of each and the unswerving Equator as the dividing line. But for all other divisions, a hemisphere is merely any 180 degrees of the earth's surface, according to choice. If the dividing lines are to run through the North and South Poles, and so mark out so-called Eastern and Western Hemispheres, there can be a great many of them, varying with the meridian of longitude which is arbitrarily chosen as the starting point.

"In addition to the element of choice involved in defining Eastern and Western Hemispheres, there is the further difficulty that the great land masses of the earth are so unequal in size as to defy exact segregation in 180-degree divisions. Europe, Asia, Australia, and Africa—generally thought of as belonging in the Eastern Hemisphere—cannot be compressed into any true hemisphere because they stretch through 208 degrees of the earth's surface, a lap-over of 28 degrees. On the other hand, North and South America—the Western Hemisphere lands—do not fill 180 degrees. When a full hemisphere is assigned to them, it necessarily cuts into European and Asiatic territory. Since no division of 180-degree hemispheres can both include the appropriate land masses and exclude the inappropriate ones, geographers have had to compromise along practical, but not straight, lines.

"Most map makers have accepted the meridian 20 degrees west of Greenwich, England, as the boundary line in the Atlantic between 'Eastern' and 'Western' Hemispheres. Geographically, the meridian includes the Cape Verde Islands and the Azores in the Western Hemisphere, but actually these island groups are more closely associated with the Eastern Hemisphere. The other borderline islands are Greenland and Iceland. Few people dispute that Greenland belongs logically in what has come to be considered the world's western half, but Iceland, the bulk of which is east of this line, has been classified by different geographers in both hemispheres.

"On the other rim of the Western Hemisphere, thus delineated, the boundary line would geographically be the meridian 160 degrees east of Greenwich. Such a line would divorce New Zealand from Australia, the easternmost extension of Siberia from the main bulk of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and many Japanese-mandated islands from Japan. Only map makers, therefore, follow such a rigid definition of the Western Hemisphere's western boundary, and they only to keep their circle round. Others generally accept as a compromise the International Date Line. This flexible time frontier has been zigzagged so as to leave New Zealand in the Eastern Hemisphere, all of the Aleutian Islands in the Western, and all of Siberia in the Eastern."

Its editor, Gilbert Grosvenor, was good enough to add a very salient phase of the date line as it affects radio and radio schedules:

The Honorable JAMES A. SHANLEY,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

I am enclosing some Geographic News Bulletins on the international date line and one just released on the hemispheres which I think you will find helpful. These are prepared for the press, free of charge, as part of the society's educational program. They are not for distribution to individuals, but we are glad to send these copies to you.

The following quotations are from the National Geographic magazine:

"IT'S SUNDAY WHERE THEY SIT, BUT MONDAY ON THAT OTHER SHORE

"Henry B. Collins, Jr., leader of the National Geographic Society-Smithsonian Institution archeological expedition, sits with an Eskimo boy on the shore of Little Diomede Island in Bering Strait. Beyond is Big Diomede, territory of the U. S. S. R. The international date line passes in the strait between, so that a day is gained in traveling from one island to the other." (Legend, p. 648, "Exploring frozen fragments of American history," May 1939.)

"Less than 2 hours out of Midway, we ran into difficulties on our broadcasting schedules. We had left Midway at dawn Thursday and when we were an hour and a quarter in flight Ingraham informed us we had crossed the international date line and it was now Friday. At one moment, it was 6:52 a. m., Thursday, and the next it was 6:53 a. m., Friday. From this point on, whenever we broadcast, we were talking out of today into yesterday.

"Several times we explained the situation, but it must have confused casual listeners to hear someone talking about Friday, December 13, when to them it was still December 12. Messages transmitted between us and N. B. C. often proved confusing. Imagine, for example, receiving a radiogram Friday morning telling us to originate a program for Thursday afternoon" (p. 692, Flying the Pacific, December 1936).

GILBERT GROSVENOR,
Editor.

Finally, as Americans we ought to be proud of our Nation's efforts in this direction. It was our impetus that brought together the International Meridian Conference in Washington in 1884 and 1885. Their conclusions and the authority which convened them I am adding as a reminder of our foresight in this direction.

[International Meridian Conference, pp. 111, 112]

FINAL ACT

The President of the United States of America, in pursuance of a special provision of Congress, having extended to the Governments of all nations in diplomatic relations with his own, an invitation to send delegates to meet delegates from the United States in the city of Washington, on the 1st of October, 1884, for the purpose of discussing, and, if possible, fixing upon a meridian proper to be employed as a common zero of longitude and standard of time-reckoning throughout the whole world, this International Meridian Conference assembled at the time and place designated; and, after careful and patient discussion, has passed the following resolutions:

I

That it is the opinion of this Congress that it is desirable to adopt a single prime meridian for all nations, in place of the multiplicity of initial meridians which now exist.

II

That the Conference proposes to the Governments here represented the adoption of the meridian passing through the center of the transit instrument at the Observatory of Greenwich as the initial meridian for longitude.

III

That from this meridian longitude shall be counted in two directions up to 180 degrees, east longitude being plus and west longitude minus.

IV

That the Conference proposes the adoption of a universal day for all purposes for which it may be found convenient, and which shall not interfere with the use of local or other standard time where desirable.

V

That this universal day is to be a mean solar day; is to begin for all the world on the moment of mean midnight of the initial meridian, coinciding with the beginning of the civil day and date of that meridian; and is to be counted from zero up to 24 hours.

VI

That the Conference expresses the hope that as soon as may be practicable the astronomical and nautical days will be arranged everywhere to begin at mean midnight.

VII

That the conference expresses the hope that the technical studies designated to regulate and extend the application of the decimal system to the division of angular space and of time shall be resumed, so as to permit the extension of this application to all cases in which it presents real advantages.

ANNEX I

An act to authorize the President of the United States to call an international conference to fix on and recommend for universal adoption a common prime meridian, to be used in the reckoning of longitude and in the regulation of time throughout the world.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be authorized and requested to extend to the governments of all nations in diplomatic relations with our own an invitation to appoint delegates from the United States in the city of Washington, at such time as he may see fit to designate, for the purpose of fixing upon a meridian proper to be employed as a common zero of longitude and standard of time-reckoning throughout the globe, and that the President be authorized to appoint delegates, not exceeding three in number, to represent the United States in such international conference.

Approved August 3, 1882.

I might say that when this entire question came before us in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Chairman SOL BLOOM gave us every assurance of his willingness to study the entire problem guaranteeing us a hearing at the earliest possible time. However, in the present emergency it seems unlikely that any attempt will be made to bring this question before the House even though the purpose of its presentation be for defeating the whole measure.

The United States Naval Observatory tells me that:

The International Meridian Conference, held in Washington, D. C., in 1884, adopted the one hundred and eightieth meridian as the international date line. The date line as shown on maps has never been officially adopted. The dates observed by the various islands in the Pacific have been chosen by the authorities in charge of those islands, and the map makers draw the date line so as to agree with the dates actually used. The Aleutian Islands all use the same date as Alaska, although part of them are west of the one hundred and eightieth meridian, while the Fiji and Tonga Islands and New Zealand use the same date as Australia, although those islands lie partly east of the one hundred and eightieth meridian. Moreover the extreme part of Siberia extends across the one hundred and eightieth meridian. The date line is therefore shown deflected to the east around Siberia, to the west around the Aleutian Islands, and to the east around the Southern Islands.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is not a legislative resolution. This is an expression of a policy on the part of Congress; we resolve "Be it the sense of the meeting," and so forth. I hope it is adopted and signed by the President so that it expresses the policy of the United States as approved both by Congress and the Chief Executive, but it is such an action as would not be susceptible of a veto.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. We have a precedent, as the gentleman knows, for this resolution in 1811, and I ask the gentleman to refer to that.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I was about to refer to that. I am not criticizing this resolution when I say that it has no technical legislative force, because I am wholeheartedly in favor of it, and take a tiny bit of pride of authorship in the amendments which I drafted. I believe such resolutions constitute the proper way in which a republic should state its foreign policy, rather than by speeches of the Executive alone. The origin of this no-transfer policy was not the Monroe Doctrine, the statement of President Monroe in 1823, but, as the gentleman from Texas states, we have a precedent in an action of the Congress in 1811, when, during the Napoleonic wars, there was a threatened transfer of the Floridas from Spain to France, and Congress took action, and passed a resolution saying that we would not, "without serious inquietude," recognize any such transfers, and therefore we would take over Florida for the "duration." As you know, we did occupy Florida, and later purchased it. An even earlier expression of this policy can be found in Washington's Farewell Address, and in 1808 this specific policy of disapproval of transfers to foreign powers was stated by President Jefferson, who objected to the transfer of Spanish possessions in this hemisphere to either France or England. This same principle was also recited in President Monroe's speech. While we speak of this as a reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine, it precedes in time the Monroe Doctrine, and it is, of course, not as broad as the Monroe Doctrine itself. I wish we were reaffirming all of the Monroe Doctrine, instead of only a part of it, and yet I cannot disapprove of part, merely because I cannot have all.

In the original resolution which was introduced in the last session the preamble set forth that—

Whereas many unexpected developments are daily arising from the present grave international situation; and

Whereas such developments are affecting states which have possessions in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas an endeavor to transfer such possessions or any of them from their present owners to any other non-American state would endanger the peace and security of not only this country, but of the other American republics.

That language has all been stricken out, and the language in the present preamble was put in by our committee last year, and it has now been agreed to by the other body.

Since this is not a legislative resolution, the preamble is of more passing importance, because inasmuch as the whole resolution is a statement of legislative purpose, any statement in the preamble is important. The discarded preamble read as if this were a new and unexpected policy instead of an old policy. The present preamble in the first paragraph reads as follows:

Whereas our traditional policy has been to—

The next words are quoted from President Monroe's message. The gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] asked whether in the RECORD there would be some references made to the way President Monroe stated the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman from California asked the preceding speaker if he would put in the way in which the Monroe Doctrine was stated by President Polk, not by President Monroe.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I stand corrected. In any event, I shall quote from President Monroe's words, as they appear in the preamble of this resolution. While we have a precedent for the no-transfer doctrine, I think this is the first time in history that the Monroe Doctrine has been stated by Congress; at least, this is the first time there has been a congressional declaration paraphrasing the very words of President Monroe, and they are as follows:

We consider any attempt on the part of non-American powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to the peace and safety not only of this country but of the other American republics.

This 118-year-old language is peculiarly timely. We are not going to have European powers "extend their system" to "this hemisphere," and we are not going to put any precise limits on what we mean by "this hemisphere." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission, subsequently granted to me today, I am including as a part of my remarks the following letter from Mr. S. W. Boggs, geographer of the State Department, and the following editorial from the Evening Star of Washington, issue of Monday, March 31, 1941, on the delineation of a hemisphere. I agree with the view expressed in the Washington Evening Star article that a decision as to the exact delineation of the Western Hemisphere should not be reached too hastily, particularly at this moment. I have taken a great interest in this whole question, as the House knows. Sometime I believe the House will decide what it believes is the demarkation between the Western and the Eastern Hemispheres.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1940.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

MADAM: Your letter of June 4, 1940, is received, in which you request a definition of the line of demarcation between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres.

There are certain types of hemispheres that are precisely defined, and there are other hemispheres which do not have specific limits. As will be explained below, the Eastern and Western Hemispheres belong to this latter category.

The Northern and Southern Hemispheres are exact concepts. The Northern Hemisphere comprises exactly one-half of the area of the earth, in which the North Pole is at the center. The Equator constitutes the exact line of demarcation between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, since by definition the Equator is the line which is equidistant from the North and South Poles of the axis of rotation of the earth.

A hemisphere in which the Capitol dome in Washington is the exact center is another precise hemisphere. The outer limit is a great circle on the earth's surface which is an oblique line passing north of the Equator on one side and an equal distance south of the Equator on the other. The Navy Department publishes charts of this character, one with Washington as the center and another with San Francisco as the center, showing the distances from the central points and the great-circle courses from the central point to all parts of the world. On each of these charts, which are useful in connection with radio bearings, an exact hemisphere may readily be indicated. An infinite number of such hemispheres may be defined exactly, each with a specific central point, such as the statehouse in Boston or the Eiffel Tower in Paris.

None of these hemispheres which are precisely defined take account of the distribution of land and water on the surface of the earth. They are simple geometrical hemispheres. When it comes to defining geographical hemispheres in which land and water distributions are involved the problem becomes essentially different. Nature's disposition of land water areas follows, of course, no simple geometrical pattern, and there is usually no single mathematical hemisphere which exactly corresponds to any particular idea which is entertained. Moreover, Nature does not provide sharp boundaries, such as man devises for property fences and national frontiers.

The geographical concept of a land hemisphere and a water hemisphere, so demarcated as to place in the first the maximum area of land surface which is above sea level and in the second the maximum area of oceans and seas, illustrates the difficulties of exact delimitation. By painstaking computation a land hemisphere may be determined closely approximating the maximum land area. The center of the land hemisphere is in western Europe somewhere in the vicinity of Berlin. Within a radius equal to one-fourth of the earth's circumference, measured from that center, lie all of Europe, Africa, continental Asia, North America, and the greater part of South America. This geographical concept of land and water hemispheres is useful, in spite of the fact that published maps of these two hemispheres differ slightly in delimitation.

The demarcation of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres is even more difficult, because it involves both the distribution of land and water and historical considerations. The question at once arises, east or west of what? The Western Hemisphere is the New World which Columbus discovered by sailing west. By the Eastern Hemisphere we mean essentially the Old World, comprising Europe, Asia, and Africa; and by the Western Hemisphere we mean the American Continents and appertaining islands. The continental areas of the Old World and the New World are very unequal, however, and the longitudinal extent of Africa and Eurasia is nearly 208°, which is 28° in excess of half the circumference of the Equator. No simple pair of meridians 180° apart can therefore be selected which will place all of Africa and Asia within the same hemisphere, although by common consent they are regarded as belonging within the Eastern Hemisphere.

The necessity of precise demarcation of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres chiefly concerns cartographers rather than geographers or political scientists. Two hemispheres exactly equal in area are usually mapped within two circles. Map makers begin by selecting a meridian in the Atlantic Ocean somewhere between Africa and South America, which bears a simple relationship in the number of degrees of longitude east or west of the prime meridian which they prefer to use and which serves their purpose best with reference to Greenland, Iceland, and other islands in the North Atlantic Ocean.

Within the last century the meridian of Greenwich has been increasingly used as the prime meridian in various countries, and map makers who use Greenwich as the zero meridian usually take the meridian 20° west of Greenwich as their line of demarcation in the Atlantic Ocean. In order to make a map of the Eastern or Western Hemisphere, comprising exactly one-half of the area of the earth, cartographers must therefore take the opposite meridian, namely, 160° east of Greenwich. In the Atlantic Ocean the meridian 20° west of Greenwich serves remarkably well, as it places all of Greenland, except a very small area in the northeast, within the Western Hemisphere, and the larger part of Iceland within the Eastern Hemisphere. It has the minor disadvantage of placing the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands in the Western Hemisphere, contrary to their historical association with the Old World. In the Pacific Ocean, however, the meridian 160° east of Greenwich is anomalous in that it places New Zealand in the Western Hemisphere (whereas Australia is in the Eastern Hemisphere), and that it places the eastern portion of Siberia in the Western Hemisphere.

Many map makers, however, use zero meridians other than that of Greenwich. For example, the meridian of Ferro, the westernmost of the Canary Islands, was adopted at a scientific conference in Paris in 1630 as the prime meridian. The meridian of Ferro, subsequently found to be almost 20° west of Paris, or approximately 17°40′ west of Greenwich, has been used very widely and has been employed on maps published in Germany, Austria, and Yugoslavia even within the last 20 years. French maps of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres today frequently use the meridians 20° west of Paris and 160° east of Paris as the line of demarcation between the hemispheres.

Although maps of these two hemispheres differ slightly in their limiting meridians, depending partly upon the selection of a zero meridian, they almost invariably agree in placing all of Europe and Africa and most of Asia in the Eastern Hemisphere, and all of the American continents in the Western Hemisphere.

Your interest in a line of demarcation between these two hemispheres is related, in part, if I understand correctly, to an interpretation of the policy which was enunciated by President Monroe in his message to the Congress on December 2, 1823. In that message, as you will recall, reference was made to "the American continents," to "this hemisphere" (mentioned twice), to "either continent" (North America and South America), and to "their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic." This geographical concept evidently related to the New World as distinguished from the Old World, and there appears to have been no thought at that time of laying down a pair of meridians, placed diametrically opposite each other, on one side of which one policy was to be followed and on the other side of which an entirely different policy was to be followed.

Except for purposes of making maps comprising exactly one-half of the earth's surface, it therefore seems better to regard this hemisphere in which we live, in relation to the land areas of the world, as comprising North America (including Central America and the West Indies, and also Greenland) and South America, together with all islands appertaining to the two continents. In order to include the westernmost islands of the Territory of Alaska and to embrace an area roughly approximating one-half of the earth's surface, it is necessary to include a considerable portion of the Pacific Ocean. For convenience the international date line might be regarded as a provisional western limit of this hemisphere. The vast areas of the high seas in both the Atlantic and the Pacific have no bearing upon the practical problem of delimiting the hemispheres, except as it affects the map maker. Otherwise we are concerned only with land areas—with continents and islands, large and small.

There is no dispute regarding the continents and related islands which are embraced within the Western Hemisphere. The limits of the conventional hemisphere of the map makers differ but slightly, depending largely upon the zero or prime meridian on which

the map is constructed. The geographical or historical Western Hemisphere is not quite so extensive, and its limits are defined neither by Nature nor by common agreement.

Very sincerely yours,

S. W. BOGGS, *Geographer.*

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 31, 1941]

DELINEATION OF A HEMISPHERE

An announcement by the German Government to the effect that British-occupied Iceland and the waters surrounding the same are to be included in operations intended to constitute a counterblockade of England raises again the question of the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere.

The problem, it is well to recall, has been discussed at intervals during several centuries. Long before the beginning of the present war, geographers and other students were at variance in their views concerning the meaning of the phrases "this hemisphere" and "the American Continents," occurring in the text of the Monroe Doctrine as set forth in its sponsor's message to Congress, December 2, 1823.

Within the lifetime of scholars living on the date last mentioned, Benjamin Mills Peirce, son of Prof. Benjamin Peirce, superintendent of the United States Coast Survey, prepared for the State Department "A Report on the Resources of Iceland and Greenland," which was published in 1868. This document, a monument of a sort to its gifted young author, who died in 1870 aged only 26, declares, with reference to the former territory: "This large island * * * is 130 miles east of Greenland and 850 miles west from Norway. By location, then, it belongs to the Western Hemisphere and is an insular dependency of the North American Continent." Further, the same writer affirms: "It (Iceland) * * * seems to be rather American in its connections than European, especially as we may add that its most important and most populous coast is the western."

The position of Mr. Peirce is endorsed and supported by Col. Lawrence Martin, chief of the Division of Maps in the Library of Congress, who, in the Geographical Review for July 1940 submits "one geographer's individual view of the extent of the Western Hemisphere," accepting the proposition, "convincingly" shown by Vilhjalmur Stefansson, that "Iceland is a part of the Western Hemisphere."

But Samuel Whittemore Boggs, geographer of the State Department, is not entirely convinced. Addressing Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, on June 8, last, he said, "It * * * seems better to regard this hemisphere in which we live, in relation to the land areas of the world, as comprising North America (including Central America and the West Indies, and also Greenland) and South America, together with all islands appertaining to the two continents." The omission of specific stipulation of Iceland may be assumed to be intentional; yet there is room for argument as to the meaning of the concluding words of the quoted sentence.

Meanwhile, Admiral William V. Pratt sums up the basic issue in Newsweek as follows: "Geographers place the Atlantic boundary of the Western Hemisphere at 20° west longitude. Old German atlases put it at 17°40' west. * * * As the Lease Lend Act does not define the limit, it is up to the President to choose among the many definitions which have been offered."

A decision, obviously, ought not to be reached in haste. It must be remembered that a scientific conference in Paris in 1630 adopted the meridian of Ferro, subsequently found to be almost 20° west of Paris or approximately 17°40' west of Greenwich." In fairness, it has to be conceded that the maps of France as well as those of Germany, for more than 3 centuries, have been faithful to this rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate resolution.

The Senate resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, for printing under the rule:

House Resolution 162

[Rept. No. 359]

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, respectively, each acting as a whole or by subcommittee, are authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the national-defense program insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committees, respectively, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as they deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the respective committees, or any subcommittees thereof, are authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairmen of the respective committees and shall be served by any person designated by such chairmen. The chairman of each committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

IMPLEMENTING INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 156, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 43, a joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I presume the gentleman from New York desires some time, so I yield 30 minutes to him.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order Senate Joint Resolution No. 43, which provides for the carrying out of the inter-American coffee agreement, concurred in on November 28, 1940. It provides for 1 hour of debate.

The purpose of this resolution is to enable the United States to carry out its agreement with 14 other American republics which are producers of coffee. Those republics are as follows: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, and Venezuela. The resolution gives the President the power and authority to make allocation for such other coffee-producing countries which have not participated in this agreement.

I feel that the adoption of this resolution and the enactment of it will materially aid the situation and will carry out the agreement entered into between the United States and the Latin coffee-producing countries. There are several smaller countries which also produce coffee in small quantities, which are not parties to this agreement, but the President of the United States is being given the power to allocate to those countries such quotas as he will deem fair, without interfering, of course, with the agreement made with the 14 republics to which I have referred.

I feel that this action will still further bring about more friendly relations on the part of these republics, and I hope that we will continue to legislate to demonstrate to those sister republics our desire to aid and help them in every way possible.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. As a matter of fact, a treaty has actually been ratified by the Senate, and all that this resolution purports to do is to implement that treaty. Is that not the fact?

Mr. SABATH. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Do we raise any coffee in this country?

Mr. SABATH. Not that I know of. I know we consume a lot of it.

Mr. RICH. We consume a lot of it, but when we do not raise coffee, what is the idea of our country trying to regulate the coffee that is being produced in these South American countries?

Mr. SABATH. This is not for the purpose of regulating production of coffee, but is for the purpose of bringing about the approval of an agreement entered into by the United States with these 14 coffee-producing republics, so that discrimination cannot be charged against us in that we are importing more coffee from one country than from another in proportion to the amount of coffee which they grow.

This will have a wholesome effect, because we already have complaints that some of the countries have been permitted to export much more coffee to the United States than some of the other countries. At the same time we give the President the right to allocate the surplus or the balance that we need outside of what is provided for in the treaty, to the smaller producing countries which are not parties to the agreement.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman stated there were a number of countries that are not parties to this agreement? Is that the case?

Mr. SABATH. Correct.

Mr. RICH. How many?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know. There are five or six, but the amount which they grow, which they have been exporting to the United States, is only a very small percentage of the total that we consume or import.

Mr. RICH. Will they come in under this agreement?

Mr. SABATH. They are not parties to it. Only those 14 countries which I have named are parties to the agreement, but it has been agreed by them that the President should have the right and the power to allocate the balance among the other smaller coffee-growing countries.

Mr. RICH. Then if those small countries have been selling coffee in the United States and they are selling over their quota, the President is going to say "You can only ship in here so much." Is that the case?

Mr. SABATH. That is the case.

Mr. RICH. Then the President is going to try to tell these other countries what they can do with their coffee?

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. RICH. We are not only going to tell the people of this country, the farmers, what they must eat, when they must get up in the morning, when they must milk the cows, how much wheat they can grow, and how much oats, but we are going down there and tell those small South American states that they cannot ship their coffee into this country. So you are going to have the President trying to regulate those countries. I think we are going too far on this, and we ought to stop pretty soon.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Some coffee is imported from the Dutch East Indies, some from possessions of the United Kingdom. They are not parties to this agreement, and for this reason the committee in reporting this bill saw fit to give the President the power to allocate quotas to states other than those entering into the trade agreement.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has explained conditions correctly.

I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the reason I cannot yield is because I have so many requests for time; and, unfortunately, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whom I admire, invariably goes far afield in making statements that are not borne out by the facts. In view of that, I hope in his own interest he will be a little more careful in making insinuations and sometimes even charges which are not based on facts.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman imply that I am telling an untruth?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no, no, no.

Mr. RICH. All right, then, we shall get along very well.

Mr. SABATH. We always have, and I hope we always will.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is in the right direction. I feel we have done splendid work under the leadership of our Secretary of State, Mr. Hull. We have increased our standing and friendship with our sister republics to the south. We are today, and I know that under his leadership and policies we shall in the future be the beneficiaries and that the benefit will not be at the expense of the sister republics. I recollect many years ago, when I advocated that we should protect our trade, a great many gentlemen were under the impression that it was necessary for us to increase our foreign representatives, especially in South American countries. That we did. We spent a little money, and we have even educated some of our young men to speak the Spanish language—the language which predominates in most of the South American countries. I feel that the action we took a little while ago and the action we are about to take on this bill will increase that friendly feeling whereby in the future we shall be in position to control the trade of these countries, as I stated, to our advantage, as well as to the benefit of the Latin countries.

Mr. RICH. Just what does the gentleman mean by "control"? The gentleman ought to explain that, for it is pretty strong language as to what we are going to do to those countries to the south of us.

Mr. SABATH. Up to a few years ago European and other foreign countries controlled more or less the trade in South America. In the last few years we have made great advances and succeeded in obtaining a great deal of their trade on friendly terms and without taking unfair advantage of them, as did some of the European countries. Our dealings are appreciated and recognized, and I feel that when these troublesome days are over America will be in position to act and will obtain, secure, and hold the greater portion of the trade of the South American republics.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman means we are going to have such friendly relations with those countries that we shall command their business? I think that is a fine statement, indeed.

Mr. SABATH. That is just what I meant. I feel handicapped at times in not being able to express myself so fluently as does my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, but that is what I meant.

Mr. Speaker, feeling that both sides are in favor of this legislation, I shall not detain the House any longer. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article, How To Salute the American Flag, and an article, How a Bill Becomes a Law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IMPLEMENTING THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to disagree with some of my very distinguished Republican colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee. I believe this bill is a proper bill and that we are making a mountain out of a molehill when we look for any serious dispute over this bill—it is a tempest in a teapot, rather, a coffeepot. [Laughter.]

In the first place, I speak only for myself on this issue. I have opposed the trade treaties which I thought were unfair to our free American labor paid $3 a day and upward, bringing them into direct competition with the poorly paid labor of Europe and Asia ranging from 2[illegible] cents a day in Japan to $1 a day in the central part of Europe; but much as I have opposed these trade treaties with European and Asiatic countries, much as I am opposed to meddling in foreign affairs, I am a pan American and will go as far as anyone in this House to uphold our distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, and his able assistant, Mr. Welles, the Under Secretary, in promoting good will and unity with the Latin American countries.

I believe the Secretary of State has done more in our day and generation to promote good will, cooperation, understanding, and friendship with the Latin American countries than has been done by any American Secretary of State.

For over 8 years he has tried to promote unity, good will, and a neighborly policy with Latin America. I believe Cordell Hull is a great American Secretary of State. [Applause.] In saying that I do not think anyone will believe I am inconsistent, because I have opposed all the interventionist policies that drag us into the Far East and into European affairs. But South America and Central America are the logical markets for this country. They are a part of this hemisphere. We passed a bill today which demonstrates our close relationship with all the nations on this hemisphere. It provides that we shall consult with them before we permit the transfer of islands from one non-American country to another.

In the midst of this war, if there is anything that is desirable it is the promotion of a closer union between all the countries on the American Continent, and if we are to do that we must give and take. There is no question but what we must make some little sacrifice, but after all, the water has gone over the dam. The agreement was made last November. It was passed upon by the Senate of the United States practically unanimously. So there is no reason now to go and look for trouble and say that was wrong. The time to have spoken was at that time when it came before the Senate. I think

I am right when I say the Senate passed it unanimously.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Why is it necessary to bring in this bill at the present time if it has already been passed upon by ratification of the Senate?

Mr. FISH. Not the bill. The agreement with the 14 South American coffee-producing countries was ratified. The gentleman knows just as well as I do that the big crop in Brazil, which is the largest country in South America, is coffee, and the minute that it gets into a chaotic state the finances and the economy of that country are ruined. We are trying to sell goods to these coffee-producing countries. Their wealth comes from coffee. We are the greatest coffee-consuming nation in the world. If the Senate had not acted and a situation had developed where chaotic conditions prevailed in these coffee-producing countries, they could not buy anything from us.

As the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee stated, what we are trying to do in the midst of this war is to gain as much of the trade in South America as possible, taking that trade away from both Germany and Great Britain, and I make no distinction between either of them. I would just as soon have the British trade as the German trade, because when this war is over, we are going to have lots of difficulty in extending our trade anywhere in Europe, no matter who wins, on account of the conditions and the destruction of wealth there. We want to keep the war away from the United States of America and the Latin American nations. A large market for our products exists down there, and we ought to go about securing it now and maintaining it afterward.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman has stated quite fairly and frankly that there was an agreement or a treaty entered into last November, and that the only purpose of this bill is to carry out the general policy of our Government, and assure a fair quota of distribution among the countries that have entered into that agreement with us?

Mr. FISH. That is correct.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and knows about these things intimately. That is the actual effect of what we are trying to do today?

Mr. FISH. I think it is a square deal in view of the fact the treaty has been ratified. We cannot go back on the treaty, therefore I think this implementation is entirely proper. The President should have the power to fix quotas in order to stabilize the coffee quotas that have been agreed upon by the Senate unanimously. I do not claim that my distinguished friends upon the Ways and Means Committee cannot make a logical case. They will have plenty of time to do that from their point of view. We have to do everything we can at this time to cement our relations with South America and to improve and develop our trade down there now.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman believes that the Ways and Means Committee has brought out as good a bill as it could?

Mr. FISH. I am for it, but I do not want to put my word against that of the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. In this agreement or treaty that has been entered into, the quotas have been agreed upon between themselves so that they are all satisfied and are all happy?

Mr. FISH. We only import something like 2 or 3 percent of the coffee we consume from these other smaller nations, whether it be Java, Malay, or wherever the coffee may come from, and that is all that is provided for in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on the rule, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. This is the first quota provision that our Nation has ever entered into. I was hoping the gentleman would contribute some comment on the question of regulation of imports and exports by quota rather than by tariff.

Mr. FISH. You are going to hear a great deal from members of the Ways and Means Committee about that. I am not a member of that committee and I would rather that they speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is an extravagant political fraud being wished on the American people by President Roosevelt under the guise of national defense. For defense of whom and what? Can it be that we propose to landlock our great Navy, the most powerful in the world, and await an attack by the aggressor navies in Lake Michigan? The absurdity of the defense subterfuge is clearly demonstrated by the fact that it will take at least 4 years to complete this project.

If we must spend half a billion dollars for canals for defense purposes, why not dig a sea-level canal in Nicaragua or at Panama? That at least would make sense and would be for national defense.

I am opposed to the St. Lawrence-ocean ship canal project as being detrimental to our own import and export trade and adversely affecting the ports of Buffalo, Albany, New York City, and a half dozen American cities on the eastern seaboard. It would mean transferring, by the use of congressional appropriations, of our American products and trade to Montreal, Canada, and hence by foreign ships to European nations. This would result in destroying our own commercial interests, the American merchant marine, and creating unemployment in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Norfolk, and even further south in the Gulf of Mexica. It would also mean the crippling of the New York State Barge Canal, and diverting traffic from our railroads, employing scores of thousands of loyal American citizens.

The proposal is harmful to the interests of 30,000,000 consumers on the eastern seaboard, adding insult to injury, as they pay approximately one-half of the Federal taxes.

In addition, the St. Lawrence ship canal would be frozen solid for 4 months a year, and the St. Lawrence River is fog-bound for part of the summer.

The St. Lawrence ship canal project was conceived in political propaganda, aimed to obtain votes on election day in certain farm States. This political myth has been exposed repeatedly as being of no advantage to the American farmers in competition with the Canadian surplus farm exports, and particularly wheat. It will not help a single American farmer to sell a single bushel of wheat to England, because of her preferential treatment of the products of her dominions.

The United States is on the road to bankruptcy, and every project not essential to our national defense should be cut to the bone. Let us begin with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and try to save America from financial suicide, bankruptcy, and inevitable repudiation if the present policy of spending the taxpayers' and people's money for nondefense purposes continues.

I shall oppose it as an unnecessary waste of public moneys and against the interests of our own country. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield, yes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Has the gentleman any figures showing a comparison of cost between a sea-level canal in Nicaragua or in Panama and the St. Lawrence seaway proposition?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I have a very general idea about that. I have used the figure of one-half billion dollars to build the St. Lawrence Canal and I have been informed by those who have discussed the matter with me it would cost at least $1,000,000,000 if they also deepened the Great Lakes and built adequate harbor facilities there. It is claimed that it would cost $1,000,000,000 to build the Nicaraguan Canal. We could widen the Panama Canal for half of that sum and probably make it a sea-level canal for that amount of money. Of course, that would be for national defense, and what I am opposing now more than anything else is that practically every measure that comes up here, measures that have nothing to do with national defense, come in here under the guise of national defense and we are appropriating billions and billions of dollars not for purposes of defense, but for pet measures for different sections of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would yield me 1 minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 1 minute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in response to public demand that Congress give attention to interferences with the progress of the defense program, I am introducing a resolution which is an attempt to meet this responsibility in an open and candid manner. I respectfully invite the attention of my colleagues, the press, and the public to this resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and in fairness to my colleague from New York State I may say that I want to talk about the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. FISH. I know that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the distinguished and brilliant gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and his oratorical statement on this seaway with a great deal of interest. I do not challenge the sincerity of the position he takes, but I challenge his judgment tremendously. His speech reminded me of that old, old story which you have probably heard about the Indian who was riding across the Kansas prairie after the first railroad was built and a cowboy was standing by. The Indian galloped along on his pony and lassoed the locomotive, and as he went rolling through the air the cowboy said, "You have a lot of damned good courage, but I don't admire your judgment." [Laughter.]

The gentleman from New York makes a fine speech and we all recognize his outstanding ability along that line. All I want time for now is to warn my colleagues against the type of speech he has made. If he did not multiply the cost and add a few trillion dollars of the waterway project over everything that the Army engineers have ever said about it, I will buy him a new hat. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman is going to do that, I will yield him 5 minutes more.

Mr. PITTENGER. Well, it will not be too expensive a hat if you win. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in all seriousness that I do not want to delay the House now and I am going to ask permission of the House to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to say now, in all seriousness, that the St. Lawrence seaway project is the greatest engineering project of modern times. It has been endorsed by every President since it was first proposed. It will be one of the greatest works of benefaction to the people of the United States when it is completed, and I believe the statesmanship in this House will rise above sectional lines and will disregard the selfishness of the propaganda artists and the powerful enemies of the seaway who are at work day and night scattering misinformation about this project with the intention to mislead you in your votes. From time to time I expect to expose some of those interests. I have heard the boast made that Philadelphia and New York City and Boston have already gotten things "under control." That is but another example of the people in the eastern seaboard wanting everything for themselves and nothing for the rest of the United States. When you analyze the objections that are made to this project, you will find that every single one of them is without foundation.

I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I know the work that the War Department engineers are doing. I have heard their report on the projects in New York Harbor and all the way down the seaboard into the Gulf of Mexico and the Texas coast, and on the western coast, and I say to you gentlemen from New York that I am in favor of those harbor improvements now pending before the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I do not vote sectionalism in my votes, because I believe that what benefits one section of this country is of benefit to all other sections, and if some of our friends in the transportation business would only take the blinds from their eyes they would know that the more highly developed this great system of water transportation becomes, the more freight there is for the railroads of the country to haul to those who produce and those who ship and those who buy. It is only 10 years ago that the president of the New England Chamber of Commerce in a most comprehensive document recommended the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway as one of the finest things that could happen to New England and a project of lasting benefit to the Atlantic seaboard. As J. Adam Bede used to say, "When we get the St. Lawrence seaway they will raise peanuts down in Virginia and send them by the boatloads to the Midwest."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute in order to propound a question. Is the St. Lawrence seaway a national-defense project?

Mr. PITTENGER. It is just as much so as any one of a lot of other projects. In my opinion it is a national-defense proposition, if you are going to put factories and industries in the Midwest.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and that they may be inserted in the RECORD previous to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 7, at the conclusion of the debate before the vote was taken, and that there may be inserted at the same time a letter from Mr. F. W. Boggs, Geographer of the State Department, stating what he believes to be the demarcation between the Western and the Eastern Hemispheres; also an illuminating editorial from the Washington Star of last evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN].

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a radio address delivered last evening by our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me I cannot do much more than present certain facts to the House of Representatives. Fifteen million nine hundred and seventy thousand four hundred and sixty-four man-hours of work have been lost to the Nation in national defense by reason of strikes in a few days over 9 months, from June 19, 1940, to March 26, 1941. During the calendar year 1940 there were approximately 2,500 strikes in all industries in the United States. The number of man-hours lost was around 60,000,000. I am just giving these facts to you for your information, and I am wanting to remind Members that we who voted for the selective-service draft last summer, many of us, did so realizing the need of it, but at the same time we expected every man, in whatever position, in the United States to do his duty if an emergency existed even as those men in the National Guard and those who are drafted are rendering their service in an American way.

If I were to reduce the hours lost by strikes to men and days, the total time lost would have been equivalent to approximately 8,000 men working 40 hours per week for 1 year on national-defense projects.

I have here and I shall file in my extension of remarks a list of the 73 strikes affecting national defense. I have divided them, maybe rightly or maybe wrongly, into major strikes and minor strikes. In the major strikes there were 10,821,000 hours lost. That included, among other things, building destroyers, building ships for the Navy, and many other things like that; and the man-hours lost in the minor list of strikes would be 5,149,344. In addition to that, I shall insert the name of each company at which a strike was held, the number of employees, the time of the strike, the number of man-days idle at each place, and whether it was a C. I. O. strike or an A. F. of L. strike.

(The statement is as follows:)

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The time of these strikes is from June 19, 1940, to Mar. 26, 1941.

Total number of major strikes	43
Total number of minor strikes	30
Grand total	73
Man-hours lost in major strikes:	*Man-hours*
From June through December 1940	1,561,568
From Jan. 3, 1941, to date	9,259,552
Total lost	10,821,120
Man-hours lost in minor strikes:	
From June through December 1940	3,831,184
From January 1941 to date	1,318,160
Total lost	5,149,344
Grand total of man-hours lost in major and minor strikes	[1] 15,970,464

(NOTE.—Of the above grand total man-hours, 10,577,712 have been lost since January 1941.)

[1] The 15,970,464 man-hours lost equals the work of 7,678 men, working 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, for 52 weeks or 1 year.

Number of employees involved in these strikes:		*Men*
Major strikes	approximately	105,457
Minor strikes	do	39,822
Total		145,279

Causes given for the strikes:

Major strikes

Strikes on account of—	
Wages	5
Wages and union relations	4
Wages and union recognition	2
Wages and other terms of new agreements	3
Wages and holidays	1
Wages and working conditions	1
Wages and grievances	1
Union relations	6
Grievances	6
Grievances and union recognition	1
Grievances and vacations	1
Union recognition	5
Union recognition and unfair labor practices	1
Jurisdictional	6

Minor strikes

Strikes on account of—	
Wages	9
Wages and other terms of new agreements	9
Wages and union status	4
Wages and union recognition	1
Union recognition	3
Union status	1
Union recognition and jurisdiction	1
Vacations	1
Jurisdictional	1

Companies involved in the strikes were engaged in the following work:

Major

One company building destroyers for Navy.
Three companies building ships for the Navy.
Three companies producing special items for Navy (turbines, boilers, tools).
Two companies producing electrical equipment for Army and Navy.
One company building ships for United States Maritime Commission.
One company producing items for Signal Corps.
Four companies producing aluminum for aircraft.
Three companies processing steel for aircraft plants.
Eight companies producing steel for defense contracts.
One company producing tanks.
One company producing smelters.
One company producing machine tools.
Four companies producing parts for aircraft.
One company producing aircraft for the United States Air Corps.
One company producing trench mortars.
One company building wind tunnels.
One company producing ammunition and tractors for Army.
One company producing powder.
One company producing copper, etc.
Two companies engaged in cantonment construction.
One company engaged in shipment of defense materials.

Minor

One company producing aluminum.
Three companies producing parts for aircraft.
One company producing aircraft tools.
Five companies producing special items for Navy (generators, engines).
One company producing Navy defense material.
One company producing gun shells.
Three companies producing steel for defense.
Three companies producing lumber for defense.
Four companies producing trucks and truck parts for Army.
Three companies producing Army equipment.
Two companies engaged in plant and cantonment construction.
Three companies engaged in shipment of defense materials.
Approximately eight or nine major strikes are still pending.
Approximately four minor strikes are still pending.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.: International Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, C. I. O.; building destroyers for the Navy; 3,400 employees; 27,200 man-days idle. Began January 23; ended February 2.

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; company produces turbines for powder plants, wide variety of machine tools, and special items for the Navy; 7,500 employees; 337,500 man-days idle. Began January 22; end pending. Issue: Union relations.

Aluminum Co. of America, Edgewater, N. J.: Aluminum Workers of America, C. I. O.; company produces aluminum for aircraft; 3,000 employees. Began March 12; ended March 22. Issues: Sunday work, wages, and union relations.

Aluminum Co. of America, New Kensington, Pa.: Aluminum Workers of America, C. I. O.; company produces aluminum for aircraft; 7,000 employees; 28,160 man-days idle. Began November 22; ended November 28. Issue: Union relations.

American Car & Foundry Co., Berwick, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; tanks; 1,250 employees; 1,250 man-days idle. Began December 30; ended December 31 (8 hours only). Issue: Grievances.

American Zinc Co., East St. Louis, Ill.: Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, C. I. O.; bricklayers and other building trades, A. F. of L.; construction of new smelter; 65 employees. Began January 12; ended March 6.

Babcock & Wilcox, Bayonne, N. J.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; boilers for the Navy; 477 employees; 8,190 man-days idle. Began January 3; ended January 27. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., Sparrows Point, Md.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; boats for United States Maritime Commission; 3,000 employees. Began September 20, ended October 7; 20,100 man-days idle. Issue: Wages.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Lackawanna, N. Y.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; steel for defense contracts; 12,000 employees. Began February 27, ended February 28; 18,000 man-days idle. Issues: Union recognition, grievances.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Johnstown, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; steel for defense contracts; 800 employees. Began January 3, ended January 8; 3,200 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances. 1,064 employees. Began January 25, ended January 30; 8,512 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances.

Bethlehem Steel Fabricating Plant, Los Angeles, Calif.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; fabricating steel for aviation plants on west coast; 100 employees. Began March 10, ended March 20. Issues: Wages and union recognition.

Condenser Corporation of America (Cornell-Dubilier Corporation), South Plainfield, N. J.: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L.; condensers for Signal Corps contractors; 2,400 employees. Began March 10, end pending. Issue: Union recognation.

Cowles Tool Co., Cleveland, Ohio: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; tools for defense contractors; 110 employees. Began February 27, end pending. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Crucible Steel Corporation: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; Syracuse, N. Y., 2,021 employees. Began November 19, ended November 22; 6,063 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances. Midland, Pa., 3,000 employees. Began November 13, ended November 17; 11,200 man-days idle. Harrison, N. J., 925 employees. Began October 3, ended October 8; 4,625 man-days idle. Pittsburgh, Pa., 1,000 employees. Began March 12, ended March 17; steel for defense contracts.

Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Neville Island, Pa. (Pittsburgh): Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; propellers for aircraft; 800 employees. Began March 4, ended March 5. Issue: Union relations.

Camp Dix, Camp Dix, N. J.: Laborers Union and Carpenters, A. F. of L.; 600 employees; 1,200 man-days idle. Began November 8, ended November 11. Issue: Jurisdictional.

Eastern Malleable Iron Co., Wilmington, Del.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; subcontracts for trench mortars; 580 employees; 24,940 man-days idle. Began January 24, ended March 20. Issues: Union relations and wages.

Eaton Manufacturing Co., Saginaw, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; parts for aircraft manufacture; 315 employees. Short stoppages on November 14 and 16. Issue: Jurisdictional.

Eaton Manufacturing Co., Saginaw, Mich.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Marshall, Mich.; Cleveland, Ohio: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; 3,113 employees; 9,339 man-days idle. Began January 13, ended January 15. Issue: Union relations.

Foster-Wheeler Corporation, Carteret, N. J.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; Navy boilers for ships; 800 employees; 5,600 man-days idle. Began February 12, ended February 20. Issues: Wages and holidays.

Fairmount Aluminum Co., Fairmount, W. Va.: Aluminum Workers of America, C. I. O.; aluminum; 200 employees. Began March 10, ended March 18. Issues: Vacations and grievances.

Harvill Diecasting Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.: National Association of Diecasting Workers, C. I. O.; casting for west coast aircraft plants; 350 employees. Began March 13, ended March 22. Issue: Wages.

Indiana Steel Products Co., Valparaiso, Ind.: Blacksmiths, A. F. of L. Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; machinists, A. F. of L.; magnets used in Army contracts for telephones, switchboards, and head sets;

205 employees. Began March 17, ended March 24. Issue: Jurisdictional.

Ingalls Shipbuilding Co., Pascagoula, Miss.: Boilermakers and machinists, A. F. of L.; ships for the Navy; 84 employees. Began January 15, ended January 24; 672 man-days idle. Issue: Wages.

Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.: Metal trades, A. F. of L. (boilermakers versus iron workers); ships for the Navy; 135 employees. Began March 10, ended March 14. Jurisdictional.

International Harvester Co.: Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; Rock Falls, Ill., 250 employees. Began January 21, end pending. Issue: Union recognition. Chicago, Ill.; tractor plant; 6,000 employees. Began January 30, end pending. Issue: Union recognition. Chicago, Ill.: McCormick Works; 5,500 employees. Began February 28, end pending. Issue: Union recognition. Richmond, Ind.; ammunition components and tractors; 1,500 employees. Began February 17, end pending. Issue: Union recognition.

Jones & Laughlin, Aliquippa, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; steel for defense contractors; 565 employees; 4,741 man-days idle. Began October 15, ended October 30. Issue: Union recognition.

Kellogg Switchboard & Supply Co., Chicago, Ill.: International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L.; switchboards and other electrical equipment for Army and Navy; 400 employees; 18,800 man-days idle. Began June 26, ended August 31. Issue: Union recognition and unfair labor practices.

King Powder Co., Kings Mills, Ohio, and Kico, Ky.: United Mine Workers, C. I. O.; powder plants; 124 employees; 2,232 man-days idle. Began September 18, ended October 10. Issues: Wages and union recognition.

Motor Wheel Corporation, Lansing, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, A. F. L.; manufacture of shells, wheels for airplanes; 2,500 employees; 22,500 man-days idle. Began February 13, ended February 25. Issues: Union relations and wages.

Phelps-Dodge Corporation, Bayway, N. J.: United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; small, direct defense contracts; copper for defense contracts; 1,600 employees. Began January 28, ended February 1. Issue: Union recognition.

Ray Day Piston Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; aluminum castings and pistons for aircraft; 110 employees. Began March 10, end pending. Issue: Union recognition.

Rifle Range and Training Ground, Holly Ridge, N. C.: Building Trades, A. F. L.; Army training grounds; 5,000 employees. Began March 3, ended March 5. Issue: Union relations.

Shipowners Association of the Pacific, San Francisco, Calif.: C. I. O. and A. F. L. maritime unions; shipment of defense materials; 1,330 employees; 61,510 man-days idle. Began October 5, ended December 4. Issues: Wages and working conditions.

Standard Tool Co., Cleveland, Ohio: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; machine tools for firms holding defense contracts; 600 employees. Began January 27, end pending. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Todd Drydocks, Galveston, Tex.: Carpenters, A. F. L.; shipbuilding and repairing facilities; 2,000 employees. Began March 19, ended March 24. Issue: Grievances.

Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation, Bridgeville, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; special steel for fuzes and airplane propellers; 1,100 employees. Began February 1, ended February 5. Issues: Grievances and wages. 1,100 employees. Began February 24, end pending. Issues: Grievances and wages.

Vanadium Corporation of America, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: United Mine Workers, C. I. O.; alloy for special steel used in defense products; 386 employees; 3,860 man-days idle. Began February 10, ended February 21. Issues: Wages and union relations.

Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.; Local industrial union, C. I. O.; alloy for special steel used in defense products; 274 employees; 4,658 man-days idle. Began February 10, end pending. Issue: Grievances (union agreement).

Vultee Aircraft, Inc., Downey, Calif.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; aircraft for Army Air Corps; 5,000 employees; 35,000 man-days idle. Began November 15, ended November 25. Issue: Wages.

Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio: Building trades, A. F. L.; electricians, C. I. O.; construction of a wind tunnel; 500 employees. Began January 28, ended January 31. Issue: Jurisdictional. 500 employees. Began March 4, ended March 21. Issue: Jurisdictional.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; basic steel for defense materials; 900 employees; 3,600 man-days idle. Began February 11, ended February 15. Issue: Grievances.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; basic steel for defense contractors; 14,000 employees. Began March 24, end pending. Issue: Union relations under N. L. R. B. order.

LESS IMPORTANT STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Aluminum Ore Co., East St. Louis, Ill.: Federal Labor Union, A. F. L.; bauxite for aluminum; 1,468 employees; 38,168 man-days idle. Began October 24, ended November 30. Issue: Wages.

American Steel & Wire Co., Donora, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; manufacturers of gun shells; 950 employees. Began February 19, ended February 20. Issue: Wage adjustments.

B. & H. Aircraft, Long Island City, N. Y.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; parts for aircraft manufacturers; 120 employees; 840 man-days idle. Began February 19, ended February 27. Issue: Union recognition.

Boomen & Rafters, Olympia, Wash.: International Woodworkers of America, C. I. O.; lumber for defense contractors; 2,500 employees; 29,760 man-days idle. Began September 30, ended October 24. Issue: Wages.

Century Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; manufacturers of generators; 1,269 employees; 97,188 man-days idle. Began June 19, ended October 25. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Clark Equipment Co., Jackson, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; axle housings for Army trucks; 848 employees; 4,240 man-days idle. Began January 18, ended January 24. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Combustion Engineering, Chattanooga, Tenn.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; essential chemicals for explosives; 550 employees. Began February 21, ended March 6. Issues: Union recognition, wages, and other terms of new agreement.

Consolidated Steel Co., Orange, Tex.: Laborers Union, A. F. L.; steel for Navy boats; 350 employees. Began March 3, ended March 7. Issues: Wages and union status.

Continental Steel Co., Kokomo, Ind.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; basic steel for Army and Navy; 500 employees. Began January 24, ended February 6. Issue: Wages.

Dahlstrom Metallic Door Co., Jamestown, N. Y.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; parts for airplane contractors; 369 employees; 8,856 man-days idle. Began July 15, ended August 15. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Farnsworth Television & Radio Corporation, Marion, Ind.: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. L.; Signal Corps contracts; 610 employees; 3,050 man-days idle. Began February 17, ended February 22. Issues: Union status and wages.

Federal Motor Truck Co., Detroit, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; tractor trucks for Army; 550 employees. Began March 7, pending. Issue: Union status.

Hertner Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; generators for the Navy; 81 employees; 1,944 man-days idle. Began February 10, ended March 13. Issues: Wages and other terms of union agreement.

International Harvester Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.; United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; some trucks and experimental work; 2,800 employees; 25,600 man-days idle. Began December 31, ended January 9. Issues: Wages and other terms of union agreement.

Kawneer Manufacturing Co., Niles, Mich.; United Automobile Workers, A. F. L.; parts for aircraft companies; 530 employees. Began July 15, ended September 28. Issues: Wages, union recognition, and other terms of new agreement.

Lacy Manufacturing Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.; Boilermakers, A. F. L.; Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; structural work on runways for shipbuilding company; 77 employees; 2,002 man-days idle. Began November 18, ended December 24. Issues: Union recognition, jurisdictional.

Lumber companies, Oregon and Washington, various places; Lumber and Sawmill Workers, A. F. L.; some lumber for cantonments; 12,000 employees; 161,659 man-days idle. Began October 1, ended December 16 (various dates). Issue: Wages.

Mesta Machine Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Building Trades, A. F. L.; plant addition to house gun-forging machinery; 20 employees; 260 man-days idle. Began January 23, ended February 10. Issue: Union recognition.

Midland Steel Co., Detroit, Mich.; United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; parts for Army trucks; 1,700 employees. Began March 10, pending. Issue: Wages.

Mountain State Steel Foundry, Parkersburg, W. Va.; Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; contracts with Rock Island Arsenal; 210 employees; 1,050 man-days idle. Began January 28, ended February 3. Issue: Union recognition.

National Supply Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: International Association of Machinists, A. F. L.; engines for small Navy boats; 222 employees; 2,220 man-days idle. Began February 18, ended March 3. Issues: Union recognition, wages.

Powell Valve Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; Navy defense materials; 964 employees; 5,784 man-days idle. Began February 11, ended February 20. Issues: Wages, union status, and other terms of new agreement.

Snoqualmie Falls Timber Co., Snoqualmie, Wash.; Lumber and Sawmill Workers, A. F. L.; 894 employees. Began December 16, end pending. Issues: Union status, wages.

Truck drivers, New York City; Teamsters, A. F. L.; contracts for handling defense materials; 7,000 employees; 22,000 man-days idle. Began October 8, ended October 14. Issue: Vacations.

Truck drivers, Newark, N. J.; Teamsters, A. F. L.; contracts for handling defense materials; 1,500 employees; 22,900 man-days idle. Began October 1, ended October 20. Issue: Wages.

Tugboat operators, Grays Harbor, Wash.; Masters, Mates, and Pilots, A. F. L.; Inland Boatmen's Union, C. I. O.; shipments of lumber; 40 employees; 680 man-days idle. Began October 17, ended November 8. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Walker Turner Co., Plainfield, N. J.; United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; tools for aircraft, British orders; 175 employees; 4,200 man-days idle.

Began October 23, ended November 26. Issue: Wages.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.; A. F. L. Building Trades; construction work; 100 employees. Began March 3, ended March 10. Issue: Jurisdictional.

S. S. White Dental Co., Staten Island, N. Y.; Federal Labor Union, A. F. L.; equipment for the Army; 565 employees; 6,420 man-days idle. Began March 3, ended March 18. Issue: Wages.

Wire and cable companies, New York, N. Y.; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. L.; Signal Corps contracts; 860 employees; 61,765 man-days idle. Began August 3, ended September 21 (3 companies); August 3, ended February 3 (1 company); August 3, pending (1 company). Issues: Wages and union status.

Mr. BULWINKLE. In giving this statement to you I realize that this is not quite an accurate picture of what is involved, because I know of plants where one strike was held, and other Members do also, in which five other factories were dependent upon that one factory; and those are not included.

Then I want to say in justice to labor that there are hundreds of thousands of industries in which there have been no strikes at all. But there is no question about it, there have been too many strikes and too many uncalled-for strikes. The men who are laboring for national defense and the manufacturer should realize that they should arbitrate their differences.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if the gentleman is in a position to incorporate in that table the causes of these various strikes?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have, sir. For instance, as an illustration, in the major strikes, five strikes were on account of wages; four strikes on account of wages and union rules; two on account of wages and union recognition; three on wages and terms of new agreements, and so on down through the various lines.

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the responsibility to correct this condition lies with the Congress or with the President of the United States?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The responsibility rests upon both the President and the Congress. We as a branch of this Government have our duty. And we as Members of the Congress should not shirk any duty that we have before us, especially in a national emergency. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON], 2 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be allowed to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read an announcement that has been issued by the executive council of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor:

As evidence of their good faith and determination to cooperate in the national-defense program, the members of the executive council of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, meeting in special session, have taken constructive action on two important problems, as follows:

1. They have solemnly pledged that there will not be any stoppage of work on account of jurisdictional disputes between any of the building and construction trades unions on any building or construction project essential to speedy completion of the national-defense program.

2. They have agreed that when the unions are unable to supply a full force of building tradesmen to contractors on defense projects who are recognized as being fair to organized labor—

(a) The contractor may employ nonunion men until such time as the various unions can replace them with members of their own organizations.

(b) No permit or privilege moneys shall be collected from these nonunion men by the unions where such conditions exist.

(c) No initiation fees or other union obligations shall be collected from these nonunion men except where they can qualify for membership and have been requested to join the appropriate union and have been accepted into membership.

(d) When such applications for membership are received, initiation fees shall be the minimum possible in view of the benefits extended by the union organizations and reasonable time will be granted for the payment of such initiation fees.

These policies were adopted at an all-day meeting of the executive council of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor held last Saturday. Copies of the two resolutions passed at this meeting will be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Labor, the Office of Production Management, and the National Defense Mediation Board.

In addition, officers of the international unions involved will be asked to instruct all of their local unions to comply with these policies, and our 512 local councils of the building and construction trades department will be similarly notified.

The building and construction trades unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and their 1,500,000 members are doing everything within their power to help the Government of the United States to build the strongest possible national defense.

Copies of the two resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas our Federal Government has embarked on an extensive program of national defense; and

Whereas world conditions of today are of such a serious nature that the rapid and uninterrupted completion of the national-defense program is absolutely essential for the preservation of our democratic system of Government; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, its officers and members solemnly pledge themselves that there will not be any stoppage of work on account of jurisdictional disputes between any of the building and construction trades on any building or construction project essential to the speedy and successful completion of the national-defense program, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions as adopted be sent to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Labor, both chairmen of the Office of Production Management and the Defense Mediation Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas there have been many newspaper articles of criticism and condemnation directed at the building and construction trades organizations of the American Federation of Labor in relation to the collections of permit moneys, privilege dues, and initiation fees on defense construction projects; and

Whereas this volume of unfair and unjust propaganda is a reflection on the integrity of the building- and construction-trades department of the American Federation of Labor and has been the cause of creating doubt as to the integrity of our organizations in the minds of the general public, Government officials, and many Members of Congress: Be it

Resolved, That in the event of any of our building- and construction-trades employers who are recognized as being fair to organized labor secure contracts for the building and construction of defense projects; be it further

Resolved, That where any and all of the building- and construction-trades organizations are unable to supply a full force of building tradesmen to man such projects, each and every organization affiliated with this department agrees that such union employer shall be privileged to employ other than members of the various building and construction trades affiliated with this department until such time as the various organizations affiliated with the department are able to replace these nonunion men with members of their organizations, or until such nonunion men are requested to become members of their respective unions; and be it further

Resolved, That where such conditions exist no permit or privilege moneys shall be collected under any circumstances. No initiation fees or other union obligations shall be collected from these nonunion men except where they can qualify for membership and have been requested to become members of their respective organizations and have been accepted; be it further

Resolved, That when such applications are received that the initiation fee shall be the minimum possible in view of the benefits received in such organizations and that reasonable time will be granted for the payment of such initiation fees.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein two resolutions pertaining to national defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order for a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I make this request in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I was beginning to be immensely pleased when I heard the gentleman supporting Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, which was just passed before this one was called up, and also when he spoke in favor of the pending resolution, commending highly the great work that has been done in the interest of our country by the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull.

Unfortunately, however, before he concluded he again felt obliged to deviate from the right legislative path, and among other things stated that the country was on the verge of bankruptcy. I know he does not mean it, because, notwithstanding that we are expending millions, yes, billions, the credit of America today is as good as ever before in the history of our country. Only a few days ago I read that the loan recently asked for by the Treasury Department was oversubscribed 12 times at a very low rate of interest.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] also charges that the St. Lawrence waterway project is unjust and should not be supported. The reason he gave was that New York, a State that pays one-half of the Federal taxes, would suffer. New York State may send the money to the Treasury, but it is not the money of New York City or New York State, for a very large percentage of that money comes from the entire country. It is only collected by New York, and New York naturally is obliged to pay its proportionate share of the expenses of our Government. As for the St. Lawrence seaway, I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas in properly answering the gentleman from New York. I feel that the St. Lawrence project would be helpful to the country, even though it might be beneficial to New York City, Philadelphia, Boston, or Baltimore. It will be helpful and beneficial to the entire Middle West—yes; to the entire country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I should like to find out from the gentleman if he still feels this is for national defense or for the farmers of Chicago?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from New York and I differ in some things. It is not in the interest of the farmers of Chicago, but it will be in the interest of the farmers of the Middle West and of all the people of the Middle West.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman explain why?

Mr. SABATH. I remember when I advocated and voted for large appropriations to build the Panama Canal, I realized that New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Boston would be the beneficiaries; but I was not so narrow as to oppose it, for I felt that if it helped the East, that some time in the future the East would recognize that the West was part and parcel of the United States and also entitled to some consideration, and that the people of the Middle West might receive some consideration from Congress. Unfortunately, I waited many years for the eastern gentlemen to show, in turn, a broad and liberal view, such as we have accorded to the East. However, it has not been until the last 8 years that the Middle West obtained fair treatment and real consideration, which I feel will continue in the future under a Democratic administration. I hope when the time comes, although I fear that under the precedents the House may not have a voice in the matter, the St. Lawrence project will be approved by the other body, in the interest of the entire Nation.

LABOR AND STRIKES

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] to whom I yielded, called attention to the fact that due to strikes last year thousands of men have lost employment. He submitted a compilation of the hours and wages lost and other factors involved, but he did not, I hope, intend to leave the inference that it was all due to labor. He did not say it was due to the unfair treatment that was accorded laboring men by many industries. I value the gentleman's friendship. I know he is extremely fair. Nevertheless, he has a wrong conception. If industry would be half fair to labor there would be no strikes. In view of the fact that industry has made more money in 1939 and 1940 than ever before in the history of this country, I feel that labor should be given fair treatment and paid a living wage.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman evidently misunderstood me because I stated very clearly that I put in the RECORD every alleged cause of each and every strike—wages, unfair labor treatment, jurisdictional, and all.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman perhaps recollects that a few days ago I criticized the jurisdictional strikes. I do not favor strikes. I call attention to the fact that the strikes could be eliminated in the first place if fair treatment were accorded to the labor of this country which, after all, are the ones who produce the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I will yield the gentleman a minute of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman any time left?

Mr. FISH. This is a very serious question, too.

Mr. SABATH. Very well, I yield.

Mr. FISH. I understood the gentleman to say that the House would have no voice in the determination of the St. Lawrence seaway project. Does the gentleman mean that it will go to the Senate as a treaty?

Mr. SABATH. That is what I understand.

Mr. FISH. Has the gentleman any authority for making that statement?

Mr. SABATH. I have no authority with the exception of my experience, that all treaties are approved by the Senate.

Mr. FISH. And the gentleman believes this to be a treaty?

Mr. SABATH. I so believe.

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman is correct, for it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows how I feel as to the other body. Nevertheless, I feel two-thirds of the membership of the Senate have good common sense and will vote for the best interests of the country.

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. The gentleman suggested in substance that if fair treatment were accorded laborers we would not have strikes.

Mr. SABATH. That is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. How would that affect the jurisdictional strikes?

Mr. SABATH. I stated to the House last week and I repeat, I criticize them. I feel it is manifestly unfair for these two great labor organizations to fight one another and to fight within their own organizations. It is not to their advantage or benefit, and it might create a condition whereby they will be the losers in the end if they do not desist in their strife.

Mr. DISNEY. Does the gentleman suggest any remedy for these jurisdictional strikes?

Mr. SABATH. The remedy has been provided. I know the gentleman gets up early in the morning and undoubtedly reads the newspapers. Within a few days four strikes have been settled by the newly created Mediation Board, set up by the President under the direction of the able Mr. Clarence Dykstra. I am satisfied that within a week there will not be any more strikes, because the labor of America is just as much interested in the welfare of our country and just as anxious for us to proceed with our defense program as anyone on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 43, to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 43, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending joint resolution is to implement and make effective by legislative action a treaty or agreement entered into by the United States with 14 other countries of the Western Hemisphere on November 28, 1940. This agreement or treaty was ratified by the Senate on February 3 of this year. These 14 countries of the Western Hemisphere are named in the resolution, as follows: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica,

Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, and Venezuela.

Under the leadership of our distinguished Secretary of State who has been rendering such outstanding service in cementing ties of friendship between the United States and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere, this agreement was negotiated as a part of the conference held at Habana last July. The 14 countries of the Western Hemisphere mentioned in the resolution are producers of large quantities of coffee. Coffee is the principal export trade of most of these countries, and in the case of at least one of them coffee constitutes 90 percent of its export trade.

In normal times these 14 countries of the Western Hemisphere producing coffee export about one-third of their coffee production to Europe. Because of the war and the situation that exists over there, this export market of theirs has been disrupted and, in most instances, completely cut off. The result has been that one-third of their coffee production has been without a market. Last year, by reason of this enormous surplus of coffee hanging over the market, the prices were demoralized and the situation was the most chaotic they had ever known.

The purpose of this resolution is to further encourage and stimulate the friendly, cordial relations that exist between these 14 countries of the Western Hemisphere and the United States.

Under the terms of this treaty or agreement something more than 15,000,000 bags of coffee, 60 kilos to the bag, are to be exported to the United States, and may I say that a kilo is about 2.1 pounds. Something over 350,000 bags of coffee will be exported to the United States from other countries of the world outside the Western Hemisphere.

Section 1 of the pending resolution is to implement the provisions of this treaty or agreement entered into last November and ratified by the Senate on February 3.

Section 2 of the pending resolution authorizes the President to fix quotas for these other countries of the world that sent some coffee to this country outside of the 14 countries of the Western Hemisphere which signed this treaty. That amounts to only 2.3 percent of the normal imports of coffee into this country. Much of this is used for blending and purposes of that kind. This coffee comes from the Dutch East Indies, some from Arabia, some from Turkey, and various other countries of the world in comparatively small quantities.

Under the terms of this treaty these 14 other American countries are allowed definite quotas based upon past experience so far as exports to this country are concerned. They have all agreed to this. In order to make these quotas effective, it naturally follows that some provision has to be made to control the imports coming from these other countries of the world outside the Western Hemisphere into the United States.

Section 2 of the pending resolution authorizes the President to fix these quotas for the other countries of the world that send coffee here, these other countries not being parties to this treaty or agreement.

Under the quotas fixed by this treaty or agreement there is more than the normal supply of coffee provided for this country. In other words, there is a margin of safety provided so that we will have an ample supply of coffee to be consumed in this country. We know that coffee is now and always has been on the free list of our tariff laws. We produce no coffee in this country but consume large quantities of it. As I said a moment ago, this is the principal crop and the principal export commodity of many of these 14 countries.

This is an effort on the part of the United States to try to help them stabilize this industry in those countries and to increase the friendly and cordial relations that exist between the United States and these other countries, and at the same time stabilize their economy to this extent so as to try to help them in the purchase of commodities that we export to those countries.

Under the terms of this agreement there is a board provided that keeps a constant watch on the situation, and if it should develop that larger quantities of coffee are needed in this country than those provided in the agreement, the Board has authority to revise the quotas upward. So we may rest assured that an ample supply of coffee needed for consumption in this country will always be readily available.

By fixing these quotas for all these 14 countries under the agreement entered into between them, this stabilizes the industry among these various countries that normally export this coffee to this country.

I feel I share the sentiment of the great majority of the Members of the House when I join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] in his praise of the efforts of our distinguished Secretary of State in carrying forward the great program of extending the friendly and cordial relations existing between this country and other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. We realize this is a serious situation. We are trying in every way possible to retain and strengthen the cordial relationship that exists between the United States and these other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

It will doubtless be charged that there may result some increase in the cost of coffee to the American consumers. Information was presented to your Committee on Ways and Means by officials of the State Department in which it was stated they thought it might not result in any increase, and if any increase at all resulted it would vary between 1 and 3 cents per pound for coffee, and, of course, that would probably vary as to different types and grades of coffee. So I think it is fair to say that even though some very slight increase in cost of coffee might occur, that in this effort to maintain and strengthen these friendly and cordial relations between this country and the countries of the Western Hemisphere, this is a splendid investment for our people to make and will result in beneficial effect for this country, and I think it is only fair for us to assume that on the whole this legislation is in the interest of the people of this country, as well as in the interest of helping to stabilize the principal industry of many of these other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I understand this bill is to expire in 1943?

Mr. COOPER. October 1, 1943.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not possible that this agreement could be continued after that date on agreement with the countries participating without the necessity of Senate ratification?

Mr. COOPER. There is a provision in the treaty or agreement that it may be terminated upon 1 year's notice, and another provision that it may be terminated even sooner, and there is a further provision in the agreement that it may be extended.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. My question is whether it will require Senate ratification.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. There is one thing to bear in mind. There are 36 members of the Board, and 12, or one-third, of the entire number, are representatives of the United States. So in the matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Board the United States at all times retains a voting power of one-third of the entire representation or membership of the Board.

The important thing to bear in mind is that this treaty has been signed by this country and ratified by the Senate. The solemn promise of this country has been given, and this country has never violated a treaty or broken a promise. So the pending resolution, which is for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this treaty and keeping this promise, should be passed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD, due to his unavoidable absence, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the pending joint resolution would carry into effect a treaty entered into between this country and various South American countries, under which the United States would undertake to impose quotas on the importation of coffee for the purpose of price stabilization, which is intended to benefit the producing countries. The American consumer is supposed to pay the bill in the form of a higher price for his coffee, estimated to be as much as 3 cents per pound.

I am absolutely opposed to any such arrangement, which clearly is not in the

interest of the American people, but rather of the foreign producer of coffee. In pursuance of Secretary Hull's so-called good-neighbor policy, the American people are being made to pay a subsidy to foreign coffee producers amounting to $60,000,000 annually.

This Nation annually consumes over 2,000,000,000 pounds of coffee, which has always enjoyed free entry into the domestic market because it is a noncompetitive product. Not satisfied with this free market, in which is consumed more coffee than in all the other countries of the world put together, the coffee-producing countries are now asking this Government to impose quotas so that our people will not be able to benefit from whatever price coffee will bring in a free market. In other words, Congress is being requested to help these countries exact a higher price for coffee from the American consumer than would prevail if quotas were not imposed.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, is one who has always insisted on free trade, yet in this instance he is seeking to restrict importations of a product which this country needs but does not itself produce. If coffee were a competitive product, there might be some justification for this action, but it is not.

The whole foreign-trade policy of the present administration has seemed "cockeyed" to me. By drastic tariff reductions under the trade-treaty program, Secretary Hull has been encouraging and inviting the importation of competitive foreign products which displace the products of our own farms and factories. Now he is seeking to restrict the importation of a noncompetitive product. It just does not make sense.

Of course, if our purpose is to help the producers of other countries at the expense of our own people, then it is possible to rationalize the administration's foreign-trade policy, but that should not be our purpose. Our first duty is to our own people. It is not in their interest to restrict the importations of coffee and thereby artificially stimulate the price for the benefit of foreign coffee producers. I am absolutely opposed to making the American consumers of coffee pay a subsidy of $60,000,000 a year to foreign producers. Therefore, I shall vote against the pending joint resolution.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the persuasive remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the stressing of the necessity during the discussion of the bill of keeping the South American republics "in our corner" at this time of vital world-war threat, one might almost be justified in classifying this bill as a national-defense measure. That is the guise under which nearly everything that is of questionable value is being considered at this time.

The first thing that strikes a Member of the House is what is the particular necessity for the bill after a treaty has been entered into, with some twenty-odd sections, very carefully written, and carefully considered and ratified by the Senate. It is called a coffee agreement; but, of course, it is a treaty because it was ratified by the Senate. The House had no opportunity to take action on it, but is it not a very unusual procedure now to have legislation to effectuate the terms of a treaty? It seems so to me. I can see one reason for that and that is with respect to the quota provision, provided for in the treaty which, of course, will be in a sense regulated and will be under the jurisdiction of customs collectors at the customs courts.

I think a representative of the State Department suggested the necessity of statutory power being conferred upon the collectors of customs, in order that they might enforce the quota provisions. The only other necessity that I can see for the bill is that they evidently overlooked something in the agreement, and there is a little fear now which is possibly due to a mental condition following unusual economic conditions in the world, as to what might happen—as to an overflow of coffee imports from the countries not in the agreement. Of course, a 2.2 percent is allocated to these countries not parties to the agreement, which is really a chocolate-covered embargo.

Of course, that is smoothed over a little in the argument by saying that that is practically what they have brought into our country over a previous period of years, but at the same time it is just taking those countries by the neck and saying that that is all that they can bring in here, and further modified by the Secretary of State's proposed amendment that authority be given to allocate the amount according to the different types of coffee. That will probably be helpful to Arabia and Turkey and one or two other countries that we would also like to have in our corner. Of course, this is just a tariff proposition by the Democrats, only it is tariff in reverse. The coffee tariff will be collected by the producing countries and the American coffee drinker is going to pay for it. That is the inconsistent part of the proposition. Of course, I believe in sound trade regulations with these southern republics, yet it seems to me that we are carrying the Santa Claus policy too far. Of course, Santa Claus is rather emblematic of many of the policies of this administration, and on Inauguration Day we ought to have had on the dome of the Capitol a statue of old Kris Kringle himself. It would have been a fine exemplification of what has been going on for the past 8 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CROWTHER. I shall take 5 minutes more.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. PACE. On page 6 of the committee report, 14 countries are enumerated as shipping to the United States a total of 15,545,000 bags of coffee, and then it seems article II covers exports that those countries are to make to other countries of the world, amounting to 11,612,000 bags.

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. PACE. And are we to understand that that total of a little over 27,000,000 bags represents the total export from those 14 countries?

Mr. CROWTHER. I presume that is so from the way in which it is written, and the total from these smaller countries is only 355,000 bags, that is, from the countries not participating in the agreement.

Mr. PACE. The point I make is that under this we are taking fifteen twenty-sevenths of the entire production.

Mr. CROWTHER. I think those figures would show that you are correct in that conclusion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] referred to the power of the Commission to increase the incoming quotas when and if they deemed it necessary. What is the yardstick for determining when they might increase the quota?

Mr. CROWTHER. I do not know what that would be. I do not know what conclusion they might come to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe he also dropped a remark that the State Department estimated the increased cost per 100 pounds to the consumer would run between $1 and $3.

Mr. CROWTHER. That was suggested.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would it be fair to assume this Commission will not increase the quota until the price advances above $3 per 100 to the consumer?

Mr. CROWTHER. There is no language in the report that refers to the probable method of raising the price.

In the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol I notice this bill was passed on March 10, in about 5 minutes, with only four questions asked by the minority leader. Mr. MCNARY asked:

> Does it decrease the amount which may be imported into this country?

Senator CLARK of Missouri said:

> Yes; of course. Without this provision, in a conceivable situation the nonparticipating countries—that is, countries outside this hemisphere which do not participate in the so-called coffee agreement or coffee treaty—might be able to come in and take possession of the market.

Of course, there is something wrong about that statement. With a 27,000,000-bag production, a group with 355,000 production could not come in and take possession of the market. That seems hardly possible. Yet that statement was made. The statement was also made that this would stabilize the price, and that it would probably raise the price.

I wonder if anybody in this House conceives the possibility of a group of foreign countries taxing themselves on importations of American tobacco, wheat, corn, or cotton and paying the added cost themselves in order to favor our producers. Does anybody believe that possible?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Not now.

In furnishing South America with a free market for coffee, and many of its other noncompetitive commodities produced there, we are doing about all that

can be expected of us without providing a subsidy at the expense of the American consumer. That is what it really amounts to. The joint resolution does not specifically impose a tariff on coffee. The increased price would have the same effect, however, except that the money will go to the foreign producers rather than to the United States Treasury.

Our policy on tariff has been to avoid a tariff on commodities that we do not produce in this country. Let the commodity come in duty free. We let raw silk come into this country duty free. Tea and coffee have always been on the free list, spices and carpet wools. Carpet wool has come in free because we do not produce any in this country. But here we have a proposal in which we are not taking care of an American industry. We are penalizing the American people to take care of the production of these other countries because we believe it is necessary to have them "in our corner" and that we must continue the good-neighbor policy. We ought to begin to practice the good-neighbor policy at home occasionally instead of carrying it to the corners of the earth. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not quite subscribe to the views of any speaker who has spoken this afternoon in full detail. In other words, I think this is a very important bill and merits serious consideration. In the first place, it involves two very important and new features. I should not want any Republican to leave this Hall under any misapprehension as to the facts in this case. This bill does two things that have never been done before in the history of the Republic. When you come to vote on a bill that enacts two new principles that have never been enacted into law before in the history of the Republic, then I say it is an important measure, and we ought to consider well what we are about to do.

What are the two principles involved? In the first place, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] so eloquently portrayed to you, it inflicts upon the American people, for the benefit of 14 other countries, a tariff of about 3 cents per pound on each pound of coffee. That is what it amounts to. As he said, it is a tariff in reverse. That has never been done before.

The protective tariff has been an issue between the two major parties for generations. The Democrats at one time argued for free trade and defended it as the policy for the best interest of the country. Later, when they had found that this policy was wrong, they came along with a modified policy of tariff for revenue only. The Republicans have always maintained that the country needed a tariff for protection. That is the policy that made the United States the greatest country in the world. This is the first time, I think, the Democratic Party has ever gone so far as to favor a tariff in favor of foreign countries and against their own country. As I have already stated, they have been for free trade. Cordell Hull has been the greatest apostle of free trade in modern times. You can praise him all you please as a Secretary of State, and I would not detract from any glory he may achieve in that position; but as a Congressman and as a Senator he always defended this policy when his party had long since repudiated it. He has been the outstanding free-trader in modern times. There is no question about it.

This bill goes further than the Democrats ever went in their history. They favor a principle that will permit these 14 countries to send their coffee to our country free of any duty and permit them to fix a penalty on us. How much is the penalty going to amount to? It will amount to just exactly what they want it to be. Under this bill, they will put us under a quota. We are the greatest consumers of coffee in the world. We take practically all of their output of some of these 14 countries. They want to put us under a quota for their protection, not for our own. The poor people of this country are entitled to get their coffee as cheap as possible. Coffee is the poor man's drink. When you fix quotas at the suggestion and for the benefit of the country from which the coffee comes, you put yourself at its mercy as to what the price will be. We do not grow coffee in the United States, and it has been our policy from the beginning to permit such articles to enter our country on the free list, that is, free of duty. This policy is a traditional policy, and any plan that would change this policy for one article would not only be a departure but it would disrupt other trade. Our coffee bill runs into hundreds of millions of dollars per year. Are we going to permit a few of these little countries to control this tremendous trade? It is not wise, and it is not right.

If we surrender our right in this respect these countries will send in what they please. We will be compelled to take it but they will not be compelled to deliver. Have you men who raise wheat ever had that kind of protection? Have you cotton fellows ever had that? Have you ever had it to your advantage so that you could fix a quota on your consumer? No; you have always been glad to get the business without compelling your customer to permit you to fix the price. That is why I say to you it is an important day in Congress today when we vote on this measure. I want to vote against it. I want to be on record against it. We have got enough New Deal fallacies without going out of our way to pass legislation never thought of before in our history. [Applause.]

I say to you it would be better for us if we took this $60,000,000 a year that this scheme is going to cost us and give it to these countries. It will cost us a minimum of $60,000,000 a year, and how much more nobody knows because they have the whip hand, they have our name to a contract and we have been quotaed off and told how much coffee they will send into our country, and the first thing you know the American restaurants and eating places will be cutting the size of the coffee cups. Already I understand that the price has increased on certain kinds of coffee 3 or more cents. Think of it, little countries like Guatemala and Costa Rica telling great America how much coffee she can drink and what price she is going to pay for it; some of you are going to march right up and vote for it simply because Cordell Hull said you should do so. If a roll call is had on this bill some of you will hesitate for I know it is against your principle.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman believe that if quotas are to be established the United States should so allocate the quotas to foreign countries that she gets something in return that would give us bargaining power which may in the future provide a flow of our goods to those countries? As it is now they establish the quota for us and they can buy wherever they please.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Certainly, and they will laugh at us. That is what they will do. We are asked to pass this bill, yet at this time as far as I know only five of those countries have ratified the agreement. Possibly some others have ratified since this report was made. They are going to hold us on the line, for we have already signed. We are a great country, we always keep our promises. They know that we have always kept our agreements. I cannot understand why our Senate would so readily ratify when the legislatures of half or three-quarters of the little South American countries have not taken it up and probably have no intention of taking it up. Yet they are going to get the benefit of our signing and going to tell the American people how much coffee they may drink and how much they must pay for it.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. And if the gentleman will yield further, while this agreement purports to expire in 1943, is it not possible that it can be continued after that indefinitely by agreement of these countries without the necessity of Senate ratification or extension by America?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. There is no question about it. While the gentleman is talking about that, I cannot see that this legislation is necessary. I have read all I could find on the subject, and from my reading I cannot find that we are under any compulsion to enact legislation to implement this treaty. The treaty is plain; we always took coffee from these countries without one cent of duty. And as far as I am concerned, these countries can send all the coffee they please to this country, and our people will drink all they can of it, for we are the greatest coffee-drinking country in the world. If we drink all we can, that ought to satisfy them.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested in the gentleman's statement, but I find on page 2 of the report a statement that the quota provision is for a total of 2,103,138,400 pounds, which is about 50,000,000 pounds in excess of the record consump-

tion for 1940. I ask the gentleman to reconcile this fact with his statement that this quota attempts to place upon the American people a restriction in the matter of the consumption of coffee. I am interested in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What is the proportion of this 50,000,000? That is the surplus—50,000,000 pounds as against 2,000,000,000 pounds. The proportion is about 1 to 50, is it not? We do not know when we will come to that. I object to their fixing our quota for us at all, when we are the greatest consumers in the world. Why submit to such a procedure? We are just putting our necks in a yoke for a lot of little countries, giving them the power to tell us how much coffee we can drink and what we shall pay for it.

Mr. KEEFE. If this agreement provides for 50,000,000 pounds more coffee next year than were shipped in during 1940, it is very difficult for me to understand how we are agreeing to a quota that is going to restrict the consumption of coffee, and I am asking the gentleman to reconcile the differences.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I say again we are putting our neck into a yoke. They fix the poundage; they fix the price. Suppose prosperity returns to Europe; they would sell their product over there and would not send their coffee here. You are going to guarantee the price for them when coffee is cheap and pay the big price when it is high. It is just like giving them about $60,000,000 a year.. It would be far better for all concerned to make it an outright gift to them, or to give it to them in the form of a subsidy, a rebate, or concession. For then we could know how much it was, but under this system we put the whip in their hand.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that all but four of these countries have already approved this agreement; all but four of the South American countries have ratified it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am glad to stand corrected on that, but from the reading I have done—and I read right here in this report the statement that only five have ratified. That was my authority for the statement I made.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That was probably the Senate report, but that is not in our report. Another thing the gentleman must take into consideration with relation to the quota is that the quota is not stable and unchangeable, for the gentleman will find that a vote of our own Government could increase the quota. There are 36 votes in all, of which we are allocated 12, and a vote of one-third could increase the quota any time we want to increase it. That protects our people.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is the trouble, a great country like the United States of America having to consult little Costa Rica, and some of these other little countries, as to how much coffee we are going to drink. I cannot agree to the proposition; I object to it.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is a phrase in this bill which may have a meaning that we have not fully appreciated or anticipated. I do not know just what it does mean. I have been trying to find out. Let me read it to you.

The Committee on Ways and Means, having had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the inter-American coffee agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

That is the thing. All through this report and the Senate report runs that phrase "and for other purposes." If anybody can tell me what those words mean, "and for other purposes," I would like to know. I do not know. I am afraid of them. I say one of the greatest nations in the world stultifies itself when it puts in that phrase "and for other purposes," which permits 14 foreign nations to put their interpretations on it. If we do not know what it means or what its implications are, we had better stop, look, and listen.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I understand the basis of this agreement we have entered into is to create more cordial relations with these countries. I am wondering if the only way that the United States of America can have friends outside the boundaries of the United States is to constantly hand them either money or favors, and if a time ever comes when we cannot hand out these doles to various other countries, how long is that friendship going to last?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Or how much it will be worth?

Mr. REED of New York. While we are giving away billions of dollars in trying to create this so-called good will, I would like to have somebody tell me what nations on the face of the earth outside of possibly China at the time of one of our great floods have ever contributed a cent or bundle to the United States of America when she has been flat.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman's observations are timely. Further in line with the thought of the gentleman from New York, whenever we have had the position of preference, when we have been able to sell to the largest nations in the world practically all of their consumption of an article, have we been anxious to lay down a quota for them? If we have been on the selling end, and we could deliver to Great Britain or to Germany practically all of some commodity, have we been anxious to fix a quota? We have been glad to get the majority of the business. We were willing to give them some concessions. If this is a business transaction with these nations then let it be on a business basis. If it is to be a gift let us call it a gift. Of course, if there is any justification for the measure, it is just what the gentleman from New York said. It might be conducive to finer relations between our country and these 14 countries, but it is too much of a penalty. You can hand a man some money, $10 or so, and you know how much it has cost you, but whenever you sign a blank check for him, that is something different. You then put your neck right in his yoke, and that is what I say we cannot afford to do. We could better afford to vote $60,000,000 a year to these countries than to do something here that we have never done before.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the gentleman understand will be the status of contracts for future deliveries of coffee that are now held by American importers?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am sorry, but I do not know. I could only make a guess, and that would not be an answer worthy of the gentleman's intelligent question.

Mr. CURTIS. That may or may not conform to this act or agreement?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not know. I do not think it is necessary, if we pass this legislation, to put these quotas into effect. Someone advanced the argument that we should do so to implement this bill. We have implemented the customs authorities to handle commodities coming in on the free list. This law does not levy any duty. If it levied a duty, it might be that we should prescribe how those duties were to be collected, and in that event it might require legislation. Whenever a commodity comes in free, we do not have the responsibility of collecting revenue off of that. We just let it come on in, and let them take the responsibility of having a glutted market.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman stated a proper procedure would be to give money to these countries to take care of their surpluses. We voted $500,000,000, or at least other Members did, last spring. What was done with the money? The minute it was given to the Agency some of it was put in a steel plant in Brazil and several million dollars were spent in Argentina. Nothing was used for surpluses after we voted the money for that purpose.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentlewoman is correct. A lot of the money, having been translated into goods, found its way over to Germany, too.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman know of any other instance where people proposed to tax themselves for the benefit of foreigners?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No. I made that statement before. This is the first time in the history of our Republic that anything like this has been done.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is going to cost us $40,000,000 a year?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Sixty million dollars a year, and if it goes over 3 cents a pound it will cost much more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Was this proposition originated by the South American republics or did we initiate the movement ourselves?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I cannot answer that. I do not know. My judgment is that the transaction may have been mutual, for the New Deal administration is always on the lookout to find someone to whom it can give a few millions, and these South American countries know their Uncle Samuel.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I got the impression from the reports that our people initiated this movement. If that is so, I think the record should show that we did and not put the burden on the South American republics.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not know what the facts are in reference to that. I do know that we are embarking upon a course that will take us into the deep, dark waters of uncertainty. It is not necessary. We should defeat this dangerous innovation that is but the beginning of what may prove very disastrous to us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have given considerable thought to the proposition now before us. Every time I think about it my mind just naturally travels back to the old arguments on the tariff which have taken place in the House from time to time during my service here. We Republicans have always believed in giving necessary protection to American agriculture and industry. We feel that is the only way we can give a proper degree of prosperity to the people of this country. Past results have amply proven the correctness of this policy. We have disagreed bitterly with the Democratic theory of the tariff, which is that only upon those things which we do not produce in this country should we place a tariff. Their theory is that whenever we put a tariff on any product that is produced in this country, we automatically tax our people for the sole benefit of only the industries which produce the commodity and that the benefits are not passed on to others as they should be, among all our people. Our Democratic friends have pursued this theory for a great many years. They have always preached the doctrine that in order to enable our people to purchase at a fair price the products which we raise at home, it was necessary to put those products upon the free list and thus subject the American producer to the competition of the producers of other countries of the world, notwithstanding the disparity in costs of production here and there.

We have not agreed with this. We have not agreed that the only products coming into this country that should carry a tariff are those that are not produced in this country. As a matter of fact, the Democratic theory is the old theory of tariff for revenue only.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I simply want to call attention to the fact that about two-thirds in value of all the products entering this country are on the free list anyway.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Yes; that is true, and I think it is generally known to the informed Members of the House, but the thing I want to call your attention to is the fact that this proposal goes far beyond any proposal ever to have been submitted to either branch of Congress, so far as I know. Our Democratic friends, in this measure, not only return to the old discredited theory of a tariff for revenue only, but, in effect, they go far beyond that.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to legalize a measure which invites nations importing coffee into this country to allocate how much of this product each shall send to our market. We in the United States produce no coffee whatsoever. Consequently, this product has been upon the free list. Today we buy our coffee at a reasonable price. It is conceded by the proponents of this legislation that it will result in raising the cost of the coffee consumed in this country at least 3 cents per pound. This means, in round figures, that American housewives will be compelled to pay what, in reality, amounts to a tax of approximately $60,000,000 annually. Taxes paid by the citizens of this country are supposed to go into the treasuries of the National and State Governments in order to meet the necessary expenses of those governments. In this instance, however, we are inviting a tax of at least $60,000,000 per year that our housewives must pay, and what becomes of this money? Does it go into the Treasury of the United States to help pay the extravagant expenditures of this administration? It does not. It goes directly into the pockets of those who import coffee into the United States.

So, Mr. Chairman, the situation which presents itself is this: The American people are already overburdened with taxes, direct and concealed. The Ways and Means Committee will within a short time meet for the purpose of placing upon the shoulders of our people taxes far beyond those we have ever dreamed of. We are the arsenal of the democracies of the world.

This House recently approved an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 for the purpose of supplying arms, ammunition, food, and equipment for such other nations as the President may direct. This $7,000,000,000, and every dollar of it, will eventually be taken from the pockets of the American people. We might as well recognize that fact. I have no doubt but what every dollar of this immense sum will be expended for the purposes outlined in the lease-lend bill, and not one dollar will be paid by any taxpayer anywhere outside these United States. In addition, we are stripping our armed forces of arms and equipment we desperately need in this country to provide for our own defense, to make it possible to properly train our own soldiers. How much it will cost us to replace these things, the Lord himself only knows.

In the face of all these things, here we are today called upon to enact legislation which will add $60,000,000 to the already tax-burdened housewives of this country, all for the purpose, I suppose, of attempting to buy the good will and friendship of the coffee-producing nations of the world. I wonder how long it is going to be before this administration wakes up to the fact you cannot buy friendship. Neither an individual nor a collection of individuals can secure honest, faithful friendship by this method. Were anything more needed to prove the truth of this statement, just examine the results of our last attempt to buy the friendship of nations. Let our minds go back to the days when, from being the great savior of nations, when our men and money were needed to actually save the very lives of those nations, and when that other attempt to make the world safe for democracy had ended, and there was no longer a need for our men, munitions, and money, we became the Shylock, yes, Uncle Shylock, to those for whom we had made such sacrifices for others as no other nation in all history had ever made.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is just another of those things; just another evidence of the utter congressional disregard of the taxpaying American citizen.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The statement has been made a number of times that the enactment of this implementing legislation will tax the people of the United States $60,000,000 a year, and the gentleman has just stated that it will result in a prospective increase in the price of coffee to the American consumer of about 3 cents a pound. That is a thing in which the American consumer is interested and the thing in which I am interested. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain, so that we may have the picture before us, just how this particular piece of legislation will have the effect of increasing the price of coffee 3 cents a pound or any other amount to the American consuming public. If it will do that, I think the people of this country ought to know about it, whether it is 3 cents or 1 cent or any other amount. How will that result be accomplished? What are the actual mechanics of the operation of this measure that will bring about that result? That is what I am finding it difficult to explain.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman, of course, knows that the sole purpose of this bill is to increase the price of coffee to the American consumer. If the measure is enacted and the importers of coffee from the various countries have the right to fix the amount of that product brought into this country, then can bring in as much or as little as they desire. We all know that the law of supply and

demand under ordinary circumstances fixes the price of a commodity. It naturally follows that if these imports are held down to a point just below the natural demand in this country for the product, the price will immediately increase. It is in this way, under the provisions of the bill and the treaty which it is intended to supplement, producers of coffee can and will make the American housewife pay a price higher than the price she pays today, and just how far they will carry this, whether they exact 1 cent, 2 cents, 3 cents, or even more than that, will depend upon the greed of those who control this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I may say to my friend from Wisconsin that I shall be very happy to answer his question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I deplore the fact that the consideration of this joint resolution has been made the occasion for the partisan emotion that has been manifested by my good friends and colleagues of the minority on the Ways and Means Committee. I deplore very deeply the fact that the tariff question has been raised, which has always been a question for partisan disputes.

My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], a very able and distinguished member of our committee, in his opening remarks referred to the fact that he did not want any Republican to go out of this hall without a clear understanding of what this bill means. I am astounded that that statement should be made at a time like this and on a measure like the pending resolution, when all the American people are hoping and praying and striving for a situation to obtain in this House that will be free of any partisan politics. Our good friends have gone along so nicely on the national defense program that I am surprised and deeply regret the fact that in their desperation to fight this bill, which they showed little disposition to fight in committee, and against which no Republican in the other body opened his mouth, apparently, none of them was wise enough to find out the great danger which they have suddenly discovered. I am greatly pleased that there was not a vote against it in the Senate because no one raised any question about it there. It was recommended by a majority report, joined in by Senator HARRISON and Senator MURRAY and Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, commending the legislation, and the statement was made that it was timely and under existing conditions was important and necessary. No Republican in the Senate was wise enough or discreet enough or discerning enough in his judgment to find out the great danger that lurked in this legislation so far as the American people were concerned.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio, who is a member of our committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And I say to the gentleman that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] did bring out the fact that the price would be higher.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, he asked some questions about it, but he did not vote against it. If he did bring out the price increase, it did not seem to influence him. He seemed to think other matters of enough importance to warrant the legislation. There was no opposition to it in the Senate. Senator MCNARY was the only man that asked any questions, and he seemed to be satisfied with the explanation that was given.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does the gentleman think this is a national-defense measure?

Mr. DOUGHTON. In a sense I would think so; yes. I think the question of national defense is involved. I do not think there is any question about it. I think to maintain friendly relations is important, as my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said. He raised himself above partisan lines and paid a very high compliment to our distinguished Secretary of State. I think he very clearly and definitely emphasizes the fact that it is important at this time above all times to further friendly accord with our sister American republics.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the distinguished chairman of the committee understand that this legislation is an attempt to implement this treaty, in that it will give effective aid to the South American countries in their prime product, coffee?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That was in part the purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman another question to bring out the point, which is not quite definite to me. Is it conceded and was it conceded in the committee that the adoption of this program would necessarily increase the price of coffee to the consumer in the United States?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not necessarily, but to be fair, it was stated that under the present condition of the coffee market, one-third of which was being cut off on account of international conditions, that this country might become glutted with coffee, and that might appreciably affect the price temporarily. We can all understand that, but the purpose of this bill is not only to help the producer, but the consumer, to give the producer a reasonable price for his commodity, and also the consumer a reasonable price, and not an exorbitant price for the coffee that he consumes.

Mr. KEEFE. If the idea is to help those South American countries, and afford them a market, there would have to be an increase in the price of coffee from those countries.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not necessarily. It might prevent a decline in the price. That might be the effect. But further answering the question, under the quota now it is permitted that about 50,000,000 pounds above the all-time high importation of 1940 may come in and it is reasonable to suppose that if we have an increased importation, it will affect the price of coffee. It cannot reduce the importation of coffee below the normal supply.

Mr. KEEFE. It does provide for a restriction in the importation of coffee, in the quota assigned to those countries outside of the countries named in this participating agreement, and those southern countries will then have a better opportunity to provide coffee within the limitations of this enlarged quota of over 2,000,000,000 pounds.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman means the countries not signatory to this agreement?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Of course, if they are free and not under restrictions, it is reasonable to assume that they will increase their exports, while these other countries signatory to this agreement cannot, and consequently that would give the nonsignatory countries an advantage which would be unfair and unreasonable and to which our Government could not afford to be a party.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I understand the purpose of this legislation it is to make our country the coffeepot of democracy.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, the gentleman always understands everything from a partisan point of view.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no, I am asking for information.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, to have it the gentleman's way, if it is to be the coffeepot, then there must be plenty of coffee, but I do not see the point in his question.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Conceding that this is a part of our program for good neighbors——

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think it is. I think it is plainly stated that it is.

Mr. STEFAN. I say, conceding that it is, because I happen to know there are other programs along the same line, you and I realize that we are not dependent upon coffee in America. If coffee becomes too expensive my people in Nebraska can do what they did before. They can use parched barley and some other grains in place of it. But let me ask the gentleman this question, if this price goes up, what good will it do to

those people down there, because we will not drink it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is an assumption, of course. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion. I remind my friends who want to make a partisan issue of this and talk about the price of coffee, that in 1926 under a Republican administration the price of coffee was much higher than it is at the present time.

Mr. STEFAN. I fear if you raise the price you may lose the consumption.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know. I cannot say about that. But in 1926 our Republican friends did not shed any great amount of tears about the price of coffee as they are doing this afternoon. The price of Rio No. 7, in New York, was 18.2 cents in 1926, and today it is 6.3 cents. Santos No. 4 coffee in 1926 was 22.3 cents a pound in New York, and today it is 9 cents a pound in New York. You did not get scared or alarmed or shed any crocodile tears then about the high price of coffee and cutting off American consumption and people having to stop using coffee. Colombian Manizales coffee in 1926 was 28.5 cents per pound—today it is only 13.6 cents a pound. So the price of coffee is still very reasonable and will doubtless remain reasonable. America is assured an adequate supply of coffee. If there is any reason why this quota is not adequate, then it is provided in this treaty that the quota can be increased by the vote of the American Government's representatives on the Inter-American Coffee Board. It is provided in this treaty that by a vote of one-third of the votes the quota can be increased. The United States has one-third of the votes. So we are on safe ground. The quota provided for is more than we have ever imported. If that is not sufficient, then by a vote of our own representatives we can increase the quota and protect our people against immoderate or exorbitant prices. This is just a scare. It is just an excuse. There is really no ground for objection or raising that question to this bill that I can see. It will promote friendly relations with the Latin-American countries, which we are not only anxious to do, but it is extremely important at this time that we do everything we can to help them and further our good relations with them.

The present coffee situation will perhaps bring about a deplorable condition in those countries, and when that is done that either directly or indirectly affects our exports to those countries. They cannot buy from us unless they sell to us. Coffee is their money crop. If their money crop brings nothing, how can they buy our products and commodities that we desire and need to export to those countries? The purpose of this bill is to prevent distress and economic ruin in our sister republics. It is protected in such a way that it cannot place any burden on us at all. As a matter of fact, it is a real benefit, everything considered, to the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not clear on this question whether this will raise the price of coffee. The gentleman asserted that it does not necessarily raise the price, but it might have the effect of preventing the price being lowered.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It might have that effect. I do not think my friend wants to see this country glutted with coffee so we can buy it for almost nothing and then be compelled to sell our exportable surplus for nothing. I do not think that is the philosophy of the gentleman and I do not think that is the philosophy of any of us.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am merely trying to get information. This will have the effect of guaranteeing to those nations a certain price?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, I do not think that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. You do not think it could have that effect?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. There is nothing that is related in any respect, by blood or marriage, to price fixing. The purpose of it is to stabilize and to prevent distressed conditions in the coffee-producing countries, which are among our very best customers and friends, so that they will be in a position and have a desire to buy our surplus commodities.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the lady.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The agreement places a ceiling over coffee that can come in. Does it place a floor under it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is just a quota beyond which they cannot go.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There is a limit to the amount. Is there a limit on the amount that they have to send? Do they have to send a certain amount in?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. They might not produce any at all. Something might occur that they would not produce any coffee. We are their market and that is their living. Coffee is their money crop. Of course, they will send all they can and they would like to get a living price for it and not have their economy completely destroyed.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I do not want the gentleman to become exercised, for I might vote for the resolution.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sure the lady will, because she is always fair and takes a patriotic view of legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I understood the gentlewoman from Illinois to ask whether there was any minimum quota.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. COOPER. Obviously there is no necessity for a minimum quota, because the United States market is the only market in the world these 14 producing countries have. They will send their quota here, or as near the quota as the American people will buy and consume.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes; but what the price is going to be depends on how much coffee comes in.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That may have something to do with it, of course.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This is the second part of the question, and this is in no sense partisanship, because I understand the ostensible leader of the Republican Party, Mr. Willkie, thinks we ought to get all the way in the war for free trade. Is not this a way of limiting free trade? Is it fair to say that this limits the free flow of trade?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, yes; in a sense it does.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In other words, does not this bill say that at least in this kind of times free trade is not safe for this country in respect to coffee? Is it fair to say that?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; I would not say it was not safe, because there is a difference in things not being safe and not being expedient. It might be safe for me to walk from here to North Carolina, but it would not be very expedient.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. At least it is not best; but this does restrict the free flow of trade.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think this is not only a just measure but that at this time viewed in the light of expediency, although I do not like to base action on expediency, it is the expedient thing to do; I think it is an expedient measure to pass as a concrete expression of friendship to our sister republics to the south, and as a means of cementing friendly relations and implementing the good-neighbor policy between our country and the South American republics. We might possibly pay a little more for coffee, but it would stimulate our export trade and we would make up for it in other ways by finding a market for some of those things of which we have a surplus. So it will be mutually beneficial to our country and the South American countries.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But the proposition I am speaking of is that this is a limitation of free trade.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; it is not a limitation on free trade in coffee because the quotas are set high enough to permit free competition by all of the coffee-producing countries. The effect of this proposition will be to maintain an orderly free trade in coffee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired, all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas an Inter-American Coffee Agreement was signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, by representatives of the Governments of the United States of America, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, and Venezuela; and

Whereas the said agreement contemplates the cooperation of the Government of the United States in a joint effort to promote the orderly marketing of coffee in international trade, with a view to assuring equitable terms for both producers and consumers by adjusting supply to demand: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That on and after the entry into force of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, as proclaimed by the President, and during the continuation in force of the ob-

ligations of the United States thereunder, no coffee imported from any foreign country may be entered for consumption except as provided in the said agreement.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I still believe that we are putting on a good deal of a sham battle on this bill. If a fight should have been made against the bill it should have been made by the minority and those opposed to it in the Senate when it came up in treaty form; but the Senate ratified it and it became not only the law but the highest law of the land. The bill before us is merely to implement that law, and I think these attacks that are now being made should have been made at that time; but we are not in position now to oppose the carrying out of the terms of a treaty duly ratified. It comes to the House as a treaty which was ratified by the Senate, and this bill is merely to implement that treaty which is the law today. I believe it is our duty to keep treaties and not to break them.

I have stated and I reiterate my high regard for the Secretary of State. Secretary of State Hull and former Secretary of State Hughes I believe have done more to build up good will, unity, cooperation, and friendship between the United States and Latin American countries than any other secretaries of state. To that extent I believe Secretary of State Hull to be a great American statesman. But I do not follow the Secretary in his trade treaties or in his free-trade philosophy and ideology. I am absolutely opposed to what he is trying to do today by having the United States buy meat, wool, and wheat down in Argentina in direct competition with the producers of meat, beef, wool, and wheat in our own Western and Southern States. That issue is not involved in this resolution, however, for we produce no coffee at all. I cannot understand the type of free trade that would sacrifice the American farmers, destroy their markets and our own home markets, and have the Congress appropriate huge sums for national defense to be used in greater or less degree to buy meat, wool, and wheat in Argentina in competition with our own farmers.

I am a Pan American and I am an upholder of the Monroe Doctrine, but there is even some limitation on that and I am not prepared to say I am more than 95 percent in favor of maintaining the Monroe Doctrine. I am not prepared to say I am willing to go to war tomorrow for Argentina or these countries 6,000 miles away. I would for these countries nearer to the Panama Canal, but Argentina is much nearer Europe than to the United States or to the Panama Canal. No matter who wins this war, whether Germany or England, Germany will buy wheat, wool, and meat from the Argentine because that is her logical market. We do not propose to buy it here. They will have to sell it to Germany whether she wins or loses. This is a matter of realism. For heaven's sake, let us not confuse the issue. A treaty is the law of the land and we are now merely implementing that treaty in regard to coffee quotas.

This coffee proposal is to create further goodwill and to obtain greater markets in Latin America. The other proposal is to bring our farm products into direct competition with the meat, wheat, and wool produced in the Argentine. I am against that species of free trading. I am opposed to sacrificing our farmers, whether they come from the West or South. They come from America, and I believe in upholding the American markets for our own American farmers.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman takes the position that this is a cultural-relation measure, winning the goodwill of the South American republics; is that correct?

Mr. FISH. Partially; but I go further than that. I think it is logical and sound, because the South American market is our natural and geographical market. We have industries that want to sell our goods in South America, and we ought to have that market. We ought to take it away from Germany and England now, but if we do not give these people a square deal on their greatest product, coffee, we will be confronted with bankrupt nations down there with no money to buy anything from the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with the gentleman from New York that, the treaty having been ratified, this bill merely provides the authority for the distribution of this extra 355,000 bags of coffee covered by the treaty, and there is no good reason why the bill should not be passed.

I rise now to express the hope that on October 1, 1943, when this treaty is eligible for cancelation, the international threat will be over and we can then return to a system of trading with our neighbors on a basis of equality and not find it necessary to further solicit their friendship purely through favors in the name of national defense. [Applause.]

We should do business with them on the basis of fair dealing, honest treatment, and value received. We should pay for what we buy, demand payment for what we sell, and buy their surplus crops when they agree to buy our surplus crops.

At present, in view of the critical international situation, I am perfectly willing to make some sacrifices and do things that are not entirely in keeping with the principles of sound business judgment. I fully appreciate the importance of cordial and cooperative relations between ourselves and the 14 South American nations which are parties to this treaty. Losing money or surrendering trading power is no worse than spending billions for the manufacture of implements of human destruction and for other measures of national defense.

As soon as this is over I hope we can place our international relations and commerce among nations on a sound business basis and get away from this idea that you can buy friends. Any person whose friendship is bought will always fail you in the hour of need.

What does this coffee treaty amount to? Under it we agree to buy nearly 16,000,000 bags of coffee from these 14 South American countries and thereby agreed to give them all of our coffee business except 355,000 bags, which is reserved for the balance of the world in order to secure some special brands to fit the taste of a few Americans. Not only do we agree to buy all of our coffee from these 14 nations, but we agree to pay one-third of the expense of enforcing this treaty and then we agree to stabilize the price of their coffee, which means an increase in the price and therefore an increase in what the American citizen must pay for his coffee.

What has the State Department asked or secured in return for this? Absolutely nothing, except it is hoped that these 14 South American nations will be our friends. They were not asked to make any concessions to us. We do not charge any duty on their coffee. They do not agree to buy any of our surplus cotton or wheat or tobacco. They do not surrender any rights or privileges.

About two-thirds of all of this coffee is to come from Brazil. For the last several years Brazil has been rapidly expanding their cotton acreage, competing with our southern cotton farmers, and they already have taken some of our markets away from us. Last year we exported over 6,000,000 bales of cotton while this year we will export hardly 1,000,000 bales. But the exports of cotton from Brazil are increasing rapidly. Of the many things that the Department of State could have done, they could at least have asked Brazil to stop expanding their cotton acreage in competition with us and in consideration of our promise to buy all of their coffee.

There are five great noncompetitive commodities imported into this country. These are coffee, rubber, silk, tea, and sugar. It is true we do produce some sugar, and I think the American farmer should be given the right to produce more sugar, but for many years to come it will be necessary for us to import many million pounds of sugar. We buy these five commodities in enormous quantities and from many different nations of the earth.

On the other hand, we have three great export crops produced in this country and we have enormous surpluses of each. These are cotton, wheat, and tobacco. Next August when we start gathering another crop of cotton we will have around 15,000,000 bales surplus stored in our warehouses. The entire export part of our tobacco crop for the last 2 years is now under Government loan and stored in our warehouses. On June first we will have on hand a surplus of about 400,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I believe any reasonable businessman could take the market we offer for coffee, rubber, silk, tea, and sugar and secure for us a market for every surplus pound of our cotton, every surplus pound of our tobacco, and every bushel of our wheat. I hope the day will soon come when our State Department will return to the practices which made this Nation great, that is, to trade with those who trade with us

and exchange our surpluses, to the extent of the commodities I have mentioned, for the noncompetitive commodities which we must buy.

If South America wants us to buy all of their coffee, then let them agree to take some of our surplus commodities. If Great Britain wants us to buy their rubber and tea, let them agree to take some of our surplus cotton, wheat, and tobacco. If Japan wants us to take 80 percent of their silk, then let them agree to stop trying to conquer the cotton lands of China and agree to take some of our cotton, wheat, and tobacco.

I believe that under this system it would no longer be necessary for the Congress, year after year, to appropriate hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in parity and benefit payments and surplus removal programs. It will mean the return to the simple principles of common sense and good business.

For the life of me I cannot understand why we are called upon to do more for the coffee producers of South America than we do for the American farmer. While we are buying the friendship of others we may suddenly awaken to the fact that we have lost his friendship.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to take the floor at any time, but I happen to be a livestock producer, a beef producer, as well as a milk and butterfat producer. I may say that those of us who are engaged in that kind of business are not shedding great tears about a few pounds of beef coming in from South America. The American National Livestock Association in conference in Washington, representing, if anybody does, the cowman, endorsed the proposition involving the importation of some of this canned beef from South America. As far as wheat is concerned, not a bushel of wheat can come in from South America, I am informed, and I think reliably, unless it pays 42 cents a bushel tariff. I do not think we should be very much alarmed about wheat coming from that part of the world.

May I say something to those who profess to be the friends of the cowmen? The price of cattle in this country is satisfactory. Cattle are high. They are so high, as a matter of fact, that many ranchmen are not putting their heifers on the market. They are keeping them for breeding purposes. In months to come, maybe in 24 or 36, I fear under this process that we are going to have about as big a surplus of cattle as we do of cotton and wheat at this time.

Last year when the question of canned beef came up, the President made a statement for which he was very greatly criticized, but I do not think he completed the statement. He said that Argentine canned beef was better than American canned beef. Everyone who knows anything about beef knows that to be true. People in the Argentine can their best beef because it is their export beef. Everyone who knows anything about cattle in this country, anyone who has ever been to a livestock barn or a packery, knows that we can the lowest type of beef that we have.

Further than that, when we are trying to build in the Western Hemisphere a great and good feeling, if this Congress should prohibit the importation of any beef from the Argentine or from South America at all, we will destroy enough good feeling that we could not buy with propaganda and advertisements for $10,000,000. So, as a livestock man, speaking the language of the American National Livestock Association, may I say that we who are interested in the first instance are perfectly willing for this pittance of canned beef to come here from South America. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I did not see anything in this bill now under consideration pertaining to Argentine beef. I thought this was a coffee bill. It may be necessary for us to get up here and defend the President of the United States with respect to some of the statements he makes, but it seems to me it is my duty to try to defend the American people and enable them to get a good cup of coffee for breakfast. When I take the minority report on this bill I find there are 2,000,000,000 pounds of coffee coming into this country annually and that we consume the greatest amount of coffee of any country in all the world. The increase here of 3 cents a pound that we are going to have to pay for our coffee is going to mean $60,000,000 to our coffee drinkers, and you fellows are not going to get your extra cup of coffee for breakfast. They are going to tax you a nickel for that cup of coffee, and they are going to tax all our people a nickel for an extra cup of coffee, and certain people of this country are going to make more money off of the general public.

Now, we talk about a good-neighbor policy for South America. I want to help South America, and I believe if there are any two groups of countries that should be together they are the countries of North and South America. I firmly believe that, but let us look at the situation from another standpoint. When any of you men go down here to buy a suit of clothes you go into a store and you shop around and you buy the best suit of clothes you can buy for the least amount of money and your wives will do the same thing. You cannot get away from that principle. It does not make any difference where you go, you will always buy the best article you can buy for the least money. The people of South America will do that, and so will our own people, and when you try to set up an arrangement with these 14 South American nations whereby you say to them they they can ship only so much coffee, when you have a number of small nations that have not agreed to that arrangement, whenever you say to those small nations that they cannot do business in our country or that we are only going to let them do so much business with our country, how are you going to get the good will of those countries or of the small South American republics? You are simply not going to get it. You have got to do business on a sound business basis.

The trouble with this whole program is that we are trying to regulate everything that everybody does at all times, morning, noon, night, Sundays, holidays, and every other day. That is exactly what Russia did. We are trying to follow now, as nearly as we can, the things that Russia has been doing, while Russia is trying to get away from them.

Why, in the case of the poor farmer of this country, you will soon be telling him when he has to get up in the morning, when he shall milk his cows, how many cows he may have to milk, and how many cows he can put on a certain amount of acreage. Then you are going to tell him how much butter that cow should produce. In our State we tell them how much butterfat they should have in milk, and if your milk is too rich you have got to water it. That is an absolute fact. What have we been doing with the farmers of this country with respect to every piece of legislation that we have considered on the floor of the House during the last 6 years? Why, it has been regimentation, and if I could see any hope of ever getting our new good-neighbor policy to work, I would support it, but I cannot see it. I have opposed most of it because it is regulation, and I would oppose this bill because it is regulation and it is not going to lead to a better understanding between South America and the United States unless we do business with them on a good, sound, business basis. The law of supply and demand has got to govern, and we have got to produce and sell them at the cheapest possible price, and if we do this we will get the good will of the South American people. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted the floor for a few minutes to ask the chairman of our Committee on Ways and Means or the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] a few questions.

I am very much interested in this increase-in-price argument that has been made here. If I understood the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee correctly, he pointed out that the wholesale price of Rio No. 7 coffee in 1926 was around 18¼ cents per pound, as against 6 and a fraction cents per pound at the present time. Now, in arriving at the $60,000,000 as the estimated increase in the cost of coffee annually to the consumer, what is the yardstick for measuring that $60,000,000?

Mr. COOPER. Nobody on this side of the aisle has made any such estimate as that, and I am just as much at a loss as the gentleman from Michigan to know how they arrived at any such figure as that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I will tell the gentleman who made that statement. It was the representative of Cordell Hull who made that statement before the committee.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will permit, he did not say any such thing as that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me this is one of the real questions involved here.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. We import 2,000,000,000 pounds of coffee a year and if, as the State Department claims, this will raise the price of coffee 3 cents a pound, that will amount to $60,000,000 a year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If there is to be an increase of 3 cents a pound, I think you will find that will run pretty near one-tenth cent per cup of coffee, but I am not yet ready to accept that argument.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield there, the gentleman certainly is not arguing that they only make three cups of coffee out of a pound of coffee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I figure 30 cups to the pound. I am not willing to accept that argument just for this reason. If you take the recent price of coffee that was terribly depressed, largely as a result of North America and South America going along with England in the effectuation of the blockade of agricultural commodities moving to the Axis Powers, you will find that coffee in particular was depressed. If we calculate the increase in price from that low point up to, say, the present price, plus a little more, you may arrive at your 3 cents per pound, but I do not think a man in business would accept that kind of approach. I am sure that if the State Department made that observation it must have fallen into the same error which it falls into in the erroneous statement which repeatedly comes from the State Department and the Department of Agriculture and certain economists that our Sugar Control Act and duty on sugar costs the consumers of this country around $275,000,000 a year. See pages 82 and 83 of Monograph No. 10 of the T. N. E. C.

Those who make these erroneous calculations take the cost and freight London-New York basis price and deduct this from the New York, including duty price, and arrive at the difference, charging this up as an additional cost of sugar to the consumers of the United States of America, giving credit, of course, for the net customs revenues. Of course, that is fallacious calculating and because the joker is in the abnormal price of sugar cost and freight London, that price being depressed by reason of Cuban conditions governed largely by our policies. If we use the argument that 3 cents per pound on coffee is arrived at on a similar basis, I think we are chasing a fallacy, and I hope that the State Department, as well as the Department of Agriculture and other economists connected with the Government and its agencies, will no longer promote such misleading figures, either in connection with sugar or with coffee. I think you will find the same fallacy used in connection with sugar has been used by the State Department's spokesman in connection with this coffee-agreement question of 3 cents a pound, which, I understand from committee members, came from the State Department. I hope this will be a lesson to us to get away from that kind of poor calculating and come down to the brass tacks of the situation.

I believe this bill has more to do with national defense than anything else because I go back to the argument I made here once before, and that is, if we are to effectuate the Monroe Doctrine from an economic and financial standpoint, we will undoubtedly be getting into fields similar to this. If, according to the Saturday Evening Post, we are going to discard the Monroe Doctrine, along with some other policies and institutions, that also brings up new issues. I think one gentleman raised the issue here that this is an extremely important bill, and I wish we had more time to discuss it. I believe that there is a grave responsibility resting upon the House to go into these South American relations very carefully and constructively.

And I say this, Mr. Chairman, because of many things we are doing. For instance, this very afternoon, almost within the hour, we approved unanimously, I believe, Senate Joint Resolution 7 dealing with the question of nonrecognition by United States of transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power. Now, Mr. Chairman, such statesmanship; such inconsistency! It illustrates quite clearly just what poor international horse traders we are. If the United States is to be the great "arsenal of democracy" not only for material but for ideas, we had better take a little more time to better understand how the other fellow views our actions. Within an hour almost we say to Latin America what we said in Senate Joint Resolution 7, and then we come along here and make the fuss we are making about a coffee agreement. I just guess we shall have to go through some rather bitter hours before we make Monroeism acceptable to the people to the south of us. A further effectuation of the Monroe Doctrine, the establishing of naval and military bases and good trading relations between the United States of America and the republic to the south of us are all linked together. They are not easily separated for a party vote or for any other purpose. I have previously pointed out, as you drift through old Mexico, Central America, and into the A, B, C countries making up South America, you find almost 130,000,000 souls. They are the barrier to the easy effectuation of the Monroe Doctrine. Did you know that we at one time had a "nationalistic movement" in this country? Germany had one; France had one. And now the authors and historians are fanning the faint flames of nationalism in the Latin countries to our south.

As those flames spread, who will be the main torch bearer? Today we find cultural nations, territorial nations, and a mixture of the two. Is the State to embark on a cultural and religious mission and completely disregard geographical limits? If that is to be the approach of European and Asiatic states in Latin America we might as well prepare for vast difficulties in all the area between the Rio Grande and Patagonia. For instance, Ibero-America has vast segments of unassimilated nationals—Italians, French, Spanish, Germans, and Japanese. As Latin people acquire a nationalistic spirit, as their national consciousness awakens, Axis entrenchment, moving in opposite direction to the aims of Monroeism, can bring about unpredictable political pains. Throughout Latin America "colonies" of certain European nationals operate similar to the Japanese in the Philippines—especially in the Province of Davao, where they have a monopoly on the Manila hemp, out of which we make our high-grade rope for the Army and Navy and upon which we are now dependent for 75 percent of our needs—with their schools, societies, sports, and cultural clubs for the young people, churches, commercial agents, all carrying on what is termed unconstitutional activities, organized on a military basis, subscribing to the mother country party funds according to dictation of the leaders, disregarding local laws and generally subservient to the home state. I saw a lot of this in operation in the Philippines. It was winked at by both Manila and Washington authorities. Under such conditions what is the future for internal public law and, too, international law? We can well afford to go to the subjugated countries of Europe for some of our answers.

Vice President Wallace; Secretary of Agriculture Wickard; and Governor Davis, of the Federal Reserve Board, all have in recent months, warned our people, especially those engaged in agricultural pusuits, of the coming storm in dealing with agricultural problems of North and South America. Let me state emphatically that if we are to effectuate the Monroe Doctrine we shall be forced to quickly move in all directions—financially, economically, socially, culturally, politically. We shall have to establish in Latin areas advance guards composed of Americans to promote local nationalistic doctrine friendly to the United States of America. Our representatives will have to serve as organs of infiltration, vigilance, and information. They will have to be connected with every branch of the economic, cultural, political, and social life of the Latins. We will have to engage in shipping, railroading, public utilities; operate airways, influence commercial policies, participate in the establishment of drinking water and irrigation systems; organize, finance, and operate sanitary districts, teach the people facts about hygiene, contagious diseases, germs, and so forth; develop insurance contacts, furnish information gratuitously, establish schools, and make democracy a practical thing. Our opposition constantly whispers into the ears of the Latins that the colossus of the North is their greatest enemy; that the plutocratic democracies of the world are dying. Our opposition is far too smart to openly acquire land areas by conquest. It operates by infiltration. In detail, we must meet the challenge on the front line all over Latin America, become a part of the life of the masses, lift them up to a higher plane of living, and make our democracy a practical and valuable thing to them if we are to dissipate their hatred and fear of us. Unless we do these things in detail

the day will come when we shall have to participate in bloody wars in these Latin American countries or give up the Monroe Doctrine. As the nationalisms of Latin America take form, we either move quickly or we shall find an anti-American spirit which will make our progress very difficult. With this job ahead of us; with Mexico just across the river from us, we plunge again into the European cauldron without even suggesting that England hand us as collateral, the securities she holds all over the Latin American area. As international horse traders, we would make good dock oyster shellers—just wait for our orders.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to make such allocations of the quota provided in the agreement for countries not participating in the said agreement as he finds necessary or appropriate in order to afford any such country or countries an opportunity to supply a fair share of the quota, whether or not required by any international obligation of the United States. The President is also authorized to make such rules and regulations as he finds necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and of the said agreement, and with respect to any provision of such regulations for any act or performance by an importer of coffee, compliance therewith shall be a condition to the entry for consumption of the coffee in respect of which the act or performance is required.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, after the word "States" insert "or in order to make available the types of coffee usually consumed in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 43, and pursuant to House Resolution 156 he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 115, answered "present" 1, not voting 135, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—178

Allen, La.	Gregory	O'Neal
Anderson, N. Mex.	Haines	O'Toole
Arnold	Hare	Pace
Baldwin	Harrington	Patman
Barry	Harris	Patrick
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Patton
Beam	Harter	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Healey	Pfeifer,
Beiter	Hébert	Joseph L.
Bland	Heffernan	Pierce
Boggs	Hendricks	Pittenger
Boland	Hill, Wash.	Plauché
Bradley, Pa.	Hobbs	Priest
Brooks	Hook	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Ramsay
Bryson	Houston	Ramspeck
Bulwinkle	Hunter	Richards
Burch	Imhoff	Rivers
Burgin	Izac	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Capozzoli	Johnson, Luther A.	Russell
Cartwright	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sabath
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Sacks
Claypool	Kee	Sanders
Coffee, Wash.	Kefauver	Sasscer
Cole, Md.	Kelley, Pa.	Schulte
Connery	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scrugham
Cooley	Kennedy, Michael J.	Shanley
Cooper	Keogh	Sheppard
Costello	Kerr	Sikes
Crawford	Kilday	Smith, Conn.
Creal	Kirwan	Smith, Maine
Crosser	Lanham	Snyder
Cullen	Larrabee	South
D'Alesandro	Lea	Sparkman
Davis, Ohio	Leavy	Spence
Dickstein	Lesinski	Starnes, Ala.
Disney	Lewis	Steagall
Doughton	Ludlow	Sumner, Ill.
Downs	Lynch	Sutphin
Doxey	McCormack	Tarver
Drewry	McIntyre	Terry
Durham	McKeough	Thom
Eberharter	McLaughlin	Thomas, Tex.
Edelstein	McMillan	Thomason
Eliot, Mass.	Mahon	Tolan
Elliott, Calif.	May	Traynor
Ellis	Merritt	Vincent, Ky.
Faddis	Meyer, Md.	Vinson, Ga.
Fish	Mills, Ark.	Voorhis, Calif.
Fitzgerald	Mills, La.	Walter
Fogarty	Monroney	Ward
Folger	Moser	Weaver
Forand	Murdock	Whelchel
Fulmer	Nelson	Whittington
Gathings	Norrell	Worley
Gavagan	Norton	Wright
Gibson	O'Connor	Young
Gore		Zimmerman
Gossett		
Grant, Ala.		

NAYS—115

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Mason
Anderson, Calif.	Gehrmann	Michener
Andresen, August H.	Gerlach	Mott
	Gilchrist	Mundt
Angell	Gillie	Murray
Arends	Graham	O'Hara
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	Oliver
Baumhart	Gwynne	Pheiffer,
Bishop	Hall, Edwin Arthur	William T.
Blackney	Hall, Leonard W.	Rankin, Miss.
Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Rankin, Mont.
Brown, Ohio	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Burdick	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Canfield	Hill, Colo.	Rich
Carlson	Holbrock	Rockefeller
Carter	Holmes	Rodgers, Pa.
Case, S. Dak.	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Chenoweth	Jarrett	Rolph
Clason	Jenkins, Ohio	Rutherford
Clevenger	Jensen	Sauthoff
Coffee, Nebr.	Johnson, Ill.	Scott
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer, Mich.
Crowther	Jones	Short
Culkin	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Cunningham	Kean	Somers, N. Y.
Curtis	Keefe	Springer
Day	Kinzer	Stefan
Dewey	Knutson	Stevenson
Dondero	Kunkel	Stratton
Dworshak	Landis	Taber
Elston	McGregor	Talle
Engel	McLean	Thill
Fellows	Maas	Tibbott
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Tinkham
Gale	Merritt	Van Zandt
Gamble	Michener	Vorys, Ohio
Vreeland	Winter	Youngdahl
Wadsworth	Wolcott	
Wheat	Wolfenden, Pa.	
Wigglesworth	Wolverton, N. J.	
Wilson	Woodruff, Mich.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Reed, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—135

Andersen, H. Carl	Flaherty	O'Day
	Flannagan	O'Leary
Andrews	Flannery	Osmers
Barden	Ford, Leland M.	Paddock
Barnes	Ford, Miss.	Pearson
Bell	Ford, Thomas F	Peterson, Ga.
Bender	Geyer, Calif.	Ploeser
Bennett	Gifford	Plumley
Bloom	Granger	Poage
Boehne	Green	Powers
Bolles	Guyer, Kans.	Randolph
Bolton	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Harness	Rizley
Boren	Heidinger	Robertson, N. Dak.
Boykin	Hinshaw	
Buck	Hoffman	Robsion, Ky.
Buckler, Minn.	Howell	Rogers, Okla.
Buckley, N. Y.	Jacobsen	Romjue
Byrne	Jarman	Satterfield
Camp	Jenks, N. H.	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Schaefer, Ill.
Casey, Mass.	Johns	Schuetz
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Secrest
Chiperfield	Johnson, W. Va	Shannon
Clark	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Cluett	Kilburn	Simpson
Cochran	Kleberg	Smith, Pa.
Collins	Kocialkowski	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kopplemann	Smith, Wash.
Copeland	Kramer	Smith, W. Va.
Courtney	Lambertson	Stearns, N. H.
Cox	LeCompte	Sullivan
Cravens	McArdle	Sumners, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	McGehee	Sweeney
Delaney	McGranery	Taylor
Dies	Maciejewski	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Maciora	Treadway
Dirksen	Magnuson	Wasielewski
Ditter	Mansfield	Weiss
Domengeaux	Marcantonio	Welch
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wene
Duncan	Mitchell	West
Eaton	Myers, Pa.	White
Edmiston	Nichols	Williams
Englebright	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodrum, Va.
Fitzpatrick	O'Brien, N. Y.	

So the Senate joint resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buck for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Wene for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Satterfield for, with Mr. Simpson against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Poage for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Boehne for, with Mr. Harness against.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Kocialkowski for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Maciora for, with Mr. H. Carl Andersen against.

Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Heidinger against.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia for, with Mr. Bennett against.

Mr. Kramer for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Bolles against.

Mr. Schuetz for, with Mr. Bender against.

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Johns against.

Mr. Mansfield for, with Mr. Dirksen against.

Mr. Barden for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. LeCompte against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Copeland against.

Mr. Cochran for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Douglas against.
Mr. Barnes for, with Mr. Halleck against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Powers against.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.
Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky against.
Mr. Duncan for, with Mr. Cluett against.
Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Harness against.
Mr. West for, with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire against.
Mr. Flannagan for, with Mr. Andrews against.
Mr. O'Leary for, with Mr. Jennings against.
Mr. Kleberg for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Plumley against.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Guyer of Kansas against.
Mr. Maciejewski for, with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire against.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Rizley against.

General pairs:

Mr. Boren with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Green with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Koppelmann with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Ford of Mississippi.
Mr. Flannery with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cannon of Florida.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. Thomas F. Ford with Mr. Pearson.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Sumners of Texas.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Geyer of California with Mr. Romjue.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Wasielewski.
Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr. Smith of Washington.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. BUCK. If he had been present, he would have voted "aye." I voted "no." I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial on the death of a prominent citizen in my State.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I desire to enter two insertions in the Appendix of the RECORD, one a statement by Cardinal O'Connell, of Massachusetts, and the other a news dispatch from the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HEARINGS ON THE BILL FURTHER TO PROMOTE THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (S. 275) entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article published in the Boston Post on January 20, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two topics and in each to include brief excerpts from periodicals.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 45 minutes.

CONSTRUCTION IN ARMY CAMPS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hour is getting late. I am going to try to cut short what I have to say and will put some of it in my extension of remarks.

Mr. Speaker, last September, when the $466,000,000 Army housing bill came before the House, an appropriations committee clerk came to my office at 11:55 a. m., or 5 minutes before the House went into session, and asked me to approve the bill without a full committee meeting. I refused to do this. When I came to the floor of the House a few minutes later, I found the bill on the floor, despite the fact that a majority of the committee had not met and approved it. I reserved the right to object, and was given time to express my views.

There was only one mimeographed copy of the break-down, such as it was, on our side of the aisle. I commented upon that break-down at the time and stated while I would not delay the passage of the bill by an objection, realizing that we had to get these buildings up so as to house the drafted Army which was soon to be called out, I stated that I would hold the War Department accountable for the expenditure of every dollar that Congress appropriated.

Last fall I began working on the construction program. I took 23 large cantonment projects, made a study of them, placed in one column the amount allocated to each cantonment under the appropriation bill, and in another column the amount required to complete the project according to the latest Army estimates.

I found that we would require 71 percent more money than Congress had appropriated for these projects. On this basis I estimated on January 16 that the Army would come in for approximately a $330,000,000 deficit. In March they were granted a $338,500,000 deficit appropriation to complete the program.

At that time I made a study of one camp in particular, interviewed the contractor, his project manager, and from such a study I drafted a schedule of subjects I wanted to inquire into together with a series of questions I felt should be answered when I visited the construction projects. I selected 13 projects situated geographically in such a way as to give me a good cross section of costs. I took in projects which reflected the low labor rates in the South and the high rates in the North, high lumber costs and long freight hauls of the North and lower ones in the South, frigid temperature zones in the North and the warmer zones in the South.

I visited 13 of these camps, and while I did not in all cases obtain all the information requested, I am including herewith general information regarding the questions or facts I inquired into.

No one knew where I was going or when I would arrive at a camp. I gave out no newspaper interviews and requested the post commander to instruct his public-relations officer to give out no information of my presence in camp. It was necessary to do this, because I did not want information given out as to my presence in the vicinity which might interfere with my work in the next camp. Also, I felt that no information should be given out until I made a complete report to Congress.

I had a letter from The Adjutant General of the United States Army directing the post commander and Army officers to furnish me with the information sought and permitting me to take photographs

of construction projects. I usually arrived at a camp before 7 a. m. so as to join the caravan of workers as they drove into the camp. In this way I got by the guard without making myself known and was able to see the men working, taking pictures, and driving through the camp before officials knew that I was there. This part of the program usually took 2 hours, or until 9 a. m.

I then reported to the post commander, and he in turn called up the construction quartermaster of the camp and instructed him to furnish me with all the information I asked for. I then went to the construction quartermaster's office, where he arranged a conference with the contractor or his project manager and the engineer and himself. I then asked the questions and obtained the information and reports I wanted. After this part of the program, which usually lasted from 4 to 5 hours, I asked the engineer, contractor, or the construction quartermaster to drive me through the camp, pointing out the unusually difficult parts, if there were any, thus giving them an opportunity of showing me just what their difficulties were, if any. I gave them every opportunity of giving me their side of any question and emphasized the fact that I wanted all the facts.

I then left camp, drove to the next project that night so as to be able to join the caravan of workers as they arrived at the camp at or before 7 a. m., the next morning. Permit me to say that I was shown every courtesy by every Army officer from The Adjutant General of the Army; the Quartermaster General, Edmund B. Gregory; the Chief Construction Quartermaster, Brig. Gen. Brehon Somervell; on down to the camp construction quartermaster. Every post commander, whether a general officer or a field officer, treated me with the utmost courtesy and did everything possible to see to it that I was furnished all the information and facts I sought. There was no attempt or effort at any time, direct or indirect, to prevent my obtaining any information.

The post commanders were especially courteous and I wish to emphasize the fact that at no time was there even the remotest sign of friction.

I might state further that in connection with my investigation of these camps, I tried to get full and complete information regarding the contractor and subcontractors, their qualifications and experience, and similar information regarding each official—Government or otherwise—who had anything to do with the construction of the camp. Similarly, I attempted to get complete information regarding the suitability of sites chosen, lumber purchases and salvage, labor methods and labor costs, the relation of labor costs to material costs, road and railroad construction and equipment rental costs. In addition, I asked for and received detailed reports from the construction quartermaster as to various phases of the work, including progress reports, pay rolls, and contour maps.

As I stated earlier, I inspected 13 camp construction projects whose aggregate cost will be approximately $250,000,000. These camps are Indianatown Gap, Pa.; Fort Belvoir, Va.; Camp Jackson, S. C.; Fort Bragg, N. C.; Camp Croft, N. C.; Camp Davis, N. C.; Fort Devens, Mass.; Camp Edwards, Mass.; Army airport, Savannah, Ga.; Camp Blanding, Fla.; Pine Plains Camp, N. Y.; Fort Dix, N. J.; Camp Meade, Md. I am now engaged in the preparation of reports on each of these camps and will give the first one of them today on Camp Blanding, Fla.

CAMP BLANDING, FLA.

The following is a description of the project:

Camp Blanding: Located on United States Highway No. 48 (an 18-foot-wide road between Green Cove Springs and Starke, Fla. Forty-eight miles southwest of Jacksonville).

Railroad: Spur of Southern Railroad from Theressa, Fla.

Executive officer: Col. R. H. Kelly.

Constructing quartermaster: Maj. James R. Rundell.

Advisory: Maj. M. W. Cochran.

Contractor: Starrett Bros. & Eken, Inc., 63 Wall Street, New York City.

Architect-engineer: Solomon & Keis, Troy, N. Y., and Fort Laurderdale, Fla.

Original project provided for tent cantonment, 39,000 men.

Completed project provides for 58,000 men. Cost plus a fixed fee. Original cost $8,796,180. Completed project will cost $27,740,214.

Original contracts consisted of: The construction of a complete cantonment and tent camp, including necessary buildings, temporary structures, utilities, and appurtenances thereto, and comprising 272 mess halls; 8 officers' quarters; 33 administration buildings; 2 guardhouses; 5 firehouses; post office; telephone and telegraph building; 20 post exchanges; 20 recreation buildings; 2 service clubs; 18 infirmaries; 3 utility shops; 42 motor-repair shops; 32 warehouses; gasoline- and oil-storage plant; 2 incinerators; radio building; laundry with equipment; bakery with equipment; cold-storage building; magazines; target and shooting ranges; 290 lavatories; fences; complete hospital unit comprising administration buildings; 9 nurses' quarters; 4 officers' quarters; 3 mess halls; 13 medical barracks; 2 clinics; physiotherapy building; 65 wards; 9 storehouses; morgue; walks; roads and heating plant; floors, framing and screening for 9,584 tents; erection of 2 theater tents; electric, telephone, and water lines; sewer, railroad trackages; clearing and grading; roads, walks.

The completed project now calls for a two-division camp of approximately 58,000 men and provides for 10,489 tent frames, 346 mess halls, 363 latrines, 98 storehouses, 41 warehouses.

It also calls for clearing and grading of 2,400 acres of land; construction of 64.8 miles of water lines, main and lateral; 46 miles of sewer lines, main and lateral; 19.7 miles of drainage; 26.5 miles of railroad, including switches; 121.3 miles of electrical service lines; 59.2 miles of roads (of which 12.5 miles are completed); 626,616 square yards of motor storage.

LAND ACQUISITION

This camp is ultimately expected to cover an area of 117,000 acres, 7,000 acres of which was turned over by the National Guard. The camp site lies adjacent to Kingsley Lake, which is an inland lake about 2 miles in diameter.

The following gives a summary of part of the land owned and acquired or in process of acquisition:

Lessor	Area, acres	Annual rent	Term of lease	Renewal option
Armory board of the State of Florida.	22,615	$4,000 for Dec. 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941; thereafter $1 per year.	Dec. 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941.	June 30, 1966
Florida Board of Forestry	20	$1	Nov. 18, 1940, to June 30, 1941.	Do.
Armory board of the State of Florida.	5,632.65	do	Oct. 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941.	Do.

The following leases are still in process of negotiation:

Lessor	Area, acres	Annual rent
State armory board	80	$21.33 for Nov. 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941.
Do	1,800	
Foremost Properties, Inc.	11,781	
Do	1,160	$696.
Do	5,735	$1,720.50.

Above does not include railroad easements which are not being negotiated by real estate.

Engineers state that 40 percent of the building area is below lake level. This statement is verified by a contour map. The contractor paid $50,198 for rental of a well point system used to pump water out of the swamp area. The system consisted of 22 units; each unit had 450 feet of well points. It consisted of a 6- or 8-inch pipe to which a well point was attached every 6 or 8 feet which was driven into the ground. There were 450 feet of well point to each unit, making a total of 9,900 feet of well point. Pumps were attached to each main pipe and the water pumped out of the ground so as to make it possible to work in the ground. Four hundred and fifty thousand feet of ground, or 90 miles, was temporarily drained in this manner. One hundred and fifty miles of surface ditching will be required, 50 miles of which is completed. Approximately 22 miles of tile is completed. The contractor states it will require 65 miles more. Approximately 60 acres of black muck had to be removed and filled in with white sand. I am informed that the architect engineer laid out a plan of the camp around Kingsley Lake and the location was approved by the Construction Quartermaster. The architect engineer claims to have submitted plans for open ditches to act as surface run-offs but this plan was not approved by the camp Construction Quartermaster on the job at that time, who ordered the engineer to proceed with the placing of the buildings and tents on the ground after clearing without preliminary grading or drainage. This necessitated the removal of 1,500 tents out of the mud. This was done by 40 men carrying the tent frame, which was 16 feet square, from No. 1 location to one side. Location No. 1 was

then filled in and tent No. 2 carried to location No. 1. Location No. 2 was filled in and tent No. 3 carried to location No. 2, and so on. I am informed that the cost of removing these tents was about $10,000. This does not include the grading cost.

One drainage line, approved at that time, was built with a 24-inch tile. Sawdust was used to fill the first foot above the pipe and white sand was hauled in for the remaining back fill. The sawdust swelled, causing disruption of the line and making it necessary to replace the entire line. When the Thirty-first Division arrived they found themselves in the mud. Outlay ditches and run-off ditches were built in the lowest areas and an attempt was made to remedy the situation.

A great deal of the road building required the removal of the muck and a back filling of sand. The muck was removed from approximately 60 acres of land and filled in with sand. Over 2,000,000 yards of dirt was moved, including the filling in of swamps and low areas from borrows which aggregated about 650,000 yards. This cost approximately $700,000, and the job is not done yet. This is in an area that is fairly level.

The following shows a partial list of items of this cost:

Roads, walks, and grading

Rough grading for roads—240,000 yards at $0.40 per yard	$96,000
For motor parkways—135,000 yards at $0.40 per yard	54,000
Fine grade for motor parkways—16,000 yards at $0.65 per yard	10,400
560,000 yards of grading the areas for buildings and tents at $0.16 per yard	89,600
Filling swamps and low areas from borrows, ditches, and available cuts—650,000 yards at $0.22 per yard	143,300
Removing muck under roads—motor parkway area—55,000 yards at $0.85 per yard	46,750
Miscellaneous work — railroad-grade berm, temporary roads — 356,000 yards at $0.46 per yard	163,760
Excavation from ditches used to fill low area—127,000 yards at $0.80 per yard	102,000
Five miles outlet ditches at $5,000 per mile	25,000
There remains two miles of this type of work to do at $5,000, or	10,000
Necessary to complete outlet ditches	740,810

LUMBER AND MATERIAL

Approximately 54,000,000 feet of lumber was used on this job, all of which, with the exception of about 10,000,000 feet, was purchased by contractors who paid for it and were reimbursed by the Government. All other material used, such as plumbing, electric-light fixtures, piping, and so on, was bought by the contractor. "Invitation to bid" method was used and no advertising done. There were not less than three bidders on each contract, and in the case of lumber the contractor claims to have had 8 to 10 bidders. This lumber cost $2,150,000, or an average price of $40 per thousand. The following is an itemized statement of what the lumber was used for:

Lumber

	Feet
Regular, extra, and miscellaneous buildings	42,000,000
Furniture	3,500,000
Batter boards	350,000
Stakes	75,000
Temporary structures	2,500,000
Forms	2,000,000
Road forms	75,000
Unloading platforms	500,000
Trestle	92,000
Increasing tent height	640,000
Additional sills under tents	1,800,000
Inventory	2,500,000
Miscellaneous and waste	2,000,000

Partial lumber purchases were as follows:

No. 2 lumber

Date	Feet board measure	Total cost	Average cost
Oct. 1, 1940	8,221,541	$331,904.31	[1] 40.37
Nov. 1, 1940	26,923,515	912,431.73	[2] 33.89
Dec. 1, 1940	11,451,035	422,459.38	[2] 36.89
Jan. 1, 1941	1,678,341	67,576.54	[2] 40.26
Feb. 1, 1941	2,506,769	96,210.06	[2] 38.38
Total	50,781,201	1,830,582.02	

[1] F. o. b., campsite, truck.
[2] F. o. b., origin.
[3] F. o. b., Theressa, Fla.

Limerock

Five hundred and eighty thousand tons of limerock was purchased for this job from a firm named McLeod & Wolfe, at $2.15 per ton, or a total of $1,250,000. This price includes 40 cents a ton freight rate, hauling and spreading. The material was used for roads and parkways.

Salvage

I looked over the dump or salvage pile and found very little scrap lumber there which was usable. It had been reworked once and then turned over to the camp quartermaster, where the odds and ends were used for shelving, duckboards, and so on. All forms made of lumber were salvaged at the site used, hauled from there to the next site, and were used so long as they could be rebuilt. All surplus lumber, usable short ends, scaffolding, and so forth, were hauled from the completed building to the next site. Only scrap was hauled to the salvage pile.

LABOR

This camp was built on a closed-shop basis. The total number employed at this job reached at the peak approximately 21,300 men, of whom 5,000 were carpenters, 15,000 day laborers, 800 plumbers, and the remainder other trades. Everyone who used a hammer and saw drew carpenter wages. It was the opinion of those in charge that approximately 50 percent of the men drawing carpenter wages were carpenters. The other 50 percent had very little, if any, previous experience.

The contractor installed a large mill at a cost of $75,000 that is now owned by the Government available for use at other points. Thirty million feet of lumber was prefabricated by electric saws at this mill where 800 of the carpenters worked. The buildings were made up here in sections, hauled to the location, and erected there. The sections were built in forms which assured that each section would fit.

ORGANIZATION OF CREW

The superintendent of construction was H. J. Stellman, with 32 years of experience and 14 years with the present contractor. The camp was divided into sections or areas. Each section had an assistant superintendent, with approximately 1,000 men. There was a foreman for approximately every 200 men with a straw boss or pusher not to exceed every 20 men. It is claimed that all foremen and pushers were skilled in their trades.

While the various unions under the closed shop insisted upon issuing a permit before men could be hired, the contractors could discharge anyone for inefficiency without interference on the part of the unions. The carpenters' union initiation fee was cut from $55 to $35, payable $5 down and $1 a day. Cards were issued when the initiation fee was paid and no refunds were made if the initiation fee was not paid up in full. I mention carpenters, because there were more carpenters than any other craft. The other unions had similar arrangements.

INCREASED LABOR COSTS

The ratio of labor to material is approximately 53 percent labor, 47 percent material, including 8 percent equipment. Increase of labor cost due to increase of rates and overtime was 16 percent of total labor cost, or 7 percent of total cost of job.

Recruiting of labor within a 50-mile radius resulted in shortage and it was necessary to build a camp to accommodate 2,000 men and to supply transportation to and from Jacksonville, Starke, Green Cove Springs, Keystone Heights, Penney Farms, and surrounding areas as far as 50 miles. After exhausting the available supply and not having sufficient help, it was necessary to procure skilled and semiskilled labor from more distant places, and the union organizations, as well as advertising media, were pressed to supply the demand. This brought about the condition of comparative wages, and it became necessary, in the opinion of the War Department, to authorize wage rates as follows:

	Per hour
Laborers	$0.30–$0.40
Plumbers	[1] 1.25– 1.50
Sheet metal workers	1.00– 1.375
Truck drivers	.40– .50
Heavy truck drivers	.50– .60

[1] Plus double time for overtime.

Labor costs due to overtime and increase of wage scales after original determination was made by Secretary of Labor were increased by approximately $2,014,600. One million seventy-nine thousand four hundred dollars of this amount was due to overtime and $935,200 to increase in wage scale. These increases constituted 7 percent of the total cost of job. I am not discussing the question as to whether or not these increases were justified, but am merely pointing out the fact that this is a part of the deficiency and difference between the original estimate of this project and the final cost.

An itemized statement of this increase is as follows:

For labor:	
10,000 men at $4 per week extra for 12 weeks	$480,000
4,000 men at $4 per week extra for 12 weeks	192,000
Plumbers and steam fitters:	
1,100 men received $10 per week extra for 10 weeks	110,000
400 men received $10 per week extra for 10 weeks	40,000
Truck drivers:	
750 men received $4 per week extra for 12 weeks	36,000
150 men received $4 per week extra for 12 weeks	7,200
Sheet metal workers:	
150 men received $15 per week extra for 10 weeks	22,500
50 men received $15 per week extra for 10 weeks	7,500
Miscellaneous, including operators of equipment, well-pump operators, etc.:	
300 men received $10 per week extra for 10 weeks	30,000
100 men received $10 per week extra for 10 weeks	10,000

Overtime had been ordered and, until discontinued, amounted to approximately:

One thousand and one hundred plumbers and electricians received 24 extra days, in 12 weeks, Saturday and Sunday time, for which they received $42 extra, amounting to a total of $554,400.

Overtime for carpenters—4,500 working time and one-half received $7.50 extra each week for 12 weeks, or $405,000.

Operators and miscellaneous pump men, etc.—600 received $20 each week for 10 weeks or $120,000.

This total for overtime, $1,079,400 and wage increases of $935,200—or $2,014,600 total, should be called to your attention.

REORGANIZATION OF JOB

On January 8 the total pay roll was $6,880,000 and the job was 46 percent complete after 4 months' operation. Seven weeks later, on February 26, the total pay roll was $10,950,000 and the job was 94 percent complete. Weekly pay rolls had been reduced at the time of my visit from $790,000 to $399,000, while at the same time field production was stepped up from 46 percent to 94 percent. During the first 4 months the initial 46 percent of the job cost approximately $6,900,000 and during the last 7 weeks 49 percent of the job cost approximately $4,100,000. Or, stated another way, more progress was made the last 7 weeks for approximately $3,000,000 less money than was made the first 4 months.

An incident occurred at Camp Blanding which, while perhaps an extreme case, shows some of the abuses which should be eliminated by labor within its own ranks. When I arrived at the construction quartermaster's headquarters I found 13 men standing outside the building, 1 man inside. The construction quartermaster informed me that the man inside was C. E. Bush, assistant business agent of the Jacksonville Local No. 13 of Asbestos Workers. He had come to the job and pulled these 13 asbestos workers off the project without consulting either the contractor, the post commander, the engineer, or the construction quartermaster because he had not given them permits to work. After the construction quartermaster was through with him I questioned him.

He told me that Jacksonville Local, No. 13, of this union, which he represented, was organized February 1, 1940; that they had six charter members of whom four were officers. W. T. Speers, president; R. E. Von Nagel, Jr., vice president; R. E. Von Nagel, business agent, secretary, and recording secretary; C. E. Bush, assistant business agent. On the date this conversation took place, that is February 24, 1941, he informed me that they still had only eight members; that the eight men had organized this local; had paid $25 for the charter; that while their initiation fee was $50, six of the eight were charter members and two transferred from Philadelphia and nothing had been paid into the local outside of the charter fees. He informed me that this little group had fixed the scale of wages adopted by the Secretary of Labor under the Bacon-Davis Act.

He claimed, however, that they were issuing permits without a fee but asked for a donation. He would state the amount of donation required. He informed me further that 48 asbestos workers were working on the job. Only 5 of the 48 belonged to a union. I asked him about nearby unions and he said that the Tampa, Fla., local had 6 members and the Charleston, S. C., local had 40 members. I interviewed each of the 13 men who had been pulled off the job. Twelve of the thirteen told me that they were experienced asbestos workers and none of them belonged to the union. They said they did not want to join a union. The spokesman for the 13 said that they had come over from Camp Jackson and went to work on the job when this assistant business agent pulled them off. After going over the matter, the 13 men went back on the job. I do not know whether or not permits were issued later.

EQUIPMENT

The appraised value of the following equipment used on job was $4,638,605.82. The rental cost up to February 20 was $1,992,080.56. Equipment used included 25 cranes, 18 bulldozers, 13 tractors, 10 tractor-scrapers, 6 graders, 16 rollers, 13 concrete mixers, 380 stake trucks, 300 pick-up trucks, 320 dump trucks, 10 semi-trailers, 8 water wagons, 3 pole-setting trucks.

The rental paid exceeded the Associated General Contractors' rates and was on a negotiated basis. Sixty-six percent of the heavy equipment has been released to the owner and one-third of the light equipment has been returned to the owners, one-third has been recaptured by the post quartermaster, and the remaining one-third is still used on this project at rates originally arrived at. I am informed that rental paid for the 700 trucks will closely approach their value and it is recommended that they be ordered recaptured. Additional funds necessary to recapture 700 trucks will not exceed $200,000.

RAILROADS

Twenty-six miles of railroad was built at this camp including a branch line of 10 miles. Army regulations, I am informed, provide that at least an 80-pound rail should be used. The construction quartermaster purchased 60-pound rails from the Southern Railroad Co., which had, I am informed, miles of this rail on hand and was trying to get rid of it to put in a heavier rail. When I spoke to the camp construction quartermaster about this matter he informed me that he had called the attention of the Washington office to the fact that the regulations required 80-pound rails but was told to purchase the 60-pound rails nevertheless. I am informed that the larger railroads are now using 140-pound rails.

I knew it was customary for the construction quartermasters of the camps to have a stenographer take down the telephone conversations with the Washington office. I asked for and have in my file a transcript of the telephone conversation which took place on February 19, 1941, at approximately 5:30 p. m., between Capt. E. E. Kirkpatrick, of the Construction Quartermaster Office in Washington, and Maj. James R. Rundell, at Camp Blanding. A part of this conversation was as follows:

Captain KIRKPATRICK. Curtail rail work as directed by Captain Tatum this week end.

Major RUNDELL. What does that mean? Cut it out?

Captain KIRKPATRICK. Do what they say do. That doesn't include buying extra rail.

Major RUNDELL. Have you ever looked at the specifications written in instructions to C. Q. M.'s as to weight of rails?

Captain KIRKPATRICK. No; I haven't.

Major RUNDELL. It says not less than 80 pounds.

Captain KIRKPATRICK. They say to leave it like it is.

Major RUNDELL. O. K.

It looks to me as though the Southern Railroad Co. unloaded some of its light rails on the Army, and I am wondering what is going to happen should the Army ever attempt to send a train load of mechanized equipment or railroad artillery over this 60-pound rail to Camp Blanding.

PROGRESS SHEET

I had the contract engineer make me a progress sheet showing, first, the theoretical progress required to complete the project on the latest date set; second, a line showing the progress and variations of the pay roll as to the amount paid each week; and, third, a line showing the actual progress of the job. This project sheet is typical of perhaps 80 percent of the projects I visited. When the job was commenced, approximately September 10, orders were given to complete it by December 1. Pay rolls skyrocketed until approximately December 5, when they reached a peak of $850,000 a week. They sagged during Christmas week to approximately $400,000 a week, when the men went home for Christmas, and then went back up again on January 4 to approximately $790,000.

On about December 20, Maj. J. R. Rundell was appointed construction quartermaster, Maj. M. W. Cochran was appointed supervising construction quartermaster, and H. W. McKenzie was appointed construction superintendent for the contractor. Immediately pay rolls began to come down and the actual progress went up until we found that between December 18 and February 12

pay rolls had come down from $845,000 to $545,000, while progress had gone up from 29 to 86 percent.

I intended visiting the camp on Monday, February 24, but learned that Secretary of War Hon. Henry L. Stimson and the construction quartermaster of the United States Army, Brig. Gen. Brehon Somervell, were to be there on Monday. I delayed my visit for a day as I did not want to interfere with the visit of the Secretary of War and the construction quartermaster.

Upon arriving at the camp the next day I purchased a copy of the Jacksonville paper which read in part as follows: Headline, "Stimson is pleased with Camp Blanding," and then the article continued as follows:

Camp Blanding, February 25. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson made a hurried inspection of this sprawling military training center yesterday and expressed himself satisfied with the progress of construction. "I am very impressed with Camp Blanding," the War Secretary said, "Especially am I amazed at the way construction difficulties were surmounted and the progress made."

When I went into consultation with the construction quartermaster, the suppervising construction quartermaster, the contractor, and engineer, I thought at first that I met with some hostility on the part of the contractor and the engineer. Questioning them I discovered to my amazement that the construction quartermaster, Major Rundell, acting under instructions had just handed the contractor and engineer each a letter terminating their services forthwith with the instructions to close shop by March 15. The job was then 86 percent complete. I asked them for the reasons and they stated no reasons were given. I insisted upon seeing the two letters and found that no reasons were given in the letters. While questioning the camp construction quartermaster he informed me that he had been instructed to make new estimates for the remainder of the job and let a new contract.

I later called General Somervell on the phone and was informed that they were to close up by March 15. I made a statement then, which I wish to repeat, that a contractor must be grossly inefficient to be discharged when the job is 86 percent complete; and if this contractor and engineer were grossly inefficient, then those in the Army in charge of construction were a long time finding it out. Incidentally, Starrett Bros. & Eken were the contractors, I am informed, who built the Empire State Building in New York. The progress sheet shows that marked progress was made between December 25 and February 24, and that during the same period pay rolls were reduced almost one-third. The men to whom the credit must go were the new construction quartermaster, Maj. J. R. Rundell; the supervising construction quartermaster, Maj. M. W. Cochran; and Mr. H. W. McKenzie, the superintendent of the construction for the contractor—Starrett Bros. & Eken. Imagine my further surprise when I was sent a copy of a telegram sent by the construction quartermaster to Maj. James R. Rundell, camp construction quartermaster, under date of March 1, 1941, which reads, in part, as follows:

You will not approve reimbursement of the pay of Mr. McKenzie, brother-in-law of Major Cochran, on the contractor's pay roll, effective this date.

Signed, Somervell, assistant quartermaster general.

I do not know whether the construction quartermaster had any reasons for discharging this superintendent other than that named in the telegram. If being a brother-in-law to an Army officer or Government employee disqualifies a person from remaining in the Government's service, then Mr. McKenzie is not the only one that ought to be discharged. If the Government were to discharge everyone in the city of Washington who has a brother-in-law, sister-in-law, father-in-law, or mother-in-law, or some other relative on the pay roll, there would be an exodus of Government employees out of the city of Washington, like the children of Israel leaving Egypt—and they would not be on their way to the Promised Land.

CRUSHED-ROCK CONTRACT

While at Camp Jackson, S. C., and at some other points, I observed roads were constructed through the stabilization method, that is, using sand with oil and using clay as a binder. At Camp Blanding, Fla., rock was purchased at a cost of $2.15 per ton, delivered on the job, to build these roads. Seven hundred and thirty-one thousand four hundred and thirty square yards of roadway and 345,000 square yards of parkway were built in this manner. The total cost of this 1,076,430 square yards of road and parkway at $1.15 per square yard was $1,247,000. Engineers inform me that this road and parkway could have been built by the stabilization method at 65 cents per square yard, or at a total cost of approximately $700,000, or at a saving of $547,000. Engineers inform me that this method of building road has been very satisfactory and could be used in southern climates during the winter months because there is no frost. The rock was furnished by a firm named McLeod & Wolfe, of Orlando, Fla. I have further information that this copartnership was formed last July and that it was formed to get in on the Blanding contract because the individuals were not financially able to get in individually; that the New York firm who took this job did so with the understanding that McLeod & Wolfe were to be given the stone contract. While I have some evidence along this line, I, of course, could not call witnesses and was not able to verify the information I had.

This firm, I am also informed, furnished approximately 50 percent of the heavy equipment. I have a statement showing the amount of rental paid monthly for each type of equipment up to March 1st. The amount of rental paid for heavy equipment was as follows:

September	$9,824.25
October	189,448.99
November	245,799.16
December	201,024.74
January	127,476.08
February	76,000.00

or a total of approximately $850,000 paid for heavy equipment. The February figures were given me after I had the original statement. The March figures are not yet available. If McLeod & Wolfe were paid 50 percent of the rental on heavy equipment, then they received somewhere between $400,000 and $500,000 for such rental.

It should be noted further that the largest reduction in equipment rental was made after the new construction quartermaster, Maj. J. R. Rundell, the supervising quartermaster, Maj. M. W. Cochran, and the new superintendent of the contractor, H. W. McKenzie, came on the job. In fact, the heavy equipment rentals were reduced $75,000 between December and January and over $50,000 between January and February. While a part of this reduction was undoubtedly due to the fact that the equipment was no longer necessary, the rapid reduction was made, I am informed, because they had been using too much heavy equipment on the job. When I was there on February 25 there was still a great deal of work being done requiring heavy equipment.

Mr. H. W. McKenzie, former superintendent of the contractor, informed me that he had left unfinished portions of roads so that he could use surplus rock which was left from various parts of the reservation. He left just enough work undone to utilize this surplus rock. There also remained to be done 600,000 square yards of motor parkway. Mr. McKenzie recommended that this motor parkway be done by using the stabilization method, at a cost of 65 cents per square yard, whereas rock would cost $1.15 per square yard. The stabilization method would still enable the Army to save 50 cents a square yard on this motor parkway, or approximately $300,000.

May I repeat that Mr. McKenzie was construction superintendent of the Michigan State Highway Department as far back as 1923. He has years of experience both as an engineer and as a contractor with the construction of roads of all types. I personally know him to be one of the best-informed men in the State of Michigan on this type of contract. Mr. McKenzie has constructed 150 miles of concrete roads in Michigan, 12 miles of grading, and 23 miles of stabilized surface on the Skyline Drive, 6 miles of grading and paving on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, and many other projects.

After Mr. McKenzie had made this recommendation the construction quartermaster of the United States Army sent the telegram hereinbefore mentioned instructing the camp construction quartermaster to stop his pay because he was a brother-in-law of Major Cochran, the supervising quartermaster. I am further informed that the following Saturday after McKenzie was fired the Army ordered McLeod & Wolfe to deliver 60,000 tons of rock at $2.15 per ton, or at a cost of $120,000, to finish the work which McKenzie was going to complete with surplus rock. It is my recommendation that either the Military Affairs Committee or some other committee investigate thoroughly—and when I say thoroughly I mean thoroughly—not only the rock

contract, but the equipment-rental situation, the railroad contract, including the purchase of 26 miles of 60-pound rails, as well as the reasons why this site was selected.

There follows a comparison of some of the original estimates and final costs:

	Original estimate	Approximate actual cost
Railroads	$225,000	$460,000
Telephones	70,000	200,000
Laundry	400,000	[1] 1,200,000
Bakery	70,000	120,000
Cold storage	300,000	350,000

[1] 2 built, including equipment.

CONCLUSIONS

First. Site: There is no question in my mind but that the selection of this site, 40 percent of which is below lake level, was not only unfortunate and extremely expensive, but shows gross inefficiency and a total disregard for taxpayers' interests. While there would have been necessary a certain amount of grading in any site, much of the expense of removing the 2,000,000 cubic yards of earth; the taking out of 650,000 cubic yards of muck and refilling with sand; the cost of renting and operating the well-point system; the removal of 1,000 tents and frames and filling in the ground after tent frames had been set; the major portion of the nearly $2,000,000 spent for equipment rental, much of which was heavy equipment, made necessary by the nature of the site; the miles of surface ditches and underground tiling; all of this and many more items can be charged to improper selection of a site.

I have not attempted to ascertain or estimate the amount of such excess cost, but will state that General Somervell testified before the Military Affairs Committee on February 26 that it cost the Army $5,000,000 more than they expected it would for preparing the site. Assuming this estimate is accurate, nearly 20 percent of the cost of the entire project can be charged to the improper selection of this site and inefficiency.

Second. Labor: Excess cost of labor on this project was due to three factors: (a) Increase of wage scale over original determination by Secretary of Labor under Bacon-Davis Act. This accounted for $935,200 of the labor increase, $672,000 of which was due to increasing common labor from 30 to 40 cents an hour and other crafts as set forth on page 9. In view of the distance that labor had to come to work, increased costs of living expenses and particularly rents, no large town being in the vicinity of this camp, I am of the opinion that this increase was justified. (b) One million and seventy-nine thousand dollars was paid out for overtime on this project, making the total cost of overtime and increased wage scale approximately $2,014,600. (c) An examination of the project chart and the weekly pay roll shows that there was a further large increase in the labor costs due to the attempt to complete the job within too short a time. The first 46 percent of job cost $6,880,000 in labor while the next 48 percent of job cost $4,100,000 in labor. Part of this increase is reflected, of course, in the overtime item set forth above. These two items, that is, overtime and crowding the job, during the first half of the construction period resulted in an increase of labor cost that in my judgment was not justified.

As soon as the change was made in construction quartermasters, assigning not only a new man for that job but assigning a supervising construction quartermaster, and when the contractor employed an additional or new superintendant, order came out of chaos, pay rolls began to come down and progress shoot up as is shown by pay-roll and progress sheets.

Third. Railroads: It was in my judgment a serious mistake, to say the least, when 60-pound rails were used in the camp and siding railroad construction. These camps should be constructed so as to enable the shipment of all types of equipment, such as heavy tanks, heavy artillery, and so forth, by rail, as this type of shipment should be a part of the training of troops. They should be trained to do the things they will have to do in times of war. I hesitate to predict what will happen should an attempt be made to ship heavy tank equipment, heavy field or railroad artillery into the camp over these 60-pound rails.

Fourth. Equipment: Equipment has already been discussed in discussing the site. In my judgment, the excessive sum paid for equipment was due, first, to the site which made such equipment necessary, second, to the fact that one-third of the equipment had to be shipped in from New York as only two-thirds of the required type was available in the area. This made it necessary not only to pay freight but to pay rental costs far in excess of the associated general contractor rates.

Fifth. Contractor, engineer, and construction quartermaster: Investigation by myself shows that the personnel of the contracting company—engineer, construction quartermaster, and supervising construction quartermaster—were all men with years of outstanding experience. The contracting firm, Starrett Bros. & Eken, has a long record as construction contractors and built the Empire State Building and many other large projects. Maj. James R. Rundell has a record as a professional engineer extending over a long period of years. Maj. M. W. Cochran was engineer of the Michigan State Highway Department under Gov. Alex Groesbeck in 1921 to 1923 when Michigan made great strides forward in road building, and the superintendent of the contractor, H. W. McKenzie, was construction engineer of the same department for a long period after 1923. All are trained men with years of experience and outstanding records.

Sixth. Lumber: Approximately 54,000,000 feet of lumber was purchased for $2,150,000 at an average price of $40 per thousand. The average price ranged, according to the quartermaster general, from $30 per thousand to $40 per thousand board feet, depending upon the time purchased and the distance from the producing area. In view of these facts and the further fact that this lumber was purchased in the South and near the producing areas, it seems to me that the price paid was from 20 to 25 percent too high.

Seventh. Construction quartermaster: I wish to call attention to the fact that the present construction quartermaster, Brig. Gen. Brehon Somervell, was appointed to this position on December 13, 1940. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am now ready to yield for questions.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of the gentleman's discussion he referred to the excavation of a great many acres of muck. What was done with the muck?

Mr. ENGEL. It was taken out on high ground and dried. Then white sand was hauled in by truck and dumped where the muck had been taken out. General Somervell testified before the committee that it cost the Army $5,000,000 more than they expected it to cost because of the nature of the site of Camp Blanding.

Mr. REED of New York. Who selected the site?

Mr. ENGEL. The Army approved the site.

Mr. REED of New York. Did they originally recommend that site?

Mr. ENGEL. The engineers recommended it and the Army approved it, I am told.

Mr. PITTENGER. Just one question. Did political consideration enter into the selection of the site?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not know whether it did or not and I do not want to go into anything political. I am trying to handle the financial end of it. All I know is that the site is there and that the Army explained why that site was chosen.

Mr. HARTER. Will the gentleman explain to the House the method of the selection of these sites for camps and cantonments?

Mr. ENGEL. As I understand the site is approved by the corps area commander of the Army.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Was the contract to which the gentleman referred let on a fixed-fee basis?

Mr. ENGEL. It was a fixed-fee contract.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. And it was not let to a Florida contractor or one who was thoroughly familiar with that land, was it?

Mr. ENGEL. The contract was let to a New York firm.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. He was not a Florida contractor?

Mr. ENGEL. No.

Mr. PITTENGER. Was the firm of McLeod & Wolfe, to whom the gentleman referred, Florida contractors?

Mr. ENGEL. They are located at Orlando, Fla.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Did the Military Affairs Committee of the House have anything to do with the selection of the site?

Mr. ENGEL. No. As far as I know the corps area commander selected the site.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the procedure we have in the Naval

Affairs Committee before each individual site is determined upon it has to be approved by the Naval Affairs Committee. I wonder why that policy has never been followed by the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not believe the Military Affairs Committee does that. Another point I want to touch on is the cost of the utilities. In every case I found that the utilities cost was from three to four times the amount originally estimated.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I have listened with great interest to what the gentleman has had to say concerning Camp Blanding. During your talk I have been trying to decide whether or not there was any corruption implied on the part of anyone in the War Department in the selection of contractors. And further, whether any consideration entered into their selection other than the belief of the department head making the selection of the contractor, that he was best qualified because of experience and knowledge to do the job?

Mr. ENGEL. If spending $5,000,000 more on a site or 20 percent of the cost of the entire project is not an evidence of inefficiency on the part of someone, I do not know what is.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. But it is not inefficiency on the part of the contractor. That error in the estimated cost was made by the engineers of the War Department.

Mr. ENGEL. May I say to the gentleman that the contractor was on the up-and-up with me. He was absolutely on the level and gave me everything I wanted. I was impressed with the efficiency of his organization. The trouble was in this as in many other cases they did not always follow the contractor's and the engineer's recommendation.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I believe in the selection of contractors it was the rule to consider all available contractors of the country. They were invited to submit a résumé of their qualifications and on the basis of their experience were given jobs. A number of these successful firms are located in my city, and I know many of them. They represent the best in the industry and have a long history of successful work well done. I refer particularly to firms like Starrett Bros. & Eken and Walsh Bros. Construction Co.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman will pardon me. I just mentioned that Starrett Bros. had put up the Empire State Building in New York.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 390. An act relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, April 2, 1941, to resume hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, April 3, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1037, to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families. Open hearing.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Wednesday, April 9, and Thursday, April 10, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day—resume hearings on H. R. 3359 and H. R. 3360, relating to preventing publication of inventions and prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents, respectively.

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions), relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

389. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to remove certain restrictions upon the employment of retired personnel of the Regular Army on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

390. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Lorain Harbor, Ohio, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted October 24, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

391. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

392. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, and the Annual Report of the City of New York, covering operations of the foreign-trade zone at Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y., during the calendar year 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

393. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1942, as amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year, involving a net increase of $19,700,000, together with a proposed authorization for the expenditure of $165,000 from Indian tribal funds (H. Doc. No. 159); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

394. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Budget for 1942 for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, amounting to $88,480 (H. Doc. No. 160); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. CAMP: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4228. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section authorizing, for the purpose of detecting or preventing certain crimes, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, when specifically authorized by the Attorney General of the United States, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications; and making such authorizations and communications, and testimony concerning same, admissible evidence; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 162. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national-defense program; without amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 4256. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4257. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4258. A bill to supplement the navigation laws and facilitate the maintenance of discipline on board vessels of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDELSTEIN:

H. R. 4259. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 4260. A bill authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, to acquire bridges now existing or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4261. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 4262. A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 4263. A bill to authorize the appointment of an additional judge for the fifth judicial circuit of the northern division of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 4264. A bill to provide for assumption of local bonded indebtedness by the United States in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 4265. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to the base period for wool; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4266. A bill to establish a Board of Civil Service Appeals; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4267. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land to the State of Oregon to be used for public park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution relating to the Temporary National Economic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution prohibiting vessels of the United States from convoying supplies, materials, or ammunition of war to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 171. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate the national-defense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 10, concerning the International Salmon Treaty; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4268. A bill for the relief of Christopher C. Cole; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 4269. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Theodore Hebert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4270. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 4271. A bill for the relief of Josefa Niziolek; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4272. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H. R. 4273. A bill for the relief of Patrick Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Miss SUMNER of Illinois:

H. R. 4274. A bill granting a pension to Florence Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHELCHEL:

H. R. 4275. A bill awarding the Distinguished Service Medal to Capt. Edgar B. Dunlap, Infantry, Eighty-second Division; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

639. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolutions adopted by the Niagara Frontier Committee for the Defense of America, of Buffalo, and the town board of the town of Niagara, Niagara County, N. Y., protesting against the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

640. Also, resolution adopted by the State Assembly of New York on March 18 favoring the appropriation of adequate funds for a program of military highway construction for the safety and security of the State and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

641. By Mr. BOLLES: Memorial requesting the Congress to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

642. Also, petition favoring the passage of Senate bill 860 to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors on military or naval reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

643. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of 50 members of the Passaic County units of the New Jersey State music project, protesting against any Work Projects Administration lay-offs which will cause undue hardships to the men affected and their families; to the Committee on Appropriations.

644. Also, resolution of the mayor and council of the Borough of Wanaque, N. J., protesting against any additional reduction of personnel on Work Projects Administrations projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

645. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Women's Downtown Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging that when Congress considers sugar legislation this year it should include provisions to curtail any expansion of the beet-sugar industry or the tropical cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

646. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, opposing the so-called St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

647. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Walnut Park (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, requesting that emergency legislation be enacted at once to require compulsory arbitration of labor disputes, the arbitration to proceed without stopping production in the industry affected; to the Committee on Labor.

648. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Los Angeles, requesting the Congress of the United States, to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

649. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution passed by the Waterville Grange, No. 835, of Waterville, Wash., urging the adoption by Congress of a cost-of-production program for agriculture, pointing out that legislation has been passed favoring manufacturing and other like businesses, and that until legislation placing agriculture on a parity with other businesses is passed, our Nation cannot fully prosper; to the Committee on Agriculture.

650. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the California State Industrial Union Council, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 615, in the interests of forest conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

651. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Department, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, March 31, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God and Heavenly Father, through whose mighty power our fathers won their liberty of old, whose Presence is with Thy children everywhere: We commit ourselves and those we love to Thy never-failing keeping, in sure and certain confidence that Thy sustaining Spirit will avail for every need. Grant, dear Lord, to those who, in the service of their country, are separated from their loved ones, a steadfast loyalty, an unbroken fidelity to the sacred ties of home and kindred.

In every time of temptation preserve all those in training for the national defense. Thou didst lead them in tender childhood by the shepherding of love, and, in this day when duty calls for high endeavor, do Thou keep their minds clean, their thoughts pure, that they may be more than conquerors over everything that maketh war upon the soul. Fill them with wisdom and gird them with strength that, with consecrated zeal, they may bless Thee for Thy goodness in

the past, in the present, in the daytime, in the night watches, in the shadow of the valley, and in the sunshine of their hopes. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, the great Companion of our souls. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, April 1, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ARKANSAS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram from the Governor of Arkansas, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *April 1, 1941.*

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.:

We are today in receipt of the following telegram from Senator JOHN E. MILLER: "I hereby resign as a United States Senator from Arkansas."

HOMER M. ADKINS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will lie on the table.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. LLOYD SPENCER, appointed by the Governor of Arkansas to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. John E. Miller.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Little Rock, April 1, 1941.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Arkansas, I, Homer M. Adkins, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint LLOYD SPENCER a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of JOHN E. MILLER is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency, our Governor, Homer M. Adkins, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock this 1st day of April in the year of our Lord 1941.

HOMER M. ADKINS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]
C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, the Senator-designate is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. SPENCER, escorted by Mrs. CARAWAY, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 6. An act for the relief of Maude Wilcox;

S. 86. An act for the relief of Worth Gallaher;

S. 192. An act for the relief of the Johnson Flying Service, Inc.;

S. 245. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. E. Purtyman and Mrs. B. H. Russell;

S. 246. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Leyvas;

S. 247. An act for the relief of Hilda C. Allstrom;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Elmer Lindrud;

S. 283. An act for the relief of Rudolph Mundt;

S. 302. An act for the relief of Clayton W. Curtis;

S. 304. An act for the relief of the Missoula Mercantile Co.;

S. 307. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc.;

S. 417. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry H. Denhardt, deceased, of Bowling Green, Ky.;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten;

S. 430. An act for the relief of Addie Myers;

S. 431. An act for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey;

S. 433. An act to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees in respect of certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status;

S. 441. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

S. 527. An act for the relief of Ernest H. Steinberg;

S. 706. An act for the relief of Blanche W. Stout;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette;

S. 790. An act for the relief of M. Seller & Co.;

S. 791. An act for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley, Ernest H. Tarpley, and Pearl Tarpley;

S. 933. An act for the relief of John McAlister, Inc.;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Glen E. Robinson, doing business as the Robinson Marine Construction Co.; and

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 319) for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 432. An act for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson; and

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 198. An act for the relief of William G. Sullivan;

H. R. 224. An act for the relief of Antone and Mary Lipka;

H. R. 327. An act for the relief of Paula Liebau Anderson;

H. R. 336. An act for the relief of Della B. Birnbaum;

H. R. 438. An act for the relief of Hughey Parsley;

H. R. 513. An act for the relief of Paul T. Ward;

H. R. 682. An act for the relief of Julius Springer;

H. R. 694. An act for the relief of the Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc.;

H. R. 696. An act for the relief of J. K. Love;

H. R. 701. An act for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation;

H. R. 785. An act for the relief of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers;

H. R. 794. An act for the relief of Catherine Ward;

H. R. 818. An act for the relief of Lucia Humble;

H. R. 819. An act for the relief of Littlefield-Wyman Nurseries;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Hazen G. Chamberlain, doctor of medicine, and Cuba Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Foot's Transfer & Storage Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1267. An act for the relief of Russell H. Gauslin;

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of Annie Brown;

H. R. 1355. An act for the relief of Adam M. Garmon;

H. R. 1647. An act for the relief of William H. Dugdale and wife;

H. R. 1678. An act for the relief of W. A. Facht;

H. R. 1731. An act for the relief of Beulah Bell Nolte and George C. Nolte;

H. R. 2006. An act for the relief of Ben Torian and Joe J. McDonald;

H. R. 2209. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 2376. An act for the relief of Ethel Ray Sowder;

H. R. 2569. An act for the relief of Charles R. Woods;

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt;

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940;

H. R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of

personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of Augusta Brassil;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck;

H. R. 3269. An act for the relief of Mary Fortune;

H. R. 3309. An act for the relief of Louis J. Banderet;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3809. An act for the relief of Stephen Kelen;

H. R. 3827. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clyde Thatcher and her two minor children, Marjorie Thatcher and Bobby Thatcher;

H. R. 3828. An act for the relief of Sophrania Holmes;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4063. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Herbert M. Gregory;

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; and

H. R. 4065. An act for the relief of Martin F. Gettings.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (S. 275) entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gerry	Pepper
Aiken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Andrews	Glass	Reed
Austin	Green	Reynolds
Bailey	Guffey	Russell
Ball	Gurney	Sheppard
Bankhead	Hatch	Shipstead
Barbour	Hayden	Smith
Barkley	Hill	Spencer
Bilbo	Holman	Stewart
Bone	Hughes	Taft
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lee	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Byrnes	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Connally	Murdock	Wheeler
Danaher	Murray	Wiley
Davis	Norris	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	
George	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes, which was on page 2, line 13, after the word "States", to insert a comma and "or in order to make available the types of coffee usually consumed in the United States."

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the Federal Security Administrator, transmitting his first annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A paper in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Walter Peterson, of New York City, N. Y., praying that the United States keep out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing Congress to liberalize the regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the various States for the purpose of building farm-to-market roads, etc.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. (See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on the 31st ultimo.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

"Committee substitute for House Joint Memorial 16

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; and to the Honorable Anthony J Dimond, Delegate from Alaska to Congress:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fifteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States and the Chief Executive of the Nation, His Excellency, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, have expressed deep interest in the need for the development of Alaska's great natural resources; and

"Whereas since 1937 that interest has been demonstrated by studies by experts representing several Federal Government departments and agencies directed toward land use and land classification, industrial, and manufacturing possibilities; and

"Whereas Alaska realizes the value of such studies and has, through its own departments and agencies, cooperated fully in these activities; and

"Whereas the need for such development in connection with the overexpanding national-defense program in the Territory, makes it more vital for such development to be intensified; and

"Whereas such development has been and is being hampered by the long-standing practice of withdrawals from public occupancy and use of both land and resources and the indiscriminate establishment of reservations which bar such development and discourage the investment of private capital in business and industry; and

"Whereas such glaring examples are the Tetlin Indian Reservation, created by Executive order of Hon. Herbert Hoover, President of the United States, dated June 10, 1930, which has had the effect of discouraging prospecting and mining in a large area, to the disadvantage of both National and Territorial interests; the creation of national monuments in the Mount Katmai area and the Glacier Bay districts, which have merely locked up vast acreages without any efforts by the responsible agencies to make them accessible to the general public for recreational purposes; the temporary withdrawal of 500 square miles in the vicinity of Eklutna by the Secretary of the Interior, which includes 25 miles of public highways on the route between Anchorage and Palmer and public-school lands granted to the Territory of Alaska by Congress, all of which withdrawals and reservations have been made without regard for the equity held by homesteaders and other settlers on the land who have been forced to appeal to Congress for relief and adjudications of their claims; and

"Whereas the wise utilization of the Nation's wealth of the country are being depleted, but rather in the balanced development of all sections; and

"Whereas there is a strong trend toward planned economy for the whole Nation, which, together with national defense and other factors, makes this a critical time for vigorous action by the Congress and the national administration to adopt a policy of immediate and fullest orderly utilization of Alaska's natural resources for the following reasons:

"1. Producers of manufactured goods in the States need a greater domestic market;

"2. Alaska is capable of becoming a much greater market, demanding larger and larger quantities of such goods. What is needed to bring about this is realization of its economic possibilities;

"3. The needed development is being seriously retarded by reservation withdrawals, numerous and overlapping bureaucratic control, and doubt and uncertainty created

in private investors by threats of more extensive withdrawals: Now, therefore,

"We your memorialist earnestly request that the National Government reexamine the policies regarding withdrawal of public lands and land and resource reservations, restoring to public entry, occupation, and use those areas which have heretofore been set aside that now serve no useful public purpose, and, further, that no additional reservations and withdrawals be made without Alaskans be first given an opportunity to be heard on them.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House, March 14, 1941."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, remonstrating against appropriation by the United States of certain lands in the northern and western portions of Lee County, Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens and members of the Townsend Old-Age Pension Club, of Delphos and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation embodying the provisions of the Townsend recovery plan; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 3486. An act to authorize an appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing; with amendments (Rept. No. 159).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 991. A bill for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty; with amendments (Rept. No. 160).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. Res. 53. Resolution providing for an investigation with respect to the development of the mineral resources of the public lands of the United States and laws relating thereto (submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on January 23, 1941); without amendment (Rept. No. 161); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; and

S. 178. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands; with amendments (Rept. No. 162).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 850. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase refuge lands within the State of South Carolina for the perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey and to provide pure-blood brood stock for restocking within its native range, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 163); and

S. 1250. A bill to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce cotton of the 1940 and previous crops which is owned by the Government or which is pledged as security for Government loans; without amendment (Rept. No. 164).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1059. A bill to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts; with amendments (Rept. No. 165).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi; without amendment (Rept. No. 166).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

Several officers to be chief gunners in the Coast Guard.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1291. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 1292. A bill to remove certain restrictions upon the employment of retired personnel of the Regular Army on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

S. 1293. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the tribal council of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Indians in the construction of a church for the use of the Indians of such tribe; and

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS PLACED ON THE CALENDAR OR REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and ordered to be placed on the calendar, or referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; to the calendar.

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940; and

H. R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3809. An act for the relief of Stephen Kelen; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 198. An act for the relief of William G. Sullivan;

H. R. 224. An act for the relief of Antone and Mary Lipka;

H. R. 327. An act for the relief of Paula Liebau Anderson;

H. R. 336. An act for the relief of Della B. Birnbaum;

H. R. 438. An act for the relief of Hughey Parsley;

H. R. 513. An act for the relief of Paul T. Ward;

H. R. 682. An act for the relief of Julius Springer;

H. R. 694. An act for the relief of the Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc.;

H. R. 696. An act for the relief of J. K. Love;

H. R. 701. An act for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation;

H. R. 785. An act for the relief of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers;

H. R. 794. An act for the relief of Catherine Ward;

H. R. 818. An act for the relief of Lucia Humble;

H. R. 819. An act for the relief of Littlefield-Wyman Nurseries;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Hazen G. Chamberlain, doctor of medicine, and Cuba Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Foot's Transfer and Storage Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1267. An act for the relief of Russell H. Gauslin;

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of Annie Brown;

H. R. 1355. An act for the relief of Adam M. Garmon;

H. R. 1647. An act for the relief of William H. Dugdale and wife;

H. R. 1678. An act for the relief of W. A. Facht;

H. R. 1731. An act for the relief of Beulah Bell Nolte and George C. Nolte;

H. R. 2006. An act for the relief of Ben Torian and Joe J. McDonald;

H. R. 2209. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 2376. An act for the relief of Ethel Ray Sowder;

H. R. 2569. An act for the relief of Charles R. Woods;

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of Augusta Brassil;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck;

H. R. 3269. An act for the relief of Mary Fortune;

H. R. 3309. An act for the relief of Louis J. Banderet;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3827. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clyde Thatcher and her two minor children, Marjorie Thatcher and Bobby Thatcher;

H. R. 3828. An act for the relief of Sophrania Holmes;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 4063. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Herbert M. Gregory; and

H. R. 4065. An act for the relief of Martin F. Gettings; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT BEFORE CONVENTION OF B'NAI B'RITH, CHICAGO, ILL.

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address

delivered by the Vice President before the Triennial Convention of B'nai B'rith at the Civic Opera House, Chicago, Ill., March 30, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION OF MANPOWER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject "Our Job—Conservation of Manpower," delivered by him before the Seventeenth Annual Regional Safety Engineering Conference and Exhibit of the Western Pennsylvania Safety Council, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 1, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTER-AMERICAN COOPERATION WEEK

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Joseph Tenenbaum, executive chairman of the Committee for Inter-American Cooperation, relative to Inter-American Cooperation Week, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS—OUR COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Country, Right or Wrong," published in the New York Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS—ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson in his column One Man's Opinion, published in the Washington Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR TROUBLES—ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of April 2, 1941, by Ernest K. Lindley entitled "Sharing the Blame," which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], which is in the nature of an amendment to the amendment reported by the Senate committee.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF AMERICAN VESSELS FOR CONVOYS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose at this time to address the Senate on the matter of convoys, supplementing what I said in my remarks 2 days ago, when I introduced a joint resolution putting a ban upon convoys by the United States Government. I am particularly pleased to see in the Chamber today the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I desire today to speak very frankly to the Senate, and to the American people through the Senate, on this vital matter of convoys.

During the congressional debate on the lend-lease bill, and at a time when millions of our people were apprehensive lest we take action to get this country into the war, the proponents of the bill took the radio and advised the people that the lend-lease bill was the best means of keeping this country from becoming involved in the war.

The question of convoys came up in conjunction with the lend-lease bill; and the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, in public and official statements before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, repeatedly asserted that he was opposed to convoys, and that convoys meant war. The President of the United States joined in this course and said—

Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war.

Members of the Senate and Members of the House and millions of the people felt assured that there was no contemplation by the administration of using convoys and thereby getting this country directly and actively into the war. Thus, the administration was successful in having the lend-lease bill enacted by a large majority in both House and Senate.

Mr. President, because of a strange paradox in our national affairs, evidenced by utterances of the Honorable Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Frank Knox, several times in the past 2 or 3 months on this matter of the potentialities of war and the danger from convoys, and his expressed attitude thereon, I, in a spirit of amazement, addressed to the Secretary this morning a telegram which I have sent to him, and which I will now read:

APRIL 2, 1941.

The SECRETARY,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.:

You, as Secretary of the Navy, and the President, in official public statements made during the past several weeks have emphasized to the people and to the Congress that convoying means war for the United States.

On January 17, in testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, you were asked, in connection with the lend-lease bill, whether it would be advisable to convoy ships, and you answered, "No; no. In my judgment, that would be an act of war."

On January 31, when testifying on the lend-lease bill before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, you were asked the following question: "You stand very much opposed to the idea of convoying merchantmen across the Atlantic?" Your answer was, "Yes." You were then asked the following question: "You look upon it as an act of war?" and your answer was, "Yes." Upon further questioning you then advised the committee that you would change your mind about it if the President were to order a convoy.

The New York Herald Tribune of April 1, in an article by Jack Beall, reported on Senate debate on a resolution to prohibit convoys, and contained the following headline: "Knox urges United States escorts." The article stated that "Secretary Knox has opposed for some time any transfer of American naval vessels to the British beyond the 50 destroyers already transferred, but it has not been explained until recently that his objection was pitched upon a desire to see American ships, under the American flag and with American crews, do the convoying rather than upon any hesitation to put the vessels at the disposal of the British."

Thus we see that in the short space of a few weeks, and now that the administration has been successful in having the lend-lease bill enacted, the weather vane has flopped 180° and the war clouds are on the way. There has to be a reason for this. The only deduction that the people can make, unless there is further explanation from you, is that as you suggested to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, your superior, the President, has given his orders and you have heard his voice. Unless you can publicly explain this, this conclusion by the people will be a natural one, and they will consider this with alarm, in view of the President's own statement that "Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war."

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator.

Two days ago I introduced a joint resolution to prohibit the use of convoys except at a time when the United States is engaged in war. Speaking on this floor, I prefaced my action with the statement that the joint resslution provides a means of affording Senators a vehicle to translate their public statements into this specific legislation to keep the country from taking this fatal step into the war. I stated that it presents the issue directly and without equivocation, and will give the people an opportunity to see whether the administration and the Members of the Senate mean business when they say they are opposed to our country entering the war.

In view of the oft-repeated assurances by the administration's spokesmen in the Senate that they are opposed to our getting into the war, and that the lend-lease bill was the best means of keeping us out of the war, I was puzzled to see the majority leader of the Senate, who is the administration's official spokesman in the Senate, stand on his feet, and in my opinion, defend convoys.

This was a new departure, a surprising departure, and if, as it would seem, his position reflects the position of the administration, then I say—God help the men and women of this country, for as sure as death follows life, the United States is about to launch into the greatest war in the history of the world—a costly war, a war which will result in thousands upon thousands of American casualties.

The majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], indicated that he could see no difference between the act of convoying and opening up our harbors to the repair of belligerent vessels, which the Congress has already approved of. He said that we have already furnished sufficient provocation for a declaration of war against us by Germany, and that the convoying of ships would "only be an incident."

Only be an incident? Then he treats convoying so lightly? Can it be true that it is in the mind of the administration to launch on a policy of convoying in the face of the President's statement that "convoying means shooting and shooting means war"? And in the face of the statement of the Secretary of the Navy that "convoying means war"?

The distinguished majority leader himself said, in the same debate with me, to which I have referred, that if we launch into a policy of convoying, it would probably mean war to this country. And yet he calls convoying "merely an incident."

I asked the distinguished majority leader to indicate if he did not agree that convoying would get us into the war, and he made a plea in abatement and said: "I will express my views on the subject when the occasion has arisen."

When the occasion has arisen? Has not the occasion arisen now that the Secretary of the Navy has done a complete "about face" and come out in favor of convoys? If we wait for the occasion of actual convoys and wait for war to commence, then the majority leader's suggestion is futile. Blood will already have been spilled.

No; I say the act of convoying is not only an incident. It holds in stake the lives of millions of Americans.

I again turn to the majority leader and ask him to express his views on the subject, not "when the occasion has arisen," for, I say, if eventually, why not now?

Are not the people of this Nation entitled to a frank debate on this vital subject now, while it is on the horizon, looming before us, sponsored by no less an authority than the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, who eats his words uttered in January, reversing himself. And I ask, Why?

So I make my appeal to the distinguished majority leader to enter into this debate at this time on this profound, far-reaching policy as to the use of convoys.

I address myself now to my friend, the distinguished leader of the great Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Each of us holds him in the highest regard. I say to him that he has set forth his views in eloquent, terse, epigrammatic language in the RECORD, as absolutely opposed to the use of convoys, and said that he himself would not vote for convoys or use his influence therefor unless he was prepared to vote for a declaration of war. I turn to him now, as chairman of this distinguished committee, and say that in his hands there reposes the resolution introduced by the Senator now speaking, and I am asking that the Committee on Foreign Relations be not only the depositary for that document which I filed 2 days ago, but that it be considered a live request for information as to facts and policies on the part of the American people, for whom I am one voice, albeit a poor one. I ask the Senator if he will not agree to take this into an executive session for consideration, and report it back, even with no recommendation, so that it will come back for debate here, in order that we who are the representatives of the plain people throughout this country in the hinterland may have an opportunity to go on record either for or against this tremendously far-reaching policy of convoys, which, if persisted in, can result in nothing else but war.

I await the pleasure of the distinguished leader of the majority. Does he care to enter into the colloquy with me this morning? I am addressing the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has a perfect right to address me, but I am not compelled, because he merely addresses me, to enter into a debate with him on a subject which I do not care to discuss at this time.

Mr. TOBEY. There is no compulsion implied or thought of, but I make the suggestion merely because we are here in what is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. If that be true, certainly it is not asking too much that we deliberate on a great question before our people; and they are looking to us, and looking for us not to cover up.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, there is nothing I care to cover up, there is nothing I have ever covered up; but I am not compelled, because I happen to occupy temporarily a position of some responsibility here, to indulge in debate with the Senator every time he brings up a subject.

The resolution to which he refers was referred 2 days ago to the Committee on Foreign Relations. When that matter will be taken up by the Committee on Foreign Relations I do not know. I do not even know that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman, knows when it will be taken up. When it is taken up it will be given the consideration to which it is entitled, and until that time comes, unless there is an occasion, which I do not now see, when we should enter into a discussion of the subject, I do not see anything to be accomplished by its reiteration.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Will the Senator use his good offices, and his very considerable influence, to see that the committee takes up this matter and brings it back for a vote in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will not make a commitment as to what my attitude will be in the committee until the committee has met and discussed the matter.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator use his influence to have a meeting for discussion in the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Georgia needs no pressure from me or from anyone else to have a meeting of the committee whenever the occasion arises for the committee to meet. To be perfectly frank with the Senator, if he wants a frank answer, I will not attempt to use such persuasion on the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. I now address the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ask him, in all good faith, and with no asperity in my heart, soul, or voice—because of the importance of this resolution, and knowing his views and his frankness and his character and ability, will he not give me assurance that he, as chairman, will have his committee consider the resolution in the near future?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator that this resolution, as all other matters before the committee which are of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of the committee will undoubtedly have the careful consideration of the committee at a reasonably early time. I am not able to say that it can be taken up tomorrow, or one day this week, but certainly at a very early date. The committee will be back in regular session on Wednesday, and I can assure the Senator that the resolution will be given careful consideration, and, of course, the action taken by the committee will be controlling upon the disposition of the resolution. But there will be no disposition on the part of the chairman of the committee not to give a full and fair and frank hearing upon the resolution.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the assurance.

Mr. GEORGE. There will be an orderly disposition of the resolution by the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. If I may ask one further question, not to press it too hard, but for information, searching for it sincerely, does not the Senator, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, feel in his heart that this matter is so pregnant with direful possibilities for this Nation, and the whole life of America, that the matter should be debated frankly upon the floor of the Senate, and Senators go on record either for or against this far-reaching measure?

Mr. GEORGE. I say to the Senator again that I shall be pleased to bring the resolution before the committee and give it the consideration to which it is entitled; and I recognize the importance of the resolution. The action taken by the committee on the resolution, of course, will be controlling, so far as committee action is concerned. I can assure the Senator that the resolution will be taken up, and taken up in order, and I am sure that the committee will have the fullest opportunity to express itself, and to make such disposition of the resolution as should be made.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel—again to be specific in my question, and asking for a specific answer—that this matter should be debated on the floor of the Senate, regardless of what the attitude of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be, so that the American people may know the attitude of their representatives in this body on so grave a matter, and we have an opportunity to go on record on it?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to debating it before the Senate and before the country, and I certainly think that all matters of importance—and I regard this as a matter of importance—should be subject to debate before the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the Senator's point of view.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator from New Hampshire aware that the minority, the Republicans in the Senate and the House, has a number of members on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House?

Mr. TOBEY. I think that is elementary. I have known that for some time; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. How is that?

Mr. TOBEY. I regard that as elementary. I have known that for some time. There is always a minority representation on all committees of the Senate and House.

Mr. CONNALLY. I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire on that knowledge.

Mr. TOBEY. I think experience would show that such representation may not,

at times, have much effect, but nevertheless it is a fact that there is such representation.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the Senator's short service here he has made a great deal of progress. I would suggest that he consult the minority members. They are very obliging gentlemen, and I am sure they will see that the Senator's resolution receives consideration, and they will be glad to report back to the Senator from New Hampshire, if he is going to take the leadership in the matter in the Senate. I am sure I can speak for the minority members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and a number of other Senators that I do not now see on the floor, who are strong, able, and outstanding Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee. It seems to me the Senator from New Hampshire ought to consult them, and they will take care of his interests.

We are ready to act when the proper time comes, but I do not think it is quite fair for the Senator from New Hampshire to catechize Senators here as to what they think down deep in their hearts, and all that sort of thing. I expect the committee will hear the Senator from New Hampshire when we have hearings on this bill, and he will be given an opportunity to debate and speak and orate all he pleases. I believe that can be arranged.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is running true to form, as he always does. There is always a little veiled criticism back of the Senator's remarks, and in his utterances he sometimes resorts to critic peep and cynic bark, and sometimes to quarrel and reprimand, but I think the world of him just the same. The Senator from New Hampshire, although he is a rustic, and comes from a small State, yet is cognizant of the fact that the minority in Congress has representation on the various committees, but the Senator also is cognizant of the fact that the majority always control, and that there is about as much opportunity for the minority to control a committee or influence a committee as the chance the proverbial snowball has in Hades, so the Senator from New Hampshire naturally looks to those in authority, who are gentlemen as much as he is, asking them to follow the proper modus operandi before this matter is debated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the Senator's prepared remarks today he reported me as having said the other day that the convoying of ships in such a way as to provoke war is a mere incident.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I did.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have examined my remarks, and I can find no such statement. I certainly have no recollection of having made such a statement.

Mr. TOBEY. If I misquoted the Senator, I apologize.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I did say was, and I repeat, that if Germany were looking for an excuse to declare war against this country she could have found that excuse, but judging by her past history she does not need an excuse. She makes war without excuse whenever it suits her. If I made any such statement as that, it was a mere incident, and I have been unable to find it.

Mr. TOBEY. I refer the Senator to page 2708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31. The Senator from Kentucky is recorded as speaking at the bottom of the page.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which column?

Mr. TOBEY. The right-hand column, page 2708, at the bottom of the page.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I am answering the Senator in good faith; if we have violated international law in such a way as could result in a declaration of war against us by Germany, we have already done that, and the convoying of ships would be only an incident.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I did not recall the use of that language. What I meant was, of course, that if Germany desires an excuse to declare war against us, the mere convoying of ships would be an incident so far as Germany is concerned, and the repairing of battleships in our harbors, or our navy yards, or our shipyards, would be a mere incident, so far as Germany is concerned, and the lending of money, or the lending of ships, or the granting of any sort of assistance to England, Greece, or China, or any other of the allied nations fighting Germany, would be, so far as Germany is concerned, a mere incident and a mere peg upon which to hang their hat if they desire to make war against us. If it were to their interest to do so they would not require any such incident even.

Mr. TOBEY. But later on, Mr. Majority Leader, on the same page, in the same column I drew an illustration about a German admiral finding out that we were convoying ships, and attacking us with submarines, and I said:

Suppose the Senator were that admiral—

and I closed by asking the Senator from Kentucky—

and he would then probably expect that the American people would rise up in their wrath and declare war against Germany, would he not?

Then the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said:

Mr. BARKLEY. That might result.

Mr. TOBEY. It is perfectly natural that it should.

Mr. BARKLEY. Probably so.

So by that statement the Senator from Kentucky put himself on record as saying that the convoying of ships and the resultant sinking of our ships by German submarines would probably involve us in war.

Mr. President, I wish to go on and read to the Senate some excerpts from utterances of distinguished members of this body on the matter of convoys. All these utterances took place during the 2½ weeks we were debating the so-called lease-lend bill which is now law. The utterances may not be in proper sequence. I may have been a little negligent in getting them in proper sequence, but they are important in my judgment, and I shall read them. I quote first from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 1890. The Senator speaking is the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He said:

But I know that the use of land and naval forces in the delivery of defense articles across the sea would endanger us and possibly involve us in the war.

Then the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] replied as follows:

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, if we were to undertake the delivery of defense articles, which are commonly referred to as munitions of war, across the ocean, and if we were to convoy them with units of the American Navy, it would seem to me an inescapable conclusion that we would with our convoys come almost immediately into contact with submarine, surface, and aircraft units of the German Empire's forces seeking to interrupt the delivery of those articles. I think that can be accepted as a foregone conclusion. Gunfire would ensue. The attack would be repelled. Otherwise we would not attempt to make the delivery; it would be futile.

The Senator from Washington then propounded a question to the Senator from Wyoming as follows:

Does the Senator from Wyoming believe that if there ensued armed conflict of that kind, which seems to me to be inevitable, we would remain out of war very long—perhaps only for a matter of days?

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] answered:

If our forces were attacked or if any convoy our forces were accompanying were attacked, I think that would be an act of war, of course; and I think the country would properly regard it as such.

The Senator from Washington then said:

Mr. BONE. Obviously, it would be difficult to conjure up in our imaginations a more inflammatory or provocative incident or set of incidents than the destruction of the lives of American citizens and the sinking of American vessels.

Personally, under such circumstances I cannot imagine the United States staying out of war; because no careful reading of history dealing with the period of our national life immediately preceding our entry into the World War reveals any other state of mind than that of almost bitter hatred for Germany, growing out of the sinking of our vessels. Obviously, the delivery under the protection of American warships would invite merely a repetition of such acts. If, as the Senator suggests, we are to be realists, I do not see how we can escape the necessity of contemplating precisely what this problem means.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is speaking:

Mr. BONE. I cannot escape the conviction that convoying defense materials across the ocean would immediately precipitate warlike acts. I have tried, in intellectual honesty, to arrive at some other conclusion, and I cannot do so.

The Senator from Wyoming is now speaking:

I conceive the danger to the democratic principle to be so great that, indeed, it might be proper for this country to run the risk of an actual war; but when that decision comes, I think it ought to be faced here in Congress directly, and not by indirection.

Now the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] is speaking:

I had from the beginning said I was opposed to convoying, and I thought that the President was well understood as having made that declaration even since the introduction of this bill. It has been published everywhere and I did not think there could be any doubt about it.

* * * * *

The only way it could be done would be by convoy, and I have always opposed convoy.

That was the Senator from Georgia speaking, and I honor him for his position. He continued:

Nor have I held the view that American armed forces, military or naval, could be sent anywhere in the world for any purpose. That has not been my view of the Constitution, and it is not now. My view of it has been, without any attempt to indicate all the limitations that must be kept in mind, that, generally speaking, the President may send the Army and the Navy to protect American rights, American property, and the lives of American citizens. That contemplates, in my judgment, primarily defensive action and not offensive action. I very well know that the occasion might arise when it would be said by men of great ability and learning and expert knowledge upon the subject that some offensive action must be taken in order to make the defense perfect and complete, but that is an exception. The broad, general principle, Mr. President, as I have conceived it, without reading any books or authorities, but considering the nature of our Government and the whole genius of the American system, is that the President of the United States, as Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, even in peacetime may protect the lives of American citizens and may protect their property and their rights. I have never conceived that he had any right—and in that sense I use power, for, to me, power is the rightful exercise of the authority claimed by the Chief Executive—to send the Army or the Navy for offensive purposes any place on earth. Therefore, in a bill which gives to the President certain affirmative powers, I have not conceived that it was necessary to negative the use of whatever power, under whatever general principles, under whatever well-recognized limitations or restrictions we have come to recognize as existing.

He further said:

As plainly as I can say it, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war.

Still further:

I said a while ago, Mr. President—if this word "transfer" has any bearing upon the matter—that we will not take the extreme risk of convoying, or of attempting to deliver on the other side of the globe any of the arms or implements of war which we wish to furnish. We will not take the extreme risk of involving our people in war unless, of course, we should be attacked. If we should be attacked, we would do what all of us would, of course, favor. That is a wholly different question.

He further said:

We are not going to convoy. We are not going to deliver arms and munitions on the other side of the ocean in areas of danger.

This is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] speaking. He further said:

Mr. President, I do not subscribe now, and I hope I never shall, to the doctrine that we are headed into an inevitable war.

That is "good stuff," Mr. President, if I may use the vernacular.

I now read from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]:

I said many times in the last campaign that President Roosevelt, in his foreign policy, had not gone too far for me. I said also, time and time again, that I would not vote to send our soldiers into a foreign war. I believed then, and I believe even more strongly now, that we here in the Senate, because of that statement so often made, have the responsibility of doing everything consistently and properly possible to help the President to avoid armed conflict.

I read further from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut:

Please let us not forget that if in spite of the promises, the solemn pledges of the President of the United States, that there would be no convoying, that none of our boys would be sent to a foreign war, we should send our vessels into combat zones, and those vessels should be subject to assault or attack, it would no longer be a foreign war; it would become our war.

Congress has the right to guard against that.

That is what motivates me in asking for action on the resolution. In the words of the Senator from Connecticut, Congress has the right to guard against this possibility. The way for Congress to guard against it is to give consideration to a resolution making it mandatory that no convoys shall go across the Atlantic, thereby reassuring the American people of our good faith in keeping the Nation out of war.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I just entered the Chamber. Will the Senator tell me from what he is reading?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire made a statement and read a telegram to the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, citing his complete about-face, as recorded in the New York Tribune of yesterday, and then went on to finish his address, and is now reading a series of utterances by various Members of this body respecting convoys during the debate on the lease-lend bill.

I now read from the remarks of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]:

I leave this word of warning in the RECORD. If we convoy the ships, that means war, and we should get ready to declare war. I go back 6 years and recall the time when I stood on the floor of the Senate and said that, in my judgment, the one thing which would keep us out of war more effectively than anything else would be to keep our nationals and our property out of war zones. I believe that judgment has been vindicated by the mutations of time. The concatenation of events has proven it to be sound.

In order to give Britain the type of aid we ought to give her, and want to give her, we shall find it necessary and desirable to convoy the ships. Let me make the prophecy that that will be the inevitable next step. How can we escape the deadly logic of that sort of thing? We have had an election which committed us to aid Britain to the fullest extent.

If the British merchant marine is unable to handle the situation, the next step will be to give Britain ships. I have no objection to that. I believe we ought to give Britain merchant ships; but I believe British crews ought to handle the ships, and the British flag ought to fly at the mastheads of those ships. If we go beyond that stage and use American warships to convoy British-owned ships to within 200 miles of the British coast—to the faint, invisible edge of the war zones set up by the President—those American warships will be in war zones, and they will be attacked. Mark my words. That is what will happen. I am not a prophet, but I can certainly gamble on that, as surely as we are in this Chamber.

That is why I think now is the moment to decide whether we want to go to the extent of supplying armed warships to convoy defense articles to Britain. Such a course may mean war for us. I merely wish to leave this word of warning in the RECORD.

I continue:

The statement has been made here that the President may do anything he pleases with the land, naval, and military forces of this country. I do not like that kind of language. I think there should be affirmative, direct, positive, blunt, mandatory provisions of law in the bill, and I should like to see such provisions written into it. There is no definite finality in any utterance of ours. Later it can be changed in 2 minutes. If we find that it does not work and that we are crippling ourselves in our efforts to be helpful to the British Empire, we can change the law on 5 minutes' notice, without going through all the argument we have indulged in. I have not indulged in much of it myself. I think my brethren would acquit me of any charge of interference with the course being taken.

War is a deadly thing. I have talked about it for 6 years, not only on the floor of the Senate but in my State. I think it is worthy of serious consideration. In my honest opinion the convoying of ships will be the torch thrown into the powder barrel.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] speaking about the danger of convoys going to the edge of the combat zone, said:

That is where the danger lies.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said:

Let me say to the Senator that as I originally drafted the amendment it provided simply that without the consent of Congress none of the defense articles should be delivered by the land or naval forces of the United States outside the Western Hemisphere or places under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], speaking on the so-called O'Mahoney amendment with respect to convoys, said:

If Senators believe that convoys may plunge us into war—and I am one who does—that they will precipitate exchanges of gunfire, then I think they ought to be at least willing seriously to consider this amendment.

Referring to the amendment to prohibit the convoys.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. My understanding was that during the debate no one contended that the President had any right to send convoys into combat zones. Quite frankly, from what the President himself has said, and from what the leaders have said on the floor of the

Senate during the debate on the so-called lend-lease bill, it is inconceivable to me that the President would for one moment contemplate sending convoys into combat zones. I do not believe it. I know, of course, that there are certain persons, such as General O'Ryan and the Committee to Defend the United States by Aiding the Allies, who are now advocating and pressing upon the administration the use of convoys. But I cannot believe that the President of the United States will be stampeded by the warmongers of this country into sending convoys, after what he himself has said, and what the proponents of the bill have said on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Does the Senator believe that the President, in view of what he has said, and in view of what was said on the floor of the Senate, contemplates using convoys?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire feels that where there is so much smoke there is some fire. In my own heart I sincerely believe that the matter of convoys is pressing very hard upon the good judgment and intentions of the Executive of this Nation.

The Senator was not present when I began my remarks. I read a telegram which I have just sent to Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, in which I quoted the remarks which the Secretary made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, with which the Senator is familiar, and the statement he made before the House committee, in which he definitely and aggressively opposed convoys. He said that such action would be an act of war, and that he was opposed to it.

I also read an article from the New York Herald-Tribune of yesterday morning, written by Jack Beall, headed "Knox urges United States escorts," which stated:

> Secretary Knox has opposed for some time any transfer of American naval vessels to the British beyond the 50 destroyers already transferred, but it has not been explained until recently that his objection was pitched upon a desire to see American ships, under the American flag and with American crews, do the convoying rather than upon any hesitation to put the vessels at the disposal of the British.

I concluded my telegram with this statement:

> Thus we see that in the short space of a few weeks, and now that the administration has been successful in having the lend-lease bill enacted, the weather vane has flopped 180 degrees and the war clouds are on the way. There has to be a reason for this. The only deduction that the people can make, unless there is further explanation from you, is that as you suggested to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, your superior, the President, has given his orders and you have heard his voice. Unless you can publicly explain this, this conclusion by the people will be a natural one, and they will consider this with alarm, in view of the President's own statement that "Convoying means shooting and shooting means war."

Now, because of that rightabout-face, my conviction and my apprehension are doubly increased.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I think Mr. Willkie did a great disservice to the country when he said that the speeches he made in the last campaign were just so much campaign oratory. At times such as these in the United States, I think the fact that a man who runs for the Presidency of the United States says that the promises he made to the great mass of the people of the country are so much campaign oratory does more than anything else to make the people of the country lose faith in their Government. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Likewise, if Mr. Knox, after saying before the committees of the Congress of the United States that he was opposed to convoys, turns around and in the next breath advocates convoys, again I say he is doing a great disservice to his Government because of the fact that, again, he is making the people of the country lose faith in their Government.

I cannot conceive that the President of the United States, after what he has said, will attempt to send convoys into combat areas without at least first coming back to the Congress of the United States, because I am thoroughly convinced that under the Constitution of the United States he has no right to send convoys into combat areas, and proponents of the lease-lend legislation agreed to that proposal on the floor of the Senate when it was before us.

I appreciate that tremendous pressure will be put upon the President to send convoys, but if he should do so without first coming back to the Congress, I am sure the American people will completely lose faith in our Government, and I do not believe he will do it.

I read a statement last night by Mrs. Roosevelt, and I desire to take this occasion to compliment Mrs. Roosevelt for saying last evening, "We are not in the war, and I hope we will not get into the war." Incidentally, I may say that a little later I shall ask to have her remarks printed in the RECORD. Likewise, she talked about the strikes that are going on, and said that when men were asking for higher wages it was not a question of patriotism. As I read the statement, she was trying to calm the hysteria with reference to that matter that is sweeping over the country.

I think Mrs. Roosevelt is to be complimented upon that statement; and I, for one, thoroughly agree with her. I think the thing that must be done in this country by the executive branch of the Government is to try to put down, rather than to encourage, the hysteria the warmongers are trying to create in the United States at the present time.

As a matter of fact, it was the warmongers, it was the hotheads of Europe, both in England, in France, and in Germany, who brought about the catastrophe over there; and the same kind of persons, the hotheads, are trying to get us into the war, when they should know, if they do not already know it, that at this particular time we are totally unprepared to go into a war. The Congress of the United States has given the President power to give to Great Britain $7,000,000,000 worth, or perhaps $8,000,000,000 worth of materials and munitions; and he has the right under that law—and nobody can complain if he exercises the right—to give more destroyers to Great Britain. Nobody in this country can complain if he gives them more destroyers. Nobody can complain if he gives them battleships. Nobody can complain if he gives them airplanes. Nobody can complain if he gives them guns and ammunition. Nobody can complain if he gives them food. I certainly would not complain, because that is the law of the land. However, I submit that it is not the law of the land, and he has not any right—and I do not believe he will do it—to send convoys into combat areas.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the senior Senator from Montana that I say "encore" to about everything he has said today, and particularly his reference with words of commendation to the First Lady of the Land on those utterances of last evening. I go also a little further with the Senator from Montana; I stand with him 100 percent in deprecating the statement made by one of the candidates in the last Presidential campaign, which he has illustrated before us today, and I draw a picture of what it means. It means that when all of us, both Republicans and Democrats, campaign in this country for our respective parties, for the men and the issues we believe in, when we speak as we do from a heart under conviction, believing we are right, then—if we take that statement and that explanation—the public whom we are trying to serve in these necessary things has a right to put a mental asterisk after every statement made on the stump, and say at the bottom of the page, "baloney." I will not accept it for myself.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. We might just as well quit talking about democracy in the United States if candidates for the Presidency of the United States definitely promise the people of the country "We will keep you out of war," and if then, right after election, the Republican candidate says "The statements I made about it are 'baloney'," and if the successful candidate ignores the promises he made. Who among the American people can have any confidence in candidates of either the Democratic or the Republican Party if those things take place in the United States?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that instead of singing God Bless America, it is high time we sang God Save America, if that state of affairs is to prevail.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I may say that when the President spoke the other day, on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner, I rather deplored the statement he made, in which he intimated that everybody who was for peace was playing upon the American people for political reasons. If anybody made a play upon the peace issue during the campaign, it was both the Republican and the Democratic candidates for the Presidency of the United States. They vied with one another in saying to the people, "We are going to keep this country out of war"; and now

the President seems to be decrying those who are still advocating what he and Mr. Willkie advocated during the campaign. I think it is regrettable; and again I say that I think Mrs. Roosevelt ought to be complimented because of the statement she made in last evening's newspaper, if she is correctly quoted.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator from Montana, further, that when I read to him part of the telegram which was sent to the Honorable Frank Knox this morning, I neglected to read the heart of the whole thing—this statement:

Upon further questioning—

Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—

you then advised the committee that you would change your mind about it if the President were to order a convoy.

So, taking that as the text, the fact remains that according to the article in the New York Herald Tribune, the Secretary has now come out for convoys. He had previously made a condition of his changing his mind the fact that the Executive would order it, and if so he said he would comply. It is a reasonable assumption, I think, that when he changes about 180 degrees, when he makes a right-about face, it must be because of somebody higher up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield very gladly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am interested only in keeping the RECORD straight. I find it impossible to search out and keep in mind everything that Cabinet officers may say from day to day. The Senator quoted from what Secretary Knox said before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I thought he was quoting from some statement Secretary Knox had made in the last day or two, indicating, as the Senator said, that he had changed his attitude 180 percent. It seems to me the Senator is quoting from a news article——

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. A signed article, written by Mr. Jack Beall, correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune. In that article does he quote anything Secretary Knox has said or does he merely comment upon some interpretation of what Secretary Knox had previously said which the Senator from New Hampshire interprets as a 180-percent change? I desire simply to keep the RECORD straight, because I think it is fair to Secretary Knox to do so if he has said anything indicating any change of his views. I recall in the Committee on Foreign Relations when he said that he was a subordinate officer of the President of the United States and he would feel it is his duty to carry out any order of the President. That was 2 months ago. So far as I know, there has been no indication that the President has not only not issued any orders but has not even contemplated any orders that are contrary to what Secretary Knox stated. I have not heard of anybody suggesting that the President is even thinking about sending convoys into danger zones or belligerent waters or into any area which he has demarked by proclamation. I have heard nothing of the sort; and I cannot quite understand what all this fuss is about until and unless he does indicate some purpose of that sort. But I should like to know whether what the Senator is quoting as applying to Secretary Knox is a quotation from anything Mr. Knox has said or is a mere comment of the news reporter upon some interpretation that he may have made of what Secretary Knox said.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that what I quoted from was an article in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 1, headed:

Convoy fight on in Senate, Cabinet split.
Knox urges United States escorts, Roosevelt said to favor more ships for Britain.
Shooting in war predicted by TOBEY.
BARKLEY says Nazis, if they want to fight, already have excuse.

The article is signed by a distinguished and reliable member of the Senate press gallery than whom there is no more reliable, in my judgment, or one more highly regarded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make no question of the Senator's statement regarding Mr. Jack Beall. I served in the House of Representatives with Mr. Beall's father many years ago, and I have the same high regard for Mr. Beall as the Senator mentions having himself, but it is one thing to quote a Cabinet officer in a way that changes his attitude by reason of something he has said, and it is a quite different matter for anybody, however sincere and honest, to draw a conclusion as to what a Cabinet officer believes by something that may have happened in a Cabinet meeting or any other meeting. I do not know from what evidence anybody could state that there is any split in the Cabinet; I do not know how any such suggestion, even if such a condition existed, would be conveyed to the public even by such sharp, alert, intelligent men as news reporters are. But the point is, I doubt whether it is fair to the Secretary of the Navy to try to convict him of a complete somersault on a subject of this sort merely by quoting what somebody has said in the newspapers who believes that to be his attitude. If Mr. Knox has said anything indicating a change of attitude, it seems to me very legitimate to quote such a statement, but I doubt whether it is fair merely to draw the conclusion that the newspaper correspondent may have drawn from something he may have heard around town to the effect that the Secretary of the Navy has changed his views. I have seen nothing from him directly on that subject, and there was nothing, in my judgment, inconsistent in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations where he indicated and said—a statement which I think anybody would approve—that so long as he is a member of the official family of the President he, of course, recognizes the superior authority of the President, that the President can direct a course, and, even if it differed from his personal views, he would feel it his duty to carry out the instructions. I think any honorable man would do that, or resign.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished majority leader, feel that a reliable newspaperman, such as this gentleman is, would merely float around town and listen to and repeat gossip on one of the most important matters to come before the American people and the bar of public opinion and make a direct statement, such as this statement of fact, over his signature?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that Mr. Jack Beall, whom, as I said, I have known for a long time, and with whose father I served in the House of Representatives 25 years ago—one of the most honorable men who ever served in either branch of Congress—would do that, but I do know that all newspapermen are seeking information; there is a sort of competition among them to get first-hand information from any source possible, and frequently they find that there are floating around Washington rumors which they try to chase down from somewhere so that they can try to confirm them, but it is not always possible to do that. I do not know to what extent the information that Mr. Beall conveyed in the article is correct. I think it is fair to the Secretary of the Navy that it be checked up before it is accepted as 100-percent proof that he has changed his position.

Mr. TOBEY. I would expect the honorable Secretary of the Navy in his reply to me either to confirm or deny that he has changed his position. I now read from Mr. Beall's article:

WASHINGTON, March 31.—A lively debate on possible convoying of war supplies to Britain by the United States Navy, termed a prelude to "shooting" war, began in the Senate today when Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire, introduced an anticonvoy resolution.

At the same time, a high Congressional authority revealed that President Roosevelt had been advised that the general sentiment in Congress was opposed to convoying at the present time.

As Mr. Roosevelt cuts short his Florida fishing vacation by 4 days to return to Washington, one of the problems confronting him is the division within his Cabinet and administration over the convoy matter.

One school of thought, led by Col. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, is for convoying, while another, which heretofore has enlisted the sympathies of the President, is for giving to the British more American destroyers and even cruisers, with which to guard their own merchant vessels. The ships would be manned by British personnel, under this latter plan.

KNOX FAVORS CONVOYS

Secretary Knox has opposed for some time any transfer of American naval vessels to the British beyond the 50 destroyers already transferred, but it has not been explained until recently that his objection was pitched upon a desire to see American ships, under the American flag and with American crews, do the convoying rather than upon any hesitation to put the vessels at the disposal of the British.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the very point. I do not desire to pursue this matter, for we have other business that is really pending and I do not want to prolong this discussion on a matter that is not pending, but that very sentence, it seems to me, may do the Secretary of the

Navy an injustice, because it practically says that his objections to letting Great Britain have any more ships of any sort out of our Navy was that he wanted these ships under our flag to convoy vessels carrying munitions and other supplies to England. I have seen nothing from any source that the Secretary of the Navy has said or indicated that was the reason why he opposed the transfer of any ships to Great Britain. I should like, at least, to find out for myself before I would accept that comment that that was the reason why the Secretary of the Navy took the position which he previously took; certainly nothing he said publicly would justify it.

Mr. TOBEY. Answering the Senator, let me say that I am very certain that when the honorable Secretary of the Navy replies to my telegram it will be of interest to the Senator and to the Senate, and I will produce it and read it into the RECORD. I will also say that I cannot possibly imagine that the newspaper correspondent who has been referred to this morning, who wrote this article, would write an article and make in the press the statement of fact he has made regarding one of the most important matters ever to come before the American Congress without having it confirmed by some authority.

I will now proceed, if I may, please, to the references which I am making for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall read several, and I ask unanimous consent to insert some without reading. There are, however, two or three that I should like to read. One, a quotation from a speech made in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is as follows:

Mr. GEORGE. To use the armed forces of the United States for any purposes of aggression, unless that aggression would become necessarily a part of a defensive move. He may protect the territory of the United States, he may use the armed forces to suppress invasion or insurrection, he may use the armed forces to protect the lives and property of American citizens or the vital interests of our country even outside our own borders. But I do not think he has the power to use them for offensive purposes. That is my conception, and I hold to it very strongly. However, I recognize that some do seem to have a different view, seem to think that the President has certain powers much beyond what I have indicated. If he has them under the Constitution, nothing in the bill, or nothing we could write into it, would take them away.

Then the Senator from Georgia goes on to say:

For that reason I thought the portion of the Senator's amendment which did give authority to use any part of the armed forces, at least to take anything that is described as a defense article which is clearly contraband right up to the line, so to speak, of the danger area, would be very disastrous because it would be by implication admitting that the bill contemplates that there may be delivery everywhere, and that we are putting that kind of a restriction on the power of the President.

I now read from a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that I very distinctly remember the utterances of the distinguished Senator from Georgia with reference to delivery which the Senator read; but already those who want to get the country into war are saying that the Lease Lend Act gives the President the right to deliver defense goods to England or to any other portion of the world, and likewise it gives him the right to convoy.

I think both the proponents of the lease-lend bill, those who voted for it, and those who voted against it, were in agreement, first, that there was not anything in the bill which authorized the administration to deliver defense goods to England or to any other country; and I think it was agreed on the part of both sides, both the proponents and the opponents of the bill, that convoys could not be used and were not authorized to be used under the bill. Certainly there was agreement on the part of some of the proponents of the bill and, I think, on the part of all the opponents of the bill that the President had no right, as distinguished from power, to use convoys and to send convoys into combat areas.

Then there is another question which arises, and that is the question as to whether or not the President has the right to use American warships for the purpose of convoying the vessels of any foreign power. I certainly do not think he has the right, under the Constitution, to do that.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was speaking on the matter of convoys. He was referring specifically to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] prohibiting convoys. The Senator from Texas said:

The amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, by implication, authorizes the convoying of ships within all the Western Hemisphere. He does not say Western Hemisphere. A convoy could be attacked by submarines in the West Indies, probably just as easily as out in the middle of the Atlantic, thereby bringing us into the war. A convoy going from here to Halifax could be attacked by a German submarine, and a state of war might result. The Senator from Wyoming is authorizing that very thing by implication.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In regard to that point, when the lend-lease bill was up for consideration there was a vote on the question whether or not there should be a prohibition on convoys outside the Western Hemisphere. I voted against that amendment because it would automatically have permitted convoys within the Western Hemisphere—that is, under the interpretations of "Western Hemisphere" which hold that it includes part of the British Isles and Iceland. Of course, to permit convoy within that area would be just as dangerous——

Mr. TOBEY. Just as pregnant with war as the other; would it not?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. That is the reason why I voted that way.

Mr. TOBEY. I now read further from the Senator from Texas:

Under the terms of the amendment, we might send a convoy to Halifax or to the West Indies, and if it should be sunk en route by a submarine we should probably be in the war.

That is no less an authority than the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

I read further from the Senator from Texas:

Under the terms of the amendment, by implication, we might send our convoys to Patagonia, and the Germans, by long-range submarines, might sink some of those convoys. We should then be face to face with a declaration of war.

That is the Senator from Texas.

I now read from the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], who was speaking. He said:

The Senator has been discussing the President's powers as Commander in Chief, whether the country be at war or at peace. The Senator from Georgia yesterday made plain in his argument his view that the bill does not deal with the disposition of men, whether in the armed naval, air, or military forces of the United States. Quite the contrary, he insisted this bill deals with property, with defense articles, as defined in the bill. Consequently the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington does not in any way depend upon the right or the power of the President as Commander in Chief. Quite the contrary, the whole proposition comes back to what is the congressional duty in this situation, and we do not have to look to what the President's powers may or may not be. If we examine the Constitution on the point, this is the one subject which is squarely within our jurisdiction. In article IV, section 3, we read:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

That is the Federal Constitution from which we are quoting now. The Senator from Connecticut added:

Consequently, when we are talking about how the property of the United States, namely the defense articles, as the Senator from Georgia referred to them, shall be disposed of, we certainly can impose any limitation, any terms, or place of delivery, or any proposed destination. We can, in other words, circumscribe the entire action under which the delivery of defense articles shall take place. It does not depend for 1 minute on what powers the President does or does not have. It depends, on the contrary, on whether we perform our constitutional function.

And I might add "and duty and privilege," as I see it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Who said that?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

In conclusion, I point out that the distinguished majority leader a few minutes ago, in his remarks, suggested that we should wait until convoys are actually sent before starting this—I do not know what he called it—the inference was "hullabaloo," or "outcry," or "campaign" on the floor of the Senate. But let me point out, in all common sense—sometimes I think it is the most uncommon kind of sense around here—that if we wait and take no action on the faith that convoys will not be sent, and they are sent, it will then be too late. Blood will have been spilled. In view of the statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the statement of

Secretary Knox, the time to take specific action to prevent this possibility is now. That is why I am on my feet, and that is why I introduced the joint resolution; and that is why, in all good faith and sincerity, and with an earnest desire to be helpful, I ask the majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to let this joint resolution have a hearing, and report it back to the Senate for the vote of the representatives of the people in this country of ours, so that we may know whether or not we are going to keep faith with our campaign promises on both sides to keep this Nation out of war.

Can I better conclude that by reading an excerpt from the Democratic National Party platform of 1940—a declamando statement, if you please? It is the first statement under "We must strengthen democracy against aggression." Here it is. Language is used to convey thought here, I hope:

> The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

And my own party, the Republican Party, in its first statement on national defense, makes this declamando statement, in which I concur:

> The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

There are 130,000,000 people in this country, and the Gallup poll says that 83 percent of them have expressed themselves against war. All of us who voted on the lease-lend bill, for or against it, with one exception, hope it will keep us out of war. That was the motivating thought in our minds, whichever way we voted. We were sincere and honest in our respective beliefs. That being true, let us keep faith with the people in the hinterlands of America and put up these protestations and these bars to prohibit convoys being used, which in my judgment is the surest means for America to be involved in the war and the blood of American sons to be spilled. God help us to keep faith with the people of this country in this crucial hour in our national history.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 26), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 3, 1941, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1941.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the days go on, the menace to our own preparedness program and to prompt aid to England steadily grows by the interruption by strikes in vital industries producing military supplies. Five hundred thousand work-days were lost in March alone by strikes in American industries engaged in defense work, and lost at a time when every minute and every hour count in supplying vital and needed military supplies to Great Britain in this hour of her great peril. The strike outlook this morning is blacker than before.

The new Mediation Board appointed by the President has no power to act. It even has no power to investigate, unless first permitted to do so by the Secretary of Labor. It must be apparent that such a board cannot accomplish the purpose of preventing strikes, when only stern and firm measures will be successful.

So far the Secretary of Labor has made only five certifications to the Mediation Board out of more than 25 defense industry strikes, and the strikes so certified are of minor importance compared with other strikes of longer duration and threatened strikes of much greater importance. The certifications made by the Secretary of Labor were the National Cyclops Steel Co., the International Harvester Co., the Vanadium Co., the Condensor Corporation of America, and the Weyerhauser Lumber Co.

The Allis-Chalmers strike, the most important of all, which has now been in progress for 75 days, has not been certified; and as to this strike, the Mediation Board has no power whatever to investigate and use "persuasive means," under the terms of the Executive order. The Allis-Chalmers Co. has vital and important contracts directly affecting our military preparations and aid to England by supplying electrical equipment for steel expansion, electrical equipment for aluminum, equipment for synthetic rubber, and other materials, and this strike is directly responsible for delaying the construction of Navy destroyers now being built, and today destroyers are the most important of all war equipment for aid of England.

The Allis-Chalmers contract is so essential to our defense preparations as to impel William S. Knudsen, Director of the Office of Production Management, and Secretary Frank Knox, to demand publicly that the strike be settled. This unusual action on the part of these two officials could only have been prompted by the delay of the Secretary of Labor in not certifying the strike to the Mediation Board. Upon the demand by Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox, the management of the Allis-Chalmers factory attempted to open the plant. Yesterday riots occurred in which 48 persons were injured, and Gov. Julius P. Heil, of Wisconsin, was stoned by the strikers. Upon the request of the local sheriff, and Governor Heil, Max M. Babb, president of the Allis-Chalmers Co., closed the plant to avoid further bloodshed. Governor Heil wired President Roosevelt that a—

> mob had created disorder beyond the control of all peace officers which can be assembled by the combined forces of the State, county, and city.
>
> The situation is absolutely out of control of all the peace officers available.
>
> I am notifying you of this action in order that you may direct such action as you deem advisable. In the meantime, in order to prevent bloodshed, I am directing the company to cease all productive operations.

A second appeal was made by Governor Heil to the commander of the Sixth Corps Area of the United States at Chicago, asking that at least 5,000 troops be dispatched to help end the rioting.

All this occurred after the chief officials of the United States Government, in charge of supplying vital defense needs for the Navy, had publicly declared that the Allis-Chalmers plant must be opened immediately, and that any further delay would imperil our national safety.

Our Government should certainly act now with firmness to open this plant closed by riots and disorder.

Why has not Secretary Perkins acted in the face of these facts? Until she does act the Mediation Board is prohibited from even making investigations of this and other strike situations not certified by the Secretary of Labor. The Executive order issued by the President establishing this Board specifically provides that the Board has only the power to investigate and mediate strikes after certification has first been made by the Secretary of Labor. Even then the new Mediation Board has no power to enforce its decisions. Its power is confined to these activities:

(a) To make every reasonable effort to adjust and settle any such controversy or dispute by assisting the parties thereto to negotiate agreements for that purpose.

(b) To afford means for voluntary arbitration with an agreement by the parties thereto to abide by the decision arrived at upon such arbitration, and, when requested by both parties, to designate a person or persons to act as impartial arbitrator or arbitrators of such controversy or dispute.

(c) To assist in establishing, when desired by the parties, methods for resolving future controversies or disputes between the parties, and to deal with matters of interest to both parties which may thereafter arise.

(d) To investigate issues between employers and employees, and practices and activities thereof, with respect to such controversy or dispute; conduct hearings, take testimony, make findings of fact, and formulate recommendations for the settlement of any such controversy or dispute; and make public such findings and recommendations whenever in the judgment of the Board the interests of industrial peace so require.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator advise me under what legal authority the present Mediation Board is established? I read the order, but I did not see any reference to any statute, and I wondered under what authority the President gives the

Board powers and takes away other powers. Does the Senator know what the statute is under which the Board is appointed?

Mr. BYRD. I am sorry that I cannot give the Senator the information he seeks. As I read the order, no powers are given the Mediation Board. It is a mediation board in name, and it is provided that there can be only voluntary arbitration of disputes.

Mr. TAFT. I notice that salaries are fixed and allowances per diem provided for, and I wondered under what authority the President could create a new governmental agency and give it the right to spend money. There may be such authority, but I wondered if the Senator knew what it was.

Mr. BYRD. I assume it comes from some of the blanket appropriations which have been made, but I cannot specify the exact act.

I continue the enumeration of the duties of the Mediation Board, as specified in the Executive order.

(e) To request the National Labor Relations Board, in any controversy or dispute relating to the appropriate unit or appropriate representatives to be designated for purposes of collective bargaining, to expedite as much as possible the determination of the appropriate unit or appropriate representatives of the workers.

These are the only powers granted to this Board created by Executive order. The Executive order in specific and direct language prevents the consideration or investigation of any controversy or dispute unless it is first certified by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 4 of the Executive order creating this Board reads:

> Whenever a controversy or dispute which has not been certified to it in accordance with section 2 is brought to the attention of the Board, it shall refer the matter to the Department of Labor.

It can take no action of its own accord, but must first refer every case to the Department of Labor.

It must be obvious, I think, that the strike situation cannot be successfully dealt with by this process. The Secretary of Labor is, in my judgment, exceedingly derelict in the performance of her duties in declining to certify the Allis-Chalmers strike to the Mediation Board, notwithstanding public announcements by Government officials as to the vital necessity of the immediate stoppage of this strike, which has continued for 75 days.

The division of authority as between the Secretary of Labor and the new Mediation Board will necessarily render this Board ineffective and nearly impotent in dealing with the conditions now confronting us. This is especially true when the Secretary of Labor has so far failed to act in accordance with at least the spirit of the Executive order creating this new Mediation Board, which is based upon the assumption that the Secretary of Labor will immediately certify those strikes wherein her own mediation efforts have failed.

Even, however, if the Secretary of Labor does certify strikes, it is not conceivable to me that the strike problem will be solved by a board with no power to enforce its own decisions, but merely with authority to act to mediate as between the conflicting interests in the strikes—something, incidentally, which the Government officials have already been attempting to do. A fair trial cannot be given the Mediation Board until it has power to act.

The new Mediation Board has no power to act in anticipation of threatened strikes. It has no power, for example, even to investigate or attempt to prevent in any way the coal strike called at midnight last night, which has been threatened for days, and which, if continued for any length of time, will tie up all the defense activities of the country. It has no power even to investigate the new sit-down strike called at 12:15 this morning by the United Automobile Workers in the giant River Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co. in suburban Dearborn.

How is it possible for a board to be effective with powers so circumscribed and whose positive actions can only begin when some other agency of the Government gives it authority?

Congress, I think, immediately should vest in the National Mediation Board full power and authority to investigate all strike situations as may be desirable, to attempt to prevent strikes before they start, and then to have the authority to enforce its decisions. The majesty of the Government of the United States must be sternly and firmly exercised to destroy this peril which now exists to our national security.

The inclination here at Washington, it seems to me, has been to measure our preparedness efforts in terms of dollars and not in terms of actual production. Day after day we pass huge appropriation bills—seven billions, four billions, three billions—and then think our work has been accomplished. Until the money so appropriated is effectively and efficiently expended, quickly and expeditiously, for those military supplies most needed, we are not making progress in our efforts.

The Congress of the United States and the people of America are entitled to receive from the Secretary of Labor—Miss Perkins—an immediate explanation as to the reason for her delay in certifying the Allis-Chalmers strike to the National Mediation Board for mediation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Do I correctly understand that the Secretary of Labor has not certified it?

Mr. BYRD. She has not certified it. I communicated with the office of the Secretary of Labor at 11 o'clock this morning, and she has not taken action with respect to this strike.

Mr. WHEELER. I was mistaken, then. I thought it had already been certified to the National Mediation Board.

Mr. BYRD. It has not.

I am asking for this explanation in the following telegram which I sent this morning to Miss Perkins:

> I feel that the Congress and the country are entitled to a full and complete explanation from you as to why you have failed to certify to the National Mediation Board the Allis-Chalmers strike. Mr. William S. Knudsen, Director of the Office of Production Management, and Secretary Frank Knox have stated publicly that the settlement of this strike is vital to our defense program. It has been in progress for 75 days. It is holding up vital equipment. What is the reason for your delay? A prompt reply will be appreciated.

The time has come when our Government must assume responsibility to the people of America for a continuation of strikes which are retarding our national-defense efforts.

I realize that no legislation can be enacted without the support of the Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate. I express the hope that the Democratic leadership of the Senate and the Senate Committee on Education and Labor will present immediately for consideration by the Congress such legislation as will remove interruptions by strikes of our defense program. Already, much time has been lost. Congress should now take quick and positive action to deal with this menace to our security.

Mr. President, I have received many communications and resolutions from my constituents in Virginia with respect to strikes holding up our defense efforts. I received one this morning, adopted unanimously by a great meeting of farmers in Roanoke County, Va., which I desire to read to the Senate:

> At a meeting of the executive committee of the Roanoke County Board of Agriculture, held on March 28, 1941, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:
>
> "Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States, as individuals and groups, to prepare the defenses of this country and,
>
> "Whereas Agriculture is striving to fully meet its obligations in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941, and,
>
> "Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations in essential industries: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *"Resolved,* That we, the members of the Roanoke County Board of Agriculture, do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; and be it further
>
> *"Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States."
>
> I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Roanoke County Board of Agriculture, at a meeting held March 28, 1941.
>
> R. V. BELL, *Chairman.*

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely wanted to make a brief statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to make a brief statement myself. I do not wish to be discourteous to the Senator, but I wish to occupy a little time now.

Mr. President, I think the people of America are overwhelmingly of the opinion that strikes are in fact holding up defense production. We are led to that conclusion almost daily by the newspaper reports. Of course, the particular quar-

rels in each factory are not known to the public. We do not always know which side is right, or if either side is right in these controversies. But, looking at the matter from a national standpoint, the important thing is that production be maintained and accelerated. It seems to me that labor and capital both ought to cooperate in continuing operation and settling their difficulties by whatever processes are available, without closing plants.

Mr. President, when we had before us the Selective Service Act, the draft act, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] offered, and the Senate adopted, an amendment—it was adopted, as I recall, with practical unanimity—providing that in the matter of production, if the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or the President through these officers, should offer a contract to a manufacturing concern which is equipped and able to produce defense equipment, and that concern did not comply with the request at reasonable prices and under reasonable conditions, the President was authorized, through the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, to take charge of the plant and operate it on behalf of the Government, paying to the owners reasonable compensation if need be through the processes of the courts.

Mr. President, it seems to me that fundamentally there is no difference between the employer refusing to go on and produce and the employees refusing to proceed with normal production. So, if I had my way about it, I would adopt a provision directing or authorizing the President, through the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, to take over any plant which now has contracts for the production of essential national-defense articles, or arms or munitions, where disputes between the employer and the employees, or other labor disturbances, or strikes are impeding and delaying production. Thus the Government would be authorized to step in and take charge of that plant and operate it in the public interest, and in the public interest alone. The Government most certainly could be trusted to pay a fair wage and provide fair working conditions; but it would not be required to act upon the dictation of either labor or the employers. It seems to me that that is the most practical approach if we are to have legislation. No doubt we had all hoped that legislation would not be necessary and that disputes could be settled through voluntary mediation or adjustment. But the people of the country are determined that production shall go on. As one who during his entire lifetime has sympathized with labor, I want to warn labor that the actions of some of its leaders are now bringing labor face to face with the threat that much of its progress and many of the benefits it has received in the past will be jeopardized if strikes in national-defense industries continue.

We must look at the problem from the governmental standpoint. The Government has a paramount interest. The people have the most sublime interest. It is for the welfare of the Nation that production should go on. We ought not to be controlled either by the employer group on the one hand or by labor groups on the other.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. When the national interest requires it, the Government ought to have authority, and the amendment should be broadened so as to authorize the Government to step in and take control.

I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not rising to dispute anything the Senator has said. However, with respect to the Allis-Chalmers strike, I have read statements in the newspapers to the effect that Mr. Knudsen and the defense group made a proposal to both labor and the company, and that the workers agreed to it, but the company refused to agree. After that time notice was sent to the company to go ahead and open the plant. It seems to me that after the Defense Board had made a proposal which it felt was a fair settlement, it should have said to both sides that the proposal should be accepted; and when labor accepted it, it should have said to the other side, "You should also accept it." It should not have taken a slap at the workers and simply said to the company, "Go ahead and open the plant." What I have said is based upon what I have read in the newspapers.

Let me call attention to the coal strike. If they are correctly reported in the newspapers, the coal miners offered to keep on working and continue the discussions in settlement of their contract, provided that if they should enter into a contract its terms would be retroactive. That proposal seemed to me to be entirely fair. In other words, the miners were not going to close down the mines or strike, provided the operators would agree that whatever contract should be entered into should be retroactive to April 1, which I think was the date in question.

We want to be fair. I am sure the Senator does, for he has always been a friend of labor; we want to be perfectly fair to both sides. We are spending billions upon billions of dollars. High prices are being paid, and in some instances operators are receiving very great profits from the contracts which are being awarded to them. It has been represented to me upon very good authority that in many instances contractors are receiving what would normally be considered very exorbitant returns upon the contracts which are being entered into for defense purposes. When that is known—and labor does know it—labor naturally says, "If you are receiving high prices for the things you are doing, we want more for our labor."

I agree with the Senator at least to the extent that at a time such as this, when we are trying to stimulate production to build up our defenses, both labor and capital ought to be willing to make some sacrifices in order that production may go on.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. He refers to the Allis-Chalmers situation, and some offer which the Office of Production Management made, which he says the workers accepted, but which the company did not accept. I do not know anything about the details.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not either, except what I saw in the newspapers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under my proposal it would not make any difference whether labor or the employer were responsible for the stoppage. If a plant is shut down and is not producing when it should be producing, what difference does it make whether it is the employer who refuses to go on or the men who refuse to go on? I say let the Government step in and take charge. If the workers do not want to work, then we shall get somebody who will work. I am sure the Senator from Montana will not dissent from those views.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not dissenting.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. It is very fine to have his agreement.

Mr. President, I was not referring to the coal strike because I was confining my remarks to plants which are directly making Army and Navy equipment, munitions, and supplies.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

So far as the coal strike is concerned, that is in quite another field, and the public will take care of that situation as soon as it becomes cold enough.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with the views now being expressed by the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I think he is taking the correct position. I think he is also accurate in his observation that the overwhelming majority of the American people are growing rather tired of strikes which interrupt the manufacture and production of national-defense weapons and munitions of war.

The Senator has referred to the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself when we were considering the Selective Service Act. I should like to have the Senator's interpretation of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator should know more about what the amendment means than does the Senator from Texas. However, I am willing to express my views as to it.

Mr. OVERTON. I have the advantage in that I was a coauthor of the amendment, although it was changed to some extent in conference. The Senator from Texas has a decided advantage over the Senator from Louisiana because he is a much abler lawyer than is the Senator from Louisiana.

The law provides that in the event any manufacturer refuses to manufacture at reasonable prices, the President, through the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, may take over the plant. The question is whether there is a refusal when a manufacturer is unable to furnish the goods by reason of a strike. It

might be interpreted to be a refusal, because he permits the strike to go on. That is, he might very well settle the strike, either by entering into an understanding with labor which would be satisfactory to him, or acceding to the demands of labor. However, I think that in all probability the law might well be amended so as to make it clear that whenever there is neglect—not merely a refusal but neglect—to fill the orders given by the Federal Government for arms and munitions, the President may authorize the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to take over the plant.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I rather agree with him that the language is probably not sufficiently comprehensive to include the case of an employer saying, "I am willing, but I cannot get my men to work." This is a rather strict and harsh remedy, and probably it would be very strictly construed.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator will recall that at the time the amendment was offered the problem was to get manufacturers and contractors to take over the orders.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. We were not then confronted with the strike situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. We were confronted with recalcitrant manufacturers and with subcontractors who demanded too high a price from the Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. OVERTON. We were trying to reach that evil. Another evil has grown up, and I think it ought to be reached, either through the administration or through the legislative processes of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I think the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Georgia deserve great praise for their amendment, which I heartily supported, and which many other Senators supported. As the Senator says, we were not then confronted with the question of strikes, and probably that question was not considered at that time.

I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana, in turn, if he does not agree that probably this is the quickest and most practical legislative approach if we have to deal with the matter by legislation, because we shall not be prejudging the case; in any particular controversy we shall not be deciding against labor or against the employer; but the Government will say, "I want this plant to operate, and if neither of you will operate it, I will operate it myself"? Then the Government will be in control, and can operate the plant with governmental personnel or with the employees already in the plant if they want to work. If they do not want to work, they do not have to work; they can leave.

However, Mr. President, it seems to me that the conferring of this sort of a power upon the departments of the Government would have a tremendous psychological effect and, if it had to be exercised, would be about the most practical way of approaching this problem.

Mr. OVERTON. In answer to the inquiry the Senator submitted to me, I will say that I think in all probability that would be the quickest and most effective way of handling the situation. But speaking for myself, I am willing to go further than that; I am perfectly willing to enact legislation, not to prevent collective bargaining and not to undertake to prohibit a man from striking, because we cannot compel a man to labor if he does not wish to labor——

Mr. CONNALLY. That is right.

Mr. OVERTON. But I am willing to enact legislation that will prohibit any man from denying an American citizen the right to work on any national-defense project. I am perfectly willing to have enacted legislation which will stop striking labor from preventing other laborers working on defense projects. I would go further than that: I am perfectly willing to support legislation that in effect, will declare that no American citizen shall be denied employment on national-defense projects either because he is not affiliated with organized labor or because he is affiliated with organized labor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I am not quarreling with any of his views, but I am interested in getting some kind of action. The Senator realizes that such measures would require a great deal of time and consideration before they could be enacted; and there is nothing inconsistent in those particular provisions with the procedure the Senator suggests.

However, it is absolutely fundamental that if the Government takes over a plant, the Government shall say who will work in it. I understand there is a law against striking against the United States Government. It is not likely that if the Government takes over a plant it will be dictated to by either the employer or the employee.

So far as the terms of labor are concerned, if the Government should take over a plant we can do as we did during the World War, when we had a governmental board, which passed on wages and passed on working conditions—our own agency, to determine in each particular factory what is a fair wage and what are fair working conditions. If the men of a particular plant do not want to work for those wages and under those working conditions, they will have a right to take their hats and go on out; and the Government will continue to operate the plant and see that the plant continues to operate, and will see that men who want to work and who can qualify will have jobs and will produce.

Mr. President, these are my views. I think what I have suggested would be the most practical way of handling the matter. I think it would have the best effect, both on the employer and on labor, to know that if they could not compose their differences and could not go on with production, the United States Government itself, Union No. 1 in this country, the Union of the United States of America, which is superior to any other union, which is the paramount union, would step in, take charge, and operate the plant, not for any selfish interest or group, but in behalf of the United States and its people, in this critical period.

Mr. OVERTON subsequently said: Mr. President, following the colloquy which occurred between the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and myself this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, as bearing upon and incident to the question of labor and strikes, a very valuable contribution on this subject made by Mr. David Lawrence under the title "Legislation on Union Fees Cited," appearing in the Evening Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 1, 1941]

LEGISLATION ON UNION FEES CITED—LAW SAID TO COVER COLLECTIONS FROM DEFENSE WORKERS

(By David Lawrence)

Estimates that anywhere from $20,000,000 to $38,000,000 in initiation fees at exorbitant rates have been collected from union workers on defense projects have aroused Members of Congress to consider legislation on the subject. But it has been discovered that there already is a statute covering the matter of exorbitant fees to be derived from workers. The measure is known as the antikickback law and it has received little attention because of a rather widespread impression that its provisions covered only contractors.

Examination of the provisions reveals that "any person" can be prosecuted and, if convicted, can be required to pay a fine or to serve a jail sentence. The statute is rather brief and the full text of section 1 is as follows:

"Whoever shall induce any person employed in the construction, prosecution, or completion of any public building, or building or work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States, or in repair thereof, to give up any part of the compensation to which he is entitled under his contract of employment, by force, intimidation, threat of procuring dismissal from such employment, or by any other manner whatsoever, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The statute was enacted on June 13, 1934. An interesting case arose recently which refutes the notion that only contractors are covered. It happened that in the construction of a building for the War Department at Fort Riley, Kans., the general contractor for the job rented several trucks. He hired drivers on the recommendation of the owner of the trucks but the drivers were paid by the contractor. Two of the drivers testified that the truck owner as a condition of his recommendation insisted that the drivers were to turn over to him half their weekly earnings.

PAYMENT WITHHELD

When informed of this situation, the War Department withheld payment of the contract under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon law, but the office of the Comptroller General ruled that the money had to be paid to the contractor. The ruling was that the contractor was not to blame but that under the terms of the statute of June 13, 1934, referred to above there could be prosecution. The Comptroller General said:

"It appears in the present situation that the general contractor paid the truck driv-

ers here involved, unconditionally and without subsequent deduction or rebate to him, the full amounts required by the contract to be paid. The truck owner was not a subcontractor or agent of the general contractor within the meaning of the contract, and the agreement which he had with the truck drivers, unauthorized by and unknown to the general contractor, cannot operate to place the responsibility on the contractor for the diversion of the contract wages paid by him."

The Comptroller General pointed out that while the Davis-Bacon law didn't apply, action might be taken by the Justice Department under the anti-kick-back law, a criminal statute.

The truck owner in the above case is analogous to a labor union executive who, by reason of closed-shop arrangements, actually acts as an outside agency arranging for the employment of workers on Government projects. To insist that an initiation fee be paid as a condition of work on a Government project or where Government work is being done, paid for by Government funds, such as Army cantonments, would seem to be clearly an offense within the provisions of the 1934 law.

WHAT IS REASONABLE?

If an open shop existed so that a worker need not join a union before applying for work, the initiation fee could hardly be regarded as an extortion or as subject to the penalties of the act. But when a union has a closed-shop agreement with a contractor who agrees with the union not to hire any but the members of a particular union, then the union executive who charges an exorbitant fee as a condition of employment or membership faces the section of the statute above quoted.

Where is the line between a reasonable or unreasonable fee? The constitution of the A. F. of L. sets forth somewhere between $2 and $15 as the standard for what is known as Federal unions, but even though it does not prescribe what strictly local unions may charge, it is a fair assumption that the courts would regard the standards for Federal unions as applicable to others. Similarly, the C. I. O. has a rule stipulating a $5 initiation fee. Since the custom of most unions is to charge a fee that is relatively small and reasonable, it would not be difficult for the Justice Department to secure indictments under the 1934 statute if the fees run from $50 to $500, as has sometimes been reported.

Only last week Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, an ardent friend of the labor movement, called attention in a published letter to the unreasonable initiation fees prevalent in some branches of defense work as a condition of employment for new members of the unions. Over the last week end one of the executives of a large union pointed out that the A. F. of L.'s executive council could not tell the local unions what fees to charge. The Government appears to have the remedy at hand if the Justice Department cares to act.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN GERMANY

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, on March 29 the press of the country called attention to what I believe to be one of the most significant items of news that has come out of Europe in several days. Archbishop Grober, of Freiburg, Germany, in a pastoral letter appealed to German Catholics to do something more than merely in their hearts resent the conduct of the German Government toward their church. This pastoral letter from Archbishop Grober was published in Osservatore Romano, the official organ of the Vatican, and indicates a condition in Germany which ought to appeal to us because of its significance.

The Catholic Church, almost more than any other institution of its kind, has a great stake in world peace. I have always had a feeling that the Pope who was the titular head of the Roman Catholic Church during the World War literally died of a broken heart because of the futility of his efforts to achieve peace in Europe. His successor saw the world horribly churned up, and the present Pope faces another supreme tragedy in the affairs of his own church because of the unending bitterness and strife and the unutterable horror of the bloodshed which is visited by Roman Catholics of one country upon those of another country. There could be no greater horror visited upon a great church institution.

This pastoral letter, given circulation in the official organ of the Vatican, seems to indicate that something very definite is happening in Germany, in the stiffening of the resistance of the Roman Catholic Church to the outrages visited upon it by the Hitler regime. Archbishop Grober in his letter says that it is "sinful to endure passively" the restrictions of the Nazi regime. The letter represents a very strong expression of disapproval against the Nazi regime; indeed, according to the newspaper article, the letter represents the strongest expression of disapproval toward that regime made public through a Vatican channel since Italy entered the war last June.

Archbishop Grober's letter declares that—

German Catholics are suffering most intensely.

Precisely that which is essentially Christian is being notoriously and fundamentally denied.

He goes on to say:

Our faith is denied and we are reproached with being anti-Fascist.

The possibility of Catholics manifesting their Christian convictions in words and in writing outside of the churches, without danger, is limited.

Mere resignation to such a situation would be a contradiction of conscience.

It would be sinful to endure passively such losses and sufferings.

The split in German humanity continues. Undeniably in recent years it has produced restrictions without precedent and ruins for Catholics, as well as the growth of un-Christian principles that differ from Christianity as fire differs from water.

I am not advised of the percentage of Catholic communicants in Germany, but it must be very large. I am advised that possibly 40 percent of Germans are Roman Catholics, that they have patiently endured their misfortunes—an endurance which constitutes a great tribute to their tolerance and their self-restraint.

It seems to me that the significance of this article is the fact that now there is growing up within Germany and in the hearts of a great mass of the German people a final determination once more to vigorously resent intrusion into the homes and into the church affairs of these millions and millions of Germans, a desire on their part to reestablish in their German homeland the inherent rights and privileges which we of this country have recognized constitutionally. I think we can find a ray of hope in the fact that now this great mass of German people, under the impetus of a high churchman, are generating in their own hearts this spirit of resistance to intolerance and cruelty and to that particularly obnoxious form of sadism which finds reflection in the things going on in that country.

THE DRIFT TOWARD WAR

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a few moments ago I mentioned the fact that I felt that what Mr. Willkie had said in his speeches in the last campaign and what he has been saying since then was tending to break down the confidence of the people of this country. I also stated that, in my judgment, the administration, the President, would not send convoys into combat zones. Then I called attention to a statement by Mrs. Roosevelt and I commended her for the statement that we are not in the war and that she hoped we would not get into the war, and likewise I commended her statement with reference to labor. I said that I thought it was extremely important at this particular time in our history when so much is happening all over the world and democracies are breaking down that in this country good faith be preserved with the people.

I call attention now to an article by the Associated Press coming out of Boston, quoting a statement by William Cardinal O'Connell, Catholic archbishop of Boston, who happens to be, I think, the senior Catholic archbishop in the United States. The heading is:

Secret maneuvers draw us near war, Cardinal declares.

O'Connell says people's trust is dangerous thing to toy with.

The article goes on, under an Associated Press date line, Boston, March 23:

William Cardinal O'Connell, Catholic archbishop of Boston, was quoted today by the Boston Traveler as saying "secret maneuvers behind the scenes of Government are drawing us nearer and nearer to war."

The cardinal said in an interview with the Traveler on his return from a winter vacation in Miami, Fla., that "the trust of the people in their government is a dangerous thing to toy with."

"There is a distinct feeling," he added, "that things are going on behind the scenes unknown to the people. This is the sort of distrust that brought about revolution in Europe, the distrust of the people in their governments.

We hear persons who want to get this country into war constantly saying, "Well, we are in the war; we are already in the war." They are trying to create a psychology among the American people that, after all, we are in the war right now, and there is nothing that can be done about it. When they say that, when they try to create the impression in the minds of the people of this country that we are already in the war, they are, in my judgment, doing a great disservice not only to their own Government but they are doing a disservice to the President of the United States, for, if we are already in the war, we are in it without the Congress having declared war, and, under the Constitution of the United States, the only body that can declare war is the Congress of the United States. Such statements give a very strong impression and create a very distinct feeling throughout the United States that the President of the United States, by

some underhanded, sly method, some trickery, has already got us into the war. That is why I said this morning that it was inconceivable to me that the President of the United States would send convoys to Europe; it is inconceivable to me that he would use convoys, because he has said that convoys mean war, and he would not use convoys without first coming to the Congress of the United States and asking for a declaration of war.

The article quoting from Cardinal O'Connell goes on to say:

"I hope," he asserted, "that this country stays out of war. I know the people want to stay out, but the Government seems to ignore their wishes while still talking of democracy."

Mr. President, those who are talking in that vein are the ones who are saying we ought to go to war now. They are the ones who are driving the Nation toward war; they are the principal members of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. They are advocating war and pushing and pushing us step by step, step by step toward war. First they said "short of war," and when the lease-lend bill was passed they were saying that it was a peace measure, but now they are saying that under it we can send convoys and that we ought to send convoys and that the President has the power to do so.

I quote further from the article:

"Some sort of secret maneuvers are bringing us nearer and nearer to war all the time. This does not tally with democracy. Everybody is wondering just where we are in this thing. It is not a fair thing for a government calling itself democratic.

"All this mystery that is going on is puzzling to the people and is not fair."

The Cardinal, greeting newsmen in his stateroom on the steamer *Boston* appeared to be in excellent health.

"I'm speaking neither pro nor con the Government," he added. "I'm merely echoing the sentiments of the people from all parts of the United States. Their question is, 'Where are we in this situation?'"

Mr. President, there is no one, in my judgment, who is better qualified to speak for one great body of individuals in the United States than is Archbishop William Cardinal O'Connell. He is, as I said a moment ago, the senior Catholic archbishop in the United States of America. He has his finger on the pulse of the American people from one end of the United States to the other, and is recognized by everybody, both in the Catholic Church and out of the Catholic Church, by both Protestants and Catholics as being one of the outstanding American citizens. His patriotism certainly can not be questioned by anybody. He tells us that the overwhelming majority of the people of this country are against war, that they have a feeling that there is something going on behind the scenes, and that, because of that fact, there is great distrust.

So I repeat what I said in the beginning, that when a man running for the Presidency of the United States advocates certain policies, and then immediately after the election turns around and says, "Well, what I said prior to the election was just so much campaign oratory," how can anyone expect the American people to have faith in a party that nominates men of that kind? I think he has done a great disservice not only to his country but to the Republican Party as well, because, after all, I have never known, in all my life, of any Republican candidate for President every saying that the promises which he made to the people of the United States were merely so much campaign oratory.

Certainly I am interested, Mr. President, in seeing that the Democratic candidate for President and the Democratic Party do not put themselves in identically the same position—not by words but by acts. I say to the Members of the Senate that if that should happen, it would be just too bad for our country; for I agree with Cardinal O'Connell, that when the people of the United States lose faith in the leaders of their parties, when they lose faith in their Government, then the same thing will happen here that has happened in countries of Europe; and let us make no mistake about it, we are no different from the people of other countries. People all over the world are losing faith in their governments. Workers are losing faith in their governments. Farmers are losing faith in their governments. Businessmen are losing faith in their governments. One of the things that we in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and the leaders of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, ought to do more than anything else is to see to it that we keep faith with the American people.

I know that men run for constable, or they run for some offices in their States, and make campaign speeches, and sometimes Senators or Representatives make campaign speeches; but I have never known a candidate for the Presidency of the United States deliberately to make speeches and then say that what he said was merely campaign oratory. I think the greatest disaster that could come to this country would be for the President of the United States to let the warmongers in this country influence him to take action contrary to the speeches and promises he made in the campaign; and I say warmongers advisedly.

I debated this question the other night with General O'Ryan. General O'Ryan has been one of the outstanding warmongers of this country. In May 1940, I think, General O'Ryan was saying that we ought to send another American expeditionary force to Europe. He was saying, "This is our war, and we ought to send another American expeditionary force over there." He was saying, "We are next on the list." He was saying, "The Axis Powers are going to come over here and take over this country." The other night he was denouncing agents of the Axis Powers, and saying there were agents of Germany over here, and there were "fifth columnists" over here, and there were dupes over here, and that we ought to convoy ships, and that under the Lease-Lend Act the words "Give or otherwise dispose of" meant that we should deliver defense articles to the people to whom they were given.

Representative FISH asked him, "Do you think we ought to convoy ships to China?"

General O'Ryan said, "No."

Representative FISH said, "Why do you not think so?"

General O'Ryan said, "Because Japan is not going to come over here and take over the United States."

We can go back and read the statements made by some Japanese leaders in times past, and we will find that they talked about the yellow race dominating the whole world, and said that the yellow race ought to dominate the whole world. That is the philosophy they have preached to their own people in Japan.

I turned to General O'Ryan and said to him, "General O'Ryan, the truth about the matter is that you are registered in the State Department as an agent for the Japanese Government at the present time; are you not?"

He hung his head and said, "Yes."

I said, "A year before you became an agent for the Japanese Government you were advocating that we get into the war; were you not?"

He said, "Yes."

He afterward asked me if I thought there was anything sinister about his action. I said, "No; I would not question your patriotism just because you, as a lawyer, were registered as an agent of a foreign government. You could still be a patriotic American; but," I said, "I am getting sick and tired of some of the persons who want to take us into war calling everybody who wants to keep this country out of war a 'fifth columnist,' or an appeaser, or a dupe." I said, "If that is the kind of thing that is to be said, there probably are agents of many foreign powers in this country. There are British agents galore in the United States at the present time. Everybody knows it, and nobody is questioning it. There probably are German agents here. There probably are French agents here. There probably are all kinds of agents here; but it is astonishing that anyone should stand up and say that everybody who is fighting for peace and to keep us out of war is anti-American, and then to find that the one man of all in the United States who is urging us to go into the war, to send convoys to lick the Axis powers—for General O'Ryan in his speech talked about Germany and her allies and what they were going to do to the rest of the world—to find out that at the time he made that statement he himself was an agent of the Japanese Government. That might be perfectly legitimate, and I never questioned General O'Ryan's patriotism at all, because he might be doing that and still be consistent in his attitude, since we were not at war and are not at war.

In closing, let me say that I think Cardinal O'Connell has expressed in that article a feeling that is growing up in this country at the present time better than I have seen it expressed anywhere else. The people are simply losing faith in the leaders; and they are losing faith in the leaders because, as I say, one candidate for the Presidency said that his utterances were merely campaign oratory. The persons who are saying to the President of the United States, "You ought to send convoys without coming to the Congress of the United States and asking for a declaration of war," are doing a greater disservice to the President of the United

States than his worst enemies could do to him. No enemy of the President of the United States could do him a greater disservice than to see him take this country into war without a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States. If there are any Members of the Senate who are friends of his, or close to him, who will urge him to do that in the face of public sentiment in this country, in my judgment, they certainly do not understand what the real sentiment is.

Certainly the people of this country wanted to help England; and the reason why some of us opposed the lease-lend bill was because, as we said on the floor of the Senate, we knew what would happen following its enactment just as surely as daylight follows darkness. We knew that the very persons who were back of that legislation and propagandizing for it from one end of the country to the other were not merely for helping England. They were not merely for giving the English tools. They were not for peace; they were for war. Now they are coming out in the open, and are saying so boldly and openly; and they are trying to make the President of the United States believe that it is the sentiment of the country that we should convoy vessels. They are saying, "Now that we have given these things to England, we must see that the goods get there," and they are saying that "give" means "deliver." As I said the other night, when the word "transfer" was in the bill as it came over from the House, and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and I raised the question as to whether or not the Attorney General might construe that language as meaning that we should take the articles over there and deliver them, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], said there was no such intention on the part of the proponents of the bill, and that while he did not think the language meant that, in order to make sure of it he would amend it so as to make it clear that that was not what it meant, or would strike it out entirely.

Even though we want to get into the war, even though there may be some Members of the Congress who want to get into the war, let us, for the sake of keeping faith with the American people; let us, for the sake of our own Government; let us, for the sake of not bringing about what Cardinal O'Connell says brought about revolutions all over Europe—lack of faith in their governments and trickery behind the scenes—urge the President, if he wants a declaration of war to come to the Congress and ask for it and let the Congress vote on it, and let the people through their representatives say whether or not they want to get into this catastrophe.

So far as I am concerned, I have heretofore advocated and I still believe that we should give to the people of the United States an opportunity to say by referendum whether or not they want to go to war. It is their Government, they are the ones who are going to have to pay and they are the ones who will have to fight and to die. But above all, let us keep faith with the people, and let us not do by indirection what we dare not do by direction.

SABOTAGE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE—ARTICLE IN HARVARD LAW REVIEW

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the right of workers to strike has been recognized and protected in the United States. Economic democracy could no longer exist if that right were denied. Perhaps more directly than any other right, the right to strike is affected by the national-defense program. Inevitably, when the press and all other mediums of publicity are devoted largely to reporting the progress of the defense program, stories of labor disputes attract universal attention. Strikes become common topics of conversation, and are regarded as obstacles in the way of attainment of adequate preparedness. Already, in the press and in the National Congress, it is being suggested that the right of workers to strike should be suspended or denied for the duration of the emergency.

In a democracy it is always highly dangerous to propose the abridgment of legal rights. Curtailment of liberties is a process which gathers momentum rapidly. From the destruction of one right it becomes easier to proceed to the destruction of many rights. When we place one limit on liberty, we are apt to set in motion a vicious cycle which will eventually encompass and destroy all our liberties.

The problem of our Government, as I see it, is to preserve democracy and prepare for any emergency. This is a difficult problem, and particularly when so large a part of our national energies must be devoted to the acceleration of production. But however difficult it may be, however serious may be the emergency which threatens us, certainly the Congress of the United States should hesitate long and deliberate carefully before it acts to suppress any of the vital liberties which together constitute our democracy.

Because of the tension generated by the defense program, because also of the hysteria which always accompanies a great national effort, most of the publicity regarding labor disputes in defense industries has been one-sided and prejudiced. I think it is vitally important that the American people and the Congress be fully informed on this important question. Recently there appeared in one of our most distinguished law reviews, the Harvard Law Review, a scholarly and instructive article dealing with this perplexing problem, written by three prominent labor lawyers. It is entitled "Sabotage and National Defense," and appeared in the February 1941 issue. I believe it is deserving of the careful study of every Member of Congress, and it seems to me to be particularly timely in view of the discussion which took place on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. So I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SABOTAGE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE *

In a time that abounds in conventional, economic, political, and moral catch-phrases by which so-called legal science is accustomed to operate, it is more than ever necessary for lawyers to be both critical and vigilant. In our examination of the problems raised by Professor Warner's model sabotage-prevention act, one of the collection of bills currently being tendered to all State legislatures as a socially desirable uniform legislative program for defense, we shall try to remain unconfused by certain axioms which have been assumed to be unquestioned and eternal truths, and, instead, endeavor to examine some basic considerations of policy. Viewing this legislation in relation to other legal measures which bear upon the same subject matter, we shall keep before us, as a primary standard by which to evaluate these proposals, the issue whether they are really conducive or detrimental to the defense of the Nation.

I

Progressive organizations, and labor particularly, are justified in greeting with suspicion the hue and cry over the danger of sabotage.[1] The danger alleged must indeed be greatly exaggerated if no less an authority than Mr. J. Edgar Hoover publicly admits that the F. B. I. records do not indicate a single "concerted act of sabotage," and that he was informed that no such cases had been reported in Canada or Great Britain.[2] Even assuming a need for legislation dealing with sabotage, we need not be swept into an uncritical acceptance of the necessity of appropriateness of State—as distinguished from Federal—legislation to deal with the supposed threat. And even if it should turn out that State legislation is necessary there still remains doubt as to the social and political necessity or advisability of a broad, vague, general statute of the type offered, which, to paraphrase the draftsman, will stage a setting for a blitzkrieg on labor and other groups, and effect a sabotage of the constitutional liberties of the American people.[3]

---

* An excited concern with war and defense has been running through the country for more than a year. In the last few months it has poured over into the domain of legal principles and technique. Consequently, we have been reaping a mushroom crop of articles and notes in the most august law journals on defense, conscription of labor, civil rights, mobilization, "crisis" legislation, etc. See, e. g., Katz, National Defense and Individual Liberties (1940) 16 Ind. L. J. 31; Hoague, Brown, and Marcus, Wartime Conscription and Control of Labor (1940) 54 Harv. L. Rev. 50; Million, Political Crimes (1940) 5 Mo. L. Rev. 164, 293; Note, Mobilization for Defense (1940) 54 Harv. L. Rev. 278; 40 Col. L. Rev. 1374; 50 Yale L. J. 250, an extended discussion occupying the entire Note Departments of the December 1940 issues, of all three reviews. The same issue of the Columbia Law Review presents Sir Cecil Thomas Carr's Crisis Legislation in Britain. 40 Col. L. Rev. 1309.

[1] In which Professor Warner joins: "The prevention of sabotage is a vital cog in the machinery of national defense" (p. 602 supra); "Destruction of machinery, factories and utilities will spell defeat just as surely as rout in the field" (ibid); ". . . the stage is set for a sabotage blitzkrieg" (p. 625 supra).

[2] See N. Y. World-Telegram, Dec. 16, 1940. Cf. Rear Admiral John H. Towers' (Chief of the Bureau of Naval Aeronautics) recent testimony before the House Naval Committee [N. Y. Sun, Jan. 7, 1941] to the effect that no cases of sabotage have been unearthed and that instances which were at first thought to involve sabotage were found, upon investigation, not to be such.

[3] Nor does our position mean that we are against national defense. On the contrary, the defense of labor's rights and the safeguarding of civil liberties are the essential conditions of effective defense of the Nation. A sure way of sabotaging the defense of the country is to repress labor and to erase civil liberties.

Since national defense is most appropriately a matter for Federal legislation and one confided to Congress by the Constitution, it would seem that the prevention of interference with defense should most appropriately be left to the Federal Government.[4] The Wartime Sabotage Act[5] has been supplemented by recent legislation[6] to cover similar crimes in peacetime. The fact that the Federal statute is narrower in scope than the one suggested for State enactment does not prove that there is need for such State legislation.[7]

Moreover, the enforcement of such legislation by innumerable State and local officials presents the gravest danger of abuse. Its enactment virtually insures a total lack of uniformity in the standards which may be used by local and State prosecuting officials and judges. As there are some 3,000 counties and law-enforcement units in the country, with innumerable variations in the standards which the officials are likely to employ, the uncontrolled enforcement of such legislation presents obvious dangers. If we are to have this sort of legislation, it would seem much more advisable to have the control over its enforcement centralized in the Department of Justice at Washington. Such control should extend from the point of determining in advance whether a particular situation should be presented to the grand jury for indictment, to the actual conduct of the prosecution itself.

Indeed, the oppressions and abuse inflicted in a few places by local officials not equipped to execute Federal policies, or even to understand larger Federal problems, may result in harm far beyond the injury to the individuals prosecuted. As the experience of the Federal Government during the first World War in the enforcement of the Espionage Act, the treason statute, and in dealing with alien enemies, confirms this view, a few quotations are apposite.

On October 28, 1918, Attorney General T. W. Gregory wrote all United States attorneys:

"The unusually broad language of the Espionage Act has given rise to differing and conflicting interpretations at the hands of the United States attorneys and United States commissioners in different parts of the country, resulting in serious confusion as to what authoritative definition is to be placed upon certain clauses of this act. To remedy this situation the following course of procedure has been adopted:

"'You are instructed that on and after November 1 no case arising under * * * the Espionage Act is to be submitted to a grand jury without first obtaining the approval of the Attorney General for this course. In every such case arising in your district you will therefore promptly communicate with this Department, submitting a summary of the facts and of the available proof together with a separate statement of your own views as to why the facts constitute a violation of law * * *.'"[8]

Previously, the Department had tried to vest the United States attorneys with more discretion in these matters. Circular No. 838, dated May 23, 1918, instructed them as follows:

"It is also of great importance that this statute be administered with discretion. It should not be permitted to become the medium whereby efforts are made to suppress honest, legitimate criticism of the administration or discussion of government policies; nor should it be permitted to become a medium for personal feuds or persecution. * * * Protection of loyal persons from unjust suspicion and prosecution is quite as important as the suppression of actual disloyalty * * *."[9]

Difficulty was experienced by the Federal Government in many cases of enforcement of law by local authorities, even where there had been no attempt to enact State legislation. Thus, in dealing with alien enemies, it was found that some local police had caused embarrassment to the Federal Government. On June 19, 1918, Attorney General Gregory sent Circular No. 851 to United States marshals, reading in part:

"In the past there have been numerous cases where alien enemies have been arrested by the local or State authorities pending Federal investigation or action and have been held for weeks and even months without notification to you or other officers of the Department. This, of course, has resulted in injustice to the alien enemies and in complaints from the Ministers of Switzerland and Sweden, in charge of German and Austro-Hungarian interests, respectively, in the United States. The plan outlined above will obviate the recurrence of such cases and you are instructed immediately upon the receipt of a telegram from the local or State authorities to the effect that they have an alien enemy in custody, to consult with the United States Attorney and the Bureau of Investigation on the matter in order that he may request a Presidential warrant or take such other action as he may deem advisable."[10]

The position of the President and Attorney General Jackson in insisting that the field of registration of aliens and similar work remain exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, is further indication of the inadvisability of entrusting such matters to local officials.[11] Recognition of the wisdom of centralization is also evident in the creation by the Department of Justice of a new unit known as the Neutrality Laws Unit.[12]

The fact that very few States enacted statutes specifically punishing sabotage during the first World War is ascribed by Professor Warner to the failure to recognize generally its danger to the country. This conclusion is open to serious question. If the Federal Government then realized the danger of "sabotage" and dealt with it, we may safely conclude that there was no justifiable reason for State legislation dealing with the subject and, indeed, that there may have been a realization of the great dangers arising from the States' attempts to deal with it.

Part of the argument advanced in favor of the enactment of the model bill is that existing State statutes under which "acts of

---

[4] Indeed, implicit in the proposal for model uniform State legislation is recognition of the desirability of exclusive Federal treatment of the subject, for no other method can ensure uniformity as effectively. See Extending Federal Powers Over Crime (1934) 1 Law & Contemp. Prob. 399–508.

[5] 40 Stat. 533 (1918), 50 U. S. C. § 101 (1934).

[6] Pub. L. No. 866, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (Nov. 30, 1940).

[7] The view that the prevention of and punishment for sabotage should be left to the exclusive domain of the Federal Government should not be taken as constituting satisfaction with the provisions of the Federal act, which is open to many of the more serious objections leveled at the State act, particularly in its failure to ensure that there shall be no curtailment of the right to strike and its potentialities as an antilabor and anticivil liberties weapon. In the debate in the Senate on the amendments to the Federal sabotage act, when John L. Lewis' proposal that "Nothing in this act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike," was offered with the express observation that it was merely a declaration of what the author of the amendments understood to be their limitations so far as the rights of labor were concerned, Senator TAFT successfully prevented the approval of such proposal on the express ground that the amendments as introduced provided and were intended to provide that the right of labor to strike in defense industries was to be affected. 86 Cong. Rec., Sept. 30, 1940, at 19322. See also id., at 21372, et seq. Chairman SUMNERS, of the House Judiciary Committee, stated that the amendments could serve to prevent strikes in national defense (and, therefore, practically all) industry.

[8] [1918] Rep. Att'y Gen. 674, reprinting Circular No. 908.

Nor was the Espionage Act the only statute whose administration was so centralized. On October 26, 1917, in Circular No. 749, Attorney General Gregory directed United States attorneys: "No proceeding for violation of the treason statute * * * should be instituted without first submitting a statement of the facts and obtaining authority from this Department" [1918] Rep. Att'y Gen. 673.

[9] *Id.* at 674. See also Cummings and McFarland, Federal Justice (1937), 425–426.

[10] Id. at 649–50. The Department found it necessary even to curb the activities of its own subordinates in the localities in this area of enforcement of Federal laws. Attorney General Gregory, on May 23, 1917, in Circular No. 686 to United States attorneys, marshals, and special agents (i. e., the Bureau of Investigation) said, with reference to arrests of alien enemies:

"If any person is now under arrest in your district by a Federal official under the said proclamation, which arrest has not been made by specific authority from the Attorney General, or is not an emergency summary arrest made by the marshal after conference with the special agent and after approval by the United States attorney * * * as set forth in said printed directions, the name of such person together with a full statement of the facts, should be transmitted at once by wire to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General will promptly either order his release or issue the requisite authority for his arrest." [1918] Rep. Att'y. Gen. 640.

[11] *Cf. Hines* v. *Davidowitz*, 9 U. S. L. Week 4135 (U. S. Jan. 20, 1941).

Indeed, if the view of the proponents of the Model Sabotage Prevention Act is sound, it would justify the uncontrolled intrusion of State and local governments into every field of defense and war activity.

It is even likely that venal local officials, or those inspired by parochial views and interests, may actually throw obstacles in the path of the Federal Government by their official intermeddling. Attorney General Jackson, in addressing the Federal and State conference out of which the bill was born said on August 8, 1940: "Our problem today is largely one to prevent, so far as possible, overlapping of efforts which always result in getting in each other's way, in blaming each other for pardonable errors, and in general inefficiency."

[12] The Department's release of April 29, 1940, to the newspapers explained that the new unit has "responsibility for control of all prosecutive action growing out of violations or charges of violations of laws relating to neutrality, foreign enlistments, treason, sedition, espionage, sabotage, or kindred offenses.

"Prosecutions or arrests under such statutes will be authorized only by this unit. The purpose of centralizing control of cases of this character is to assure uniformity of policy throughout the United States, which has not been possible when prosecutions are initiated by district attorneys. Some of the statutes involved prescribe only the most general classifications of offenses, and it is desirable that standards to govern a prosecutive policy be made uniform and that each case be scrutinized with reference to both adequate protection of the national interest and the civil rights of individuals involved."

sabotage" may be punished do not contain penalties of sufficient severity. This, of course, is no justification for a blanket statute. A remedy can be found in appropriate enlargement of the punishment, if it be desirable. Moreover, if diverse local conditions afford justification for variations, it would be particularly fitting that each State determine for itself the appropriate penalty. But the main reason advanced is that, at the present time, in most States, "sabotage" cannot be punished as "sabotage" because the acts involved constitute some crime other than "sabotage," and the applicable statutes do not cover all property which might be "sabotaged" or all methods of "sabotage," but must be punished, if at all, as another crime. In particular, the malicious mischief statutes, which seem most immediately applicable, are alleged to be "inadequate." [13]

There might be some point to this contention if anyone were able to furnish a reasonably definite description of what is meant by "sabotage" of national defense.[14] The proposed bill does not do so, and, as yet, no one has been able to define the crime in such terms as would convey a reasonable certainty of the nature of the acts covered. Who is there that can determine beyond a reasonable doubt just when one "impairs [or] interferes with real or personal property with reasonable grounds to believe that such act will hinder, delay, or interfere with the preparation of the United States or of any of the States for defense"? Suppose a newspaper editor advises workers not to work unless they get a wage increase. The editor may thereby have solicited the workers to impair or interfere intentionally with the property of the employer—not alone the physical property but his property, in the legal sense, of the right to operate his business without interference.[15] The idleness of some types of machines or other property impairs them. The closing down of a plant impairs the property right, frequently enunciated by the courts, of operating a business, of making profits.

The provisions of section 3, that "whoever intentionally * * * omits to note on inspection any defect in any article or thing with reasonable grounds to believe that such article or thing is intended to be used in connection with the preparation of the United States or of any of the States for defense" virtually renders the ordinary worker a warrantor of the fitness of the product for use. And this is to be enacted despite the public testimony of Admiral Towers that "carelessness" which was to be expected because supervisory forces in the factories have been abnormally spread out,[16] and that this carelessness was, in most cases, responsible for the instances at first thought to be sabotage but which turned out, upon investigation, not to be such.

We must bear in mind that whether a man intended to make a defective article or intended to pass a defective article will be jury questions. The issue of fact will be decided in an atmosphere of national defense or wartime excitement. That atmosphere will be brought into the courtroom, and sent to the jury room, in every case arising under such a statute. The statute itself guarantees that. Few prosecuting attorneys will be so lacking in desire to add further conviction victories to their records that they will fail to tell the jury the purpose of the statute.

What about the person accused of having solicited such action or omission by workers? How is such solicitation to be proved to a jury which will have the power to decide whether there was solicitation? A man's writings, his speech from a platform, or in ordinary private conversation, a garbling of what has been said, can send him to prison for a long term under such a statute.

We can conclude only that the bill is a most dangerous threat to basic liberties. The attempt to embrace within the vague and sweeping language of sections 2 and 3 any possible act which any person might conceive to be detrimental to what is currently accepted by some persons to be national defense, of necessity encompasses so many innocent acts that these sections really make for an ideal "frame-up" and "witch-hunt" statute.

To the academician, "frame-up" may mean little more than a logical abstraction called "perjury" or "lawless enforcement of the law." But to labor, to the Negro people, and to all minority, underprivileged, or oppressed groups who must struggle to attain their social aspirations, it is a living, bitter reality. In their experience, frame-ups are an integral part of our system of "jurisprudence," as vivid and poignant as lynching, brutal police and vigilante attacks on picket lines and union halls, and the open cynical denial of the right of free speech, free press and assembly, which still obtains in many parts of our country. One need but conjure up the names of the Molly Maguires,[17] the Haymarket martyrs,[18] the Mooney-Billings cases,[19] the Sacco-Vanzetti case,[20] the Scottsboro case.[21] Disregard of the abuses inherent in sections 2 and 3 alone is astounding, in the light of the long history of the perversion by courts of apparently clear legislation,[22] of lawlessness on the part of public officials,[23] and of the oppressions and abuses during the First World War and shortly thereafter in connection with the enforcement of the Federal Espionage Act and the criminal syndicalism statutes.[24] Equally astonishing is the unconcern over the possibility that these sections may be violative of the Federal Constitution.[25] This, despite the fact that the statute seems so broadly worded as to give insufficient notice of what constitutes the crime proscribed, thus rendering it in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.[26]

---

[13] The imagining of some act of "sabotage" which might not perhaps be embraced within existing State law does not justify the leap to a bill which endangers all activity, lawful or not. The isolated instances of alleged inadequacies which are cited could better be taken care of by specific amendatory legislation than by the sweeping legislation proposed. *Quaere*, whether the proposed remedy is not worse than the evil.

"A * * * threat is inherent in a penal statute * * * which does not aim specifically at evils within the allowable area of State control but, on the contrary, sweeps within its ambit other activities that in ordinary circumstances constitute an exercise of freedom of speech or the press. The existence of such a statute * * * readily lends itself to harsh and discriminatory enforcement by local prosecuting officials, against particular groups deemed to merit their displeasure * * *." Mr. Justice Murphy in *Thornhill* v. *Alabama*, 310 U. S. 88, 97, 98 (1940). Cf. *Carlson* v. *California*, 310 U. S. 496 (1940); *Hague* v. *C. I. O.*, 307 U. S. 496 (1939); *Lowell* v. *Griffin*, 303 U. S. 444 (1938).

[14] The term "sabotage" is usually defined as malicious damage or injury to property of an employer by an employee in retaliation for failure or refusal to comply with demands. See *State* v. *Moilen* (140 Minn. 112, 115, 167 N. W. 345, 346 (1918)).

As shown, infra, page 645, the concept of sabotage in connection with national defense has a more accurate, though broader, meaning for us than that envisaged by those who take Professor Warner's position. Cf. Brissenden, Sabotage, in 13 Encyc. Soc. Sciences (1934) 495, pointing out that the "price strategy" of an employer is often calculated and planned sabotage—e. g., the destruction of products or restriction of output, in order to raise prices. The sit-down strike of capital of 1937 and the more recent one of the aviation manufacturers which lasted until they obtained the tax and profit bonanzas that they demanded of the Government are clear cases of wholesale sabotage. Likewise, the wholesale neglect, until recently, to subcontract defense contracts has impeded defense production. Is it proposed to jail these saboteurs?

[15] Picketing has traditionally been regarded as "interference with property" by antilabor courts. (*Truax* v. *Corrigan*, 257 U. S. 312 (1921); cf. *Coppage* v. *Kansas*, 236 U. S. 1 (1915); *Adair* v. *United States*, 208 U. S. 161 (1908).) Even today, while sanctioned, it is still regarded as an "interference" with property. (*Exchange Bakery* v. *Rifkin*, 245 N. Y. 260, 157 N. E. 130 (1927).)

There is also the danger that local courts and officials not too closely attuned to labor's interests would be uninfluenced by even the more enlightened decisions of the Supreme Court. See, generally, Picketing: From "Sinister Name" to Constitutional Right (May 1940), 8 I. J. A. Bull 113.

[16] This "carelessness" appears to be chiefly that of management in the rush of expansion and consequent "speed-up" of workers. Aside from the dangers to workers themselves, from the relaxation of safeguards—particularly those designed to protect the health and safety of labor (see The New York State Labor Department Serves Defense, Prelim. Ann. Rep. Industrial Comm'r (1940) 10–13)—there is the equally apparent danger of production of defective articles. Despite this overwork of employees, would Professor Warner, in addition, subject them to the possibility of punishment for the resulting defective product?

[17] See Bimba, The Molly Maguires (1932).

[18] See Yellen, American Labor Struggles (1936) c. 2.

[19] See Nye, Justice for Tom Mooney (1929); Symes, Our American Dreyfus Case (1935); Chaffee, Pollak and Hern, The Suppressed Mooney-Billings Report (1932); cf. *Mooney* v. *Holahan*, 294 U. S. 103 (1935).

[20] See Frankfurter, The Case of Sacco and Vanzetti (1927); Dos Passos, Facing the Chair (1927); Fraenkel, Sacco-Vanzetti (1932).

[21] *Powell* v. *Alabama*, 287 U. S. 45 (1932); *Norris* v. *Alabama*, 294 U. S. 587 (1935); see Scottsboro Defense Committee, The Scottsboro Case (1936).

[22] See Fraenkel, Judicial Interpretation of Labor Laws (1939) 6 U. of Chi. L. Rev. 577; Judicial Nullification of Anti-Injunction Acts (1936) 4 I. J. A. Bull. No. 11, p. 1. Cf. Landis, A Note on "Statutory Interpretation" (1930) 43 Harv. L. Rev. 886, 891–92; Note (1937) 50 Harv. L. Rev. 1295.

In passing, it is interesting to note that the only statute enacted by Congress as part of the extensive exercise of war powers during the last war with which the Supreme Court found fault was the Lever Act prohibiting profiteering. *United States* v. *Cohen Grocery Co.*, 255 U. S. 81 (1921)

[23] See Hopkins, Our Lawless Police (1931); Note, Lawless Enforcement of Law (1920) 33 Harv. L. Rev. 956.

[24] Note, Federal Sedition Bills: Speech Restriction in Theory and Practice (1935) 35 Col. L. Rev. 917; Lipsig, Sedition, Criminal Syndicalism, Criminal Anarchy Laws (1935); Nelles, Espionage Act Cases (1918).

[25] Cf. Hoague, Brown, and Marcus, Wartime Conscription and Control of Labor (1940) 54 Harv. L. Rev. 50, 89: "as experience of the World War indicates, slight notice is given to constitutional technicalities in times of stress. Any further or more detailed discussion of the constitutional aspects * * * would seem especially quixotic at this time." But what these gentlemen term "technicalities" are the guaranties of basic liberties and these are what we avowedly seek to defend by our defense program.

[26] Cf. *Lanzetta* v. *New Jersey*, 306 U. S. 451 (1939); *Herndon* v. *Lowry*, 301 U. S. 242

Even more likely to be unconstitutional is section 9, which permits the closing and restriction of the use of streets and highways upon which properties used in defense production abut. In the famous *Hague* case,[27] the mayor of Jersey City prevented labor organizers, representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union, and individuals of liberal tendencies, including Congressmen, from using the streets of the city for meetings, for the distribution of leaflets, the solicitation of membership in unions, etc. Notwithstanding the mayor's defense that this action was for the purpose of preventing disturbances and riots, a United States District Court, a Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States enjoined such actions, holding them in violation of elementary constitutional rights and liberties. It is now proposed to circumvent the *Hague* case by State legislative action which would open the door to the very practices declared unconstitutional in that case. In other words, we are being offered a model "denial of free speech, free press, and freedom of assembly" bill, which will ensure a rich harvest of local Hitlers.[28]

The New York Times of January 11, 1941, p. 5, col. 4, reports: "Edgar F. Hazleton, Suffolk County attorney, ruled that the closing of a street near the plant was legal. He commended Harry T. Tuthill, County Highway Superintendent, for 'good judgment' in closing the thoroughfare.

"'In case there were a strike, the strikers wouldn't injure the plant,' Mr. Hazleton said in a memorandum to Sheriff Jacob Dreyer. 'You know that. But persons interested in sabotage might take advantage of the situation to do their dirty work.

"'The road can be kept closed indefinitely and will remain closed as long as the *Ranger people* think it should be.'" (Italics supplied.) What becomes of the right to picket if the "Ranger people" make the decision?

In this instance, the issues never came to a climax; a settlement was reached which avoided the strike. N. Y. Times, January 12, 1941, p. 31, col. 5. Presumably, thereafter, all fear of "sabotage" disappeared and the road was reopened.

The bill attempts, by means of the provisions of section 11, to safeguard the rights of labor.[29] This provision was taken bodily from the language of the National Labor Relations Act[30] and is wholly out of context in the "model" bill. The N. L. R. A. is concerned with the right of collective bargaining. The "model" bill menaces more fundamental rights, the rights to strike, to picket, and to assemble. Professor Warner's statement that "the act does not affect strikes"[31] should be read in the light of the omission from the model bill of the safeguard in section 13 of the N. L. R. A. that "nothing in this act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike."[32]

Nor is section 11 any protection against the dangers of abuse inherent in sections 2 and 3 discussed above. It is certainly no guaranty against the potential use of the bill in frame-ups. The history of the perversion of labor legislation in the past should serve as warning that reliance upon a section such as this is self-delusion.

Even assuming that, after many years of litigation, appellate courts might wring from this section some protection to labor, such decisions would be of small comfort in the immediate situations out of which they arise. In labor disputes the immediate availability of basic civil rights may be a matter of life and death to the organizations involved. Often as a result of the denial of these rights a union may be destroyed and unable to carry an appeal through the courts.

Further, no protection is afforded those others, not within the phrase, "employees or their representatives," who might be adjudged by some jury to have aided or advised such employees to act or omit to act. What of the cases in which the exercise of civil rights not relating to union or labor matters would become the basis for prosecution? What of the millions of individual workers not engaged in union activities?

As to the sections of the bill dealing with attempts, conspiracies, unlawful entry upon property, questioning and detaining suspects, and the revocation of the privilege against self-incrimination, considered abstractly, they seem hardly objectionable. But these sections are all ancillary to the main provisions of the bill which, as shown, presage a sabotage of civil liberties, rather than a prevention of sabotage of national-defense efforts, or the apprehension of some inept saboteurs. The fact that New York State and other jurisdictions restrict the break-down of the privilege against self-incrimination to specific situations[33] shows a significant appreciation of the necessity of not departing from constitutional guaranties, except in carefully considered and specified instances.

II

Thus far we have considered chiefly the technical legal questions raised by the proposed sabotage prevention bill—its surface aspects, so to speak. More important, however, is the basic problem of whether this legislation would in fact be conducive or detrimental to the defense of this Nation. All the evidence seems to point to the conclusion that they are menaces to the defense of the American people. Labor peace, and the resultant steady flow of production, can best be achieved through fair dealing—not repressive legislation. Legislation proffered in good faith but capable of perversion is at least as dangerous as laws avowedly aimed at curtailing labor's freedom. Our experience during the first World War with attempts to prevent labor from striking indicates that such attempts tend only to bring on strikes.[34] It should be clear to any patriot that the defense potential of our people is not raised by the reduction of their living standards (through confiscation of their bargaining weapons) and the stealing of their basic liberties. Defense demands diametrically opposite policies and programs.[35]

What then should be embraced in a program of defense legislation? As stated, we support fully a proper defense program. We are also in favor of legislation which will effectively carry out such a program. We agree with the proponents of the legislation criticized by us that the continuance of production is essential to defense. Our effort, however, is to discover the basic causes for interruptions in production, with a view to eradicating them.

Impartial investigation over many years has indicated that the refusal of industry to permit labor to organize into unions of its own choosing and to bargain collectively has been the most frequent cause of strikes;[36] this truth is embodied in the declaration of policy in the N. L. R. A.[37] There can be no doubt that violations of this right, as well as of others guaranteed by that act, are being committed daily and by leading figures in defense industries.[38] This is the first and

---

(1937); *United States* v. *Cohen Grocery Co.*, 255 U. S. 81 (1921).

[27] *Hague* v. *CIO*, 307 U. S. 496 (1939), 24 Corn. L. Q. 422, 7 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 1026, 38 Mich. L. Rev. 571, 14 St. Johns L. Rev. 157; see (1938) 52 Harv. L. Rev. 320; (1938) 48 Yale L. J. 257.

[28] These implications of section 9 are confirmed even before its enactment. The New York Times of January 7, 1941, p. 15, col. 6, reports that consequent upon the authorization by the members of Local 661, Aircraft Division of the United Automobile Workers of America, C. I. O., of a strike at the Ranger Engineering Division of the Fairchild Engine and Airplane Corporation, "Harry P. Tuthill, Suffolk County Superintendent of Highways, today closed Conklin Street, which passes the Ranger and Republic Aviation Corporation plants, explaining that he had done so at the request of *officials of the concern* to prevent sabotage and to facilitate the building of a spur railroad siding to the plants. Barricades were erected and guards posted" (italics supplied).

[29] The section reads as follows: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to impair, curtail, or destroy the rights of employees and their representatives to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection."

[30] 49 Stat. 452 (1935), 29 U. S. C., sec. 157 (Supp. 1939).

[31] See p. 603, supra. See also sec. 8 of Senator WAGNER'S mediation bill, S. 3410, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (1940).

[32] Full awareness of the dangers of the bill and the inadequacies of the provisions supposedly intended to protect the rights of workers is shown in the general letter of December 18, 1940, of President Philip Murray of the C. I. O., expressing opposition to the bill. The same views are expressed, and with equal vigor, in the memorandum of Daniel Tracy, as assistant secretary of labor and labor adviser to Advisory Defense Commissioner Hillman, sent under date of January 13, 1941, to the Labor Policy Advisory Committee of the National Defense Advisory Commission.

It is of more than passing interest and significance to note that this bill reflects the general trend in its veiled antilabor provisions. For some time now there has been a concerted drive to deprive labor of its basic right to strike, an attempt which has taken direct as well as indirect forms. E. g., H. R. 10707 and H. R. 10708, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (1940); "24-hour limit set on defense strike," N. Y. Times, Jan. 15, 1941, p. 1, col. 7. This effort largely takes the form of "conscription of labor" suggestions. See, e. g., Hoague, Brown, and Marcus, Wartime Conscription and Control of Labor (1940), 54 Harv. L. Rev. 50. Related, too, is the drive to emasculate the N. L. R. A. and the Fair Labor Standards Act (e. g., the Smith amendments, H. R. 9195, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (1940); see Murdock, The Defense Emergency and the National Labor Relations Act (1940), 3 Nat. Lawyers Guild Q. 87; H. R. 5435, 76th Cong. 1st sess. (1939)) and the "antitrust" drive against trade-unions. See The Folk-Law of Thurman Arnold (Dec. 1939) 8 I. J. A. Bull. 53.

[33] See supra, p. 623, n. 69.

[34] See Bing, War Time Strikes and Their Adjustment (1921); Sacher, Labor's Experience, 1917–18, Proceedings of Conference on Labor's Rights and the Defense Program (Nat. Lawyers Guild, N. Y. City, Dec. 13, 1940).

[35] See N. Y. Times, Jan. 17, 1941, p. 18, col. 3, quoting the special report of State Health Commissioner to Gov. Lehman: "'Wars are won or lost in the last analysis by the civilian population,' the report said: 'The health and well-being of the workers on the home front are of the utmost importance to a nation.'"

[36] N. L. R. B., Division of Economic Research, Bull. No. 1 (1936).

[37] 49 Stat. 449 (1935), 29 U. S. C., § 151 (Supp. 1939).

[38] Cf., e. g., *Republic Steel Corp.* v. *N. L. R. B.*, 107 F. (2d) 472 (C. C. A. 3d, 1939), cert. denied except for minor point, 309 U. S. 684 (1940), 310 U. S. 655 (1940); *Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp.* v. *N. L. R. B.*, 114 F. (2d) 930 (C. C. A. 1st, 1940).

most important form of sabotage of national defense which must be disposed of. And what would be more effective and more in the interests of national defense than the enactment of legislation, adding criminal penalties for violations of the N. L. R. A.? With one stroke we should thereby have created the legal machinery whereby we might really put a stop to the sabotage of defense on a colossal scale. This done, we could add a further ounce of prevention through the Presidential issuance of an Executive order denying Government and defense contracts to such violators.

Other changes to further the defense of the Nation might include vigorous enforcement of anti-trust laws to keep prices down; extension of the application of the Wage-Hour law and the Walsh-Healy Act; furtherance of work relief and youth training; extension of social security and public housing; passage of the Coffee National Guard bill prohibiting use of the National Guard for strikebreaking purposes; and revival of the quiescent Civil Liberties Unit of the Department of Justice.[39] And with the enactment of the La Follette oppressive labor practices bill [40] outlawing the use of industrial spies, guns, and munitions by employers against their employees, we should be so far on the road to industrial peace as to have a practical assurance of uninterrupted defense production.

We feel confident that with the effectuation of the program of legislative and executive action outlined, the American people can be assured of safety from attack from any source.

LEE PRESSMAN.
D. WILLIAM LEIDER.
HAROLD I. CAMMER.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hope I will not be considered discourteous to the Senate if I discuss the matter pending before it. A motion is now pending, as I understand the parliamentary situation, to strike from the bill language on page 7, lines 17 to 24. This is part of a committee amendment. It is that part of the committee amendment comprising the first proviso.

I wish to discuss what I think was a very unjust action on the part of the Senate yesterday. I shall confine my remarks today, unless something is brought up by someone else to which I think I should refer, to an endeavor to get a roll call on the amendment now pending.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I shall be glad to join the Senator from Nebraska in getting a roll call on the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator very much. I would expect that position to be taken by the Senator from Georgia, who always believes in a square deal and fair play.

Mr. President, yesterday I asked for the yeas and nays and they were denied. We did not have a very large attendance, but there were more Members on this side of the aisle than are present now, and while I did not count, I looked around and saw nearly every hand on this side raised, and I knew without counting those who did not unite in asking for a yea-and-nay vote that there certainly were more than one-fifth of the Members present asking for the yeas and nays. I was met with the proposition that in order to get the yeas and nays the request must be seconded by one-fifth of 48, I suppose the idea of those who believe in that kind of doctrine being that 48 is a quorum of the Senate.

I called attention to the Constitution of the United States, although I did not have the Constitution before me and did not read the provision. I think, however, I cited it almost verbatim. I shall read the provision now from the Senate Manual. It will be found in paragraph 3 of section 5 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, and it reads as follows:

> And the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

Is there an eighth-grade child in the United States who does not understand that language? Most of the Members of the Senate have boasted from time to time on every Fourth of July and during every campaign that the thing most sacred on earth was the Constitution of the United States, that it was drafted by the ablest men who ever lived, and contains the fundamental principles which underlie all our liberties and all our freedom. We have heard that from day to day. A new Member came into this body today, and he took the same oath that I took, and that you, Mr. President, took, that every other Member of this body took, when he raised his hand and swore before Almighty God to support the Constitution of the United States. Yesterday we trampled it in the dust, without giving a second thought or any consideration to what we did.

Mr. President, that provision of the Constitution was made to protect minorities, and, of course, we who wanted the yeas and nays were in the minority. I do not think there is any doubt about that. We wanted to avail ourselves of that sacred thing, the Constitution of the United States, to protect us in our minority views.

Mr. President, I concede that in the end, in this body, as in every other parliamentary organization, the majority must prevail, and it is the duty of us all to abide by the action of the majority when it is arrived at constitutionally and fairly. I want to do that. I wanted to do that yesterday. I found no fault with any Senator who did not agree with my motion. I find none whatever now. I concede that Senators who opposed my motion are honest in their purpose, they are patriotic, and probably I ought to concede, which I do, that they possess most of the ability and the wisdom on this question.

Mr. President, my education was sadly neglected early in my life; so early, in fact, that I have almost forgotten now what I learned then. But I still know how to count up to 10. As I looked over the upraised hands on this side of the chamber I knew there were more than 10, if I knew anything about it. I realize that sometimes we think we are certain of a thing when as a matter of fact we are not, and I may have been mistaken. There were some hands raised on the other side of the chamber as well. Even if we were to disregard the Constitution, and require one-fifth of 48 Senators to raise their hands in order to obtain a yea-and-nay vote, yet I contend we had that number yesterday. One-fifth of 48 would be 9⅗. So that 9⅗ Senators, under that construction, were entitled to a yea-and-nay vote. If 10 Senators raised their hands, it is certainly true we had 9⅗. I can count up to 10, I think, just as well as can anyone else. That may be assuming too much on my part, but I have no doubt of it myself. There was no Senator present at that time, I take it, who would even suggest that I was trying to filibuster, that I was trying to do anything I had no right to do under the Constitution of the United States, which is superior to a rule of the Senate or a precedent of the Senate.

Yet, Mr. President, we were denied a yea and nay vote. Had we been accorded a yea and nay vote and had the vote been adverse, as I suppose it would have been, I would have acquiesced as gracefully as I know how. There would not have been any complaint on my part. But because it happened that a machine was in control, consisting of most of the Senators who were present, the constitutional right of every Senator was crushed to earth. That is what I protest against now. That right is more sacred to me than the result of the vote.

Mr. President, I think too much of a practice is growing in the Senate on the part of Presiding Officers, to see who can put matters through in the quickest time. Yesterday it was contended for a while that I had not made my demand in time. Yet, realizing how anxious Presiding Officers recently have been to see how quickly they could make snap judgment, and having seen it work in the case of many Senators, almost daily, I was calling for the yeas and nays just as soon as the Presiding Officer was saying, "The 'noes' appear to have it." The Presiding Officer did not finish his sentence before I was asking for the yeas and nays.

Mr. President, I think that precedent is an exceedingly bad one. We hear it said here and all over the country that this is the greatest deliberative body on earth; that we are Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world. Yet we see majorities here crush the life out of minorities, without giving them the

---

[39] "The Attorney General has been at all times mindful of the fact that this Department is not only responsible for law enforcement, but in a larger sense, is responsible for the protection of civil liberty. Its activities have been confined at all times strictly to the legal powers conferred upon it and no attempt has been made at any time to resort to extra legal process. * * * It has been the view of this Department, consistently adhered to throughout the war, that every act of arbitrary and unnecessary interference with the life, habits, and occupation of the citizen would lessen efficiency, disturb order, and weaken public confidence in the American standards of justice. It has been the constant endeavor of this Department to frame all of its administrative policies in accordance with this fundamental view." (Rept. Att'y Gen. (1918) 16.

[40] S. 1970, 76th Cong., 1st Sess. (1939).

constitutional privilege which is contained in that sacred document, and which we have a right to expect will be given to us even by a majority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has had to say, and I certainly sympathize with the views he has expressed. As the Senator says, the right to demand the yeas and nays is a constitutional right given to each Member of this body by the Constitution itself. It seems to me the right is defeated because of the precedents of the Senate which hold that the Presiding Officer cannot count a quorum; that unless some Member on the floor makes a point of no quorum the Presiding Officer must shut his eyes to what may be the true situation with respect to a quorum, and presume and act on the presumption that a quorum is present. Under those precedents, in order to obtain the yeas and nays, the request must be seconded by at least 10 Members, because a quorum at present would be 48 Members. Therefore it would be necessary to have 10 Senators second the request. It might happen that there were not 10 Members on the floor at the time; perhaps there might not be over 5 Members on the floor, and yet——

Mr. NORRIS. If there were only 5, the Senate would not get very far, that is, if it were necessary to have 10 Members second the demand for the yeas and nays in order to obtain them.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly the point I make. If only five Members were on the floor, then under the precedents of the Senate there would be no chance on earth for any Senator to exercise his constitutional right and obtain the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is true. I think it is as simple as can be, for the Constitution says:

> And the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that no Senator is denied the right to demand a quorum. Any Senator may demand a quorum. After the quorum has been obtained, he may renew his demand for the yeas and nays. So no Senator is denied the right to have a quorum present. All he has to do is to say, "I suggest the absence of a quorum." Then, when the quorum is obtained, he may renew his request. To have any other rule than the rule of the precedents would absolutely disrupt the business of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. It would not necessarily disrupt the business of the Senate. In the House of Representatives the Chair always counts.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senate wants to do business without a quorum, and no Senator makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, it may do so; and we do it almost daily as a matter of practice.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, under the practice in the House of Representatives the Chair always makes the count.

Mr. NORRIS. Why does not the Presiding Officer in the Senate make the count?

Mr. HILL. That is something I have never understood.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the Chair always does so in the House. He counts when the yeas and nays are demanded. The Presiding Officer in the Senate certainly knows how to count. It would not be any more difficult for the Presiding Officer of the Senate to count than it is for the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or anyone else.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. It so happened that the Senator from Washington was presiding yesterday afternoon when this matter came up. Seven hands were raised at the time. It was my job to count those hands, and I counted seven hands.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that all?

Mr. WALLGREN. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would not dispute the Senator. He has as much right to his opinion as I have to mine. I know, as well as I can know anything without demonstrating it mathematically with a counting machine, that it is becoming a common practice, when only a few Senators demand the yeas and nays, for the Chair to say, "An insufficient number," and go on in the same breath and announce the passage of the bill. That is what I am complaining about. Of course, if the Presiding Officer says he counted seven, I accept his word for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). Let the Chair read the precedent under which the Presiding Officer was acting yesterday afternoon. This was on May 8, 1936:

YEAS AND NAYS

THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE NUMBER OF SENATORS DEMANDING A ROLL CALL IS BASED ON THE LAST PRECEDING ROLL CALL

On May 8, 1936, the Senate had under consideration H. R. 12527, the naval appropriation bill, when Mr. FRAZIER asked for the yeas and nays on an amendment proposed by him.

Almost exactly the same situation as that which now prevails.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee), submitting the request, held that it was not sufficiently seconded, only five Senators having held up their hands.

The following colloquies then occurred:

"Mr. FRAZIER. That is more than one-fifth of those present."

* * * * *

"Mr. FRAZIER. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, because five Members held up their hands, and I believe that is more than one-fifth of the number present.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the Chair assumes that a quorum is present.

"Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a point of order.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

"Mr. CONNALLY. I submit that five is not one-fifth of those present, because presumptively there is a quorum present.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct about that.

"Mr. CONNALLY. Therefore, since 5 is not 20 percent of 49, the call of the yeas and nays is not in order.

"Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, no presumption whatsoever is indulged in a case of this kind.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised by the parliamentarian that it is.

"Mr. MCNARY. I disagree with the parliamentarian. That is not correct practice and it has never been followed. The number necessary to order the yeas and nays is one-fifth of those present, and it is the duty of the Chair to count the number present.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the custom has been to go back to the last roll call. On the last roll call 69 Senators were present, and 5 is not one-fifth of 69; so the ruling of the Chair will stand.

"Mr. MCNARY. I insist that the ruling is wrong, and I suggest the absence of a quorum."

A quorum was called.

Mr. CONNALLY, supporting the ruling of the Chair, said: "I state as a matter of fundamental parliamentary law, whether there is any rule on the question or not, that the presumption always exists that there is a quorum present in the Senate unless the point of no quorum is made and the Senate by having the roll called determines that there is not a quorum present. Therefore, when a demand is made for the yeas and nays, unless one-fifth of the presumptive quorum present hold up their hands, the Chair is under no compulsion to order the roll called for a yea-and-nay vote."

Mr. MCNARY disagreed with Mr. CONNALLY, stating that it had been the practice of the Senate for 19 years (his tenure as a Senator) that if one-fifth of those actually present asked for a roll call, the roll call was ordered, and that no presumption of the presence of a quorum was indulged in.

After further argument, Mr. FRAZIER stated that he would not take an appeal from the ruling.

He was thereupon recognized by the Chair to renew his request for a roll call, which was then granted.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, pages 6901, 6902.

That is the precedent under which the Presiding Officer was operating yesterday.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and I think that precedent shows on its face that it is foolish, Mr. President. The Presiding Officer looks over the Senate and sees 5 or 6 Senators present, and assumes that there are 49 or 50 present. In the case cited in the precedent just read the previous roll call showed that 69 Senators were present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair make a statement in that connection. The Chair makes no argument one way or the other. The Chair was simply reading the precedent to the Senator. The Chair will say to the Senator from Nebraska that if the present occupant of the chair had been in the chair yesterday he would have ordered the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should like to finish one thought first.

I remember the occurrence referred to by the Chair, and I remember that the minority leader [Mr. McNARY] took the opposite view. He took the correct view, as he usually does. I do not believe there is any foundation or rule for any other view. The argument in the precedent just read is that when the Presiding Officer wishes to ascertain the number represented by one-fifth of the Senators present he should first look up the record and see what the previous roll call showed. In that instance the previous roll call showed that there were 69 Senators present. Therefore the argument is that the demand for the yeas and nays must have been seconded by one-fifth of 69.

Another view is that it must be assumed that a quorum is present unless the point of no quorum is made. Today it would be assumed that 48 Senators are present. Yet the Presiding Officer can look in front of him and see that such an assumption is contrary to the fact. Why does not the Presiding Officer count and ascertain whether or not one-fifth of the Senators present are demanding the yeas and nays? What reason or right has he to look up the record and see what the previous roll call showed, or assume, instead of doing that, that 49 Senators are present, when he absolutely knows that there are not 49 Senators present?

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to get into an argument with the Senator from Nebraska on that point, although under the rule when a point of order is made that there is no quorum present, although the Presiding Officer knows that there are 96 Senators in their seats, it might be just as reasonable to assume that there is still no quorum, and that the roll must be called in order to ascertain whether or not a quorum is present.

Mr. NORRIS. That has nothing to do with this question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to a yea-and-nay vote on the Senator's amendment. Yesterday the Presiding Officer ruled that there was not a sufficient demand for the yeas and nays. I think it is customary, not only in this body, but in every other parliamentary body, unless the point is made, to assume that a quorum is present to transact business.

Regardless of all that, I am willing, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is willing, to ask unanimous consent that a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair read a ruling by former Vice President Garner.

Mr. NORRIS. I have read that ruling. I know what it is. I know what brought about that ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling was:

> Under the rules of the Senate, the Chair is not allowed to count the Members present. Therefore, the Chair cannot tell the Senator whether or not there is a quorum present.

Any Senator has a perfect right to ask for a quorum at any time.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that; but the Presiding Officer has just read something which cannot be found in the rules. The ruling which he has just read says that it is based upon the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is simply reading a precedent.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; but as the Presiding Officer has read the precedent, it says that under the rules of the Senate the Chair has no right to count the Members present. I should like to have the Chair cite the rule which so provides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are only precedents. The Chair did not cite the rules.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; of course, they are only precedents.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. At this time may I inquire whether a request for the yeas and nays on the amendment is in order, so that the Senate may decide?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; such a request is in order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I expect to make that request before I sit down. Now, I am arguing that yesterday I was entitled to a yea-and-nay vote as a matter of right, and that I ought not be required to appeal, on bended knees, with hat in hand, to the magnanimity and the mercy of the majority, to grant me the mercy and the privilege of having a yea-and-nay vote, when, as a matter of fact, the Constitution of the United States gives me that privilege.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I recall what happened yesterday, after the Senator requested the yeas and nays, and the Chair ruled that the request was not sufficiently seconded, the Senator from Nebraska was about to make the point of no quorum, in order to secure the presence of a quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I actually had made it. I was asked not to insist upon it; and out of courtesy to my fellow Senators I did not insist upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that was wise.

Mr. NORRIS. I was glad to yield to the Senator's request not to insist upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I have no doubt that if the Senator's request had come following a quorum call and if a demonstrated quorum had been present sufficient hands would have been raised to have gotten a yea-and-nay vote.

It was my idea that when we met this morning we would take up just where we left off, and that after a quorum call the Senator from Nebraska then would make his request for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. However, we were shunted off for about 2 or 3 hours, in considering another matter.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senate was met with the request that several Senators be permitted to make 5-minute speeches; and when they were concluded it was almost 3 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish the Senator would make his request.

Mr. NORRIS. I expect to make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Nebraska will be patient with the Chair, the Chair has a further precedent which he desires to have placed in the RECORD, which he thinks will sustain his point and will show that a year ago the Vice President whom he quoted had in mind exactly the same idea the present occupant of the Chair has in mind:

> Subsequently the Vice President said:
>
> "Let the Chair make a statement to the Senate again, since he has meantime made inquiry of the Parliamentarian. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that there is no rule requiring the Secretary, an agent of the Senate, to count in order to determine whether or not one-fifth of those present have seconded a demand for a yea-and-nay vote. Whether one-fifth of the Senate has demanded the yeas and nays is a constitutional question, and the Chair thinks it is the obligation of the Chair to determine whether one-fifth of those present have seconded the demand.
>
> "Let the Chair say to the Senate now that it will be useless in the future to talk to the Chair about not seeing a sufficient number of Members seconding the demand to order the yeas and nays, because if one-fifth of those present on the last call for a quorum second the demand, and the Chair sees them, the yeas and nays will be ordered. That is a constitutional right, and the Chair is going to consider it sacred. Therefore, if one-fifth of the Senators present, according to the last quorum call, ask for the yeas and nays, the yeas and nays will be ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I view the matter, the argument just read is absolutely contradictory to the defense made yesterday, and which now is being made by some Senators, that we assume a quorum is present. The purport of the precedent is, in effect, that the Chair cannot count how many Members are present, but it is admitted that the Chair can count enough to ascertain whether one-fifth of those answering in the last quorum call are asking for the yeas and nays. So, under that very argument, the Chair would make a count, and if he could count one-fifth we ought to be able to assume he has sufficient education to be able to count five-fifths. That would not be as bad an assumption as to assume that a demand by one-fifth of the Senators present at the previous roll call is necessary in order to have the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Nebraska that if the present occupant is in the chair when the yeas and nays are asked for, and if he sees one-fifth of those present asking for them, he will order the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair thinks that is according to the Constitution.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I have been asking for. That is what I desire to have established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; let the Senator proceed to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the present occupant of the chair is not in the chair

very much, and he may not be in the chair at the time when the yeas and nays are asked for—as he was not there yesterday when the vital question came up. I say to the Senator who was in the chair yesterday, and who said he counted seven, that I do not question that at all. Of course, that is what he counted, if he said he did; I accept his word. I think seven was more than one-fifth of the Senators present, beyond any doubt. Thirty-five Senators were not present when that episode occurred.

However, Mr. President, I do not think he counted them all; that is what frequently happens. A Presiding Officer who desires to put through a bill in about 2 minutes, when probably it ought to take 2 hours, does not see one Senator over here or another Senator over there. He counts the Senators he sees, but he does not see very many. That is the whole difficulty.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. I counted them all, and they were all behind the Senator from Nebraska; none of them was in front of the Senator from Nebraska. They were all behind him and were on his side.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. Of course, the Senator counted 7. While I did not count "1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7," I took it for granted, from the hands that were raised, that half a dozen hands were raised. I am entirely satisfied that I saw that many hands raised, and that is the reason I felt aggrieved: First, because the Chair assumed that it must be one-fifth of 48; and, second, because now the precedents cited by the Chair have completely exploded the argument that that is not the way to proceed, but that it must be one-fifth of the last roll call, which might have been had the day before or possibly 2 hours before. We know as a matter of actual fact that when we have a quorum call not all Senators answering the call are in the Senate Chamber at the time the call is finished, and that very often during the calling of the roll a quorum is not physically present. A Senator enters the Senate Chamber, answers to his name, and then goes out of the Senate Chamber before some other Senator enters the Chamber and answers to his name and stays here, so often we do not get an actual quorum.

However, Mr. President, how can anyone escape the argument that the Chair would be unable to determine that more than one-fifth, or less than one-fifth, have raised their hands unless he counts?

In one of the precedents cited by the Chair it is said that nothing in the rules permits a Presiding Officer to count. Of course, these rules are old, Mr. President, and were adopted many years ago in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. I have always had great respect for provisions of the Constitution, and so do others when an effort is made to pull the feathers of the eagle, or something of that kind. However, when a Presiding Officer wishes to put over a little joke on some Senator who is trying to exercise his constitutional rights, he may in his enthusiasm forget his patriotism.

If the Senate will give us a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, then, so far as I am concerned, I am through; I shall abide by the result, of course.

However, I now notify the Chair that if the Senate does not give us a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, then, since the amendment will be followed by the committee amendment itself, which is practically the same thing, if the present Presiding Officer retains the chair that long, I shall ask him for the right to speak on the committee amendment if the pending amendment is declared defeated without a yea-and-nay vote. I desire to notify the Chair right now that on the vote on the committee amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays if I do not succeed in obtaining them on the vote on the pending amendment. This notice probably will obviate any tendency, if there is any on the part of the present occupant of the chair, to hurry this matter through at lightning speed and to try to have the amendment agreed to before I can address the Chair.

Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall take but a few moments. I sympathize with the views of the Senator from Nebraska, but the Senator starts out with an assumption that is not warranted. He assumes that every Senator has a right to have a roll call. That is not his right at all. It is his right only when and if one-fifth of this body doing business second the demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a minute.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to interrupt the Senator without his consent, but that is not what the Constitution says. One-fifth of this body is not the wording of the Constitution, but it says "one-fifth of those present."

Mr. CONNALLY. "One-fifth of those present"; very well. If the Senator from Nebraska were technically correct, practically all the legislation we pass here could be vitiated, because he would permit parole testimony as to how many Senators were present when a certain bill was passed.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no. If the Senator will permit me there, when there is a roll call, if the roll call discloses that a quorum has not voted, that roll call does not amount to anything; but there has to be a call of the House, another roll call, and always before the proceedings are completed it is shown that a quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the point I make is that between those two roll calls the presumption is that a quorum is here. It may be, in fact, here; it may be out in the anterooms reading the newspapers; it is available if there is a roll call on anything important. Although there may not be a quorum physically present on this floor, we indulge the presumption that a quorum is always present until somebody questions it; it is a continuing supposition until it is questioned.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I am concerned with the precedent involved, and that is the reason I desire to ask the Senator from Texas, who has knowledge of the rules, a question. If seven Senators or eight Senators constituted a fifth of those who were present, that would demonstrate mathematically that a quorum was not present. I understand that under the rules we cannot do any business in the absence of a quorum except to enforce the presence of a quorum; and I am wondering, if we adopt that rule, if we do not really nullify what we are doing. If a number less than a fifth of an actual quorum constitutes a fifth of those present, it seems to me to follow mathematically that, therefore, we are not qualified to do business because a quorum is not present.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct in that assumption except to the extent that the Chair need not note on the record how many he counted. He may merely say a sufficient number have ordered the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair never does announce how many he counts. It is all up to the Chair, and if the Chair thinks a sufficient number have seconded the demand, then the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true, but the point I make is that if it should affirmatively appear, I will say to the Senator from Colorado—and I assume that is what he had in mind—in the RECORD that only 7 had been counted, and the Chair had ruled that that was one-fifth of those present, it would be spread on the RECORD that there was no quorum present and the action which we might take, unless there was a subsequent roll call, would be vitiated because no quorum was present.

So I am submitting to the Senator from Nebraska that it is a necessary assumption we have got to indulge or else stay here and call the roll every 30 minutes all day and do no business, that when the roll is called and a quorum is established that quorum continues in existence. Here is the rule:

> If, at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate, a question shall be raised by any Senator as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate.

That rule, it seems to me, is exclusive; by implication it excludes any other procedure as to the determination of a quorum. That is why the Chair has heretofore ruled that he would not count, because the rule provides that whenever the presence of a quorum is questioned, the roll shall be called, which excludes the right of the Chair, if the question is raised, to count and determine there is a quorum present, or whether there is a quorum present or whether it is not. To a good many Senators it may seem to be a foolish rule to have a roll call when the Chair can count and say that there is a quorum present. I rather agree that the rule is subject to criticism, but it is the rule, and until the Committee on Rules brings in a change it will probably continue to be the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator says that may be a foolish rule, but it is the rule and it must be enforced. Here is the Constitution; why not say that about the Constitution? The provision of the Constitution may be foolish, but the forefathers and grandfathers adopted it, and we have never changed it. It may be foolish, it may be silly, but it is the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that, and I appreciate the veneration the Senator from Nebraska has for the Constitution. I think it has been lacking in veneration in many quarters; but the Constitution also says that the Senate cannot do any business unless there is a quorum present, and we have got to pay some attention to that constitutional provision. If the Senator were right, on yesterday we would have had to adjourn, as we did adjourn, or we would have had to dissolve or to have had a quorum called, because it would have been disclosed that there was no quorum present. When the Constitution says one-fifth of those present, the Constitution means one-fifth of a quorum, or if there is more than a quorum present, one-fifth of the entire number. The absolute assumption from one roll call to another is bound to be that there are at least 49 Senators present, because if there are not 49 Senators present, the Senate is not in session, and so, if we do any business at all, we have got to act on the presumption that this rule is exclusive, and until a quorum is questioned, a quorum continues, which is 49 Members, so that one-fifth of a quorum has to be at least 10 Members, and not a number short of 10.

This is not the first time this question has been before the Senate. I recall that we debated it here several years ago; and I think the Chair followed, in the main, what I am trying to say now. The Senator from Oregon, I am sure, will agree that that was the ruling of the Chair. I submit the matter. Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think attention ought to be called to the suggestion made by the Senator from Alabama, a contention for which, it seems to me, there is no foundation whatever. He says suppose there were only 7 hands up and the Chair held that was a sufficient number, as there were 35 Members present, that would show that there was not a quorum present. That would be true, but that happens in the Senate every day, even in connection with the most important legislation we pass. But I should like to say to the Senator that when we find ourselves in that position, and it first appears of record that no quorum is present, then we do not do any more business until we get a quorum, and when the yeas and nays are called for, if there is not a quorum present, but only 35 Members are present and 7 ask for the yeas and nays, the quickest way, ordinarily, to develop a quorum is to call the yeas and nays. It is necessary to have a quorum before anything is done. That roll call brings a quorum, and a quorum cannot be developed any quicker than that roll call will develop it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question with reference to his amendment rather than the parliamentary situation?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's amendment would strike out, as I understand, beginning with the word "Provided" in line 17, on page 7, down through the word "thereto" in line 24, page 7.

What that language does, as I read it, is simply to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to transfer certain funds now available for the operation of the R. E. A. and the Farm Credit Administration to funds derived from other appropriations.

I share the Senator's fears about the consolidation of the Legal Division of the R. E. A. with the regular Legal Division of the Department of Agriculture; but, in case the Senator's amendment should be adopted, I wonder if that of itself would prevent the consolidation of the Legal Division of the R. E. A. with the regular legal staff of the Department of Agriculture. I also wonder if, under the language on lines 5, 6, and 7, this consolidation might not be effected, and then, if the Senator's amendment should prevail, if there might not be any money with which to pay the R. E. A. lawyers.

I ask that question in order that I may know the full effect of the Senator's amendment. I have some doubts about it. I will say frankly to the Senator that I talked with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has charge of the bill, and I think perhaps that is his view of what might be the effect of the Senator's amendment. In other words, if we should adopt the Senator's amendment, it would not prevent the consolidation, but we might have the consolidation and then not have any money with which to pay the lawyers from the R. E. A. who are consolidated with the lawyers of the regular staff.

I wonder if there could be any such situation as that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have not any fear of that result. My fear was described yesterday as well as I could describe it. I do not desire to consume any further time in expressing it over again. What I am trying to prevent is having the legal department of the R. E. A.—I shall have to call it that; I presume that is not its technical name, but it is probably known as the Legal Division of the R. E. A.—blotted out under the office of the Solicitor of the Agricultural Department. In other words, I think the lawyers who are trained in this line of work can do a better job of looking after the R. E. A. than the lawyers in the Solicitor's office can do unless they have several years' practice along that line. I think those connected with the R. E. A. who are fearful about the effect of this provision are fearful of that one thing.

Yesterday something was said about the salaries. The next proviso contains something about the salaries, to which I have no objection; but I was informed today that the highest salary in the R. E. A. for the man who has charge of the Legal Division is $9,000. It does not come to $10,000, as was said. That may be wrong. I do not think it is very material whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I made that statement yesterday. I find today—and I intended to correct the record before this proposition is voted upon—that I was in error with respect to the R. E. A. The Chief Counsel for the Farm Credit Administration, who is likewise affected by the amendment, receives a salary of $10,000 per year; but, as stated by the Senator from Nebraska, the compensation of the General Counsel for the Rural Electrification Administration is only $9,000 per year at the present time, and therefore he would not be affected by the second proviso..

Mr. HILL. Mr. President will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I yield the floor.

Mr. HILL. I desire to ask the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, whether or not, if the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska should be adopted, the Secretary of Agriculture would still have power under the preceding language of this section to consolidate the legal division of the R. E. A. with the regular legal staff of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only would the Secretary of Agriculture have that right, but, as I sought to point out yesterday, under the language of the bill as passed by the House these departments are consolidated. The Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee and requested the language which the Senator from Nebraska seeks to strike out to enable him to compensate the legal staff of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration; and the Secretary stated in his letter that he feared that without the language which the Senator from Nebraska is seeking to have eliminated from the bill he could not pay any of the lawyers of the Rural Electrification Administration or the Farm Credit Administration, and it would be necessary for him to disband those two legal staffs. The committee, feeling that the Rural Electrification Administration was an important part of the Federal Government and a very important part of the Department of Agriculture, felt that it should have the benefit of the legal staff that it had assembled, and sought to provide language in the bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the legal staff. If this language is stricken out, according to the representations made to the committee, the present legal staffs of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration are very likely not to be able to draw any compensation.

Mr. HILL. The Senator means, then, that we would have the consolidation without any money to pay those of the legal staff of the R. E. A. who are consolidated with the regular legal staff of the Department?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly. The consolidation takes place by virtue of language in the House bill which is not affected by the Senate amendment. The Senate

committee was merely seeking to provide the Secretary of Agriculture with authority to pay the legal staffs of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration. I tried to make that clear yesterday.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask one other question in that connection. Does the language put in the bill by the House of itself effect the consolidation, or does that language of itself merely authorize the Secretary to make the consolidation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the consolidation has already been effected by proclamation of the President of the United States. I quote from Reorganization Order No. 1. This is part 4, section 401 of the proclamation issued by the President pursuant to the Reorganization Act:

The Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, and their functions and activities, together with their respective personnel, records, and property (including office equipment), are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, and shall be administered in such Department under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be responsible for the coordination of their functions and activities.

The Rural Electrification Administration was not brought into the Department of Agriculture by Reorganization Order No. 1. It was brought in by Reorganization Order No. 2, from which I now quote:

The Rural Electrification Administration and its functions and activities—

That also applied to the legal staff of the Rural Electrification Administration—

are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture and shall be administered in that Department by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I now desire to direct the Senator's attention to another statute which is not involved in the reorganization order. This statute says that—

The legal work of the Department of Agriculture shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Solicitor.

That is 36th Statutes, 416.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, then, takes the position that really no question of consolidation is now before the Senate; that the consolidation has been effected?

Mr. RUSSELL. The consolidation has been effected by the Reorganization Act. I may say, however, that up to this time the legal departments of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration have not been directly under the Solicitor of the Department, and that that was only brought about by the action of the House in this year's bill, because neither the present nor the former Secretary of Agriculture had placed these legal staffs where they belonged, which is in the office of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. Now this provision has been adopted; and, as I understand the matter—of course I may be mistaken—what the Senator proposes would fix the item so that the legal staffs of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration could not draw any compensation for their services.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I understand the situation, without this language in the committee amendment the whole amount available to the Solicitor for legal assistance would be $209,535. That is the total amount carried in the bill for that purpose, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that if he is already consuming that amount in the regular operations of the legal division of the Solicitor's office, he could not pay any of these other attorneys in the R. E. A. or the Farm Credit Administration any salary unless he deducted from the $209,535 enough to pay them. That, of course, would mean that he would have to dismiss somebody else, provided there is a consolidation, which, if it has not actually been done, can be done tomorrow by the Secretary of Agriculture by placing the legal staff of the R. E. A. and the Farm Credit Administration under the Solicitor.

This amendment is intended to authorize the transfer and the addition to the $209,000 of whatever may be available for the R. E. A. or the Farm Credit Administration legal forces; that would be added to the $209,000 and would give them the right to pay their staffs. Is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret very much that I failed to express myself in the English language so as to convey that thought to others. I have endeavored three or four times to express in words very similar to those used by the Senator from Kentucky the very thought the Senator from Kentucky conveys.

I wish to say again that in my judgment without this language in the bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer funds to pay these lawyers in the R. E. A. and the Farm Credit Administration, there will be no legal authorization or appropriation with which to compensate them.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask whether the question before the Senate is the adoption or rejection of the committee amendment contained in the language in italics or whether there is a motion to strike out something.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on a motion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to strike out the first proviso, which begins in line 17 and ends in line 24.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a part of the committee amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to be understood, of course, as trying to contradict the Senator from Georgia. I have no doubt of his sincerity, and he may be right and I may be wrong. If he is right, if we adopt this amendment, no money can be expended. That assumes, to start with, that as the House passed the bill it left out entirely provision for the men referred to by the Senator, because this language was not in the bill as it passed the House, and they would not have received any compensation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator read all the provision affected by the amendment, the entire provision?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will read lines 5 and 6 on page 7, he will see that the House changed the language that was submitted by the Budget, and the House language provides that—

For all legal services for the Department of Agriculture, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including clerical and other necessary expenses incident thereto, $209,535.

Mr. President, the Department has already budgeted that full amount down to the last dollar to compensate those already employed in the Solicitor's Office. So, when the House changed the language submitted by the Budget for the legal services, Office of the Solicitor, so as to read, "For all legal services," they brought the legal staff of the Rural Electrification Administration into the Solicitor's Office, and did not provide a way under which they could be compensated. At least there is some doubt whether the House language is clear.

The Senate committee amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer funds from appropriation to this agency with which to pay these men, and that is the only thing involved in the language which the Senator from Nebraska seeks to strike from the bill. At least, that is my opinion, and it is not altogether unsupported. Someone will have to rule on this. When the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture was before the committee he expressed the same view I have expressed, and he is the man who will rule on the matter. I will read to the Senate the testimony given by the Solicitor when he appeared before the subcommittee. I asked him this question:

How about the proviso on page 7, which appears in the bill for the first time?

That proviso is found in lines 13 to 17, through the word "involved."

Mr. WHITE. There are three points in connection with that to which the attention of the Senate committee is called.

The first is that the language of the bill, as it now stands, would require that all legal services for the Department of Agriculture be performed under this particular appropriation and other funds transferred to the appropriation.

The House proceeded further in the language of the House provision, and sought to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer the amount set out in the Budget schedule. They thought they were taking care of the matter by that language. It so happens that in the case of the Rural Electrification Administration there is no budget schedule for legal services as such. So the Senate committee amendment was designed with the purpose in view of compensating the legal staff of the Rural Electrification Administration by giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to

transfer the funds from the general appropriation to the Rural Electrification Administration.

I resume reading from the testimony of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture:

It occurred to the Department that perhaps the House, when it inserted this restrictive language, did not think of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration. These are two agencies which were formerly independent establishments of the Government and which were transferred to the Department under the Reorganization Act of 1939. At the time of the transfer, each of these agencies had its own legal personnel for the performance of legal services, and the two agencies have continued up to the present time to maintain their legal organizations. This language would make it mandatory for the Secretary of Agriculture on July 1 to transfer to the Solicitor's office all the personnel and all the functions of the present legal divisions of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Now I read from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture:

This language, if finally enacted by the Congress, would make it mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture, on July 1, 1941: (a) To transfer to the Office of the Solicitor the functions and personnel of the legal divisions of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration; and (b) to transfer to this appropriation, from the funds available for the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration, the sums necessary to cover the cost of providing legal services for these agencies.

Although the basic statute of the Department of Agriculture provides that the legal work of the Department shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Solicitor, the Secretary of Agriculture thus far has not deemed it practicable to integrate the legal work of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration with the legal work of the remainder of the Department. These agencies were transferred to the Department of Agriculture under the Reorganization Act of 1939. At the time of the transfers, each agency maintained a legal division for the performance of legal services for the agency. These legal divisions have continued to function separate and apart from the office of the Solicitor.

That is the opinion of the Department on the effect of the House language as bringing the legal staff of the R. E. A. and of the Farm Credit Administration into the Solicitor's office.

I now return to the testimony of Mr. White before the subcommittee:

Mr. WHITE. The second point to which we would like to direct the attention of the committee is that, when and if the legal work and the legal personnel of the R. E. A. and the Farm Credit Administration are transferred to the office of the Solicitor, there should be some clear provision for the transfer to this particular appropriation of money from the funds provided for the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration in order to defray the cost to the Solicitor's office of the legal work of these agencies.

Then the Solicitor suggested the language which the Senate committee adopted and brings here in the bill, to permit funds to be transferred to pay the cost of these legal staffs. That is all the language does.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, reading the House provision, we find that it transfers these functions to the Solicitor, without transferring the money that should go with them.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is some doubt as to that. The House language did not transfer the money clearly, and that is what our committee was seeking to do.

Mr. SMITH. Reading the Senate committee amendment, we find that it transfers not only the legal division, but the compensation for it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that if the committee found that the sum originally appropriated in the House bill was not sufficient, it could have remedied the whole matter by making the amount large enough so it would be sufficient. That is all that would have been necessary. I do not know whether money enough has been appropriated to pay for the full legal services under the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and under the R. E. A. I have assumed there was, but if there was not, we ought to increase that amount of course, or it should come here later in a deficiency appropriation bill, I suppose. The legal officers, together with everything else in the R. E. A., went over to the Department of Agriculture; they were all transferred by the President's order under the reorganization law which we passed. If the money which we appropriated is not sufficient to pay the lawyers in the Department of Agriculture who were there before, and also the lawyers who were transferred to the Department from the R. E. A., and who are just as legally in the Department of Agriculture as any other lawyers, why is it said that all that money will be used to pay the lawyers who have heretofore been under the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and that none of it will be used to pay those who have been transferred there by the President's order.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language does not say any such thing.

Mr. NORRIS. I gathered that from the Senator's argument.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language is:

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may transfer to this appropriation, from the funds available for the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration, such sums as he may determine are properly allocable to the cost of providing legal services for these agencies.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that. There is no dispute about that. The Senator evidently does not see the point I am trying to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not.

Mr. NORRIS. That is my fault, of course. But I am trying to explain that when we appropriate a certain sum for the legal services of the Department of Agriculture it necessarily must include, or ought to at least, the attorneys in the Department of Agriculture and also the attorneys who have been transferred to the Department, and if it does not, the amount ought to be increased, of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what we are trying to do by this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. The way to have changed that would have been simply to increase the sum appropriated. That is all that would have been necessary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have tried to make clear, and evidently I have not been able to do so, that the House brought the R. E. A. and Farm Credit Administration into this appropriation by the change of the language in line 5, on page 2 of the bill. It further sought to provide for transfer of the funds, but the Budget schedule for the Rural Electrification Administration on which appropriations are based, does not contain a schedule for the Legal Department as such. It contains a schedule for a lawyer who might be a member of the engineering staff of the R. E. A., or who might be in the Loan Division of the R. E. A., but it contains no Budget estimates for the Legal Department as such. The committee, therefore, did not know what amount was properly allocated for legal work of the Rural Electrification Administration. The Department was evidently in some doubt, because it did not bring to the committee any specific sum of money that was now being expended for the Legal Department of the Rural Electrification Administration. Under amendment we therefore vested the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to transfer to the cost of the lawyers of the R. E. A. such amount as could be properly charged to the Rural Electrification Administration for legal services.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if there was nothing else than that, all that would be necessary would be to increase the amount. It seems to me this amendment is not needed in order to provide for the payment of lawyers in the R. E. A. They are a part of the Department of Agriculture as much as anyone else.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia on this matter. If you try to solve the problem simply by increasing the appropriation from $209,000 to some sum larger than that——

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know that that is necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but the Senator has suggested that.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If you did that only, you still leave in these two funds whatever money is available there, and it could not, without this amendment, be transferred and allocated to this same work. So you would have the lawyers of the R. E. A. and of the Farm Credit Administration paid out of the general appropriation, and still have these two funds intact.

Mr. NORRIS. I may be wrong on this matter, of course, but it seems plain to me that the amendment is not necessary to accomplish any of those things. I cannot help but be suspicious, Mr. President, that the amendment was put in the bill without the knowledge of the

R. E. A. or anyone connected with the R. E. A.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have stated here once on the floor that the amendment was suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. NORRIS. Absolutely. That is what the Senator stated.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Secretary of Agriculture, under the reorganization order of the President, is charged with the general supervision and direction of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, I think that is correct; but no one connected with the legal department, or any other part of the R. E. A., ever had any notice of the matter until seeing it in print. The committee had before it the Administrator, Mr. Slattery, and he testified. He was not asked a thing about this matter. The attorneys knew nothing about it until they read this amendment that was put into the agricultural appropriation bill just a day or so before the Senate took the matter up, and naturally, they wondered why all this was done without their knowing anything about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have only this to say, that when the Secretary of Agriculture comes before the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations and makes a statement, and makes some suggestions as to some appropriations for some one of the bureaus, the committee does not bring all the personnel of that bureau before it and ask them what they think about the matter. The Secretary of Agriculture is charged with responsibility for administering the Department. When he comes in and makes a statement on a question of policy to the committee, we assume that he is the man who is empowered to establish the policy of the Department. I may say that the Secretary's letter requesting that this language be contained in the bill, under date of March 14, the day the committee started the hearings, came to the committee several days before the Secretary of the Rural Electrification Administration appeared before the committee, and the Rural Electrification Administration had ample time to acquire full knowledge of what the Secretary of Agriculture had recommended.

Mr. NORRIS. But they did not know anything about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. That certainly is not the fault of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. They never heard of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have nothing further to say about the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems strange to me that this amendment could be put into the bill without any member of the Rural Electrification Administration, from top to bottom, knowing anything about it. It seems strange that no member of an organization as large as is the Rural Electrification Administration, which goes into every nook and corner of the United States, an organization almost as large as the Department of Agriculture itself, should know anything about it.

I am not charging anything against the committee, and perhaps not much against anybody. I am not now thinking of the committee. However, I cannot help wondering. For some time it has been known that there has been a sort of organization among Government employees who wanted to get rid of Harry Slattery. Various high officials in the Department of Agriculture have spoken to me about it. I asked one man who told me about it, "Do you know Mr. Slattery?" He said, "Oh, yes." I asked him, "Have you known him a long time?" He said, "Oh, yes." I said, "What do you think of him?" He replied, "He is incorruptible. I do not believe any of the rumors I have heard." I said, "Well, what do you want to do about it?" He said, "I have heard so much that we ought to do something." I said, "It seems to me the thing to do is to inquire of those who are making the charges."

It is alleged by a great many that there are quite a number in the office who want Mr. Slattery's job. I know there has been a systematic effort to get him out of it. So far as I know no one has charged any dishonesty or anything wrong with him. No definite charge is made.

I first heard of the committee amendment the day we took up the bill in the Senate. When my attention was called to the amendment I could not help thinking that perhaps the amendment is working along the same line as the efforts to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I have occupied a longer time than I had intended. I am ready for a vote, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	O'Mahoney
Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Glass	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Russell
Bankhead	Gurney	Sheppard
Barbour	Hatch	Shipstead
Barkley	Hayden	Smith
Bilbo	Hill	Spencer
Bone	Holman	Stewart
Brooks	Hughes	Taft
Bulow	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Byrnes	Lodge	Tunnell
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Caraway	McCarran	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wallgren
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	Wiley
Davis	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Norris	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment reported by the committee, which would have the effect of eliminating lines 17 to 24, inclusive, on page 7. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. Not knowing how he would vote, and being unable to obtain a transfer of my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico, [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR];

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

These Senators are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—20

Aiken	Danaher	Shipstead
Austin	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Ball	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Langer	Tobey
Burton	Murray	Wiley
Butler	Norris	Willis
Capper	Pepper	

NAYS—49

Adams	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Glass	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Bankhead	Guffey	Russell
Barbour	Gurney	Sheppard
Barkley	Hatch	Smith
Brooks	Hayden	Spencer
Bulow	Hill	Stewart
Byrd	Hughes	Taft
Byrnes	Kilgore	Truman
Caraway	Lee	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Vandenberg
Connally	Lucas	Van Nuys
Davis	McCarran	Wallgren
Ellender	Maloney	Wheeler
George	Murdock	
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—26

Bilbo	Harrison	Reed
Brewster	Herring	Schwartz
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bunker	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Wagner
Chavez	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Mead	White
Downey	Nye	

So Mr. NORRIS' amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM APRIL 3 TO APRIL 14, 1941

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask to have laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 26, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 3, 1941, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1941.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to ask the Senate to act on the concurrent resolution in order that the House may know what action the Senate takes. I have been informed by the Speaker and by the majority leader of the other House that by tomorrow night the House will have concluded any business it may be called upon to transact between now and the 14th of April, and that instead of having the usual 3-day recesses the House would like to recess or adjourn for a period of 11 days from tomorrow, the 3d of April, until the 14th of April. I see no reason why the Senate should object to that course unless there is some legislation upon which the House would be required to act before that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kentucky will not insist on a vote on the concurrent resolution at this time. If we should make no faster progress than we have made today, there might be an adjournment tomorrow afternoon with the agricultural appropriation bill suspended in midair. I certainly hope that by tomorrow we shall have completed consideration of the bill and that the Senator will not insist on consideration of the concurrent resolution at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill before us is the regular appropriation bill. Is there anything in it that would take effect before the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; there are supplemental appropriations in the bill for a number of purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that the concurrent resolution would have no effect upon the Senate; it refers only to the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that; but if the Senator from Kentucky secures adoption of the concurrent resolution at this time, any Senator who might be opposed to certain features of the bill might take the floor tomorrow at noon and block the passage of the bill until such time as the House had adjourned, so that the House could not take action upon the bill until the 14th of April.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not proposed that the Senate adjourn. Under the Constitution, neither House may adjourn for longer than 3 days without the consent of the other House.

Mr. RUSSELL. The concurrent resolution would not affect the Senate at all?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; we can hold a session every day next week if we choose to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then I have no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to inquire if adoption of the concurrent resolution would prevent sending a bill—for instance, an appropriation bill—to the House of Representatives during the recess or adjournment of 10 days.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if the House were in adjournment, nothing could be done by the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should not like to see the bill tied up in such a way that the conferees could not work on it. It is a long bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Unless the bill contains some emergency appropriation that will have to be acted on before the 14th of April, I am not in a position to say how urgent it is that the bill go to conference at once. However, the concurrent resolution obviates the necessity of the House recessing every 3 days. There will not be enough Members of the House in attendance to have a quorum anyway; and the result will be just the same. It would be a little embarrassing for a Member, who might desire to go home for a few days, to have to explain that the House is in session.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate should pass the agricultural appropriation bill either this evening or tomorrow afternoon and should request a conference with the House, and if conferees were named on the part of both Houses, there would be nothing to prevent them from conferring on the bill, would there?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all. The conferees could go ahead with their work, and any committees of the two Houses could go ahead with any work they might have before them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand it is proposed to obtain the consent of the Senate to the adjournment of the House?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about the matter of obtaining the consent of the House if the Senate should desire to adjourn?

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be no difficulty about that. We might join in a concurrent resolution to adjourn both Houses of the Congress for the same length of time. But there is a bill, which I hope will be reported tomorrow, extending the Coal Act, which expires on the 26th day of April. If that act is to be extended, it must be done in time to secure the appropriation to administer it before April 26.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will not press the matter now.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are not, in the Senate, in a position to adjourn for 10 days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in House Concurrent Resolution 26.

The resolution was concurred in.

VIRGINIA BOWEN, WILLIE W. HUDSON, AND JOHN L. WALKER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 319) for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker, which were, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "$1,048.25" and insert "$1,000"; on page 1, line 8, to strike out "$403.75" and insert "$401.25"; and on page 1, line 9, to strike out "$58.25" and insert "$57."

Mr. BYRD. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP MATTERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me an informative statement in the form of an unusually well-digested press release by the Congressional Information Bureau.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries are requested to maintain order while going out and coming into the galleries.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, most of the disorder is on the floor of the Senate. I want that clearly noted in the RECORD.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The release is dated April 1, 1941, and pertains to immigration and American citizenship matters. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who are interested in those subjects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1941.

REGULATIONS AMENDED GOVERNING MANIFESTING OF ALIEN AND CITIZEN PASSENGERS DEPARTING FROM THE UNITED STATES

Amendment of immigration rules and regulations relating to manifesting of alien passengers and citizens departing from the United States and its insular possessions has been made by the Department of Justice in a general order (No. C-30), scheduled to become effective on and after May 1, 1941.

The general order, dated March 29, 1941, appears in today's issue of the Federal Register under title 8, chapter I, part 107; amends rule 2, subdivision C, paragraph 3 of the Immigration Rules and Regulations of January 1, 1930, edition of December 31, 1936, as amended; is signed by Lemuel B. Schofield, Special Assistant to the Attorney General and approved by Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General; and was filed with the Register on March 31, 1941, under F. R. Doc. 41-2352, at 11: 16 a. m.

Following is the text of the general order, which adds to rule 2, subdivision C, paragraph 3, Immigration Rules and Regulations, requirements as to the depositing with immigration officials of the manifests covered by the specified rule and section:

"Pursuant to the authority contained in sections 12 and 23 of the act of February

5, 1917 (39 Stat. 882, 892; 8 U. S. C. 148, 102); section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. V (5 F. R. 2223); section 37 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 675; 8 U. S. C. 458), and 8 C. F. R. 90.1 (5 F. R. 3503), section 107.11 of said regulations (Rule 2, subdivision C, paragraph 3 of the Immigration Rules and Regulations of January 1, 1930, edition of December 31, 1936, as amended) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 107.11. Forms required; specifications as to departing passengers; time for filing: The list required by section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917 containing information regarding alien passengers and citizens of the United States and its insular possessions departing from the United States and its insular possessions, either permanently or temporarily, shall be typewritten or printed in the English language on commercial ledger paper in sheets 21 by 16 inches (substance 32), color white, according in every respect to Form 628 now in use and approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, or on such form or forms as hereafter may be prescribed. Such lists shall be deposited with the immigration officials before the departure of the vessel, except that in the case of vessels making regular trips to ports of the United States such lists may be delivered to the immigration officials at the port of departure within 24 hours after departure of the vessel. (Sec. 12, 39 Stat. 882; 8 U. S. C. 148.)

"This amendment shall be effective on and after May 1, 1941."

—

WOULD PROHIBIT UNITED STATES SHIPS FROM BRINGING ALIENS TO THIS COUNTRY IF CITIZENS ARE UNABLE TO OBTAIN SPACE

Requirement that the master of any ship of American registry shall not take on board any alien for passage to the United States unless the American consul at the port of departure shall certify that at the date of sailing there were no citizens of the United States evacuated from countries at war and within his consular jurisdiction desirous of obtaining passage to this country, would be provided under the terms of a bill (S. 1287) introduced today in the Senate by Senator REYNOLDS, of North Carolina.

The measure, which has been referred for consideration to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would provide a penalty of $10,000 for violation of its terms, would make the vessel liable for that penalty, and authorize its seizure and action against it by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the offense.

Following is the text of the Reynolds proposal:

"Be it enacted, etc., That, after the enactment of this act, it shall be unlawful for the captain of any ship of American registry to take or retain on board, as a passenger to the United States, any subject or citizen of a foreign state, unless the United States consul at the port of departure shall certify that at the date of sailing there were no citizens of the United States evacuated from countries now at war, within his jurisdiction, desirous of obtaining passage to the United States and able to pay for such space as may be necessary for their accommodations.

"2. The Secretary of State shall, upon the passage of this act, instruct all diplomatic and consular officers of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and for the communication of its purposes to American citizens residing abroad and seeking an opportunity to return to the United States.

"3. Any person who shall violate, attempt to violate, or connive at the violation or evasion of any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000, for which sum the vessel shall be liable, and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the offense."

—

TENEROWICZ OFFERS BILL CARRYING SHORT-TERM NATURALIZATION PROCEDURE FOR ALIENS PERMANENTLY ADMITTED PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 1930

Short-term naturalization for certain aliens who were admitted into the United States for legal and permanent residence prior to January 1, 1930, would be provided under the terms of a bill (H. R. 4234) introduced in the House on March 31, 1941, by Representative TENEROWICZ, of Michigan.

The measure, which has been referred for consideration to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, would amend the Nationality Act of 1940 by adding immediately after section 320 of that act a new section (sec. 320a), to read as follows:

"Persons admitted prior to January 1, 1930

"SEC. 320a. Any alien eligible for citizenship who, prior to the enactment of this section, has made a declaration of intention or filed a petition for naturalization, and who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence prior to January 1, 1930, and has ever since lawful entry maintained a bona fide residence in the United States, may be naturalized upon full and complete compliance with all requirements of the naturalization laws, with the following exceptions: That the applicant be exempt from the required oral and written examination, and that after thorough investigation as to the fitness of the applicant, he or she shall be required to appear in any court exercising naturalization jurisdiction and file his petition in person, and to take the prescribed oath of allegiance in open court. The petition for naturalization shall be supported by affidavits of two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, identifying the petitioner named in the petition and attesting as to the good moral character of the applicant."

—

FAVORABLE REPORT MADE TO HOUSE ON BILL TO PROVIDE SHORT-TERM NATURALIZATION FOR CERTAIN ALIEN VETERANS OF MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

Favorable report, without amendment, was made to the House on March 31, 1941, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on the bill (H. R. 4167, H. Rept. No. 355) to provide short-term naturalization for alien veterans of the naval or military forces of the United States who served during the World War or the Spanish-American War. The report was made by Representative ALLEN, of Louisiana.

Introduction of the measure in the House by Representative VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, was covered in our letter No. D–402A, of March 27, 1941, at which time we carried the full text of the proposal.

Explaining that the purpose of the bill is to exempt honorably discharged veterans of the Spanish-American and World Wars from the requirements an ordinary alien is subjected to in securing American citizenship, Representative ALLEN, in his report, asserts the measure was originally introduced by Mr. VAN ZANDT at the request of veteran organizations; that at a public hearing held on it, representatives of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and Disabled American Veterans of the World War appeared to urge its enactment; and that no one appeared in opposition.

After citing the history of legislation designed to afford a short-term naturalization procedure to certain alien veterans, Mr. ALLEN'S report states the necessity for the bill is due to the fact that the Alien Registration Act of 1940, together with the requirements of industry that only citizens be given employment, for the first time apprised many Spanish-American and World War veterans of the fact that they were not American citizens.

"When these veterans were called upon to produce proof of their citizenship," continues the Allen report, "they found in many cases that their parents neglected to take the necessary steps of acquiring citizenship. The veteran organizations who support this legislation stress the fact that many veterans of the World War are denied employment because they do not possess the necessary proof of citizenship.

"It is impossible to estimate the number of alien veterans who will take advantage of the provisions of this bill. It appeared to your committee that the least that this Government could do in recognition of the services of these veterans is to grant this small privilege. Therefore, this report is a unanimous one and the committee recommend speedy passage of the bill."

ALLEN WOULD EXCLUDE CERTAIN ALIENS FROM UNITED STATES

Aliens imprisoned or otherwise incarcerated in the United States or in a foreign country would be excluded from this country for a period of 5 years from the date of release under the terms of a bill (H. R. 4215), introduced in the House March 27, 1941, by Representative ALLEN, Louisiana.

The proposal, which has been referred for consideration to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, reads as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That no alien who has been imprisoned or otherwise incarcerated in the United States or in a foreign country shall be eligible to apply for admission into the United States until after the lapse of a period of 5 years from his or her release from confinement and until such alien shall have made an affirmative showing that he or she was not confined for the commission of a crime involving moral turpitude and that he or she has been a person of good moral character since such confinement."

WALTER S. MITCHELL, *President.*

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—printing and binding", on page 9, line 10, after the word "direct", to strike out "and also including $50,000 for the publications entitled 'Diseases of the Horse' ($25,000) and 'Diseases of Cattle' ($25,000) to be printed from the latest available manuscript and to be distributed in the manner provided herein for the distribution of the congressional quota of farmers' bulletins,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Experiment Stations—payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations", on page 12, line 2, after "(7 U. S. C. 386–386b)", to strike out "$67,500" and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 24, after "7 U. S. C. 427–427g)", to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert: "$2,463,708: *Provided,* That of this amount

$63,708 shall be allotted to States and Territories for which allotments under the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, for the fiscal year 1942 are less than the allotment of the respective State or Territory in the fiscal year 1941, each such State or Territory to receive a total allotment under the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, in 1942 at least equal to the allotment for the respective State or Territory in 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 9, after the word "stations", to strike out "$6,862,500" and insert "$6,933,708."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses", on page 14, line 24, after the word "Stations", to strike out "$7,107,235" and insert "$7,178,443."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Special research fund, Department of Agriculture", on page 15, line 20, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico", on page 16, line 19, after "(7 U. S. C. 343 c-1)", to strike out "$203,000" and insert "as amended, $555,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 18, after "(7 U. S. C. 343f-343g)", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$128,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 20, after the word "work", to strike out "$13,806,918" and insert "$14,186,918."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses", on page 18, line 5, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$550,000" and insert "$620,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 21, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$790,000" and insert "860,000", and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$667,756" and insert "$726,236."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, at the end of line 24, to increase the total appropriation for the Extension Service, from $14,596,918 to $15,046,918.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics", on page 19, line 18, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$857,105" and insert "$3,120,000"; in line 20, before the words "of which", to strike out "together with $1,762,895 transferred from other appropriations as herein provided,", and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,615,812" and insert "$1,765,812."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations", on page 20, line 21, after the words "Grand total, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture", to strike out "$26,890,268" and insert "$29,882,371."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and Expenses", on page 25, line 25, after the word "animals", to strike out "$603,500" and insert "$611,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 4, after the words "In all, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry", to strike out "$13,964,300" and insert "$13,972,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals", on page 28, line 15, after the words "Total, Bureau of Animal Industry", to strike out "$13,964,300" and insert "$13,972,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry—Salaries and Expenses", on page 30, line 24, before the words "of which", to strike out "$567,600" and insert "$576,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 12, after the word "byproducts", to strike out "$43,500" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 15, after the word "conditions", to strike out "$226,828" and insert "$229,228."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 24, after the word "control", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$306,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 10, after "(16 U. S. C. 581b)", to strike out "$245,000" and insert "$255,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 19, after the word "storage", to strike out "$1,431,362" and insert "$1,441,362."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 21, after the word "handling", to strike out "$140,544" and insert "$145,544."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 23, after the word "Industry", to increase the total for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, from $5,201,055 to $5,250,455.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 40, line 1, after the word "Act", to strike out "$11,004,500, of which not to exceed $18,500 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics,'" and insert "$11,086,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 11, after the word "industries", to strike out "$100,000, of which not to exceed $2,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'" and insert "$98,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 5, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$605,000" and insert "$655,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 9, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$270,935" and insert "$280,935."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 12, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$632,500" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by me before the subcommittee, appearing on page 421, and following, of the hearings, may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY, MADISON, WIS.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the committee has been having exhaustive hearings on this bill, and I wish to conserve the time of the committee as much as possible. Therefore, I shall not go into any of the background in relation to the Forest Products Laboratory, because on practically every appropriation bill I have appeared here before this committee and discussed in detail the historical background and the definite research achievements of the Forest Products Laboratory which have inured to the benefit of all of the States of the Union producing wood in commercial quantities.

I appear here this morning in the hope that I can impress upon the committee the importance of increasing the appropriation authorized by the Budget and passed by the House for the purpose of enabling the Forest Products Laboratory to be geared into the national-defense program and to render somewhat the same constructive service in relation to the national defense which it rendered in the last World War. I shall not burden the committee with a résumé of its achievements in that field.

There is a critical and increasing need for adequate technical and scientific information and services to insure the rapid procurement and efficient use of a great volume and variety of wood and other forest products required in our expanding national-defense program.

It is my information that in Germany in the present war they are utilizing forest products for such diversified purposes as wood for cantonments, barracks, houses, factories, hangars, scaffolding, boats, wharves, bridges, pontoons, railway ties, telephone poles, mine props, antitank barriers, shoring, shipping containers, and air-raid shelters; they are also using plywood for airplanes, blackout shutters, prefabricated housing, concrete forms, ship patterns, assault boats, ship interiors, truck bodies, and army lockers; fuel for gas engines, trucks, tractors, stoves, boilers, and mobile kitchens; pulp and paper for surgical dressings, boxes, cartridge wrappers, building papers, pasteboards, gas-mask filters, printing, and propaganda distribution; synthetic wood fibers, such as in rayon, artificial wool and cotton, for clothing, parachutes, and other textiles; wood cellulose for explosives; wood charcoal for gas masks and steel production; resin for shrapnel and varnishes, turpentine for flame throwers, paint, and varnishes; cellulose acetate for photographic film, shatterproof glass, dynamite; wood bark for insulation, tannin, and dyestuffs; and rubber for

all peacetime uses in addition to tire, tank treads, and other standard army and navy uses, and plastics for many uses.

I merely mention all of these categories to indicate the wide need for the further continuation of research in these fields in relation to national defense.

Most of the items which I have mentioned are essential to our own needs; and all of them may become so as the emergency continues.

Essentially the national-defense program is concerned with using for any given purpose the widest number of wood species, of the smallest dimensions and cheapest grades and qualities permissible for satisfactory services; with the developments of improved techniques and processes to provide either better or cheaper products and to accelerate procurement; and with efficient specifications and competent inspection.

Illustrative of the kinds of activities which might be carried out in an expended and accelerated program of research in relation to the national defense, and the economic significance of the results, I would like to mention briefly the following:

A new waterproof, nonshrink, hard-surfaced "compregnated wood," successfully developed for covering for wings and fuselages or parts of them for training and combat planes, would be superior to the plywood and possibly to the aluminum now used. Also, it would relieve the possible future shortage of aluminum and of metal workers; further, this product has possibilities for other military purposes, such as molding hulls of small ships and boats, pressing gunstock blanks, etc.

The best selection of the increasing number of waterproof glues and the control of the techniques for their effective application is critical to the use of plywood, "compregnated wood," and spliced and laminated spars and structural members in airplanes.

A new accelerated method for drying lumber and other wood products in half the usual time is of the utmost significance for rapid procurement deliveries since drying time is the technical "bottleneck" for speed.

Increased yields and better quality of pulp from present mill equipment. Cutting off of the Scandinavian pulp already threatens shortage—which may aggregate, I am advised, as much as 700,000 tons in 1942. The study should also be made of possibility of using hardwoods for pulp. This would, if successful, help to meet the shortage and improve forest practice.

A comprehensive attack on the redesign of containers for the enormous variety of defense commodities would save millions of dollars and also reduce cargo space for individual commodities from 5 to 20 percent as was done in the last war.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask permission to insert at the conclusion of my statement an excerpt from the report of Benedict Crowell on American munitions, 1917-18, in which he outlines the school which was established at the Forest Products Laboratory to train people in packing, and points out the enormous service which it rendered, not only in securing more protection for the commodities to be delivered, but also in conserving shipping space at the time when we were short of ships due to the submarines in the last war.

Senator RUSSELL. We will be glad to have that statement following your remarks.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. The commercial development of a new process giving high yield and quality alpha cellulose from wood pulp would widen the source and reduce the cost of alpha cellulose for explosives and plastics and relieve a possible future cotton-linters shortage.

Improvement in the quality of charcoal from wood and from other sources, such as wood lignin and "compregnated wood," would be of great significance to the production and procurement of gas-mask charcoal.

The development of a new plastic wood, either thermal setting or thermal plastic, might have important application in such military uses as certain structural members of airplanes, ribs for small ships, and supporting frames for coverings on escort wagons.

The wider development and application of a new high-yield semichemical pulping process to many qualities of pulp and to diversified species, particularly hardwoods, is important in alleviating pulp shortages due to cutting off of Scandinavian imports.

Additional needs include such work as the development of engineering data for plywood used for aircraft and other structural purposes; proper fastenings for wooden structural aircraft members; proper splicing, laminating, and gluing of aircraft members from spruce and substitute species; improved finishes for exposed wooden and plywood parts of planes and other structures; application of "connectors" and laminated beams and arches for defense structures; development of the new electrostatic heating for the rapid drying of wood and setting of glues; improved fire-resistant coatings for hangars and other wood structures for protection against incendiary bombs; and the comprehensive education and training of inspectors for defense wood products and processes.

Comprehensive and adequate technical services along the lines that I have mentioned would undoubtedly bring direct economic savings many times greater than the modest expense involved in increasing the appropriation by $600,000. The results are of importance not only to segregated immediate technical problems of the War and Navy Departments but also to anticipated problems and to many other defense agencies such as the Office of Production Management in its procurement problems, the Maritime Commission and the British Procurement and Shipping Agencies in their needs to economize shipping space, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Coast Guard, and those agencies concerned with price control, priorities, and Central and South American problems of exports and imports of lumber, plywood, and pulp and paper.

In view of the things which I have mentioned, there can be no question of the importance of immediately making provision for the best facilities available to be fully utilized on an adequate basis.

The Forest Products Laboratory is the only Federal agency exclusively devoted to technical and scientific work on wood and other forest products. During the last war it was expanded sixfold for technical services mostly for the War and Navy Departments.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you know the amount of the appropriations they received at the peak during the World War, Senator?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I do not believe I have that information, but I can furnish it, Senator, for the record.

(Senator LA FOLLETTE later filed the following information for the record.)

"The total investment in the laboratory buildings and equipment is about $1,500,000. The permanent pay roll is approximately 170, of which about 70 are professional, and 100 nonprofessional employees. This pay roll is 14 percent smaller than it was 8 years ago."

"During the last war about 500 were at work at the laboratory. During the last war the laboratory's defense activities were largely financed through extra allotments and not by regular appropriations. During the last 8 months of the war, $400,000 was provided in this manner. It should be borne in mind that the cost per person on the pay roll during the last war was about one-half of present salaries as provided by the Classification Act and amendments thereto since that time."

Senator LA FOLLETTE. The possibilities of making our forest resources meet military needs in different and more efficient ways were explored with feverish activity at this time. Intensified research yielded information vital to the more efficient promotion of the war. It covered such things as improved drying of spruce for airplanes, walnut for gunstocks, oak for artillery wheels, glued and laminated spars and plywood for aircraft, and redesign of containers for overseas shipment to reduce cargo space.

With such facts as I have presented, and knowing that our present defense needs for forest products are steadily increasing both in volume and variety I wish to respectfully submit to this subcommittee that not to utilize the laboratory to the fullest extent possible would be a tragic error in our present grave emergency.

I have learned that the laboratory's current program of work has already been greatly reoriented to some extent to serve defense problems but not much more can be done in this direction with the appropriations now available for its work. On the other hand its present plant and equipment are sufficient to handle a greatly enlarged defense program, and requests for such work from defense agencies and companies engaged in defense work are steadily increasing.

Gentlemen, I hope you will not overlook this opportunity to see that the laboratory is geared into the defense program for the services so badly needed and which it is so well qualified to provide.

And in connection with another item, Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I would like to urge——

Senator HOLMAN. May I interrupt just a moment, before you leave this item?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Pardon me, Senator; certainly.

Senator HOLMAN. Pardon me; may I make an observation?

Senator RUSSELL. Surely, Senator.

Senator HOLMAN. A few days ago when this matter was up, I called particular attention to this item, and I had not had an opportunity to confer with either of the Senators from Wisconsin; and I made a plea at that time for a figure of an additional $900,000, which had been given to me by correspondents, and so on. But a witness from the Forest Service said $600,000 would be ample for their needs. So I revised my petition for $600,000.

Now, my particular interest in this item is that in the Pacific Northwest there is one of the largest stands of timber in the world. In my State, half of every pay-roll dollar in the area comes from timber and wood products. And we have a very lively interest in the utility and the facilities of this Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. It is very encouraging to me to see that the two Senators from Wisconsin are here talking on the same item.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Senator, I wish to say I very much appreciate and understand the interest of your State in the work of this laboratory, and it reemphasizes the point I made at the outset, that the laboratory serves the entire Nation. The fact that it happens to be located at Madison, Wis., has led some people who are not familiar with it—and of course that does not apply to anybody on this committee—to believe that our interest in this program was purely from the standpoint of the fact that the laboratory was located there. But the laboratory has served every commercial-producing timber area in the whole United States. And I think it deserves a considerable amount of credit for the development of a process which made it possible to use southern woods for pulping,

and is helping to develop a new industry in the South.

Senator GURNEY. Can you tell me, Senator, how many people are employed?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Just let me finish——

Senator GURNEY. And what investment the Government has in the laboratory there?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I cannot give you the exact number of employees.

Senator GURNEY. Approximately.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I know that the original building which was built by the Federal Government was around $950,000. On previous occasions I have had pictures of the laboratories to present to this committee. It is a very large structure and has all of the equipment for this type of research work. I will be glad to furnish, however, Senator, the exact number of employees for the record.

I wanted to say, Senator HOLMAN, that I think that the request to raise this appropriation $1,500,000 would be entirely justified, and would pay dividends. But that increase calculates or takes into consideration the increase in the normal so-called regular activities of the laboratory.

Senator WILEY. They have been asking for that every year.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I know they have, but, realizing the feeling on the part of Members of Congress that the ordinary activities should not be extended, after consultation with my colleague and others, we felt that perhaps we would be in a better position and have more hope of favorable consideration if we confined our request to what we believe are absolutely justified increases in this appropriation, directly relating to the national-defense program.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, this committee has been impressed by the arguments you have made heretofore, Senator, in behalf of securing these amounts for the continuation of the activities of this laboratory.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. But we have encountered a lot of legislative difficulties in writing it finally into the bill.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I understand that, Senator, I know just exactly what the situation is. But may I say, off the record——

(Discussion off the record.)

(The excerpt from the report of Benedict Crowell is in full as follows:)

"AMERICA'S MUNITIONS 1917–18—REPORT OF BENEDICT CROWELL, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR, DIRECTOR OF MUNITIONS

"(From pp. 489–490)

"*Packing*

"American exporters generally for many years have had the reputation of packing goods improperly for overseas shipment. Time and again travelers and investigators in foreign lands have pointed out that if America expected to compete successfully with other manufacturing nations in foreign trade, she must learn to pack goods so that the packages will not break en route and damage the contents. When we sent an Army of over 2,000,000 men to France, it was evident that unless we learned quickly how to put up our supplies properly for overseas shipment, our lack of knowledge would be costly to us.

"Accordingly the packing-service branch of the Quartermaster Department was established. One of its first acts was to set up a school of baling, packing, and crating, this school being located at the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., where studies of packing were being made by scientists. The school started in July 1918, and before the armistice came it had graduated 400 students from its 6-week course.

"Now, while it was important that Army supplies reached the other side in good condition, it was soon seen that of even greater importance would be the economy that might be effected in shipping space by the scientific packing of goods. This obscure and little-known packing-service branch was really one of the most important agencies in the whole war organization, since the results which it accomplished in the saving of ship space were nothing short of astonishing. These economies came at a time when the German submarines were still highly destructive to American and allied shipping, and the shortage of ocean tonnage was one of the most disturbing factors in the whole war situation. The American packing service, in saving thousands of tons of shipping space, in reality offset the operations of the U-boats over a considerable period of time."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with this item, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by me before the subcommittee, beginning on page 427 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY, MADISON, WIS.

Senator RUSSELL. Senator Wiley, did you wish to make a statement?

Senator WILEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to say that I agree fully with everything my colleague has said. I have prepared a statement on this subject which is somewhat more definite.

As some of you probably know, I am a stanch advocate of economy. Frequently it appears to me that our appropriations are more than liberal, and that the expenditure of these appropriations is often unnecessarily wasteful.

I believe, however, that it is poor economy to curtail the activities of any division of government whose work bolsters up our general economy and results in the creation of new industries and new jobs.

I believe also that it is poor economy to curtail the activities of any governmental office engaged in research vital to national defense. If we have learned one lesson from the mechanized armies of the totalitarian governments, it is the lesson that research for military purposes is essential to our own defense.

I could digress and say that what we need more than anything now is the answer to the submarine and the answer, of course, to the airplane, which so far research has not answered, has not obtained the answer for. But that is outside the matter we are discussing here.

I am referring specifically to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. I wish to urge at this time that the laboratory's appropriation be increased from $632,500 to $1,232,000 with the proviso that $600,000 of this $1,232,000 be allocated specifically in equal parts to aircraft research and for other military uses of wood.

During the last World War the Forest Products Laboratory was the only Federal institution concerned wholly with the investigation of the mechanical, physical, and chemical properties of wood and wood products. At that time the laboratory operated on a 24-hour basis. In other words, our past experiences demonstrated its effectiveness in defense work.

At the present time there are numerous known needs for additional research on wood.

Much needs to be done in the way of research to make veneers and plywood serve aircraft production needs.

In the impregnation and compression of these materials to obtain specific properties.

Molding and lamination of aircraft parts for mass production, including gluing and possible electrical setting of the resin glues.

Testing of miscellaneous assemblies.

Development of methods for facile field repairs.

Preparation and improvement of material and process specifications relating to wood in aircraft, including the instruction of inspectors, designers, and specification writers.

Under other defense jobs the following needs are notable:

Gunstocks: Better and faster drying, substitution of species other than walnut; possible wood waste plastic.

Explosives: Possible improvement of the purity and viscosity of alpha cellulose for nitration purposes, possible need for nonspark charge bags for explosives, new matrix papers for encasement of precipitated explosives.

Gas masks: Possible improvement of wood charcoal and of filter paper.

Fire retardants: Special coatings, paints, or treatments for hangars and other critical structures.

Plastics: Application to sundry military uses.

Essential wood chemicals: Stimulation of production of such things as acetone, ethyl, methyl, and propyl alcohols, manitol, sorbitol, and glucose, oxalic and tannic acid, possibility of deriving antiknock chemical from products of hydrogenation of wood by new Forest Products Laboratory process.

Cork and kapok: Exploration of possible substitutes.

Containers: Design of containers for specific commodities and for conservation of space.

Specifications and inspectors: Simplification and improvement of wood material and process specifications and training of inspectors, designers, and specification writers.

On March 19, 1941, in this connection I spoke at some length with Mr. S. Paul Johnston, Coordinator of Research for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—the group which does the basic research work in aeronautics. At that time he advised me as follows—and I am quoting from a direct stenographic transcription—I talked to him over the telephone:

"I have visited the Forest Products Laboratory in connection with the investigation we made of all research facilities in the country and have been very much impressed by the work they have done up there. They made a very valuable contribution during the last war to the technology of the use of wood.

"Now in view of the possibility that we may have to make full use of all available materials for aircraft, we believe that wood and its properties, especially in the form of plywoods (utilizing new kinds of glues, particularly of the plastic type) should be very thoroughly investigated so that designers can have available to them the necessary and valuable information they need for designing airplanes.

"I have found a great deal of interest expressed in the aircraft industry in the use of woods and plywood and plastic combinations. There is a great deal of interest on the part of designers not necessarily in building complete airplanes at this time, but in substituting wood and plastic parts where they can be best used in order to relieve some of the production bottleneck of metal parts. All designers I have talked to say they have very little information available as to this substitution, and I think there is quite a gap which should be filled by an adequate research program.

"I think it is only logical that work up there and the appropriation to cover such work ought to be expanded along with the expansion of all other facilities. There is a need for expanded research in wood and glue as it is applied to aircraft."

I am concerned, however, not only with the direct use of the Forest Products Laboratory in our defense program; I am also concerned with the part it may play in our

economic defense. I submit that that economic defense is also important to the security of our country.

The Forest Products Laboratory can develop new industries; consequently new jobs, and thus play an important part in bolstering our general economy.

At the present time we have 462,000,000 acres of commercial forest land available for national defense. That makes us virtually the world's greatest forest country.

The forest industry represents a tremendous wealth and the forest pay rolls represent a substantial economic contribution to our national economy.

Now, I contend that aside from the importance of the Forest Products Laboratory to our vital defense needs, this laboratory plays an important role in the normal progress of our industrial life. I am thinking now in terms of those permanent peacetime contributions to our American industries and our American economy.

I digress from my statement to say that I am one of those who listened to the Ambassador from England speak last night, and he called attention to what all of us know, that our big problem after the show is over is the peacetime problem; and that, as I have repeatedly said on the floor of the Senate, is the thing that I think is engaging the interest of all thinkers. And that means that right into that picture fits this Forest Products Laboratory.

At the present time industries related to forest products support, in one way or another, some 13,000,000 people. In order to continue this support it is vital that research in forest products not only be maintained, but increased.

I realize that private industry has been carrying the burden of research in many fields of industrial activity, including that of forest products. I maintain, however, that it is the obligation of government (and it is a traditional obligation in this case) to carry on research in forest products. If there were no other reason it would be the obligation of the Federal Government to carry on this research because it is such a large owner of timber in the United States.

I am informed that our Federal Government, at the present time, owns about one-third of the so-called saw timber in the United States. In addition to this there are almost three and one-half million farmers who are small forest owners.

It is impossible for these farmers and small forest owners to participate in any program of research other than the Government program. In other words, the type of forest owner and operator which we encounter in most sections, and in Wisconsin, is usually more of a farmer than an industrialist.

At the present time we are confronted with a grave problem of forest material, which is today almost unusable for lumber purposes. The Forest Products Laboratory, through research, can develop uses for this forest waste.

In my State the United States Forest Products Laboratory in 1932 moved from its small quarters to a marvelous new modern structure at Madison, Wis. This building represented limitless possibilities for forest products research, but throughout the past 8 years of almost unlimited Federal spending, this laboratory has been treated as a kind of stepchild, and has consistently received inadequate appropriations, so that its facilities—and this is a Government institution, mind you—have never been adequately utilized and its research has never been as comprehensive as it should have been. As a matter of fact, there has been a 12-percent reduction in personnel and a 50-percent reduction in supplies, equipment, and travel. That partially answers the chairman's question that he asked Senator La Follette a little while ago; there has been a 12-percent reduction in personnel, and a 50-percent reduction in supplies, equipment, and travel.

I might add that the general overhead cost of maintenance remains just as high for a partly used building as it would be for a completely used building.

Of course, during this same time the laboratory has had to meet greatly increased demands, so that my request to this committee that the appropriation for the laboratory be increased to $1,232,000 is, as Representative MARTIN stated—"extremely moderate in view of what we expect the laboratory to do for American industry, and in relation to the five million expended annually by private forest research agencies."

Now, as I said, there are 13,000,000 people whose income is entirely, or partially, derived from industries concerned with the use of wood. This group represents 10 percent of our population, and yet of all the Federal funds expended for research this group received the benefit of only one hundredth of those funds.

In the last three decades the laboratory has made tremendous strides. For example, in the development of plywood, in the development of laminated structural timber, in the development of the ring connector of modern timber engineering, in the conversion of spruce veneers to a material used in the construction of airplane propellors, in the development of low-cost lumber, in the exploration of lumber insulation, in the utilization of southern pine for pulp, and in numberless other instances.

Now, the point I wish to make is just this: The United States today is faced with a problem of marketing our timber crop, particularly the low-grade wood material so that the grower will receive a profit, and so that 13,000,000 people who derive their livelihood from wood industries can continue to share in our economic blessings.

We cannot meet this problem without research. If there were no research in other fields, there would be no soybean, there would be no plastics, there would be no rayon, and there would be no nylon.

By continued research this laboratory can write the answer to the problem of marketing our timber, and in so doing it will also write the answer to the continued maintenance of 13,000,000 people.

We know that today, in the Office of Production Management, the Priorities Division in copper, in zinc, and in aluminum are being flooded with requests for materials that are becoming scarce. We know that the steel industries are being rationed, and we know that there is a possibility of a shortage of iron ore, and we know also that our coke stocks are at a low ebb.

What does all this mean? It means that we will have to look for forest products to supplement our metal construction. We have 100,000,000 acres of commercial timber. We are going to have to use that timber as it can be adapted to our needs by research.

We know that Britain today is using Douglas fir for airplane construction, and it may be we will have to use plywoods of some kind in airplane construction.

The Coordinator of Research for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics tells me that he considers this to be a vital research activity in aeronautics at the present time. That, my friends, is the judgment of the Coordinator of the group which does all of the basic research work in aeronautics for the United States Government.

Representative MARTIN says about this matter—he said this in his speech of January 27, 1941, before the House of Representatives—the laboratory at the present time, with its limited resources "is making veneers and plywood serve today's aircraft-production needs; further industrializing methods of impregnating and compressing these materials to improve specific properties and developing them for molding and laminating aircraft parts for mass production, including gluing and the electric setting of resin glues; testing aircraft parts; developing methods for rapid and effective field repairs of wood equipment and wood parts.

"With a little larger trickle from the flood of billions going into defense the laboratory could do important work in the use of wood cellulose for nitration, including wood charcoal and filter papers for gas masks, special paints, coatings, or other fire retardants for airplane hangars; and the new process for hydrogenation of wood to produce antiknock chemical for gasoline. The laboratory also has the equipment for developing new designs of containers for military commodities, to conserve shipping space, and for extending pulp and paper production to use more species of wood with higher yields of pulp and to meet American and South American requirements now cut off from former Scandinavian sources.

"What the laboratory may do in wood chemistry may be judged by the great work it has already done in the field of timber engineering, which I have cited."

I agree wholeheartedly with Representative MARTIN and with others who believe that at this time we must make good on the obligation which Congress assumed in 1928 when it passed the McSweeney-McNary Forest Research Act. You will recall that that act authorized—and this, Mr. Chairman, is your answer—an annual appropriation of a million dollars a year for a 10-year period for forest-products research.

Are you listening?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir; that is $10,000,000 over 10 years.

Senator WILEY. That is for 10 years, and that was back in 1928.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator WILEY. There was no limit set for the appropriation after 1938. As a matter of fact we have not as yet made that obligation.

There has not been a single year since 1928 when Congress has appropriated more than $665,000 for research in forest products. At the present time the appropriation is $632,500 and that is $9,000 less than it was in 1932.

It would not be at all unreasonable for us to say at this time that actually the laboratory on the basis of the act of 1928, is entitled to about $5,000,000 back pay. That was the law; that was what you passed. However, that is not the point I raise today. My request today is that Congress should appropriate the $1,232,000 which is now so sorely needed to permit the laboratory to utilize its facilities to the utmost, and to enable the laboratory to make an outstanding contribution to national defense and to make a permanent long-time contribution to our general economy.

Senator RUSSELL. We are very glad to have your statement, Senator WILEY, and we have all been interested in your message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 14, after the numeral "9", to strike out "$250,000, of which not to exceed $3,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' ", and insert "$247,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$13,856,455" and insert "$14,360,455", and in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$868,519" and insert "$898,159."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest-Fire Cooperation", on page 44, line 5, after the word "Act", to

strike out "$2,350,000" and insert "$2,490,000", and in line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "'$10,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", and not to exceed.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of Lands for National Forests", on page 44, line 16, after "(16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521)", to strike out "under sound commercial title satisfactory to the Attorney General as provided in said act,", and in line 21, after the word "lands", to strike out "$1,500,000, of which not to exceed $12,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'", and insert "$1,988,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 23, before the word "of", to increase the total appropriation for the Forest Service from $18,022,455 to $19,154,455.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Roads and Trails", on page 46, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$59,500" and insert "$69,500", and in line 14, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$9,000,000, of which not to exceed $44,500 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'", and insert "$12,955,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering—salaries and expenses," on page 49, line 12, after the word "reports", to strike out "$294,469" and insert "$321,950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 21, after "(5 U. S. C. 556b)", to strike out "$92,400" and insert "$115,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 23, after the word "Engineering", to strike out "$834,733" and insert "$885,214"; and in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$455,752" and insert "$462,572."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—salaries and expenses", on page 52, line 4, after the words "Mexican authorities", to strike out "$167,960" and insert "$175,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 4, to insert:

Citrus canker eradication: For determining and applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $13,485: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 22, after the words "Ohio Valley", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 17, after the words "European corn borer", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$27,939."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 22, after the word "purposes", to strike out "$162,500" and insert "$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 16, after the words "apiary management", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$83,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 22, after the word "fungicides", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 14, after the name "Mexico", to strike out "$680,000" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 6, after the words "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine", to strike out "$5,198,493" and insert "$5,407,917."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "White Pine Blister Rust Control" on page 58, line 19, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$1,159,000" and insert "$1,409,000"; in the same line, after the word "amount", to strike out "$115,000" and insert "$215,000"; on page 59, line 1, before the word "of", to strike out "$644,000" and insert "$694,000", and in line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural marketing service—Salaries and expenses", on page 60, line 8, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$739,000" and insert "$759,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 25, after the word "products", to strike out "$1,125,000" and insert "$1,160,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 23, after the word "amended", to strike out "$439,000" and insert "$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 10, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$85,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 21, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$356,879" and insert "$381,879."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 3, to strike out "$168,180" and insert "$193,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 5, after the word "Service", to strike out "$6,278,808" and insert "$6,604,808", and in line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,629,062" and insert "$1,639,062."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 71, line 9, after the word "information", to strike out "$23,533,350, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," and insert "$23,458,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 4, after the word "Service", to reduce the total appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Soil Conservation Service, from $25,618,684 to $25,543,684.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources, Department of Agriculture", on page 73, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$750" and insert "$1,200"; in line 4, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$499,521,220, of which not to exceed $600,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'", and insert "$498,921,220", and in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Parity Payments", on page 76, after line 5, to strike out:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, $49,991,160, of which not to exceed $125,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," to remain available until June 30, 1944, and the said Secretary is authorized to make additional commitments or incur additional obligations, not to exceed $162,000,000, with respect to parity payments in connection with the 1942 crops of the commodities herein named: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded by less than 10 percent, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1941, for the same purposes specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, $150,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1943, to make parity payments to the producers of the commodities wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco, for which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in 1941: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the

commodity for harvest on the farm in 1941 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment.

The proviso contained in the paragraph headed "Parity payments" in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1941 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment."

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, $300,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment. The Secretary may also provide by regulations for similar deductions for planting in excess of the acreage allotment for the commodity on other farms or for planting in excess of the acreage allotment or limit for any other commodity for which allotments or limits are established under the agricultural conservation program on the same or any other farm.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield so that I may offer a couple of amendments which merely affect the text of the committee amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia to make an explanation of the whole amendment after that, if he is willing to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment reported by the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 77, line 20, following the word "by", it is proposed to insert "not more than."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 78, line 8, following the word "by", it is proposed to insert "not more than."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senate now has reached what is known as the parity-payment provision contained in the appropriation bill.

There has been some confusion relative to the action of the Senate committee in dealing with this provision; and the impression has been created in some quarters that the Senate committee has recommended a much larger increase than in fact has been suggested.

The bill, as it came from the House, as will be noted on line 6 to and including line 25 on page 76, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 77, contained a provision for parity payments by which a direct appropriation of $50,000,000 was made and the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to enter into contractual obligations in the further sum of $162,000,000. There is nothing in the parity-payment section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which mentions or provides for any contractual relations between the Secretary of Agriculture and the farmer which vests in the Secretary any discretion other than that which is carried in the act. In other words, if the farmer complies, he ipso facto becomes entitled to share in the parity payments to the extent money is appropriated.

I assume that the Budget Bureau sent up this language, and that this language was approved by the House, either that the Budget might not appear to be excessively large or to give the Secretary some unusual discretion. If the language confers no discretion in derogation of the basic parity law, these payments will be made on exactly the same day, whether the contractual authorization is contained in the bill or whether a direct appropriation is made. The money would come from the Treasury in either event.

In considering this question, the Senate committee decided that we might as well approach this matter directly and frankly, and say what we intended to do. We therefore struck out all reference to any contractual authorization which might have vested any discretion in the Secretary of Agriculture or the President as to whether these parity payments should be made, and provided for a direct appropriation of this sum of $162,000,000 rather than any contractual authorization.

Mr. President, we made other changes that affect the total amount; but I merely wish to point out that when the statement is made that the Senate committee's recommendation amounted to $449,000,000 more than the House bill, we should deduct the sum of $162,000,000, which sum was in both bills, but was in the House bill as a contractual authorization and therefore not appearing as an appropriation, while it is in the Senate bill as a direct appropriation now, rather than making the appropriation as a deficiency appropriation next year, as would have been the case under the House bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, however, the $162,000,000 was not included in the President's Budget submitted in January.

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. TAFT. So when the President said in his Budget message:

> For the items subject to administrative rather than legislative action, I have been able to reduce expenditures by $600,000,000 or 15 percent—

He was counting that $162,000,000 which, as a matter of fact, he was not saving.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a question which I should prefer to have the Senator from Ohio answer in his own time. I am explaining this specific item of $162,000,000 which came up as a contractual authorization; and if the Secretary had entered into contractual authorizations under that provision, the money would have been paid out at the same time. So the Senate committee struck out that language and made it what it actually was, even though we knew it was going to provoke a great deal of criticism from those who claim that we have exceeded the Budget by a sum that was $162,000,000 in excess of the amount by which we really did exceed the Budget.

Mr. TAFT. I entirely agree with the Senator that what the committee has done in that respect is correct; but, if the committee is correct, I only wish to point out that the President's Budget message is $162,000,000 incorrect. He was claiming savings which, as a matter of fact, were never contemplated and were not actually made.

Mr. RUSSELL. The President might have thought that the war would have a different effect on farm prices than it actually has had. At the time the Budget was made up last year, the President undoubtedly thought the war would bring about an increase in farm prices. If that had occurred, one of the provisions of the contract entered into with the farmer could have been to the effect that if farm prices reached certain levels, no payments would have been made. Then, of course, this money never would have been appropriated, and it would not have properly appeared in the Budget. But conditions have changed since last fall, when the Budget was submitted; and the evidence submitted to the committee demonstrated beyond any peradventure that there would be a greater need for parity payments this year and next than there had been at any year since parity payments have been made.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if the Secretary of Agriculture knew of these changed conditions and approves of these additional parity payments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether he does or not. I did not ask the Secretary whether he approved of the payments or not. I asked him to give his opinion as to what the condition of the farmer was going to be during this year and the next year; and the Secretary testified, and the head of the triple A tes-

tified, that from all the facts that were apparent to them, some producers in agriculture were headed to a condition worse than that of 1932 unless something were done by the Congress. When that statement of fact was brought to the attention of the committee—that the farmer was going to be worse off than he was in 1932 unless something was done for him—the committee did not feel called on to ask the Secretary of Agriculture what he thought about additional parity-payment appropriations. We knew, without asking him, what should be done. The Congress has some responsibility.

Mr. BYRD. But the committee did call upon the President of the United States recently; and in view of these changed conditions does the President of the United States recommend these parity payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not asked the President whether he recommends them or not.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator had a conference with the President; did he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of us had a conference with the President on the farm problem; but, in the first place, I did not ask the President that question. In the second place, I do not think it would be proper for me to state all that did transpire in that conference. If the Senator from Virginia wants the President's views, he can ask him.

Mr. BYRD. So far as the Senator knows, neither the President of the United States nor the Secretary of Agriculture nor the Budget Bureau recommends this additional appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of all the Members of this body who I thought might rise on this floor and ask what the President of the United States wanted in order to forecast their votes, the Senator from Virginia is the last man I would have expected to take that position, because certainly he has not been guided by the opinions of the President heretofore on this floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want to take exception to that statement. I have followed the President of the United States in every single reduction in expenditures he has advocated. I voted with him in his veto of the bonus. I have supported him on all measures of economy, and I have never yet voted to increase the Budget he has submitted to the Congress. I think the Senator from Georgia is not in good taste when he makes that reference to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia is not stating the facts when he makes that statement, because I very distinctly recall that last year the Senator from Virginia voted for an increase suggested by the committee in agricultural appropriations for section 32, funds that was far in excess of the amount recommended by the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. What does the Senator mean by "section 32"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean the Federal surplus-commodity disposal. The Senator from Virginia was present and voted "yea."

Mr. BYRD. I feel certain the Senator is not correct, although over a period of 8 years there may perhaps have been a single instance of that kind.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator made the statement that there has not been a single instance of the kind, and I called the Senator's attention to one that I happened to remember. I do not know the entire record of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. My recollection does not agree with that of the Senator from Georgia.

I voted consistently not to increase the Budget. I voted against the parity payments last year which were not included in Budget estimates, and when the Senator from Georgia says that the Senator from Virginia is prompted in his vote only by a consideration of whether the President of the United States favors or does not favor a certain proposition——

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said that the Senator from Virginia should not inquire whether the President favors or disapproves of a certain proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say the Senator from Virginia should not ask that. I asked the Senator from Virginia whether in all matters he would accept as a yardstick only what the President of the United States favored.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia has never accepted that as the yardstick and never will. I have voted with the President when I thought he was right, and I have not voted with him when I thought he was wrong.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I am proposing to do in this instance. I have not asked the President whether he is in favor of this increase or not, but I am saying that, if he declared himeself, the position of the President would not change my views, whether he did or did not favor the increase. I would not feel that I had discharged my obligation if I did not follow what I believed to be right.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator from Georgia state to this body that the President has not told him that he did not approve of this appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will. I have already made the statement that I had not mentioned the question of this increased appropriation to the President. So how could I know how the President stood on it?

Mr. BYRD. The President has not told the Senator from Georgia that he did disapprove this increased parity payment?

Mr. RUSSELL. He has not. I have not mentioned it to the President. Whether he approves of it or disapproves I do not know, but frankly, while I always like to follow the President, and have been much more consistent in that regard than many other Members of the Senate, my opinion in this matter would not be determined solely by whether the President of the United States approved or disapproved this appropriation. It has not influenced my position on parity payments and farm legislation in the past. My responsibility in these matters is as great as the President's. I think I know something of the condition of the farmers in this country, and I shall do what I consider my duty without regard to the views of any other man, even though I entertain as high an opinion of him as I do of the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia allow me to make a statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I do not think it is becoming a body which, under the Constitution, has the right to frame laws to ask what is the opinion of someone outside. Our duty is to know about conditions and meet them, regardless of what anyone else says. I should like to know what certain men who arrogate to themselves the right to say what people shall receive know about all the conditions in the different States, and the circumstances under which the people work and make a living. I believe that since we have been asked to reduce and reduce and reduce, and officials measure up the amount which can be planted of the different crops, provision should be made to take care of the condition which they create. I do not like the tenor of the colloquy between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Georgia. I have an obligation to meet, and, so help me God, I am going to meet it regardless of what the President or the Budget says. The Budget comes here and allocates how much money we shall get. If that be right, then let us just wait until the Budget sends down a bill, and let us sign on the dotted line.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, if we are to be guided solely by what the Budget recommends in these appropriation matters, we might as well avoid the necessity and trouble of dealing with an appropriations bill altogether, and just let the Budget fix the amount of the expenditure. Surely Congress has a duty to inquire into any question involving appropriations, particularly one which is as vital and as pressing today as the distress on the farms of this country, a duty to determine what the Congress of the United States should do in dealing with this question.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. We have been talking recently about the condition of the American farmer, and we were led to believe that there is less need for parity now than there was before. Today we are told that the need for increased parity payments is greater than it has been at any time during the so-called depression. I just wonder what has changed the situation so much from what it was yesterday or the day before, when we were considering the importation of agricultural products, which I opposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will do me the honor of listening to me a few minutes, I think I can clear up my position in his mind, whether he agrees with me or not.

The committee went rather fully into the situation as to the several great commodities which are produced in the United States, before making these recommendations to the Senate. I might say that the appropriation for parity

payments is included in two separate items. One appropriation of $150,000,000 is made immediately available to be paid to the farmers on their 1941 crops, and at the same time that the appropriation for the last year is available for payment. That would make a total available for parity payments for this year, for 1941, of $362,000,000 when we include the $212,000,000 voted last year and already available.

In addition to transferring the $162,000,000 contractual authorizations into a direct appropriation, which made a total appropriation of $212,000,000, as was recommended by the Budget and approved by the House, the committee added $88,000,000 to the appropriation for parity payments for the fiscal year 1942. Therefore, if the amendments are adopted, there will be available $300,000,000 for parity payments in 1942.

The total amount by which the committee exceeded the 1941 appropriation was $257,000,000; $238,000,000 of that amount is found in the increases in parity payments.

In addition, the committee increased the appropriation for the surplus-removal program, under the provisions of section 32, which was largely expended in the so-called stamp plan, by the sum of $35,000,000. The Budget and the House of Representatives had reduced the amount available for the so-called surplus-removal program by $35,000,000, and the Senate committee is recommending the restoration of that sum, so that the Department will have available the same sum that is available for expenditure in the present fiscal year. In those two items will be found the total amount whereby the Senate bill, as recommended by the committee, exceeds the appropriation for 1941.

I have here a table which clearly shows the amount of these increases, the Budget estimate for 1942, the amount provided by the House for 1942, and the recommendations made by the Senate committee; and I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of Agriculture appropriations (exclusive of permanent appropriations and trust funds. This table covers items carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act)

	Appropriation, 1941	Budget estimates, 1942		House bill, 1942		Senate committee bill, 1942	
		Total	Compared with 1941	Total	Compared with 1941	Total [1]	Compared with 1941 [1]
Total appropriations in bill (includes reappropriations) plus contract authorization of $162,000,000 in Budget and House bill for parity payments	$1,094,262,964	$1,069,070,655	−$25,192,309	$1,064,142,721	−$30,120,243	$1,351,929,428	+$257,666,464
On this basis, House bill is below Budget estimates $4,927,934, or 0.5 percent. Senate committee bill is above Budget estimates $282,858,773, or 26.5 percent.							
Total direct appropriations in bill (excludes reappropriations) plus contract authorization for parity	1,036,958,922	1,057,751,971	+20,793,049	1,052,824,037	+15,865,115	1,340,610,744	+303,651,822
On this basis, House bill is below Budget estimates $4,927,934, or 0.5 percent. Senate committee bill is above Budget estimates $282,858,773, or 26.7 percent.							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for farm-tenancy loans, rural rehabilitation loans, and rural electrification loans	275,000,000	190,000,000	−85,000,000	250,000,000	−25,000,000	275,000,000	

[1] Including $150,000,000 for additional parity payments, 1941.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a great many uninformed people are of the opinion that the present world situation will greatly improve the condition of the farmers in the general scheme of things. We called before us the Secretary of Agriculture, we had before us the Administrator of the triple A, representatives of the Federal Farm Bureau, of the Farmers' Union, and of other great farm organizations. These witnesses were unanimous in telling the committee that the position of some of the great basic crops, such as wheat, cotton, and tobacco, and perhaps corn, would be much worse in the fall of 1941 than it is today.

There is today in the world more wheat than has ever been known before in all human history. In Canada alone there is enough wheat on storage to provide for the needs for the Dominion of Canada and the British Isles for the next 2 years if not another single grain of wheat is planted in Canada during that period. This Nation has the greatest surplus we have ever had in the history of wheat, and in South America wheat is being fed to livestock and allowed to go to waste in the fields because the people have no way of ridding themselves of their great surplus of wheat.

There is a tremendous supply of cotton in the world today—approximately 25,000,000 bales of American cotton—whereas exports, which have heretofore taken a considerable quantity of our wheat and approximately half our cotton, have been reduced to almost nothing, as the British have practically laid an embargo upon shipping space to be used for the exportation of wheat or cotton. The same thing is true in the case of tobacco.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point as part of my remarks a table showing the parity prices of the five basic commodities, together with the farm prices as of February 15. The table shows that wheat is bringing 59.2 percent of parity, that cotton is bringing 59.2 percent of parity, corn 75.9 percent, rice 67.4 percent, and tobacco 78.5 percent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Commodity	Unit	Parity price at Feb. 15, 1941	Farm price 1940 crop	Farm price percent of parity	Farm price including 1940 A. C. P.	Farm price plus A. C. P payment, percent of parity
		Cents	*Cents*	*Percent*	*Cents*	*Percent*
Cotton	Pound	15.87	9.39	59.2	10.83	68.2
Corn	Bushel	82.2	62.4	75.9	71.4	86.9
Wheat	Bushel	113.2	67.0	59.2	75.1	66.3
Rice	Hundredweight	231.3	156.0	67.4	161.85	70.0
Tobacco	Pound	20.0	15.7	78.5	16.6	83.0

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, how much does the program call for?

Mr. RUSSELL. It calls for only a total increase of $238,000,000 for parity payments.

Mr. WHEELER. Why should we quibble about $238,000,000 for the American farmers? Why should it even be necessary to mention the appropriation of such an amount for the American farmers when we are appropriating $7,000,000,000 to give to foreign governments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certain Senators have asked for certain information, and the Senator from Georgia, within his very limited powers, has been endeavoring to state some of the reasons moving the committee to make these recommendations. They, of course, will not give the farmer full parity.

Mr. LANGER. Is rye not considered a basic commodity?

Mr. RUSSELL. Rye is not a basic commodity. Under the act there are only five basic commodities, they being the five I named.

Mr. President, I have here another table which shows the rate of parity payments on the five basic commodities under the sums that will be available in the event the amendments are approved by the Senate. It shows that if these amendments are approved cotton will receive about 74 percent of parity, wheat 74.1 percent, corn 86.9 percent, rice 83 percent, and tobacco varying according to

the grade and type of the tobacco. I ask that that table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Estimated appropriation of $362,000,000 and resulting rates of payment—1941 parity payment program [1]

Commodity	Unit	Rate of parity payment	Farm price	Farm price plus payment	Parity price	Farm price plus payment as percent of parity price
		Cents	*Cents*	*Cent*	*Cents*	*Percent*
Corn	Bushel	9.0	62.4	71.4	82.2	86.9
Cotton	Pound	2.35	9.39	11.74	15.87	74.0
Wheat	Bushel	16.9	67.0	83.9	113.2	74.1
Rice	Hundredweight	36.5	156.0	192.5	231.3	83.2
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured	Pound	1.0	16.5	17.5	18.5	94.6
Fire-cured	Pound	.7	8.0	8.7	10.5	82.9
Dark (35 and 36)	Pound	.4	6.5	6.9	8.4	82.1

[1] Based on data available Jan. 1, 1941.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee went very much at length into the position of the other great farm commodities. We went into the position of dairy products, of wool, of beef, of fruits and vegetables, and all other farm commodities. Some of those commodities are not in a very favorable position today. Practically every one of the great farm commodities, with the exception of beef products, and of wool, are still far below parity. But the committee was able to get a ray of light with reference to the immediate future of those commodities. It was testified that a considerable quantity of butter, of milk, of lard, of meat products, and of vegetables and fruits, would probably be embraced within the appropriation which has already been made under the lease-lend bill, and that sizeable quantities of those commodities would find their way into the export market in the very near future.

We therefore only restored the appropriation dealing with those commodities under this surplus-removal program, to the amount that was available for the current fiscal year. It was stated by the head of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation that with the amount restored to the sum they had this year, it would probably be possible to extend the food-stamp plan to many communities which did not now have that plan, inasmuch as there had been a great reduction in the relief rolls of the cities where the plan was already in effect.

Viewing this situation, Mr. President, in all its ramifications, the committee felt that it was thoroughly justified in making these very modest suggestions of increase. We could but consider that today in this country we were expending more money than any people had ever before spent in all history. The appropriations for defense work have reached almost $40,000,000,000, according to a statement I saw today from the Office of Production Management. The effect of that expenditure has not reached the farmers, and with respect to the wheat, the cotton, and the tobacco farmers, in the very nature of things, it cannot reach them because of the greatest surplus the world has ever seen, which will depress the market for these export crops without regard to how much we might increase the earnings of capital or labor in this country. We feel justified, therefore, in suggesting this very modest increase in order that these farmers who have produced this great store of food and fiber which is so essential in any national-defense program, might not experience actual hardship during this period when every other group in the country is enjoying the greatest benefit they have enjoyed for many years.

Mr. President, I was interested to see the effect that this spending program has had upon the income of corporations. In the year 1938 the net income of corporations, according to the Department of Commerce, was $1,230,000,000. In 1939 we started this defense program, and the income of these corporations—the net income, mind you—increased to $3,847,000,000. Whereas last year, in the year 1940, despite the new taxes we had levied, which some said were going to absorb these defense earnings, the income of these corporations of this country hit the five-billion-dollar mark.

Now, when we come to the dividends which were paid out by these corporations, it will be seen that the stockholders in these industries are occupying a more favorable position than they have for many years, despite the fact that we were assured in the Congress that these vast increases in income were to be exacted by way of taxation. In 1938 the dividends distributed by corporations were $3,370,000,000. In 1939 the dividends distributed by the same corporations reached $4,124,000,000. In 1940 the dividends of these corporations, after the imposition of these new taxes, reached the staggering total of $4,800,000,000, the largest dividend distribution that has occurred in the United States since the year 1929.

Let us now look to the effect this program has had upon other groups of our citizens. In 1938 the total compensation paid to employees of every type in this country was $44,301,000,000. In 1939 it reached $46,768,000,000.

The preliminary figures for 1940 indicate that the nonagricultural pay roll of the United States for last year will probably exceed $50,000,000,000.

When we break that down to the income of the average person employed in labor in the manufacturing industries, we find that in January 1939 the average wage of the industrial employee was $23.80. In the same month of 1940 the average wage had reached $25.51. But in 1941 the average wage for January is $27.69. And there are more people employed in industry today than there have ever been before in the history of the United States.

In February of 1941, this month just passed, industrial employment in this country was almost one and one-half million more than it was in the halcyon days of 1929.

Let us turn to the total weekly industrial pay roll to show how this great and important group of our people has been faring under the spending program. In January 1939 the total weekly pay roll of all persons employed in manufacturing industries in this country was $160,708,000. In January 1940 it was $189,359,000; but in January last past the weekly pay roll of the manufacturing industries of the United States reached $228,926,000. These figures, Mr. President, show that capital, industry, and labor in this Nation are sharing unprecedented benefits and profits as a result of the defense and lease-lend spending.

In a matter of this kind I always like to look through the great mass of mail which comes to my desk—as it comes to the desk of every Senator—for 2 or 3 weeks before I present any bill, to see the current trends.

I hold in my hand Labor's Monthly Survey, issued by the American Federation of Labor, for March 1941, which came to my desk last week. Under the head of labor barometer there is the following statement:

Wages: Increases are the order of the day.

It goes on to show how the average hourly earnings in factories are well above those of last year—69 cents an hour in January 1941, compared to 66¼ cents an hour in January 1940.

The statement deals with profits—

United States Department of Commerce estimates that profits of all corporations in 1940 [after taxes] were $4,900,000,000 compared to $3,900,000,000 in 1939.

This is an increase of 25 percent in corporate profits in this country for the year 1940.

I ask that a part of this report be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR BAROMETER

UNEMPLOYMENT

There were 8,874,000 unemployed in January. This is 1,025,000 more than in December, when 7,849,000 were out of work. Layoffs from farms and from Christmas rush work are always large in January. This year they were offset by defense jobs, and fewer jobs were lost than last year. In January 1940, 10,656,000 were out of work.[1] With full speed ahead on defense, skilled labor is in even greater demand. There is new emphasis on training.

[1] American Federation of Labor unemployment estimate.

WAGES

Increases are the order of the day. Labor Department reports show 193,296 factory workers received wage increases in January. (This report covers 75 percent of all factory workers.) The average increase was 4.9 percent, but many industries were higher: Engines, 11.4 percent; sheet metal, 13.2 percent; canning, 10.7 percent; meat packing, 9.6 percent; retail trade, 10.0 percent; chemicals, 8.1 percent.

Average hourly earnings in factories are well above last year—69 cents in January 1941, compared to 66¼ cents in January 1940. Hours worked are longer because there is more full time and overtime, less part time. Averages show January this year 39 hours per week; last year 37½ hours. Weekly earnings average $2.18 above last year—January 1941, $27.69; January 1940, $25.51.[2]

PROFITS

United States Department of Commerce estimates that profits of all corporations in 1940 (after taxes) were $4,900,000,000, compared to $3,900,000,000 in 1939, an increase of 25 percent. Wall Street Journal states corporate profits are still rising and industry will probably report considerably higher net profits for the first quarter of 1941 than last year, in spite of increased taxes, higher costs, and larger reserves to amortize plant expansion for defense.

COST OF LIVING

Cost of living as a whole is still not much above last year. Figures for February show an increase of 1.2 percent over February 1940. But some prices are moving upward. Sheets and blankets are higher; men's work clothing is up and wool clothing is going higher; furniture and automobiles have increased; rents have shot upward in some defense areas. Taxes have raised the cost of movies and cigarettes. The outlook continues as before—increases not expected to exceed 5 percent.

[2] Figures in this paragraph cover factories only and are from U. S. Department of Labor.

Wage increases recently reported by affiliated unions

FEDERAL LABOR UNIONS

Industry	Location	Amount of increase	Number of employees affected
Asbestos products	Elizabeth, N. J.	5 cents per hour.	23*
Bakelite products	Elyria, Ohio	do	1,250†
Chemical products	Collinsville, Ill.	7½ cents per hour.	86*
Do	Baton Rouge, La.	$4 per month	21*
Do	St. Louis, Mo	2½ to 7½ cents per hour.	500*
Edible oil	Los Angeles, Calif.	10 to 15 cents per hour.	203*
Enamel workers	Elyria, Ohio	5 cents per hour.	230†
Fertilizer	East St. Louis, Ill.	7 cents per hour.	67*
Do	Woburn, Mass.	7½ cents per hour.	42*
Flour mills	Cleveland, Ohio.	2½ cents per hour.	80
Metal castings	Kearney, N. J.	5 to 7 cents per hour.	512*
Metal	Shafter Tex.	25 cents per day.	22
Metal tubes	Euclid, Ohio	3 cents per hour.	150
Office workers	Chicago, Ill.	$2 per week.	488*
Do	East St. Louis, Ill.	$3 per week.	7*
Paper box	DeKalb, Ill.	3 cents per hour.	67*
Paper envelopes	Dayton, Ohio	5 percent increase.	44
Petroleum piping	East St. Louis, Ill.	12½ percent increase.	56*

Wage increases recently reported by affiliated unions—Continued

Industry	Location	Amount of increase	Number of employees affected
Soap	Dover, Ohio	2 cents per hour.	100
Steel products	Philadelphia, Pa.	10 percent increase.	2,200
Thermometers	Norwood, Ohio.	8 cents per hour.	40

LOCALS OF INTERNATIONALS

Hod carriers	Dayton, Ohio	10 cents per hour.	11
Street railway	Lorain Ohio	2½ cents hour.	43
Steel foundry	Dayton, Ohio	5 cents per hour.	275

*These figures refer to union membership and may not be strictly comparable with the number covered by the wage increases.

†Vacations with pay recently established.

Mr. RUSSELL. From the matter which came casually to my desk I have selected in the same way a publication called News and Opinion, described in the caption as "A reflection of current situations in New York City building trades, published by Building Trades Employers' Association of city of New York," dated March 7, 1941. The headline reads as follows:

Department of Labor reports highest union building trade wage scales in history—$1.487 hour national average for journeymen.

This statement shows that the hourly wages of the skilled trades in this country have risen to $1.80 an hour in New York City, $1.18 in Los Angeles, Calif., and a national average of approximately $1.50 an hour for the skilled trades. This publication, issued by labor itself, shows labor today drawing the highest wages it has ever received in all the history of the United States.

There came to my desk today a publication issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, in which we find this very significant statement:

For the fourth consecutive month total nonagricultural employment has exceeded the levels of all corresponding months in previous years. Employment in nonagricultural industries in February 1941 reached the highest February level on record, there being 36,584,000, this being 1,350,000 above the previous February peak in 1929.

Mr. President, I also clipped from a newspaper another little article which reflects upon the condition of the farmer. I shall read the headline which appears above an Associated Press story published on March 25:

Farm Income in February Is Below 1940.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to observe that the Senator appears to me to be making a very strong indictment of the farm program adopted by this administration since 1933.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia can draw any inference he chooses from my remarks. However, I am not now attacking that program. I am asking the Senate to follow that program by making appropriations for parity payments as authorized in the act of 1938, to which the Senator from Virginia refers.

Mr. STEWART and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, but I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to ask the Senator whether he has any comparative farm income figures for any particular year with which he might compare the income of corporations, laboring men, and so forth?

Mr. RUSSELL. Such a statement appears in the hearings. I did not know whether to offer it for the RECORD or not.

There appears in the hearings a statement of the annual average income of the farmers in each of the several States of the United States. It shows that in some States that income is below $100 per capita, running from approximately $100 per capita to approximately $800 per capita. The average farm income is about $250 per capita. The per capita income of all groups is much higher and is still climbing.

Mr. STEWART. With the Senator's permission, I briefly call to the Senator's attention figures which were recently put into the hearings on the Bankhead parity-payment bill when it was being considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Whether or not the statement should go into the RECORD will be for the Senator to determine. I wish to interrupt the Senator for only a moment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEWART. I call attention to the fact that for the year 1939 the average farm income throughout the entire United States was only $266 per capita. The income in some of the States—particularly and noticeably the Southern States—is so pathetically low as almost to shock the conscience of those who are particularly affected. In my own State of Tennessee the average per capita income for the year 1939 was only $95. In the State of Alabama it was only $81. In many other States it was not quite that low but proportionately low. I think the figures show that definite attention ought to be given to the needs of the farmers. We ought to do something more for the farmers than merely spend our time talking about the needs of the farmers. As the Senator has so eloquently pointed out, other groups throughout the country are now enjoying prosperity the like of which they have not known for many years. The farmer's income is entirely out of proportion.

I hope the Senate will pass the parity-payment provision.

I ask the Senator if he will permit me to put these figures into the RECORD at this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to have them put in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm population and cash farm income, by States, 1939

State and division	Farm population Jan. 1, 1939 [1]	Cash farm income, total	1939 [2] per capita
Northeast division	2,642,000	$925,810,000	$350
Maine	191,000	53,999,000	283
New Hampshire	81,000	21,778,000	269
Vermont	127,000	40,533,000	319
Massachusetts	168,000	73,838,000	440
Rhode Island	22,000	9,857,000	448
Connecticut	148,000	52,237,000	353
New York	784,000	307,657,000	392
New Jersey	145,000	100,023,000	690
Pennsylvania	976,000	265,888,000	272
North Central division	8,630,000	3,320,075,000	385
Ohio	1,163,000	325,779,000	280
Indiana	861,000	274,203,000	318
Illinois	1,020,000	534,505,000	524
Michigan	830,000	224,675,000	271
Wisconsin	920,000	291,802,000	317
Missouri	1,139,000	276,744,000	243
South Dakota	311,000	129,073,000	415
Minnesota	905,000	356,657,000	394
Iowa	940,000	655,279,000	697
Nebraska	541,000	251,358,000	465
East Central Division	6,457,000	770,231,000	119
Delaware	53,000	18,710,000	353
Maryland	243,000	67,905,000	279
Virginia	1,048,000	121,419,000	116
West Virginia	590,000	42,510,000	72
North Carolina	1,735,000	240,543,000	139
Kentucky	1,397,000	146,766,000	105
Tennessee	1,391,000	132,378,000	95
Southern Division	10,868,000	1,734,754,000	160
South Carolina	961,000	115,121,000	120
Georgia	1,460,000	158,492,000	109
Florida	349,000	122,371,000	351
Alabama	1,420,000	114,863,000	81
Mississippi	1,372,000	168,823,000	123
Louisiana	867,000	134,604,000	155
Arkansas	1,180,000	159,583,000	135
Oklahoma	981,000	193,301,000	197
Texas	2,278,000	567,596,000	249
Western Division	3,462,000	1,788,732,000	517
Arizona	114,000	59,390,000	521
California	699,000	575,454,000	823
Colorado	257,000	135,251,000	526
Idaho	201,000	94,515,000	470
Kansas	656,000	270,072,000	412
Nevada	15,000	12,493,000	833
New Mexico	191,000	53,986,000	283
North Dakota	330,000	132,959,000	403
Oregon	274,000	109,659,000	400
Washington	362,000	148,734,000	411
Montana	162,000	97,133,000	600
Utah	136,000	45,871,000	337
Wyoming	65,000	53,215,000	819
United States	32,059,000	8,539,602,000	266

[1] Estimated.
[2] Including Government payments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator gave some figures on the average increase in skilled labor. Has the Senator any figures on the average increase, if any, in unskilled labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President, other than those embraced in the general figures for all persons, whether skilled or unskilled, employed in the manufacturing industry, and the total compensation paid to employees of every type.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is aware of the fact that there are only about 10,000,000 persons employed in the manufacturing industries, and that in the cities we probably have at least twice as many employed in other industries than manufacturing industries.

Mr. RUSSELL. The report of the American Federation of Labor which I put in the RECORD—I did not desire to read it all—shows that there has been a tremendous reduction in unemployment, and the figures I gave show the extent to which nonagricultural employment in this country has risen. I stated that it was 1,350,000 above the figure for 1929.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, those who had nothing are now getting something, which I think is a very good thing; but I do not see what bearing it has on the farm situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not expect the Senator from Ohio to see anything bearing on the farm problem.

Mr. TAFT. As I understood the Senator, he stated that this year it is proposed to make a parity-payment distribution of something like $350,000,000, which is higher than any parity distribution that has ever been authorized by the Congress. That is justified because the condition this year is worse. I have a statement from the Chicago Tribune of Saturday which says:

All deliveries of wheat and corn sold at the best prices since May 1940.

In what way is this situation so much worse this year than last year, so as to justify an increase of $238,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about the increase being justified, Mr. President. The price of manufactured goods is rising. Due to the defense program, there is a general rise; and it is a much more rapid rise than the rise for even the most favored agricultural commodity, which is meat. The products of industry are increasing in value in the market place much faster than the most favored agricultural products; and every figure that can be brought forth from any reliable source shows that fact.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a moment.

Mr. President, I asked the Administrator of the triple A what was the outlook for cotton, for wheat, for corn, for rice, and for tobacco for the coming year; and I might say that I would much prefer to take his judgment than that of the Chicago Tribune. He stated that the outlook for wheat and cotton this year was all but impossible; that without the commodity loans we would not have any market at all for wheat and cotton at the present time; and that at this moment only the loan of 56 percent of parity was keeping the producers of wheat and cotton from having to market their commodities at whatever the buyer might care to pay.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I was extremely interested in the remarks made by the Senator with respect to the deplorable condition in which agriculture finds itself today; and likewise I was extremely interested in the figures quoted a moment ago by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. I am heartily in favor of relieving the agricultural situation; and had I been able to follow the speeches made the other day in defense of the American market for the American farmer, as well as the speeches being made today in defense of parity payments, I think we would have gotten much further than we did. Would it not be much more practicable to bring relief to the American farmer by protecting him in his own market? At least, that is one way in which we can give him practical benefit and help.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will not quarrel with the Senator from Nebraska about that. The Senator from Nebraska seems to think there is some inconsistency between my vote in favor of permitting the Army and the Navy to buy a limited amount of beef produced in other countries and my position here today. Of course the Senator is entitled to his own opinion. I may say that in times past I have consistently voted differently on the same matter which was under consideration yesterday. I voted for the committee amendment this year, if it is any consolation to the Senator from Nebraska, only because of the representations made to the committee that the cattle producers would be benefited by it, because the Army and the Navy proposed to buy only a small amount of imported beef, whereas they proposed to purchase carcasses of a smaller size, and therefore help the domestic producers.

I will say to the Senator that while I should like to have him agree with my position on the beef question, whether he does or does not is not material in this discussion. I may have erred once in my efforts to support the American farmer wherever he may be, in Nebraska or in Maine, I have always done that which I believed was best calculated in the long run to serve his interest and I do not think I hurt him by my vote on the beef amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator I should like to say that the proposal the other day did not cover meat purchases only. It covered all articles produced by the farmer—meat, food, and clothes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska does not trust those who are now handling the defense program, who have stated that they are going to buy only certain commodities in limited amounts; but I do trust them. That is one difference between the Senator from Nebraska and myself. I might point out, too, that there is some little difference between the situation today and the situation when the amendment has been pending heretofore, because it happens that beef and wool are the only two products of the toil of the farmer anywhere in the United States which are today selling above parity.

FARM INCOME LOW

Mr. President, of course, this little sum of $238,000,000, insignificant judged by present appropriations, is not intended to solve the farm problem. We are not going to do that merely by dealing with parity-payment appropriations from year to year; but it is recommended, and I urge the Senate to accept it, on the theory that it will at least enable the farmer to exist during this very trying period, when his export markets are almost completely closed down, and his income is shrinking, while that of every

other group in this country goes up. This country cannot get along with one-half of the people getting richer and the other half getting poorer.

The 25 percent of the American people who live on the farms last year drew only 9 percent of our national income. Included in that 9 percent was every chicken that was killed by the farmer's wife and consumed on the farmer's table. Included in that 9 percent was every vegetable grown in the farmer's garden and that he ate or fed to his family. When it comes to cash income, the farmer's share of the national income goes down to approximately 6 or 7 percent; and yet while Congress delays dealing with the farm question some Senators rise up and oppose, in the name of economy, appropriations of this type to keep the farmer's body and soul together.

NEW FARM LEGISLATION NEEDED

We cannot much longer delay dealing with the farm problem in some way other than through piddling appropriations of this nature. This appropriation is not intended to supplant or to defeat any other farm bill that may be pending here, designed to give the great agricultural interest of this country a fairer share of our national income. There is no conflict with any farm legislation. If you give the farmer parity through any other device none of this money will be spent. We will have it for guns and ships.

CONGRESS HAS PROVIDED FOR OTHERS

I desire to point out, Mr. President, that when we started out on the national-defense program the great industrialists of this Nation came here to Washington and said, "You have a limitation of 8 percent on our profits with respect to some commodities, and a limitation of 12 percent on our profits with respect to airplanes manufactured in the United States." We almost had a sit-down strike on the part of industry in this country, who said that these limitations on their profits and certain tax laws created an uncertainty which made it impossible for them to go ahead with a defense program: their demands were heeded. The Congress of the United States repealed those limitations on profits, under which our defense agencies were recapturing millions of dollars and returning them to the National Treasury. As it turned out, even with the tax bill that we passed, the dividends of corporations in this country last year reached a new high. Mr. President, we have built the factories for some corporations 100 percent out of the Federal Treasury, and have turned them over to them a lock-and-key job, and then have afforded the corporations cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, whereby they could not lose one dime on their operations. We have passed the National Labor Relations Act to protect the interests of labor in this country. We have put a floor under the hourly wage and a ceiling on hours to protect those who labor in industry in this country. We have passed a Social Security Act that increases the cost of everything the farmer buys, and yet he cannot share by one dime in the distribution of the funds collected under the social-security program. We have adopted artificial devices protecting every segment of American life except the man who produces the food we eat and the clothes we wear.

I am not advocating the repeal of those laws. The farmer of this country is not opposed to reasonable profits. He is not opposed to higher wages for industry; but he is entitled to have his own just demands for a reasonable share of our national income heard by the National Congress, and to have legislation enacted that will give him a fair share of that income.

This amendment does not propose to do that. This is a little hand-out that will keep the farmer off the relief rolls; and I say to you in all solemnity that if you turn the cotton and wheat people loose next year without doing anything for them, it will cost you more money to keep them on relief than it would cost to keep them on the farm under the very modest sum that is suggested here.

FARM PAYMENTS NOT GREAT

Senators rise and complain about what the farm program is costing this country and protest benefit and conservation payments. This program deals with 32,000,000 people, the most underprivileged people, and it has cost only about five and a half billion dollars since this administration came into power, whereas we have appropriated nearly thirteen and a half billion dollars for those on the relief rolls, not nearly so large in number or in the number of their dependents. I do not complain of that. I am merely making a comparative statement in order that some of those from the great centers of population who have supported the relief appropriations, in which we from the agricultural areas have joined, will join us now in seeing that this small measure of justice is handed out to the American farmer. It is insignificant; it is not even half-way justice; but it will at least help him to tide over until the Congress can get away from the defense program, from writing cost-plus contracts, from repealing limitations on profits, and turn its attention to some permanent solution of the farm program.

I may say, Mr. President, that those engaged in industry and labor have some stake in this amendment. This defense program is going to be over one of these days. Peace will come. When it does come, if we have let the buying power of the American farmer be absolutely dried up industry and labor will have no market whatever for their products. Of course, the farmer has produced so much food and fiber that if you put him out of business now it will not hurt the rest of the people immediately, because he has built up a reserve of food and clothes sufficient for 2 or 3 years; but when this period is past, and you turn to look for a market for the products of a peace-geared industry, if you have dried up farm buying power you will bring about an economic collapse in this country that will make your 1932 and 1933 period look like a Sunday-school picnic, with everybody having a full basket of food.

This amendment is the very least the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States can do for the almost forgotten one-fourth of the people of this country who live on the farm, who are today existing on such an insignificant share of the national income.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee giving an itemized statement of the increases in the pending bill above the estimates included in the Budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Agricultural bill for fiscal year 1942, as reported to Senate, compared with Budget estimates for fiscal year 1942

Object	Estimates, 1942	Amount in bill for 1942	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with estimates
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
Salaries	$609,424	$609,424	
Miscellaneous expenses	99,341	99,341	
Rent of buildings in District of Columbia			
Total, Secretary's office	708,765	708,765	
Office of the solicitor	209,535	209,535	
OFFICE OF INFORMATION			
Salaries	344,883	344,883	
Printing and binding	1,550,111	1,550,111	
Total, Office of Information	1,894,994	1,894,994	
Library	102,000	102,000	
OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS			
Payments to States and Territories for agricultural experiment stations:			
Hatch Act	$720,000	$720,000	
Adams Act	720,000	720,000	
Purnell Act	2,880,000	2,880,000	
Hawaii	67,500	75,000	+$7,500
Alaska	25,000	25,000	
Puerto Rico	50,000	50,000	
Title I, Bankhead-Jones Act	2,400,000	2,463,708	+63,708
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration of grants to States and coordination of research	161,735	161,735	
Insular experiment stations	83,000	83,000	
Total, Office of Experiment Stations	7,107,235	7,178,443	+71,208
Special research fund, Department of Agriculture	1,200,000	1,400,000	+200,000

Agricultural bill for fiscal year 1942, as reported to Senate, compared with Budget estimates for fiscal year 1942—Continued

Object	Estimates, 1942	Amount in bill for 1942	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with estimates
EXTENSION SERVICE			
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico:			
Capper-Ketcham extension work	$1,480,000	$1,480,000	
Extension work, act of Apr. 24, 1939	203,000	555,000	+$352,000
Extension work, sec. 21, Bankhead-Jones Act	12,000,000	12,000,000	
Alaska	23,918	23,918	
Puerto Rico	128,000	128,000	
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration and coordination of extension work	620,000	620,000	
Extension information	240,000	240,000	
Total, Extension Service	14,694,918	15,046,918	+352,000
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	3,120,000	3,120,000	
Foreign agricultural relations	221,716	221,716	
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY			
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration	170,020	170,020	
Animal husbandry	824,380	824,380	
Diseases of animals	462,000	707,000	+245,000
Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease	5,843,140	5,598,140	−245,000
Eradicating cattle ticks	300,000	300,000	
Hog-cholera control	105,000	112,728	+7,728
Inspection and quarantine	603,500	611,500	+8,000
Meat inspection	5,429,820	5,429,820	
Virus Serum Toxin Act	218,712	218,712	
Total, Bureau of Animal Industry	13,956,572	13,972,300	+15,728
BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY			
Administration	75,400	75,400	
Dairy investigations	655,905	655,905	
Total, Bureau of Dairy Industry	731,305	731,305	
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY			
Administration	209,942	209,942	
Arlington Farm	49,414	49,414	
Cereal crops and diseases	565,000	576,600	+$11,600
Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases	443,535	443,535	
Drug and related plants	48,500	50,000	+1,500
Dry-land agriculture	226,828	229,228	2,400
Forage crops and diseases	300,000	306,500	6,500
Forest pathology	245,000	255,000	10,000
Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases	1,426,362	1,441,362	15,000
Irrigation agriculture	140,500	140,500	
National arboretum	54,587	54,587	
Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys	350,947	350,947	
Rubber investigations			
Soil and fertilizer investigations	355,021	355,021	
Soil survey	275,000	275,000	
Sugar-plant investigations	337,275	367,275	+30,000
Tobacco investigations	140,544	145,544	+5,000
Total, Bureau of Plant Industry	5,168,455	5,250,455	+82,000
FOREST SERVICE			
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration	598,520	598,520	
National forest administration	10,986,000	11,086,000	+100,000
Reconstruction and repair of roads, national forests in Georgia, North Carolina South Carolina, and Tennessee			
Water rights	20,000	20,000	
Fighting forest fire	100,000	100,000	
Private forestry cooperation	98,000	98,000	
Forest management	605,000	655,000	+50,000
Range investigations	270,935	280,935	+10,000
Forest products	632,500	1,000,000	+367,500
Forest survey	247,000	247,000	
Forest economics	140,000	140,000	
Forest influences	135,000	135,000	
Forest-fire cooperation	2,490,000	2,490,000	
New England hurricane damage			
Acquisition of lands for national forests	1,988,000	1,988,000	
Acquisition of land from national forest receipts	316,000	316,000	
Total, Forest Service	18,626,955	19,154,455	+527,500
Forest roads and trails	9,955,500	12,955,500	+3,000,000

Object	Estimates, 1942	Amount in bill for 1942	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with estimates
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTRY AND ENGINEERING			
Administration	$105,200	$105,200	
Agricultural chemical investigations	342,664	342,664	
Industrial utilization of farm products and byproducts			
Agricultural engineering investigations	321,950	321,950	
Naval-stores investigations	92,400	115,400	+$23,000
Total, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering	862,214	885,214	+23,000
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE			
Salaries and expenses:			
General administrative expenses	165,980	165,980	
Fruit insects	424,600	424,600	
Japanese beetle control	425,000	425,000	
Sweetpotato weevil control	70,000	70,000	
Mexican fruitfly control	175,460	175,460	
Citrus canker eradication		13,485	+13,485
Gypsy and brown-tail moth control	375,000	375,000	
Dutch elm disease eradication	300,000	350,000	+50,000
Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication	89,800	89,800	
Forest insects	212,500	212,500	
Truck crop and garden insects	366,580	366,580	
Cereal and forage insects	379,500	379,500	
European corn-borer control	27,939	27,939	
Barberry eradication	182,500	225,000	+42,500
Cotton insects	144,544	144,544	
Pink boll worm and Thurberia weevil control	526,800	526,800	
Bee culture	83,000	83,000	
Insects affecting man and animals	181,500	181,500	
Insect pest survey and identification	154,790	154,790	
Foreign parasites	38,000	38,000	
Control investigations	72,518	72,518	
Insecticide and fungicide investigations	130,000	130,000	
Transit inspection	44,059	44,059	
Foreign-plant quarantines	700,000	700,000	
Certification of exports	31,862	31,862	
Total, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	5,301,932	5,407,917	+105,985
White pine blister rust control	1,409,000	1,409,000	
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE			
Administration	166,108	166,108	
Crop and livestock estimates	729,000	759,000	+30,000
Market News Service	1,125,000	1,160,000	+35,000
Market inspection of farm products	459,000	459,000	
Marketing farm products	400,000	400,000	
Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standard Acts	433,000	650,000	+217,000
Perishable Agricultural Commodities and Produce Agency Acts	152,000	152,000	
Standard Container Acts	10,000	10,000	
Cotton Quality Statistics and Classing Acts	465,000	465,000	
Cotton Futures and Standards Acts, enforcement	490,000	490,000	
Enforcement of the United States Grain Standards Act	748,941	748,941	
Administration of the United States Warehouse Act	450,000	450,000	
Federal Seed Act	85,000	85,000	
Packers' and Stockyards' Act	381,879	381,879	
Naval Stores Act	34,700	34,700	
Enforcement of the Insecticide Act	193,180	193,180	
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	6,322,808	6,604,808	+282,000
BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS			
Administration	31,735	31,735	
Home economics investigations	301,310	310,310	
Total, Bureau of Home Economics	333,045	333,045	
Commodity Exchange Administration	626,000	626,000	
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE			
Administration	510,334	510,334	
Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations	1,500,000	1,500,000	

Agricultural bill for fiscal year 1942, as reported to Senate, compared with Budget estimates for fiscal year 1942—Continued

Object	Estimates, 1942	Amount in bill for 1942	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with estimates
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—con.			
Soil and moisture conservation operations, demonstrations, and information	$18,458,350	$23,458,350	+$5,000,000
Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida	75,000	75,000	
Total, Soil Conservation Service	20,543,684	25,543,684	+5,000,000
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	498,921,220	498,921,220	
Parity payments	[1] 49,866,160	450,000,000	+400,133,840
Commodity Credit Corporation	[2]	[2]	
Disposal of surplus commodities	100,000,000	135,000,000	+35,000,000
Sugar Act of 1937	47,923,960	47,923,960	
Federal Crop Insurance Act:			
Administrative and operating expenses	5,734,488	5,500,000	−234,488
Subscriptions to capital stock			
Total, Federal Crop Insurance Act	5,734,488	5,500,000	−234,488
Farm Tenant Act:			
Farm Security Administration:			
Salaries and expenses	2,449,962	2,449,962	
Loans	[3]	[3]	
Liquidation and management of resettlement projects	738,689	738,689	
Farm Tenant Act—Continued.			
Soil Conservation Service:			
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal lands	$2,278,239	$2,278,239	
Total, Farm Tenant Act	5,466,890	5,466,890	
Loans, relief, and rural rehabilitation	[4] 66,000,000	[4] 66,000,000	
Water facilities, arid, and semiarid areas	500,000	500,000	
Cooperative farm forestry	400,000	700,000	+300,000
Rural electrification:			
Salaries and expenses	3,946,000	3,946,000	
Loans	[3]	[3]	
Total, Rural Electrification	3,946,000	−3,946,000	
Beltsville research center	86,620	86,620	
Farm Credit Administration:			
Salaries and expenses	3,810,000	3,810,000	
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans	[5]	[5]	
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, administrative expenses	[7]	[7]	
Total, Agriculture Appropriation Act	[8] 895,751,971	1,340,610,744	+444,858,773

[1] Together with contract authorization of $162,000,000.
[2] Authorization of $1,500,000.
[3] Authorization to borrow $50,000,000 from Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
[4] In addition, $100,000,000 Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans in estimates; $125,000,000 in bill.
[5] Authorization of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans: Estimate, $40,000,000; in bill, $100,000,000.
[6] Reappropriation of collections and unexpended balances of former appropriations, expenditures of which are estimated for 1942 (and in bill), $26,660,000.
[7] Authorization of $8,350,000 in estimates and in bill.
[8] In addition, $11,318,684 reappropriated and $162,000,000 of contract authorization.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot conclude the consideration of the pending bill today. There are two or three other speeches of some length to be made on the pending amendment, so it will be necessary to go over until tomorrow. Therefore, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

EDWARD MACAULEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion? There is a nomination here which I should like to have disposed of tonight.

Mr. BARKLEY. That nomination went over yesterday on the objection of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that since the objection on yesterday the Senate Committee on Commerce held a regular, due meeting this morning, that a quorum under the rules were present, and the committee ratified the action of the members of the committee in heretofore reporting this nomination. So the nomination has been regularly and duly acted on by a regular meeting of the Commerce Committee, and it is now on the calendar. I very much hope we may have an executive session in order to dispose of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered as in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be read as in executive session.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Macauley, of California, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1938.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. As in executive session, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a nomination and an international agreement which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 3, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 31), 1941:

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, VETERINARY CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. Harry John Robertson, Veterinary Corps Reserve.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 31), 1941:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Edward Macauley, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Prince of Peace, in the strength of grace, with hearts that are free and glad, help us this day to guard against conjecture, delusion, and fatalistic contentment. Bless us with gentleness under provocation, patience under wrong, and humble us in the presence of our urgent need. Help us strangely to forget our own sorrow and find ourselves stronger, rising in conscious power of our God. Heavenly Father, subdue the deadening ministries which seek to establish our land in the ways of disquietude and distress and convert the winter of discontent into spring, turning the life of unrest into a garden of brotherhood and the Golden Rule. Blessed Lord, we thank Thee for the precious teaching exemplified in the life and character of Jesus of Nazareth, which tends to solidify all nations into one family; that which hurts one nation injures all; that which helps one blesses all Thy children everywhere. Our hearts go out in prayerful sympathy to all

stricken multitudes, who in resignation are being plunged into the tides of despair. Oh, gird our lives, granting us wisdom and courage that we fail not, and Thine shall be the praise forever. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4124. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2788) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes," and that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the Senate amendment No. 5 to said bill.

FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR, WOODRUM of Virginia, CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 4124) may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 40]

Andersen, H. Carl	Grant, Ala.	O'Day
Barden	Green	O'Leary
Barry	Harness	Osmers
Bell	Healey	Patman
Bender	Heidinger	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett	Hinshaw	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bloom	Hoffman	Ploeser
Bolles	Howell	Poage
Bolton	Jarman	Randolph
Bonner	Jenks, N. H.	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Jennings	Rizley
Bradley, Pa.	Johns	Robsion, Ky.
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Romjue
Buckler, Minn.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, W. Va.	Schaefer, Ill.
Camp	Kee	Schuetz
Cannon, Fla.	Kelly, Ill.	Secrest
Celler	Kilburn	Shannon
Chiperfield	Kirwan	Sheridan
Clark	Kleberg	Smith, Ohio
Copeland	Kocialkowski	Smith, Pa.
Creal	Kramer	Steagall
Crosser	Lambertson	Stearns, N. H.
Delaney	Lea	Sullivan
Dewey	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Dies	McArdle	Sweeney
Dingell	McGranery	Taylor
Dirksen	Maas	Thomas, N. J.
Ditter	Maciora	Thomason
Domengeaux	Magnuson	Treadway
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wasielewski
Duncan	Mott	Weaver
Fish	Murdock	Weiss
Flannery	Myers, Pa.	Welch
Folger	Nichols	White
Forand	Norton	Wigglesworth
Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventeen Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. MCCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 26

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 3, 1941, it stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1941.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. RABAUT, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 360), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

REVISION OF THE LAWS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to codify Title I of the United States Code. This is the first of a series of bills I propose to introduce which will have for their ultimate objective the enactment of the entire Code into positive law. The attainment of this objective should thereafter facilitate the drafting of future amendatory or new legislation in terms of title and section of the Code. No changes in substantive law will result from the enactment of this and the subsequent bills to codify the Code.

I am hopeful that in this program the Committee on Revision of the Laws will have the cooperation of the leadership, the standing committees, and particularly the Committee of Objectors of the House.

For technical assistance in the drafting of the legislation, I am indebted to Charles J. Zinn, of New York, and the editorial staffs of the West Publishing Co. and Edward Thompson Co. [Applause.]

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately after the vote on the resolution just adopted, and explain my position on that matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman that the rule and the practice have been that no speech of more than 1 minute shall go in the RECORD before the legislative program of the day.

Mr. BOREN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD. The entire speech will not be longer than 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, it was my purpose when I came to the House today to object to a recess and I wish to express my reasons why I as an individual am opposed to a recess at this time. These reasons are embodied in the conditions in the Nation today with which we are all familiar, I refer to the general chaos in industry that is essential to the national defense as the result of strikes.

We have had before us the experiences of Europe, especially France. We are all agreed on the urgent necessity for an all out preparedness effort by management and labor.

We are confronted with the greatest crisis in history. Greatly aggravated by the selfishness of management and the leaders in some labor groups. We have no time to waste. I feel we must stop strikes for the duration of this crisis. I

am not willing to wait even 1 hour for action toward that end. Because I believe that Congress could and should enact legislation to prevent strikes, or any other delay in national-defense industries, I feel compelled in the interest of my country to object to any proposal for a recess at this time.

While I have been alone and single-handed today in the Congress insisting that we stay in session and pass legislation to solve this problem, I believe when you go home to your districts you will find that the American people feel as I do about this crisis.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, day by day the strike situation in defense industries gets worse and worse. Nothing is being done of an effective character against it. The one thing about the recess the House has voted that will help is that some of the Members will go home and will find out that the people back home do not approve of Congress dilly-dallying with that situation any longer. That is the one thing about that recess that I love. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which is built around the theme that the man who fashions the gun and molds the bullet is as important and necessary a part of our defense establishment as the man who shoulders the gun and fires the bullet, and that our Government should duly honor those patriotic workers who stay on the job during the defense emergency. I am going to speak on that concurrent resolution in the time allotted to me under a special order at the end of the legislative program today. I hope as many Members as possible can conveniently be here. While I am not so bold or so sanguine as to claim that my measure represents a solution of the distressing strike situation, it may, if translated into action, prove to be a palliative of that situation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from the Defense Weekly on strikes and national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix a letter that I received from the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Newark, and also a synopsis of reports on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics and in each to include therein quotations from my own letters and letters from constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered before the Southern Policy Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I may make on the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce by including therein a statement by Mr. Ed O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION OF ARMED FORCES TO CONVOY SUPPLIES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution prohibiting using the armed forces of the United States to convoy supplies to England or any other country. In this I agree with President Roosevelt, who has said in substance, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

The United States has taken many steps that have brought us closer to war. But convoying is war. Suppose our Navy does undertake to convoy supply ships, they would be compelled to adopt a policy to shoot first. A convoy that waited for an enemy to attack, and destroy at least part of the convoy, would not be effective.

I am convinced that an effort will be made in the near future to have our Navy convoy these supplies. That little group of heartless internationalists, who use the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies as their mouthpiece, have already announced that as their next objective. That little group of interventionists, many of whom have long advocated war, seem to get everything they want. They have dominated the foreign policy of this administration. In fact membership in that little clique seems to qualify one for a high executive position in our national-defense scheme.

Convoying means war. The Constitution vested in Congress the sole power to declare war, and I believe that we should not permit any individual or any group of individuals to usurp that power. The American people should be informed as to what is going on, for they will then rise up and compel both political parties to make good their party platforms and stay out of foreign wars. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by Dr. C. J. Koerth, of San Antonio, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LABOR

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, amid all the abuse and vilification of labor that we have been hearing on the floor these last weeks, I rise to say a word of commendation for the working people of this country. The Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production has now reached 141, a tremendous increase since a year ago. Many factors contribute to that increase, but it could not have occurred at all but for the work of the wage earners of this country, in mines, mills, and factories. Millions of those wage earners are in unions, and millions are not. Their average annual earnings, for people employed throughout the year, are $1,305 a year. To these people America looks for production necessary in the future for our national defense, and to these people we owe now a fair measure of recognition and of praise. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech by Harold E. Cockley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a table on farm tariffs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address I made over the radio on the subject of the conservation of daylight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the business on the Speaker's table is disposed of and other orders heretofore made, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROGRESS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall probably not be able to have an opportunity later this afternoon to voice my sentiments regarding House Resolution 162, which I understand is coming up in the House, and which authorizes the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to proceed with the investigation of the progress of national defense. About a year ago, just as the defense program began, as the people of the United States were becoming more and more interested in the progress of national defense, I introduced in the House a resolution which called upon the President to give from time to time to the Congress and the public a definite report as to what was being done in national defense. I hope these committees will take advantage of their authority and will come back to the House advocating definite and decisive steps to be pursued in order to prevent further delay in the carrying out on the part of management and labor alike of the great task of making this Nation invulnerable to attack. I fully believe that the work and the duties of the various members of the committee proposed in this resolution will answer, to some extent at least, the provisions of the resolution which I introduced, and therefore I hope it will pass, and I expect to support it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

STRIKES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] a few moments ago said that labor was entitled to its share of praise for the work it had done in national defense. We all admire and we glory in the great number of American people who are engaged in the work on national defense, but the fact is today that we have some radicals in these labor organizations who are hindering production for national defense. We certainly cannot praise them. We censure them for hindering honest, law-abiding citizens from working. In Wisconsin the Governor had to call out what power he had to quiet the riots, but because the Federal Government took his National Guard away from him he was near helpless, and he called on the President of the United States to suppress rioting because he was unable to meet the situation. What is the situation we have here? You have agreed to recess for 10 days without prohibiting it by law. Now it is up to the President. He is responsible. The Members of Congress would not pass any laws so that they could take care of it, and now it is in the hands of the President, and he will say what action he is going to take, although we find remarks from Miss Perkins that there are no strikes, and Mrs. Roosevelt said yesterday there were no strikes, but we find out we have them—terrible, bloody, unnecessary strikes against national defense. If you do not conquer the "red" movement in our country, it may conquer the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

THE LATE HON. CHARLES ADKINS

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death of the Honorable Charles Adkins, late of Decatur, Ill., who had the honor to represent the Nineteenth District of Illinois in the Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, and Seventy-second Congresses.

Mr. Adkins departed this life on April 1, 1941, at the age of 78 years. Charlie Adkins, as he was known to his friends, was born in Pickaway County, Ohio, February 7, 1863. He taught school, worked on farms, and later became one of the leading farmers and livestock feeders in Piatt County, Ill., where he became president of the Piatt County Farmers' Institute and later president of the Illinois Livestock Breeders Association.

Charles Adkins was a member of the Board of Supervisors of Piatt County, Ill., for a number of years and served as chairman of that board. In 1907 he was elected a member of the Illinois House of Representatives from the twenty-fourth district of Illinois, where he served two terms as speaker of the house. During the administration of Gov. Frank O. Lowden Mr. Adkins was appointed director of agriculture, and in 1924 he was elected a Member of Congress from the Nineteenth District of Illinois, where he continued to serve until the spring of 1933. He was a member of the Methodist Church and belonged to a number of fraternal organizations. In Congress Charles Adkins was a member of the important Committee on Agriculture, where he served faithfully and well during his membership in this House. In the passing of Charles Adkins the State of Illinois and the farmers of this Nation have lost a real friend, and I would pay tribute to my friend by saying that Charles Adkins' word was his bond. He was a man's man, kindly, tolerant, and no task was too great for him to undertake in the interest of a friend.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a brief statement made by certain Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BONNEVILLE POWER

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein this press release from the Bonneville Power Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE LATE HON. C. ELLIS MOORE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like especially to have the attention of the older Members of the House, because it is my sad duty to bring to the House the information that last night a very fine gentleman, a former Member of this House, died. I refer to Hon. C. Ellis Moore, who was a Member of this House for 14 years and who lived in Cambridge, Ohio.

I dare say that regardless of politics, regardless of circumstances, everybody who knew Ellis Moore will agree with me that he was one of God's noblemen, a fine, highly educated, Christian gentleman. I am sure that I can carry to his estimable widow and his two splendid children the profound sympathy of this House.

I should like permission to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that those of us on the Democratic side who served with Ellis Moore join with the Ohio delegation in mourning his loss. I was probably closer to him than any other Democrat now serving in Congress. We lived in the same building. Our children were of

about the same age. They played together daily. Therefore we were thrown together almost every day. I certainly join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] when he says that Ellis Moore was one of God's noblemen.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the membership that in pursuance of a proclamation of the President of the United States, the Military Order of the World War will on the coming Saturday, April 5, Army Day occurring on Sunday this year, commemorate the entrance of this country into the World War in honor of the United States Army by a parade passing the Capitol at about 1:45 p. m. and proceeding down Constitution Avenue.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD so as to include the proclamation issued by the President.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The proclamation follows:

ARMY DAY, 1941

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session (50 Stat. 1108), provides—

"That April 6 of each year be recognized by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America as Army Day, and that the President of the United States be requested, as Commander in Chief, to order military units throughout the United States to assist civic bodies in appropriate celebration to such extent as he may deem advisable; to issue a proclamation each year declaring April 6 as Army Day, and in such proclamations to invite the Governors of the various States to issue Army Day proclamations: *Provided*, That in the event April 6 falls on Sunday, the following Monday shall be recognized as Army Day."

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, pursuant to the aforesaid concurrent resolution, do hereby declare Monday, April 7, 1941, as Army Day, and invite the Governors of the 48 States to issue Army Day proclamations; and, acting under the authority vested in me as Commander in Chief, I hereby order military units throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions to assist civic bodies, as far as may be practicable, in the appropriate observance of Army Day.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 7th day of March, A. D. 1941, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-fifth.

[SEAL] FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

HEADLINES AND FOOTNOTES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, headlines and footnotes are always interesting and thought provoking. In the metropolitan press I note such headlines as these:

Indiana Standard Clears $33,597,342.

Record Breaking Backlog by Republic Steel.

$20,076,739 Earned by Eastman Kodak.

General Motors Has Sales Record With $1,794,936,640 in 1940.

Anaconda Copper Earns $35,052,699.

United States Steel Reports 26 Percent Business Rise With Company's Volume in 1940 Put at $1,081,000,000—

And so on.

Then, in contrast, I notice this footnote in a country weekly:

Eggs, strictly fresh, 14 to 15 cents a dozen.

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

CONVOYS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, those who have been talking about unlimited aid to Britain in one breath and keeping out of war in the next breath are running out of breath on the question of convoys. Up to now they have been able to argue that everything that has been done has been short of war. Now, however, they are faced with the following dilemma: Unlimited aid to Britain means getting the aid to Britain instead of to the bottom of the ocean, and this means convoys, and convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war, and this means breaking the platform pledges of both political parties, the promises of the President, and of every Member of Congress. This is what is taking their breath away.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the President of the Vermont Federation of Labor endorsing the position I recently took with respect to strikes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Illinois State Federation of Labor weekly news letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "No Strike Need Be."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATE RESPONSIBILITY IN LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I may be privileged to do it I should like to make a sort of announcement to the House, to the States, and to the people.

We saw in the paper this morning the article about the Governor of a State being stoned and appealing to the Federal Government. For whatever it may be worth, I want to express the judgment to the people and to the States that this situation is one in which they have got to come into major responsibility themselves. [Applause.]

I do not believe Washington is going to handle this job, and probably it is the best thing in the world for us that it does not happen. If the States claim their sovereignty and their place in our scheme of government, they have got to tend to their own business. The idea of the Governor of a sovereign State appealing to Washington in order to protect himself against being stoned is just something that does not work out under our system of government. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. The administration took the militia away from the State. What has the Governor got to defend himself?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Brave men like the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Dr. John Mohler, of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROGRESS OF NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 162 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 162

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, respectively, each acting as a whole or by subcommittee, are authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the national-defense program insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committees, respectively, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as they deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the respective committees, or any subcommittees thereof, are authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the respective committees and shall be served by any person designated by such chairmen. The chairman of each committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on page 2, line 10, there is a clerical error and I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution by striking out, on page 2, line 10, the words "it deems", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "they deem."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the stupendous construction program that we have imposed upon the War and Navy Departments to carry into operation. If this resolution is adopted, and I urge that it be adopted, I know these standing committees of the House named in the resolution will take into consideration the tremendous task these departments have had imposed upon them.

I call attention to the fact that during the World War, 1918 and 1919, the estimated cost of construction in the War Department was $925,951,971. In the period from 1920 to 1927 relatively small appropriations were made for new construction work. During 1937 and 1938—and the figures will be in the RECORD—the total amount was $191,750,738.93.

Period 1927 to 1938

1927	$8,010,000.00
1928	6,029,000.00
1929	14,515,555.04
1930	16,407,812.69
1931	17,852,734.41
1932	21,594,605.72
1933	10,088,325.74
1934	52,773,422.95
1935	2,756,828.00
1936	17,924,440.62
1937	8,396,537.05
1938	15,407,476.71

During the period 1939 to 1941 the present estimated cost of the program now under way is $1,229,712,987. To this it is expected will shortly be added the sum of $900,000,000 to provide new plants, new storage, and additional facilities.

The present construction program dwarfs that of the World War period of 1918–19 both in magnitude and speed of accomplishment. When the Armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, 18 months after the United States entered the war, that construction program was not completed. In the United States only 66 projects were completed and 172 were discontinued when hostilities ceased.

The present construction program lists at this time 256 projects with additional ones planned for the immediate future. Only 6 months have passed since September, when large appropriations for construction first became available. Of the 256 projects mentioned above, 32 have now been completed, 207 are under construction and on only 17 has actual field construction not started but plans for their construction are well under way. Every soldier who was scheduled by the War Department to be under arms today is housed more adequately than have been the soldiers of any army in history and, moreover, there are surplus accommodations now available for 285,000 more who will soon join the colors.

The record of accomplishment during the 6 months that the present construction program has been in force is astounding in comparison with that of the 18 months of the World War period which has always been pointed to as bordering on the miraculous.

Public sentiment toward the necessity for national preparedness was not aroused until the present European war was several months old and then public opinion changed virtually overnight. Action was demanded immediately and a tremendous burden was suddenly thrust on the departments concerned with national defense. These departments, organized on a routine peacetime basis, had to suddenly expand and reorganize to undertake the largest preparedness program in the history of the Nation. Funds were made available in September of 1940, permitting little if any time for proper planning or organization for the work.

A program for induction of trainees and for calling the National Guard and the Reserves to active duty was decided upon. The urgency with which these had to be put in training necessitated the prosecution of an emergency construction program to accommodate them. In effect many large camp cities housing from 10,000 to 60,000 people had to be constructed in the seemingly impossible period of a few months. Speed was essential and at the start of the program had to be an important governing consideration.

The enormous program which was suddenly thrust on the country required sudden expansion of forces handling construction, not only in the Government departments, but also among civilian construction companies and firms supplying materials and equipment. This sudden expansion created a temporary shortage of qualified supervisory and other key personnel, adding to the difficulties of organization and expansion to meet the situation.

Many of the contractors for construction and engineering firms which had the necessary qualifications, equipment, experience, and assets to handle the large projects of the construction program were already engaged and had to expand to carry on additional work.

Few, if any, contractors in the Nation had had experience in carrying on projects at the speed required, and in order to bring their organizations up to the required tempo there was considerable waste in both labor and materials before the organizations began operating in an easy and economical manner.

There was a marked shortage of labor in the skilled crafts at certain locations throughout the country. This was particularly true of qualified carpenters, plumbers, steamfitters, sheet-metal workers and electricians.

As a result of the unprecedented demand for lumber and lumber products for the construction program, all available materials were consumed and it became necessary at an early date to use lumber which was often not properly seasoned and in many cases might not have been considered as conforming to specifications, but which, due to the urgency of the situation, was accepted and used in structures. This great demand has been the cause of considerable delay in practically all projects, and if a supply of quality material had been available the resulted construction would have been better than that which has been obtained.

The delivery of furnaces and other heating units required for the camp cantonments has resulted in a serious bottle neck which has caused many material delays. If it had been possible to have delivered these units to the project in small increments, in order that the mechanical trades could install them, rather than to have deliveries in a bunch right at the deadline, saving could have been made and many projects completed at an earlier date due to the inability to secure sufficient skilled craftsmen to install the units over a short period of time.

The projects in the construction program were located at sites, the selection of which was governed by military requirements and necessity. In many cases these sites were isolated and at a distance from labor and material markets, transportation facilities were lacking and had to be constructed, virgin forests had to be cleared, water supply had to be developed, and, in short, wilderness areas with no facilities had to be developed into livable cities, with all essential facilities and many modern conveniences and comforts.

Large appropriations for the construction program were made available on September 24, 1940. In spite of the long hours of work and stupendous efforts to get the program under way as soon as money became available, it was humanly impossible to avoid the necessity of prosecuting a large proportion of the work throughout the winter months. This is, in general, the poorest season of the year for outside construction work. At many locations where large projects

were in progress unusually bad weather was experienced during this last winter. Heavy rains flooded some areas, completely stopping work; other areas were turned into seas of mud, making transportation about them virtually impossible. Cold weather and snows at northern locations materially reduced the efficient prosecution of the work.

So far as the Navy Department is concerned most of us are inclined to think of the United States Navy in terms of ships and aircraft, but there has to be a large supporting shore establishment to make those ships and aircraft function with the maximum effectiveness in battle. Any expansion—and this information I have received from the Navy Department, I rely upon it and know it to be correct, and I agree with it—any expansion in the fighting forces must be accompanied by a parallel expansion in the shore establishment needed to maintain and operate those forces and to recruit, train, and house the personnel who man them. All of the shore establishments are designed, built, and in many cases operated by the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department. The work of this Bureau along with all other branches of the Navy has expanded tremendously under the impulse of the national-defense program. To illustrate: During the period from June 1, 1940, to April 2, 1941, 10 months, they have awarded $520,000,000 worth of public-works contracts.

The magnitude of this load in comparison with past records can be seen from the fact that from July 1, 1916, to December 1, 1937, a period of 21 years, the total contract awards were only $362,000,000, and this included the period of the World War. In other words, the Bureau contracted for $158,000,000 more in 10 months than during the whole 21-year period.

But awarding contracts is not an indication of whether the work is being accomplished. A measure of accomplishment is the rate at which the money is being expended for labor and material. Let us examine into that phase. During June 1940, the cash disbursements of the Bureau amounted to $7,452,000. These disbursements increased rapidly so that 6 months later, in January 1941, the expenditure was $37,000,000 and it is now estimated that the cash disbursements for the fiscal year 1941 will approach $400,000,000.

The record of specific accomplishments is equally impressive. I am particularly pleased with the performance on the construction of the new air bases. Last Saturday, February 15, the new base at Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, was placed in commission. The contract was awarded in August 1939, and the work was scheduled for completion in August 1942. The station at Corpus Christi, Tex., which will cost $28,000,000 for the initial development, was commissioned on March 12. The contract was awarded in July of last year, and the time for construction estimated at 30 months. Similar progress has been made at Jacksonville, Norfolk, Quonset Point, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and a number of other bases.

Other activities of the Bureau involve the provision of shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, fleet facilities, storage structures, Marine Corps stations, ordnance depots, personnel structures, defense housing, hospitals, radio stations, power plants, and laboratories. Progress comparable to that on the air bases has been made on all of these programs, the total of which for the current fiscal year amounts to $518,000,000.

The accomplishments of the Bureau of Yards and Docks can be attributed to a number of factors, as follows:

(a) Much of the work has been planned long in advance and standard designs are available.

(b) Highly trained nucleus personnel were on hand.

(c) The use of outside engineers and architects has made available a great reservoir of engineering and architectural talent throughout the country.

(d) The use of fixed-fee contracts has enabled the Navy to initiate the work rapidly and to prosecute it energetically.

(e) By decentralizing the work and placing full responsibility on the officers in charge of local activities most of the red tape has been eliminated and delays avoided.

(f) Last—and most important—a spirit of loyalty, cooperation, enthusiasm, and pride in the work has been developed among the engineers, contractors, and Government representatives, all of whom are working together as partners to accomplish a vital national-defense effort.

The use of fixed-fee contracts for this high-speed program has played an important part in the success to date. For the first three of these contracts, awarded in 1938 by the Navy Department, the law permitted the payment of a fee up to 10 percent. The Bureau negotiated these contracts, amounting to $54,900,000, for a fee of 5.72 percent, or about one-half of the maximum allowable. The work was located in the western Pacific, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, and was of the most difficult character.

For the next group of contracts, the law permitted a maximum of 6 percent and the Bureau has, to date, negotiated these contracts, amounting to $350,800,000, for 4.57 percent, or about two-thirds of the maximum allowable.

All fees are fixed, that is, regardless of how much the work actually costs, the contractor gets the same amount, so he is not tempted to increase the cost of the work.

The Bureau has not discontinued awarding contracts by competitive bidding. On the contrary, whenever increases in cost and time will not result, the Bureau prefers the competitive bidding method. Since July 1, 1940, the Bureau has awarded 289 contracts amounting to over $28,000,000 by competitive bidding. Recently, however, it has become increasingly difficult to obtain competitive bids on difficult and long-term work except at exorbitant prices, because of the uncertainties of the future. In some cases, no bids are received for work which would ordinarily be much sought after.

The Bureau is to be particularly commended for its work on the housing program. Since October 1, 1940, the Bureau has contracted for 17,055 housing units at an average cost for land, houses, and utilities of about $3,100. Already about 2,000 of these units are occupied, and the entire program will be completed and the houses occupied by July of this year.

The present resolution is intended in the spirit of collaboration with and for the purpose of constructive criticism and suggestions wherever warranted.

You will note the resolution calls for study and investigation. This resolution has properly been drawn to express the spirit of the House to the committees named in the resolution to collaborate with the power to investigate, when and where necessary. The word "study" is used before the word "investigate." That is as it should be. That is as intended to show the spirit and intent of cooperation and collaboration.

It is also wise that the standing committees of the House acquainted with the problems of these departments have been designated in the pending resolution. Both chairmen are able, sincere, and courageous Members of the House who have proven their worth through years of service and experience. The members of those committees, representing both parties in the House, are also gentlemen of ability, of sincerity, and of courage. The members of both committees are aware of the problems that confront both departments in the carrying out of the stupendous task imposed upon them.

The members of the committees designated are also aware of the danger of having officers performing important national-defense duties subjected to continuous attendance before the committees, or subjected to fear of an investigation based upon the theory that something must be developed of a sensational nature, and the reputation of someone smeared in order that the appetite of some may be satisfied.

I know these committees will perform the task imposed upon them in the manner intended by the Congress and will perform their duty always in the spirit of collaboration with these two Departments to the end that the great national-defense program imposed upon these Departments will be carried out in confidence and in trust. With the spirit of confidence and trust existing between the committees and the War and Navy Departments, with the Departments cooperating with the committees, the important work of the Departments will be more effectively carried out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I had not expected such a generous allowance of time from the gentleman from Michigan. In fact, I did not request this amount of time and I do not deserve it. What I am about to say may not be regarded as strictly relevant to the subject before the House, but in view of the fact that some observations have been made recently on the floor and in other public places concerning the treatment of our troops, especially with respect to their food, I thought it would not be out

of place for me to lay before you for a very few moments the results of some observations which I myself have made in visiting four of the Army mobilization centers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a schedule which contains the menu of the Second Armored Division at Fort Benning, covering three meals a day for 7 days. It is an informing document.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS SECOND ARMORED DIVISION REPLACEMENT CENTER—WEEKLY MENU

January 10–11, 1941

Supper: Coleslaw, braised beef with peppers, fried potatoes, boiled kidney beans, bread and butter, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Apples, corn flakes, fried potatoes, scrambled eggs, toast and butter, coffee and fresh milk.

Dinner: Celery, combination salad, fried beefsteak, mashed potatoes, buttered peas, brown gravy, bread and butter, sliced pineapple, coffee and milk.

January 11–12, 1941

Supper: Spanish-style frankfurters, hash browned potatoes, buttered carrots, Spanish sauce, bread and butter, jam, Krispy crackers, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Oranges, corn flakes, French toast, fried bacon, sirup, butter, coffee and fresh milk.

Dinner: Sliced tomatoes, lettuce and mayonnaise, fried pork chops, mashed potatoes, buttered string beans, pork gravy, bread and butter, sliced peaches, coffee and milk.

January 12–13, 1941

Supper: coleslaw, boiled frankfurters, peppers and onion sauce, creamed carrots, boiled kidney beans, sliced peaches, bread and butter, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Oranges, corn flakes, fried eggs, fried bacon, bread and butter, coffee and fresh milk.

Dinner: Combination salad, mayonnaise, beef (Swiss style), mashed potatoes, buttered peas, beef gravy, bread and butter, apple pie, coffee and milk.

January 13–14, 1941

Supper: Coleslaw, fried meat cakes, baked macaroni with cheese, Spanish sauce, bread and butter, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Stewed prunes, assorted dry cereals, egg and bacon omelets, fried potatoes, fried ham, toast and butter, coffee and fresh milk.

Dinner: Combination salad, mayonnaise, roast beef, mashed potatoes, buttered carrots, beef gravy, bread and butter, egg custard, coffee and milk.

January 14–15, 1941

Supper: Barbecue spareribs, green peppers, sauce, baked potatoes, boiled sauerkraut, bread and butter, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Assorted fruit, corn flakes, French toast, fried bacon, sirup, butter, coffee and fresh milk.

Dinner: Lettuce and tomato salad, celery, mayonnaise, chicken potpie, mashed potatoes, sweet corn, giblet gravy, bread and butter, rice pudding, vanilla sauce, coffee and milk.

January 15–16, 1941

Supper: Beef stew, boiled lima beans, fried cabbage, bread and butter, rice pudding, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Apples, assorted cereals, fried eggs, fried potatoes, toast and butter, coffee and fresh milk.

Dinner: Coleslaw, mayonnaise, Virginia baked ham, boiled potatoes, boiled spinach, brown gravy, bread and butter, chocolate cake with icing, coffee and milk.

January 16–17, 1941

Supper: Meat loaf, French baked potatoes, succotash, tomato sauce, bread and butter, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Stewed prunes, oatmeal, corn flakes, scrambled eggs, fried potatoes, bread and butter, coffee and milk.

Dinner: Combination salad, mayonnaise, fried perch steak, boiled potatoes, buttered beets, brown gravy, bread and butter, pineapple pie, coffee and milk.

January 17–18, 1941

Supper: Sliced tomatoes, Italian style spaghetti, meat sauce, meat croquettes, bread and butter, coffee and milk.

Breakfast: Apples, corn flakes, creamed beef on toast, fried potatoes, steamed grits, toast and butter, coffee and fresh milk.

Dinner: Sliced tomatoes, sliced onions, sliced pickles, Boston baked beans, grilled frankfurters, catsup, mustard, bread and butter, jam, sliced peaches, coffee and milk.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will impose upon the Members by reading the menus of three sample meals as I discovered them. For example, in the Second Armored Division at Fort Benning, I find this as a typical breakfast: Oranges, corn flakes, fried eggs, fried bacon, bread and butter, coffee, and fresh milk.

As a typical midday meal: Combination salad, mayonnaise, roast beef, mashed potatoes, buttered carrots, beef gravy, bread and butter, egg custard, coffee, and milk.

As a typical supper or evening meal: Barbecue spareribs, green peppers with sauce, baked potatoes, boiled sauerkraut, bread and butter, coffee, and milk.

I can see before me some veterans of the World War with their mouths watering and as an ancient veteran of the Spanish War, along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], I faint, I fail, when I remember, the soldier's mess of that day.

I lay these before the House with the assurance that these menus are typical; in fact, they are regulation as to character and quality. I entered many a mess room. I went through the kitchens and I saw these menus being prepared. I sampled them with the result I had no appetite left. I ate so much by the sampling method, I had little or no appetite left for my own lunch.

I do this upon the present occasion in order that I may bring you some assurance, indeed definite and conclusive assurance, that never has an army been fed as well as our Army is being fed today. [Applause.]

There has been nothing lacking. Indeed, I think there has been nothing like it in military history. I can say the same thing for the housing or shelter for the men and for the clothing. Indeed, the same for the training that they are undergoing. It was my good fortune to see this Second Armored Division in training. Much has been said about lack of equipment. An armored division is composed of 3 tank regiments, 1 regiment of medium tanks, and 2 regiments of light tanks, 108 tanks to each regiment, which makes 324 tanks in all—an enormous command.

In the Second Armored Division at Fort Benning there are now 270 tanks actually in use of the modern kind, fast and armored, and 60 tanks are actually on the way to delivery to that division. With the receipt of the 60 we will have a complete armored division at Benning. It contains 11,000 men.

Mr. Speaker, the men in our Army are training and working all day, and in their odd moments are laughing—the finest morale I have ever seen. [Applause.]

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. As Fort Bennings lies in my district, I want to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman for the report he brings from there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am speaking of a typical division. As for morale and sanitation, no army has ever made such a record. Believe it or not, when I visited the Twenty-seventh New York National Guard Division at McClellan last week there were 17,900 men in the division, and only 2 men in the guardhouse. I almost suspect them of running a Sunday school. Do the veterans in this House remember any such record as that?

The social diseases, which are greatly feared by all armies, have been brought under such control that in the matter of such diseases the rate in that division was twenty-four one-hundredths of 1 percent. It is amazing.

We need not be afraid of how our men are being treated and cared for. We ought to be proud of them. [Applause.]

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I call attention to the fact that Fort McClellan is located in my State—Alabama—and I had the pleasure of training there for 13 summers. It is an ideal place, so far as climate and training conditions are concerned. I appreciate the implied compliment the gentleman pays to the people of Alabama. We are happy, indeed, to have the boys from New York there for training.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The New Yorkers are thriving there and are happy. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I believe the resolution which we are presently considering should be adopted by the House and that the Military and Naval Affairs Committees should be given the authority provided in the resolution.

Some time ago the Committee on Rules reported to the House a resolution which sought to set up a general, over-all committee to be charged with the responsibility of inquiring into the progress of our defense efforts and the efficiency with which such efforts are being carried on. I was one of those who supported that resolution, because it seemed to me then and it seems to me now that the Congress of the United States has an over-all responsibility to all the people to see to it that the program as a whole is carried on efficiently and well.

At the time that resolution was before the House it was vigorously opposed by certain members of the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees. If I recall correctly, they urged that their committees were competent to inquire into this matter and were inquiring into it, and they felt that in some way the appointment of such an over-all committee would usurp their prerogatives.

The House did not adopt that resolution; it was defeated. Immediately thereafter I reached the conclusion that as far as I was concerned I wanted these legislative committees to have full power to do the job that apparently everyone thought should be done. So I am for this resolution and hope it is adopted.

After this resolution is adopted, I for one am going to take the position that the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, by reason of the position that they, or at least many of them, have taken in the consideration of this whole problem, must now of necessity assume a large measure of the responsibility for seeing to it that the program insofar as their particular line of action is concerned is properly carried forward.

By this resolution they will be given the authority to subpena witnesses and to compel their attendance. With this authority and this power there can be no reasonable excuse for not seeing to it that the program is carried forward with due diligence and proper care, to the end that money be not wasted, that things be not purchased that we do not need, and that the whole defense effort be made vital and effective.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will this investigation be broad enough to go into the question of what is causing the strikes and holding up the defense program?

Mr. HALLECK. I take it that it would be broad enough, because each of these committees has charge of the authorizations that provide for the construction of defense materials. Certainly, anything that unnecessarily interferes with or impedes that construction would be a proper subject for their inquiry.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that this morning the greatest single manufacturing plant in the world, with 86,000 men employed, is closed as a result of strikes. In that plant are $164,000,000 worth of national-defense contracts to be completed. They will not be completed unless you do something about this strike situation.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, may I say that it was the testimony before the Committee on Rules that the authority would be broad enough so the committees would have the power to go into that situation. Is that not correct?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; that is my understanding of it.

Mr. DONDERO. Fine.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I concur in what the gentleman from Mississippi has said about the information given to the Committee on Rules. I also heard my distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Judge SUMNERS, announce that it was his view that the Federal Government should do nothing about these strikes, that the matter should be left entirely up to the States. That is what I understood him to say. I also heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania inquire how the States were going to proceed in case of riot inasmuch as the Federal Government had taken away the State Guards. In Michigan, of course, we are organizing State troops to protect the home people while the boys are in the Federal service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield to me to reply, because that statement is not true?

Mr. MICHENER. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will yield to the gentleman from Texas, and I hope the gentleman will read his remarks.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will read them.

Mr. MICHENER. It shocked everybody on our side who heard it and who understood as I understood the gentleman.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know what the situation is as to allotment of time here, but I want to have something to say about this matter.

Mr. HALLECK. I have the floor.

Mr. MICHENER. I have some time.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Michigan was just a step or two in front of me, because I expected to comment on that myself. However, if the gentleman from Texas at this moment wants me to yield to him so that he may make such statement as he desires, I shall yield to him.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] entirely misunderstood my statement, and the RECORD will show it. I stated that this proposition is not something that is going to be taken care of by the Federal Government, meaning, of course, exclusively—that the States have got to get in on this game, that the people of the States have got to get into this game and that the Governors of the States ought to be able to protect themselves, in substance, I said, without coming to the Federal Government for that job.

Mr. MICHENER. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about what my understanding was, I may say it sort of hinges on the use of the word "would" or "should." I understood the gentleman to leave the impression with the House that the Federal Government "should" do nothing about it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I did not mean that.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it the gentleman means the Federal Government would do nothing about it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; sort of half way between the two.

Mr. MICHENER. Just what does the gentleman mean then?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Can I get a little time myself from somebody?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think I prefer at the moment to continue with my statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Indiana 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I sat here on the floor and listened to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] said and, frankly I, too, was a little shocked at it, although very likely I did not understand just what he had in mind.

In consideration of responsibilities for dealing with strikes, I think we must all bear in mind that these strikes are affecting Federal contracts that are a part of the national-defense effort. They involve questions arising under national legislation, questions that must necessarily come to Federal tribunals for decision. And so I do not believe that we can say to the States that the responsibility is all theirs, or possibly, even that they have the primary responsibility.

In that connection, the thing that struck me first of all was the more or less helpless situation in which we have left some State governments, when we inducted the National Guard into the Federal service. [Applause.] I was one of the few who voted against that. I thought at the time my reasons were sufficient, and I believe today they were sufficient. Be that as it may, in my State and in any number of States, whenever you find a situation under which local peace officers cannot prevent riots and violence, the power and the force that heretofore existed in the State, by reason of the presence there of a State militia, is no longer in that State.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 more minute.

Mr. HALLECK. The men who might have been called out are not there. Now in any number of States frantic efforts are being made to enlist again something of a National Guard or a home guard, to the end that there be present a force to maintain order. But at the present time many States do not have any militia because of action taken here in Congress. The additional responsibility thereby placed upon the Federal Government in respect of the internal affairs of the State is a question for every one of us to consider.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I have no presently fixed judgment as to what ought to be done with respect to the question that is being discussed, and I simply want to make the general observation that due to the acts of Congress and the prior administrations for the last 8 years, we have so com-

pletely divested the States of all authority that the police powers of the States are crippled, and we ought to send a lot of things back to the States.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the gentleman on that, and he can look my record through and he will see I have given it more action than words on occasion. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know what the parliamentary situation is. I do not know whether the time has all been allotted or not. Is there any chance for me to get a little time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is in control of the time on the resolution. The gentleman from Virginia has been recognized for 1 hour and has control of that hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to work out some time for the gentleman from Texas, because he ought to have time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I preface my remarks on the pending resolution with this statement: For the Congress to further dilly-dally on the strike question will be not only to invite but will be to abundantly deserve public contempt. We have given and the country has given the President everything he has requested with respect to national defense. We have supported and the country is supporting him in his defense program, but as regards the gangsterism and racketeering in labor at this time we have come to the point where the President himself should stand up and take a bold, firm position. [Applause.] The time for soft-pedaling and temporizing has passed. [Applause.] Law and order is being destroyed in this country. The defense program is being sabotaged, and somebody must be bold enough to stand up and speak for the country.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I am sorry, but I cannot. The suggestion has been pending here for some time that Congress should at least in a measure meet its responsibility to follow through on all of these tremendous appropriations that have been made and see to it that the money is properly expended, and that the program which it is intended to effectuate is efficiently and economically carried out.

A question has been raised as to the power of these committees named in the resolution, both acting separately, both keeping within the general jurisdiction of the two committees. There is an attempt to delegate some additional power, and the question has been raised as to whether these committees can inquire into matters that are now of such tremendous concern and worry to the Congress and to the people of the country.

The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs appeared before the Rules Committee and testified on the resolution. The question came up as to whether there is the will and disposition on the part of these committees to exercise to the fullest extent the powers which are sought to be conferred. As far as I am concerned, I have the utmost confidence in my colleague, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, who appeared before us, and I know that it is his understanding that his committee can do the things which were detailed by him in his appearance before that committee and which he himself will mention in this debate. Very frankly, I doubt if the resolution is broad enough to enable either of these committees to deal with these matters in an effective manner. When the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee appeared yesterday before the Rules Committee the question was propounded to him—as to whether, under the resolution, the committees might investigate the policies and practices of management and labor in connection with the manufacture, production, or fabrication of any material designed for use either directly or indirectly in connection with the national-defense program. He answered in the affirmative. Mark you, and follow me, I was asking whether his committee had power under the resolution to investigate the causes and effects of strikes in defense industries. We know that there is a disposition on the part of a great many to skirt around every proposition to investigate strikes and I wanted to be certain. Very frankly, this resolution is in a sense a detour. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee answered that question in the affirmative. Then this question was propounded—as to whether these committees could investigate the extent and effect of excessive fees and dues, if any, imposed on employees on any Government project or in conection with the manufacture, production, or fabrication of any material designed for use, either directly or indirectly, in connection with the national-defense program. A qualified answer was made, but in effect it was in the affirmative. Then this question was propounded—whether his committee could investigate the effect of the National Labor Relations Act and the orders and decisions of the National Labor Relations Board and any other statute on the defense program, and, as I recall, no positive answer was made either one way or the other to that question. Then there was the question, Could the committees investigate the policies and procedures followed by labor organizations in voting to strike in defense industries and to obtain any other information relating thereto that would aid Congress in enacting any necessary remedial legislation? I do not recall his reply to that question, but certainly the gentleman to whom I refer has put himself on record. He has declared that there is need for such investigation, for such inquiry, and he has testified that the disposition and the will to go through on this subject is present in his committee.

So much for the Naval Affairs Committee. The Military Affairs Committee is represented here and its chairman has appeared in the debate on this resolution already. I would like to search his bosom. I would like to know if he agrees with the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee as to the scope of this resolution and as to the powers that are conferred. If he so agrees, if there is present in his committee the will and determination on the part of himself and his committee to go through in the same fashion and to seek as best they can to aid in the solution of this problem which is a national scandal and which the Congress ought to meet and should have met long before now.

My friends, there is a great deal involved. We are taking the boys of this country away from their homes and their loved ones and their security and jobs and we are putting them in camps for training. Here we find these racketeers, these gangsters holding up production and not a word of condemnation coming from any source except for a few feeble Members of this body and from the country as a whole. This Government seemingly stands paralyzed in the grip of these gangsters. How long can government exist when such conditions are tolerated? How long ought a government to exist that tolerates such conditions? My friends, the country is aroused. They want something done. They want it done now. We ought to stand up on our own feet, do our own thinking and meet our own responsibility in an open, manly fashion. Unless we do, we will go the way of France. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grateful to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge COX, for making the issue clear as to what I conceive to be a part of the jurisdiction conferred, as far as the Naval Affairs Committee is concerned, with reference to this inquiry.

I had no hesitancy, and I have none now, about what position the Naval Affairs Committee would take with reference to the investigation and that relating to strikes. If there is any doubt in any man's mind as to what course we shall pursue in seeking to deal with this matter in a straightforward manner, he had better vote against this resolution [applause], because strikes certainly have impeded and are now interfering with the national-defense production.

If this resolution is adopted, I propose to inquire into the effect that it has had in retarding the program. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he goes further into a discussion of the subject?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the question of the scope of the authority of this investigation, I am somewhat concerned as I read the resolution. The two committees are authorized to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the national-defense program?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The words "progress of the national defense"; if strikes have interfered with the progress of the national defense, they shall be inquired into. So the word "progress" does

not limit the scope of the investigation whatsoever.

Mr. COLE of New York. The limit of the scope of the investigation is by the wording of the resolution, and it is rather directed to investigating into progress solely. Is the cost of a project an element of progress?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course it is. We will go into that, because we have got that jurisdiction today. The only additional jurisdiction that is being conferred is the jurisdiction to subpena witnesses and compel the production of documents. We have all the jurisdiction to make these inquiries, and we have done it time after time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, that is the very reason, because of the power to subpena witnesses, that I feel we should be very particular in the scope of the investigation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman need not worry about the word "progress."

Mr. COLE of New York. May I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that he omit from the resolution "investigation of the progress of national defense"?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman thinks that will strengthen the jurisdiction and broaden the territory, I am perfectly willing to do it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does not the qualifying language in lines 8 and 9, "with a view of determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously and economically," cover the point which the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] raises?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the resolution is broad enough. If the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee want to do a worth-while job, they have plenty of jurisdiction here to do it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; not now.

Now, here is what I propose to make inquiry about:

First. To ascertain the progress of the Navy national-defense building program.

Second. To ascertain if the Government is getting value received for money that is being spent.

Third. To ascertain the profit that is being made on contracts.

Fourth. To ascertain the best type of contract that is to be used; that is, by competitive bidding or by negotiated contract.

Fifth. To ascertain if there have been delays in performance of contracts and delivery of material, and if so, what has brought it about.

Sixth. To ascertain if there has been an appreciable increase in cost of material and if so, to determine what has caused the same.

Seventh. To find out if any additional legislation should be enacted to expedite the program.

Eighth. To investigate what effect strikes have had on the fulfillment of contracts.

Ninth. To see if there has been a proper distribution of defense contracts throughout the country so that the Nation's productive capacity can be fully utilized.

Tenth. To determine whether the Nation's facilities are being utilized to the fullest extent, and all contributing their share to the defense program.

Eleventh. To see if there is sufficient training of technical personnel to provide adequate skilled labor to eliminate shortage of such workers.

Twelfth. To determine the priority of national-defense contracts over commercial production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield me 5 minutes of his time?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If we go into a manufacturing plant and, upon making inquiry, ascertain there has been a strike, we will then seek to ascertain the effect that has had on delivery, the effect it has had on the defense program, what brought about the strike, and make as thorough an investigation as possible, because it all has a relationship to the national-defense program.

Let me call your attention to this very important objective:

> To see if there has been a proper distribution of defense contracts throughout the country, so that the Nation's productive capacity can be fully utilized.

Now, listen to this:

> Of the eleven and one-half billion of prime contracts awarded between June and February of this fiscal year, between 20 and 25 percent went to two groups of companies of very closely interrelated ownership. Between 40 and 45 percent went to six very closely interrelated groups. A total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies or financially interrelated groups of companies.

Too many plants have been located in areas where defense industry is already concentrated. By doing this we are uprooting families, shifting population, leaving great resources untapped. When our defense efforts slow down we will find that we have overbuilt and overdeveloped areas. This will be our harvest unless the eyes of a very few shortsighted and perhaps selfish dollar-a-year men are opened. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this resolution be adopted. If the House imposes this responsibility upon the Naval Affairs Committee, I feel confident we can and will do a worth-while job, which demands to be done immediately in view of the fact that some $25,000,000,000 of the people's money is now being spent in this national-defense program. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that those Members who today have so vociferously demanded strike-curbing legislation have missed the boat.

It is my opinion that the wave of strikes now destroying our defense effort is a part of a well-planned program to bring American industry under the control of the New Deal administration.

I am convinced that the President and his utterly incompetent Secretary of Labor have purposely remained inert and silent while the defense program has been sabotaged. It is apparent to me that they are biding their time until public wrath will have reached the point where either the people of the Nation will demand a Government-controlled industry, or the industrialists themselves will have become so exasperated as to demand that their plants be temporarily taken over.

If this is not the purpose of the present administration, the President should immediately crack down on those who, behind the scenes, are responsible for the present wave of strikes.

Under the authority granted the President in the Lease-Lend Act and the conscription law, no other legislation is needed to cope with the present situation. The President can, if he will, sweep aside all the laws that are enabling sabotaging agencies to paralyze our defense industries. One word from him and every strike in America would be ended in 5 minutes.

The President is conscious of the rising tide of public indignation against the sabotage of our defense program. This is indicated very clearly by his recent appointment of a so-called National Mediation Board which has no authority until it is first given the green light by Madam Perkins. In my opinion, the appointment of this Board was one of the saddest evasions of Presidential responsibility in the Nation's history.

I do not anticipate that the President will call upon labor to end the present wave of strikes. I believe he would much prefer to let the situation develop to a point where he could, with a grand display of impartiality, decree the nationalization of all industry. If we live to see this day, I fear organized labor will regret its part in the program.

Under this resolution I hope that the committee will find ways and means of determining just how far the administration intends to go. President Roosevelt, however, is in a position to make this clear without a congressional investigation. The people of the Nation, through Congress, should call upon him to do so. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is because of my complete approval of the purposes of this resolution, and a recognition of the need that the investigation be made, that I am concerned about the wording of the resolution and take this time again to call to the attention of the entire membership, but more particularly to the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], what I fear may be a restriction

on the scope of the investigation. As I interpret the resolution, the committees are directed to inquire only into the progress of the national-defense program.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be amended, on page 1, line 4, by striking out the words "of the progress."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 1, beginning in line 4, strike out the words "of the progress."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the adoption of the amendment, the scope of the investigation now is for these two committees to inquire into the national-defense program which unquestionably includes labor disturbances, costs, collusion between contractors and bidders, location of plants, and the investigation has no limit whatever. Failure now on the part of these committees to inquire into the various phases of the subject which are of interest to all of us rests upon the committees themselves. I have every confidence that the gentleman from Georgia, at least, representing the Committee on Naval Affairs, will see that the investigation is thorough, impartial, and without restriction on the many phases of the defense program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] in order that he may explain his position, which seems to be rather misunderstood, or uncertain, at least.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, of course, I did not say what my friend from Michigan understood me to say. It was a mistake perhaps to attempt to discuss a matter of such importance in only 1 minute.

This is what I am trying to get across and I know it is important: In my judgment, and I reiterate it, the solution of these problems—the maintenance of local order—in the main has got to come from the people and from the States themselves. They have got to get in the game as the dominating controlling forces in our Government. I certainly did not mean that there is not the most vital and compelling Federal responsibility in the situation with regard to these strikes. What I was trying to emphasize is that the States and the people of the States must cease to depend so much upon the Federal Government and must depend upon themselves to the limit of their ability before they come to the Federal Government with regard to difficulties that arise within their own jurisdiction. I think it is a good thing for States to keep open the factories within those States and to protect the people of those States against violence within the States from any source whatever. I do not mean by that that a tremendous obligation—a great obligation—does not rest upon the Federal Government, upon the President, or upon the Congress with regard to these matters. But this Government belongs to the people. They are the Government. It is not safe to depend too much upon the Federal Government. The people had better find it out now before it is too late.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If I understand the gentleman's statement correctly, it simply means that, unfortunately, there is not to be found in the Federal Government any very great enthusiasm for the application of pressure to any sort of a labor group?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not think they are bursting open with enthusiasm. What I am trying to say, and I am indeed earnest about this, is this: I believe it would be a fine thing for the people of the communities and the States to begin to look to themselves and to their own States to deal with these problems and every other thing connected with their own governmental situation which they can deal with. This is a time to begin to take back a part of their powers they ought never to have surrendered; besides, it looks like they are going to have to take them back and attend to them if they are to be attended to, and the quicker they get at it the better.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Where we have passed Federal legislation, which may be at the bottom of the conditions that have arisen in this country, does not the gentleman feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility to the people of the States?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. Do not misunderstand me. I think the Federal Government is in the first instance responsible during this period of war preparedness. Do not misunderstand me about that. I do not think we are doing what we ought to do here quickly enough. It is really mighty difficult now. The thing I have been trying to get across for years and years is that our States have got to assume the responsibility of dealing with those things within their own governmental capacity. We are getting a demonstration now of what happens to a people, any people, who want somebody else to do the governing. In making that statement I did not mean to absolve the Federal Government from its responsibility.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman realize that by the adoption of certain Federal laws and by the appointment of certain types of people to enforce them, we have taken jurisdiction from the State with reference to a large number of those problems?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That may be so. But the very idea of a governor appealing to the Federal Government to protect him physically against some people in his own State, in my opinion, is not the thing to do, and I do not believe it is the helpful thing to do.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that we have passed laws that handicap him very seriously in that connection?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Maybe so. But what is the use of dodging this? We have a big job to do. Why do you try to protect your own States in this country? I am trying to get the people and their States back on the job against discharging their governmental responsibilities. They have got to begin to take over or take out. You should not do it. I believe in a democracy, a real democracy, a government by the people, but they must govern.

Mr. TABER. We must not protect the Federal Government or the Federal authorities from taking on their own responsibility for standing for that sort of situation.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I know that. Why do you argue that with me? Do you not want to do the same thing? Why do you try to make an issue of this? I am trying my best to get everybody in the game. Everybody has got to do it if we win. Where they really begin to do their job they will see to it that Washington does its job. What we need is to have the amount of authority reversed in this country. It has been going from Washington down to the people. What we need is for it to come from the people up to Washington. That is the direction in which the current of authority in a true democracy moves. That is what I am trying to get started. Then we can get results. Why do you gentlemen on that side try to make an issue of what I said?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to myself.

Mr. Speaker, once upon a time there was a President by the name of Grover Cleveland. A question arose as to whether or not the Federal Government had any interest in the mails moving in interstate commerce. Labor disputes and a strike threatened the dispatch of the mail. That President said, "The mail must go forward," and the mail did go forward.

Today we are confronted with interference in the national-defense program. Labor strikes are the cause. Investigation has served its purpose. The case has been diagnosed. We do not need further investigation and diagnosis in order to learn that the national defense is being interfered with by strikes. My hope is that we have a President who, even at this late hour, will come out boldly and announce to the country that "the national defense must go forward." [Applause.]

Organized labor did much to elect President Roosevelt. It apparently has faith

in him. A word from him at this time, making it clear that jurisdictional strikes and the like will not be tolerated by the Federal Government in the carrying out of our national-defense program, will be most effective. I mean a plain, understandable, courageous declaration by the President. Will he take that stand and make that declaration? If not, why not?

This is not the first time that I have urged such action on the part of the President. Indeed, that action is too long overdue. I am not in the habit of making speeches criticizing organized labor. In times like these I believe in accomplishment rather than talk. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have heard Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Hillman, Under Secretary of War Patterson, and all the rest give their views concerning the national-defense program. No definite position against unwarranted and ofttimes unauthorized strikes in the national-defense program has been taken by any official in the present administration until Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox mustered courage enough to express their views in connection with the Allis-Chalmers strike. Apparently those controlling this strike have but contempt for the statement of Secretary Knox and Mr. Knudsen. Indeed, these gentlemen were queried by the head of the C. I. O., who is a member of the President's mediation board, as to their authority to make any such suggestion in connection with the national defense.

The time has arrived for action. There comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue, and that time is now, so far as these national-defense strikes are concerned. Organized labor apparently does not realiz. that it is digging its own grave; that the organized-labor movement, nurtured by Federal legislation as it has been, is committing suicide. You cannot convince me that the honest workingman in our mills and our factories is responsible for this type of conduct at this time. He is the unwilling or the unsuspecting victim of racketeer labor leadership.

Labor has certain rights under the law, but labor has no rights or privileges that come before the preservation of our Government. Labor should not attempt to take advantage of our lack of preparedness in its endeavor to compel the unionizing of all of our factories and industrial activities. By the same token, industry has no right to more profits and more privileges than accorded in normal times. Each should realize its obligation and its patriotic duty to lay aside personal and organization gain and give all-out aid to the national defense.

We have heard much about all-out aid in recent days, and right here is a good place to interpret those words into action in our own behalf. This cannot be done if the national-defense program is to be sabotaged by strikes and lockouts. Again I repeat, investigation has diagnosed the ailment. We must now have the prescription. If the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, will take a few minutes off for a fireside chat and in no unmistakable language make a courageous statement indicating that this interference with the national-defense program must cease here and now, in my judgment strikes and lockout troubles in the national defense will end. Mr. President, we appeal to you. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the language of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee was brutally frank. It left no doubt in the mind of anyone as to what the purpose of this resolution is, namely, to constitute two great committees of this House into strike-breaking agencies. I therefore shall vote against this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the Naval and Military Affairs Committees to investigate the progress of national defense. I hope these committees fully realize the responsibility which they voluntarily assume.

I have had some experience in the investigation of labor difficulties and I want to warn these gentlemen that they cannot do this job thoroughly or as the American people expect them to do it by meeting once a week in committee at 10:30 o'clock and adjourning at 12 o'clock noon. I found it necessary to have these meetings running for week after week, beginning at 10 o'clock and ending at 5 in the afternoon. I hope these gentlemen will do the job we all expect them to do.

There is but one thing the matter with the national-defense program, and there is no use in skirting around the situation; it is strikes and it is labor difficulties. That is the situation this House and the American people are going to expect these two legislative committees to investigate fully and fairly and thoroughly, and tell the American people the facts and tell the Congress what to do about it.

Mr. Speaker, what is the matter with this labor situation? Let me read you the headlines emblazoned all the way across the front page of the Washington Post this morning:

Call for Troops Reported in Allis Riots; State Police Asked to End Ford Sit-Down; Peace Efforts Fail, Coal Mines Shut Down.

And we talk about getting ready to fight dictators on foreign shores. What about the dictators at home?

The coal labor dictator has told you this morning that you shall not produce coal to turn the wheels of your factories. The labor dictators at the Ford plant have told you this morning that you shall not manufacture automobiles for defense in the biggest automobile factory in the world. The labor dictator in the Allis-Chalmers plant has told you that you shall not make machinery to manufacture the powder that the boys you have put in the Army at $30 a month must have to shoot. They have told you that you shall not manufacture the machinery that will put your new destroyers out in your first line of defense. Yet I heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations say here the other day that we have appropriated $32,000,000,000 for preparation to fight dictators 3,000 miles away. Thirty-two billion dollars is nearly one-half of the total annual income of the people of America. We have appropriated $32,000,000,000 to fight dictators in Europe. And what are this Congress and this administration doing about dictators in your own country? [Applause.]

What are we doing? We sit here seeing the living example of a writhing, prostrate France, and while we look at that and while we look at these headlines streamed across every paper in the United States this morning, what do we do? Blithely we vote to take a recess for 10 days. Are we going to wake up someday, gentlemen of this House, and resume the responsibility that is ours, or are we going to do as France did?

Let us look for just one moment at the history of the Allis-Chalmers strike. I wish I had the time to go into it fully. What happened there? There was an election called by a man who is the head of that union, the Allis-Chalmers dictator, if you please. He demanded an election of the members of that union to decide whether they would strike. When they voted at his dictation, he stuffed the ballot box with over 2,000 votes. This was proven and subsequently admitted by the union. He called that strike in a vital national-defense industry. It has now proceeded for over 60 days and nothing has been done about it. In the last 10 days the Dies committee has given you indubitable proof of the long "red," Communist record of the leader and dictator of that union, and still we have done nothing about it.

After a while, when the forgery of the ballots in that plant was disclosed and admitted, the Secretary of the Navy and Mr. Knudsen sent a joint telegram to both the employer and the employees, appealing to them to return to their duties and resume this vital work for national defense. What happened then? Why, a few days previous to that we had just had appointed a mediation commission, a mediation commission to settle these difficulties, and what happened to Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Knox? Immediately they were rebuked by Mr. Murray, a member of your Mediation Commission, for having called upon those people to do away with that fraudulent strike and go to work for their country.

So this morning at the Allis-Chalmers strike "red" insurrection and rebellion prevail. You can call it by any other name you want, but that is what it is. Blood flows in that strike area over a strike that was called after a fraudulent election, a strike brought about by a "red" Communist, who is dictator of labor in that section.

What do we find at the Ford factory? We find the old technique of the sit-down strike. What is the sit-down strike? Call it what you will, it is anarchy, nothing more and nothing less. [Applause.]

With those questions confronting us, what are we going to do about them?

The headlines again:

Call for troops reported in Allis riots; State police asked to end Ford sit-down; peace efforts fail, coal mines shut down.

What are we, the chosen representatives of the people of the United States, going to do about it? That is the question you must answer. I say to you that the people of this country are not going to be satisfied with the answer that we must do nothing for fear we may offend somebody's delicate sensibilities. The people of this country are not going to be satisfied because somebody tells the Congress of the United States that you ought to do nothing but take a 10-day vacation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 155, noes 4.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, nay 1, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—327

Allen, Ill.	Cartwright	Eberharter
Allen, La.	Case, S. Dak.	Edelstein
Anderson, Calif.	Casey, Mass.	Edmiston
Anderson, N. Mex.	Chapman	Elliot Mass.
	Chenoweth	Elliott, Calif.
Andresen, August H.	Clason	Ellis
	Claypool	Elston
Andrews	Cluett	Engel
Angell	Cochran	Englebright
Arends	Coffee, Nebr.	Faddis
Arnold	Coffee, Wash.	Fellows
Barnes	Cole, Md.	Fenton
Barry	Cole, N. Y.	Fitzgerald
Bates, Ky.	Collins	Fitzpatrick
Bates, Mass.	Colmer	Flannagan
Baumhart	Connery	Fogarty
Beam	Cooley	Folger
Beckworth	Cooper	Ford, Leland M.
Beiter	Costello	Ford, Miss.
Bennett	Courtney	Ford, Thomas F.
Bishop	Cox	Fulmer
Blackney	Cravens	Gale
Bland	Crawford	Gamble
Boggs	Creal	Gathings
Boland	Crowther	Gavagan
Bolles	Culkin	Gearhart
Boren	Cullen	Gehrmann
Bradley, Mich.	Cunningham	Gerlach
Bradley, Pa.	Curtis	Geyer, Calif.
Brooks	D'Alesandro	Gibson
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ohio	Gilchrist
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Tenn.	Gillie
Bryson	Day	Gore
Buck	Delaney	Gossett
Buckley, N. Y.	Dickstein	Graham
Bulwinkle	Disney	Granger
Burch	Ditter	Gregory
Burdick	Dondero	Guyer, Kans.
Burgin	Doughton	Gwynne
Byrne	Downs	Haines
Canfield	Doxey	Hall,
Cannon, Mo.	Drewry	Edwin Arthur
Capozzoli	Durham	Hall,
Carlson	Dworshak	Leonard W.
Carter	Eaton	Halleck
Hancock	Mansfield	Scott
Hare	Martin, Mass.	Scrugham
Harrington	Mason	Secrest
Harris	May	Shafer, Mich.
Hart	Merritt	Shanley
Harter	Meyer, Md.	Sheppard
Hartley	Michener	Short
Hébert	Mills, Ark.	Sikes
Heffernan	Mills, La.	Simpson
Hendricks	Mitchell	Smith, Conn.
Hess	Monroney	Smith, Maine
Hill, Wash.	Moser	Smith, Ohio
Hobbs	Mundt	Smith, Va
Holbrock	Murdock	Smith, Wash.
Holmes	Murray	Smith, W. Va.
Hook	Nelson	Snyder
Houston	Norrell	Somers, N. Y.
Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	South
Hunter	O'Connor	Sparkman
Imhoff	O'Hara	Spence
Izac	O'Leary	Springer
Jackson	Oliver	Starnes, Ala.
Jacobsen	O'Neal	Stefan
Jarrett	O'Toole	Stevenson
Jenkins, Ohio	Pace	Sumner, Ill.
Jensen	Paddock	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Ill.	Patman	Sutphin
Johnson, Ind.	Patton	Taber
Johnson, Luther A.	Pearson	Talle
	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Tarver
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Pheiffer, William T.	Tenerowicz
		Terry
Johnson, Okla.		Thill
Johnson, W. Va.	Pierce	Thom
Jones	Pittenger	Thomas, Tex.
Jonkman	Plauché	Thomason
Kean	Plumley	Tibbott
Keefe	Powers	Tinkham
Kefauver	Priest	Tolan
Kennedy, Martin J.	Rabaut	Traynor
	Ramspeck	Van Zandt
Kennedy, Michael J.	Randolph	Vincent, Ky.
	Rankin, Miss.	Vinson, Ga.
Keogh	Rankin, Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Kerr	Reed, Ill	Vorys, Ohio
Kilday	Reed, N. Y.	Vreeland
Kinzer	Rees, Kans.	Wadsworth
Knutson	Rich	Walter
Kopplemann	Richards	Ward
Kunkel	Rivers	Weaver
Landis	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wene
Lanham		West
Larrabee	Robertson, Va.	Whelchel
Lea	Robinson, Utah	Whittington
Leavy	Rockefeller	Wigglesworth
Lesinski	Rodgers, Pa.	Williams
Lewis	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson
Ludlow	Rogers, Okla.	Winter
Lynch	Rolph	Wolcott
McCormack	Russell	Wolfenden, Pa.
McGranery	Rutherford	Wolverton, N. J.
McIntyre	Sabath	Woodruff, Mich.
McKeough	Sacks	Woodrum, Va.
McLaughlin	Sanders	Worley
McLean	Sasscer	Wright
McMillan	Satterfield	Young
Magnuson	Sauthoff	Zimmerman
Mahon	Schulte	

NAY—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—101

Andersen, H. Carl	Gifford	Maciejewski
	Grant, Ala.	Maciora
Baldwin	Grant, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
Barden	Green	Mott
Bell	Harness	Myers, Pa.
Bender	Healey	Nichols
Bloom	Heidinger	Norton
Boehne	Hill, Colo.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bolton	Hinshaw	O'Day
Bonner	Hoffman	Osmers
Boykin	Hope	Patrick
Buckler, Minn.	Howell	Peterson, Fla.
Camp	Jarman	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Jenks, N. H.	Ploeser
Celler	Jennings	Poage
Chiperfield	Johns	Ramsay
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.
Clevenger	Kee	Rizley
Copeland	Kelley, Pa.	Robsion, Ky.
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Romjue
Dewey	Kilburn	Scanlon
Dies	Kirwan	Schaefer, Ill.
Dingell	Kleberg	Schuetz
Dirksen	Kocialkowski	Shannon
Domengeaux	Kramer	Sheridan
Douglas	Lambertson	Smith, Pa.
Duncan	LeCompte	Steagall
Fish	McArdle	Stearns, N. H.
Flaherty	McGehee	Stratton
Flannery	McGregor	Sullivan
Forand	Maas	Sweeney
Taylor	Wasielewski	Wheat
Thomas, N. J.	Weiss	White
Treadway	Welch	Youngdahl

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Maciora with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Howell.
Mr. McArdle with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Wasielewski.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. White.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Scanlon.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Steagall with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Green with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Dewey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, may I ask my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], the ranking member on the minority side, if we may not have some agreement as to general debate. I would

suggest that we proceed with general debate for today and then read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think that arrangement would be satisfactory if it is the disposition of the leadership to continue in session until late in the afternoon, so we may give those who desire to speak an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RABAUT. A number of Members have indicated that they would like to leave tomorrow night, and in order to accomplish that we would have to complete general debate on the bill today and read the bill for amendment tomorrow, as the bill contains about 100 pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4276), the State, Commerce, Justice, and Federal judiciary appropriation bill, 1942, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations comes before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union today with the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the judiciary for the fiscal year of 1942. Taking the whole bill into consideration, it is $31,010,489 under the 1941 appropriation act. The Department of State is reduced below the estimate of the Budget $425,667. The Department of Commerce exceeds the Budget by $580,699. The Justice Department is below the Budget by $673,290, and the Budget estimate for the judiciary is reduced by $455,222. The total figure beneath the Budget for all four departments is $873,480.

This committee began its hearings on January 29, and for 9 weeks has sat daily, morning and afternoon, with the exception of the afternoons of the week of the lend-lease bill. The hearings comprise some 2,000 pages and are set forth in three volumes. I wish, as chairman of the committee, publicly to refer to the diligence of the individual members of the committee, my colleagues, Mr. KERR, of North Carolina; Mr. HARE, of South Carolina; Mr. HUSTON of Kansas; Mr. BEAM, of Illinois; Mr. HARRINGTON, of Iowa; and then to the ranking Republican member, Mr. CARTER of California; Mr. STEFAN, of Nebraska; and Mr. JONES, of Ohio. I would indeed be remiss in my duty this day were I to fail in the name of the committee to make reference to the devotion and ability of the clerk of the committee, a faithful servant in the Congress, Mr. Jack McFall. Yes, my colleagues, your committee has labored long and diligently to bring you a bill that has had the consideration that legislative matters deserve.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

In an upset world the Department of State is the five senses of your Uncle Sam, and this bill deals with the appropriation for this agency. The changes in the map of Europe have imposed new burdens upon our Foreign Service officers. Costs of living have been affected, and loyalty to their posts have brought attendant hardships. Some 20 missions and consulates abroad have been closed, but the ever alert Department has seen fit to open some 31 new consulate posts. World-wide developments approve such observations. As is set forth in the report, the statement of Secretary Hull before the committee is recommended for the reading of the House membership. It will be found on pages 1 to 11, inclusive.

The Budget estimates for the Department of State call for an appropriation for $21,719,467. After a careful and detailed survey of each item, your committee has recommended a sum of $21,293,800. This is a reduction of $425,667 in the Budget estimates.

When it is noted that a sum of $18,000,000 is required for work in the Department solely devoted to our foreign relations, and that returns or receipts accruing to the Government amount to approximately $4,000,000 it will be seen that the taxpayers' bill for this all-important right arm of their Uncle Sam amounts to approximately $14,000,000. The hearings before the committee, amounting to some 500 pages, stand as evidence of the committee's devotion to the task, and while time will not permit a detailed reference to each item in the Department, a survey of the report, however, sets forth the condensed decision and the reason therefor.

Office of the Secretary

The committee has made reduction in the salaries of the Secretary's office in the item of contingent and miscellaneous expenses, in the Passport Division, and for the collecting and editing of official papers for the Territories of the United States. It has made a reduction of $25,000 in the item of ambassadors and ministers, and of $50,000 in the foreign service building fund.

Emergency fund for the President

I wish to call particular attention to the language in the report concerning the emergency fund:

Emergency fund for the President: An item of $53,000 appears in the bill for the first time to meet the expenses incident to the maintenance of the Division of Controls. During the current year the President allotted $50,000 from his emergency fund to set up this division which has as one of its chief functions the issuance of export licenses. As additional commodities are placed on the export restriction list, the work of this division is correspondingly increased. Some indication of this step-up in the volume of work is indicated by the fact that whereas some time ago this division was issuing 100 or 150 licenses per week, recently they had increased this license issuance to approximately 2,000 a day.

Under contributions and quotas dealing with various types of international organizations, conventions, and so forth, the committee has seen fit to reduce the appropriation for the International Labor Organization by $2,000. They feel justified in doing it insomuch as the office of the organization is now located in Montreal, Canada, and the long journey to Geneva of former days is now unnecessary for the meeting. The committee also struck from the bill the sum of $47,856, that sum being the proposed contribution to the American Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy. At a time like this it was considered to be a waste of money and the cry for economy comes from all places except for national defense.

Cultural relations program

This activity in the State Department is devoted to the good-neighbor policy. It is a builder of good will and better understanding with our neighbors in South and Central America. The Budget allowance for the fiscal year of 1942 is $877,950. The committee regarded this program of vital importance. In the report will be found an itemized break-down setting forth the sum allowed for the various activities in the cultural relations program for the fiscal year 1942 totaling $877,390. In this connection I wish to quote from the report as follows:

The cultural-relations program has been under way for less than a year, hence it is still too early to evaluate the results that are being attained. Again, even after the program has matured, it will probably be difficult in many cases to place a monetary value on a program of this kind. We are not in the business of buying good will. We are endeavoring to extend a helping hand to our neighbors to the south of us, in order that they may be in a better position on the strength of the facts that we present them, to make a fairer evaluation of us and have a better understanding of our ways, means, and methods of life. In turn, our contacts with them cannot but serve to enrich our own knowledge of their problems and principles of life and pursuit of happiness.

There is no thought of indulging in any propagandizing. There is no thought of any proselyting.

The program is a straightforward American approach to learning more about our neighbors and having our neighbors know more about us. By this means we can and are making the good-neighbor policy something more than an empty word.

As with most appropriation subcommittees considerable knowledge is always gained by your committee in the many statements that are encouraged "off the record." It developed before the subcommittee that private interests are so conducting themselves in their business negotiations in South America as practically to wipe out by a single action the good that has been done in the cultural-relations program.

Among others, I am referring particularly to the movie industry, which unfortunately placed the picture, Mr. Smith Goes to Washington, on review. This industry, as an agency, has been most alert to the war situation and has used its strategic position to influence public opinion. Equal devotion demands a conduct of their enterprises, especially with our neighbors to the south, so as to preserve at least the good will of the few remaining countries with whom we have cultural relations. In other words, it was the opinion of the committee, and the State Department was so advised, that all business is to take a little broader view than that of a strictly monetary consideration.

The devotion and the character of the personnel in the Department of State is worthy of the highest commendation of the Congress, and their frankness in presenting their problems to the committee was of a manner to merit universal praise.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For the Department of Commerce the committee has appropriated $112,228,000. This amount is $35,298,272 below the appropriation for 1941, but due to a favorable consideration by the committee for civil pilot training the amount appropriated for the entire Department results in an increase over the Budget estimate of $680,699. The committee has agreed with the Budget estimate in some of the agencies of this Department but has seen fit to reduce its amounts below the Budget in many of the agencies resulting in an increase for the subdivision of Civil Aeronautics of $1,179,014.

Office of the Secretary

The Budget estimate for the Office of the Secretary was $494,800. The committee approved $488,000. The increase is for additional personnel in the offices of the Secretary, the Solicitor, and the Chief Clerk. It also allowed additional personnel in the division of Personnel, Supervision, and Management now subjected to an increased load because of the expansion of the national-defense program. The report commends the administrative officers for the attention given to the committee's suggestion that the method of detailing employees from one division to another be corrected.

Printing and binding

Under the item of printing and binding the committee has eliminated the estimate of $32,000 for the publication of bulletin "W" by the Weather Bureau. This Bulletin "W" is printed by the Department on a 5-year basis at a cost of $163,500. The purpose is to supply statistical meteorological data for each county in the country since the year 1874. The usefulness of such a bulletin is unquestionable but the deferment for 1 year in the beginning of its publication will not result in material damage.

National Inventor's Council Service Staff

This agency came into being as a result of moneys from the President's emergency fund. Scientists and inventors under this council devote themselves to the study of suggestions relating to national defense. Suggestions of all kinds are reviewed by this eminent group composed of 12 members. The committee has allowed the sum of $150,000.

Bureau of the Census

The cost of the Sixteenth Census, the data for which has now been gathered, is estimated to be $53,250,000. This sum includes $8,000,000 for the housing census. It might be interesting to observe the cost of the last four decennial censuses from 1910 to 1940:

Thirteenth Census, 1910	$15,000,000
Fourteenth Census, 1920	23,300,000
Fifteenth Census, 1930	39,507,580
Sixteenth Census (estimate), 1940	53,250,000

It may well be said that the census just taken will result in the greatest amount of factual data that has ever been available to the Nation. The committee has allowed an appropriation in the sum of $6,800,000 for the completion of the 3-year program for this work. It will be observed that an estimate of $110,000 was approved, for the purpose of searching census records, to apply age information in connection with Social Security benefits. This particular division in the Census office in 1940 had 100,000 unanswered requests on hand. This has now been reduced to 65,000 due to the committee's attention to the Bureau's appeal. We look for a further reduction in the arrearage in this service to the people.

Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics

Some years ago this activity was in the Bureau of Air Commerce and at that time was before this committee. So the older members of the committee were not wholly unacquainted with the requirement for air navigation. Due, however, to the reorganization plan No. IV, the President placed the Administrator for Civil Aeronautics under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department. So, again, this agency returns to its first love. It sure was an infant when we had it before and the committee was certainly surprised to see what a husky child had been developed. Most thorough hearings were had concerning this agency, dealing as it does with the developments in the field of civil aeronautics, and we have dwelt at length with the affairs of the office of the Administrator, general administration, maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, technical developments, enforcement of safety regulations, establishment of air navigation facilities, civil pilot training, maintenance and operation of the Washington National Airport, and the development of the landing areas.

During the current fiscal year a total of $103,142,637 was made available to this agency to carry on their varied and important activities. For the next fiscal year the committee is recommending an appropriation of $78,677,000, or a reduction of $24,465,637. Although the action taken results in this considerable decrease as compared with funds available for the current year, the amount carried is, nonetheless, approximately $1,180,000 in excess of the Budget estimate.

In connection with the reorganization referred to whereby the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics became a part of the Department of Commerce, information furnished the committee indicated that as a result of the reorganization a saving of $321,000 was effected.

The developments that have taken place in the field of civil aeronautics during the past 3 years are perhaps greater than those in the previous 35 years. There are now some 17,000 civilian planes in operation, and during the last fiscal year the regularly established air transport companies and private flyers flew a total of 348,500,000 miles. The following table is illustrative of the increase in airplane mileage flown in the last 5 years by all air carriers and private planes:

Year:	*Miles flown*
1936	164,532,000
1937	177,896,000
1938	207,556,000
1939	263,844,000
1940	348,482,000

While this tremendous development in this mode of transportation was taking place a commendable record was also being built up in the matter of air safety. For example, in the fiscal year 1938, the air lines flew approximately 13,400,000 miles per passenger fatality. In the fiscal year 1939 this figure had increased to 18,400,000 miles. In the calendar year 1940, however, the figure jumped to 36,260,000 miles, or an improvement of 170 percent over the fiscal year 1938, and practically a 100-percent improvement over the fiscal year 1939.

It was also brought out at the hearings that the Government is paying rental costs of airways traffic control stations located at many of the airports throughout the country. The position of the committee in this matter is the same as expressed under the appropriation for the Weather Bureau. The Government is paying large sums of money to maintain a service of personnel and equipment dedicated to the public safety, and we feel that the least contribution that should be made by the municipalities or those owning the airports is to provide free rental for the personnel of this agency including all housing services. The policy of the Department should be directed in the future to the attainment of this end. The appropriation for air navigation facilities are for both maintenance of existing facilities and for establishment of new facilities. The program under this heading in the judgment of the committee appeared to be somewhat ambitious and the committee has allowed for this worthy purpose the sum of $14,000,000 which, however, is a reduction of $236,000 under the Budget estimate. The committee has not undertaken to approve or disapprove salaries for personnel but has placed this decision with the Administrator. The report carries language directing the Administrator to establish the personnel on a yearly basis. There are at this time, according to the evidence presented to the committee, 173 airplanes in the Department and the committee feels it proper that the Department should have this type of vehicle for their transportation purposes. In an effort to control costs the committee has made known to the Department the policy as to the purchase and use of automobiles, so that the agency may be governed as to expenditures and the usage as to miles flown and age of vehicle.

The committee adopted the policy some few years ago of not allowing funds for the exchange of passenger motorcars until they have attained the age of at least 3 years and have been driven at least 50,000 miles. The committee will expect the office of the Administrator to be governed by this expression of policy.

Also there is a policy as to the cost of cars and the committee will look forward to similar information from this bureau as to the standardization of airplane vehicles.

Technical development

The committee has allowed $500,000 for this work during the next fiscal year and has approved of the Administrator's request that such parts of this sum as he deems proper may be used in payment to private industry for study in this field. Under the heading of "Air navigation facilities" the committee has approved the proposal for the high-frequency ranges and accordingly 57 ultra-high-frequency ranges will be installed and 11 airport radio-blind-landing systems were also approved. The Army is now acquiring equipment to take advantage of these improved facilities. It is also being installed by many of the commercial air liners. We understand that the cost per plane amounts to about $650,000. An experimental station equipped with these facilities is in operation at Indianapolis.

Civilian pilot training

In 709 colleges and 211 noncollege units courses are given for civilian pilot training. The training consists of 2 courses, primary and secondary. Of the 35,000 taking the first course, 18,000 have completed it; of the 4,000 taking the secondary course, 1,500 have completed it. Investigation has brought to the committee's attention the fact that 4,800 of the trainees have entered the air service of the armed forces of the Nation and 941 of the instructors have left the service to supply trained personnel in the national-defense units; 22 percent of the new cadets to the air forces of the Army and the Navy have come from the C. A. A. program. The committee was somewhat surprised to learn that the Navy has looked with approval to this program and has given to the graduates of the secondary course a credit of 33 hours of service. The Army, on the other hand, to the apparent discouragement of those who have been schooled in the C. A. A. and as graduates from the first and secondary courses, except on one occasion, has placed these boys back to scratch at the beginning of their primer class or on an even footing with the lads inducted into the service and who know nothing about a plane or its mechanism. This treatment on the part of the Army of these trainees did not sit well with the committee, as is evidenced by the record in the hearings. The following sentence has been placed in the report with a view toward effecting the desired results:

> There should be complete understanding and cooperation among the Army, Navy, and Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that they will all work together for the consummation of the main purpose of the whole national-defense effort—preparation of our citizens to meet the emergency if and when it arrives.

The safety record of the civilian pilot-training program deserves a broadcast. From a total of 40,000 students in some form of training there register 17 fatalities. Life-insurance companies have given heed to this splendid record. Policies originally costing $30 a thousand for civil pilot-training students can now secure a $3,000 life-insurance policy and $1,000 hospitalization protection for $9. For the current year there was appropriated $37,000,000 for civilian pilot training. The Budget estimate for 1942 reduced this item to $18,000,000. The committee is mindful of the ambition of the youth of this Nation to fly. The committee recognizes the great need of pilots by the national-defense program. The story of the progress of Germany in its development of pilots and the results obtained thus far in the conflict abroad stands in the minds of the committee as a warning to the Nation, the decision of the Budget to the contrary notwithstanding. As a result of the Versailles Treaty the use of power planes in Germany was reduced to a minimum, but pilots were nevertheless developed. Children were taught in simple division not to quarter an apple but to tell of the parts of a plane. From 8 to 12 years of age as part of the school curriculum they made small models. From 14 to 18 they joined the gliders' club, and 100,000 of them a year were busy in that occupation. The next step was a development of the flyers, 25,000 a year, and so today America is air minded. Walk into the homes of this country and ask them what the C. A. A. is and you will be told it is the place where the boys are trained to fly for the Army and the Navy. The committee has increased this appropriation above the Budget $7,000,000. It is still $12,000,000 less than the amount allocated to the agency in 1941. The civilian pilot training under the program with over 700 institutions cooperating brings this activity within reach of the boys and girls in every section of our land. Were the Budget estimate to prevail, this opportunity to serve and to learn would be denied to many in the Nation, for a considerable percentage of the schools would have to be stricken from the list.

Maintenance and operation of Washington National Airport

The revenue that will accrue from concessions at this airport will amount to approximately $400,000. The committee dwelt at some length concerning the fees charged commercial companies and expressed its views to the Administrator concerning the establishment of rates more in keeping with the services the Government is rendering.

Development of landing areas

Airport landing fields are a vital part of the defense program. An appropriation of $40,000,000 was made for the current year to begin the program. All airports to be improved are listed on pages 599 to 683. The cost of such improvement is also set forth. You will recall that the Government buys no land, builds no buildings from the funds appropriated, but it does improve airfields publicly owned. The entire airport program covers landing fields totaling 4,000. It is a 6-year program. The fields, as you will recall, are divided into four subdivisions, and the total cost of this field program is approximately $560,000,000.

The Budget had proposed an expenditure of $33,500,000 to complete the program during the next fiscal year. If that sum had been allowed, it would still have been necessary that $47,500,000 of Works Progress Administration moneys be used to supplement the appropriation of $33,500,000. While the contribution of Works Progress Administration to the fulfillment of the plan entails a larger total cost than would be required if all of the work were performed by the Administrator's office, nonetheless the committee feels that it is desirable that Works Progress Administration labor be used as much as possible on Federal projects. Further than that, from the standpoint of the morale of the workers, it is certainly desirable that they be afforded opportunities such as this in order that they may add their bit to the fulfillment of the national-defense program.

The committee has proposed, therefore, to reduce the estimate for this landing area development work from $33,500,000 to $28,500,000, thus making it essential that funds amounting to $47,050,000 be contributed by the Works Progress Administration to complete the entire program.

The following tabulation gives an overall picture of the number of projects and the cost thereof.

Cost summary of 250-airport program

Number of projects in program	250
Number of projects placed under way with funds now on hand	188
Number of projects to be fully completed to ultimate desired classification this fiscal year	45
Number of projects on which work is proposed for the next fiscal year	205
Total estimated cost of 250-airport program exclusive of Work Projects Administration labor furnished this fiscal year	$113,550,000
Estimated value of Work Projects Administration labor furnished this fiscal year	9,000,000
Total	122,550,000
Funds now available:	
For construction, act of Oct. 9, 1940	38,000,000
Estimated value of Work Projects Administration labor made available, present fiscal year	9,000,000
Total	47,000,000
Balance required for full completion of 250-airport program	75,550,000
Amount in bill to apply to completion of program	28,500,000
Balance representing cost of work remaining to complete program to be undertaken by Work Projects Administration	47,050,000

The Civil Aeronautics Board

Under the President's reorganization plan the Civil Aeronautics Authority is now set forth as a Civil Aeronautics Board and placed by Executive order in the Department of Commerce. It therefore comes to this committee as such this year for the first time. The Board is charged by law with complete authority covering all phases of civilian

aeronautics. It is a big job in a rapidly expanding industry. The committee approved the sum of $1,153,000 which was $28,175 under the Budget for the salaries and expenditures of the Board. During the year 1940 the personnel of the Board investigated 455 accidents involving loss of life or serious injury. There is a table in the hearings on page 327.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

For the current fiscal year the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is operating under an appropriation of $2,213,000. The committee is recommending an appropriation of $2,217,000 for next year. This is less than the Budget estimate by approximately $50,000. It was proposed to devote approximately $60,000 of the increase allowed by the Budget for next year in making two specialized studies and establishing a new division in the Department. As far as the small business division which the Bureau seeks to set up, the committee finds no objection. It seems patent that there are a good many services the Government can render to small business that are needed and that will be of real assistance to small enterprises in endeavoring to maintain their position in the economic life of the country. Thirty thousand dollars was sought for this purpose. The projected study of the national-income distribution by size of the income is not regarded in a favorable light by the committee. Funds totaling $11,600 were provided by the Budget for an analysis of the national income in terms of the final product. The committee recognizes that a study of this nature will perhaps be of measurable value in the economic decisions surrounding post-war adjustment and have placed their stamp of approval on this expenditure. An overall reduction of $46,640 has been made, however, in the appropriation for the departmental salaries and expenses, as it is the considered judgment of the committee that many of the surveys, investigations, and reports that the Bureau is getting out at the present time are not of such immediate value that they cannot yield to the demand for economy to cope with our stupendous national-defense expenditure. The explanation of some of the studies being conducted by the Bureau gives the impression that it is a question of laboring to find something to do. All theoretical studies must be dispensed with at this time and emphasis placed exclusively upon services that are absolutely needed to maintain a healthy national economy.

You will note from the table at the end of the report that we have given proper consideration to the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, the Patent Office, and the National Bureau of Standards.

Weather Bureau

For the first time the committee has had the consideration of the appropriation for the Weather Bureau and when you comment upon the weather remember that it is a vital question as far as expense is concerned to your Uncle Sam. For the Weather Bureau enjoyed our consideration to the expense of $7,348,000. This was $91,740 beneath the Budget estimate. The Weather Bureau as you will recall was formerly in the Department of Agriculture. Under the President's reorganization plan it was placed in the Department of Commerce. The sum allotted is an increase of $66,100 over the current year appropriation and as I said previously is a reduction of $91,740 in the Budget estimate. The committee had an observation to make which the chairman feels should be recorded here.

One of the items which has given the committee considerable concern is the fact that the Weather Bureau is compelled to pay for the cost of heat and light in the offices they occupy in certain airports throughout the country. The Weather Bureau is an agency serving the immediate locality where it is located and certainly is essentially an integral part of the operations of the air lines coming in and going out of any particular airport.

Rendering such a specialized and useful local service as it does, therefore, the Government should not be called upon to be out of pocket for the expense of maintaining these offices on airport property. The committee will expect that presentation of the committee's views be made in the necessary quarters in order that this charge may be liquidated.

The committee feels there are many places in the country where expense that ought to be borne locally is heaped upon the Federal agencies and this is one case that was discovered in the Weather Bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 15 minutes.

I think it was Mark Twain who said, "Everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it" but your Uncle Sam is doing considerable study about it, not that he wants to change it but he wants to know how and where it is. Information concerning the weather has always been most highly regarded by agriculture but now with the new use of the sea of the air it is a most vital concern to life and limb.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman from Michigan and the members of his committee will be pleased to hear that so far as the Weather Bureau station, which was established in New England is concerned, it has rendered wonderful service. The forecasts have been made in a manner that has brought great public commendation of the service. My friend from Michigan who is now addressing the House helped me so greatly in getting through last year the appropriation which enabled the office to be established as a regional office for New England. I know that the gentleman and the other members of his committee will be pleased to learn the great success of that office.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the majority leader that as he will recall, that particular improvement was established on a 9-month basis. The committee has now seen fit to put it on a yearly basis under the provisions in this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very pleased to hear that.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. RABAUT. The 1941 appropriation for the Department of Justice was $61,703,187. The estimate for 1942 was $66,930,790. The amount recommended in this bill is $66,257,500, or an increase as compared to 1941 of $4,554,313 and under the Budget estimate of $673,290.

Office of the Attorney General

During the current fiscal year a Special Defense Unit with 17 employees was established in the office of the Attorney General by means of an allocation of funds from the emergency fund of the President. The regular Budget for the fiscal year 1942 provided a sum of $37,420 for personnel to carry on the activities of this unit and on March 18 a supplemental estimate of $350,000 was transmitted, in House Document No. 144, to the Congress, of which sum $60,000 was contemplated to be used to increase the staff for the special defense work to be conducted by this agency. Considering then the two items mentioned, or an aggregate sum of $97,420, the committee has allowed in all a total of $50,000 for the continuance of this work during the next fiscal year. The duties of this unit are extremely varied in nature and have to do primarily with the task of acting as a liaison between the Attorney General and other units within the Department of Justice and other departments of the Government in the matter of recommending policy to be adopted by the Department of Justice in the multifarious fields of defense activity in which the Department of Justice is projected.

Voorhis Act

In addition to the $60,000 contained in the above cited House document to meet the needs of this unit during the fiscal year 1942, provision was made in the same document for a sum of $290,000 to be available for investigations, study, and analyses connected with the enforcement of Public Act No. 870, approved October 17, 1940, commonly referred to as the Voorhis Act, which had as its main purpose the requiring of registration by certain organizations carrying on activities inimical to the interests of the United States. Extensive hearings were had by the committee in developing the philosophy of approach to the matter of the enforcement of this act. Up to the present time no organization has registered under the act. The effort to require registration of this type of organization has never before been tried by any country and therefore the path of approach to enforcement is untrod.

Tax Division

The work of the Tax Division continues to expand, and as additional taxes are imposed it is reasonable to expect that there will be a corresponding proportionate increase in the work that this Division will be called upon to perform. The attorneys of the Division carry approximately 44 cases per man and in the

fiscal year 1940 recoveries of approximately $37,000,000 were effected for the Government as against recoveries of $26,000,000 in 1939. In the fiscal year 1940 there was an increase of 13 percent in business over the preceding fiscal year.

Traveling expenses

A total of $510,000 is appropriated for traveling expenses. This is a reduction of $19,000 in the Budget estimate.

Evidence presented to the committee indicates that the attorneys of the Claims Division are apparently subject to the whim of the commissioners of the Court of Claims as to the time and place of hearings on claims cases. The committee is hopeful that both the Court of Claims and the Claims Division of the Department will by conference reach some understanding in this matter in order that the additional expense thrown on the Government for needless travel may be eliminated.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Now I want to address myself briefly to the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In line with all other agencies of the Government that have taken on the responsibilities of national defense preparation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has had an enormous expansion. Ten years ago the appropriation for this agency was something less than $3,000,000 annually. Today we find it necessary to make appropriations for the next fiscal year amounting to $16,350,000. A better part of half of this sum, of course, is made necessary by the exigencies of our national defense program as we must supply manpower to track down all saboteurs and espionage agents of foreign governments who are trying to weaken our democratic structure by the termite process of boring from within.

Considering both the regular activities of the Bureau as well as the national defense phase, we find that today there are over 33,000 cases assigned to agents of the Bureau for investigation and in addition to that figure there are approximately 8,500 cases awaiting assignment to agents. The net effect of this vast avalanche of work is to bring about a case load per agent of nearly 21 cases, and, of course, for an agent to handle that number of investigative matters requires a tremendous burden of overtime activity.

I think the House will be interested to know that the Bureau has on file now nearly 16,000,000 fingerprint records, of which the large majority are criminal prints. The fingerprint identification unit is working on a 24-hour basis, endeavoring, without too great success I must reluctantly say, to keep pace with the daily fingerprint receipts which have reached a total of approximately 17,000 per day. The responsibilities placed on this unit have been made further burdensome by the necessity of classifying, filing and making reports on each one of approximately 5,000,000 fingerprints taken by the Alien Registration Division of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in connection with the recent Nationwide alien registration program. The amount of overtime being performed by the employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has assumed stupendous proportions. Hundreds of thousands of hours of noncompensated extra duty are being performed by both the employees at the seat of government as well as by the clerks and agents in the field.

I know we all take a commendable pride in the record that Mr. Hoover has made and is making in the consummation of his arduous task of apprehending the violators of our Federal laws. During the past several years we have added innumerable statutes to the books making offenses out of crimes that were formerly recognized only by State and local jurisdiction. It is plainly evident that every time we add any one such additional law we bring in its wake the necessity of making further provision for machinery to insure its proper enforcement. And, my colleagues, that machinery is expensive if it is to be efficacious.

I only wish that the membership of the House would make it a point to visit the Federal Bureau of Investigation in order that they may become personally acquainted with not only one of the most efficient but one of the most humanly interesting phases of our entire governmental activity.

Immigration and Naturalization Service

The Immigration and Naturalization Service under the President's reorganization plan was transferred to the Department of Justice from the Department of Labor. This Bureau was formerly with this committee when it had as the ranking member on the Democratic side our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. Some years ago the Department of Labor was taken from this committee, and so for the new members of the committee this is the first time this agency comes before them.

The estimate as submitted in the Budget calls for additional increase over the amount available for the current year of $3,865,585. One thousand three hundred and fifty-four additional employees are proposed for this agency. They will be employed not only in the regular functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service but will also be employed on duties incident to the recent alien registration work. Very thorough hearings were given the proposal of this agency, and the committee has decided upon an amount of $15,800,000, which is a reduction of $298,965 under the Budget estimate. It is proposed in the language of the bill that $200,000 of the appropriation be set aside for the employment of personnel to be exempted from the civil-service laws and regulations.

There are approximately 5,000,000 questionnaires awaiting consideration. This division is 10 months in arrears in the handling of applications for naturalization. The appropriation will assist in this matter to bring the naturalization work to date. The committee was impressed with the request that a small amount of the funds be permitted for use for a naturalization survey to improve the method of handling this activity.

One of the major problems confronting the Service is the fact that at the present time there are approximately 4,200 cases where warrants of deportation have been issued and where for various reasons it is impossible to deport the aliens. Of this total of nondeportable deportees something less than half cannot be deported because of the present conditions in Europe. Of this 50 percent a half are criminal aliens. The problem is a most important and pressing one and the committee expresses the hope that some legislation can be adopted by the Congress that will effect a fair solution to the difficulty.

It is possible at this time to make some preliminary conclusions from the mass of data gathered in connection with alien registration and one of the findings is that approximately 40 percent of the aliens that registered have taken some step toward attaining citizenship; while 5 percent were ineligible for citizenship for one reason or another, particularly on account of not having become of sufficient age to exercise the right.

Border patrol

It appears that the patrol service is confronted with the fact that they are losing many of their best and experienced officers because of other agencies of the Government offering a greater salary inducement and taking them by way of transfer. In the opinion of the committee, this problem of intergovernmental service transfers should be given immediate study with the view of preventing the loss of people to the services in which they have been trained at Government expense to be effective units of production.

This cheap chiseling among the different services for employees is true in a great many more instances than the one to which I have just referred.

The Antitrust Division

The committee allowed $2,325,000 for the Antitrust Division. This is an increase over the Budget estimate of $750,000.

In this time of national emergency there are two important things that must be guarded against. The first is to prevent unreasonably high prices for goods sold to both the public and the Government. The second is to prevent our trade secrets, patents, or control of strategic materials from falling into the hands of foreign countries.

One of the divisions of the Federal Government which seeks to forestall such contingencies is the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Its purpose is to enforce the antitrust laws and to curb conspiracies and combinations in restraint of trade. In fulfilling this purpose it accomplishes the two objectives which I have mentioned.

Let me point out how this is achieved. A short time ago the Office of Production Management applied the priority system to aluminum and magnesium, among other items. In simpler terms an acute shortage exists in two of the most important metals necessary for aircraft production. I, and members of the committee, have been alarmed by the testimony of experts of the Antitrust Division concerning some of the reasons for this shortage.

In the case of aluminum a world cartel was formed in 1931 and production was cut 50 percent. The Government has charged that the Aluminum Co. of America was a member of this cartel. Quotas were fixed by countries, prices were regulated, and profits were enormous.

When Hitler came into power, the German members of the cartel threatened to withdraw unless the restrictions on German aluminum production were removed. A compromise was reached, and the quota restrictions were lifted in regard to Germany, but remained fixed for the rest of the world. What happened? In 1934 Germany produced one-half as much aluminum as the United States; by 1940 it produced 50 percent more than we did.

In regard to magnesium, the Germans used the patent device to accomplish a similar result. The Magnesium Development Co. was formed. It was owned 50 percent by the Aluminum Co. of America and 50 percent by the German Chemical Trust. Our own Dow Chemical Co. was the sole licensee of this Magnesium Development Co. in this country and agreed to sell only a small amount to England, while its other exports were to go to the German Chemical Trust at a lower price than any domestic user could purchase it for in the United States. As a result, a magnesium monopoly has developed in this country and now, in time of emergency, we do not have the capacity to produce the amount of magnesium which we require.

A comparison of German and American production of magnesium is very significant. In 1938 the United States produced 2,400 tons of magnesium. Germany produced 12,000 tons. In 1940 the United States produced 6,000 tons of magnesium, while Germany produced 25,000 tons.

Likewise, an acute shortage of military optical goods, such as range finders, bomb sights, torpedo directors, and height finders has arisen. The indictment of the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. reveals that a secret agreement with Carl Zeiss granted many privileges to the German producer of military optical goods.

By limiting the Bausch & Lomb Co. to sales only in the United States, the Zeiss Co. effectively restricted the productive capacity of the American company so that now when we are confronted with a national emergency the necessary capacity to produce is nonexistent.

Another example of the same type is to be found in tungsten carbide, which is the second hardest substance known and very important in the machine-tool industry. Agreements between American and German companies fixed prices at exorbitant levels and divided world territory.

The astonishing part of the testimony is that this control of production, prices, and selling territory is not something new. It is a repetition of what happened to us during the first World War. We all know of the acute shortages of drugs and dyes, aluminum, and optical goods at that time. The present shortage is a parallel of the situation which existed in 1917.

These are merely some examples which I have presented today. Mr. Thurman W. Arnold, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, has stated before the Appropriations Committee that at least 31 industries producing vital war materials are awaiting investigation. With sufficient personnel he would be able to call grand juries in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Detroit. I am informed by the Department of Justice that in the Detroit area alone there are complaints about 10 companies but that nothing can be done until more personnel is available.

I have touched only upon one phase of the activity of the Antitrust Division, namely, its investigation and prosecution of monopolistic practices in the field of industrial production for emergency defense needs. But, it is equally important that we guard against the restraints of trade which raise the price of any of the necessities of life. Food, clothing, and shelter also need careful watching. For the sake of the Government, as well as the public, exorbitant prices must be curtailed and we must prevent the control of our trade secrets, patents, and strategic materials from falling into the hands of foreign countries. With sufficient personnel the Antitrust Division can continue its splendid record of accomplishment.

Incidentally, it may be mentioned that last year approximately $2,700,000 was collected in fines because the law had been enforced. This sum is a little more than double the amount of the 1941 appropriation for the Division.

In addition, the price of aluminum has dropped from 20 cents per pound to 17 cents since the Antitrust Division commenced its proceedings against the Aluminum Co. Similarly, the price of tungsten carbide has fallen from $205 per pound to $48. In military optical goods the Antitrust Division has now prevented royalties and important information from getting to Germany as well as opening the field to other producers which now makes possible the development of increased capacity. In magnesium the monopoly has been broken and a competitor to the monopoly is now building a plant in San Francisco.

The committee was very much interested in the statement of Mr. Thurman Arnold. He is doing a wonderful job and the committee has seen fit to encourage him in his splendid work.

Examination of judicial offices

This unit has the function of examining the offices of the marshals, district attorneys, clerks, United States Commissioners, referees, and so forth. The committee has approved funds for some new personnel. The hearings brought to the attention of the committee that the examiners have discovered a good number of defalcations, embezzlements, and petty chiseling in the Government on the part of some of the employees of the Department and employees of the Federal courts. Offenders, the committee learned, have been retained in their positions with a slight reprimand, a pat on the wrist, so to speak, with the warning, "Do not let it happen again." The committee took the position that of all departments the Department of Justice should set the example among the many agencies of the Government, and the language in the report is strong in setting forth the committee's attitude. The committee is not entirely satisfied with the record of the past. A watchful eye will be exerted on the disciplinary action taken by the Department in the future.

The Lands Division

The Lands Division has been abnormally active, due, of course, to the defense program. Up to this date during the fiscal year, land to the value of $160,000,000 has been purchased.

District attorneys

Three million three hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars is appropriated for salaries and expenses of district attorneys and their assistants. The amount provides for eight additional assistant district attorneys to serve the eight new district judgeships as well as for clerks. I call attention to the observation of the committee as set forth in the following language in the report:

> Up to the present time no really accurate scientific approach has been made to the matter of determining the salaries that district attorneys or assistant district attorneys should be paid in the region in which they are assigned. The net result of no clearly defined practice in this regard is that there are constant importunities being made on the Department, frequently from political sources, to raise the salaries of certain district attorneys and their assistants. In order to obviate this condition, the committee suggests that a study be made ascertaining first, the cost of living at the various districts throughout the country; second, the volume of work in such districts, and, third, character of work performed, and a proper percentage ratio established among these three factors. If some such appropriation is made, it will then be possible to determine a classification rating for this group of personnel, and uniformity will prevail in the application of compensation and salary promotions.

Federal Bureau of Prisons

During the past year members of the committee, and the clerk of the committee, visited some 18 Federal penal institutions. Those visitations proved of great help to the committee in knowing just what we are talking about when they come before us with their justifications. This committee also visited some of the buildings for which we have appropriated funds in the District of Columbia, including the court building downtown. The Supreme Court, and the National Training School for Boys.

The appropriation for the Federal Bureau of Prisons contained in the 1942 estimates for the Department of Justice calls for an expenditure of $15,364,615. You will note that the amount proposed for maintenance is only slightly more than that appropriated in 1941 for similar purposes, which was $14,933,000.

During the past 10 years we have witnessed the greatest program of expansion ever undertaken in the care of Federal prisoners. Twenty-six new Federal institutions, including two hospitals for narcotic addicts under the United States Public Health Service, have been added

to the five institutions which made up the Federal prison system at the beginning of this period. For the maintenance of these institutions appropriations have increased from $8,506,443 for the fiscal year 1930 to $14,839,675 for the fiscal year 1940, and during this period the number of Federal offenders cared for in Federal institutions has increased from a daily average of 11,815 in 1930, to a daily average of 19,333 in 1940. This increase in the appropriation is only slightly greater than the increase in population. Yet far more is being done now than 10 years ago looking to the reduction of crime through deterrence of offenders by strict enforcement of the sentences of the court, by constructive rehabilitation of the prisoner, and by planning the release and follow-up of each discharged prisoner. I think it also should be noted that working conditions of the guards and other employees of the Federal prisons are now much better than they were 10 years ago. None of them work more than 48 hours a week, whereas in 1930 most of them were on the job 65 and 70 hours a week. All of the leave authorized by law is now being allowed, and the Government furnishes them with their uniforms. It also provides housing for a considerable number on Government property at reasonable rentals. All in all, working conditions for prison officers are much improved, and this accounts for most of the proportionate increase in the cost of operating the Federal prison system.

For the first time, however, during the hearings on the appropriations for 1942, I believe we begin to see a ceiling to expenditures for taking care of those who offend against regular Federal statutes. We do not, of course, know as yet what effect the defense program will have on the Federal prison population. Doubtless it will be considerable, but we have based our appropriations on what might be called normal conditions. The average number of Federal offenders in confinement during 1940, both in Federal institutions and elsewhere, is but slightly greater than the average for the 3 years 1930, 1931, and 1932, when these totals reached their peak. Thanks to a successful probation system, the number of prisoners in confinement seems to have leveled off. Moreover, for the first time since the Federal prison system was established, the capacity of Federal institutions is now somewhere nearly equal to the number of prisoners who should be cared for in such institutions. On June 30, 1940, the total number of Federal offenders in confinement was 24,360, of which 19,097 were housed in Federal institutions under the Bureau of Prisons, 1,390 in hospitals under the United States Public Health Service, and 3,873 in local jails and institutions. I am informed by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons that the number housed in local institutions will be still further reduced as the new prisons opened during the past summer get under way. This has prompted us to reduce the Budget estimates for support of prisoners by $150,000.

The Federal Government for the past 10 or 12 years has developed one of the outstanding prison programs in the world. Its classification studies, its medical care, industrial production, its educational and religious instruction, are the very basis of its present place as the recognized leader in prison administration in America. The development of this professional side of the work has, in large part, made possible the great expansion in the supervision of criminals in the community under probation and the consequent saving of millions of dollars which would have been spent had these offenders been institutionalized. It is unthinkable that we should cut down on this program and revert to sending all offenders to jail or prison, as was the case 15 years ago.

Of the 23,003 persons committed to Federal prisons by the courts in the year ending June 30, 1940, approximately 50 percent were first-termers and 24 percent were under 25 years of age. Allowing for overlapping, this provides a group of at least 10,000 prisoners for whom treatment in the community is a very real possibility under present professional methods of classification. Already this method is being successfully applied with juveniles under 18 years of age as a result of the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act passed in 1938. The extension of some of the provisions of this act to first-termers and to youths under 25 years is one of the policies which I believe the Congress will do well to consider if only as a measure of discriminating economy.

It is an error which has too often been repeated that crime and delinquency among young people under 25 years of age is on the increase. As a matter of fact, it has not increased during the past decade. Youths from 14 to 19 years of age made up about 14.5 percent of the general population, yet this group represented only 13.75 percent of the total arrests in 1940. However, from 20 to 24 years of age, there seems to be a disproportionate number of offenders against the laws of the States and Nation. This age group, comprising 11.6 percent of the general population, represents approximately 19 percent of the total arrests.

Clearly, youth is the age of unrest and immaturity, two of the greatest factors making for conflict with the law. But youth is also the age of great possibilities when a little control and supervision are often sufficient to set a boy or a girl on the way to constructive manhood or womanhood. It is to youths of this age that the country is turning at times like the present for its defenders. Can we not afford to be tolerant of their mistakes which are sometimes due to lack of experience, and training, and judgment, and do whatever we can in any way we can to guide and mold the lives of these young people toward a more perfect goal? Or have we only one answer to youth's difficulties, namely, prison?

I am afraid we try to depend entirely too much upon fear and punishment to prevent young people from departing from moral standards. As the father of nine children I know that one has to be patient, ingenious, tolerant, and sympathetic toward the problems created in our youth by modern conditions. I have tried to understand and appreciate some of the problems the young people of today are facing. It has always been true, of course, that youth is a time when pressing decisions must be made and when ethical standards and values must be established. It is easy for some boys and girls to get the notion that their generation does not have as many opportunities as someone else, and they easily succumb to the feeling that they are being persecuted. They follow readily would-be Messiahs and radical leaders. We know where Hitler and Mussolini found most fertile ground for their propaganda. It seems to me we cannot just crack down on all those young people who do not conform to accepted standards. If we do, we will make a lot of problems for ourselves. It is well known, for instance, that the incidence of avoidable mental disease is proportionately greater among young persons. Just now hazards to the mental well-being and ethical standards of young people are greater than ever. This is so partially because these are times of serious economic dislocations affecting young people particularly. For instance, nearly 40 percent of the farm youth of America in certain areas is unemployed because of the tendency to mechanization and consolidation of farms. Farm youths are, therefore, necessarily faced with the problem of readjusting themselves to some other occupation. Many of them will be forced to migrate to the cities with attendant social problems and adjustments. No doubt the changing economic and social conditions will also cause many instances of vocational maladjustment among the city youth. They are being forced by economic conditions into vocations for which they have no aptitude or which are distasteful. This particular generation may also feel that they have not only had to bear the burden of a depression but also must carry the load caused by conscription for military service. Situations of this kind are, in many cases, very real hazards to the stability, well-being, and uprightness of the youth of today and their effect upon crime and delinquency is obvious.

I have been very much impressed as I have visited our Federal penitentiaries, and especially our reformatories and correctional institutions, to note the methods and the results which the new methods of observation, diagnosis, and planning are having on the whole outlook of both officers and staff in dealing with the problems of young people especially. The tough guy is given just what he needs, but the youth who needs mostly spiritual guidance, medical care, education, vocational training, is also given what he needs. We are learning to discriminate not only as between types of institutions to which we assign Federal prisoners but also as to types of programs to which Federal prisoners are being adjusted.

And within each institution the prisoner whose offense was accidental or environmental, or due to some physical handicap, or whose criminal tendencies arise out of a psychopathic or psychotic personality or from a definitely antisocial attitude toward society—each of these is carefully grouped for treatment as cases in a great hospital. The development of

such a program over the past 10 years has been one of the achievements of the Federal prison system. In it I believe lies the answer to the problem which confronts us in the consideration of what future facilities and appropriations are necessary for this work.

Barring an emergency which would greatly increase violations of the law in some particular aspect and based on present figures, I believe we can, while continuing to develop our professional program, stabilize our plant and equipment for Federal prisoners at present levels for some years to come.

I also look forward to a great expansion in Federal parole work and treatment under supervision in the community whether under a modified parole system or some other system of community treatment such as is provided in the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act. Today Federal parole results show that considerable expansion of this program could be undertaken if personnel were available before the parole board would reach the limits set by Federal judges in probation. During the past decade only 1 in 15 prisoners violated his parole, while during the same time 1 in 11 offenders violated probation. In other words, it is possible that the Federal Board of Parole could extend parole considerably before the violation rate of parole would become a matter of serious concern. Since the great majority of violators of both probation and parole are apprehended and cared for without danger to the public, it is safe to say that a 10-percent violation rate would not be beyond the margin of safety. With the excellent records now available through the classification procedure, certainly our parole authorities can choose with as much discrimination as a Federal judge who often does not have such complete records.

The time has come when the problem of what to do with the criminal cannot be solved by walls and bars and punishment alone, just as we have found that poor relief, and child care, and a host of other social ills cannot be solved by institutions alone. I have great faith in youth. I do not believe we are going to solve their problems ultimately by building more and more prisons and reformatories in which to curb their spirits and dull their faculties. Let us improve the facilities which we have created, leaving no stone unturned to give the best we have to solve this problem. But let us be reasonable about it.

National Training School for Boys

The committee visited as a group the property of the National Training School for Boys, located in northeast Washington on Bladensburg Road. The institution is very old, some of the buildings dating back to the Civil War, and the facilities afforded for the custody and care of the four-hundred-odd young lad inmates at the institution are anything but desirable. In fact, if the institution were to be placed in shape to qualify by the same standards set for other institutions it would require the expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of dollars. There are 30 separate buildings used in the operation of the wardship of the 400 boys. The committee is of the thought that the Director of Prisons should proceed at once to find the most appropriate method and means of disposing of this institution and making plans for the construction of an additional institution in keeping with the general pattern of institutional construction and management that exists in the rest of the institutions today. The land occupied by the institution is extremely valuable, comprising, as it does, some 350 acres, and could doubtless be put to excellent use by some of the defense agencies.

Again the thought occurs to the committee that it might be used as a housing center in connection with defense housing. In any event, it should be disposed of even if necessity requires that it be sold, and the committee will expect during its hearings next year to have some indication of the fact that its recommendations in the premises have been carried out. In the meantime, the committee is providing funds which it deems will be sufficient to operate the institution for the next year on a bare maintenance basis, having eliminated from the estimate the sum of $80,000 which it was contemplated would be spent for items of major repair.

THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Office of the Administrator of United States Courts

Now, I want to give just a passing word to the matter of our Federal judiciary.

The membership of the House will recall that something over a year ago we passed a law establishing the Administrative Office of United States Courts separate and distinct from the Department of Justice.

The design behind the bill was to afford some administrative machinery whereby uniform practices and procedures could be established throughout all of our circuit and district courts. The office, located over here in the United States Supreme Court Building, is now engaged in making procedural studies aimed at improving the efficiency of our judiciary system and eliminating as far as possible congestion that exists on the dockets of many of our district courts.

We are setting up a small bankruptcy unit in this division in order that they may make an exhaustive study of bankruptcy practice throughout the United States, in order that certain present-day practices and procedure might be eliminated and more effective and efficient means and methods adopted.

As an example of a sphere of activity in which this administrative office can be of benefit, I might cite the matter of pretrial procedure which has been adopted so successfully here in the District of Columbia under the able guidance of Judge Bolitha Laws. If the Federal judges throughout the country were willing to adopt this pretrial procedure, we would effect tremendous savings not alone to the Government in the matter of the cost of operating our courts but also to private litigants who would be enabled to get a prompt settlement of their differences with a minimum outlay of expense.

I know that I speak for the committee when I say that there is a fertile field for accomplishment in establishing uniform practices in our Federal judiciary, and it is to be hoped that during the ensuing year the Administrator of our court system, who is just now getting into full stride, will be able to show us a series of concrete accomplishments. [Applause.]

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 1 hour. If he desires further time, it must be had by unanimous consent.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Michigan on his very illuminating statement in respect to the Department of Commerce appropriations. There is one activity in the Census Bureau in which all industrial districts are deeply interested. It is the business of supplying from census records data as to place and time of birth of citizens. Under the law, citizens are required to show birth certificates before they can be employed in defense work. A great many States have been lax in keeping birth records. In my district scores and scores of persons are asking for this information from the Census Bureau. They have jobs and are ready to go to work providing they can produce a birth certificate. I notice according to the hearings that there are 65,000 accumulated requests, and I think it is essential that this work be expedited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, of course, I do not want to object, but I entered into an agreement here this afternoon and I have a number of requests for time. I do not want the time to be all consumed on the other side nor by one individual on the other side. I have no doubt that a great deal of time could be consumed in asking important questions. I think that some time should be consumed on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the request?

Mr. CARTER. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for 5 minutes more?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. These persons who are inquiring for this birth-certificate information rarely come in contact with their Government, but when they make these requests they feel there should be a prompt answer.

Mr. RABAUT. We have allowed $110,000 for this backlog to be adjusted.

A year ago they were in arrears 100,000. Now they have reduced this to 65,000.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas rose.

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I just rise to say that this is one of the most informative and well-prepared explanations of a bill which we have listened to in a long time.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. While we still have approximately 400 Members on the floor who have been listening to the gentleman from Michigan, I want to congratulate the chairman of this subcommittee for the splendid explanatory statement he has just made and I want to congratulate the clerk of the committee and the members of the subcommittee for the generous understanding of the wishes of the subcommittee in asking any questions of any witnesses who might appear before them, to any degree and at any length. You have done a good job.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the chairman of the committee and all concerned have done a very fine piece of work and the chairman has made a very fine presentation of the matter. Did you grant all that was asked for the Foreign Service of the Department of State? It seems to me they have done a very amazing work in foreign countries during the past dangerous years.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. We allowed for the 840 officers that they requested.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. You allowed all that they asked for?

Mr. RABAUT. All that they asked for. That is the number they asked for. They are coming in with a bill asking for 20 additional officers. That will be presented in the efficiency appropriation bill. Because of the disturbed condition of the world, we have a great many more listening posts than we had before.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to refer to the Weather Bureau item to which the gentleman has made reference. It has been estimated that there is real need for a Weather Bureau station in Minnesota. A bill has been introduced by my colleague Mr. YOUNGDAHL asking for such regional station. It has not been reported on by the Bureau, but I understand the report may be favorable. They recognize the need for this Bureau. Does the gentleman think there is a possibility that we could offer an amendment so that the item may be included as a part of this bill?

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think it would be proper. I feel it would be more proper to have somebody appear before the Bureau of the Budget and bring it up to the committee through the regular channels.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman thinks it would be necessary before it would be included in the bill?

Mr. RABAUT. I think it would be the better way to do it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to say that in the discussion of the work of the Antitrust Division it seems to me the gentleman has included some material of tremendous consequence. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether he does not feel the work of that Division, particularly in helping break up the bottlenecks, as we call them, is of extreme importance from a national-defense standpoint?

Mr. RAUBAUT. The entire public feels that way about it, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. BEAM. I just wanted to reiterate the views expressed by the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON] in complimenting the chairman of the subcommittee. During my service in the Congress for the last 11 years I never heard or listened to a more exhaustive, detailed, comprehensive report from the chairman of an appropriations subcommittee than the gentleman has furnished the House today. I think it is laudable, and he is to be congratulated and complimented upon his achievement. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to a somewhat lengthy, detailed account of these appropriation measures by the chairman of the subcommittee who conducted these hearings in a very splendid manner.

I want to say that this subcommittee has been in continuous session since the first week in January, holding sessions both morning and afternoon.

Generally these appropriations are slightly under those of last year. My own personal inclination and judgment is that they should have been considerably under what they are at the present time. I endeavored to bring that result about, but not having the votes in the subcommittee my efforts were somewhat futile.

There was one increase that I did vote for, and it was a very substantial increase. I want to announce to the House my interest in the appropriation for the antitrust provision. That was increased $750,000. I voted for that. In fact, I think I made the motion to increase the amount, because for every dollar we give the Antitrust Division they return $2 to the Treasury of the United States. If there ever was a time in the history of this Government when we needed an investment that would make returns, it is now. I am looking for self-liquidating propositions. I am looking somewhat in vain as far as Government investments are concerned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Irrespective of the gentleman's motion to increase that one particular appropriation, I think he should be commended for his effort to decrease all other appropriations in conformity with the times.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman very much. I did not vote to decrease the other appropriations because in many instances I felt the work they were carrying on was not worth while. I did think it was worth while. I think it is a good work, but I felt that with the condition of the Treasury of the United States as it is, where we are running largely on borrowed money, where we are having a deficit month after month and year after year, that even though some things might be commendable and splendid under ordinary circumstances, yet under the present condition of the Treasury we should pass them over for a few years.

We are making stupendous appropriations for national defense. These are necessary and essential, and we must continue to make them. I was therefore opposed to item after item of increase in this bill, and in some instances where there was no increase, where they were asking for the amount of last year, it was my desire to cut it down under that amount.

Time will not permit me to take up all these proposals, but there are a few I desire to call to your attention, and to tell you why I stood in opposition to the appropriation. The matter of cultural relations with South America has been referred to, the work being carried on by the State Department. If you will refer to the report of the committee you will find on page 13 a list of the things it is proposed to do with the cultural-relations appropriation amounting roughly to three-quarters of a million dollars, and I want to call your attention to just a few of these items. You will find on page 14 that the State Department asked for funds for the preparation of a handbook on South American Indians in the sum of $12,000. It may be all right for us to go down there and count the Indians in South America, find out what they are doing, classify them in different ways, and write up a very illuminating story about them, but certainly at this time, when we are borrowing at least $9,000 out of the $12,000 with which this work would be done, I did not think it was urgent, and I want to say that the committee agreed with me on that, and we cut out the $12,000; it is not in the bill.

Here is another item: Cooperation in connection with the preservation of the flora and fauna of other American Republics. It would be very nice to send an expedition down there to pick wild flowers and classify them. They ask $39,000 of the taxpayers' money for this purpose. It will be a very nice junket for a certain number of people, but in the present condition of the Treasury I do not believe we should, with enthusiasm and gusto, adopt a proposition of that kind. I therefore, objected to it, but my objections in this case were of no avail, for the $39,000 is in the bill and is

a part of the cultural-relations program for South America.

Another item was fish and wildlife service. Here we were going to transport fish and fish eggs to South American Republics. I do a little fishing myself at times; not always as successfully as I would like, but if there is any fish planting to be done, I wish they would do some of it in my section of the country. [Laughter.] That was an item of $20,000 and I objected to it. I must have made a very telling appeal to the members of the committee because when I told them of my desire to fish and my limited ability, and the necessity of having streams well stocked wherever I fished they did break down and cut out that $20,000; so we are not going to supply fish for those South American sportsmen.

Another item, the Children's Bureau, cooperation with American republics in maternal welfare, and special students in South American republics, an item of $30,000. This is still in the bill. This is very fine work. I think it is nice to be neighborly, but I think we ought to attend to our own affairs at home just a little more before we branch out down there in matters of that kind when our own Treasury is so low.

Another item that was allowed by the committee related to the Weather Bureau and the training of students of South American republics in weather forecasting and technique. It is a very commendable thing to teach South American students how to predict more accurately what the weather is going to be. We sometimes feel that they do not always do it very well here. This item of $15,000 was allowed and is in the bill. It no doubt has some value. I must say that all these items that are in here, the Weather Bureau, fish, and everything else, had a national-defense aspect according to the individuals who appeared before the committee in support of the items. They usually showed that it was very closely connected with national defense, but I could not follow them in most cases.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I will always yield to my chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. The weather, as the gentleman knows, does not start at any one place on our borders. I am sure the gentleman realizes that the hurricanes that hit the East here a year or two ago and rolled all their timber up on their lawns started away to the south of this country. We cannot very well stop the weather.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, yes. It was brought out before our committee that they start in the Caribbean Sea and come up around this way, but we could have our own observers there. We have our ships there and our own stations.

Another thing they wanted the taxpayers of the country to pay for to the extent of $13,000 was tidal investigations in South American republics. It may be all right to investigate the rise and fall of the tides. We all know they have been doing that for quite a long while now and probably we ought to substantiate it, especially as it necessitates the sending of men down there and paying their expenses out of the taxpayers' money. I may be a heartless spender, but at least I have some little compassion for the man who pays the taxes and I am opposed to these items. I feel we are getting very little of practical value out of the whole cultural relations program. They told about the broadcasting they were going to do down there and my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made the best suggestion that was made there, and, by the way, they are going to adopt his suggestion. He suggested that they send down transcribed records. They had not thought of that. They had so many other things to think about that they had not thought of sending recordings. When he suggested that, they said they thought it was an excellent idea, and they are going to do that rather than broadcast to a lot of people down there, many of whom do not have radios anyhow.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is there an item of appropriation providing money for teaching Members of Congress, committees, or other individuals Spanish and Portuguese to develop these cultural relations?

Mr. CARTER. That idea is not in this bill. Of course, the gentleman knows that there is provision made for bringing students to this country from South American countries, to be maintained here at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. We found that had already been done. They said a certain number of students have been brought in, a comparatively small number, but at the expense of the Government of the United States, and were maintained here. There were 11 brought in. We also found without any encouragement from the State Department, that entirely at their own expense about 1,100 or 1,200 South American students had come in under their own power. I think that is the way they should come here, in all fairness to our people. So I cannot get very enthusiastic about this cultural-relations program. I think it is inadequate, ineffective, and a useless waste of the taxpayers' money of this country.

Furthermore, we must remember that the appropriation for these programs in this bill by no means takes care of all the activities in the field of promoting relations with South America or Latin America. Last August there was established under the Council of National Defense the Office of Coordinator of Cultural Relations Between the American Republics. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York—who, by the way, is a dollar-a-year man—was appointed to the Office of Coordinator. According to the 1942 Budget, this office will obligate $3,425,000 during this fiscal year, and the estimate for 1942 is $4,985,000. The money for this office this year comes from the President's national-defense emergency fund, but it is expected that the 1942 money will be requested through regular appropriation channels later on in this session.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One of the strongest factors that has always contributed to the great friendship existing between England and the South American countries and France and those South American countries has been the exchange of students with them. I wonder if there is any appropriation in this bill for that purpose?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How much?

Mr. CARTER. One hundred thousand dollars. That includes students and professors. It is for the interchange of students and professors.

I must hurry on because there are a number of other gentlemen, members of the committee, who desire to speak and I want to say just a word about the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

We are well aware of the great expansion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the valuable services it is performing, and I want it understood that I stand right behind them, but a few comments seem in order. Since a large part of the work of the F. B. I. is in connection with national defense, supposedly of a temporary nature, we have a separate appropriation for these activities.

The normal A item is seven and one-half million dollars, while the national defense, or the temporary item, which we refer to as the B budget, is $8,750,000 for 1942. In order for efficient administration the F. B. I. cannot use a distinct group of special agents for national-defense work. Out in the field a special agent must handle whatever comes his way. That is all right. But looking forward to the future, I think we should be sure and keep in mind that the personnel provided for any national-defense work is temporary, an amergency, and when the war issue is settled the extra appropriation item is to go. I am sure that we are going to have the cooperation of the F. B. I. in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to the case of Harry Bridges. Those of us from the west coast in particular are gratified to hear that the Department of Justice is conducting another hearing on the question of the deportation of Harry Bridges. The last hearing was conducted for the Immigration and Naturalization Service by Dean Landis, of Harvard Law School, when the Immigration and Naturalization Service was under the Department of Labor.

The general bungling of the whole case is so well known that the whole background need not be repeated; but Mr. Hoover, of the F. B. I., gave us information in the hearings this year which provides additional evidence of the fact that the Department of Labor was protecting Bridges and did not wish to deport him. Let me read a few paragraphs from the hearings at pages 194 and 195:

Mr. RABAUT. Now, this question deals with something of great interest to the public

and considerable interest to the Members of Congress. In the course of your investigation of the Bridges case, did you take testimony from individuals who had testified in the previous hearing before Mr. Landis?

Mr. HOOVER. We did.

Mr. RABAUT. Did you find any difference in the testimony given by those individuals before the Landis hearings and the testimony given to your agents?

Mr. HOOVER. We found that during the course of that investigation—and, incidentally, the investigation took about 4 months; it was initiated in August and it was completed in the latter part of November—certain witnesses who had appeared in the first case of the deportation of Harry Bridges had apparently committed perjury.

Mr. RABAUT. What has been done looking to the prosecution of those individuals if they are guilty of perjury?

Mr. HOOVER. I recommended to the Attorney General that steps be taken to prosecute for perjury. It was found upon inquiry that Mr. Landis did not have the necessary authority to administer oaths, although they were administered during the course of the hearing. So that any person who testified in the first *Bridges case* did so under an oath that was administered without authority.

I am advised that Dean Landis was appointed a contract labor examiner and not an immigrant inspector. The United States Code, title 8, section 153, empowers an immigrant inspector to administer oaths. There is no statutory provision, however, conferring on a contract labor examiner such authority. And obviously, any oath that he administered was without due authority of law.

Mr. HARE. Who is responsible for that oversight?

Mr. HOOVER. I do not know who is responsible, Mr. Congressman. At that time the Immigration Service was in the Department of Labor.

Mr. HARE. That seems to be an elementary proposition and looks like a willful oversight on the part of someone.

Mr. HOOVER. It means that practically the whole first proceeding was not conducted in accordance with law, because none of the witnesses were really testifying under a legally administered oath.

Mr. Chairman, as a Californian, I want to discuss for you some of the things I have learned about civil aviation and the Government's relationship to it.

Californians have perhaps a bigger stake in the welfare of the aviation industry today than the people of any other State. Roughly, half of all the airplanes produced in this country are produced in California. If you leave out engines, California produced last year 60 percent of the country's total aircraft production. More Californians are pilots and they own more airplanes than the people of any other State. From the current defense standpoint, California industry is building nearly half of the $3,000,000,000 worth of aircraft products in the defense program.

But every citizen, from coast to coast and from Minnesota to Louisiana, has a stake in aviation because, first, it is a key instrument of national defense; and, second, because it will have a fundamental bearing on civil life after this emergency is over.

As a member of the appropriations subcommittee studying the Budget requests of the Department of Commerce, I have had the opportunity to examine quite closely into the progress of civil aviation and the relationship of the Federal Government to it. It is one of the great new stories of American industrial achievement, and, of course, it has been sorely beset by problems of public regulation.

Every other great transportation system went through the same evolution. This process involves the period of cutthroat competition, the period of political manipulation, and the period of public subsidy and regulation. You all know what happened with the railways, the waterways, and the highways. Now our problem is the airways, and it is largely the same old story.

Up to 1938 there was no pattern or coherence to the Federal Government's relationship to aviation. The idea of flying, like Topsy, "just growed," and when the aviation people came to Washington with a problem they had no agency to approach whose primary concern was flying. If it was air mail, they went to the Post Office Department. If it was rates, they went to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If it was airports or navigation aids, they went to the Department of Commerce. If it was weather reports, they went to the Department of Agriculture.

They could get regulation at every turn, but nowhere could they get constructive help. They knew that vast sums of Federal money had been poured out in the past to aid the development of railways and waterways and highways, and I do not blame them for growing bitter.

The early years of the Roosevelt administration further fanned the flames of bitterness in the hearts of the aviation industry. The cancelation of air-mail contracts, disrupting the air transport organizations of that time, was followed by a regime in the Bureau of Air Commerce which quite frankly placed partisan politics above the welfare of aviation. The sorry story of bureaucratic internal warfare and petty personal politics aroused the whole industry to a cold fury; and I think the sad performances of this period are the principal reason the industry last year was so alarmed at the thought of a return to any association with the Department of Commerce.

In 1938 the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act, setting up the Civil Aeronautics Authority, created the first Federal agency primarily concerned with all major phases of civil flying. This act drew together in one agency most of the varied services to civil aviation performed by the Federal Government. And, perhaps more important, the agency was empowered to help as well as to regulate—to subsidize the air carriers, if you please, to an extent that would permit them to grow strong.

It must be remembered that when the Civil Aeronautics Authority was created in 1938, the air lines of this country were in desperate financial straits from unbridled, suicidal competition. It was then the rule that they had to bid competitively on air-mail contracts in order to get possession of mail routes, and some of them were bidding as low as net nothing. The result, as revealed by various studies and investigations of that time, was that about $4 out of every five invested in air transport had been lost, and capital was becoming very hesitant about making further investments in such a hazardous business.

The fact that this statement sounds incredible today is the proof of how far we have traveled along the sensible road in less than 3 years. The Civil Aeronautics Authority immediately stopped the suicidal competition, enabling the carriers to buy better equipment, hire more and better personnel.

Under the Authority, the air lines set an unparalleled safety record. Under it, private flying was stimulated tremendously by the launching of the highly successful civilian pilot training program.

Then the C. A. A. was reorganized by Executive order and brought into the Department of Commerce. I was opposed to this move, along with a majority of this House. But what is past is past. Now, of all times perhaps in our history, we must look constructively at the present and the future.

I have been much impressed by the facts presented to the subcommittee by Brigadier General Connolly, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, concerning the scope and importance of the operations of his staff. I want to speak for the vital need of that appropriation.

The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and his staff of 5,200 people, scattered all over this country and up into Alaska and out to our insular possessions, exercise supervision and control over more civil aviation activity than exists in all the rest of the world.

They built, operate, and maintain a 40,000-mile network of aerial highways, with beacons and radio beams and hundreds of intermediate landing fields and a teletype system to help keep watch over airplanes in flight. They are installing this year the first of a series of blind-landing systems that are the fruit of years of hard experimental work. To keep the airways up to current needs and to operate them day and night, in all weather, requires a force of some 3,000 workers.

This system of aerial highways is of the greatest importance to national defense. Already it is used more by the armed forces than it is by the commercial air lines. Imagine how vital it would be, is this country were attacked, in affording well-marked routes over which large forces of military aircraft could be flown to any section of the country, regardless of weather conditions en route.

The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics also has the responsibility of enforcing the safety regulations enacted independently by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

To do this he has a force of several hundred inspectors checking periodically at every danger point. Engineering inspectors study the plans for new civil airplanes. Flight inspectors go up in the finished plane and check its performance. Air-carrier inspectors check the operations of the air lines, from the quality of their maintenance work to the performance of pilots in flight. Every airplane and every pilot gets a periodic examination and must have a certificate from the C. A. A. This includes private flyers and planes as well as commercial.

Of course, I do not mean to imply that a representative of the Government can

watch every mechanic take down a motor or sit beside every pilot in flight. Neither we nor the industry would want the long nose of bureaucracy stuck into every move. It is a basic idea of our free system, I believe, that people can be trusted, that private enterprise wants to do just as good a job as does government, but that it is subject to certain temptations and pressures which government is not. On that theory we set up a limited amount of Government supervision and regulation.

When there is emergency need, we tighten that regulation. For example, the C. A. A. now has a dozen of its crack air-line inspectors working directly out of Washington, riding the planes, checking the traffic control machinery, studying every phase of air-transport operations. This is a special, temporary set-up to bear down extremely hard on air-line safety, because of the recent accidents.

The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is directing the construction or improvement of some 200 civil airports—$40,000,000 worth—which have been selected by the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce as especially important to the national defense.

The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is administering the civilian pilot training program. Surely I do not need to tell any of you about that, because its more than 900 training centers probably embrace colleges and commercial flying schools in every congressional district. But you should know that it is proposed to reduce the funds very considerably for this program during the coming year. I think we need this program, running at capacity. I believe that right now we ought to be training every possible flyer through every means at our command. But at least, every Member should be aware of the status of this program for next year.

The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics performs a great many other services. Through research and technical development his staff is attacking every day the realms of the unknown in aviation. He built, and will maintain and operate, the great new Washington National Airport at Gravelly Point, which will set the pace for the world in modern landing fields.

In conclusion, let me remind you that nothing in this amazing world is growing as fast as aviation. When we attempt to forecast its needs for tomorrow, we cannot even measure them safely by the yardstick of today, for any phase of this fantastic industry may be anywhere from 40 to 250 percent larger next year than it is this year. This is literally true. There were 80 percent more civil airplanes produced in 1940 than there were in 1939. Air-line passenger traffic increased about 60 percent. Those are samples.

Now for the handling, in fiscal 1942, of all the services I have talked about, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is slated for a total appropriation of $77,497,986. That is for the extension and operation of the great airways system, the maintenance of a Nation-wide inspection force, the improvement of much-needed civil airports for defense, the training of thousands of young pilots, the carrying on of research and technical development, and the operation of the Washington National Airport.

It is my considered judgment that there are very few items in the Federal Budget which transcend in importance the appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Administration. And I believe it should have enough money to do its vital job with maximum efficiency. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], such time as he may desire.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in 1940 industrial accidents in the United States resulted in 17,000 deaths, 93,000 permanent disabilities, 1,250,000 temporary disabilities. Without reference to the 17,000 dead and those among the 93,000 who were temporarily taken out of productive employment through loss of hands, legs, eyes, and other crippling injuries, the temporary disabilities alone caused a direct total loss of 200,000,000 man-hours of production. Since skilled and semiskilled workers predominate in most industries the majority of the accident casualties were in these employment groups, many of them in trades and occupations most needed for defense production at this time and in which definite shortages exist.

Labor wastage through work injuries increased 10 percent in 1940 over the preceding 12 months, concurrently with the 6-percent rise in employment. In many industrial operations, however, the accident-frequency rate during the past 18 months has been at least double the percentage increase in employment. Among the reasons given for this abnormal increase in 1940 are—

First. The employment of many new workers and the reemployment of long-idle workers unfamiliar with the hazards of plant operations.

Second. Lack of instruction in safe work practices and the lack of systematic and sustained safety programs in plant operations.

Third. Greatly accelerated pace of production.

Fourth. The overcrowded condition of plants due to sudden and abnormal increase in working forces.

For every man-day of idleness resulting from strikes in 1940 there were 4 days lost through work accidents. Strikes and lock-outs resulted in 6,500,000 man-days of idleness, or an average of less than one-quarter of a day per worker. Disabling injuries caused the loss of 25,192,000 man-days, or an average of more than 1 day per worker.[1]

Strikes and lock-outs are front-page news, but because accidents happen as single minor incidents the interruptions they cause are scarcely noticed. Yet in the aggregate they assume the proportions of a major tragedy far more serious than any other single threat to production schedules.

Of the 35,000 nonfatal injuries reported in one typical industrial State[2] in 1939, the skilled crafts experienced 5,382—or approximately 15 percent—of the total. For example: 393 machinists were injured, 66 electricians, 39 boilermakers, 20 core makers, 48 cranemen, 253 foremen, 363 molders, 23 pattern makers, 295 polishers and grinders, 126 superintendents and managers, 199 welders, 3,557 other skills.

The records indicate that semiskilled workers received 15,737—or approximately 45 percent—of the 35,000 nonfatal injuries. In this semiskilled group are included 2,735 machine operators and 2,729 helpers. The balance—13,899 injuries, approximately 40 percent—were sustained by workers listed as unskilled.

For example, here is a fairly accurate picture of the accident losses in the manufacture of aircraft—one of our greatest defense industries. On-the-job accidents in the American aviation industry during 1940 injured over 5,600 workmen, many of them highly skilled craftsmen. With 164,920 employees engaged in the production of planes at the close of 1940, the industry as a whole had an accident frequency rate of 17 accidents for each million man-hours of production. These accidents resulted in a total time loss of 580,518 days, or the equivalent of a year's working time of 2,322 men.

Due to the step-up in production necessitated by national-defense orders and the necessity of training thousands of new workers, the aircraft industry may expect from 10 to 15 percent increase in the number of accidents in 1941 unless drastic remedial steps are taken.

The total production loss through accidents last year was in the neighborhood of one and one-half billion man-hours. A billion and a half man-hours, if applied to the production of various war implements, would be sufficient to build:[3] 15,000 to 18,000 large bombers; 30,000 medium bombers; 75,000 to 90,000 fighter planes; 112,500 to 225,000 trainer planes (depending on type); 450 submarines; 375 destroyers; 45 battleships.

In computing the one billion and a half man-hours, this includes not only the 200,000,000 man-hours of production estimated to have been lost in 1940 as a result of temporary disability, but also the man-hours lost in accordance with the standard calculation practice for those persons who were killed or permanently injured during 1940, and by permanent injury I also include those who lost an arm, a leg, an eye, or some part of the body which in industrial form is considered a specific loss.

It should be understood that these estimates do not include the labor required off the site for raw materials or partially fabricated parts, nor is it claimed that corresponding skills were involved, but rather it represents what one and one-half billion man-hours could produce.

Investigations of these accidents disclosed in many cases unguarded gears, belts, and pulleys, hazardous arrangements of machines and equipment, dirty and disorderly working conditions, lack of instruction, training, and supervision, and failure to provide fire-protection facilities, safety belts, respirators, and other known safety devices.

[1] From a memorandum to Mr. Lubin, O. P. M. and A. F. Henricks, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, January 23, 1941.

[2] Pennsylvania.

[3] Memorandum from Bureau of Labor Statistics, February 1, 1941.

Accidents are caused by known conditions and known unsafe work practices. Some of the country's largest and best managed industries, by studying and removing these causes, have proven that accidents are 9 percent preventable. There are tried and tested techniques within reach of every manufacturer which, if adopted and applied, could practically wipe out on-the-job accidents and occupational health disabilities.

Accomplishments in industrial accident prevention [4] are strikingly shown by the records of many individual plants where everyone, from the executives to the lowest-paid workers, thinks of safety as an important part of their jobs. For example, a large chemical company operated 11,361,846 man-hours without a single injury. A heavy machinery manufacturer in Massachusetts operated 7,019,736 man-hours without a lost-time accident. A large steel company in Cleveland, Ohio, 5,325,144 injury-free man-hours. A textile plant in Newark, N. J., 6,792,695 injury-free man-hours. A large rubber-products manufacturer in Providence, R. I., 5,688,369 man-hours without an accident.

Since 1912 the steel industry has engaged in intensive safety activities which have resulted in a 90-percent reduction in the disabling accident rate. Through a program of safety engineering and education it is estimated that a total of more than 645,000 accidents have been prevented in the steel plants of the country.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' section on employment and occupational outlook recently estimated that the defense program will require, between now and the end of 1941, 1,600,000 new workers. Unless extraordinary precautions are taken to conserve our presently employed manpower, there will be added to this burden of recruiting and training a million and one-half workers an additional burden of finding replacements for the 1,800 [5] workers who will be killed as a result of work accidents, and another 20,000 [5] who will lose hands, eyes, arms, and legs to the extent that they will be off the job for an average of 70 days each, and many of whose impairments will prevent them from ever returning to their previous jobs.

In most industries, increases in exposure were matched by increases in the number of injuries. Further, the increases in injuries often exceeded the increases in employee-hours worked, pointing to the need for extra safety efforts when new employees are added. In the manufacture of special industry machinery, for instance, a 5-percent increase in employee-hours was accompanied by an 18-percent increase in the number of injuries. Industries in which the percent of increase in injuries was at least double the percent of increase in employee-hours included hardware manufacture with a 21-percent increase in employee-hours accompanied by a 63-percent increase in the number of injuries; manufacture of textile machinery, which experienced a 35-percent increase in employee-hours, and a 70-percent increase in the number of injuries.[6]

The purpose of this speech is to lay before the Congress and the public some important facts about lost production in defense industries through accident and work-exposure casualties. The subject has received too little attention here and in the press. The revelation that there is a form of labor wastage much more damaging to production than strikes will be startling to many. I am offering no program at this time, but simply putting forth the thought that more attention must be directed to checking this accident drain upon our supply of skilled manpower. Whether the most effective action would be along regulatory lines or through the further development of voluntary effort by industry can be determined through a closer analysis of the problem. In any event, we know that accidents can be prevented, and we should not be diverted from the job of doing it because of any monetary emphasis upon the avoidance of strikes and other forms of work interruption. [Applause.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill we bring you today may not deal in the billions of dollars but it has to do with activities which affect every part of our national defense; it affects every individual in our land and embraces all of our activities in every part of the world. It is the legislation making appropriations for the departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, for the next fiscal year. It asks that you appropriate $21,287,300 for the Department of State; $112,228,000 for the Department of Commerce, and $78,571,900 for the Department of Justice. This totals $212,087,300. It is under Budget figures and $31,016,989 less than last year. It comes to you in a unanimous report by the committee which has been working on the measure for 9 solid weeks. We bring to you three volumes of hearings over 2,000 pages which contain sufficient material on every phase of the activities of these important departments to give you a fair idea of their functions. Due to the reorganization legislation you will find that some new divisions have been added to these departments making it necessary for your committee to expend considerable time in making new appropriations. You will find interesting and valuable material in these hearings and you will also find there the fact that because of our national-defense program and for some other reasons these departments are expanding. You will also find that your committee was exceptionally liberal in those items which in the opinion of the members were actual defense needs and that decreases were made in items which in the opinion of the committee could be made without decreasing the efficiency or affecting the normal activities of the various bureaus affected.

Your committee has been in session every morning and every afternoon for more than 2 months. We heard many witnesses. We have recalled witnesses time and again in order to better acquaint ourselves with the manner in which the taxpayers' money is being spent and how effectively and how efficiently it was being expended. We have not confined our investigations to Washington. We have gone into the field to see for ourselves. We have interviewed employees in the various offices and institutions the country over. Some of your members have visited practically every major office in foreign lands. There have been differences of opinion in committee. More than 70 percent of what was said in the hearings was off the record for obvious reasons. There has not been one word of partisanship spoken in the long hearings and conferences. It has been an attempt to bring you a bill which has had the most careful investigation and serious consideration.

My sincere belief is that this is the most important appropriation bill which has been brought to you this year. Just let me give you briefly some of the items with which we have been dealing for these past 2 months and what services of government your vote today is affecting. Look at the item for the Department of State. That means we are appropriating here for Secretary Hull and our entire State Department, all of our ambassadors, ministers, and our entire foreign service; for the items of claims between the United States and The Netherlands; editing of foreign papers; cooperation with the American republics; cultural relations conventions; emergencies arising in diplomatic and consular service; the emergency fund of the President; for our foreign building funds; international boundary disputes; waterways treaties; passports business; and salaries for everyone concerned in that Department.

In the Department of Commerce we are dealing with the Census Bureau; Civil Aeronautics Board and administrator; the Coast and Geodetic Survey; foreign and domestic commerce; marine inspection and navigation; the Patent Office; the Bureau of Standards; the Weather Bureau, and all of the functions of Jesse Jones as Secretary of Commerce.

We also have here the entire Department of Justice, which includes the Supreme Court; the Attorney General's Office; the Anti-trust Division; the Federal Bureau of Investigation, directed by J. Edgar Hoover; the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, which now will have a new department of investigation due to the registration of about 5,000,000 aliens; the bonds and spirit division; district attorneys and all Federal courts; the land division; the Bureau of Prisons; veterans' litigations; and scores of other matters too numerous to mention.

Mr. Chairman, before I take up further discussion of these important matters I want to pay a tribute to our distinguished chairman, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, for his fairness in handling this bill from its inception to its conclusion. I also wish

[4] From Accident Facts, published by the National Safety Council, 1940.

[5] Based on estimated number of disabling injuries during 1939 for the manufacturing industry (Serial R1144 BLS), adding a known 10-percent increase in 1940 and an expected additional increase of 10 percent in 1941.

[6] Relation of exposure, frequency and time lost from "Industrial Injuries in the United States during 1939." Serial No. R-1144, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

to pay tribute to our committee clerk, Mr. Jack McFall, who represents that body of highly train men in our Appropriations Committee who have made a career of Appropriation Committee clerkship and upon whom we must depend for guidance in making many of our decisions. These efficient men are very seldom heard about in print, but I doubt if your subcommittees could bring to you intelligent appropriation bills without their valuable assistance. I also wish to pay tribute to the Honorable ALBERT CARTER, the ranking minority member of this committee; the Honorable JOHN KERR, the Honorable BUTLER B. HARE, the Honorable JOHN M. HOUSTON, the Honorable HARRY P. BEAM, the Honorable VINCENT F. HARRINGTON, and the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES, the other members of this committee. Each and every one of them have contributed a great share in bringing to you a bill which we believe is fair and a measure in which the interests of our Nation and our taxpayers were given first consideration.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I will discuss only one phase of this bill—the civilian pilot-training program. Later I will discuss three other items—those relating to the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice; the problems of our Bureau of Prisons, and, finally, the Weather Bureau.

I will now devote the time allotted me to the question of civilian pilot training.

CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING

One of the most important things that ever happened to American aviation is the C. A. A. pilot-training program. We have that item in our committee now for the first time.

It is of vital importance to this country whether we face a period of peace or a period of conflict, or both.

This program for this year is probably the largest civilian effort of its kind ever undertaken by any nation in a single year, yet judged by other major activities related to national defense its cost is exceedingly modest—$37,000,000.

I question whether any Federal program as small as that ever made the impact on the American people that the C. A. A. pilot-training program has made. I have seen a hundred tributes to it from important people or publications in the field of aviation. I hear almost daily about it from my friends in Nebraska, and I dare say every Member of this House has heard from his home folks about it. I imagine Delegate DIMOND has heard about it, because there are two of these training centers in Alaska.

Why do we all hear about it? Because this C. A. A. pilot-training program is such a perfect example of democracy in action. It takes aviation to the people. It takes the opportunity for this training to LeMars, Iowa, and Tarkio, Mo., and Norfolk, Fremont, Columbus in my own State just as well as it takes it to New York and Los Angeles and Omaha.

900 TRAINING CENTERS

Do you realize that the C. A. A. now has over 900 of these pilot-training centers? Every State has half a dozen, and the larger States have up to 40 or 50. More than 700 colleges and universities are giving the ground-school courses, and some 200 civic organizations such as chambers of commerce are giving it for the noncollege units.

And when these boys get their ground-school, where do they take their flying lessons? They take them at a local commercial flying school near the college, with which the C. A. A. has contracted to do this work.

That is another truly American feature of this program. It has not set up more bureaucratic machinery and bought thousands of training planes and hired a big Federal pay roll. It offered the ground training to the colleges of this country, and the flight training to qualified local business firms in the aviation business. It farmed out this big job to the regular local education people and to local private enterprise, under careful C. A. A. supervision. It does not pay any fancy prices, but these people responded the way good Americans would, and in 2 short years we can look at accomplishments that nobody thought would be possible.

FUNDS CUT IN HALF

Now when our home folks write and telegraph us about this program, what do they say? They say that although Congress voted $37,000,000 last spring to greatly enlarge the C. A. A. pilot-training program during the present fiscal year, they notice that the Budget proposal for fiscal year 1942 contained only $18,000,000 for C. A. A. pilot training. They were surprised and they were displeased. They know how fruitful this program has been, and they ask us why in heaven's name, at a time like this, the funds for training civilian pilots in this great and successful Nation-wide program have been cut in half. They ask us if this Congress, after the astronomical appropriations it has made in other fields, would consider crippling the C. A. A. pilot-training program by cutting $19,000,000 off its present figure.

Hundreds of the small colleges and small flying schools could foresee clearly that if this program were to be cut in half they would have to be dropped entirely. The precious universal democratic character of the plan would suffer. The boys in the towns and villages no longer would have equal opportunity with the boys in the cities, and the United States of America would suffer a definite set-back in its record-breaking aviation expansion.

I, for one, do not want that to happen. I am of the loyal opposition, but I know a good thing when I see one. This is not a partisan matter, it is an American matter, a defense matter. So I am happy to report to the House that your committee has increased this item from the Budget figure of $18,000,000 to $25,000,000. I hope the House sustains this committee. I want to briefly tell you why.

FOR WAR OR PEACE

This program was preceded by some of the most careful and thorough planning you can imagine. Before a wheel was turned leaders of all the important elements of aviation were brought to Washington for conferences. The air-line people and the manufacturers and the private flyers and the scientific people and the educators and the Army and Navy all had their say.

On the basis of their combined opinions, the C. A. A. plan was drafted. The forces of civil aviation wanted the type of program that would assure the future of aviation as a great industry. They argued that this country needs strong, new industries to employ idle capital and idle men. They felt that teaching large numbers of young people to fly would make the whole Nation air conscious and hasten the day when a million Americans will fly their own airplanes. This was more than 2 years ago, you must remember—before the airplane had reduced great areas of Europe to rubble.

MILITARY MEN AGREE

The military men agreed with the civilians. They asked only that the courses be planned and the qualifications of the students be set, so that they would be useful to the armed forces in a possible future emergency.

So everybody had essentially what he wanted. But the C. A. A. was not satisfied even yet. It wanted a "dress rehearsal" to be absolutely sure. So it set up experimental centers in 13 colleges and trained 300 student pilots. The results were splendid, so it was ready.

In the spring of 1939 the President asked Congress for $10,000,000 to train 20,000 beginners in aviation during the fiscal year. Congress cut that down to $4,000,000, with which the C. A. A. set up its pioneer machinery in over 400 training centers and trained 10,000 young people to fly light airplanes.

That simple, single course was spread over the entire school year. The colleges were paid $40 per student for the ground work and the flying schools about $350 per student for the flight course. The student paid a few dollars in examination and insurance fees, mainly to prove his interest.

Everybody was delighted with this first year's program. Ninety percent of the students who started it passed the work and became licensed private pilots. The new-type, rigidly controlled flight course designed by the C. A. A. proved many times safer than anything previously known—so much so that the insurance companies made a series of voluntary reductions in the insurance premiums which the trainees must pay for coverage.

CHORUS OF PRAISE

There was a chorus of praise. The highest air officials of the Army and Navy—General Arnold, Admiral Towers, General Fickel, and Captain Smith—wanted more of it. They endorsed a second—more advanced—C. A. A. course on regular primary military airplanes. This course, added to the one on light planes, would give each student about 200 hours' ground school and 80 hours' flying experience.

The European situation was getting more menacing. The Army and Navy wanted various changes in the program to make it fit their requirements more closely, and the C. A. A. made those changes. The Army and Navy appointed liaison officers to follow the program and recommend improvements.

Certainly we in the Congress must have liked the C. A. A. pilot-training program. Why do I say that? Because we boosted its appropriation over 900 percent—from $4,000,000 to $37,000,000. We virtually said, "The sky's the limit."

The plain fact is that we gave the C. A. A., last June, an almost impossible order. I am not one to urge waste of the public money, and I will rest my case in this matter on how well the C. A. A. carried out, or failed to carry out, that difficult order.

MIRACLE WAS WORKED

The C. A. A. would be the first to admit that it never could have succeeded but for the fact that it was so well decentralized. But it could pass our challenge on to hundreds of American colleges and a thousand flying schools. And because this great network of free firms and institutions shared the responsibility with the C. A. A., the challenge was met.

Few people realize the miracle that was worked. The C. A. A. proposed to train 45,000 beginners and 8,000 advanced students in a year. To do this it had to double the number of its training centers and complete three training periods during the year instead of one. To get enough flight instructors it had to give improvement or refresher courses to thousands of experienced aviators who were not quite up to the teaching standard. It had to literally write the textbooks for these various courses, publish and distribute them, and set up supervision to assure uniform standards in the teaching.

I say to you that this is one of the most inspiring chapters in the whole book of national defense. In 90 days—between last July and September—the C. A. A. turned out its first group of nearly 15,000 light-plane pilots and 1,000 advance flyers. Immediately it started another 15,000 beginners and 3,000 advance. These came off the "production line" in February. Another 15,000 beginners and 4,000 advance students started then, and will finish in June.

4,800 VOLUNTEERS

These thousands of young aviators are not yet military aviators. That has been granted freely, all along. But they have a good start. They save the Army and Navy precious time; and the Army and Navy are coming, slowly but surely, to realize it.

Bear in mind that this C. A. A. program is civilian in character, and the bulk of its boys are college students. Bear in mind that it is not our national policy to call students out of college during the school year, even under the draft. Then look at the facts about the C. A. A.'s young pilots. By March 1, more than 4,800 of them had volunteered and been accepted by the Army and Navy Air Services. Nobody knows how many hundreds have slipped off to Canada, because the Canadian officials would be the last to ask embarrassing questions of a lad with a Texas drawl who gave his home address as Vancouver. Seventy-eight especially qualified C. A. A. flyers are taking advance courses in weather forecasting, to enlarge this vital element in the defense forces. Hundreds have gone to the airlines as future replacements for veterans in the military reserve.

And thousands more are still in school, but already partly trained—and getting this training before they are available to the armed forces. This saving of vast amounts of precious time ought to be obvious to anyone.

HOW GOOD ARE THEY?

Now, how good are these C. A. A. trainees? Ask the Army. The Army has found by careful study that boys who have taken the first C. A. A. light plane course are less than one-third as likely to fail the Army primary training as boys who have not had it. Specifically, out of 100 flying cadets it will have to "wash out" only 11 of the C. A. A. beginners, but it will lose 39 of the others.

Now, how good are the advance trainees, with 40 hours on "flivver" planes and 40 hours on primary trainers? They are good enough so that the Navy, after experiments, has issued orders that they shall start naval flying at an advanced stage which will save the Navy from 30 to 50 hours of flying on each boy.

Occasionally you may hear a military man speak lightly of this training. I am giving you facts. The Navy gets copies of each list of C. A. A. trainees as soon as it is available, and goes after them with traveling recruiting missions. It has printed posters addressed specifically to C. A. A. students. The Adjutant General of the Army has sent a circular letter to C. A. A. trainees stating that the Army considers them especially qualified for Air Corps enlistment, and offering them deferred call until college is out if they will sign up now.

INSTRUCTORS ALSO

And 4,800 of them already have signed up and passed the examination. C. A. A. officials estimate they are signing up at the rate of over 600 per month right now. It is known from Army records that about 22 percent of all the primary cadets the Army is getting from the entire population are C. A. A. trainees.

You might judge the quality of these young flyers by the quality of their instructors. Well, the C. A. A. program on March 1 had fed nearly 1,000 civilian instructors to other defense activity. Four hundred and sixty eight of them were teaching at Army schools, 27 at Navy schools, 117 at Canadian schools, and 207 had gone to the air lines as replacements.

I said this was an inspiring story. Do you realize that the bulk of the Army's expanded primary training has been staffed by these instructors from the C. A. A.?

And the beautiful part about it is that the C. A. A. program keeps right on, by improving and refreshing more instructors to replace those needed elsewhere.

You may ask what will happen when the C. A. A. runs out of old-time flyers who can be improved into modern instructors. As a matter of fact, if the defense forces continue to draw on its teachers, that will happen before snow flies again. For the Navy already has expressed its desire for at least 400 C. A. A. instructors in the near future.

MORE COURSES PLANNED

I predict that when that day comes—if we do not cripple the C. A. A. by cutting its money in half—it will be producing full-fledged flight instructors from its own lads who started flying a year or 18 months ago. I say this because the C. A. A. already is planning to do it if necessary. It already has written two more advance courses for students that will do the job. It already is training an experimental group of students in one of them, and it is training instructors how to teach the other. One is called the student-instructor course, the other the cross-country course.

But these advance courses are more expensive, and the C. A. A. cannot keep itself ready to meet any need if we reduce its appropriation.

I have the notion that in the present world situation we should not be bickering about the merits of one kind of American aviation versus another kind of American aviation. We should be doing all the training that all the resources of this country can possibly handle. Here are 900 training centers, all set up and going. They are producing partly trained pilots at the rate of over 4,000 a month. They are the only large source of trained flight instructors. In this program are hundreds of commercial flying schools which have gone in debt to buy training planes to carry on this work. All this network was set up because we provided the money. We underwrote it, only 9 short months ago. Were we wrong? Is the world situation so much rosier today than it was then?

WHAT CAN WE LOSE?

If anything has changed, it is not the C. A. A. program. It has done the job. It has delivered as it said it would.

For after all, what will this Nation lose? If we are fortunate enough to escape the need for an actual military defense, we will merely have built a firm foundation to help solve one of the most troublesome problems which is sure to arise after this emergency. What are we going to do then, with the tremendous plants and the tremendous working force now engaged in aircraft production? Will we abandon them to rust and ruin, or will we build in this country a tremendous peacetime industry? I say we will do the latter, and these boys we are now training will be the bedrock on which it is founded.

ANTITRUST DIVISION AND THE FARMER

Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that the House will approve of the action of our committee in increasing the appropriation for the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice. I hope the membership will go along with us, especially on the increase of $750,000, which the committee has written into the bill in order to enable that division better to cope with the problem of price fixing, restraints, and monopolies, all of which affect farm producers and consumers. The Budget provided $1,575,000 for antitrust enforcement, which is an increase of $250,000 from the $1,325,000 appropriated for the present fiscal year. Sufficient evidence was presented to the committee indicating that it would be impos-

sible for the Division to go very far into the price-fixing field unless this amount was increased; so we added the $750,000, which it is understood will be used for a real clean-up of the collusive and monopolistic practice used in the distribution of farm products, which is felt by the farmer and the consumer. I feel sure that you agree with me that we must not let this war be an excuse for collusive price fixing. The Division has heavy duties placed upon it by the serious need to investigate war industries that are growing so rapidly under our national-defense program.

Witnesses appeared before us, calling our attention to the fact that during the last war business groups developed ways of acting together which continued through the 1920's and which were used even after the war to prevent industrial prices from falling as fast as farm prices fell. So your committee has added this additional money for the use of the Antitrust Division, with the idea that investigations will be made of combinations and restraints which directly reduce the amounts received by the farmer for farm products. Such investigations, we feel, are needed with respect to livestock, fruit and vegetables, poultry, eggs, sugar beets, cottonseed, trucking, terminal-market rackets; investigation of rackets of trade, of processors and distributors of farm products, with the result of raising the prices to the consumer and limiting the available market, and also investigate into meat, cheese, fresh milk, sugar, evaporated milk, canned goods, bread, wholesale and retail groceries; also investigations of price fixing, restraint, and collusive practices which raise the price of the commodities the farmers buy. We also feel that investigations are needed into farm machinery, building materials, gas and oil, drugs and medical supplies, household supplies, cotton goods, and so forth. Those of us from farming sections realize that we will never solve the farm problem nor can we solve the economic war which is bound to come in the postwar period unless we solve the problem of transportation and distribution of our farm products.

FARMER IS THE VICTIM

In 1940 the Department of Justice indicated that an investigation would be made of the processing and distribution of food, and farmers are very anxious that this investigation be carried forward to a successful conclusion. We realize that right now the farmer is getting it in "the neck." After the war it may be worse.

Mr. Thurmond Arnold, Chief of the Antitrust Division, stated at that time that if he could get sufficient funds to carry it out, this investigation might prove to be the most important service to the American farmer ever performed under the antitrust laws. We feel we are arming him with the necessary weapons in this bill and that his Division will give us the results anticipated.

Mr. Edward O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who appeared before us to testify in behalf of this increase for Mr. Arnold's Division, presented a most convincing case, as did others who appeared for the same purpose.

Most of us feel that no group in our country has suffered more than the agricultural from artificial restrictions and burdens imposed by other groups. In the Farm Bureau argument presented by Mr. O'Neal, it was well established that for more than 20 years, agriculture has been at a disparity with industry and labor, and Congress has recognized this situation by enacting a number of laws to aid farmers. Although some progress has been made, figures given to us from the Department of Agriculture show that our national farm income is still falling far short of parity every year, and much of this disparity is due to artificial restraint which restricts the exchange and service in our economy. Farmers have received too little for their products and pay too much for the products they buy. On one hand agriculture has had to sell its products in a free market and sometimes in a market rigged against it by artificial monopolistic control; while on the other hand the farmers have had to buy many of their industrial goods due to monopolistic control of industry and labor. There have been legal agreements and collusive action on the part of various groups. There have been legal restraints of trade, which flourish when antitrust laws are not enforced, all resulting in hardship on the farmer who is helpless to control either the prices he receives or the prices he pays. In marketing his products the farmer has been getting a declining percentage of the consumers' dollar. The cost of transportation has gone up enormously until in 1939 he only received 41 percent of the prices paid by consumers for the goods he produced, as compared to around 53 percent back in 1913. In this connection I call your attention to page 763 of the hearings in which we have placed a table, the source of which is the Bureau of Economics, Department of Agriculture, showing the farm retail price spread of food products in 1939.

FARM BUREAU SPEAKS

I have been asked by a number of Members in the House just what we hope can be accomplished for the farmer with these additional funds we are providing for the Antitrust Division. In answer to those questions, I refer the membership to page 775 of the hearings where you will find that in my questioning of Mr. O'Neal and at my suggestion he furnished to us, for the record, a most illuminating memorandum written by Mr. W. R. Ogg, of the department of research, American Farm Bureau Federation. In my opinion, the substance of this memorandum should be a guide for the Antitrust Division because I feel that if most of it is carried out, much of our farm problem will have been solved. Because of the importance of this memorandum, I include it in my remarks in order that it may be available to the membership and to the country at large.

1. There is a need to investigate combinations and restraints which directly reduce the amount received by the farmer for farm products. So long as these conspiracies are allowed to operate, they work at cross purposes with the effort of the Federal Government to provide assistance for agriculture which will raise farm prices. They are particularly dangerous now because they enhance disparities in prices which are beginning to arise as the defense program raises prices for many manufactured goods, while the level of farm goods still lags.

Below are listed a few examples of alleged restraints which should be thoroughly investigated by the Antitrust Division. It must have additional funds in order to conduct these investigations.

(a) Livestock: It is alleged that meat packers buy fixed proportions of the livestock which moves to the Chicago market and that a quota system extends to other terminal markets and perhaps to all purchases of livestock by the big packers. Such an arrangement could not arise except by agreement. The effect of such a system obviously would be to eliminate competition in purchasing and thereby drive down the price received by the farmer. For example, when deliveries at the Chicago Stockyards are lower than usual, a quota system automatically destroys the incentive for packing companies to bid more keenly for the reduced supply and thus destroys the incentive which might otherwise raise livestock prices.

(b) Fruits and vegetables: Large buying organizations, which include certain canners and fruit driers and certain chain stores, have devised ways of manipulating the farm price of various fruits and vegetables. In some cases they seek to buy most of their requirements under contracts made before the crop is ready, which provides that the delivery shall be made on a date to be fixed by the buyer and that the price shall be that which prevails upon a designated market at the time of delivery. Thus they need only control a price on a single market during a brief period in order to establish the buying price for most of their requirements. This strategic market price is manipulated by intimidating other buyers and sometimes by dumping the product upon a particular market. In the case of apricots several years ago such a scheme was so successful that it overreached itself; at the crucial time there was not a single buyer available in the market at any price, and growing interests found it necessary to appeal to the California Farm Bureau Federation requesting them to find someone to make an offer for the product.

In other cases the farm price is controlled by extending credit on terms which reduce the farmer to a kind of peonage. In certain areas the fertilizer companies finance potato growers under an arrangement by which the company acquires a lease upon the grower's farm, the grower is bound to obtain his supplies from the company, and the potatoes are delivered to the company to be marketed where, when, and at whatever price the company chooses. Under these contracts the farmer may be charged from 25 to 50 percent more than the market price for his supplies and may receive a price below the market for his product. The arrangement provides that after the company has been fully paid for its cash loans and for supplies sold at exorbitant prices it shall still receive one-fourth of whatever income remains. Very frequently this last provision is not important, because there is practically nothing left after the farmer's debts are paid.

(c) Poultry: In some parts of the country the same form of peonage is imposed upon poultry farmers by companies which sell them baby chicks. The farmer pays more than the market price for his chicks and supplies and delivers his poultry to his creditor to be sold to a dummy middleman at a reduced price. In such cases the poultry farmer who breaks even at the end of a year may be regarded as lucky, for the proceeds of the fake sales are often insufficient to cover the accumulated debt, and the creditor often pushes the farmer into bankruptcy and takes over his farm.

(d) Eggs: The price paid for eggs by wholesalers in one area of the country is customarily determined by deducting 2 cents from

the quotation established on an exchange in that area. Since this exchange handles only from 25 to 300 cases of eggs per day, its transactions are obviously no more than a device used to fix a price. In periods when eggs are plentiful the exchange price governs not only the wholesaler's buying price paid to farmers, but also his selling price to distributors. In seasons when eggs are scarce, however, the wholesaler's selling price is established at a premium above the exchange price. The effect of this system is to prevent the scarcity of eggs from raising the price paid to farmers and thus to enable the wholesaler rather than the farmer to derive profits from the scarcity.

(e) Sugar beets: In some areas the sugar refiners are said to have conspired to fix the prices which they will pay to beet growers. Such conditions should be thoroughly investigated.

(f) Cottonseed: The large producers of cottonseed oil have established a price structure whereby the processor and middleman get their operating returns and the farmer gets whatever is left. Farmers cannot escape from this system by setting up their own cooperatives to produce this oil because the big companies refuse to supply anyone who likewise buys from a cooperative. Thus the markets available to the farmer are restricted to a few buyers who do not need to depend upon the big companies for any part of their requirements. Vigorous action should be taken to stop such practices and to investigate thoroughly all monopolistic practices in this field.

(g) Pulpwood: The sale of pulpwood to be used by container and paper manufacturers is becoming an important source of income for Southern farmers. Last summer the American Pulp Wood Association and various companies buying pulpwood were indicted for violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The indictment charges that these companies and other companies producing pulpwood have an arrangement by which exclusive territories are assigned and the amount of pulpwood to be cut is predetermined. The effect of this plan is necessarily to deprive the farmer of competition among the customers for his wood. We believe that the Antitrust Division should examine this state of facts with a view to indictment for violation of the Sherman Act. The farmer should be protected in his right to sell in a free market.

(h) Transportation from farm to market: In the distribution of many fruits and vegetables and some dairy products transportation by truck is so important that any group which conspires to raise the cost of trucking necessarily hurts the farmer. In some cities local associations of truck owners and local truckers unions make an organized attempt to prevent the delivery and unloading of foodstuffs from interstate trucks unless duplicate labor is unnecessarily hired. The load is transferred to a local truck or payments are made to local interests to buy immunity from molestation. In some cases these groups try to prevent the farmer from hauling his own product to market in his own truck or insist that though he is not operating for hire he must qualify as a member of a union and conform to union rules which require him to hire unnecessary labor for unloading. All such rackets amount to a toll upon the transportation of the farmer's product which directly reduces his income. The Department of Justice has successfully prosecuted some of them in the New York market, but there are many more both there and elsewhere which it should have the resources to attack. In a few cases, labor organizations have been induced by the Farm Bureau to withdraw voluntarily their demands that farmers hauling their own products be required to join a union.

(k) Terminal-market rackets: The same kinds of charges are made at certain terminal markets upon the food which arrives by rail or water shipment. In New York there are a series of unnecessary charges for truckage from the piers, transfer of produce to a second truck, cartage, and so on, which, coupled with the high cost of handling produce in a market with antiquated facilities, involve $112 per carload greater expense upon produce which moves through the lower Manhattan market than upon other produce entering New York.

In some cities the racket is so profitable that it is reported that trucking companies give secret rebates to the receiver as a bribe to get his trucking business; but of course the whole trucking charge is assessed against the farmer and the rebate merely adds to the receiver's profit. Schemes of this sort are maintained by limiting the number of trucks which have access to railroad yards or piers, by organizing their owners in an association, and by imposing arbitrary union rules upon the handling of the produce. An investigation by the Department of Justice in each principal terminal market probably would save the farmer many times the cost of running the whole Antitrust Division.

2. Farmers cannot be prosperous unless there is a large consumption of farm products. Therefore, the farmer has a direct interest in attacking all restraints of trade by processors and distributors of farm products which have the effect of raising the price to the ultimate consumer and thereby limiting the available market. We list below a few illustrations of alleged restraints and collusive practices which have the effect of reducing the market for farm products. Such practices injure both farmers and consumers. It is vitally important that such cases be thoroughly investigated and all violations of law be vigorously prosecuted.

(a) Meat: Increases in the price charged the consumer for meat have been so substantial within the last year as to arouse protests from consumers. Reason for these increases may be the success of the large packers in driving small independent packers out of business or absorbing their business and in using various devices to force meat prices up. Jewish newspapers in New York City indicate that the price of kosher meat in that large market has been raised in a campaign by the packers to enlist retail meat dealers, unions, and even rabbis in an effort to prevent the consumption of meat from independent sources located in other cities. There is reason to believe that this campaign has raised the spread between livestock prices in Chicago and kosher meat at wholesale in New York City by as much as 5 cents a pound.

(b) Cheese: A control of the distribution of cheese by a few large companies is being used to eliminate effective competition. This control begins with a few ludicrous "sales" on so-called cheese exchanges in one State, which have become the means by which the large cheese buyers determine the price they will pay to the little cheese factories. The producers are not represented on these exchanges and have no part in the determination of these prices. Thereafter the cheese passes into the hands of one or two giant companies. The largest of these concerns is reported to be engaged in driving independents from the market by forcing distributors to buy its full line of products if they want to obtain the one or two products in that line which the consumer will insist upon having. We are informed that another large distributing company is prevented from going into manufacture by an arrangement under which it buys cheese at a great discount not available to competitors. The result of the whole system of distribution is that natural cheese has been largely driven from the market and that the process cheeses sold by the dominant companies are distributed at unduly high prices.

(c) Fresh milk: Two cases already instituted by the Department of Justice illustrate the nature of the milk problem. In Chicago the Department obtained a decree enjoining the continuance of a conspiracy to prevent the distribution of milk through retail stores. In Dubuque, Iowa, the Department recently obtained an indictment which charges that distributors and milk-wagon drivers conspired to prevent one distributor from increasing sales by lowering his price on extra quarts of milk delivered to the same buyer at the same time. Both of these cases involved private efforts to prevent a reduction of the costs of distributing milk which will make possible a lower price and a larger consumption.

It is essential that these distribution costs be brought down. The margin between the farm price and the consumer price has been growing in many parts of the country. It is one of the chief factors in setting milk prices so high that the American public cannot consume the fluid milk it needs for an adequate diet. Dietary authorities estimate that the entire annual production is scarcely adequate to meet the Nation's actual needs, if consumers could buy enough milk for an adequate diet. Experience in various parts of the country have shown that it is possible to establish a lower price to the consumer without a reduction in the price to the farmer; but this can only be done if the Department of Justice keeps open the opportunities for businessmen to improve distributive processes and reduce the retail price.

(d) Sugar: Pricing practices in the sugar industry suggest that there may be a price-fixing conspiracy which ought to receive the attention of the Department of Justice.

(e) Evaporated milk: The producers of evaporated milk are alleged to be engaged in a conspiracy to fix and maintain their selling prices on this milk and to raise the prices charged by the group of producers whose brands are not well known to the public. At present there is a differential between the price of the well-known brands and the price of other brands. The availability of some brands at lower prices affords a partial check upon the price charged for the most popular brands. Steps have been taken by the manufacturers to reduce the differential, not by lowering the high prices but by raising the low ones.

Price fixing on evaporated milk is particularly important, because a large amount of this milk is bought by people who are too poor to afford fluid milk and doubtless they would buy a great deal more if the price were brought down to a level they can more easily afford.

(f) Canners: There is reason to believe that the canners of fruits and vegetables in some areas maintain an agreement by which none of them will establish a price upon any product until after they have all submitted cost figures to their association and this association has calculated a weighted-average cost for each product. The obvious intent of any such plan is to fix a collusive price in relationship to the average cost thus calculated.

In the case of canned peaches in 1937, the farmer's interest in this kind of price fixing became particularly apparent. An alleged price-fixing conspiracy by the canners is said to have resulted in a very large carry-over of canned peaches. In consequence, negotiations for a peach-marketing agreement broke down in the next season, and while the canners moved their inventories, the growers were forced to take a price lower than that prevailing at the bottom of the depression.

Other instances of alleged price fixing and collusion have been reported in connection with other canning crops.

(g) Bread: The Department of Justice has already obtained indictments against bakers who sell bread in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, charging them with a conspiracy to raise prices in markets where they have obtained control and to cut prices in order to drive out independents in certain other markets. There is reason to believe that the same kind of price-fixing conspiracies exist in various important markets from

coast to coast. In the Philadelphia area the Department of Justice has estimated that the conspiracy was costing consumers from $4,000,000 to $8,000,000 a year.

(h) Poultry: In some of the principal metropolitan markets the price of poultry is apparently fixed by a few daily sales upon an organized exchange. The insignificant quantity of the product which moves through the exchange suggests that the appearance of an organized market is actually a mere cloak for a conspiracy to fix prices by wash sales. This matter should be investigated carefully.

(i) Wholesale and retail grocers: The Department of Justice has already obtained indictments against a group of wholesale grocers in Seattle who are charged with conspiring to fix wholesale prices, and against a combination of wholesale and retail grocers in Colorado who are charged with price fixing under the pretense of helping the State to administer a law against sales below cost. In the Colorado case all the defendants but two have already paid fines. There is reason to believe that similar price-fixing conspiracies, masquerading as aids to the administration of State laws concerning sales below cost or permitting resale price maintenance, are being carried on in various other States. Their intent and effect is to raise the wholesale and retail charges for distributing food, and thus to raise prices to the consumer. Sometimes they are financed by imposing a charge of 1 or 2 cents per can upon evaporated milk, with a corresponding increase in the retail price of this product. The necessary effect of such plans is to restrict the amount of food the consumer can buy, and thus to restrict the farmer's market.

3. The help of the Antitrust Division is needed to destroy conspiracies which raise the prices of the commodities farmers buy. The broad effort to establish a proper relation between farm prices and the price of manufactured goods can only be successful if artificially high prices of manufactured goods by price-fixing restraints are prevented. The farmer cannot gain substantially so long as price-fixing groups are able to take away what he has gained. Illustrations of some of the most important problems in this field are listed below. Such cases should be thoroughly investigated under the antitrust laws, and illegal restraints and collusion should be vigorously prosecuted.

(a) Farm machinery: The Federal Trade Commission reported in 1938 that from 80 to 100 percent of many of the most important farm implements is produced by from four to six large manufacturers; that these manufacturers often force retailers to carry their full line of implements, thus depriving small independents of adequate selling facilities and inducing the wasteful establishment of an unnecessarily large number of retail dealers; that the large concerns exchange price lists among themselves; that manufacturers' sales representatives call meetings of dealers to discuss price competition; and that associations of dealers seek to control trade-in allowances, to enlarge the retail margin upon repair parts, and to get adherence to suggested resale prices established by the manufacturers. Such activities are obviously designed to eliminate or restrict competition, both at the manufacturing and at the retailing level, and thus to charge the farmer a noncompetitive price for farm machinery.

(b) Building materials: Farmers buy substantial amounts of lumber, cement, paint, and other building materials. Within the last year the Department has instituted proceedings against alleged conspiracies to restrict output or fix prices, or both, by manufacturers of western pine, Douglas fir, southern pine, and redwood lumber; plasterboard and plaster lath; millwork; hardboard; sand and gravel; and mineral wool. It has also proceeded against numerous alleged conspiracies among building-material distributors, contractors, and labor unions in the building-materials field. The activities of the Department of Justice should be expanded to determine whether similar conspiracies exist to limit output and raise prices among producers of other kinds of lumber, cement, and various kinds of plumbing and electrical supplies. The Department's investigations of building-material distributors and of construction should likewise be extended. Limitations of staff have confined these investigations thus far to the large cities. Indeed, the Department has publicly announced its inability to proceed with such investigations in small cities like Great Falls, Mont., even though the housing authority of that city officially charged that there are violations of the law and requested the Department to act. To protect the farmer it is necessary for the building investigation to cover the whole country instead of being limited to urban areas.

(c) Gas and oil: Within the last few years the Department of Justice has taken successful action against alleged conspiracies by petroleum manufacturers to eliminate the competition of independents by buying up the independent gasoline and to maintain the prices of gasoline by abusing patents which cover the use of tetraethyl lead. The Department has just begun a proceeding against the entire petroleum industry which charges that there is a conspiracy to restrict output, to fix prices and distributors' margins, to discriminate against independent producers, to charge excessive amounts for pipe-line transportation, and to control wholesalers and retailers who distribute petroleum products. The over-all effect of this conspiracy is said to be to establish a high-cost system of distribution and to exact not only the return of these high costs but also the profits of a price-fixing conspiracy from every farmer who buys a gallon of gasoline or a quart of oil. The names of the defendants in this case take up five printed pages of the complaint. It is important to American farmers that the Department of Justice have a large enough staff to push this case rapidly to a conclusion and restore competition in the petroleum industry.

(d) Drugs and medical supplies: Within the last 2 or 3 weeks the Department of Justice has obtained indictments which charge producers of insulin and of surgical instruments with conspiracies to fix prices. We are informed that these indictments may be the beginning of a broad investigation of the drug industry. Commodities of this class are usually bought when the buyer is under stress of pain and need and is, therefore, peculiarly helpless to resist any price-fixing combination. In a first monograph issued by the Temporary National Economic Committee there is evidence that any drug retailer can make 25 different drugs at a cost which ranges from 5 percent to about 60 percent of their wholesale price. This fact clearly points to exorbitant manufacturers' prices which probably could not be maintained without some form of unlawful restraint of competition. This same publication indicates that a great many drug items are sold under resale price contracts which give the retailer margins of from 30 to 50 percent. In a memorandum submitted to the Temporary National Economic Committee the Department of Justice recently said that in practice the establishment of resale prices in the drug trade usually involves unlawful collusion which could be successfully dealt with if the Department had the resources to proceed. It is important to the American farmer and to all other consumers that such unlawful price-raising activities be stopped.

(e) Household appliances: In selling a large number of products, such as refrigerators, radios, furniture, rugs, and gas ranges, various groups, sometimes composed of retailers alone and sometimes including both manufacturers and retailers, are said to be engaged in conspiracies to keep prices up. In some States, we are informed, these conspiracies have been organized under the pretense of helping to administer State laws which permit resale price maintenance, but they have involved agreements among competitors which are not permitted by those laws. In some cases the retail groups have tried to force the manufacturers to stop selling to consumers' cooperatives, to mail-order discount houses, or to any other concern which may pass the product on to the consumer more cheaply than the so-called legitimate dealers. On many of these products the dealer's margin is as great as the manufacturer's price, and therefore it is particularly important that every opportunity be preserved to enable the farmer to buy from those who will distribute the goods more cheaply.

We have discussed this matter as a farmer's problem with people from the Antitrust Division, and they tell us that though they have some evidence about several cases of this kind, they have been unable to complete an investigation of these cases for lack of people to do the work.

(f) Cotton goods: In spite of the fact that the surplus of cotton in this country is large enough to create a national problem, there have been repeated indications in recent months that the producers of certain cotton goods are taking advantage of alleged shortages to raise prices. Denims, for example, have gone up more than 30 percent since the beginning of the European war. There have been various cases in which price increases were simultaneously announced. This was true of a recent increase by several manufacturers in the price of percale and of an increase upon a number of different brands of sheets and pillowcases. Printers and dyers of cloth have likewise increased prices simultaneously, and, according to the trade press, have held meetings at which they agreed upon a program of minimum prices allegedly based upon cost. We understand that for lack of men to do the work, the Department of Justice is now doing substantially nothing about such indications of collusion in the textile field. Yet, if collusive practices are not stopped in the production of cotton cloth, they must inevitably raise the prices paid by farmers and farmers' wives for dresses, towels, sheets, underwear, shirts, and many other textile products.

ED O'NEAL'S STATEMENT

Every member in this body who represents a farm district should not hesitate to support the committee in this increase in funds for the Antitrust Division, especially regarding this phase of investigation. It is an approach which I am sure will meet with the approval of every farmer who has given a serious study to his future and who realizes that unless the farmer is given an equal opportunity with labor and industry, we will never be able to solve the economic war which is confronting us. We are indebted to Mr. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and his staff for the exhaustive work and information they have furnished the committee, and in closing my remarks on this section of this appropriation bill, I include a statement by Mr. O'Neal:

The importance of the antitrust program to the farmer may be summarized in a short sentence: It is trying to break up the situation whereby the farmer both buys and sells in controlled markets. The campaign on behalf of the farmer takes two forms: First, in breaking up the price and production controls on commodities the farmer buys; and, second, in breaking the strangle hold on the fabrication and distribution of farm products on the way to the consumer.

Only recently has the importance of this two-way program become evident. For many years, enforcement of the antitrust laws took the form of random lawsuits here and there for specific violations of the law, with little or no attention paid to the whole fabric of trade restraints in an industry or chain of industries examined as a whole. For this reason, enforcement has not been effective both for the consumers who must buy in a controlled market and the farmers who must both buy and sell in such markets.

Recently, however, the Antitrust Division has concentrated its efforts, although hampered by lack of funds, into a comparatively few channels, such as the housing program which has obtained substantial results, and the food program, primarily the processing and distribution of farm products, on which there has been a start with a limited staff. With additional funds we should begin to see, therefore, much more definite results, both for food growers and consumers, than the sporadic prosecutions of the past have shown.

However, in spite of the handicap of lack of funds for these concentrated industry drives, real results of benefit to the farmer have been obtained both in the field of products which the farmer buys and in the field of distribution and fabrication of what the farmer sells. By way of illustration of what can be expected from a concentrated effort, a few cases are reviewed.

BREAKING LOG JAMS IN WHAT THE FARMER BUYS

Fertilizer: Perhaps the most important program of the Antitrust Division toward breaking the log jams in products which the farmer buys, is that of fertilizer. More than a hundred companies and individuals have been indicted in the fertilizer industry. Regardless of the ultimate outcome of these indictments, undoubtedly the drive the Antitrust Division has made against restraints of trade in this industry during the past 2 years has been a very important factor in holding down the price of fertilizer to the farmer, and that something resembling the serious situation arising in the first World War might have developed during the current war in the absence of this drive.

The case of potash is an example of beneficial results for the farmer which the drive has obtained.

During the first World War, potash went from $40 or $50 a ton up to $400. During the current war, with exports cut off, there has been a net decrease in potash prices due to the activities of the Antitrust Division in this field. It is true that domestic production of potash is large now as compared with no domestic production at the beginning of the first World War. However, with the cutting off of European imports not only from the United States but from other consuming countries, there is reason to believe that potash prices would have run away if there had not been close contacts between the producers and various agencies of the Government, including the Antitrust Division. The world price of potash is substantially above the American price.

The reference to the net decrease in potash prices requires some explanation. It will be found that published quotations have not changed during the past 2 or 3 years, but these are quoted on the basis of deliveries at the Atlantic seaboard. Actually, as a result of the Department's civil decree with the potash producers after indictment, there was a change in the basis of delivered price of potash as a result of which the inland area west of the Alleghenies had a substantial reduction in price. It is estimated that this reduction amounts in total to several hundred thousand dollars.

Petroleum products: Gradually the Antitrust Division is making headway against rigid prices of gasoline and oil. Breaks in the line of price control here and there have begun to benefit the farmer who buys important quantities of gasoline. In Washington for more than a year consumers have saved 2 cents a gallon on their gasoline bills due to what the dealers call a price war but which is in fact a step toward competition under the eye of the Antitrust Division. This saving amounts to about $2,000,000 annually in the District of Columbia alone, and if extended generally over the country would amount to hundreds of millions. A cent a gallon, for example, on a consumption of 25,000,000,000 gallons amounts to $250,000,000.

There is reason to believe that the ultimate result of the broad petroleum suit now pending will break the petroleum blockade in such a manner that a saving of a cent per gallon is a modest figure. The breaking of the Middle West pipe line control alone, in the heart of the agricultural area, should save the farmer at least 2 cents a gallon on gasoline, to say nothing of the other phases of the suit.

This 2 cent figure is not imaginary. It costs approximately 2 cents more per gallon to ship gasoline by tank cars than by pipe line. Yet delivered prices are fixed on the basis of tank car rates although petroleum products move from the Southwestern fields to the Middle West by pipe line, either in the form of crude or refined products. The least we can expect of this suit is to pass this 2 cents on to the consumers in the agricultural areas.

Glass containers: Glass containers, in which great quantities of the farmer's products are marketed, have been the subject of rigid restraints of trade and price controls for a generation. The more the processor pays for the bottles and jars the less he can pay for the food which goes in them. A lawsuit begins in a few days to break this control.

Lumber: During the past year there have been a number of indictments in the lumber industry charging price fixing, restriction of output, and the use of restrictive grade markings. These cases have had the effect of retarding the rise of the price of lumber during the present emergency, which is an important consideration to the farmer. In addition, liberalization of the grade-mark practices will enable the farmer, especially in the South, to market the products of portable saw mills to a better advantage than before the lumber suits were undertaken. More specifically, the Southern Pine Association, composed of the large saw-mill owners, have exerted pressure for the sale of lumber having the grade marks of the association and have denied these marks to the small producers on equal terms. The recent decrees obtained against the association requires it to supply its grade-mark services without discrimination and at reasonable cost.

Millwork: A few weeks ago the Antitrust Division obtained indictments against manufacturers and wholesalers of millwork (doors, window sash, etc.) in the Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas area. Obviously the farmer has a direct interest in breaking up this combination so that he can get millwork at lower prices.

Plumbing: Farmers have an interest in the success of the Government's trial in the plumbing industry. It is charged in this indictment that the plumbing groups in some areas of the Middle West make it impossible to buy plumbing fixtures unless they are sold on an installed basis with union labor. This is a great handicap to the farmer who desires to modernize his house because the installation charge under these conditions is likely to be more than the cost of the fixtures. A great saving is possible if the farmer is free to buy the fixtures from mail-order houses and have them installed at his own expense.

BREAKING THE LOG JAMS IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF FARM PRODUCTS

Unfortunately, the drive of the Antitrust Division on processing and distribution of food products raised by the farmer has been slowed down through the lack of funds. Nevertheless, substantial results have already been obtained.

Generally speaking, this work has taken two forms. First, breaking the monopolies in the transportation of farm products largely by the truckers and truckers' unions; and second, action against food dealers and processors who inflate the prices to the consumer and therefore cut down consumption.

Tobacco: There is reason to believe that the Department's pending suit against the large tobacco companies has already borne some fruit in the form of more competitive bidding for leaf tobacco. More than 2 years ago the Department started the tobacco investigation in Baltimore where the sale of tobacco was believed to be under the control of a few buyers. Since the investigation was started, competing marketing methods have been set up throughout the Maryland tobacco area, and in the last 2 years Maryland farmers have benefited by the additional outlets. Later the investigation was extended to all important leaf areas, and if we may believe the current advertisements, large companies are attempting to make a showing, at least, of some competition on the auction floors. How real this is remains to be seen during the course of the pending suit. In the long run, breaking up the situation whereby the profit of a half-dozen tobacco companies in some years is as much or more than they pay the farmers for the tobacco, is bound to benefit the farmer.

Milk: Milk is an illustration of a serious reduction in consumption due to high prices. Only those with comparatively high incomes can pay 14 cents a quart for milk and purchase the volume of milk they need. The great mass of the people who need it cannot purchase enough milk to meet the minimum nutrition requirements, so long as high distribution costs hold up prices to consumers at excessive levels, and therefore they and the farmer suffer. It is significant that in the Chicago area the prices of milk have fluctuated up and down within a range of nearly 50 percent directly with the fortunes of the Government in prosecuting the case through the various courts. Instead of the privileged few only having enough 14-cent milk, the farm area should be given the benefit of supplying the milk requirements of the whole city population by reducing the present distributing margins, which are excessively high, and with no reduction in the farm price, which is too low, to say nothing of doubling and trebling the quantity sold. This is not a bickering problem affecting the milk-shed of a few cities. It is a national problem of adequate diet on the one hand and of farm prosperity on the other, which has got to be fought out to the end.

Groceries: The Association of Wholesale and Retail Grocers in Denver, Colo., was indicted in January 1941 for fixing retail mark-ups on groceries. While the grand jury was investigating the case, the price of 100 staple grocery items fell in Denver by about 10 to 16 percent. Obviously, the farmer has an interest in such cases both from the point of view of the consumer and the increased consumption of farm products which lower distribution margins will encourage.

Bread: The Antitrust Division moved in on the bread situation in Philadelphia, and prices of bread fell 1 cent per loaf over the whole surrounding area in New Jersey, Delaware, eastern Pennsylvania, and Maryland. This saving amounts to several million dollars annually, which will be spent for other food.

Transportation bottlenecks: One of the most serious trade restraints on farm products is the transportation charge to market, which at times involves extortionate charges to farmers. One of the most notable examples of this type of restraint was a case against a union operating in and around New York City. Trucks bringing farm produce

to the metropolitan area of New York were stopped at the city limits by members of the truckers' union and, by threats of violence, drivers were compelled to pay nearly $10 per trip for the privilege of entering the city unmolested or for permitting some member of the union to complete the delivery. This surcharge amounted to more than a million dollars annually for New York City alone. Several thousands of dollars in fines were assessed against members of the group and prison sentences for a number of them were imposed. This is but a example of what may be going on all over the country if funds were available to disclose it. Ten dollars per truckload of farm products is, in many cases, more than the profit of the farmer on the shipment. Such cases hurt the labor movement. We have no quarrel with the legitimate right of labor to organize, so long as they do not violate the fundamental rights of others.

OUR WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. Chairman, the town of Homer, Nebr., is located on Omaha Creek, a small tributary of the Missouri River. One night last June that creek rose suddenly, flooding homes and streets and business houses, destroying property, and causing loss of life and considerable distress to the community. The citizens of Homer wanted to know why they had not been warned of the approach of this damaging flood in order that their property might have been protected. That is a reasonable question—there is a Government agency for providing flood warnings. Fifty years ago, recognizing the public need for such warnings, Congress authorized the establishment of a meteorological service to provide them. This agency is the United States Weather Bureau; and the flood-forecasting service it now conducts upon our larger rivers is the means of saving this country about $7,000,000 worth of property each year. Most of us are more or less familiar with its successful operations on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and many other sections of the country also benefit very materially from its work. The town of Homer and other towns affected in my district in Nebraska did not benefit upon the occasion of which I am speaking, because they had no warning; and I have lately investigated to find out why.

The Weather Bureau was first organized in 1871 as a unit of the Signal Corps of the Army. Its specified duty at that time was to forecast storms along the seacoasts and over the Great Lakes. Between 1871 and 1890 the usefulness of weather forecasts for civilian purposes was so clearly demonstrated that in 1890 this service was taken from the Army and placed in the Department of Agriculture. In June 1940, because of rapidly increasing commercial applications of meteorology, the weather service was transferred by Presidential reorganization order to the Department of Commerce.

Since 1890 the development of the Weather Bureau has been accompanied by three important public problems: First, the public demand for its products has far exceeded the Bureau's means for meeting them; second, the true nature and magnitude of these demands have apparently never been understood by anybody but the people within the Bureau and by the farmers, businessmen, railroad people, advertisers, orchardists, shipmasters, utilities operators, engineers, and thousands of others who wanted something the Weather Bureau was too poor in funds to produce; and third, the United States—the most modern and progressive Nation on earth—has suffered the loss of untold millions of dollars and of thousands of lives, because means have not been provided to expand the meteorological service and enable it to function as well as it might have done.

HISTORY OF WEATHER SERVICE

It is this last point that I wish particularly to emphasize; but first I should like briefly to review some facts about this service. It began with the purpose of predicting storms for shipping on the seacoasts and the Great Lakes. It succeeded in that work. Then it was given the duty of predicting floods in the navigable rivers of the country; and it succeeded in that work. At about the same time, it was assigned the task of measuring and recording the climate of the United States which, with three long coasts, with major mountain ranges, inland waters, desert areas, vast stretches of tableland, forests, arid regions, and swampland, has unquestionably the most complex climate on earth. It has largely succeeded in that work. In the interval between these beginnings and the present, it has established separate services for predicting frosts and freezing temperatures for the great orchard industries of California and Florida, for special forecasting to aid in the protection of our national forests, for the exact prediction of hurricanes, for an entire new service to safeguard flying operations, for collecting data on snow depths in the Rocky Mountains to determine water supplies for irrigation and other purposes, and even for the collection and publication of snow information for the thousands of skiing enthusiasts who patronize our winter-sports resorts. All of these services, with the single exception of that for aviation, have been squeezed out of a continuing appropriation far, far below the needs of a weather service for such a nation as this. They have been established, each in its turn, not simply because somebody wanted them or thought they might work, but because the public interest forced their establishment.

In addition, the general forecasting work with which we are all familiar has continued with a regularity that never fails. It has grown from the first limited predictions of major storms to the forecasting of all weather changes—once a day at first, then twice, and now four times a day—and has passed from the early flag-displays to newspaper announcements, weather maps, bulletins, the radio, and most recently to the use of an automatic telephone service under which the simple dialing of a number brings an announcement of a forecast never more than 6 hours old. Full details of the growth and improvement of this service would take hours to relate; but it is safe to say that the Weather Bureau has seen to it that no discovery or advance within the science has been neglected that could be used to benefit the American public. It is a service we have learned to take for granted. We remember its mistakes and forget its successes. It is surprising as well as impressive to discover sound statistical proof that its forecasts are successful between 80 and 90 percent of the time.

What this comes to is this: First, that in spite of the restrictions that have hampered its growth, the Weather Bureau has met its challenges and developed its skill to an amazing degree of usefulness; and second, that that usefulness could be and should be very much greater than it is—in other words, the citizens of the United States are being unnecessarily denied the advantage of an important economic improvement which they immensely deserve. It is significant and characteristic, for example, that in in the British Isles, with an area slightly greater than the State of Nebraska, there are 8,000 rain gages; whereas in the United States, with an area nearly 40 times as great, there are between five and six thousand. This comparison has point because it is typical.

SHORTAGE OF RAIN GAGES

The United States, requiring three times this number of rain gages, does not have them because the Weather Bureau's climatological service has never been given the funds to establish them. Again, with a river and flood service which alone saves the country enough money to pay the costs of the entire Weather Bureau service, this Bureau has been asking unsuccessfully for years for the few thousand dollars that would enable it to treble this value by forecasting floods for small tributaries as well as for the larger rivers. Again, the most important recent aid to weather forecasting is a little instrument perfected lately, which is called the radiosonde and which enables the meteorologist to get observations of conditions in the upper air, where our weather changes are generated. In the area of the United States, 3,000,000 square miles, there are now 40 of these radiosonde stations, where there should be at least a hundred. Further, in our complex commercial and industrial life there are to be found more specific uses for advance weather information than we can imagine. If that information could be made available in such a form that industrialists could use it in the operations of their businesses, our light bills could be reduced, our perishable foods could be made to cost less, our advertising would be more accurate and significant, our marketing procedures would be facilitated, our production would be increased, and our losses reduced in such a way as to produce immense direct benefit to the public. The source to which we should look for this benefit is the United States Weather Bureau. But because the Bureau lacks the facilities to accomplish it, the American public continues to pay unnecessary costs and to suffer unnecessary inconvenience and losses. Finally, with respect to the comparison of cost and return, I need say no more than this: The Weather Bureau costs the taxpayers of this country approximately 5 cents apiece, per year; whereas, during the calendar year of 1940, the value of the

service to the Nation exceeded $20 per citizen.

That this value can be increased is unquestionable. I feel it conservative to say that every dollar invested in this service will produce at least a tenfold return. To get an idea of the capability of the Bureau and its science for producing new and profitable features, it is only necessary to refer to two or three of its comparatively recent advances. Consider, for example, the tremendously important contribution it produced almost overnight a few years ago in the prediction and reporting of weather conditions for the use of aviation. Although nearly every human activity is to some extent dependent on weather information, none depends so much upon it as this great and growing business; and the Weather Bureau goes quietly and efficiently about the job of supplying that information as one of the indispensable supports of the industry.

UTILITIES ARE HELPED

Besides this, there is the evidence produced in January of last year at a meeting held in Washington by representatives of several public utility organizations of the eastern half of the United States. These gentlemen, some of whom had previously voiced some criticism about the usefulness of the Weather Bureau's general forecasts, were invited by the Chief of the Weather Bureau to come to Washington, to state their problems, and to assist the Government in devising ways and means for serving them better. Among other things, the results of the meeting showed that special sky forecasts during the afternoon and early evening hours would reduce the expense of electric lighting operations—that special rain and stream forecasts would greatly facilitate power-dam operations—that wind and ice forecasts could be made to reduce by hundreds of thousands of dollars a year the annual loss in damaged transmission lines.

WEATHER BUREAU AND DEFENSE

Further, one of the most convincing evidences of the flexibility and efficiency of this service is the manner in which it has met the emergency of the present national-defense program. In modern war, meteorology is all but indispensable—for flying, bombing, troop movements, supply, artillery actions, naval operations; and while it is true that the Weather Bureau's facilities are far below our military needs even now in peacetime, it is also true that they have contributed very significantly to the training of meteorological officers, and to other essential first steps—such, for example, as increased reporting in Alaska and the Caribbean—in the national protection.

LONG-RANGE FORECASTS

Lastly, there is perhaps no problem in meteorology more important in the economic sense than long-range forecasting. Scientists, quacks, magicians, witches, prophets, and common men have been trying for centuries to make such forecasts; and their failures have produced more bad proverbs and superstitions, to say nothing of the tons of yearly calendars and almanacs, than any other concern of mankind. The concern is very real; the value of a dependable and specific knowledge of the weather a month or more in advance would be tremendous—to farmers, shippers, business people of all kinds, vacationists, and practically everybody else. At its very best, meteorological knowledge is still not able at present to produce accurate forecasts a month in advance, but the Weather Bureau in cooperation with research institutions has within this last year developed and is now using a method for making predictions of very considerable value for 5-day periods. These, necessarily, are very general in nature and application; but the point I wish to make is that they are better than anything of the sort the world has ever seen before, and the Weather Bureau is doing its level best, with the means now at its disposal, to make them better still. Moreover, it does not discourage the hope that reliable forecasts for longer periods will eventually be possible. Requests and inquiries come to its offices by the thousand every year, proving time and time and time again the great value and number of uses these long-range forecasts would have. With that proof constantly before it, the Weather Bureau investigates every theory or development likely to lead to the time extension or any other improvement in forecasting methods.

RESEARCH BRINGS IMPROVEMENT

Such improvements must come from research and a more intensive weather observing and reporting system. In times of storm and flood, the Weather Bureau suffers much unjust criticism for the property destruction and loss of life which great storms always cause, while we overlook the vastly greater values in lives and property saved through Weather Bureau warnings. In fact, these savings are in large part obscured or unknown. The fact remains, however, that they could be increased, that the lives and property of more Americans could be protected, if the facilities of the Weather Bureau were enlarged and improved to a standard better suited to the size and importance and complexity of our national life. This is a problem not simply of Bureau or of local importance but of national importance, fully deserving of the interest and attention of Congress.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to the appropriation for the Bureau of Prison which, in the aggregate, is now about $16,000,000. The growth of this Bureau shows, as no other organization of the Government, the extent to which local responsibility for law enforcement and local control over the activities of its citizens has been shifted to the National Government during the last half century. Its activities also illustrate the fundamental difference between the manner in which a democratic government treats those who do not conform to its laws, and the way in which the totalitarian states strike fear into the hearts of those who disagree with their leaders.

Your subcommittee, under the energetic leadership of its chairman, Hon. LOUIS RABAUT, visited a number of the Federal prisons this fall so that we could see for ourselves the manner in which they were being operated, and how the funds made available to the Bureau of Prisons were being administered. It was an extremely interesting experience. Incidentally, we found that no congressional committee had ever before visited some of these institutions, and not since 1929 had any committee of this House taken the trouble to look systematically into the manner in which they were being operated. It seems to me that a Congressman owes it to himself and his constituents to take the time to get first-hand information on such an important part of our judicial machinery.

In preparation for our visits I looked up the history of the Federal Government's efforts to deal with its prisoners. Up until recent years the criminal jurisdiction of the Federal Government was inconsequential. The original Federal crimes were limited to those committed on the high seas, counterfeiting, treason, and protection of the mails. The punishment of all other crimes, like murder, rape, assault, larceny, and so forth, was left entirely to the States. George Washington made arrangements to take care of the handful of Federal prisoners of his time by farming them out to the State of Connecticut, where they were worked in an old copper mine 75 feet below the ground under most appalling conditions. Indeed, little or no attention was paid to this problem by the Federal Government for the first 100 years of our National Government, because the States were willing to accept those few men convicted of crime in Federal courts. In fact, they wanted them, since they were able to contract out or lease their labor to private individuals, often at a profit.

Even as late as Civil War days there was no place where the Federal Government could take care of its own prisoners. For instance, four of the eight persons convicted of complicity in the murder of President Lincoln were thought to be too desperate to house in the New York prison at Albany, where most Federal prisoners were then housed, and it was finally necessary to send them to an old brick fort on Dry Tortugas Island, 60 miles off Key West.

About the turn of the century, however, the Federal Government found itself faced with the necessity of taking a firmer hand in dealing with crimes committed in interstate commerce by bands of organized criminals and by those who attempted to evade arrest by fleeing across State lines. And so, in 1895, the Federal Government embarked on a program of looking after its own prisoners in its own institutions. In that year Congress authorized the erection of two Federal penitentiaries. One was located at Leavenworth, Kans., where 300 Federal prisoners were housed temporarily in the Army prison at Fort Leavenworth. Shortly afterward a second penitentiary was established, at Atlanta, Ga. Both were occupied early in the present century. In 1909 an old territorial prison at McNeil Island, Wash., was taken over and remodeled as a Federal institution. These three institutions became the nucleus of the Federal prison system and

comprised the entire system until 1926. In 1924 Congress authorized the establishment of a Federal institution for women at Alderson, W. Va., and in 1925 a reformatory for men at Chillicothe, Ohio. The first prisoners arrived at the old Army barracks of Camp Sherman, Chillicothe, Ohio, in January 1926 and began the work of building one of the most modern correctional institutions for young men in America. The completion of these five institutions marked an era in the Federal prison program.

PRISON POPULATION GROWS

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, there was a daily average population of 301 prisoners in all Federal institutions, while slightly over 2,500 prisoners were boarded in State and county institutions. During the fiscal year 1930 there was a daily average population of 11,815 prisoners in Federal institutions and 11,211 prisoners were boarded in non-Federal institutions. In other words, while there was a total of about 2,500 Federal offenders in confinement in 1896 there were approximately 23,000 Federal offenders in confinement in 1930.

But this, it seems, was only the initial stage in the growth of the Federal prison system. From 1931 to 1941 we have witnessed great development in the program for Federal prisoners. During the past decade no less than 26 institutions for Federal offenders have been added to the 5 in operation in 1930. These have included the maximum-security institution for intractable, notorious, and dangerous offenders at Alcatraz in California; 2 institutions for older improvable offenders at Lewisburg, Pa., and Terre Haute, Ind.; 2 for younger improvable offenders at El Reno, Okla., and Denver, Colo.; and 1 for improvable offenders of the agricultural type at Petersburg, Va.; another reformatory for women at Dallas, Tex.; 6 institutions for short-term offenders at Ashland, Ky., Danbury, Conn., El Paso, Tex., Sandstone, Minn., San Pedro, Calif., and Tallahassee, Fla.; 5 prison camps at Dupont, Wash., Kooskia, Idaho, Mill Point, W. Va., Montgomery, Ala., and Tucson, Ariz.; a medical center for physically and mentally maladjusted offenders at Springfield, Mo.; 2 hospitals for narcotic addicts at Fort Worth, Tex., and Lexington, Ky. (under the U. S. Public Health Service); 2 institutions for narcotic offenders at Milan, Mich., and Texarkana, Tex.; a training school for boys at Washington, D. C.; and 2 institutions for offenders awaiting trial or serving short sentences at New Orleans, La., and New York, N. Y.

On June 30, 1940, the total number of Federal offenders in confinement was 24,360, of which 19,097 were housed in Federal institutions under the Bureau of Prisons, 1,390 in hospitals now under the United States Public Health Service, and 3,873 in local jails and institutions.

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS

What does this program of custody and treatment of Federal offenders in Federal institutions stand for?

First, with its 31 institutions classified for various types of offenders it permits segregation of the dangerous and the vicious from the improvable type of criminal; the confirmed habitual offender from the first-termer; the narcotic offender or addict from the nondrug user; the short-termer from the long-termer; the physically and mentally sick from the normal prisoner; the juvenile and younger convicts from older offenders; female prisoners from male prisoners; and offenders awaiting trial from those already convicted.

Within the institutions a program of custody and treatment designed to meet the needs of the individual prisoner in his readjustment to society is being developed. The basis of such a program is the classification system which is administered by the staff of the institution.

In the old days when an offender was committed to prison, his name, address, and other identifying details were noted, together with his length of sentence; possibly he was also interviewed by the warden or deputy who assigned him to a cell and a shop. Beyond that, however, he was left to shift for himself as best he could. Lucky was he if he did not offend against the prison rules and regulations, get thrown in solitary confinement, or lose some of the precious good time alolwed for good behavior.

Today all that is changed. The new man is received in quarantine, where he is kept from the general run of the population for 30 days. During this time he is thoroughly examined by the doctor, the phychiatrist, the chaplain, and the parole officer, as well as the deputy warden and the warden. All the important facts about his past history, including his criminal record, his education, training, and vocational experience, his family, and his religious activities, his physical and mental make-up, are examined and recorded as the basis for his treatment. Based on these facts, his criminal tendencies are considered and a program developed to offset or reduce them as far as possible.

A few objectives and results of this program will serve to illustrate its effectiveness. The first contact with the individual treatment program made by a Federal prisoner is with the medical service. This service is provided by the United States Public Health Service under the direction of a regularly commissioned officer detailed to the Bureau of Prisons as medical director. The routine medical program includes a complete physical examination of all new inmates, care of the daily sick line, and hospitalization for all serious medical and surgical cases. The primary principle behind this program is that which holds that the first essential in preparation for release is a sound physical and mental condition.

INDUSTRY IN PRISONS

Next to a sound body, the ability to support one's self and one's family is essential to any permanent social adjustment. Lack of this ability looms large in the history of Federal offenders. To meet this need the Federal Bureau of Prisons has organized an industrial program which provides healthy, constructive employment and vocational training for at least 16,000 of the 19,000 prisoners confined in its institutions. Of these, 3,500 are engaged in 26 different industries producing articles for Government use. The total value of their products in 1940 amounted to over $5,200,000. This substantial enterprise is entirely self-supporting, and, in fact, returns a reasonable profit to the Treasury as well as provides for all its own buildings, equipment, personnel, and other expenses, including part of the vocational-training program which supplements the shop work. In addition to those prisoners engaged in prison industries, another 3,500 are employed in dairying and farming and on construction. Several hundred of these prisoners are constructing roads in West Virginia, Idaho, and Arizona on Government lands which would otherwise be without these roads. Nearly 9,000 prisoners are engaged in work connected with the operation of the institutions, including office work, culinary operations, hospital and mechanical service, and general maintenance work.

In connection with these activities, opportunities are offered to prisoners through the educational program of the Bureau to supplement their practical experience in the shop or office, on the farm or dairy, on construction, in the kitchen, with vocational training and other courses designed to render them competent in useful skills and trades. These courses include day and evening classes, reading courses, correspondence courses, discussion groups covering many subjects and interests.

The practical success of this industrial-educational training program is illustrated by two cases called to our attention:

One young man, called "Red," trained in the bending room of the chair factory at the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, established such a reputation in the handling and bending of wooden-chair parts that three jobs were open for him when he was released from the institution. He was placed with a chair-manufacturing company, and during the past 3 years has been in charge of the bending and steam room, with 30 to 40 employees under his supervision, during which time he cut the factory's losses in the bending room from around 8 percent to less than 2 percent. Following his placement in this factory he has arranged for the placement of several other boys in the same factory, all of whom so far have made good and have become hard-working, law-abiding citizens of that community.

Another example is a young man trained in the foundry at the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe. He was somewhat more fortunate than the average prisoner because he and his people had financial resources not available to most men. Upon his release from the institution he returned to his home community, established a small iron foundry on the basis of his experience at the Federal institution, and is today operating the foundry and furnishing employment to a number of the citizens of the community.

CHURCHES HELP DISCIPLINE

Nor are the spiritual needs of Federal prisoners given only perfunctory recognition. Your committee has done everything to encourage this phase of the program for rehabilitating prisoners. By special arrangement with the Federal Council of Churches and the National Catholic Welfare Council, chaplains are trained and provided for all Federal institutions. These devoted men, who serve at comparatively low salaries, not only maintain the usual formal religious services but give unsparingly of their time for individual counsel and guidance and in the institutional classification program. Recognized as part of the professional staff who conduct the treatment program, they occupy a position of unique importance in the system.

Such a program helps to explain, I believe, why discipline in Federal institutions is maintained at a high level. During the 10 years from July 1, 1930, to June 30, 1940, of 125,830 prisoners confined in Federal penitentiaries, reformatories, and camps, only 753 escaped. Of these only 38 are still at large, and 30 of these escaped from a border camp designed for alien violators of the immigration laws, and have probably returned to their own country, chiefly Mexico. The net loss is, therefore, only a fraction of 1 percent of those committed. The Federal Prison Bureau is fortunate also that with one or two notable exceptions, no riots or other major disturbances have occurred in Federal institutions during this 10-year period.

Perhaps some of the credit for the fact that none of the bloody riots or scandals which have occurred in State institutions is due to the fact that the entire system is under civil service. Congress has also been most generous in granting funds which have made possible great improvement in working conditions and salaries for the prison personnel. None of them work more than 48 hours a week, and the minimum salary of a prison officer is now $1,860 a year. This has added considerably to the cost of maintaining the prisons, which seems to me to have about reached the limit. It now costs an average of about $1.35 per prisoner per day to house, feed, clothe, and guard a Federal prisoner. About 28 cents per man-day is spent for food; about 7 cents per man-day for heat, light, and water; about 6 cents for clothing; about 7 cents per man-day for cost of transporting him to his home and for other expenses connected with his release; and about 16 cents for other miscellaneous items furnished the prisoner and for maintenance of the buildings and grounds, stationery, and office expenses and other administrative expenses. This amounts in total to about 64 cents per man-day for so-called maintenance and operation costs. All of the rest of the appropriation goes for the personnel to guard the prisoner and provide him with opportunities to educate and train himself.

50 PERCENT OF PRISONERS RETURN

This would, of course, be money well spent if we could be sure that the men leaving prison would go out law-abiding citizens. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case. Testimony in the record indicates that for the country as a whole over 50 percent of the men and women who leave prison again revert to crime. The Federal Prison System seems to have a better record than the State systems, but even here it is far too high. Mr. James V. Bennett, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, admits that a considerable number of those who leave his prisons again get into difficulty, but contends the responsibility should be placed upon the community for failure to give the ex-prisoner a reasonable chance to make good. He rightfully points out that they are shunned and discriminated against on every hand, become discouraged and so embittered that they return to crime as the only lucrative occupation they know. That may be true, but something constructive ought to be done to stop the waste and the human suffering caused by known criminals. We have been struggling with this problem for years and do not seem to be getting very far. There was a time when the cure-all for crime was drastic punishment. But the rack, flogging, banishment, and untold cruelties have not stopped crime and probably never will. We must find a better way not only to help the man while he is in prison, but after he comes out.

NEBRASKA HELPS REHABILITATION

In my own State of Nebraska there has been established recently an organization of private citizens to aid the discharged prisoner. Our very able Governor, the Honorable Dwight Griswold, has given a great deal of attention to this problem, and has supported the Nebraska Council for Crime Prevention and the Rehabilitation of Offenders. By doing this he shows not only his essential humanity and interest in the citizens of our State, but is attempting intelligently to solve in a practical matter-of-fact way a most difficult problem. He is really hacking at the roots of crime when he encourages private citizens to accept responsibility for the discharged prisoner. Other citizens of our State, including Judge Lincoln Frost, Judge Harry D. Landis, Judge Ernst Reeker, as well as the Reverend Mr. Gosnell, of Lincoln, and Mr. Howard Freeman, of Lincoln, have given generously of their time and charity to the difficult problem of finding practical means of preventing crime through rehabilitation of the prisoner. It seems to me that the Federal Government ought to do more in supporting and helping these organizations.

But the Government cannot do it all. In the last analysis, the initiative must come from private, charitable organizations as has been the case in Nebraska. Incidentally, the present policy with respect to arbitrarily barring from the armed force all persons convicted of a felony ought to be reviewed. Just because a young man at one time committed an offense, does not mean that he should be considered morally unfit to join the armed force. His record since leaving the institution in the community, his conduct, and his attitude ought to be taken into consideration. It is hardly fair to insist upon drafting the flower of our youth and allowing others to escape their responsibilities simply because they may have committed some minor offense. On the whole, I doubt that Congress need take any action in this matter, but the military authorities ought to reconsider the existing policy in the light of the need for conserving our manpower.

PAROLE SYSTEM IMPORTANT

The limitations of the prison as a means of fully and completely protecting the public from the criminal should be obvious. Practically every man in prison is some day released. He ought to be discharged at a time most propitious for his reabsorption into society. The Federal Government has been trying to do this through its system of parole and also by not sending men to prison if some better means of treating them can be found.

Parole for Federal offenders was first established by Congress in 1910 and probation in 1925. Neither was developed as part of the Federal penal system to any great extent prior to 1930. In that year the general supervision of both was lodged in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and during the next 10 years probation developed from a system with officers in only 8 Federal courts to 1 with 233 officers and 134 stenographer-clerks who serve every judicial district with the exception of Delaware and Utah. The number of Federal offenders on probation on July 1, 1930, was 4,281, and by June 30, 1940, the number was 29,221. On July 1, 1940, the Federal Probation System was transferred to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The Federal Board of Parole was established by Congress in May, 1930. As a result of its organization and the development of parole supervision through Federal probation officers, a Federal parole program worthy of the name has been established. In 1930 there were approximately 1,700 Federal prisoners on parole, all supervised by volunteer workers. By June 30, 1940, there were 5,657 on parole and conditional release, all under supervision of paid Federal officers.

This army of Federal offenders under supervision in the community is one of the most notable achievements of the whole Federal penal program. During the 10-year period just past, that is, from July 1, 1930, to June 30, 1940, there was only 1 parole violator in every 15 prisoners paroled, and 1 violator in every 11 offenders placed on probation.

This program, which has won its place as a permanent part of the Federal penal system, is in itself a justification for the professional approach to the treatment of criminals. Success in probation and parole from the standpoint of the administration is dependent on accurate studies which enable the judge or the parole board to predict with some accuracy whether a man may be released to supervision in the community. This should be borne in mind when consideration is given to the expense of maintaining these studies in the regular prison or probation program. Without them, the whole system is blindfolded. With them, the courts and the parole authorities can go forward in confidence

with results which make not only for greater salvage of human lives but also for greater economy in the whole correctional process.

An outstanding characteristic of this phase of the penal program is the enormous savings made possible when offenders who are found reformable are enabled to serve a part of their sentence under supervision in the community. Without a well-developed probation and parole program during the past decade, the Federal Government would have been completely unable to have met the demands made upon its correctional facilities and resources. Instead of 31 institutions capable of housing all Federal offenders in need of institutionalization, more than double that number would have been required at costs which would have increased by leaps and bounds.

COURTS AND THE PRISONS

One of the things which struck me and the other members of our committee as we went around visiting the prisons was how infrequently they were visited by the Federal judges. You will see from the hearings that we made special note of this. It seems to us that beyond all doubt or question there is one class of person who ought to know what goes on in prison—the judges who send men there. A little thought will convince how grotesque the situation is at present where few of our judges take the time or trouble to visit an institution. No man in America can practice medicine without having seen in the hospitals the effect of the treatment of the patients. But as regards the law, matters are different. Judges administer bitter medicine but never ask how they affect the victim. Perhaps they think about the law, and the medicine, and not its effect. But unless they exaggerate to themselves the horror of crime and belittle the horrors of punishment, how can they carry on their work? Certainly they ought to know what happens to men in prison if they are to pass sentence intelligently.

Even in the midst of a vast defense program we and all other Federal officials can stop a minute to see how well our democracy is working in its efforts to solve the problem of crime. That has been the attitude and thought of your committee. The Department of Justice, under the leadership of the present Attorney General, Mr. Robert H. Jackson, is doing a sane, intelligent, and constructive job of crime control and the rehabilitation of prisoners. We, of the minority, and you, of the majority, can, however, by sound criticism and intelligent guidance, make our democracy work more efficiently in this field of crime control and prison reform. In conclusion, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of our Bureau of Prisons, whom the committee is unanimous in praising for the splendid work he has and is now accomplishing in this important branch of our Government.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly, because he touches on a point that I believe to be very important?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Why would it not be in order for the gentleman or the rest of us in this committee to suggest to the legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that we change the title of clerks of the Appropriations Committee to advisers, or counselors, or some similar name.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is a member of the majority party. I am merely a humble member of the minority party in the House. The gentleman, who has so much friendship with the leadership of the majority, should take the initiative in this matter. I think you have a very good thought there.

Mr. HOUSTON. I would be very glad to do that.

Mr. STEFAN. I am only making a suggestion. We of the minority usually make helpful suggestions, and I am glad that you usually credit us for being helpful.

Mr. HOUSTON. The statesman will join me in this, will he not?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly I will.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. I am very glad to note that the committee has increased the appropriation for the Antitrust Division. Is that substantially the amount the Division asked for?

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will refer to page 38 of the hearings he will find a full report on that, with the correct totals. I will be glad to discuss this phase of the bill also.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. How does the proposed appropriation for the coming year for the Antitrust Division compare with what they had last year?

Mr. STEFAN. There is an increase.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Of $700,000?

Mr. STEFAN. It will be $1,000,000 more than the Budget allowed, or about that amount, including $750,000 for this investigation, plus some additional money, making an increase of about $1,000,000.

Mr. HOUSTON. If the gentleman will permit, I think the total amount is $2,325,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. How much did they have last year?

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will look at page 38 he will get the complete information.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If I may ask one further question, is it not true that the Antitrust Division, through its work, takes in a considerable income; in fact, more than we appropriate?

Mr. STEFAN. It is about 2 to 1.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, for every dollar we appropriate for them there is 2 dollars of revenue?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I am very pleased to yield to my chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. I am happy to hear the gentleman make the statement he has made about the civilian pilot training program, but I understand that has not reached a formal agreement.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand there is now harmony and cooperation between the Army, Navy, and the civilian pilot training program.

Mr. RABAUT. I am very delighted to hear that and I want to compliment my colleague for the part he took in effecting that cooperation which certainly should be for the benefit of the Nation.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no finer flyer in the world than Gen. "Johnny" Johnson, of the Army Air Corps, who was a classmate at West Point with General Connolly, of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, who has charge of pilot training as the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. General Connolly is one of the finest Army officers in the United States and the Navy men who came before us represent some of the finest flying experts in the world. With these three branches of our Government cooperating together the civilian pilot training program, I have no fear that the United States of America will lack sufficient pilots. I wish I could tell you off the record some of the serious and grave problems confronting some of our friends today because of the loss of fighting pilots. The civil pilot training program of the United States is the foundation of our future aviation in America, and I hope the Committee will go along with us in this small increase in the appropriation over what the Budget had asked.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be made of record at this time that the committee appreciates greatly the interest manifested by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] in the aviation program, and particularly in the pilot-training feature of that program.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman very much for his kind words.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced the following resolution in a last effort to avoid my country taking the last fatal step in its march to war. The sole object of the resolution is to avert our involvement in this second World War, an involvement which I am fearful will be inevitable if we convoy supplies with our vessels:

Whereas the Democratic Party in convention assembled on July 15 to 20, 1940, at Chicago, Ill., adopted the following plank in its platform:

"The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

"We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

"The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and maintenance of its peace"; and

Whereas the Republican Party in its national convention held from June 24 to 29, 1940, at Philadelphia, Pa., adopted the following plank in its platform:

"The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

"We are still suffering from the ill effects of the last World War—a war which cost us a $24,000,000,000 increase in our national debt, billions of uncollectible foreign debts, and the complete upset of our economic system, in addition to the loss of human lives and irreparable damage to the health of thousands of our boys"; and

Whereas the overwhelming majority of our people are opposed to our involvement in the European-African-Asiatic war now being waged; and

Whereas the convoying of supplies to Great Britain by vessels of the United States is imminent and will be followed by open warfare in the judgment of all competent observers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the people of the United States through their duly elected Representatives in Congress assembled declare their unalterable opposition to the use of vessels of the United States for the convoying of supplies, materials, or ammunition of war to any country now engaged in war.

SEC. 2. The President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy shall each be furnished a copy of this resolution.

Back in 1916 and 1917 I was one of those who said that "old Bob La Follette" was right and that we should keep our nose out of Europe's affairs and mind our own business. I have repeatedly reiterated that stand and warned our people, both in public and private speeches, that Europe was preparing for a second World War and that we should watch our step so as to keep out of it.

Statesmen of Europe and of the United States were well aware of this fact and repeatedly warned their own countries that an open break would take place, and that there would be more bloodshed. The Congress of the United States realized this and created a special investigating committee to look into the reasons for our involvement in the first World War, especially the munitions industry, and make recommendations to keep us out of the second one.

The neutrality acts in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses followed as a result of the startling disclosures of that committee. The senior Senator from California, HIRAM JOHNSON, whom the people out there trust as no other man has ever been trusted before in public life in his home State, succeeded in having an act passed prohibiting Americans from purchasing the securities of any nation which was in default on its debt to this country. We passed those acts when we were in our sober senses and right mind and there was no war hysteria. That was only a few short years ago. Now we have thrown those acts out of the window and have passed the so-called lease-lend bill. This latter act was the most drastic change in the policy of the United States since the Declaration of Independence. It is not a defense measure but is a measure of aggressive warfare. In short, it is an undeclared declaration of war.

We have broken with our past. We have thrown away our New World, our splendid isolation, our geographical advantage of 3 to 1 against all aggressors, our separate political religion. There is no longer a New World nor an Old World, but now one world in which the American people have been cast for a part they will have to learn as they go along (Saturday Evening Post, March 29, 1941).

If our people want war, I have no argument. If they do not, then I think I have the soundest argument in the world. Eighty-five percent of the people of this country are opposed to our involvement in any foreign war, yet they sit passively and helplessly by while the 15 percent are slowly but surely shoving us in. What is the reason for that? Lack of organization. Militant minorities, well financed and well organized, can accomplish a great deal more than a disorganized and unfinanced majority. That is the case with our present situation in relation to war.

Is there anything that the 85 percent can do to aid in preventing our involvement in war? Yes; I think there is. The 85 percent is a powerful factor and could easily put an end to the propaganda that is now deluging the country through the columns of the press, through the motion pictures, and over the radio. If the 85 percent no longer financed the columns of those newspapers that merely give one side of the picture and withhold the other side from the people; if the 85 percent should stay away from the motion-picture theaters that are constantly showing war propaganda but nothing on the other side of the question; if the 85 percent should cease buying the commodities that sponsor radio commentators who are avowedly and professedly in favor of our entrance into this war, how soon there would be a change in the attitude of these various propagandists, swivel-chair warriors for the most part who never have been in a war and do not intend to get into one. Yes; the 85 percent of our people can and should take positive action to end what is so obviously war propaganda. I do not mean a shutting off in the columns of the press, in the movies, and over the radio any expression of those who believe we should get into the war. On the contrary, I want them to have their say and their full say, but I want the advocates of nonintervention to have as free and fair an opportunity and chance as the others to express their views, and this they are not getting. The 85 percent of our people can see to it that there is an even break on this question and that the people are fully informed as to the best arguments on both sides.

I predict that supplies for Great Britain will be convoyed by the vessels of the United States and that unrestricted submarine warfare will then be waged upon our vessels. They will be sunk. Our property and many lives will be lost, and we will be engaged in actual warfare. I predict that the armed forces of this country will be marching into actual battle without any further formal declaration of war. Then what? I predict that, being engaged in the Atlantic, convoying supplies for Great Britain, a golden opportunity will be offered Japan to attack us in the Pacific. Our most vulnerable point is undoubtedly the Panama Canal, and it is my fear that an effort will be made to blow up some of the locks in the Canal, so as to prevent our ships from going from the Pacific to the Atlantic and vice versa. Furthermore, Japan could take the Philippine Islands, because it would be extremely difficult for our warships to travel 6,000 miles to fight a war without naval bases near at hand.

I heard Admiral Leahy testify that a navy lost 40 percent of its efficiency after it traveled 4,000 miles. This gives Japan the advantage, if we must proceed to the Far East, and we cannot successfully cope with Japan unless we do go to the Far East.

I have, therefore, felt that the best defense for our country is to strengthen herself in every possible way here at home. Much war fear has been disseminated among our people by the cry that Hitler would invade the United States. Every military and naval expert agrees that he cannot do it. The obstacles are insurmountable, providing we have a united people here at home.

Many of our people believe that if Hitler is stopped in his attack upon Britain, the war will be over. If that were all there would be to this problem, then it would be simple, but, to my mind, that is merely wishful thinking. If Hitler is stopped in his attempt to invade Britain, and I believe he will be, it still does not solve his hold on continental Europe. Even if Hitler were killed today, the machine he has built up would keep on functioning, no doubt, with Goering at the head. Continental Europe would still be a difficult problem, but this fact must be remembered, that a dictator cannot remain on the throne if he fails. He must continue to advance, and he must continue to succeed in order to maintain his hold on the people. Once they begin to realize he is not a superman, doubts will culminate in dissatisfaction and eventually his overthrow.

Therefore, to counterbalance the loss of Britain, Hitler would have to make some other move to maintain his triumphal march. That move, to my mind, would be the Ukraine. I call these facts to your attention so that you might not delude yourself with the fond hope that this war will last only 6 months and then everything will be lovely again. Six million armed men, fully equipped and mechanized, with all continental Europe for their operations, cannot be so readily or easily disposed of; and if we should find ourselves in the unenviable position of attempting to invade continental Europe to destroy this madman and his army, it would take 4 or 5 years, anywhere from five to seven million men and would cost seventy-five to one hundred billions of dollars. This is food for thought and should not be brushed aside lightly.

I voted against the $7,000,000,000 appropriation for Britain for two reasons: First, because I felt the $7,000,000,000 should be devoted to defenses for our own country, and secondly, England cannot use the seven billions for some time to come. Her need is destroyers, bombers,

and merchant vessels, all of them being turned out and handed over to her as fast as our plants can deliver them.

Unfortunately strikes are playing an important part in delaying our defense program, especially in the airplane industry. Why our Government permits it is beyond my understanding. Only recently it was shown on the floor of the House that the strikes at the Harvill plant in Englewood, Calif., were instigated by Kenneth Eggert, who recently was the faction organizer of the Communist Party in Toledo, Ohio. Eggert was sent to the Pacific coast by the Communist Party for the express purpose of sabotage in the aircraft industry. Eggert changed his name to Eckert in order to cover up his identity. Who is this man Eggert? He has had a valuable training for violence and sabotage. In 1932 the Communist Party sent him to Russia for a period of study in the Lenin school. There he learned the tactics of violence and sabotage to be used for special purposes in American industry.

Another Communist who had a hand in the strike was Ralph Dawson, right-hand man of Harry Bridges, who has used different aliases at different times. He has repeatedly run afoul of the law and has a criminal record.

The Dies committee has disclosed many of these persons and many of these organizations and has performed a very valuable service. The administration should begin a policy at once of ferreting out these communistic agents and the agents of the Nazis, the Fascists and the military clique of Japan, and either send them to prison or send them back to their own countries.

I have far more fear of these un-American activities than I have of Hitler. I honestly feel that Hitler bit off a bigger chunk than he can chew and that while he can inflict great damage, that he cannot conquer Britain. His military advisors told him before the war started that he could not successfully fight a war on two fronts at the same time; they told him that is why the Kaiser lost the war. So he made an alliance with Stalin and protected himself on the eastern front. However, the collapse of Italy in its fight with Greece has now made it necessary for Hitler to invade the Balkans and wage war on the British Empire in the Mediterranean. This forces him to fight on two fronts which is just the thing he did not want to do. I do not believe that with his limited resources he can carry on this double conflict at the same time and win. I, therefore, feel that he cannot overcome Britain, that he lost his chance to do that last summer, and that from now on Britain can and will assume the aggressive and that Hitler will lose.

What, then, is Hitler's next move? As I see it, he can do two things: make peace with the invaded countries, leaving Great Britain out of the picture. This would be a shrewd move whereby he could win trade concessions and give himself the inside track on doing business with the countries of Continental Europe. He can do one other thing. He can take the Ukraine away from Russia because through its purges Russia has destroyed many of its ablest generals. The Ukraine would be a rich prize as it is one of the most fertile sections in the world. But Russia's almost unlimited resources, both in materials and in manpower, should make Hitler stop and think before he starts something with Russia.

With all this activity going on in Europe, and with America helping Britain with all our resources, Japan would have the choice of sitting quietly by or taking the aggressive. My guess is she would take the aggressive, thereby destroying all our trade in the Far East and leaving us holding the bag when peace is made. And if she should make a deal with Russia whereby they would both attack us, our problem would be increased tremendously.

The advocates of intervention now with ships and men have sought to frighten us with the fear of invasion. To invade, Hitler must overcome Britain, leave behind him a force powerful enough to hold in check all the invaded countries, cross the Atlantic, and obtain a foothold on our shores. To transport even 1,000,000 men together with supplies and equipment, he would need more ships than exist in the world today. To maintain 1,000,000 men in the United States for even 30 days, he would need 23⅓ tons of equipment, ammunition, food, and supplies for each man. So that Hitler would have to have not only ships enough to transport 1,000,000 men across the Atlantic, but he would need ships enough to transport 23⅓ million tons of equipment and supplies for 30 days, and he would need more than 30 days to conquer us. So it is clearly evident that he would need more ships than are in existence. And you must remember, many of these ships would be sunk.

How about South America? We cannot count on the Argentine Republic which has never been overly friendly to us and which would not help us if she could get out of it. The rulers of Brazil are friendly to our cause but not the people. There is a strong party opposed to the rulers in Brazil who would revolt at the first opportunity, and you can depend on it that all the foreign governments who hate us, particularly the dictators, would stir up all the trouble they could in Brazil. Chile is friendly and would give us what help she could. The rest of the countries are not powerful enough to make much difference.

We have, then, this situation in case of intervention—the certainty of open conflict on the Atlantic, the sinking of our ships by submarine warfare, the possibility of bombing on our Atlantic seaboard, and the undercover manipulations of foreign agents. We have the possibility and probability of warfare on the Pacific, particularly in the Far East and undercover agents on our own Pacific coast, plots against the Panama Canal and, no doubt, against our new bases in the Caribbean Sea, and then comes the third possibility, the establishment of Axis bases in South American countries. Much activity is taking place in South America by Axis agents. Bundists and Communists are making common warfare upon us and the British in all the larger cities. How far they can get is a problem. Up to the present writing they have not succeeded, because, I believe, of fear of what the United States might do. If, however, they saw our country involved in a war on two fronts, their task would be simplified. Of course, we are building a very powerful navy but that will not be ready for 4 or 5 years yet, and this struggle will be over by that time.

Therefore, as I see our picture, when we voted seven billion for Britain and four billion for our own country, we put the cart before the horse. In other words, we should have voted four billion for Britain and seven billion for our own country, and worked night and day to prepare our defense. To hope for Britain's protection is an idle and futile hope. We must rely upon ourselves.

And one more thing which I cannot emphasize too strongly:

We have focused our gaze so intensely upon the foreign situation that we have failed to see what is going on here at home. I believe it to be of the utmost importance that we put our own house in order. The Dies committee says there are 150,000 foreign agents in this country undermining the normal processes of life in every field and it is estimated that their influence is even more far-reaching because there are many thousands of our people who are sympathetic to some of these groups but who do not belong to them. I believe that we should devote our best efforts to uniting our people, to insuring the producer a just rate for his services, no matter in what field. I mean by that that the farmer should get not only cost of production but a reasonable profit; that labor should share in the wealth which it produces; that capital should not seek unconscionable profits; that our statesmen should devote more time and energy to the folks at home; that in time of war or even in preparation for war no one should benefit at the expense of his country. And above all things, I urge that everyone, men and women, young and old, give his first thought, his first devotion, his first loyalty to the United States of America and then to give such aid to our friends as we can give without weakening ourselves. I see no sense in "committing suicide for the sake of aiding a bleeding friend."

You and I love our country. We may differ on everything else, but on that question we are all united. Let us then take care of her first, and after that, give others all the food, supplies, munitions, money, and implements of war we can give consistent with our own defense. Let our thoughts and our acts be governed by the central idea—America first.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, first I pay tribute to the membership of the committee on their painstaking efforts in reaching the sums arrived at in the writing of this bill, particularly to the chairman of the committee, for the fine manner in which he conducted the investigation, and the services of the clerk, Mr. Jack McFall.

In writing up the bill there are items that I have not agreed with, and one of

them is in respect to the cultural relations program. If gentlemen will look at page 13 of the report they will see the number of agencies that are in this program. I turn to the Children's Bureau, which is in charge of Miss Katharine Lenroot. You recall, Miss Lenroot in January of 1940 tore out the pages of the report of the White House conference on children of the democracy which showed children barefooted on their way to public schools. That is an example of the representation that will be given the United States in South America. I cannot conceive how Katharine Lenroot can make friends in South America for the great masses of the American public who have barefoot children going to school in the warm climates during the warm days. I think it is typically American to have them in bare feet. I expect that two-thirds of the membership here in the House went to school at one time or another barefooted. You are of the stock of country cousins whom Miss Lenroot will deny are Americans. She will praise the pink brand of Americans to our humble southern neighbors.

With reference to the Woman's Bureau, they want a fund of $10,000 for one woman and a secretary to go to South America and, starting in at Brazil, and covering all the rest of the South American republics in a year. How wide can the extension of American cultural relations be effective with that sort of a program?

With reference to the Library of Congress, they are labeling and cataloging the music of South America and are preparing to make a history of the Indians in South America. We do not even have a history up to date of the Indians in North America.

With reference to the program of Federal security agencies, they are proposing to send two professors to each country in South America and receive in return two professors from each of the South American countries. We are spending $75,000 in this program to bring students to the United States, I believe to bring up 14 students, and an additional amount to bring 6 more, when at the same time under their own steam some 1,200 students are going to colleges in America with the help of college and private-business scholarships, to South American students. In the bill this year not only do we pay for the traveling expenses of our own students but we are going to pay the traveling expenses for students of other countries, and it seems to me that a point of order would lie against such an item, and I expect to make that point of order tomorrow.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Was any attention paid to the fact that there is a great deficiency of teachers of Portuguese in the United States? That is the language of Brazil.

Mr. JONES. I do not recall that point being developed.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I notice they are all teaching Spanish, but Portuguese is a language that is really of importance in South America.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentlewoman for her observation. In the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, there is a proposition to pay the salaries of a staff of employees to introduce South American history and subjects into the high and elementary schools of the United States. I object to that kind of extension of the Bureau of Education in its control over the public-school systems of the several States.

There is also an item for the health department to give assistance to the South American republics. I say, if we are going to extend our health appropriations for the South American countries, we are overlooking our wards in North America. In the Territory represented by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] there are virtually hundreds of Eskimos starving to death and dying of tuberculosis. If we have any extra money, we should give it to the people to whom we owe that kind of attention. Are we going to spend $40,000 and let the Eskimos die?

There is about the same amount of money we spent last year for a continuation of the trade-agreement personnel. A few months ago that was lined up for the great cause of peace. The world is on fire in spite of the New Deal propaganda. Still the trade-agreement personnel is to be continued on, and for what reason no one knows. There is nothing tangible that can be used to make a study of the international trade agreements until this war is over, but the personnel continues on.

I want to say, in compliment to the committee, every place the committee has visited they have come back with suggestions of economy, and they have done a fine job in every spot they have visited. I think the time will soon be at hand when the House will employ an investigator or some kind of employee to constantly make a thorough investigation of the needs of the departments and establishments of government, so that the House can have some check on the demands made. We are all sail and no anchor. The Budget is the President's Bureau. Then we listen to the personnel officers and the fiscal officers of the departments—more Presidential appointees—for their needs, and we have nothing at all by which to check on the demands and requirements of the bureaus, unless the committee or the clerk can make a personal investigation. Wherever economy has been effected it has been brought about by personal inspection of the committee members. The items thus cut are infinitesimal compared to the total bill.

Now, with reference to the Department of Justice bill: I was slightly shocked that the Attorney General of the United States did not seem to be interested in the large growth of the publicity departments in the several bureaus, in strict violation of a law passed in 1922 by Congress. He stated in effect that there should be no publicity unless it was specifically provided for by act of Congress.

The Attorney General said, to my chagrin, that a complaint had to be made by a Congressman before the Department of Justice would recognize the offense. In other words, if any of the bureaus or any of the Cabinet members had a lapse of morality and disobeyed the law, the Attorney General seems unwilling to check into it, but leaves it to the Members of Congress and other interested citizens to bring a complaint. It seems to me there ought to be somebody representing the rough realm of the country, the taxpayers of the country.

Now, with reference to the report of the W. P. A. investigating committee of the Appropriations Committee: Some time ago the chairman of the Appropriations Committee sent down a report requesting vigorous action of the Attorney General with reference to these violations. Millions of dollars are involved. The W. P. A. subcommittee records show approximately $7,500,000 spent by W. P. A. in putting the Orleans Levee Board in the speculative real-estate business; about $1,750,000 in building a yacht basin primarily for a private yacht club; about $1,500,000 building an amusement park for the levee board to rent for more than $200,000; and about $125,000 building a cow barn for the Louisiana State University, although it is not in any W. P. A. project.

Mr. Rogge, now with the Associated Gas & Electric Co. receivership, where good ex-new dealers go, told the press that he found no wrongdoing on the part of any responsible W. P. A. official.

Mr. Berg, assistant in charge of criminal prosecutions, told the Committee on Appropriations that the United States attorney prosecuted some W. P. A. laborers for alleged false statements made to get on W. P. A. "to establish an example" in "cases of this nature." He uses four pages telling about the wholesale diversion of W. P. A. labor and materials to private uses—uses of such persons as the Governor, high State officials, and big contractors—and winds up by showing that what Rogge said was true, that no responsible W. P. A. officials were prosecuted.

These wholesale wrongs could not have occurred without culpability by W. P. A. employees beyond the rank of foremen and small fry.

Mr. Berg says the Department of Justice is not concerned with, and makes no investigation of, the violations of the criminal provisions of the Relief Act. It seems they do nothing when such cases are dumped in the lap of the great Department of Justice.

On page 96 of the hearings on the Department of Justice appropriation bill you will find that there has not been one conviction of a major offender.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. There has not been one conviction of a major offender among the W. P. A. officials in Louisiana. Every one of the officials are either State officials or some contractor or some business house. The only W. P. A. officials that are prosecuted are some three or four small-fry W. P. A. employees who made some false statement in order to get on the W. P. A. rolls. I say it is almost impossible that

the Government should be defrauded out of millions in Louisiana and not have some high W. P. A. official know about it, and be chargeable with an offense.

It seemed to me from the demeanor and temper of Mr. Berg, of the Department of Justice, that there was no interest whatsoever in pursuing the wishes and intent of Congress to prosecute offenders and wrongdoers in Louisiana. Wherever there is a lot of smoke there surely must be some blaze some place. I hope some amendment will be written into the bill that will provide that this money which we are giving the Department of Justice will be spent to pursue anyone who will rob from the poor. That is what it amounts to. Taking W. P. A. money is dipping the fingers of public officials into money that belongs to the needy of the country. We should not stand for it.

Another peculiar thing that is happening in the Department of Justice that I think needs to be called to the attention of Congress is this: The Dies committee investigated several people who were on the pay roll of the Federal Government who belonged to "fifth column" organizations. It published a list, and it was spread throughout the length and breadth of the land. Every time anybody hears about it they are alarmed. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the guardian of the public against sabotage by private individuals, has never sought that list from the Dies committee.

I should like to see an amendment put on the bill adding $25,000 if necessary to give the Federal Bureau of Investigation the authority and the power and the blessing of this Congress to investigate every last one of the Federal employees who are members of subversive groups. Why should we spend $39,500,000,000 for the defense of the country and every other alleged democracy in the world and leave on public pay rolls men and women who do not believe in the American way of life, but who do believe in organizations that would forcibly overthrow our Government?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree in principle that no Communist or Fascist who seeks the overthrow of the Government should have a place on any public pay roll, but the DIES charges were just a lot of loose charges without a scintilla of evidence to point to any particular individual as being a member of the Communist or Nazi Parties, employed by the Government. It was just a lot of loose talk. If you get some committee to find out and pin down the obstructors in Government I agree with the gentleman that something ought to be done to get rid of them.

Mr. JONES. I have great confidence in the Dies committee. I have been convinced that we should not stop with the publication of a list of names and then think we have solved the problem.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. JONES. If the Dies committee thought it was important enough to publish names it ought to be important enough for the Department of Justice and the F. B. I. to make sure we have no such people on the pay roll.

A few years ago we established an Administrative Office of the Courts which I thought was to clear the dockets of the courts, but, lo and behold, I find it is a bureau that covers the accounting of the offices of the marshal and other officers of the courts throughout the land. Here is a strange situation: the Department of Justice which should have the highest type of manhood on its rolls taking care of the administration of justice in the land, yet it has three different bureaus going over the books of the courts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. The Attorney General's office goes over the accounts of the marshals, clerks, and other officers; then every 3 months the Administrative Office of the Courts goes over the accounts as they send in reports; then they are all gone over by the General Accounting Office. We are on two horns of a dilemma: Either we have a bunch of dishonest officials, or we have a lot of duplication in the departments. Let me point out that repeatedly I have protested against duplication of accounting in the offices of the courts. Millions of dollars are spent every year that are never accounted for, never investigated by the General Accounting Office or any other office. I can show you in southeast Washington where there is hauled away by the truckload reports, original bills, and files sent in from W. P. A. offices in the 48 States, records that are carted away without even being looked at. Certainly there ought to be just one thorough accounting system for every Federal dollar spent. This branch of the courts should not be devoted to accounting when that branch was originally set up for the express purpose of clearing the dockets and expediting the administration of justice. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the American people like to believe that there will never be another war, and that the last war fought is the last war for all time. That is, by their actions they indicate they so believe. When the present program of defense was begun, everyone was amazed at the woefully unprepared condition of the country. None of the plants produced in 1917–18 were available. Munitions plants, powder factories, and every other facility for the manufacture of material of war had been dismantled or turned into other pursuits. But one organization was ready to assume the duties which emergency conditions cast upon the civil population. That was the Officers' Reserve Corps of the United States Army. Providence must have dictated its creation, expansion, and maintenance. Had it not been available there would have been no adequate supply of trained officers to take command of our rapidly expanding military force.

Large standing regular armies have never been in accordance with the policy pursued by this Nation. Our policy has always been to maintain a small highly efficient Regular Army capable of expansion in the event of war. The citizen-soldier has furnished the great bulk of the Army in every emergency. This is the first time that there has been available a sufficient number of patriotic men who have given of their time and energy over a period of years to the training necessary to maintain themselves in readiness for service when their Nation might be in peril. The Army has called upon the members of the Reserve Corps in the present program in large numbers. On March 1, 1941, there were 32,022 members of the Reserve Corps on active duty with the Army. The service they are rendering is easily understood when we know that only approximately 12,500 Regular Army officers are now in the Army.

These Reserve officers have asked nothing but the privilege of serving their Nation in this its hour of need. It is my purpose, on this occasion, to call the attention of Congress and the Nation to an injustice suffered by the Reserve officers, and to suggest a remedy for the condition.

Under the provisions of section 37 of the National Defense Act, the Secretary of War is given absolute authority to make regulations governing the promotion of Reserve officers in all grades. In accordance with that section, paragraphs 31 and 32, Army Regulations 140–145, June 16, 1936, have been promulgated by the Secretary of War. Those paragraphs set out the requirements for promotion, as follows:

(a) The officer must hold a certificate of capacity for the next higher grade.

(b) There shall be a vacancy in the higher grade within the allocation of such grade in the corps area in which the officer resides.

(c) The officer must have served the minimum time prescribed in his grade.

(d) The officer must have had at least 14 days active-duty training during his service in the grade.

In practice these requirements produce an inequality and an injustice which should be removed by Congress. In the first place, it will be observed that compliance with all of these requirements does not require the promotion of the officer to the next higher grade. The matter remains entirely within the discretion of officials of the War Department and experience has shown that promotion is slow and upon no systematic plan. The greatest discrimination results, however, from the provision that there shall be a vacancy within the grade in the corps area of the officer's residence. This has been based upon a system of "paper organizations," with their complement of officers and all excess over that complement within the corps area being attached to the "paper organization." In theory, therefore, no reason could be advanced for the promotion of an officer unless there was a position within the complement of the "organization" to which he could be promoted. When we

realize that those organizations remain as "paper organizations" at this very moment of our greatest defense effort and none of them has been activated, the theory loses all form. It remains only as a stumbling block to those officers who have energetically pursued their work as Reserve officers and freezes them in their lower grades.

I have offered H. R. 3962, which will eliminate this injustice, inequality, and discrimination. This bill sets up a permanent system of promotion by well-recognized, easily understood standards. It provides for the automatic promotion of a Reserve officer when he has completed the years of service in grade required by the bill and holds a certificate of capacity for the next higher grade. The years of service in each grade provided in my bill are the same number of years of service now required in those grades by paragraphs 31 and 32 of the regulations heretofore mentioned. The only variance from the requirement of a certificate of capacity is the provision that a Reserve officer on active duty for a period of 6 months shall be regarded as holding such certificate. This provision is entirely reasonable because the War Department will not retain an inefficient officer upon active duty for such a long period of time. The bill does not provide what shall be regarded as qualifying an officer for a certificate of capacity. Therefore, the qualifications will be prescribed by the War Department and thus absolute control of the efficiency and standing of the Reserve Corps remains in the War Department.

Until June 13, 1940, when Public, No. 612 was approved, the officers of the Regular Army were promoted in accordance with their position on the promotion list as vacancies occurred in the next higher grade. By Public, No. 612, Congress, with the approval of the War Department, abolished the promotion list and provided for the promotion of Regular officers upon the completion of the periods in the respective grades provided in that bill. This constitutes an abandonment of the idea of promotion list as far as the Regular Army is concerned. Existing regulations for promotion within the Reserve Corps continue the unsatisfactory and discarded "promotion list" theory in effect insofar as the Reserve is concerned. No reason exists for any difference in the system of promotion. Far better argument exists for the maintenance of promotion lists in the Regular Establishment than in the Reserve. Tables of organization control the necessity for officers in each grade in the Regular service far more than in the Reserve Corps.

At this point I want to emphasize the fact that nothing contained in this bill will prejudice any officer of the Regular Army. Every officer of the Regular Army now has the absolute right to, and will receive, promotion upon the completion of his years of service in each grade. The placing of Reserve officers under a comparable system cannot in any degree impede or delay the promotion of Regular officers in their permanent grades.

Members of the Officers' Reserve Corps are officers of the Army of the United States who serve, or will serve, in the present emergency only by abandoning their private businesses and placing themselves in a position where they will have to begin at the bottom when they return to civil life. Unlike officers of the Regular Army, they will not receive retirement pay. Many of them are now serving, or will serve, for considerably less money than they earn in civil life.

Partly because of the longevity pay statutes but principally because of the present promotion regulations, the status of Reserve officers has been adversely affected in a number of respects. Some of the more undesirable results are:

(1) An officer of the Regular Army usually receives about 50 percent more money each month than a Reserve officer of the same age.

(2) Regardless of his length of service and regardless of his compliance with requirements for promotion, the Reserve officer finds it virtually impossible, from a practical standpoint, to secure a promotion.

It should be borne in mind that heretofore the Congress has reposed in the War Department full power and sole discretion to regulate the promotion of Reserve officers. Congress has, by the passage of Public, No. 612, Seventy-sixth Congress, accelerated the permanent promotion of Regular Army officers. As to Reserve officers, however, the figures, taken from the February and March issues of the Reserve Officer, tell the following story; the figures used are in each instance those Reserve officers eligible for active duty, and columns A, B, C, and D are for June 30, 1938, June 30, 1939, June 30, 1940, and January 31, 1941, respectively:

	A	B	C	D
Colonels	683	665	634	472
Lieutenant colonels	1,963	1,900	1,752	1,332
Majors	4,550	4,532	4,492	3,603
Captains	13,993	14,544	14,701	13,049
First lieutenants	41,084	43,917	42,783	42,452
Second lieutenants	37,831	39,007	39,860	40,975

At the present rate of decline, the grade of colonel will disappear entirely from the Officers' Reserve Corps in about 5 more years. The number of lieutenant colonels is almost one-third less than it was 2½ years ago, and the number of majors is one-fifth less than it was at that time. A slight decrease is also shown in the grade of captain, and the only grades in which increases are shown are those of first lieutenant and second lieutenant.

These figures are particularly interesting in view of the failure to make promotions of Reserve officers upon the ground that no vacancy exists. On the basis of the table showing the strength of the corps as of June 30, 1938, there should now be 211 vacancies in the grade of colonel, 631 vacancies in the grade of lieutenant colonel, 947 vacancies in the grade of major, and 944 vacancies in the grade of captain.

Comparison of numbers in grade in the Officers' Reserve Corps with numbers in grade in the Regular Army is even more enlightening. Although the figures in column D, above, are for January 31, 1941, no figures for the Regular Army are available later than those shown by the last Army Directory, which reveals the condition as of October 20, 1940. These figures for the Regular Army do not include temporary promotions made since that date or before that date, nor permanent promotions made thereafter. Bearing that important defect of the statistics in mind, much may, nevertheless, be gained from the following comparison:

	Officers' Reserve Corps as of Jan. 31, 1941	Regular Army as of Oct. 20, 1940
Colonels	472	705
Lieutenant colonels	1,332	2,883
Majors	3,603	2,469
Captains	13,049	1,877
First lieutenants	42,452	2,017
Second lieutenants	40,975	2,219
Total	101,883	12,170

These figures show slightly more than eight times as many Reserve officers as officers of the Regular Army. Yet there were not half as many lieutenant colonels in the Officers' Reserve Corps as in the Regular Army, only about two-thirds as many colonels, and only one-third more majors. In the grade of captain the number becomes more equitable, but even in that grade the percentage of the Regulars is 15.6 percent and that of the Reserves less than 13 percent. Only in the grades of first lieutenant and second lieutenant does the Officers' Reserve Corps take a commanding lead, and in the former grade the ratio is 21 Reserve officers to 1 Regular Army officer.

But the figures as of October 20, 1940, do not present the true picture of the Regular Army as of today. Of the 2,219 second lieutenants shown as of that date, 1,435 had already at that time received temporary promotions to first lieutenants. Shortly thereafter all first lieutenants, as a group, were promoted to captain; recently 1,055 captains have, as a group, received temporary promotions to the grade of major. The Army and Navy Journal each week carries a long list of temporary promotions; these are made individually. In addition, there have been a large number of permanent promotions.

The assurance of some standard for promotion which will be adhered to and upon which reliance can be placed will be of inestimable value to the morale of Reserve officers now and in the future. In other words, this bill is not a mere temporary expedient but a standard which can be followed in time of peace as well as emergency or war.

The power of the Secretary of War to make permanent or temporary promotions, regardless of years in grade, is preserved by section 2 of the bill. This will take care of those special cases where, for some reason, it appears desirable to promote a Reserve officer without regard to age or rank, if such cases should arise.

Section 3 makes special provision for longevity pay. Under section 3, Pay Readjustment Act, the Officers' Reserve Corps is the only Reserve component of the land or naval forces which receives only half-time credit for longevity pay purposes. Under certain circumstances, the Na-

tional Guard does not get credit for such purposes for all of the time during which an officer has held a commission. But, in view of the temporary character of the work which a Reserve officer performs and in view of the fact that he is taking time from business, probably at a loss to himself, it does not appear reasonable that he should receive only half credit for longevity pay purposes.

In certain sections of the Officers' Reserve Corps, original appointments are made in the grade of first lieutenant, and in one section original appointments are made in the grade of captain. Special educational and professional qualifications are required for appointment in these sections. Section 4 of H. R. 3962 makes special provision for purposes of promotion only for these groups.

Section 4 also makes provision for giving a year's constructive credit to those who have performed 6 months or more active duty during the present emergency. This is justified because promotions have been so slow in reaching Reserve officers and because some special consideration should be given to those who have performed active duty. It has been suggested that service with the Civilian Conservation Corps should be specially excluded from the benefits of this provision.

By establishing a systematic plan for promotion, H. R. 3962 will secure justice for those patriotic men who give so freely of their time and ability to the welfare of the Nation by service in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the United States Army.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to request time to discuss the important subject of the possibility of a domestic supply of rubber; however, in view of the lateness of the hour I am not going to make the request. I want to serve notice on the Members who are interested in the subject that I shall ask for a special order on Wednesday, April 16, at which time I intend to take 30 or 40 minutes to go into this subject.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may be permitted to extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

THE "BUY AMERICAN" AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot being said and heard the past few days on the subject of the good-neighbor policy. The State Department, for which appropriations are carried in the bill under discussion, is reported as greatly concerned over the possible adverse effects of the buy-American amendments that have been approved by the House as a part of the defense appropriation bills. A great deal that is being said is based upon a misunderstanding of the amendments. I desire, therefore, to set forth the exact language of these amendments.

The original amendment, written, I believe by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], has been carried in the Navy bill for 2 or 3 years. It has been called the "Argentine beef" amendment, but a reading of the exact wording of the amendment fails to reveal anything sinister or unfriendly toward any nation. Here it is—

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel stationed there.

A fair reading of that language shows that it is simply a buy-American provision. In principle it is identical with the provisions of many acts that seek to limit employment on Government projects to citizens of the United States.

Money paid by the taxpayers of the United States pay for these articles of food; the amendment seeks to insure that the taxpayer who pays the bill shall be patronized in the purchases made.

The amendment which was presented in the Appropriations Committee to the fifth supplemental defense bill, and was there adopted, and subsequently approved by the House, was identical with the amendment above except for the addition of two words—

Or clothing.

These words "or clothing" were added immediately after the words "articles of food" where they appear, so that the requirement of domestic purchasing would cover—

Articles of food or clothing.

It should further be noted that the amendment provided for exceptions—

Except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities.

And that is not all—

or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed.

And there are further exceptions to take care of vessels in foreign waters and establishments outside the continental United States.

Read closely and exactly, then, why should it be said that these amendments are directed at any nation or are, in any sense, a matter of ill will, or a lack of good-neighborliness?

Is it bad neighborliness that we protect the contractors on these national-defense jobs by giving them "cost plus" contracts—insuring that they will not lose anything? We might get foreign contractors, we might get contractors from Mexico and Brazil and the Argentine who would undertake these contracts on a lump-sum basis without a guaranty of a fee plus costs.

Is it bad neighborliness that we protect our wages and workmen by writing the Walsh-Healey Act into defense contracts? That act requires that prevailing wages must be paid. It is quite possible that workmen from other countries would be glad to take jobs on these projects at much less than the prevailing domestic wage, but we protect domestic workers when they are paid by the money of our taxpayers on Government jobs.

These buy-American amendments are simply an attempt to secure Government markets for the domestic producers—those in the field and those in the factory—for it will be noted that the language covers the production of the articles as well as the growing.

I have called the attention of the Members to this matter, because there is a great deal of misunderstanding of the situation. Certainly, no one can look at the language employed in these amendments and say that they differ at all in principle with those other usual provisions surrounding the expenditure of governmental funds that seek to protect domestic workers.

The amendment to the fifth supplemental defense bill, we understand, has been changed in the other body, and presumably will be before the House tomorrow. The change strikes out this language:

Except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed.

And substitutes in its place the following:

Except insofar as the head of the department concerned shall determine that such articles of food or clothing cannot be procured in the United States of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed.

That, I understand, is the wording of the so-called Adams compromise.

I urge that each Representative read the language of these amendments carefully. They do not contain any absolute prohibition against foreign purchases; they are simply an attempt to give the domestic producer the market that is created and paid for by the taxes he pays. They are not designed in any spirit of ill will; they are simply the natural protection which the citizens of any country would seek to give to its own workers and producers.

I earnestly hope that those who administer the discretion provided for in the so-called Adams compromise will do so in such fashion that there will be no further controversy on this subject.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, the problem presented by the wave of strikes and threats of strikes in defense industries is of such magnitude in its effect on every phase of our national life as to challenge the Congress to promptly, but with just and deliberate consideration, bend its every effort toward seeking palliatives which may hold the breach until a permanent solution,

fair and equitable to the rights of both labor and management, is evolved. We are sitting on a volcano, and each day we delay in our efforts to better the situation brings the eruption of that volcano one day nearer.

I am sure I bespeak the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the Congress when I say that the basic living standards for the workingman must be preserved, and his civil rights must be protected, and there is nothing in the present situation that should be allowed to imperil those standards and those rights. Yet I believe it is the consensus of the people of the United States that the constantly recurring strikes and threats of strikes in plants manufacturing arms and armaments are the burr under the saddle blanket of our defense program, although it is unfair to charge labor with the sole responsibility for this condition. When we get to the root of a labor dispute, it is sometimes found that management is seeking to exploit labor under the guise of the exigency of national defense, or is reluctant to accord labor certain of the rights provided by existing law. Labor should not be made the only whipping boy. In these critical days labor and management should work as a team in the defense industries, with the mutual understanding that there is no room in the harness for a balky horse, regardless of whether the balk is on the part of one side or the other.

We read a great deal in the papers these days, and hear quite a lot from the floors of the House and the Senate, about the alternative of the Government adopting forceful measures in compelling striking workers to return to their jobs, and, as a corollary to this alternative, it is being urged in some quarters that the Government should take over and operate those plants which are strike-bound on the ground that they are "failing" to operate in the manufacture of defense materials. Force in the settlement of any kind of dispute is a sorry alternative, and plain realistic thinking should immediately make it clear that the federalizing of defense plants would simply add fuel to the fire and would be sowing dragon's teeth which might reap a harvest of labor disorders that would make the present strikes seem like pink teas in comparison. After governmental seizure of a plant the problem of disposing of the strike would still remain. But, aside from the danger of intensifying strife by Government control of defense plants, simple logic tells us that the wholesale control and management of defense industries by the Government is so impractical as to border on the fantastic. An attempt to operate an intricate and highly specialized manufacturing plant by a Government bureau or commission would inevitably result in disorganization and confusion, and, as an incidental evil, we would find ourselves with a new group of entrenched New Deal bureaucrats. Mind you, I am not going on record as saying that it will not be necessary to adopt drastic and untried measures in the building of an unassailable defense for America. That defense must be built, and built quickly, without hindrance from any quarter.

But I do urge, with all the sincerity of which I am capable, that we hold our tear-gas bombs and armored cars in reserve until we have exhausted all other means of bringing labor and management to an accord on the proposition that the tying up of defense industries by strikes endangers the very life of their and our Nation. I confidently assert that at least 95 percent of the members of labor unions in this country are God-fearing, patriotic American citizens, who would sacrifice their lives on the altar of their country, if need be. When they engage in needless and sometimes fraudulent strikes, such as the one now in progress at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Wisconsin, they are unwittingly being duped into following false prophets in the persons of paid labor agitators and organizers of a very pink complexion, and their view of the American flag is obscured by the subversive writings and preachments of these false prophets. During all the fanfare and blowing of trumpets over the strike situation a direct and official appeal to the patriotism and love of country of the workers has been noticeably lacking. In my judgment the great mass of American working men and women would be proud to subscribe to the slogan that the man who fashions the gun and molds the bullet is just as necessary and important a part of our defense establishment as the man who shoulders the gun and fires the bullet. For the purpose of implementing this slogan I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which would have the effect of establishing a roll of honor, sponsored by the Office of Production Management, under the name of Patriotic Builders of America's Defense, on which will be inscribed the names of those loyal and patriotic men and women working in defense industries who pledge themselves to the principle that their love of country transcends union lines and that they will, during the period of the existing emergency, refrain from any action that will retard the building of their country's defense, either by strikes or otherwise, until such time as the newly established National Defense Mediation Board has exhausted every reasonable means of mediating differences between labor and management. The text of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States have become alarmed over the recent strikes in defense industries; and

Whereas measures of compulsion to deal with such strikes have been proposed; and

Whereas in a democracy compulsion in such matters should be resorted to only after all efforts to secure patriotic and voluntary cooperation have failed; and

Whereas at least 95 percent of the workers in defense industries are loyal to the United States and are anxious to cooperate to the fullest extent in the building of America's defense and should be given an opportunity to so express themselves; and

Whereas the participation by such workers in the building of America's defense is as essential thereto as service by others in the land or naval forces of the United States, and should be suitably recognized as such: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the prevention of unnecessary strikes in defense industries can be accomplished by the voluntary and patriotic cooperation of American workers, and that the faithful and patriotic service of workers in defense industries to the building of America's defense should be suitably recognized. To this end Congress hereby requests the Office of Production Management—

(a) To establish a roll of workers in defense industries to be known as the roll of Patriotic Builders of America's Defense, who pledge themselves, during the present defense emergency, not to participate in any strike until the National Defense Mediation Board has exhausted every possible means of settling the dispute or controversy in question;

(b) To give every worker in defense industry an opportunity to sign such roll and thereby subscribe to such pledge;

(c) To cause to be prepared suitable certificates, medals, or other insignia for presentation from time to time to each worker who has signed such roll, attesting that such presentation is made in testimony of such worker's patriotic and faithful service to the building of America's defense; and

(d) To make suitable provision to insure that the signing of such roll is purely voluntary, and that the failure of any worker to sign be not made the basis of any discrimination against him.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as depriving, modifying, or in any manner affecting the rights guaranteed to labor under the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

I call your particular attention to the fact that there is no word of coercion or compulsion in this measure. In operation, it will simply be a straightforward official appeal, from the Government of the United States to the mechanic, the artisan, and the unskilled worker in our defense industries, all of whom contribute important vertebrae to the backbone of our country, that they work hand in glove with their Government in these hair-trigger days when the fate of our Nation and the American way of doing things may be hanging in the balance. Such an appeal embodies the true spirit of America, and it may be more effective in alleviating the strike situation than all the police night sticks, tear gas, and armored cars in all the armories and arsenals of our country. And by responding to this appeal, the workingmen and women will not be sacrificing an iota of the hard-won rights vouchsafed to them under existing law. And they will have the enduring satisfaction of knowing that when the historians write the dramatic story of these days of 1941, they will tell how labor, management, and Government presented a united front in meeting the challenge to democracy. Thus, we will have an epic of America at work and a record of accomplishment of which Americans of all future generations may well be proud. And those men and women who, by virtue of their patriotism and loyalty to their country have their names inscribed on the roll of Patriotic Builders of America's Defense, will have a cherished heirloom to hand down to their posterity as a token of their response to their country's appeal in her hour of need. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, Senate bill 262, an act regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation has been passed by both the House and Senate. Before this act becomes a law, if it does become a law, I want to make my position clear. I voted against the measure. I voted against it because, in the long run, I believe it will work an injustice against the farmer despite the plea of the act's proponents that it would aid the farmer. Too, since congressional action early in December, the Department has been unable to accept storage bids already received. As a result, the Government has been unable to obtain savings amounting to about $500,000, and this amount increases at the rate of $5,000 a day. Furthermore, I consider the act tantamount to a monopoly on the storage of cotton with the possibility of increasing storage rates which will add to the already heavy charges against surplus cotton, a condition that will make the situation grow steadily worse.

After reviewing the testimony presented by both the proponents and opponents of the bill before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I firmly believe the act will create virtually a monopoly especially for a comparatively small group in control of large "chain" warehouses. Their principal argument that any movement of Government-owned cotton from interior warehouses in order to save storage expenses would involve an ultimate loss to the farmer, bears out this contention. They testified that removal of the Government-owned stocks would make it necessary for them to raise the rates on farmer-owned cotton in storage in the same warehouses. This implied threat possibly was the cause of some support that cotton farmers gave to the measure. If a warehouseman went to a farmer and said, "Now, I have 1,000 bales of Government-owned cotton in my warehouse, and I have 10 bales that belong to you. The Government is going to take its 1,000 bales of cotton out, so I will have to increase the storage rate to you on your 10 bales."

Naturally, the farmer is perturbed. He might even write his Congressman a letter. But the very argument advanced by the warehouseman condemns him as a monopolist. If the farmer sat down and reasoned out this implied threat of the warehouseman, he may have written an altogether different letter. He might have reasoned it out this way: "This warehouseman says that the Government may take 1,000 bales of cotton out of his warehouse. This will leave him with some vacant space. Space is a commodity which he sells, much as I sell my cotton. Then, if the Government moves the cotton he will have a surplus of space. If he must sell his space under competitive conditions, as I sell my crops to competitive bidders, then the price of his storage space should go down, not up."

In other words, if the warehouseman already is in a position to reverse the law of supply and demand by raising his price when the supply of what he is selling, storage, is increased, there can be only one conclusion. There is a monopoly. And, as I see it, S. 262 will so hamstring the Department of Agriculture that it cannot protect the farmers as it has been doing during the past few years. The testimony by officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation indicates that the only effective public regulatory force that can now be brought to bear against this monopoly is the right of the Department of Agriculture to move Government-owned cotton without legal restriction. S. 262 deprives the Department of this protection against monopolistic power. Both the farmer and the public will suffer.

It is not difficult to see how this monopoly will work. Under S. 262 the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot move the Government-owned cotton unless substantially lower carrying charges are available elsewhere. Suppose, then, that the warehousemen demanded an increase in rates. How could the Commodity Credit Corporation refuse them? They have the cotton and it means the Government has to pay, after a date named by the warehousemen, unless the cotton can be moved. To obtain substantially lower carrying charges, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to go to the same people who are asking for the increase. If interior warehouses were operated as independent units, there would not be so much danger of a monopoly. But with a few big chains in control—one firm has a storage capacity of more than four and one-half million bales—the monopoly is more than a threat.

In the past 2 years the Commodity Credit Corporation has effected large savings to farmers and to the Government by reducing warehouse rates on cotton. The rates for storage, including insurance, on Government stocks of cotton generally in effect in 1939 were 25 cents per bale per month for the first season of storage and 18 cents per bale per month thereafter. A study of these storage rates indicated that the farmer and the Government were paying excessive rates for this storage. At the time of the study the Commodity Credit Corporation had acquired title to nearly seven million bales of cotton which could be moved from one warehouse to another without legal restriction. For the first time the Commodity Credit Corporation was in a position to utilize competitive forces and bring about a reduction in storage rates to a more reasonable level. Then, on October 19, 1939, the Commodity Credit Corporation announced that the maximum rates for the storage of old Government stocks of cotton would be 12½ cents per bale per month.

Under this new cotton-storage program a saving of approximately $10,000,000 per year was made for cotton producers and the Government.

It was only natural for the warehousemen to object to the reduction in rates. But their insistence that it removed the profit for them is not evident. There was little demand that the Government remove the cotton from the warehouses under the lower rate. On the other hand, subsequent competitive bids brought even lower storage rates.

In his testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Carl B. Robbins, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, made the following statement:

> The Department of Agriculture looks upon the competitive bidding requirements under the provisions of section 3709 as a great cornerstone of efficiency, economy, and fairness in the conduct of public affairs, and in practice exemptions are granted from its requirements only when conditions indicate that solicitation of competitive bids would not obtain the necessary results.

It is easy to see why Mr. Robbins makes such a statement. The records of the Commodity Credit Corporation show that on October 13, 1939, bids were asked in order to arrange for the storage of any Government-owned cotton which any local warehouseman might not care to hold at the maximum rate of 12½ cents per bale per month. Bids were solicited from warehousemen in those ports and interior points to which the cotton would be moved in the normal course of marketing. Under this arrangement approximately 336,000 bales of cotton were moved and stored at an average rate of about 10.4 cents per bale per month. Thus it was evident that there were some warehousemen who thought they could make money at a rate substantially below the maximum.

Again, records of the Commodity Credit Corporation show, bids were asked for the storage of a substantial amount of cotton in the New England textile-manufacturing area. Through this solicitation of bids, arrangements were made to store about 300,000 bales at rates ranging from 7 to 8 cents per bale per month.

No warehouseman is going to make a bid where he will lose money. Some of them may figure on a fairly close margin of profit, but they know they have to have some profit to continue in business. The competitive bids obtained by the Commodity Credit Corporation prove to my own satisfaction that warehousemen were making a huge profit back in the days when the rates were 25 cents and 18 cents, and that there is ample margin for profit in the maximum 12½-cent rate set by the Commodity Credit Corporation back in 1939. They again have the excess-profit motive in trying to tie the Department's hands so that they can again jack up the price.

So satisfactory was the competitive-bidding system that the Commodity Credit Corporation announced in November 1940 that bids were solicited for the storage of all Government-owned stocks of cotton, except the 1940 cotton, which was then in the process of coming under the loan. This was done with a two-fold purpose—of obtaining the cheapest possible rate for the farmers and the Government and to relieve congested storage situations in certain localities so as to provide farmers with sufficient warehouse space for the 1940 crop at all local points.

At this point the warehouse chains got together. They said they did not have time to make the bids, and requested a

deferment, which was granted by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This request for an extension was followed by a Senate resolution which requested the Department of Agriculture not to receive bids until the matter could be considered by the Congress. This brought a postponement until February 1941. On January 9, S. 262 was introduced. Since then there have been two more postponements. These postponements, as I have pointed out before, are costing farmers and the Government at the rate of $5,000 a day. If this act is signed by the President, these costs will continue indefinitely, and the rate probably will increase.

The language of the bill is purposely vague and no doubt will result in costly litigation if it becomes a law. The bill purports to grant authority; but, in effect, these vague words substitute restriction instead. It proposes to accomplish through these uncertain provisions many of the already accomplished purposes of existing legislation. Perhaps the most ironic statement of all is—

to prevent monopolistic control and monopolistic tendencies with respect to the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton owned by the farmers or by the Government.

In closing, I would like to refer you to some remarks in the testimony of D. W. Brooks, manager of the Georgia Cotton Corporation. This organization is a group of cotton-growing farmers who own their own warehouses. Mr. Brooks testified, in part:

Our observation to date has been that it is well-nigh impossible to obtain any reduction in warehouse rates voluntarily. All, or practically all, the reductions in rates have come about from pressure by the Commodity Credit Corporation to reduce rates. * * * We believe the passage of the bill will take away the bargaining power which it has had in the past, and that soon thereafter storage rates will be advanced to a point where farmers will again be paying exorbitant rates, and that is the reason that we are opposed to it.

This is the testimony of a man who knows both sides of the question—from the farmer's viewpoint and from the warehouseman's viewpoint. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, the whole world has anxiously watched the recent visit of the Japanese Foreign Minister, Yosuke Matsuoka to Berlin.

The cordial welcome of Herr Hitler and of German officialdom to him must have been noted with deep humiliation by the exiled Kaiser, William II, at his quiet retreat in Holland.

For if there was one fear during his reign that agitated the troubled brain of William II, it was the Yellow Peril which he proclaimed so hysterically in private and public talks.

In 1904 Emperor William was in despair because, for a time, he feared there would be no Russo-Japanese war.

In the memoirs of Prince von Bulow, the then Imperial Chancellor, who distinguished his career by laying a heavy hand of restraint on Emperor William's impetuous nature, William II is quoted as saying in connection with a discussion on the Russian situation:

This is the Yellow Peril, the greatest danger threatening the white race, Christianity, and our entire culture. If the Russians run away from the Japanese, within 20 years now the yellow race will be in Moscow and Posen.

Some 35 years after this terrifying talk, the Japs appeared in Berlin as the confidantes and allies of the German people—at least of Herr Hitler.

My colleagues, I am sure, will hear with interest an episode in the flighty career of William II that touches the United States, and is chronicled in the memoirs of Prince von Bulow.

During the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, Emperor William II found himself attracted by the vigorous personality of the American President, and opened correspondence with him.

In these letters the Kaiser was continuously exploiting his prejudices for Japan, being convinced that war between Japan and the United States was unavoidable and imminent.

Without foreknowledge of Prince von Bulow, who as censor of the Kaiser's letters saved him from many a blunder, the Kaiser wrote President Roosevelt that Japan was preparing for war with the United States, and hinted that this country must be more on its guard against the Yellow Peril.

When the Kaiser casually mentioned that he had written a "first-class" letter to the American President, Prince von Bulow had reason to be alarmed, and he inquired into its contents.

I told the Kaiser—

writes Prince von Bulow in his memoirs—

that this communication must never reach Roosevelt: On the one hand, I thought the contents incorrect in substance, on the other, the Kaiser must never permit such a weapon to fall into Roosevelt's hands.

The upshot was that Von Bulow held up the dispatch box that carried the imperial missive over the Atlantic, just as it was landed in New York, and had the offensive letter fished out and returned unopened to Berlin.

It was incidents of this kind that caused Prince von Bulow to fall into disfavor with William II, and finally led to his retirement from the Government before the first World War.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the bill now under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hour is somewhat late, but I do not crave the indulgence of the House very often or impose upon your patience.

Today occurred an incident in my State of Michigan, however, which the Members of Congress cannot ignore and which the people of the United States will not ignore. Hitler won a notable victory in the United States this morning with the passive assistance of the President of the United States. The dictators of Europe ought to celebrate tonight, they ought to hold a banquet over what they achieved in this country today without the use of bombs, without the use of parachutists, without the use of panzer divisions and without the use of modern warfare as we know it in this world today. Hitler may make his boast good that aid to Great Britain from the United States will come too late.

The Ford Motor Co., at Dearborn, Mich., is closed. Eighty-six thousand men who drew good wages yesterday are walking the streets out of work today and the defense program of this Nation has bogged down, it is stymied, and is held at a standstill.

That plant has $164,000,000 in contracts of a national-defense character, for the making of airplane engines and light trucks for the use of the Army of the United States. They are not being produced at this hour.

The Ford Motor Co. has produced one-third of the automobiles of this world. Henry Ford, because of his great mechanical genius, provided a commodity for the common man, the poor man, the great masses of the people of the world, and because he provided them with that commodity, a low-priced automobile, one of the great conveniences of our day and age, the wealth of the world rolled into that factory. He has used it to expand the plant and to provide work for more men.

Henry Ford does not need to build automobiles today because he needs bread, but he does continue the production of the commodity that people need and want in order to provide work for men. For more than 30 years he has conducted his great industry without any difficulty, without any trouble, without any shut-downs, without any labor disputes whatever, so far as I know, and I have lived almost within rifle shot of that great industry, the greatest single industry in this world, all the years it has been in operation. During that time men have been paid the highest wages given to laboring men the world over.

But today that mighty plant, with all of its great facilities to produce defense weapons, which we need in this national emergency, is closed and there is no smoke belching from the smokestacks of that great factory at Dearborn, Mich.

Patriotism and loyalty to our country does not exist in the ranks of Communists, radicals, and saboteurs. Honest American labor must go without work and their families be deprived of the necessities of life because the enemies of the United States are having their way. The one man who revolutionized wages for the laboring man is denied the right to run his own industrial plant. Henry Ford, who was voted by 74 percent of labor as the best friend that labor has, has become the victim of racketeers and a labor despotism now in the saddle in this country.

The President and this administration, by appointing to key positions in the official life of this Government men and people of questionable records, has done more to bring about the condition now existing in the United States than any other power or force in our beloved land. His apparent unwillingness and indifference to use the great powers of his office to bring to an end the destruction of our defense program is beyond the comprehension of many Members in this House, and, I believe, to the great masses of the American people. The administration has coddled these radical elements. Not only have they been appointed to high places, but when their names have been exposed to public view and it was shown that the departments of Government are honeycombed with Communists and those identified with communistic organizations, nothing has been done. It is well known that a committee of this House designated to investigate subversive activities in this Nation has been thwarted and obstructed in the discharge of its duty by officials of this Government who ought to have given every aid possible to achieve the desired end.

At this very moment one who holds a very high position in the defense program of the Nation is drawing his salary from a labor union affiliated with the same organization that has succeeded in closing the Ford motor plant, one of the greatest defense units in the Nation. I listened to his testimony for hours before the Judiciary Committee of this House and heard him say that he did not want any legislation to give him the power to prevent strikes in the Nation's effort to defend itself.

What is the American citizen and the American taxpayer to believe and think when a condition of that kind exists in the Nation, and he is called upon to furnish money produced by his brawn and sweat in order to defend his home and his family against the peril which we are advised now threatens the Nation?

The President has demanded speed and more speed, not only for the defense of Great Britain, but in order to defend America and the Western Hemisphere. The Congress of the United States has responded to his appeal and voted him billions of dollars for that purpose, but there is no speed. The defense program is permitted to lag behind, to slow down, and in more than one instance to stop dead, and yet the President has thus far failed to lift a finger or exercise his executive authority and bring an end to the subversive interests, of which we have been duly warned by the Dies committee, now sabotaging the very strength of the Nation.

There are many Members in this House, on both sides of the aisle, who are not proud of the conditions that exist at this hour in freedom-loving America. The time has come when this Government must act and act promptly in asserting its right to defend itself against the enemies from within, as well as the potential enemies from without. Let us have faith, my colleagues, that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it. Let us call upon the President and insist that he employ the power that he has to put an end to internal conflict; and if he does not have the power to do so, let us grant it to him by unanimous vote.

We are no longer "the land of the free nor the home of the brave." We are not entitled to liberty and freedom if we are not willing to courageously exert ourselves to preserve it. Let us be united, and I utter the plea of the President in this Chamber at the beginning of the session of Congress, that on the question of the defense of this country there should be no middle aisle. There will be no middle aisle if we can be assured that the enemies of this Nation shall be prevented by the powers of Government from destroying us before it is too late.

Mr. President, the United States of America and the freedom-loving people of this Nation call upon you today to act and act swiftly before it is too late. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of this committee has already told you, there is included in this bill an item providing funds for the enforcement of what is known as the Voorhis Act. That act was passed by the Congress at the last session. It is designed to do something which, in the words of the committee report, has never been attempted by any nation before. It is designed to use the method of exposure for the purpose of protecting a constituted democracy against organizations whose aim and purpose is the destruction of that democracy. It is designed to protect that great majority of the people who desire and cherish freedom against the undercover operations of organizations that—frequently under direction from foreign powers—attempt to take advantage of the liberties afforded in a democracy in order to destroy them. The act requires the registration of organizations which are under the control of foreign governments or which seek by force or military measures to accomplish political purposes in this country, or which have as any of their aims and purposes the conduct, control, seizure, or overthrow of government in the United States by means of military force or threats of such force.

Penalties are contained in the bill for failure to register. Registration under the terms of the bill consists of giving all pertinent facts about the organization to the Department of Justice, including the sources of its funds, the names of persons who have contributed in any way toward the support of that organization, its principal officers, and an account of what it attempts to do.

Up to date no organizations have registered under the act. This was to be expected. For the one thing, such organizations do not want is full exposure to the light of public knowledge. Indeed, the Communist Party held a special convention for the purpose of declaring that it was no longer affiliated with the Third International, on the theory, I suppose, that this would make it unnecessary for them to make a registration.

The Department of Justice has certain plans for the enforcement of this act. I believe they are very definite and good plans. If they are successful one of two things will happen; either these organizations which seek by force to dominate the American Nation and impose upon it their will will be compelled to tell the American people all about themselves and their operations, or they will be subjected to penalties which will render their continued work practically impossible.

I shall not go into detail about those plans, but they have been given to the committee in its sessions and described to the committee. The committee saw fit to include $150,000 for this work. The Budget request was for $290,000. I believe personally that amount of money could have been well spent in this field, but I shall not attempt to change the amount the committee has seen fit to include in the bill.

I merely want to point out that in these days when it is going to be very easy for us to become hysterical and to make mistakes that will be more serious than anything that has happened yet in this country, this kind of an approach, an approach to require the bringing out into the open of the facts about an organization that seeks the destruction of democratic principles of government. is perhaps the soundest method we could use. Indeed, I am thoroughly convinced that the very fact that no organization has seen fit to register under the terms of this act, when I know perfectly well, as do other Members of the House, that there are at least three or four organizations—the German-American Bund and the Communist Party, for example—that clearly come under its terms, is an indication of the fact that the one thing they cannot stand to do is to have the facts regarding them known.

Persecution? That is all right from their point of view. Persecution means that they can come out with great publicity telling how cruelly they are being treated. They can claim that they are being so treated because they stand up for what may be termed the cause of this, that, or the other. But exposure, so that the American people may know what these purposes are and who the people are that are carrying them out, and what the sources of their funds are, that is a different matter. It is the thing no nation heretofore had adequately attempted. It is, I am convinced, the thing the minions of the dictators most fear.

I believe I am correct that the only bill that Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, and Fritz Kuhn, then head of the German-American Bund, both came to Washington to oppose was this bill, and they both testified in the hearings before the Senate committee against this bill.

I am glad the committee has seen fit to include some funds for the enforcement of this law. It seems to me the democratic approach to this problem is the approach of saying, "Yes, we permit

freedom of political action in this country but we do not permit undercover political activity on the part of any organization in the United States."

And one last word. Unless we make distinction here between those who really are against America and disloyal to her on the one hand and those great groups of our people on the other who simply seek improvement of their lives and conditions, we shall defeat every purpose of our defense program.

The effective carrying out of the Voorhis Act would help to make this distinction clear. But it will not be enough. There must also be fair speaking by every Member of the Congress. For example, I deeply regret that there were speeches made in the House today in which it was declared that the only trouble with the defense program was traceable to labor.

Such talk will breed a situation of distrust and bitter feeling from which only those who do not wish America well can profit. What must be done is that the rightful claims of labor and the great loyal millions of American workers be separated in every speech from the work of that small but dangerous minority who hurt labor's cause by their very presence in the movement.

Have the gentlemen who make those statements forgotten that some great industrial concerns have and are failing to obey the laws of this Congress; have we forgotten the months during which the whole defense program waited while we here were devising and passing legislation to protect against future loss the owners of the industries; have they forgotten that even now we need expansion in certain industries which we are not getting?

I am not coming here as a person who is going to say that labor is never at fault. Indeed, I am deeply disturbed by some of the news we have received today. But I do believe that it is most important, as I said in my speech the other day, that we see the other side, too, that we recognize and condemn profiteering where it exists and failure to meet labor fairly on the part of employers where that exists. Let your condemnation be sharp and precise when it is made—whomever it hits. And let it be based always on what we are sure is true. For upon every group in America knowing that Congress is being fair and just will depend the effectiveness of whatever action it takes, and perhaps the future of our country itself. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS TO THE ANTITRUST DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, the 1942 Department of Justice supply bill, which we are now considering, contains one item of great importance to the Nation as a whole and of particular importance to agriculture. I refer to the item making provision for a continuation of the antitrust enforcement work which has been going forward so successfully under the able leadership of Mr. Thurman Arnold, the Assistant Attorney General.

The Farm Bureau Federation has consistently advocated that all illegal combinations in restraint of trade be prosecuted to the full extent of the law, whether they be by industry or labor, or even by agriculture itself. At this point I would like to read the resolution on antitrust enforcement which was unanimously adopted by the voting delegates at the 1940 annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

> Antitrust enforcement: We strongly endorse the attitude of enforcement officials in the administration of antitrust laws. We especially appreciate the attention which is being given to monopolistic restraints upon materials used in agricultural production and in the channels of distribution for farm products. We insist upon the expansion of this program and upon the provision of adequate funds for the full enforcement of the antitrust laws.

On November 25, 1940, the Department of Justice announced the beginning of a Nation-wide investigation of the processing and distribution of food. Farmers are very anxious that this investigation be carried forward to a successful conclusion. Speaking of this investigation, Mr. Arnold said:

> If we can get the funds to carry it out, this investigation may prove to be the most important service to the American farmer ever performed under the antitrust laws.

No group in our economy has suffered more than agriculture from artificial restraints and barriers imposed by or for the benefit of other groups.

For more than 20 years American agriculture has been at a disparity with industry and labor. Congress has recognized this situation and has enacted a number of constructive laws to aid farmers. The goal of this legislation has been parity prices and parity income for agriculture. Although considerable progress has been made toward this goal, figures computed by the Department of Agriculture show that our national farm income is still falling short of parity goal by nearly $2,000,000,000 a year. Much of this disparity is due to artificial restraints and trade barriers which restrict the exchange of goods and services in our economy.

We must remember that there are two sides to the parity equation—farm prices and industrial prices. Farmers have received too little for their products and have had to pay too much for the products they buy. On the one hand, agriculture has had to sell its products in a free, competitive market, and sometimes in a market "rigged" against it by artificial, monopolistic controls; while, on the other hand, agriculture has had to buy many of its industrial goods at rigidly high prices, due to monopolistic controls of industry and labor.

Many of these restrictions, for example, tariffs, have been brought into being by the enactment of laws, but many others have been put into effect through illegal agreements or collusive action on the part of various groups.

The illegal restraints of trade, which flourish when antitrust laws are not enforced, bear down with a particular hardship on the farmer, who is unable to control either the prices he receives or the prices he pays. In the marketing of his products the farmer has been getting a declining percentage of the consumer's dollar. The cost of distribution has risen enormously. In 1913 farmers received 53 percent of the money consumers spent for 58 foods purchased by the typical workingman's family, but in 1939 farmers received only 41 percent of the prices paid by consumers for these foods.

In the case of commodities bought by farmers, a high degree of concentrated control of production and prices and restraints of trade result in the maintenance of high uneconomic prices, which are far out of line with farm prices and with the purchasing power of the masses of people—with the result that these artificial controls and restraints reduce the purchasing power not only of farmers but of consumers generally. The reduced purchasing power means less employment for labor in the industries producing these and other goods, less demand for agricultural products, and less profit for industry.

I would like to point out that the already heavy duties of the Antitrust Division have been greatly increased by the imperative need to investigate the war industries that are flourishing under our national-defense program. If defense is to be carried forward efficiently and economically, it is vitally important that the Antitrust Division have adequate funds to make any necessary investigations as the need arises. We all remember that during the first World War business groups developed ways of acting together which continued through the 1920's, and which were used after the war to prevent industrial prices from falling as fast as farm prices fell. We must not let this war become the excuse for collusive price fixing.

Important though these investigations in connection with the national-defense program may be, there is an evident need for a thoroughgoing clean-up of the collusive and monopolistic practices both in the distribution of farm products and in the production and distribution of commodities bought by farmers, all of which are penalizing both farmers and consumers.

Farmers and consumers are helpless to correct monopolistic controls. They must rely upon Government to protect them from such predatory practices. The antitrust laws were enacted by Congress to protect our citizens, but unless Congress makes available sufficient funds to the Department of Justice, these laws cannot be enforced effectively. Failure to enforce such laws makes a mockery out of our laws and extends an open invitation for the strong to pillage the weak. Disrespect for law strikes at the very vitals of our democracy. It is not true economy to cripple and prevent the proper enforcement of our laws by failure to provide the necessary appropriations.

I therefore sincerely hope Congress will make available the $2,325,000 allowed by the committee, which to my mind is the minimum amount required to do a constructive job.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, according to this afternoon's Washington News, I note that Mr. Lowell Mellett, head of the Office of Government Reports, told the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments yesterday that President Roosevelt has no intention of establishing a censorship over expression of opinion by the press and radio. This is indeed interesting, if true.

On the other hand, many of us have noted from time to time that certain newspapers seem to have established their own censorship when it comes to expressing public opinion in opposition to this country's entering the European war. An example of this was furnished by the Washington Post this morning.

Last night some 70 or more Members of this body and of the Senate—Democrats and Republicans alike—met to discuss future means to be pursued in keeping this country out of war. Our immediate concern is over the drive now being conducted by certain propaganda agencies in this country, notably the Committee to Defend America by Aid to Britain, to secure delivery of matériel being furnished under the Lease-Lend Act to Britain in American bottoms and with American convoys.

At that meeting, a formal statement was prepared for release to the press, and at least one gentleman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]—went out of his way to see to it that this statement was given to the Washington Post. He called the night editor and dictated this formal statement to him personally, and consequently he was very much surprised this morning to find no space whatsoever was given to this meeting in this particular paper. On inquiry of the editor today, he was told that this news release and an account of this meeting was actually set up in type but was not printed, because it was crowded out by more important news. I should like to ask, Mr. Chairman, when there is any news in this country more important than an honest effort on the part of Members of this Congress to keep this country out of war? [Applause.] This is not our war. England is not fighting our battle. We were not consulted before the war started, and we shall probably not be consulted about the peace terms when it is concluded.

Mr. Chairman, many of us are seriously concerned about this drive to convoy war materials to England or to transport them in American bottoms. We are concerned because the President himself recently stated that "convoying meant shooting and shooting meant war."

Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee stated during the debate on the lease-lend bill, and I quote him:

> As plainly as I can, I have always stood against convoying vessels, by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war.

Mr. Chairman, on Monday of this week the able Senator from New Hampshire introduced a resolution in the other body designed to prohibit either the transfer of this material in American bottoms or the convoying by American warships, planes, etc. I have introduced a companion resolution in this House today and I hope it will receive prompt consideration.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] recently made the statement that the President of the United States was in the war, that the Congress of the United States was in this war but the people of the United States were not in this war. I agree with the last part of that statement, but I do not agree with the other two parts. I have contended right along that we are heading toward war just as fast as we can. According to the President himself, when we start to convoy war material we will certainly see shooting and shooting does mean war, and that is the last step. Consequently, if the Congress is determined to keep out of war, it is up to us to definitely prohibit convoying at this time, as well as delivery in American bottoms.

During the lease-lend debate, we heard repeatedly stated on this floor and in the Senate, that the President had no intentions of convoying material. When many of us sought to write a definite prohibition against convoying in the lease-lend bill, we were voted down overwhelmingly. If the President has no intentions of convoying, why did he tell us yesterday in his press conference—or so it is reported today—that the question of convoying has been under consideration for the past year and a half? If we are serious, if the President is serious, when we say that the lease-lend bill was enacted to keep us out of war, and then if he is serious when he says convoying means war, then certainly he should not object and neither should any Member of this House object to the passage of my bill.

Now, while we are on this question of our trend toward war, let me review for you a few facts and show you how far we have come along this road to war and what it may mean for the future of this country.

Repeatedly, we have been told here in Washington that the reelection of President Roosevelt last fall constituted an endorsement of his foreign policy. Some administration spokesmen even go so far as to say our present course is following the campaign promises of both major parties. This I deny. War or peace was not an issue publicly debated by either candidate. Both candidates insisted that in our program of "aid to Britain" we would follow policies "short of war."

We were not told last fall:

First. That we would become the "arsenal for democracy."

Second. That we would embark on a program to rearm, at the American taxpayers' expense, all the countries in the world standing in opposition to the Axis Powers.

Third. That that program—as well as our national-defense program—would be very effectively sabotaged by a wave of labor strikes, many of which are known to be Communist inspired.

Fourth. That a lease-lend bill would be forced through Congress as "must" legislation, providing:

(a) That we would assume full responsibility for the conduct and outcome of the war against the Axis.

(b) That the President of the United States would assume the responsibility of becoming the quartermaster general for all nations standing in opposition to the Axis Powers.

(c) That he would be given dictatorship powers over our own people in order to defeat the dictators of Europe.

(d) That we would bring the war right to our own shores by repairing, supplying, and equipping belligerent foreign warships in our own navy yards.

We were not told last fall:

Fifth. That we would continue to denude our own defenses by giving them away to other nations.

Sixth. That we would scrap the cash-and-carry provision of the Neutrality Act.

Seventh. That we would repudiate the Johnson Act.

Eighth. That despite the expressed intention of the Congress in the Lease-Lend Act the President would not insist on such collateral as is available for materials shipped abroad.

Ninth. That $7,000,000,000 would be requested as the first "ante" in this lend-lease program.

Tenth. That in the first 3 months of this Congress your war bill to date would be run up to $39,000,000,000.

Eleventh. That the Congress would be providing funds for an army of 4,000,000 American soldiers.

Twelfth. That an invading army of 16,000,000 men would be required to defeat them on United States shores, according to military experts.

Maybe you have not been told that, among other things, we are now:

First. Making but feeble efforts to clean up the strike menace.

Second. Painting over our Navy to match the colors of the British Fleet.

Third. Reconditioning some of our largest liners for troop-transport work.

Fourth. Transporting ammunition and fighting matériel for our own Navy to Singapore (and have been for months past).

Fifth. Rapidly advancing our outposts in the Atlantic and Pacific.

Sixth. Quartering a Marine Corps Reserve dive-bombing squadron from the District of Columbia on the Island of Samoa—6,000 miles from San Francisco, thousands of miles from Japan (but close to Australia), and equipped with no aircraft with which to defend itself.

Seventh. Hearing administration spokesmen openly and repeatedly advocating delivery of lend-lease matériel in American ships.

Eighth. Hearing administration spokesmen openly advocating convoying such matériel in either foreign or American bottoms—in fact, according to radio comentators last night, the President himself said he had been considering it for the last year and a half. The President himself has said "Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war."

Maybe you have not been told:

First. That high administration spokesmen, such as Adolph Berle, of the State Department, recently publicly advocated that at the conclusion of this war we must be expected to share our wealth and natural resources with the world.

Second. That we may become parties to a definite program to internationally socialize England and the United States, and, perhaps, the balance of the world under an international subsurface leadership.

Third. That under such a program private ownership and private initiative must give way to a program of national socialism, very similar to that in the dictator nations.

Fourth. That under the "Conscription Act," the President can take over control of industry—and, hence, labor.

Fifth. That this Communist-inspired labor unrest is part of this program designed to force the Government to take over industry and labor—all part of the program to force on us a national socialistic economy—where the state is the supreme sovereign and every one and everything is for the state.

Sixth. That the power to withhold aid is equally as important as giving aid to other nations, in need, in forcing upon them this new economic order.

Is that the future you want for your America? Do you want the people to become the servants of the Government? Shall government in the United States reign supreme?

Or, do you want to preserve the American way of life? Do you still believe in government of, by, and for the people? Do you still want the Government, and its agents, to remain the servants of the people? If so, let the American people immediately get in touch with their Congressmen and their Senators and force them to stop right here on this trend of war and not permit a single pound of this material to be shipped in American bottoms, or a single pound of this material to be escorted or convoyed 1 foot across the Atlantic Ocean by American naval craft. Let this Congress show the American people that it does have the will to remain at peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 2, on page 2, of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAMSPECK] having assumed the Chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on April 17, after the business on the Speaker's table has been disposed of, and any other special orders fixed for that day, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a letter I received this morning from the secretary of the department of public assistance in Pennsylvania, covering the general subject of relief.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], be permitted to withdraw his special order for today and be given permission on Wednesday, April 16, to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of potential domestic rubber supply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the other unanimous-consent request is that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be permitted to extend his own remarks and include certain quotations from hearings on the bill under consideration today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address made before the National Paper and Pulp Manufacturers Association by a constituent of mine, Mr. Ralph Haywood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by President Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, delivered over the radio March 30.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief article from the Washington Star on convoys.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 15 minutes.

COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, can democracy survive?

This is the overshadowing question of this age.

There is a military threat that must be guarded against.

But deeper than that, What has destroyed democracy in the nations that have lost it? I am convinced it has been the unsolved economic problems which have produced unemployment, fear, and insecurity for the people of those nations.

FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

Can a great people solve that economic problem without loss of liberty?

If it can, then democracy is sure to win in the long run.

If it cannot, democracy is doomed.

WE MUST HAVE FAITH

It is not enough to be able to do it.

We must believe we can do it. And on our believing that depends the morale of our defense program itself.

The solution must be found in such manner as to avoid the necessity of ever-increasing governmental activity if we are to fully achieve our purpose.

THESE PROBLEMS ARE SERIOUS

We face great problems, problems that will remain even after this international struggle is over. Here are some of them.

Our people's active buying power does not keep pace with production and so there is unemployment.

Private monopoly must either be broken up or publicly controlled or it will prove the destruction of free society and the strongest force making for fascism.

But the little people—farmers, small manufacturers, and so forth—are losing their hold. Monopoly grows. It is growing now. The number of people who own small amounts of property is declining.

These things are serious.

IS THERE A WAY OUT?

And even more serious and fundamental is the fact that we still do not know how to bring a thing called a surplus together with human need of that very surplus.

Is there a way out?

A way we can take now?

A way not dependent on governmental subsidies?

A way in which every citizen can play his part. A way that offers an answer to the gigantic problem that inevitably will face us when this period of huge spending is over. There is such a way that fills all those conditions.

It is a way that offers an answer to the problem of monopoly and largely to the problem of distribution of buying power.

It is a way that has been tried by experience in whole nations and found effective. It solved very largely the eco-

nomic problem of Finland, Denmark, and Sweden and gave them a balanced workable economic life. It is said by many people to be the basic strength of China today. This way, this method conducts about one-sixth of all the business of England today.

Yet few Americans know much about it.

COOPERATIVES VERSUS DICTATORSHIP

I refer to the cooperative method, cooperative business organizations belonging to the people, organized and built by the people without governmental help or favors. And, significantly, it is the cooperative principle that is the very opposite of dictatorship.

The hope of democracy lies in our doing this: It lies in our overcoming individual power with the principle of cooperation and mutual help to one another.

I am giving to the House today a picture of the work of our American cooperatives. I think this is the answer to the question so often asked by our citizens: "What can I do to help save my country's institutions?"

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE

I am doing it now because the month of March 1941 marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of founding of the Cooperative League of America.

In March of 1916 a handful of individuals gathered in the library of the home of Dr. James P. Warbasse, an eminent surgeon in Brooklyn, N. Y., and there founded the Cooperative League. Other cooperative organizations had existed prior to that time, but I think it is fair to say that with the organization of the Cooperative League, which is the educational arm of the consumer cooperative movement, the cooperative movement found a rallying point and there began the process of growth and development.

It has been a comparatively slow growth up to the present time, but I think that the facts to which I will pay attention shortly will astound those who are not acquainted with the accomplishments of the cooperative movement in America It has been a slow growth, but a very sound one, because the cooperatives can only live and grow if they are founded on a sound educational background among the people. Cooperatives are voluntary organizations. And any organization which must be developed through educational processes must have slow growth for a time. But once firmly established, as these organizations now are, expansion can proceed without fear.

The Cooperative League, nurtured through the guidance of Dr. Warbasse in its early years, soon became a federation of local retail stores. Then the efforts were expanded into great wholesale cooperative organizations, then into regional federations. And now, these buying organizations have launched into the manufacture and production of goods for sale to their members.

HOW MUCH ARE THE CO-OPS ACCOMPLISHING?

Today there are 20 national and regional cooperative organizations with 1,115,000 families affiliated as members; and the Cooperative League has offices in Chicago, in New York, and in Washington.

Paralleling the work of the Cooperative League is the development of National Cooperatives, Inc., a Nation-wide purchasing federation set up by the various cooperative societies. Through cooperation among cooperatives, this organization has succeeded in bringing to the consumer members the great savings made through large-scale buying operations. By similar methods thousands of American farmers have materially improved their conditions. And they can do so to a much greater extent than they are doing now.

These cooperatives now own oil refineries in Kansas and in Indiana, leases on oil lands, gathering pipe lines, motor transport, paint factories, fertilizer factories, feed and seed mills, a small tractor manufacturing plant, coffee-roasting mills, baby-chick hatcheries, the fifth largest casualty-insurance company in the country, a life-insurance company, and several banks. They are now doing business which runs close to three quarters of a billion dollars each year and they are saving millions of dollars for their members, through whose hands it flows back into the stream of active consumer-buying power. There are a million farm families which are associated with farm marketing or producing cooperatives and there are several million persons who are now solving their personal loan problems through credit unions which are credit cooperatives. Nor does this include the 1,000,000 or more members of Rural Electrification Cooperatives—the cooperatives that are literally lighting up the farm homes of the whole United States.

A thousand retail cooperative grocery stores have demonstrated their ability to compete successfully with the great chain-store organizations. They have done some things far better than the chain stores in fact. For example, through establishing their testing kitchens and their standards for goods (which standards are indicated by color combinations on labels) they are bringing to consumers an assurance of quality, of honesty in distribution of goods.

But for those who think of cooperatives only in terms of grocery stores, I might add that consumer cooperatives now distribute more than one-sixth of all the farm supplies in the United States. They handled in 1939 some $448,000,000 of supplies bought by farm families.

CO-OPS VERSUS FERTILIZER TRUST

One of the most dramatic of recent stories about the cooperatives has to do with what happened in Ohio where the cooperatives met and beat the fertilizer trust. This was accomplished by a technique which is common to cooperative enterprise throughout the world. The cooperatives first started to buy and distribute fertilizer. Then they began joint purchase from a chemical company of the byproducts of other chemical processes. By 1938 the co-ops were distributing 15 percent of the commercial fertilizer in Ohio. Likewise, they did a large business in this general field in Indiana, Pennsylvania, New York, and other States.

In 1939 and 1940 the co-ops built or bought a million dollars worth of fertilizer factories in Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, New York, and Massachusetts. In Ohio alone the cooperatives invested approximately $250,000 in three fertilizer factories.

Hardly had the cooperative factories in Ohio begun operations when the trust cut its prices on fertilizer from $30 a ton to $26 a ton. At one time the trust might thus have crushed the cooperatives, but at last the cooperatives were strong enough to make this fight not only in the interest of their members but also in the interest of the public generally. The cooperatives met the price cut and entered into a competitive struggle with the fertilizer trust. A cooperative yardstick was thus established. The net result of the operations in 1940 was that farmers in general in Ohio, those who were members of the cooperatives and those who patronized the trust, bought their fertilizer last year at $4 a ton less than they would have paid for it if it had not been for the cooperatives. The net result was a saving for Ohio farmers of approximately $750,000 on fertilizer cost alone, almost three times the total investment made by the Ohio cooperatives in their fertilizer factories.

The moral in this story is obvious and the farmers of Ohio will, I am sure, show their appreciation of the tremendous service given to them by the Ohio cooperatives.

COOPERATIVES VERSUS "BIG OIL"

In the petroleum business, the cooperatives have made spectacular progress. The first retail gas and oil cooperative was established at Cottonwood, Minn., in 1921. Today, 2,000 cooperatives are handling $100,000,000 worth of petroleum products each year and the business is growing rapidly.

As the cooperative competition brought savings to the consumers and the Oil Trust began to cut its retail margins in an attempt to undermine the cooperative business, the cooperatives decided to move back into fields of production. They have built refineries in Kansas, Indiana, Saskatchewan and built pipe lines to gather oil for their refineries. They have even drilled their own wells. In northwestern Kansas, the cooperatives are now handling oil and gasoline from the oil well to the consumer.

This story of Kansas is a remarkable one. When the cooperatives decided to build a great refinery in the drought-stricken areas of western Kansas, near Phillipsburg, and thus offer the farmers an opportunity to improve their conditions, they were confronted by the menace of a State oil-production-control law. They realized that they might build their refinery and then find the State officials refusing to permit them to produce or buy oil sufficient to operate it. They conferred with the State officials who welcomed the development, the first industrial development of that kind in that part of Kansas. They were assured of an adequate supply of oil.

They built their refinery, borrowed some money from the Government cooperative banks and offered stock for sale

to persons interested. The stock certificates carried on their face the stipulation that the interest or dividends to be paid would never exceed 4 percent. Money poured into the Consumers Cooperative Association of North Kansas City, the promoters of the development. Money came in pennies and dollars from all States and from countries as far distant as Australia. The investor from Australia later visited the refinery and remarked that he felt he was standing on a most important page of history as he stood on the refinery site.

The cooperatives had been assured of a sufficient supply of crude oil to maintain the daily operations of their new refinery but hardly had their refinery been put into operation when the Oil Trust began to squeeze it. And the trust had the help of State officials who were responsible for the administration of the State oil production proration act. The cooperative refinery which needed 3,000 barrels of crude oil each day from a State where the potential production of crude oil would be many millions of barrels each day, was practically cut off. Only a few hundred barrels of oil a day were allowed the refinery. The cooperative refinery had to shut down, temporarily. But the people of Kansas rose up in their wrath and before long State officials corrected the injustice done the cooperatives and the Oil Trust, temporarily, at least, abandoned its attack on the refinery. I shall not stop here to relate other stories told me about this refinery: How the Oil Trust threatened engineers who proposed to build the refinery, how one contractor after another abandoned his efforts to get this most important contract to build this refinery, how banks were called in to threaten the credit of contractors who were interested in building the refinery, how every effort was made by the Oil Trust to sabotage the cooperative association. At some future date, when I get all the facts together, I may discuss that subject at some length. I am only referring to it here to demonstrate that now, regardless of the tremendous power of money and monopolistic control, the people are demonstrating that they have a way to freedom from monopoly control of this country, a way back to democracy and that way is the cooperative way.

CO-OPS AND INSURANCE

A year ago, I am told, the Farm Bureau Cooperative Insurance Service of Columbus, Ohio, decided that the public, the taxpayers, were paying too high a rate of insurance on school busses. The cooperative insurance company announced that it was going to offer a much lower rate, and it did so. Immediately, the other automobile-insurance companies fell into line, and the public in Ohio is now buying its school-bus insurance at 40 percent less than it formerly cost them. In 1926 this cooperative-insurance company was formed, with only $10,000 of capital. The loyal consumer-owners of the insurance company trusted their own company and supported it. At the outset the cooperative automobile-insurance company cut the rates about 40 percent as compared with rates charged by other great insurance companies. At first, big companies paid no attention to this little cooperative-insurance company. But gradually the cooperative-insurance company grew until today it is the fifth largest insurance company of its kind in the country, and its business increases at a more rapid rate than does that of any casualty-insurance company. Along with its fire- and its life-insurance associates, all joined under the Cooperative Insurance Service of Columbus, it has an annual premium income of $10,000,000. Today the other automobile-insurance companies are meeting the rates established by this cooperative-insurance company. And even those who do not buy their automobile insurance from this cooperative are enjoying a substantial saving in insurance cost.

FUNERAL SERVICES

I recently heard another story about the cooperative burial societies in Minnesota. I understand similar societies exist elsewhere. At Virginia, Minn., up on the iron range, cooperative burial societies in six counties have become members of a federation of cooperatives in that territory. They now own their mortuary at Virginia and their funeral-service association. One of my friends told me of visiting the mortuary and finding there a young man, an embalmer who had just gone to work for the cooperative mortuary. The young embalmer told of the services given, services exactly like those given by commercial funeral directors. But the cooperative service costs about 20 to 50 percent less than the services of other funeral directors, for exactly the same service. And the burial cooperatives could show at the time that, although they were saving the unfortunate survivors of the dead a tremendous sum in the first cost of funerals, the cooperatives would still have a profit of as much as 50 percent to turn back to the survivors in patronage dividends. Burial cooperatives are springing up throughout the country. It is a wonderful field of service because here, if any place, the true cooperative spirit, the spirit of absolute, unselfish service which is the mark of a cooperative association, should reign supreme.

BUYING FACTORIES BY PATRONIZING "CO-OPS"

I could go on at length to tell of the newspapers and magazines now owned by the cooperatives, of the coffee roasting plant, of the feed and seed mills, of how the Consumers Cooperative Association at Kansas City now owns a paint factory, a grease compounding plant—both of which the cooperative consumers built without actual cost to themselves and which they now own without cost to themselves. In these instances, the consumers merely built the plants, produced paint and grease and oil, sold it to themselves at the cost they would have had to pay to buy it elsewhere, and the profits paid for the plants in from 6 to 12 months.

Factories are free—

Said Howard A. Cowden, president of the Consumers Cooperative Association—

The consumer has paid for all the industrial plants in this country. He has paid for them in the prices he has paid for the goods. He has paid for them but he does not own them. Now, through the Consumers Cooperative Association, the consumer is paying for the plants but he also is owning them. As he pays, he also owns. When the consumers throughout the country wake up and insist on being masters of their own destiny, they will not only pay for plants, they also will own them.

ON THIS WE BUILD OUR HOPE

But I want to turn to something else. I have referred at length to the wonderful service given by the cooperatives, the service of supplying goods and services. But the supplying of goods and services is only a means to an end. The true purpose of cooperatives must be the purpose of contributing their bit to the establishment in this country of the kind of life which has always been hoped for by all men of good will. The true spirit of the cooperatives is expressed by the messages and tidings associated generally with the Christmas season.

The cooperatives not only believe in a better distribution of wealth in this country. They are acting to bring about a better distribution of wealth.

The cooperatives not only believe in helping themselves. They must, to be successful, believe in helping the other fellow too.

The cooperatives, to live and to be successful, must be unselfish.

The true cooperator, for example, who lives in the city and works in industry, must be interested in the success of the cooperator who lives on the farm. The true cooperator who lives on the farm must be interested in the welfare of the cooperator in the city.

Thus, you find the consumer cooperatives now asking complete freedom for their efforts to extend their services into cities, to give the benefits of cooperation to wage earners and other city dwellers as well as to farmers.

SELLING AND BUYING

The cooperative movement first began to develop great strength in this country after the World War. It really got under way as a movement to help the producers of farm commodities. It was looked on, largely, as a movement to help the farmer market his crops. And in this field cooperative marketing associations offer today the one greatest hope, perhaps, of enabling the farmer to obtain something like a fair price for his crops.

We are all consumers. The word consumer is a broad word which destroys class distinctions and distinctions also as to the place where we live and work, the farm and the city. It is the one universal economic activity and interest. Our interest as consumers is a binding, unifying interest—the kind of interest we need to bring us together as one great people.

The farm marketing cooperatives must have a market for their goods. Their large market is among city consumers. If that market is served, predominantly as it now is in many States and cities, by the big chain stores, the farm marketing cooperatives will eventually have to reckon with the power of the chain stores. In other words, the outlet for the farm goods, or the mouth of the tremendous stream of farm goods, is now

controlled by the chains in large measure. Their power controls the flow of farm goods. But there is an answer to this problem, too.

The farm marketing cooperatives in some States sensed what it was years ago and began to develop their consumer cooperatives. In other words, they turned part of their interest and their emphasis from marketing to buying and they have become the strongest of all cooperative groups with an assured future. Fortunately, I understand, other farm marketing cooperatives are also grasping the vital fact that they must so far as possible develop a free market for their goods, a market owned by the consumers themselves.

CO-OP TRACTORS

Incidentally, I should mention that in Indiana, where Mr. I. H. Hull is one of the leaders of the consumer-cooperative movement, where consumers now are operating a refinery, a baby-chick hatchery, a fertilizer mill, tremendous supply organizations, another hopeful sign has developed. Mr. Hull and his associates in the cooperative movement in Indiana have manufactured the first few farm tractors in a new cooperative tractor plant. It may seem a day far away when the cooperatives can hope to break the terrible grip the farm-machinery trust has fastened on the throat of our farm population. But may God speed that day.

CO-OPS, EDUCATION, AND A NEW KIND OF TOWN MEETING

In many States, the cooperatives are conducting thousands of study clubs where groups of people meet each week to discuss their problems. I understand in one State alone, Ohio, about 1,000 of such study clubs meet each week. That means about 12,000 families are working together, studying, discussing, to meet their problems.

Here is true democracy at work. The study clubs not only discuss their local organization problems. They discuss the difficulties of the day, local problems, national problems, problems of taxation, of education, of health services. They discuss the problems always with the understanding that as rapidly as they learn how to solve the problems, they will organize to solve them. The consumer cooperatives are promoting these study clubs, they are struggling to bring together the worker in the city and the worker on the farm and to have them sit down to discuss their problems. The consumer cooperatives are proving that understandings can be had, that good will can be developed, that the farmers and the workers in cities can sit down together and in peace. Here is the way to save democracy at home, through making democracy work.

A few years ago, before a Senate committee, Mr. Murray Lincoln, president of the Farm Bureau Cooperative Association of Ohio, reminded the Senators on the committee that during the Hoover administration, more than a billion dollars had been spent by the Government in the effort to get parity for the farmers, that during the Roosevelt administrations, more than $7,000,000,000 had been spent in this effort to get parity. Mr. Lincoln insisted he and his organization were most interestd in getting parity, that they had done everything to get parity. And in Ohio Mr. Lincoln said, the consumer cooperatives had developed business in five fields, and with these results:

Fertilizer: The farmers of Ohio were buying at 20 to 36 percent better than parity.

Automobile insurance: The farmers were buying at 46 percent better than parity.

Gasoline: The farmers were buying at 38 percent better than parity.

Feed and seed: The farmers were buying at much better than parity figures.

Credit: The farmers were getting it at better than parity.

And, Mr. Lincoln added, all the cooperatives ask for is assurance that they will not be destroyed by hostile legislative action, that barriers be not constructed to prevent their development. They are asking for no assistance from the Government. They can solve the problem of parity, Mr. Lincoln insisted, and they already have proved they can solve it as rapidly as their activities move into a field of commodities or service.

Testifying before that same Senate committee hearing, Mr. Roland Benjamin, of the Pennsylvania cooperative organizations, suggested the way in which cooperatives can, if strong enough, provide the answer to increasing governmental regulation. He said that the consumer cooperatives were endeavoring to save the Congress and the Government much of the burden now carried by Government. When asked how the cooperatives could do that, he said:

> You may always need a pure food and drug law for those who will not join cooperatives, but you will not need it for us. We learned years ago that there was nothing to be gained by fooling or cheating ourselves. We are not going to put short weights in cans to sell to ourselves, or poor food in cans to sell to ourselves. In other words, we will govern ourselves in fairness to our fellow man, and hence we will take some of the burdens off your shoulders in Congress.

I might go on. Last fall the Cooperative League of the United States of America had its twenty-fifth congress celebration in Chicago. There the same Dr. Warbasse who started the league acted as president of the congress and also still as president of the league. Dr. Warbasse spoke, and he mentioned the war. In general, he said that future historians who would study the methods by which world peace was achieved would not turn to the palace of The Hague or elsewhere; they would turn to the cooperative refinery at Phillipsburg, Kans. And why? Because the Phillipsburg refinery is selling oil and gasoline to consumer cooperatives in Scotland and elsewhere, to cooperatives there which own stock in the Phillipsburg refinery. That is the way of peace—an international exchange of goods between partners in an enterprise, full partners who engage in an entirely unselfish transaction. Cooperatives in this country are buying more and more of the wares of cooperatives abroad. It is a good sign for peace in the future.

So, as the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Cooperative League of the United States of America is marked by this month, I think it is well that we take sufficient time here to recount just a bit of the story of consumer cooperation. In these dark days we need every cause for hope in this world of suffering. And here is hope—hope for peace and understanding and good will at home and hope for peace and understanding and good will abroad, hope which can be found in the growth of the American cooperative movement and of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, the educational arm of that movement.

ALCOHOL TAX FOR NONBEVERAGE PURPOSES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1941, I introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 3383, a bill pertaining to the tax on ethyl alcohol used for nonbeverage purposes. Since that time I have received many letters making inquiry with respect thereto. It is evident also that many Members of Congress have received inquiries respecting the bill, for I have been asked to explain the measure by many Members of the House. That all Members may be informed of the purpose of the bill, thus enabling them to reply to queries of constituents, I should like to make the following statement.

H. R. 3383 proposes to amend section 2800, chapter 26, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 by establishing a new classification of nonbeverage ethyl alcohol used exclusively in the manufacture of medicinal preparations, flavoring extracts, flavors, and for other nonbeverage purposes, and fixing a rate of tax therefor. The proposal is neither complicated nor is it unusual. A similar classification and tax appeared in the law prior to the repeal of national prohibition.

Section 3105 of the Internal Revenue Code reads in part as follows:

> The Commissioner shall from time to time issue regulations * * * to place the nonbeverage alcohol industry and other industries using such alcohol as a chemical raw material or for other lawful purposes upon the highest possible plane of scientific and commercial efficiency.

It is the purpose of my bill to carry out the foregoing mandate of law, namely:

> to place the nonbeverage alcohol industry and other industries using such alcohol as a chemical raw material or for other lawful purposes upon the highest possible plane of scientific and commercial efficiency.

Those skilled in the arts and sciences have long recognized that alcohol is an indispensable chemical product. Our internal revenue laws indicate that Congress likewise recognized the importance of alcohol to industry, and made proper provision for taxation thereof. During 1940 more than 223,000,000 proof gallons of tax-free alcohol were devoted to industrial use, having first been made unfit for beverage purposes.

But if alcohol is used for beverage purposes, there is levied a tax of $3 per proof gallon, equivalent to a tax of $5.70 per wine gallon, this latter being the measure with which we are most familiar. However, beverage use of alcohol is essentially a luxury use, and the rate of tax is fixed commensurate with such luxury use. This principle—beverage or nonbeverage use, luxury or necessary use—has been recognized by Congress and the Government since enactment of the first tax on distilled spirits.

However, pure alcohol is used widely for certain medicinal, scientific, professional, and other lawful purposes, not including its use as a beverage. For instance, manufacturers of medicinal products and preparations are among the large users of ethyl alcohol, for which no satisfactory or lawful substitute exists. Manufacturers of certain food products, such as flavoring extracts, flavors, and other food products, use pure alcohol in substantial quantities. Pure alcohol so used today must pay an internal revenue tax equivalent to the tax paid on distilled spirits for beverage use, that is, $3 per proof gallon. I cannot conceive it was ever the intention of Congress to tax alcohol used for essential household and medicinal products at the same rate as alcohol in whisky or other potable spirits.

The Third Congress of the United States, in 1794, distinguished between beverage and nonbeverage uses of alcohol. And today, except in the United States, there is no other nation on earth which taxes alcohol used for essential household, medicinal, and other nonbeverage purposes at the same rate as alcohol used for beverage purposes.

Our neighbor to the north, Canada, beset with all the problems incident to war, has found it prudent and desirable to fix a rate of tax for nonbeverage alcohol equal to 21.4 percent of the rate of tax on beverage alcohol. Experience shows that a reasonable tax on nonbeverage alcohol increases its use in those products wherein it is a chemical essential. There is thus no appreciable loss of revenue, nor is the art of bootlegging encouraged. The purpose of my bill therefore is to carry out the provisions of existing law, safeguarding the public interest with respect to the necessities of life and the national revenue.

H. R. 3383 has been referred by the Committee on Ways and Means to the Treasury Department, for a report and recommendation thereon. When this report is made available to me, I should like to again impose on your time, and present a digest thereof. In the meantime, should any Member desire factual or other information with respect to H. R. 3383, I should deem it a privilege to endeavor to furnish the same.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the foregoing brief statement will in some measure assist Members and their secretaries when replying to inquiries received respecting the provisions of H. R. 3383.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. NORTON, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. D'ALESANDRO, for today, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. FORAND, for an indefinite period, on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. GRANT of Alabama, for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to provide for the printing with illustrations and binding in cloth of revised editions of the special reports on the diseases of the horse and the diseases of cattle; to the Committee on Printing.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 3, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, April 3, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1037, to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families. Open hearing.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions), relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction-reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4276. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4057. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the Freedmen's Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 145. Joint resolution authorling the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 149. Joint resolution relating to marketing quotas and loans under the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HALLECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; with amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4239. A bill to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 105. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee of conference on disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4124. A bill making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 368). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 4277. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor"; to the Committee or Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 4278. A bill to impose tax upon income derived by nonprofit organizations from dividends as a result of ownership by such organizations of substantial or practical voting control of private corporations for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland:

H. R. 4279. A bill to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Twenty-ninth Division, American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4280. A bill to codify title I of the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4281. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire by donation land, or to accept donation of the cost of acquiring same, for military or other public purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4282. A bill to repeal the act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1543); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4283. A bill to repeal the provision of law requiring recoupment by the United States of sums advanced by it for school-construction purposes to certain school districts furnishing school facilities to Indian pupils; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 4284. A bill prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 4285. A bill providing for proof of age before any board, agency, or commission of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4286. A bill to amend sections 701, 702, and 703 of title 7 of the Social Security Act amendments of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4287. A bill to amend section 80a of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 273; U. S. C. Annotated, title 12, sec. 972); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4288. A bill to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value as provided in Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; to restore full employment and production; to prevent inflation and depression; and to provide a stable currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 4289. A bill to provide that individual income-tax returns may be made without the formality of an oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES:

H. R. 4290. A bill to provide for a postal cashier at each central accounting office not having a postal cashier under existing law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 4291. A bill prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 4292. A bill to exempt certain State-owned and operated carriers and employees of carriers from the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4293 (by request). A bill to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment" (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 30), as amended, June 2, 1939 (Public, No. 109, 76th Cong.), so as to provide compensation for donors of blood for persons entitled to treatment at Government expense whether or not the donors are in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4294. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the relief of ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed needy American Indians through the utilization of surplus American agricultural and other commodities and provide for the purchase of land for landless Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4295. A bill to provide for the control and utilization of the armory for the militia of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 16 of each year to be National Youth Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to define American intentions in respect to international relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution changing the effective date of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 (Public Law No. 850, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution requesting the creation of machinery for the voluntary and patriotic cooperation of workers to prevent unnecessary strikes in defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. Res. 172. Resolution authorizing the expenses to conduct the investigation authorized by House Resolution 113; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution dated March 17, 1941, with reference to the beet-sugar industry and our good-neighbor policy with South and Central America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 10, with reference to the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a fur tanning and dyeing establishment in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4296. A bill for the relief of James F. Mellon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4297. A bill for the relief of Gussie Hart and Louis Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4298. A bill granting an increase of pension to Essie M. Pursel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4299. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 4300. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Sage; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4301. A bill granting an increase of pension to Imogen Morris Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 4302. A bill for the relief of Violette Gross; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4303. A bill for the relief of Henrietta Moritz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4304. A bill for the relief of Marie L. Silcox; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

652. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of the employees of the Aluminum Goods Manufacturing Co. of Manitowoc, Wis., calling attention to the serious situation due to the apparent shortage of aluminum ingot for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

653. By Mr. CLUETT: Resolutions of the Common Council of the City of Troy, N. Y., opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

654. Also, resolutions of the Troy Chamber of Commerce, Troy, N. Y., opposing development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

655. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Mrs. R. E. English, teacher, and other members of Kings Daughters Sabbath School Class of the United Presbyterian Church, Grove City, Pa., opposing setting of Sabbath Day as Citizenship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

656. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Emeryville (Calif.) Post, No. 1010, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Selective Service and Training Act so that ex-members of the Navy and/or the Marine Corps may be granted such equal deferment as ex-members of the United States Army are now accorded under the present bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

657. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Long Beach, Calif., urging that

Congress give immediate consideration to the rivers and harbors bill now pending because of the extreme importance of the bill to the national defense; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

658. Also, petition of the California State Board of Agriculture, requesting the Congress of the United States to make adequate provision for a continuance of the effective study of the Tolan committee in order to develop certain facts upon which a sound national program can be based; to the Committee on Rules.

659. Also, petition of the Los Angeles City Council, requesting that immediate action be taken leading to the construction by the Federal Government of the following-named projects, all of which heretofore have been submitted to the Federal Government, and which particularly affect the operation of the Lockheed Aviation Factory, the Northrup Aviation Factory, the Vultee Aviation Factory, and seriously affect communications via highways and railroads serving this area in Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

660. Also, petition of the Seventh District, Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, requesting that the California delegation in the Congress of the United States give immediate consideration to the pressing need for the construction of a veterans' hospital located in the central part of the State, because of the inadequate facilities of the hospitals located at Sawtelle, Fort Riley, and Yountville, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

661. By Mr. OSMERS: Petition of the New Jersey State Senate, opposing any change in the existing laws affecting the importation of sugar which would add additional burdens on the already overburdened consumer, and cause further unemployment in the State of New Jersey, or disrupt in any way our good-neighbor policy with South and Central America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

662. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Women's Downtown Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., to curtail any expansion of the beet-sugar industry or the tropical cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

663. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, petitioning consideration of resolution to Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

664. Also, memorial of the State of California, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to legislation to provide marine hospitalization for fishermen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

665. By Mr. VREELAND: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, adopted on March 17, 1941, urging Congress to oppose any change in the existing law that would add additional burdens on the already overburdened consumer, cause further unemployment in the State of New Jersey, or disrupt in any way our good-neighbor policy with South and Central America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, March 31, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the Everlasting, without beginning or end of days, who searchest our hearts with holy influences from Thy secret place, we beseech Thee to keep us inwardly alive, with spirits unrestrained by any cares that may infest our day. Send from above some lifting thoughts that may lead us in quiet contemplation to Thy holy hill and to Thy dwelling. Rebind us with Thy touch to those eternal verities from which we are so prone to drift; open our eyes anew, in this anointing moment of devotion, to the glory of the common life, to the crying needs of others, that we may glimpse the heaven that lies about us in that perfect life of service which is Thine.

Bear us, then, on spirit wings to that mount of vision, far above the hills of promise, where we may know the rapture of achievement discovered in the bliss and pain which love alone can bring. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Wednesday, April 2, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gerry	Overton
Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Glass	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Russell
Ball	Gurney	Sheppard
Bankhead	Hatch	Shipstead
Barbour	Hayden	Smathers
Barkley	Herring	Smith
Bilbo	Hill	Spencer
Bone	Holman	Stewart
Brooks	Hughes	Taft
Bulow	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lee	Tobey
Byrnes	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico, [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORTS OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AND REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, together with the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Library.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate Resolution 48

"Whereas the Nation faces at this time a crisis of the utmost gravity in preparing itself for defense against powerful foreign foes who threaten its freedom as a people and its prestige and position as a world power; and

"Whereas in this great effort to effect within the shortest possible time adequate and proper means of defense it is essential that unity of purpose and harmony of action and enterprise prevail among all our people, to the end that no discord and dissension shall disturb us; and

"Whereas in modern war it is imperative that our industries operate smoothly and without interruption in the production of the implements of defense, and that any such interruption imperils our safety and gives hope and comfort to the common enemy; and

"Whereas we have in training now more than 1,000,000 young men, thousands of whom have been drafted to such service, and who are dependent upon the speed of our industries for equipment and material to properly function as an army of defense; and

"Whereas there are grave tendencies on the part of certain labor groups and certain employer groups to bicker and engage in controversies, which have resulted in many strikes and which threaten many others, creating confusion in the defense industries and causing delay in production of war material to such an extent that the safety of the Nation is imperiled and to the further extent that the whole national-defense program is endangered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the State of Texas that labor controversies and strikes arising therefrom in any war industry or transportation system give aid and comfort to our enemies and wittingly or unwittingly hinder our own country in its effort to prepare itself against threatened attack; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of Texas respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation designed to substitute mediation and arbitration as a mandatory means of settling labor disputes in lieu of strikes and lockouts during the period of the present emergency, to the end that hindrance and delay in the production of the materials necessary to our defense

may be avoided, in harmony with the suggestion of Mr. Knudsen, chairman of the Committee on National Defense, and that such legislation provide for the preservation of any right which either employee or employer may assert in all controversies concerning wages, hours, or any other matters of difference; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each of the United States Senators from Texas, and to each of our 20 Congressmen."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 29

"Whereas this Nation is engaged in the mighty task of preparing for defense against the aggressor nations of the world; and

"Whereas the State of Texas produces a large percentage of the petroleum produced on the North American continent; and

"Whereas petroleum and its products are vital to the national defense; and

"Whereas the State of Texas has enacted and has in force laws providing for an orderly development, conservation, and production of its petroleum resources and such laws are reasonable and enforceable; and

"Whereas the Railroad Commission of the State of Texas, the agency charged by law with the administration of the development, conservation, and production of the petroleum resources of this State, has tendered its cooperation to all agencies engaged in perfecting our national defense; and

"Whereas no necessity exists for the control of the petroleum resources of this State by the Federal Government or any of its agencies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be petitioned not to enact any laws regarding the conservation, development, and production of the petroleum resources of the State of Texas or placing the conservation, development, and production of the petroleum resources of this State under Federal control or the control of any Federal agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, a copy to the Speaker of the House, to the President of the Senate, and a copy to each Member of the Texas delegation in Congress."

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter which I have received from the Governor of Massachusetts setting forth some of the many respects in which the St. Lawrence waterway and power project would be detrimental.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, March 31, 1941.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: The St. Lawrence Waterway and power project is again before Congress. Massachusetts has been and is in the forefront in contributing to the fullest extent to national defense. Were this project helpful in the defense program, other considerations might be subordinated. But since it cannot be completed within from 5 to 8 years, full weight can well be given to its detrimental effects upon the industrial, commercial, and maritime interests of Boston and of Massachusetts.

The groups vitally concerned in this Commonwealth have reported to me after recent exhaustive study as follows:

New England Council: The proposed development of the St. Lawrence River for power and navigation purposes is not in the interest of the economic welfare of the New England area nor in the interest of the national defense.

St. Lawrence Project Conference: New England sentiment is overwhelmingly opposed either as a necessary part of the defense program or as a national economic necessity.

Associated Industries of Massachusetts: Conditions which led to our approval 20 years ago have disappeared. Today project is uneconomical and unwise, excessive in expenditure of public moneys and labor requirements needed in national-defense program. Would be wasteful duplication of existing efficient and economical utilities.

Boston Port Authority: Detrimental to port of Boston, of national commercial usefulness in no way comparable to cost involved, and of no demonstrable value from point of view of national defense.

This country will face a major economic problem when the present defense emergency is over. We must weigh every project both in the light of its speedy contribution to the immeditae emergency and its application to the critical times further ahead. Measured by both tests, this proposal has dubious value and may be highly injurious to Massachusetts. In view of these opinions of the different groups of New England men who have studied this proposal, as Governor of the Commonwealth, I respectfuly ask your most careful consideration of this project, the culmination of which most certainly seems to be highly detrimental to the future of our State without being of tremendous advantage to the United States.

Respectfully yours,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. Res. 72. Resolution extending the time for filing reports by certain governmental agencies of a study of workmen's compensation with reference to applicability to seamen (submitted by Mr. OVERTON on February 13, 1941); without amendment.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 768. A bill to amend the Neutrality Act of 1939 to permit the transportation by American vessels of articles and materials to certain naval and air bases leased by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 167); and

S. 1123. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No 168).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 1, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 390) relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1295. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 856, sec. 6, 45 Stat. 941); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1296. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 1297. A bill to revise the method of determining the payments to be made by the United States to the several States with respect to conservation lands administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 1298. A bill for the relief of Berthel Christopher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1299. A bill to give Richard L. Byrd the right to bring suit against the United States in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. ANDREWS introduced Senate bill 1300, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. HARRISON):

S. 1301. A bill for the relief of the Canton Exchange Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1302. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to extend its provisions to wool; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1303. A bill to permit certain officers, employees, and agents of the United States to administer oaths and affirmations in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1304. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River near Nolan, Mingo County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1305. A bill for the benefit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT—GRANTS OF AID

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The purpose of this bill is to provide means by which the distribution of seeds and other materials used in the soil-conservation program may be conducted through established commercial channels. This bill will provide farmers who are participating in the agricultural-conservation program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration with credit for the purchase of seeds and other materials necessary for compliance. It will also insure the orderly marketing of the seeds through regularly established commercial channels and encourage and increase domestic production of certain seeds important in the program.

Lacking this legislative authority, great volumes of seed will have to be purchased, distributed, and sold by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in direct competition with established business channels. The bill I introduce provides, through a mere extension of credit, the means by which private industry can, without placing any burden on farmer compliers, furnish the necessary materials used in compliance with the conservation program.

Because of the lack of authority which would be granted by this legislation, in the operation of the 1940 soil-conservation program the marketing of seeds and other soil-conserving materials in the South was reduced to less than one-half through regular channels, these materials having to be distributed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1300) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making of grants of aid, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. O'MAHONEY, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) relating to the Temporary National Economic Committee, and it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT OF 1937—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (for himself, Mr. BALL, and Mr. CAPPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4146) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

BOCA DAM IN LITTLE TRUCKEE RIVER, CALIFORNIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 15) to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 35—INVESTIGATION OF CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled 'Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power,' of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 5,000 copies for the use of the House document room."

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently, from the Committee on Printing, reported the foregoing concurrent resolution without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO—RECIPROCAL TRANSIT OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT

As in executive session,

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent to report favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without reservation, Executive D, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, an agreement signed at Washington on April 1, 1941, between Mexico and the United States, to facilitate the reciprocal transit of military aircraft through the territories and territorial waters of the two countries, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 4) thereon. I ask that the agreement be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, does the Senator anticipate that the agreement will be taken up today?

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have it taken up at the earliest moment, but if the Senate is to be in session tomorrow I will not undertake to bring it up today.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I simply wish to state for the RECORD, in case I should not be here, so that my colleagues on the minority side of the aisle may know, that the Senator is entitled to say that the agreement has the complete and unanimous support of the entire committee, and in my judgment it ought to be ratified at once.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the agreement will be received, and the report will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY AT RICHMOND, VA.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day address delivered by Senator CONNALLY on March 29, 1941, at Richmond, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

AIRPLANE CRASHES—LETTER BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY HINCKLEY

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Robert H. Hinckley, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to the editor of the Chicago Tribune, on the subject of airplane crashes, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER BEFORE THE NATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, at the graduation exercises of the sixteenth session, National Police Academy, at Washington, D. C., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF STRIKES—LETTER BY E. MERRICK DODD

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the New York Herald Tribune by E. Merrick Dodd, Jr., of Harvard University, on a plan to eliminate strikes, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH—ARTICLE BY BEATRICE M. JONES

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article with reference to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, written by Beatrice M. Jones and published in the Winter Haven (Fla.) Daily Chief, which appears in the Appendix.]

POEM ON OCCASION OF DEDICATION OF NATIONAL ART GALLERY

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Washington, written on the occasion of the dedication of the National Art Gallery, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, yesterday about noon I sent the following telegram to the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins:

I feel that the Congress and the country are entitled to a full and complete explanation from you as to why you have failed to certify to the National Mediation Board the Allis-Chalmers strike. Mr. William S. Knudsen, Director of the Office of Production Management, and Secretary Frank Knox, have stated publicly that the settlement of this strike is vital to our defense program. It has been in progress for 75 days. It is holding up vital equipment. What is the reason for your delay? A prompt reply will be appreciated.

About midnight last night the Secretary of Labor certified the Allis-Chalmers strike to the Mediation Board.

This morning I received from Miss Perkins the following telegram, which I desire to read to the Senate:

There has been no delay on the part of the Secretary of Labor to certify the Allis-Chalmers case to the Defense Mediation Board.

Permit me to advise you that the Defense Mediation Board met in the Social Security Building at 11 a. m., March 25, and perfected their organization.

On March 26, Chairman of the National Defense Mediation Board C. A. Dykstra notified the Secretary of Labor that the Board had set up its office in the Social Security Building and was ready to begin its work. The Secretary of Labor was fully prepared to certify the case of Allis-Chalmers plant at 12 noon, Wednesday, March 26. We were advised at 11:30 a. m. Wednesday, March 26, that Mr. Knudsen and Secretary of Navy Knox were in conference with the employees of the Allis-Chalmers plant for the purpose of seeing what could be done in reaching settlement of strike of the Allis-Chalmers plant. At 3 p. m. Wednesday, March 26, we were advised Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox send a telegram to the management of the Allis-Chalmers plant requesting them to open their plant for operation, requesting the employees to return to work. Naturally, with another branch of the Government apparently on the verge of securing a settlement, it was not wise or practical to make reference and certification of the case at that time to the Defense Mediation Board.

On Thursday the employees advised they would meet on Saturday morning, March 29, to consider the telegram to them from Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox.

At this meeting the employees rejected the request of Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox to return to work.

The management of Allis-Chalmers Co. opened up the plant and requested their employees to return in compliance with the request of Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox. A majority of the employees refused to return on Monday, the 31st, and the result was the confusion which caused Governor Heil, of the State of Wisconsin, to advise the Allis-Chalmers management to close the plant on Wednesday, April 2, today. We are even now considering this case.

With respect to the statement made by Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, that there has been no delay in the certification of the Allis-Chalmers strike, I desire to say that I think Miss Perkins was justi-

fied in not certifying this strike between the dates of March 25 and 29, as during that period the Secretary of Labor was advised of the efforts of Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox to reopen the plant. On March 29, however, the employees met and rejected the request of Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox. It was evident then that the plant could not be reopened, and I think Miss Perkins should have certified the strike immediately when the employees rejected the request to return to work. The result was that when the company attempted to open the plant, in response to the request of Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Knox, disorder and bloodshed occurred, and the plant was again closed on Wednesday, April 2.

Had this certification been made to the National Mediation Board immediately after the meeting of the employees on Saturday morning, March 29, it is possible that the Mediation Board could have taken some steps to avoid the disorder and bloodshed that resulted in closing the plant. In any event, at least 5 days' delay resulted from not certifying this strike until midnight on April 2.

I hope Miss Perkins will, without any delay, certify all other strikes that are now in existence in defense projects to the Mediation Board for such action as the Board can take.

I desire again to express my earnest hope that the Democratic leadership of the Senate will at once present legislation to give power to the Mediation Board to enforce its decisions and remove the conflicting authority that now exists between the Labor Department and the Mediation Board. The Mediation Board should have jurisdiction over all strikes in the first instance, and not be compelled to await the pleasure of the Labor Department before action can be taken.

One of the chief values of the Mediation Board is to prevent strikes before they occur; but this Board has no power even to investigate until authorized to do so by the Labor Department.

In this time of crisis, when defense strikes constitute a serious menace to the defense of our Republic, it certainly would not be unreasonable to require, in the event of disagreement and dispute between the employers and employees working on defense projects, that such matters be submitted to fair arbitration, and that neither the employers nor the employees be permitted to take any action to interrupt defense work until the matters thus submitted to arbitration are decided; and each side then should be compelled to abide by the arbitration.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. First a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. My understanding is that the rejection of the committee amendment will restore the House provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. So that the question before the Senate is, in substance, whether or not we shall increase the parity payments from the level which was provided last year to a new level approximately $150,000,000 higher per annum, totaling, in the case of this appropriation bill, $228,000,000. In other words, the committee amendment proposes an increase in the parity payments of $100,000,000 over anything we have heretofore ever appropriated, so far as I recall, for parity payments.

My reason for opposing the amendment is that it represents an increase in nondefense expenditures, the first substantial increase proposed, an increase above the amount recommended by the President of the United States, an increase above the amount submitted by the Budget Bureau, an increase above any amount we have ever previously appropriated for this purpose.

I believe that in taking this position I am in accord with the position of the President and of the present administration, and of those responsible for administering the finances of the United States. As long ago as November 26 of last year President Roosevelt made a statement during a press conference, which I shall read from a report of the press conference taken from the New York Times:

> Nonmilitary projects were being eliminated so far as possible from the next Budget, the President stated at a press conference, because the Government expected that by spring the defense program would employ a great number of those who are now unemployed.
>
> Remarking that the Government was spending large amounts of money for defense and must economize somewhere, he made clear that he would not permit the defense program to act as a shield for carrying on domestic works projects. He was establishing a strict rule that national defense meant munitions and not other developments, such as roads.

On January 3 the President sent a Budget message to the Congress in which he again reaffirmed the general position which I have described. After setting forth the defense program, he said, with relation to nondefense expenditures:

> The increased military expenditures permit a substantial reduction in nondefense expenditures, particularly for those activities which are made less necessary by improved economic conditions.

He said further:

> For the items subject to administrative rather than legislative action, I have been able to reduce expenditures by $600,000,000, or 15 percent.
>
> * * * As I indicated in my Budget message last year, the operating costs of the regular departments are already down to the bedrock of the activities and functions ordered by the Congress. In spite of the defense pressure on many of these regular programs, expenditures will be kept below the level of the current year.

With regard to agriculture, and showing that he had particularly considered the Budget provisions which were before the committee and approved by the House, he said this:

> The increased domestic market for farm products, resulting from defense expenditure, will improve the income position of many farmers. At the same time the curtailment of foreign markets, particularly in cotton, wheat, and tobacco—

Showing that he took that factor into consideration—

> would leave large numbers of these farmers in a serious plight without the continuance of the farm programs. After weighing both of these factors, I estimate a reduction of $45,000,000 in the agricultural programs. We are definitely maintaining the principles of parity and soil conservation.

So, the President says that if we adopt the Budget he submitted without this increase of the committee "we are definitely maintaining the principles of parity and soil conservation."

The general position has been reaffirmed since that time by Secretary Morgenthau, both before the House committee and the Senate committee. He said before the House committee:

> At this time our whole economy and effort should be concentrated on national defense. One step which the Government should take is economy in Federal expenditures. I believe, therefore, that all Federal nondefense expenditures should be reexamined with a magnifying glass to make certain that no more funds are granted than are absolutely essential in the existing circumstances.

He was questioned on that subject by Mr. DOUGHTON, the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, who said:

> There is one matter that the chairman had in mind to which he did not call the Secretary's attention. It is to be found on page 5 of the Secretary's statement, under the heading, "Economy in nondefense expenditures." I congratulate the Secretary on bringing this matter so forcefully to the attention of the committee, and also I should like to make some inquiries with respect to it.

Secretary Morgenthau appeared on February 12 before the Senate committee, and reaffirmed the former statement he made. He said again, in slightly different language:

> Our whole economy and effort should be concentrated on national defense. I once again want to urge economy in Federal expenditures. I believe, therefore, that all Federal nondefense expenditures should be reexamined with a magnifying glass to make certain that no more funds are granted than are absolutely essential in the existing circumstances.

With that policy stated by the President, with that as an essential part of the whole financial program, I cannot but believe that if the pending bill is passed with an increase of $238,000,000 for nondefense expenditures, it will be vetoed by the President, and I say that Congress will be in an indefensible and unpopular position if it forces upon the President any such veto, because I believe the people of this country are in favor of economy in nondefense expenditures to every possible extent.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM PROMISED PARITY

With regard to parity payments, I have examined the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, and, while both promised a continuation of payments, neither of them promised or even suggested an increase in parity payments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not have before me the platform of the Democratic Party, but I recall definitely that the platform of my party promised

the farmers full parity, not the very modest increase provided in the pending bill. It did not say how parity was to be arrived at, but the party promised the farmer full parity, and we are seeking to use the only machinery for approaching parity. The Republican Party dwelt on the farm problem at great length, telling the farmers that the Democrats had not done half so much for them as they would do if the voters would return them to power.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will allow me, we had before our committee the Secretary of Agriculture, and he frankly stated that two of the major products of the country were in such a fix that if something were not done they were bound to suffer. The two major crops he mentioned were wheat and cotton. They are the great export commodities, and he told the committee that if something were not done disaster would befall these two great products.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio talks about defense production. I should like to know what is more permanently necessary to defense than good crops and sound agriculture. Men fight on their bellies; they do not fight with empty bellies. The wool and the cotton growers produce material out of which to make clothes for our soldiers and other things for their comfort. We have drafted many men into the Army and there are only a few farmers left. The Senator from Ohio must recognize that because of the curtailment of acreage production has been cut down to bedrock. We, the farmers, of whom I am one, were promised parity when we were making full crops. Now we are making about one-half of what we previously made, and an attempt is made to balk at parity on the half crop. If there is any element in our economy which should be taken care of, it is the man who has no guaranty of hours, no guaranty of maximum or minimum pay—the man who has to work night and day in order to furnish food for the restaurant below this room. Yet when it comes to economy some seem to say, "Put it on Rube. He cannot fight back."

I wish to God the farmers would strike and not be obliged to continue on the present basis.

Mr. TAFT. One question ought to be cleared up, and that is the question of the difference between parity and parity payments. There are many methods by which parity may be secured; incidentally, many more effective methods than by parity payments. Parity cannot possibly be secured by parity payments. To secure parity on the crops of the United States would cost the Government over $2,000,000,000 a year. As a matter of fact, the loan program and other programs are far more effective in securing parity.

The Democratic platform said this:

> We pledge ourselves:
> To make parity as well as soil-conservation payments until such time as the goal of parity income for agriculture is realized.

They did not promise to increase parity payments. They simply promised that they would continue the existing parity payments until the goal of parity was realized; but it never can be realized through parity payments. It can only be realized through other parts of the agricultural program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the English language means anything, the only construction that can be placed on the plank in the Democratic platform which the Senator from Ohio has just read, is that the Democratic Party was by that plank committed to full parity for the farmers of the United States. I further contend that the language of the platform undoubtedly means that the Democratic Party would sponsor increasing parity payments, if they were necessary, until the income of agriculture had reached parity with the income of all other groups in this country. The language says:

> We pledge ourselves to make parity as well as soil-conservation payments until such time as the goal of parity income for agriculture is realized.

Of course, if the pledge meant nothing; if it meant that parity might be reached in 1999, and we would never increase appropriations to reach it, the position of the Senator from Ohio would be correct, but those of us who went on the stump in the campaign of last year told the farmers that the Democratic platform pledged our party to full parity, and I must frankly say that I am somewhat ashamed that the amendment as proposed does not fulfill what I regard as a solemn pledge and undertaking of our party, and the covenant it made with the farmers of the country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I read again the pledge of the Democratic platform:

> To make parity as well as soil-conservation payments until such time as the goal of parity income for agriculture is realized.

That does not mean parity payments in such an amount as to realize parity, because the Democratic Party could not make such a promise.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am willing to leave the construction of that plank to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield for a minute.

I have before me the testimony of Edward A. O'Neal. At page 304 of the Senate committee hearings he testified that it would take $2,000,000,000 direct payment out of the Treasury of the United States to reach parity by the method of parity payments.

Mr. President, there are many more effective methods of reaching parity, and all the Democratic platform pledge means—and no one who reads it can believe that it means anything else—is to continue parity payments in some amount until other methods have reached the goal of parity which we desire to reach, which both parties desire to reach. There is no pledge to increase parity payments; and if there were, the committee amendment would be just as much a violation of that pledge as the action taken by the President of the United States, who surely knows what the platform says, and the action taken by the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. According to the construction placed on the language of the platform by the Senator from Ohio, if we should make an appropriation of $50 for parity payments to all the farmers of the United States, we would discharge our pledge to the farmers. I must frankly say that I disagree with that suggestion, but I am glad to have the Senator's statement of his views on record.

Mr. TAFT. No; the pledge was made to make parity payments in the same amount, just as we have been making them; that we would continue them until by some means we could reach parity for the farmers in all respects. As a matter of fact, if we are to increase payments to the farmers in an endeavor to reach parity, I maintain that parity payments are about as poor a method of doing it as any method that could be devised.

As was said here yesterday, it is just a little handout to the farmer. It is not going to make a difference in results to the farmer. It is not going to make a difference in any substantial amount. The whole payment adds something like 2 percent to the gross farm income of the American farmer, and it adds it, incidentally, in a most inequitable way as between the different States. Parity is confined, of course, to five crops. Many farmers of the United States—I should say a great majority of the farmers of the United States—get nothing from parity payments.

I have here the figures for 1939, showing the percentage of gross farm income represented by parity payments made in the Northeastern States. In the northeastern division, which includes Pennsylvania, New York, and a portion of New England, the parity payments made are one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross farm income, and some of those States are great farm States. They produce over a billion dollars a year in farm products. The total amount of farm payments they receive is less than $1,000,000. They get one-tenth of 1 percent.

On the other end of the field is Texas, which has a gross production of $646,000,000. Texas parity payments amount to 4½ percent; in other words, 45 times in percentage to farm income, what is received by the farmers in the northeastern division.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator wants to be fair, I am sure he will give the figures as to the distribution of the $235,000,000 that was provided for removal of a part of the surplus commodities, a large part of which was spent for dairy products and other commodities in the area which the Senator from Ohio seems to wish to cause to feel prejudiced by making the farmers there think they

have been discriminated against. There are two items in this bill; parity payments for the basic commodities, and $235,000,000 for the removal of surplus commodities not covered by the basic act naming the five basic agricultural commodities.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not have the figures. I read them the other day. But even after all the different forms of farm benefits are included, some States are tremendously more benefited than others in proportion to their gross farm income. The Senator can no doubt find those figures and place them in the RECORD, and I shall be glad to accept them as a fact.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer not to yield at present. I prefer first to finish my argument.

The State of Ohio receives about 1½ percent of its gross farm income in parity payments, while the State of Illinois receives 2.4 percent, and the State of Iowa receives 2.7 percent. Georgia, the State of the able Senator in charge of the bill, receives 3.7 percent, almost the highest percentage of any State in the United States.

On the other hand, the State of Florida receives only two-tenths of 1 percent, or about one-eighteenth of what is paid to Georgia under that program. The percentages are stated in the table set out on page 318 of the Senate hearings.

I wish to make one other comparison on the question of fairness. Ohio produces one-third as much corn as does the State of Iowa, and yet the corn benefits received in Ohio are approximately one-sixth of those received in the State of Iowa.

Of the $198,000,000 which was distributed in parity payments in 1940, approximately one-half, or $96,000,000, went for parity payments for cotton, $44,000,000 for corn, $56,000,000 for wheat, and $1,600,000 for rice. So it is apparent that the greater part of the parity payments, or at least half, is for the cotton farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is not correct in that statement. It does not amount to half; but according to the usual custom of exaggerating and to arouse prejudice against the amendment the Senator says that half of any appropriation which may benefit the South goes to the cotton farmers.

Mr. TAFT. Yesterday the Senator from Georgia drew a contrast between farmers and city dwellers. I quite agree that there is a disparity, and that we should pursue every kind of practical program to increase the farmers' income; but I maintain that the method of paying out cash from the Treasury of the United States to individuals because we think the economic system does not treat them right is in the long run an unsound system. Such payments are not made in the nature of relief. They go to wealthy farmers as well as to poor farmers. They go to anybody who complies with the provisions and who raises a particular kind of crop.

It is not true that the defense program is a tremendous benefit to the cities. Frankly I think a city would be better off today if it did not have a tremendous boom in connection with the defense program. For a while there is additional income, but the great bulk of my constituents in the city of Cincinnati do not benefit from that additional income. No bank clerk, no clerk in a store, or in any part of the general distributive system will receive any higher wages. Very likely such workers will be required to pay more for what they buy. We cannot draw an arbitrary line and say that everybody in the city profits from defense and everybody in the country does not. As a matter of fact, the indirect benefit probably goes both to the farmer and to the nondefense worker. The number of actual defense workers is a very limited percentage of the total number of people in the United States.

I do not believe that the facts presented show any additional need over last year, and, therefore, I see no reason for an increase in parity payments.

There is one other thing about the proposed increase, and that is that we are proposing to make the increase without proposing the levy of a single additional cent of taxes. No method is proposed in the bill by which the additional $228,000,000 is to be raised.

I think that next year we shall face a tremendous crisis. I have tried to estimate what the actual expenses of the Federal Government will be during the next 12 months, beginning on the 1st of July. The President presented a Budget which called for expenditures of about $18,000,000,000. Since then we have had supplemental estimates which total at least $5,000,000,000. We have appropriated $7,000,000,000 for aid to Britain. All of it may not be spent, but it seems to me that if we study the figures it is a conservative estimate to say that in the next 12 months we shall likely spend the vast sum of $25,000,000,000—more money than we spent in any year during the World War, and more money than we have spent in any 12-month period in the history of the United States.

Taxes are estimated to produce about $9,000,000,000. I think possibly they will produce a little more. The returns this March look promising. Possibly taxes will produce $10,000,000,000. That leaves us with a deficit of $16,000,000,000. I say that presents a menace to the safety and welfare of the people of the United States, because we cannot keep it up. If we borrow the money and create paper purchasing power out of nothing, the reaction will be that much greater after the war; and after the war we shall face the biggest depression we have ever seen in this country. It will make the depression of 1932 look like Coolidge prosperity.

Inevitably a reaction will come from artificial spending and the artificial creation of purchasing power. To the extent we can limit it by taxes, there will be less reaction. To the extent we can hold down expenditures, there will be less reaction. The only way to cure the after-the-war situation is to adopt a sound financial policy right now in dealing with our present expenditures.

There are only three things we can do. We can try to get the bonds into the hands of the real investors, so that we can draw money which cannot otherwise be spent to inflate the general economy; we can tax; or we can reduce expenditures. Congress is almost powerless to reduce defense expenditures. I hope the administration may do so. But when the administration comes to Congress with unknown problems before it, we cannot say, "You ought to ask for less money." We have to leave it to the administration. We can economize in nondefense expenditures. That is one of the steps which I believe is necessary if this country is to escape the reaction after the war.

I am all the more concerned because after the war I see the threat of a depression. I see the defense industries stopping and people thrown out of work. Where defense industries have been built up to the greatest extent there will be the worst depression. We saw it in the cities in the inflation of the 1920's. Many cities had a vast boom before the depression came. With the depression the boom collapsed, banks failed, and many cities have hardly recovered since that day. On the other hand, a city which did not have much of a boom succeeded in going through the depression with its banks solvent and its economy safe.

What will happen if we come out of this thing? Having had inflation, having had a "shot in the arm," having had artificial spending, which really acts like a drug, pressure will be brought not to stop. It will be said, "If you stop there will be a depression. Go on and spend $10,000,000,000 next year in some way." That philosophy is now largely dominating many of the economists connected with the Government. I do not know how many Senators have read the book which was published by seven young economists very largely connected with the administration. They set forth the theory that the Government debt should go on increasing indefinitely. I quote the essential part of their book, which today seems to be guiding the thinking of a good many economists in Washington and outside Washington. They say:

> The long-range public investment program should be financed chiefly through borrowing. This will, of course, mean a steadily increasing total of public debt. To many people—perhaps to most people—the prospect is terrifying.

But it is not terrifying to them. It is not terrifying to the present type of Government spenders.

> The public debt, they say, cannot continue to increase forever. The burden of taxation will eventually become intolerable. These and other apprehensions are the result in part of confusion, in part of hostility to the extension of conscious social action in the economic sphere.

Mr. Mordecai Ezekiel testified not long ago, and his testimony embraced the defense program, because it is a spending program. They like it. Everybody else regards it as a necessity, but a serious threat to the welfare of the United States; but the gentlemen who think this way are completely satisfied with it. They like it. They think that is the way to produce prosperity.

Mr. Ezekiel said:

If the Government borrows and spends the excess of savings above investment, then the buying power for goods will keep pace with the production of goods, and both can rise together until full production is reached. The correctness of this view has been partially demonstrated by the spending programs of previous years. It is now being more fully demonstrated by the defense program.

But I think perhaps the most extraordinary presentation of this viewpoint is to be found in the report of the National Resources Planning Board, which the President sent to Congress 2 weeks ago. The report has an introduction which apparently sets out the theory that we should go on spending—deficit spending—forever. The Board say:

The barrier that stands between us and the attainment of what we have looked on as the American standard of living is in part a psychological barrier. It is the notion that only through a vast national abstinence can we provide needed capital improvements or public works; that if we wish to provide these things we shall have to "tighten our belts," i. e., reduce our standard of living.

The Board say:

We have too long burdened our thinking with these false analogies drawn from a simple economy of scarcity.

Oh, no. They say we can go on borrowing indefinitely, increasing the public debt forever, in violation of every principle, of every standard that history and economics alike have laid down, in violation of the experience of every nation that has tried such a policy.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Speaking of fallacious ideas about economy, some of us who come from New England and from the older sections of the country have been taught to believe in thrift and that thrift is a virtue; but now, in contradistinction to those teachings and that standard, one of the closest advisers of the administration, a noted economist, David Cushman Coyle, advanced this theory some time ago in one of his utterances:

Saving for a rainy day and thrift are out of date. Saving for a rainy day only makes it rain all the harder.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. I suspect it is possible that Mr. Coyle may have written what I am about to read to the Senate.

This extract is from the report of the National Resources Planning Board. They say:

If we can develop the requisite ingenuity and inventiveness, if we can bring about the requisite institutional adjustments and organization of the will to do, then we can provide here and now those things to which the American people aspire, subject only to the physical limitations of time and effort.

Then they praise the defense program.

As a current and dramatic example—

They say—

the decision by the Congress and the Executive to do the things required in our defense program has set in motion a connected series of forces which will in time go far toward attaining the goal of full employment. Given our resources, equipment, techniques, and skills, only that decision—only that courageous implementation of the will-to-do—was required to release the log jam of idle plants and idle men.

At a cost to the American people of $25,000,000,000 a year, and an increase in the public debt of $15,000,000,000 during the next year, to which the National Resources Planning Board does not even refer.

Mr. President, what I am concerned about is that if we adopt a policy of deficit spending, if we do not do everything possible to hold down the spending of money we do not have, of piling up a tremendous debt, then when the war is over we shall be faced with this kind of a philosophy or theory: "Well, now, you have to prevent a depression. You have to go on borrowing money in the same amount and spending money for every conceivable purpose, and we are going to look around for objects for which to spend it." The Board sets up a vast series of public works on which money may be spent. But money may be spent on other things. We may have a plan to spend Federal money on education, to spend Federal money on all kinds of socialized medicine. We shall have every known project presented here; and unless we take a stand now, and say that we will hold deficit spending down just as far as we possibly can, I say we shall increase the debt next year $15,000,000,000, and we shall be faced with another $15,000,000,000 increase the next year.

A depression can be postponed by increasing the debt; but when the break comes we shall face a complete breakdown in the whole fiscal system, in the whole business system, in the whole political system of the United States.

There is not very much that we can do; but, in the first place, we can increase taxes. I personally believe, if my figures are correct—and they may not be; the expenditures may prove to be somewhat less—I believe that we should, as the Secretary of the Treasury recommended, raise at least 60 percent of this tremendous bill by taxes. That would mean an increase in taxation in the sum of approximately $5,000,000,000 a year; and that would mean an increase, the Treasury officials say, in every form of taxes that you or I or anybody else can think of.

The other thing we can do is to hold down to a minimum all the nondefense expenditures over which we still have control, and which the situation leaves to our decision to determine.

So, Mr. President, I do not think I am taking an unreasonable position when I say that this is not the time to increase any nondefense expenditures for any group of the population. I think it is fair to say that this is not the time to add to the parity payments, to increase them from about $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 a year—$100,000,000 more than they ever have been before. Incidentally, if we do that it means establishing them on that basis for all time to come, so far as I can see, because we never decrease any of these particular payments.

So, I believe it is reasonable to say that we ought to take that position now, since this is the first opportunity we have had to declare our policy. The same question may come up in connection with relief. I will vote against an increase in any expenditure in the nondefense field, but the question comes up first in this connection. Unless we say here and now that we will hold nondefense expenditures at least to the Budget figure recommended by the President of the United States, I think we shall be embarking on a course which we will all regret, and a course from which, in my opinion, the country will not be likely to recover.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a question?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Ohio is opposed to the increase in parity payments contained in the pending bill. In the course of his argument he said there were many other methods by which parity could be reached, but he did not describe any of them. I wonder if he is now prepared to tell us what other methods could be used which in his judgment would be better than the payment of money as provided in the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. I believe, for example, that the corn farmer has been far more benefited by the corn loan than he will be benefited by any parity payments. As a matter of fact, without the corn loan the corn farmer probably would lose 20 or 30 cents a bushel. Perhaps the Senator can tell me what the corn farmer will get in parity payments. It is only a few cents. Does the Senator from Georgia know how much the corn farmer will get in parity payments? It is my recollection that it is somewhere between 5 cents and 10 cents.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I put the figures in the RECORD. If the amendment that is pending shall be adopted, the corn farmer would receive 9 cents a bushel under the increased appropriation. With the present farm price of corn at 62.4 cents a bushel, under the $150,000,000 additional appropriation the parity payment would be 9 cents a bushel, giving the corn farmer 82.2 cents, or 86.9 percent of parity.

Mr. TAFT. My point is that the corn farmer would get about 6 cents under the House provision and 9 cents under the Senate amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he would not get 6 cents under existing law, but about 5 cents.

Mr. TAFT. My point is that without the corn program corn would probably be selling at 30 or 40 cents today. In other words, it is a more effective means of raising the price of corn and does more good in the end than parity payments.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator think, if the corn program has the effect of increasing the price the farmer gets—and I think it does—after all, it comes out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. TAFT. It does, but I do not think it comes out in the way of a direct payment of cash to individuals on the ground that they are discriminated against. If we once adopt that principle, I can find many people who are not getting a fair break under our present economic system. There are many manufactured products which are not selling at a fair

price. I think the principle of saying, "If you do not get a fair price, or what we think is a fair price, we are going to pay out of the Treasury of the United States cash to you to make up the difference," is an unsound principle that cannot be applied to everybody; and it is unfair if it is not applied to everybody.

Mr. NORRIS. Everybody is anxious if we can obtain parity for the farmer, or anybody else, that we should do it. I desire to follow a little further the illustration the Senator has given. As I understand, the way the farmer gets an increased price from loans is that loans are made on corn, perhaps in excess of the market price of the corn. If he had to sell his corn on the market, of course, he would lose in the operation.

Mr. TAFT. In the long run, the other program, I think, of having the Government directly or indirectly buy up the surplus, and take it off the market, so that the laws of supply and demand may work in a reasonable way, would be better. Then, the Government would have to dispose of that surplus, and it would cost the Government something to do that; but it seems to me it is far better to raise the price than it is to dish out individual doles to people on the basis of a system of complicated calculations.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator, after all, think it would make any great financial difference to the Government which method was pursued?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot say; I am afraid I have not studied the question sufficiently; both methods cost the Government money; but, of course, this proposes an increase over anything heretofore considered. If we put all the program together, this proposal would increase the cost, I think, by more than a hundred million dollars a year over anything the Government has ever done.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize that, and I dislike to do it, but I should like to follow any plan that was feasible and would do the work. I am wondering whether in the Senator's opinion, the other method would not, after all, result in a greater expenditure of money by the Government?

I should like to ask the Senator if there are any other methods—he said there were several—by which we could accomplish the same desirable end?

Mr. TAFT. The purchase of surplus commodities for distribution under the stamp plan. Of course, the Government now has about 10,000,000 bales of cotton, part of which it has actually purchased. That grows out of the loan, but the cotton has now been purchased.

Mr. NORRIS. That has not worked very satisfactorily, it seems to me.

Mr. TAFT. I am not defending the farm program. I think something must be done. A number of different plans have been tried, and I think a number of them are more effective than parity payments.

Mr. NORRIS. So far as I am concerned, I should like to follow an effective method and one that would involve as little expense to the Government as possible. But it does seem necessary to me, if it is within the bounds of possibility, that we ought to bring about, especially to the farmer of the five major agricultural crops, parity.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there was a time when our philosophy of government was expressed in the words of a great Democrat, Grover Cleveland, who said that it was the business of the people to support the Government instead of the Government supporting the people.

Anyone who has eyes to see with realizes that conditions have changed so that now Government must take a hand, in order that a good citizen may not be deprived of his inherent right of living on the basis of American standards. Especially is this true when the citizen, because of no fault of his own, finds himself, in spite of his willingness to work, financially broke.

This has particular application when we find that a large segment of our society, because of present-day economics, finds itself sick financially. The leaders of the Nation, therefore, seek ways and means of curing this sickness. It is not, however, the business of Government to make leaners and chiselers and grafters out its citizens. In this connection there is a situation with which I am acquainted which this bill absolutely ignores.

It was my pleasure last evening to talk with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in relation to the very amendment that is now under discussion. As I understand, the bill takes care of parity payments for corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and cotton, but leaves out of the picture the greatest farm segment of all, and that is the dairy farmer.

I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate, by using a few figures, the milk situation in Wisconsin. It is truly a tragic situation.

Wisconsin in 1939 had a total production of 11,973,000,000 pounds of milk. It received for that milk an average of $1.23 per hundred pounds, or $147,268,000. It required 2,108,000 cows to produce that milk.

The farm population in Wisconsin for 1939 was 920,000. The total cash income for the farmer was $291,802,000, or $317 per capita. But these figures do not give the correct picture, for we find that the average receipt for milk was $1.23 a hundred pounds.

About 20 percent of the farmers in Wisconsin who live near cities, within certain milkshed areas, are getting the cost of production or more out of their milk. That leaves 80 percent who were probably getting, during 1939, about 90 cents a hundred for their milk.

It takes on the average 100 pounds of milk to produce 46½ quarts. In other words, 80 percent of the farmers of Wisconsin during 1939 averaged less than 2 cents a quart for their milk.

Who is this farmer? He is the man or the son of the man who brought the farm out of a wilderness. He came, or his forbears came, from the British Isles, Germany, Scandinavia, Switzerland, and Holland. He has a natural love for the soil. In the old country, perhaps, he had no chance to own land. Here he became an owner. The land produced well. He built on a strong basis. He became a sturdy American. He loved the land because it gave him a livelihood, a chance to rear his family and give them an education, much of which, if not all of it, was impossible for him in the old country. He gladly paid his taxes, believed in schooling for everyone, perhaps became a member of the county board, and got out of debt. He loved to look at his herds as they roamed over the grassy fields. He loved to look at his other livestock, and he loved to look at the sunset, and he said it was good to be an American. Perhaps he accumulated a little savings; perhaps he drove a car; and then he wrote to his relatives in the old country, a little boastfully, about America and what it had done for him. He became in fact and in deed and in thought an American.

Then came the lean years, some of the lean years that have been pictured here so graphically by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in relation to other crops. I am not going to vote against this amendment on the theory that it does not help my Wisconsin farmers. I know the problem of the farmer, and I want to say that there is one place that will have to be strengthened in our national defense in this country, and that is the farmers of America. We must see that they get something for what they raise. I care not how we bring it about, but it is our obligation to attend to that job.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from Wisconsin takes a very broad view of this matter. I may say to him that the only hope on earth the agricultural interests of this Nation have of securing any measure of justice at the hands of the Congress is for all to stand together, whatever be the commodity that is produced within the several States of the Union.

So far as I am concerned, I have always stood shoulder to shoulder with those representing the dairy industry, the wheat industry, the pork industry, or any other industry which does not exist in my State to a very large degree. I think that with the viewpoint of the Senator from Wisconsin, if the farm interests of the country will get together, we shall be able to write a bill that will solve the farm problem. It cannot be solved through the attempts made by the Senator from Ohio to prejudice one section of the United States against another.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one moment?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to suggest that the principle announced by the Senator from Georgia might be extended so that the farmers would combine with the "reliefers" and with other groups, and the result would be the largest and most successful raid on the Treasury of the United States we have ever seen. The principle that all the groups that want to get something out of the Treasury should unite to support every measure that gives money to one group is a principle which will destroy the Government of the

United States if carried to its logical conclusion.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is not very often that I disagree with my distinguished associate from Ohio; but before I am through this afternoon I propose to show him that the man who works from sunrise to sunset, who puts in the hardest kind of labor, who sweats and grinds on the farm, and produces the milk and the cream and the cheese and the wheat and the corn, is entitled, no matter what scheme is used, to the same consideration as the workman who produces shoes in the factory and gets $6 or $7 a day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Let me conclude, please. Society has arranged one kind of economic compensation for the workmen in the shoe factory, for the mechanic, for the Member of the United States Senate; but we do not work any harder than do the farmers. We are no better than they are. They are still blood of our blood and bone of our bone, and they are Americans.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. When it comes to saying that they are in the same class with the men who loaf and lean and chisel, there I take exception. They are producing real wealth; they are producing the stuff that makes the blood and the bone of the Nation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I only wanted to say that I agree with everything the Senator said, so he does not have to go any further to convince me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I started to say that then came the lean years for the farmer we have been talking about. His standard of living was going up all the time. His children demanded more than he ever dreamed of when he left the old country. But he kept his courage up, and worked all the harder. Because the farmer could not support his brood, some of them moved into town. His savings started to go; but, Mr. President, he kept his chin up. He had his land and his cattle and his horses, and he loved every foot of the farm. He knew what the farm cost; but he came from a foreign country where he could not own land, and he loved his farm. He knew what it cost in labor and sweat, but he gloried in the fact that he was a free man, and something more—something that most of us do not appreciate: He was a freeholder. He had his toes in the soil. It meant something to him. But, Mr. President, his milk check kept getting smaller. He was selling his milk away below what it cost him to produce it.

Mr. President, Government records show that what the farmer was selling his milk for was away below the cost of production, and I have shown you that in 1939 80 percent of the farmers of my State were getting less than 2 cents a quart for their milk. I am using milk as an illustration because I am not as well acquainted with the other commodities, but I do not doubt that they may be in the same fix. Two cents a quart is all the farmer received, while on the eastern seaboard, in Boston and elsewhere, consumers are paying 18 cents a quart for their milk. What kind of a society have we arranged that gives to the man who invests and produces and works and sweats less than the cost of production, while it gives all the "cream" to the man who works 3 or 4 or 5 hours a day?

Let me continue the story. When the farmer went to town he paid just as much during these lean years for what he had to buy in the stores as he had paid during the fat years, and sometimes he paid more. He saw the men in the shops—and I mean this—he looked at the men in the shops in his adjoining town getting from 50 cents to $1 an hour, while he could not make enough to pay his taxes. For the first time, Mr. President, this land that he worshipped began to look less desirable to him. He said to himself, "If I were young, I would move into town, and I would work in the factory." But he was getting too old for that. He remained on the farm, hoping and working and praying that the tide would turn; and now for 8 years he has hoped.

Mr. President, I have seen the light and the courage and the morale go out of these men who were the salt of the earth; and you and I would react in the same way if we had the same experience. For the first time, I said, the land did not look as good to the farmer.

Mr. President, the farmer voted for the New Deal because he was told that it would do something for the farmer. Year after year he got a little pittance, ranging from probably $20 to $40, in the form of a conservation check. I think the average in Wisconsin is about $30. He did not want that. He wanted to get a fair price for the merchandise he produced. He wanted to get a fair price for the product that was making the lifeblood of this Nation.

I have already spoken on this subject in the Senate and have constantly reiterated, as you know, that the facts from the milk, and the milk itself, and the cheese are the finest foods on earth. The farmer saw—and this is the point to which I want to direct the attention of the Senator from Ohio—that society had not arranged its mechanics so that he would get a just wage. He saw the woman working in the factory and the man working there, protected by law, receiving a minimum-wage scale. He saw the carpenter and the painter and the mechanic and the lawyer and the doctor fix the prices of their wares. They stated what they would work for and what they would sell their products or their services for; but the farmer let someone else fix the price of the product he produced.

He saw that society was not thinking in terms of the farmer, because society took advantage of him. It made him sell for 90 cents a hundred the pounds of milk which cost him at least $1.80 to produce. Yet this farmer gloried in the fact that he was raising the best food in the world, gloried in the fact that he was giving strength and vitality to this great people.

Now, we have come into this critical world period, and the farmer has commenced to remember the days of old, to recall that back in 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918 prices rose; and he thought that here was an opportunity perhaps to recoup his losses, to regain title to his farm.

He heard the President talk straight to him over the radio, and praise the farmer for his patriotism and his loyalty and his nerve. Senators will remember that the President made a special appeal to the farmers of this country a week ago.

Then the farmers read in the papers that farm prices were to be kept down. He has read in the papers how a warship now costs three times what it cost at the time of the last war. He has read about the high prices paid for labor in every national-defense scheme except the real defense scheme, the basic defense plan, that is, the farm. Yet he knows he is not recognized in this picture.

If the country does not realize it, the farmer knows that without him the country could not go on. But he works from morning until night hoping there will be wisdom somewhere, that somewhere there will be men who will recognize that he is not asking for alms, that he is not asking for aid, but that he is merely asking that he be paid on a fair, equitable basis for what he produces. So he works and works and works, praying that wisdom will be found, so that not only will he be paid the cost of production, but that society will recognize its obligation to protect itself against the time when the farmer, discouraged and with broken morale, ceases to go on.

Mr. President, because 20 percent of the milk farmers are making a good thing out of their labors—and that is so—there is no reason why we should ignore the 80 percent. It appears that in Massachusetts in 1939 the milk farmers averaged $3.29 a hundred pounds, but in Wisconsin 80 percent of the farmers received 90 cents a hundred. And I want my colleagues to know that in Wisconsin we produce billions of pounds more milk than are produced in Massachusetts. The Minnesota farmer who is a dairy farmer has been hit just as hard as has the Wisconsin farmer. The farmers in Minnesota raise other crops, wheat, and other things in large quantities. Because Wisconsin runs so much to milk, 80 percent of the farmers of that State have probably been among the hardest hit. Bear in mind that the dairy industry is the greatest farm segment, by far. Cotton and corn and tobacco combined about equal it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am tremendously interested in the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator stated that farmers needed satisfactory prices for their products.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. What is the Senator's plan to bring that about?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to discuss that when I get through with the remarks I am now making. I did not rise to suggest any plan. I rose to call

attention to the fact that in carrying out the parity program the dairy farmer is forgotten, but I made the statement that this does not cause me to have less sympathy for the other farmer who is taken care of.

Mr. BAILEY. I was hoping the Senator had a plan, because if he has, it might solve all our difficulties. If he has no plan, I do not know what he is arguing.

Mr. WILEY. As I have said on the floor of the Senate many times, all the minority can do is to suggest an idea here and there and hope that someone on the Senator's side will take hold of it; and I will give him a few suggestions later on.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall be glad to take hold of it, if the Senator will give me something to take hold of, but I cannot take hold of a thing which has neither head nor tail.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps we will prove that there is an animal that has both a head and a tail.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is complaining about parity payments not going to the dairy farmer. Of course, the Senator knows, does he not, how difficult it is to reach the type and kind of base upon which parity payments can be provided for the dairy farmer?

Mr. WILEY. I cannot agree to that. Assuming my figures are correct, that 80 percent of the farmers of Wisconsin, say, in a given year have received 95 cents a hundred for milk, it would be a very simple matter to provide that the 80 percent who sell their milk in Wisconsin to creameries, cheese factories, and to powdered milk factories——

Mr. LUCAS. What percentage of the milk farmers in Wisconsin do that?

Mr. WILEY. I should say that 80 percent of them do. They are the ones who are hit.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not an expert on this question, but I think the hearings held from time to time will show that the experts in the department and on the outside have found it most difficult to ascertain and determine a proper base upon which parity payments can be made to the dairy farmers. For that reason I went along with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and other Senators interested in the dairy problem in affording an increase in the surplus-commodities program in order that the dairy farmer might obtain his proportionate share, because of the fact that he was not able to obtain his proportionate share in the matter of parity payments.

As the Senator knows, the dairy farmer is at least realizing the benefits of the appropriations which were made last year, and will realize the benefit of appropriations which will be made by the pending bill, toward taking care of surplus commodities. I think that if we compare that with the parity payments the corn farmer has received in my section of the country, it will be found that the parity payments will be pretty close to the payments the dairy farmer is to receive under the pending bill through the Surplus Commodities Corporation.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator for his ideas; but let me finish my reply. If we have 12,000,000,000 pounds of milk in Wisconsin, and if we have 80 percent of that sold to the factories, and if that 80 percent is sold at about 50 percent of what it cost to produce it, there is a basis on which society can at least do the equitable thing. It is the most simple approach to the problem that can be found.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator will at some time sell that idea to the experts in the Department. I never realized it was so simple to handle the question of parity payments as applied to the dairy farmers, and I am sure the officials in the Department would be glad to receive the benefit of the Senator's plan, because if the Senator has a plan for providing parity payments to the dairy farmers which will work satisfactorily, I will support it.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator for that assurance. If he will examine Government records he will find that in some of the States the farmers themselves are getting far above parity, on the average, for their milk, if by parity is meant the cost of production. In other States, such as my own, by reason of the fact that certain milkshed areas obtain—and I may say that Chicago, in the Senator's State, is one such area—we cannot ship milk from certain areas into Chicago. The result is that one farmer living on one side of the fence is probably getting 5 or 6 cents a quart for his milk, and the farmer living across on the other side of the fence, because he is in another area, averages 2 cents a quart.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator propose to do about that?

Mr. WILEY. I shall carry through this thought and shall be glad to give some other suggestions.

Mr. LUCAS. The statement which the Senator has just made is a very interesting one, and it certainly shows the existence of inequality. I think I know what the Senator is driving at. I think I understand the milkshed areas to which he is referring. But I wonder how the Senator is going to correct any such inequalities. I am interested in that matter also.

It is always interesting to talk about these inequalities which we know exist, but it is often difficult to offer a remedy. If the Senator has a remedy I should like to hear it. If one farmer, living on one side of a fence, receives 2 cents a quart, and another farmer living on the other side receives 5 cents a quart for his milk, I can scarcely understand how they can live there without having a local revolution. The Senator ought to offer a remedy to take care of the milk producers if such a situation exists. I think he ought to offer a remedy for such a situation, economic or otherwise, and I think he knows how the situation can be remedied.

Mr. WILEY. One remedy I have suggested in this connection was the definite elimination of the so-called State trade barriers which deny the Wisconsin dairy farmer access to a great many markets where there are higher milkshed areas. I introduced a bill last year directed toward an elimination of these trade barriers but it was opposed by the administration.

The Department of Agriculture states that 53 percent of the livestock, 27 percent of the butter, 39 percent of the eggs, 65 percent of the live poultry, and 40 percent of the fruits and vegetables are moved from farm to market by truck and consequently are seriously affected by State trade walls.

One of the ways to eventually achieve parity is to eliminate these artificial and unnecessary restrictions. Another way to materially aid the general farm economy, incidentally, is by retaining the American market for the American farmer. We have not determined our prices on our great surplus crops on the basis of American standards and American costs but in the world's market centers.

I am bringing this situation to the attention of the Senate and the country month after month, and I am glad some Senators are taking an interest in the question. Do not misunderstand me. I may have used an illustration which is not literally true, and yet it may be true. If farmers are outside a certain milk area they cannot ship milk.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Why is it that the Senator cannot sell the milk just where he wants to?

Mr. WILEY. That is a long story. Of course, under the Federal Constitution these barriers should not apply, but the question is: Why cannot I send my milk to Chicago?

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Have not the majority of those who produce milk in this country entered into agreements of a kind to take care of that very situation? Have they not entered into these marketing agreements all over the country?

Mr. WILEY. I am not sufficiently informed to say "Yes."

Mr. LUCAS. The majority of the producers of milk, including the farmers in the Senator's community, have entered into that kind of a marketing agreement.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think it operates that way, sir.

Mr. LUCAS. If it is not due to a marketing agreement or to some legislation that has been passed, what is it that keeps the Senator from selling his milk where he wants to sell it?

Mr. WILEY. Just the strong arm of regulation or law.

Mr. LUCAS. And the Senator is not for that, I take it?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Wisconsin is not discussing that subject now. Some day I shall.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Illinois was in the Chamber when I began speaking. We were talking of the matter of parity payments. I called the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the fact that the largest segment of the farm industry was the dairy industry, and it was left out of the parity picture entirely.

In my previous remarks I told about the farmer, and I pictured his situation.

I wish to repeat the thought I previously expressed. The farmer travels from his farm to the adjoining city. He sees a shoemaker employed in a factory for probably 44 hours a week at $50. He lets his mind range along the whole category of men employed. He sees the banker and the merchant doing well, and he asks "Why am I not getting along?" He realizes that he works twice as long and produces the finest food in the world, and yet he cannot get a decent living from his work. Why? Simply because society has so ordered it that the shoemaker, the mechanic, and the others shall receive a living wage. The farmer knows that if he stacks the result of his labor up against that of any of the others, compares what he produces with what they produce, he has not fallen down on his job; but when he tries to convert what he produces into dollars and seeks to buy what he needs, then he finds that society has so ordered it that he is the neglected man, if not the forgotten man.

The same farmer sees in the newspapers how we are spending—we call it lending—to countries in South America billions of dollars to put people there on their feet.

Now, Mr. President, I am trying to picture the situation of the farmer as I have seen him. I know something about what these folks are suffering, and if you and I were in their shoes we would suffer also. It is something which cannot be laughed off. As several distinguished Senators have said previously, it might be a good thing if the farmers went on a strike. If they went on a strike, perhaps they might arouse the conscience of America, not to give them aid, not to succor them, but to see that some plan is arranged whereby they can get a fair wage for what they do, for the time they put in, or fair compensation for the commodities they produce.

The farmer, as I have said, reads in the newspapers that this country is spending billions of dollars in South America to put the people there on their feet, to resurrect them economically. He reads in the newspapers that in the large cities in this country there is need for butter and cheese and milk. He reads in the newspapers that a large percentage of the young men who have been examined for the Army are defective because they have not had milk and butter and cheese in sufficient quantities and quality to give them the stamina that makes good soldiers. He reads in the newspapers that the milk for which he cannot get 2 cents a quart is being sold in the large cities in the East for as much as 18 cents a quart.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln once said that in the trial of a lawsuit he always placed himself in the other fellow's shoes in order to get the perspective of the other fellow. All I am asking is that the Senate of the United States put itself in the other fellow's shoes. We who live in this city, this boom town with its better than 200,000 employees, have an opportunity to see what is going on. We know what secretaries in Senators' offices receive. The lowest paid secretary in my office receives twice as much a year as the ordinary farmer can gross in my State. We do not see the other fellow's viewpoint often enough.

I remember a few years ago talking to a distinguished ex-Senator from my State who held a job, and I told him he had been so long holding on to Government pap that he did not know what the problems of Wisconsin were.

I say that is true throughout the country now. We are spending billions. We have strikes. We think our defense is simply a matter of guns, carriages, and ships. We feed our men in the camps according to a standard which no army in the world has ever approached. But we forget to arrange to pay the man who produces the supplies of food a fair return for what he produces.

Mr. President, the farmer reads how statesmen speak long and oratorically as to the obligation of this country to other peoples, and we vote hundreds of millions—yes, billions—for them. Sometimes, after the day's work, the farmer thinks that he is the forgotten man. He says, "Is it worth while?" He reads in the newspaper about the "hifalutin" notions of the economists who sit in easy chairs in Washington and draw big salaries from the Government. He reads about the overgrown baby, the Department of Agriculture, and how it pays out almost $1,000,000,000 a year. He wonders, "What have they done for me? I guess I am neglected. I should like a job down there for myself."

The farmer hears about carpenters and mechanics in factories making $12, $14, $16, or $18 a day. Put yourself in his position. How would you feel? You would not have mental equilibrium for a day.

Still, Mr. President, this man plods on, reading his weekly newspaper and going to church on Sunday, and gratefully acknowledging the blessings which nature showers upon him as he looks out over his fields. He loves the sunset and the sunrise; but sometimes in his prayers, in which there is included a prayer for the safety of his loved ones and his country, he humbly asks that light may strike somewhere in Washington, so that Washington will appreciate his problem and see, not that he receives charity but that the economics of the country are straightened out so that he may receive what it costs to produce his products.

I have been catechized several times by Senators. They want to know what the answer is. I do not claim to have the complete answer, Mr. President. However, as I said to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I know that about 80 percent of the milk produced in my State is sold to creameries, cheese factories, and powdered-milk factories. Every month we know what the farmers receive for so many pounds of milk. It is a simple matter. It would not require much of a set-up to see that the farmer is compensated on a proper basis. Suppose things were so arranged that he could be paid half a cent a pound for his milk if he did not obtain parity. What would be the result? I roughly estimate that under present conditions such a program would cost probably $30,000,000. Then I remember the words of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He speaks of the $30,000,000 as though it were charity. We do not call it charity when we pay a man working on an airport $16 a day. We do not call it charity when we pay $12 a day to a man working on a building. But the farmer is building the product which goes into our lifeblood and the lifeblood of our children. He is building safe, clean, healthy food, and yet we want him to work for 50 cents a day.

I am not so sure that the head of the Grange does not have an idea which might work into this picture. I give it for what it is worth. His idea is that farmers should be paid something to grow certain products. Such payments are called "incentive payments." Incentive payments could be made to farmers for growing crops which are not now grown. They could be paid to farmers for growing specialty crops needed in the national defense. They could also be paid to farmers for following certain types of agriculture which would benefit the Nation. The incentive-payment program would be designed to pay farmers for doing things, not for what they do not do. It would also be designed to assist in a program to give to agriculture a larger share of the Nation's income and to put both men and acres to work.

Let me cite an example. The Nation, in its national-defense program, needs great quantities of drying materials. This is especially true of the Army and Navy. We import perilla oil from Japan by the millions of pounds. We have some perilla growing wild in the South, but we have never tried to develop American perilla. If we should give the southern farmer an incentive payment of $5 or $10 an acre, or so much for the seed harvested, many farmers would be induced to experiment with perilla seed, instead of growing cotton or having their land lie idle. I have no doubt that we could successfully grow perilla.

To make alfalfa king in America required 100 years after George Washington. To make soybeans a standard product required almost 50 years. This came about by progressive and hard work on the part of the farmers themselves.

The incentive-payment idea is only one avenue. I think that such an idea, combined with research in our experiment stations, might turn trick for which we are looking. Certainly this administration could do a great deal more in research designed to use casein and dairy byproducts. However, in the meantime, we cannot afford to forget the farmer. We do not forget the paralytic, we do not forget the consumptive, we do not forget the blind, we do not forget the poor, but we do forget the farmer. Why? Because we are blind to his problems. We are so taken up with our own problems and so close to things here that we have no sense of our obligation to 25 percent of the people—the farmers—who make up the population of this country.

When we talk about national defense let no one tell me that we can pay $15 a day to a man making gunpowder to destroy property and life and yet cannot pay the farmer, who gives us the substance which sustains life, at least the cost of production.

What do I mean by that? If at the close of the year the average small farmer in my State could pay his taxes and insurance, paint his house, keep up his machinery, put a little fertilizer on the soil, and pay the interest on his mortgage, he would thank Almighty God for the privilege of living. Year after year I have seen the little savings of farmers dwindle. I have seen fear come into their eyes and I have seen them go to pieces. I have seen the Government take over tens of thousands of farms in the Middle West—all because there is lack of vision here.

If a poor man comes along the street with his hand out, the average citizen reaches into his pocket and gives him something. But the farmer, who provides the gasoline for the human machine, the vitamins for the human race, in order that the Nation may live, is apparently not entitled to anything. With that philosophy, I cannot agree.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 6 and 22 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 to the bill and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 324) to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 6. An act for the relief of Maude Wilcox;

S. 86. An act for the relief of Worth Gallaher;

S. 192. An act for the relief of the Johnson Flying Service, Inc.;

S. 245. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. E. Purtyman and Mrs. B. H. Russell;

S. 246. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Leyvas;

S. 247. An act for the relief of Hilda C. Allstrom;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Elmer Lindrud;

S. 283. An act for the relief of Rudolph Mundt;

S. 302. An act for the relief of Clayton W. Curtis;

S. 304. An act for the relief of the Missoula Mercantile Co.;

S. 307. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc.;

S. 417. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry H. Denhardt, deceased, of Bowling Green, Ky.;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten;

S. 430. An act for the relief of Addie Myers;

S. 431. An act for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey;

S. 433. An act to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees in respect of certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status;

S. 441. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

S. 527. An act for the relief of Ernest H. Steinberg;

S. 706. An act for the relief of Blanche W. Stout;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette;

S. 790. An act for the relief of M. Seiler & Co.;

S. 791. An act for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley, Ernest H. Tarpley, and Pearl Tarpley;

S. 933. An act for the relief of John McAlister, Inc.; and

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE, NEW HARMONY, IND.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 324) to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries, which were, on page 9, line 8, after the word "necessary", to insert "solely", and on page 10, lines 16 and 17, to strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "Federal Works Administrator."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have examined the amendments placed in the bill by the House of Representatives. I have no objection to them, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ADEQUACY OF AMERICAN FIGHTING PLANES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to discuss another subject for a few minutes; my discussion of it will be very brief. This morning's Washington Post carries an article indicating that Ruth Mitchell, a sister of the late "Billy" Mitchell, was sworn in at Belgrade, on April 2, as the first foreign woman ever to join the revolutionary, death-defying Comitaji. That is a patriotic band of Serbians who have pledged themselves to die for their country. It will be remembered that "Billy" Mitchell, the brother of this woman, was the Wisconsin man who was cashiered out of the Army because he dared speak up for the future of the airplane. Since then it has been demonstrated that everything Billy Mitchell said was true. He knew airplanes, he knew the part that airplanes would play in this war. He foresaw the importance of the airplane.

That brings me to the matter I desire to discuss now for a few minutes. It will take only a few minutes, and I hope I may have the attention of the Senate. There is no question but that now we are in the international poker game way up to our necks. We have a stack of chips in it that shows that we are not bluffing. We have taken over Italian and German ships. We are building and spending for the building of materials, munitions, ships, and equipment at a pace hitherto unknown in history. Unless the American people make their desires known to the Executive in no uncertain terms, that they do not want America to engage in convoying foreign ships, it is generally conceded that such convoying will lead us into armed conflict, with all our material, ships, and men.

Mr. President, in coming from Pittsburgh the other day I read an article by Major Williams. Who is Major Williams? Let me read what Who's Who says about him.

He was born in New York in 1896; he is a graduate of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. He enlisted as an aviator in the United States Navy in 1917, remained with the Navy as research aviator until 1930, attained the rank of lieutenant, tested planes, developed aerial acrobatics for air combat, specialized in high-speed research, formerly held the world record for maximum speed, developed improvements for standard combat planes, was a lecturer in aeronautic engineering at the University of Pittsburgh, and since 1933 has been manager of the aviation department, Gulf Oil Corporation.

Mr. President, why do I introduce this graphic picture of Major Williams? I do so because I read his article. The article brings out the significant challenge that our fighter ships are inferior because of their lack of speed. He makes the accusation that pilots who know ships are not being considered.

All of us remember what happened to our fighting ships in the last war. We did not even get them into action. This time we are to be an arsenal not only for all the world but for ourselves. In the last war England and France were the arsenal.

Mr. President, this is a serious charge by Major Williams. It goes to the question of American lives and American safety. It will be remembered that Churchill said about the R. A. F., in substance:

> Never before in history have so many owed to so few so much.

But the R. A. F. had the Spitfire and other fighter planes that made it possible for them to turn the trick over the English Channel.

Mr. President, are we permitting the same closed minds—minds that were

closed to the arguments of Billy Mitchell—to remain closed to this matter of life and death, these fighting planes, the superiority of which is vital not only to our flyers but to the future of America? I repeat what I have said before on the floor of the Senate: Beware of the closed mind, the "ruttist" mind.

I should like to call attention to some of the ideas Major Williams brought out. He says in substance that there is no question that the Spitfire and the Messerschmitt are superior to anything we have produced. If this be true, then our officials must know it. Certainly the English have reported it. We, as the appropriating body, ought to have information on that subject. Will we permit the same stubborn, closed mind that caused Billy Mitchell to be kicked out to cause our boys to be put in jeopardy if we get into the war? All of us know what condition the country was in when we started to prepare, and we know the condition the country is now in.

Major Williams brings out the idea that the air-cooled engine for the fighter plane has not developed sufficient speed. Apparently we still stick to the outmoded liquid-cooled idea for our planes.

Mr. President, it is not very far to England. Let us ask the English Government to send someone over here to tell us what is going on over there in connection with airplanes. We have sent our airships over there; let us find out.

Major Williams, who is in Who's Who, who was in the last war, who is now a major, suggests something else. He speaks plainly; he issues a challenge which should not be overlooked. Let me read it:

News is supposed to be leaking out that American single-seater fighting planes are inferior in speed, climb, and gunpower to British and German fighters. Once known and published, twice forgotten, and then it's news again.

A stiff reader question inspired this column. Let's get down to brass tacks. I'm talking now as a fighter pilot. You ask me which ship I would select if I had to go up right now—a British Spitfire, a German Messerschmitt, or an American P–40. I'd take either one of the foreign jobs—with my eyes shut.

Listen to that—

Why? Because the Spitfire and the Messerschmitt are both good for about 360 miles per hour (newer ones faster than that). They both carry more guns. Both can climb faster.

In bringing this matter before the Senate I am asking this body not to "pass the buck" but to pay attention to what is here stated. The lives of our boys are at stake.

The British and German liquid-cooled engines in those ships are far more efficient and powerful than the Allison in the P–40. The Allison is fair for about 950 horsepower. The British Rolls-Royce and the German Daimler-Benz are both good for about 1,100 horsepower. The P–40 is good for about 330 miles per hour.

The Spitfire and the Messerschmitt are safer and easier ships to fly. The P–40 is tricky, loggy, and darn nasty to land, as witness the scores of these P–40's which have been cracked up already in this country.

There is a statement by a man who is a specialist, who says that the P–40's that we are producing are not only defective as to speed but are tricky and have caused the death of our boys who are practicing in them.

To complete the picture, we have a fighter known as the Bell Airacobra. It's a new type of fighter, faster than the P–40, but years younger as a type than the Spitfire and the Messerschmitt. It has greater gun range than the foreign jobs (cannon). But still I say it is a younger and newer type and not proven as the foreign jobs. Hence I select the Spitfire or the Messerschmitt.

Mr. President, if we had something else to attend to that required the opinion of a specialist; if this were a matter of health; if it were a matter of business or economics, we would consult a specialist and listen to him. Why do we not do so in this instance? Why do we not find out about the matter? If we cannot get any action, I serve notice that I shall offer a resolution in a few days to try to ascertain what the conditions are. Listen to this. I quote:

You can fool around all you please with nonsense figures attributed to American fighters as to speed, etc., but if I had to fight today—now—in the air over Europe, I would select one of the foreign fighters. I don't think I could offset their greater speed and greater fire power with an American ship.

If Mr. Knudsen opposes scrapping the Allison engine because it would be uneconomical to break and introduce a new model, I take issue with him. More engines of the same type won't enable American pilots to outperform the foreign fighters.

We are in approximately the same relative position today as we were in 1917. Our factories were flooded with orders for foreign equipment, and we didn't have the right kind of an American aircraft engine. So we built the Liberty engine. It was the best automobile engine that ever flew an airplane. The Liberty became useful and reliable in or about 1921.

Hard-headed Americans recommended then (1917) that we build an American version of the existing and tried Hispano-Suiza or the Rolls-Royce "Eagle." But no; we hadn't developed an engine prior to the war and we didn't have the one we built until after the war was over.

Major Williams continues:

If I had my way, I would take a sample German Daimler-Benz engine, of which the British have plenty (captured) and build that engine over here without much ado. The Rolls-Royce engine won't fit our American needs of mass production. It is a fine engine but it's not modern in the production angle. Furthermore, it is an upright engine—cylinders upright and the crankcase on the bottom. Those cylinders are right where a pilot needs visibility.

The Daimler-Benz is an inverted 12-cylinder engine. It has no carburetor.

Listen to this:

No icing of carburetor. That's modern. With no orthodox carburetor, a fighter equipped with the Daimler-Benz can take off as soon as the engine is turning over. Don't try that with any carburetored engine. You'll break your neck. It's getting off in a hurry that's important.

I say it is important. We read every day that the purpose of the combatants in Europe is to surprise the other fellow on the ground. The newspapers stated yesterday that Germany claimed to have destroyed, I think it was, 8 or 10 British airplanes on the ground.

What about our American radial air-cooled engines? Best in the world. It's the only engine we have for all kinds of work. But it's not fast enough, and no ship equipped with an air-cooled radial engine has held the world's top-speed record within 20 years. Why? Because it is not suitable for super-speed racers or fighters. The air-cooled people will howl about this, but let them get out and beat the present world's speed record (469 miles per hour) and I'll withdraw my argument.

American airmen—

Mr. President, think of this: The men who fly the ships, he says—

have pleaded for the Government to sponsor and build a modern streamlined liquid-cooled engine. It's the answer for American fighters. We know it and have so told the country for years. The best liquid-cooled engine we ever had was the Curtiss 12 in 1923. We scrapped it and put all our engine eggs in one basket labeled "air cooled." And if anyone wants to argue about the part lobbying and money played in that scrapping, I'll answer that one, too.

That is a pretty serious challenge. "If anyone wants to argue about the part lobbying and money played in that scrapping, I will answer that one, too," he says.

We had better find out whether our country is being "taken for a ride." We were talking about the farmers a little while ago, and it is too bad that some of the profiteers cannot share a little of what they get with the farmer.

The writer concludes his article with this remark:

It's too late to build a brand new, liquid-cooled, speed engine in this country now. We can build proven foreign speed engines. And no American fighter plane pilot cares a hoot where the engine originated, provided it gives him the speed and performance he hasn't got now.

Mr. President, I am praying and hoping that we will not get into this World War, but I cannot close my eyes to the fact that we are at the present time considerably in it; we are a partner with Britain in many ways. America has changed her course from isolation to intervention, and is not simply meddling but has become an active participant in European affairs, diplomatically and economically, and has taken sides in this conflict by opening up her shipyards for Britain, furnishing Britain equipment, airplanes, and ships; and now the Government has seized the ships of the Axis Powers in our ports; it has thrown neutrality out the window and is now contemplating convoying British ships. Having this condition in mind, recognizing the realities of the situation, I want to know if what Major Williams says is true.

Mr. President, I am speaking for the pilots of America who will be fighting your battle and mine, if we become involved in war. Are we building inferior fighting planes? He says we are. If our men are to do any fighting, they are entitled to the best ships America can produce not only for themselves but for the land they will defend.

Mr. President, I close with this thought: The grafter and the chiseler, the man who is making money out of this period had better look out, and if there are those in authority who are falling down and are failing to meet the challenge now presented in relation to fighting airplanes, they had better look

out. We do not want any more gold-braid artists in the Navy and the Army who have their eyes closed. This is a time for men of vision, and when we pay large salaries and when we enlist the services of men to prepare the defense of America we expect results; we do not want another fiasco such as occurred in the World War.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment as modified with respect to parity prices.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire very briefly to state my position with respect to the pending amendment, which, if adopted, will more than double the parity payments for certain agricultural products. The time has come, I think, Mr. President, to consider where we are going. In 1941 agriculture will receive, without the increase provided in the pending bill, the sum of $1,036,958,000, included in the agricultural bill. This, compared to $58,000,000 for agricultural purposes received from the Federal Government in 1933, is an increase of almost 20 times.

Mr. President, there is no Member of the Senate more desirous of promoting the true interests of agriculture than is the Senator from Virginia. Throughout a rather long political career as State senator, as Governor of my State, and as United States Senator, I have done everything in my power to promote the interests of the farmers of my State and of the Nation; but I do not believe, Mr. President, it is either to the interest of the farmers or to the interest of the people of America to make large increases in nondefense spending at this time when great financial strain and responsibility rest upon this country because of colossal disbursements for defense and other obligations which the Nation has undertaken.

I, of course, think that, in view of the enlarged Budget as compared to 1933, agriculture is entitled to an increased appropriation, but I do not believe, considering the conditions which confront us, that now is the time to make an increase in nondefense spending.

I wish further to say, Mr. President, that I have always favored the soil-conservation program, because I believe that program is soundly founded; I believe it is based upon good common sense, that it is constructive, and results in benefit to agriculture.

The pending appropriation bill, if enacted in its present form, will add approximately $444,000,000 to the Budget estimates. That amount will be above the estimates carried in the President's Budget for cash expenditures for the year 1942 if this bill shall be passed in its present form. If this bill is enacted in its present form, the spending for nondefense purposes will be increased—assuming that other items in the Budget are not increased—by an amount of $500,000,000 for the year 1942 as compared to the year 1941; and this nondefense spending will exceed the nondefense spending for any year in the history of this country except when the soldiers' bonus was paid.

After allowing for the normal cost of the operations of the Army and Navy, and eliminating what may be termed emergency defense spending, the nondefense expenditures for 1942, in the event this bill is passed, will reach $8,500,000,000, which is $300,000,000 in excess of the Treasury's estimate of the revenue. That is to say, every single dollar of our gigantic and colossal expenditures for national defense and aid to Great Britain will be added to the public debt.

We shall soon have in prospect, Mr. President, a public debt of $100,000,000,000. The debt is now approaching $50,000,000,000, and we have appropriated and authorized for defense the sum of $40,000,000,000, all of which must be financed by additional borrowings. Other appropriations for defense and for aid to England will follow; so we may look forward in the near future, in view of appropriations already made, to a minimum Federal debt of $100,000,000,000, with the prospect and the strong probability that the Federal debt will greatly exceed that figure before deficit financing is stopped.

Some may not view with alarm a debt of $100,000,000,000. Some may think that those of us who call attention to it are doing a useless thing at this time. But, after all, Mr. President, $100,000,000,000 is the value of all the property in 20 average States of the Union. The average value of our States, including the actual value of all the property in them, is $5,000,000,000; so this debt is the value of 20 average States. It is three times the actual value of all farm lands, including farm equipment and farm buildings. The interest on this debt at the present rate will be two and a half billion dollars, and this interest alone will be nearly three times as much as the total cost of Government was in 1915.

Before the World War we owed $1,000,000,000. In this day of crisis I think, as a matter of patriotism and public sacrifice we must refrain from asking from the Public Treasury additional amounts for nondefense spending. Where will it end? There are only three ways: First, repudiation; second, uncontrolled inflation; third, to pay the debt and the interest—pay it by the sweat and toil of the American people out of taxes exacted by the Government.

I think the farmers of this country are more interested in a solvent and stable Government than are the members of almost any other class of our citizens. I do not believe that a majority of the farmers of America are willing to ask their Government at this time of great peril, at this time of colossal expenditures for defense, for great increases in the payments they are now receiving. To do so will serve as an invitation to other branches of the Government to make similar demands in excess of the Budget estimates.

Mr. President, this increase in parity payments is not approved by the Budget Bureau. It is not approved by the President of the United States. It is not approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and was not included in the estimates which were submitted to Congress by the Chief Executive. It will, as I have stated, mean an additional cash expenditure of $444,000,000 in the year 1942 above the Budget estimates.

Mr. President, we must not overlook the fact that agriculture will greatly benefit by the appropriations in the lease-lend bill. There is $8,300,000,000 of available appropriations under the Lease-Lend Act; and agricultural products have been declared among the commodities that may be purchased under that act. Agriculture will likewise benefit by the increased purchasing power of the people of America occasioned by the vast sums which are now being spent for defense. Therefore, to defeat this Senate committee amendment, Mr. President, simply means that the amount for parity payments will still be carried in the bill as passed by the House, the same amount that was approved by the Congress last year.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall cast my vote against the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment for parity funds has been fully discussed; and I doubt that anything said on the floor of the Senate at this time will affect the action of the Senate. There are one or two tables which shed considerable light on this subject which I think should appear in the RECORD, not only to explain the reasons which actuated the committee in recommending these increases, but also for the benefit and information of those in other divisions of the Government who may pass upon this question.

Last year, when the then Secretary of Agriculture, now the Vice President of the United States, came before the Appropriations Committee, he brought with him two Sears, Roebuck catalogs. One was for the year 1913, in the parity period. The other was for the year 1940. By breaking down the prices of various necessities of life that appeared in those catalogs in terms of the number of pounds or bushels of the commodity that the farmer produces, it was easy for even a wayfaring man to see the discrimination which has been practiced against the farmer in the tremendous increase of the cost of manufactured products as compared with the price the farmer receives in the market place for the things he has to sell. This was the simplest explanation of parity and the disadvantages under which the farmer is laboring, as compared with other groups, I have ever seen.

Last year I included in the RECORD a copy of that table. This year we have brought the table down to date. Time will not permit me to go through all the various commodities required to be exchanged for the various articles that it is necessary for the farmer to purchase; but a study of this table will show that their purchase requires more bushels of wheat and more pounds of cotton in 1941, after this defense program—which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] says should solve the farm problem—has been under way for a year, than it did in January of 1940.

I will take up just one or two of these items, and then I shall ask to have the table inserted in the RECORD.

INJUSTICE TO THE FARMER

Take the case of a man's pair of overalls—and even a farmer has to have overalls, unless he is to be arrested for public indecency. In 1913 a pair of overalls, when translated into bushels of wheat, could have been obtained for nine-tenths of a bushel of wheat. In 1940, last year, it required 1.2 bushels of wheat to get the same pair of overalls; but in January of 1941 the wheat farmer was required to pay 1.4 bushels of wheat to get the same pair of overalls for the product of his toil.

Now let us consider a pair of women's shoes; and even any foe of this amendment will admit the farmer's wife is entitled to have a pair of shoes occasionally. In 1913, in the parity period, 15 pounds of cotton could have been exchanged by the farmer for a pair of shoes for his wife. In January of last year it required 28 pounds of cotton to obtain the same pair of shoes. In January of this good year the cotton farmer was compelled to exchange 29.6 pounds of cotton to get a pair of shoes for his wife. And bear in mind the cotton farmer has reduced his acreage about 15,000,000 acres since the parity period.

Mr. President, that brings this whole question of parity down to such simple terms that any person on earth who has the slightest desire to do so should be able to see the position in which the wheat farmers and the cotton farmers of this country are placed when they take their crops to the market place to exchange for the bare necessities of life.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator recognize that he is using an unfair illustration when he compares cotton and shoes? According to the Secretary of Labor, the people in the South do not wear shoes. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. I have commented on that observation heretofore, and I will not do so at this time.

I hope that Members of the Senate who desire to deal fairly with every part of the United States and every segment of our population will tomorrow get this table relating, as it does, to cotton, corn, wheat, wool, and beef, and see how in the case of corn and in the case of wheat and in the case of cotton the producers of those commodities today have to exchange from about 25 to 100 percent more for the bare necessities of life than was the case in 1913, in the parity period.

I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm products equivalent in value to specified commodities, Jan. 15, 1913, 1940, and 1941

Commodities	Unit	Farm products																	
		Pounds of cotton			Pounds of wool			Pounds of beef			Pounds of hogs			Bushels of wheat			Bushels of corn		
		1913	1940	1941	1913	1940	1941	1913	1940	1941	1913	1940	1941	1913	1940	1941	1913	1940	1941
Work shirts	Each	4.7	7.2	7.4	3.1	2.6	2.1	10.6	10.5	8.3	8.4	14.0	9.6	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.2
Overalls	Pair	5.8	10.1	10.5	3.8	3.6	3.2	13.0	14.7	11.8	10.3	19.7	13.7	.9	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.9	1.8
Men's suits	Each	102.0	179.0	193.1	66.0	64.0	58.3	228.0	262.0	217.5	181.0	348.0	251.4	15.8	21.4	25.0	25.0	34.0	2.6
Women's shoes	Pair	15.0	28.0	29.6	9.9	10.0	8.9	34.0	41.0	33.4	27.0	54.0	38.6	2.4	3.3	3.8	3.7	5.3	5.0
Common nails, 8d	100 pounds	17.0	36.0	33.9	11.3	13.0	10.2	39.0	52.6	38.1	31.0	70.5	44.1	2.7	4.3	4.4	4.2	6.9	5.7
Axes, single bit 4-pound head	Each	7.9	18.7	18.9	5.2	6.7	5.7	18.0	27.0	21.3	14.0	36.5	24.7	1.2	2.2	2.5	1.9	3.6	3.2
Hand saws, 26 inch	Each	9.6	20.5	22.2	6.2	7.4	6.7	22.0	30.0	25.0	17.0	40.0	28.8	1.5	2.-	2.9	2.3	3.9	3.7
Drag harrow 60 teeth	Each	83.0	196.0	209.0	54.0	70.0	63.1	186.0	286.0	235.4	148.0	380.0	272.0	12.9	23.4	27.1	20.0	37.0	35.3
Corn planter checkrow	Each	258.0	353.0	767.2	168.0	235.0	221.6	579.0	956.0	864.1	460.0	1,268.0	998.6	40.0	78.0	99.3	63.0	124.0	129.5

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be observed that while the producers of the export crops are at a greater disparity than a year ago, the producers of those crops consumed domestically are much better off, and some commodities, especially wool and beef, are above parity and stronger than in 1913. This strengthens the contention that unless something is done for the farmers producing those export commodities they will suffer great hardship this year.

Mr. President, the argument has been made that the increasing consumption due to defense efforts would help the farmer, that people in the defense plants, whose wages are rapidly increasing—and I think that is not disputed—will buy more products of the farmer's toil, and, therefore, cause the prices of the farmer to rise.

THE FARMER GETS ONLY CRUMBS

I have in my hand a very interesting table, which shows what the farmer receives for the finished product which the defense worker buys. For example, let us take a loaf of whole-wheat bread. In January 1941, while everything else was going up, that loaf of bread was cheaper than it was in January 1940, bearing out the statement I made yesterday that the farm income in February 1941 was much lower than the farm income in February 1940.

The average price of that loaf of whole-wheat bread in January 1940 was 9.3 cents, and in January 1941 it had fallen to 9.1 cents a loaf. What is the farmer's part of it? In 1940 he received as his share 1.3 cents, though he had produced all the wheat that had gone into the loaf of bread. In January 1941 he received only 1.1 cents for the wheat which went into that loaf of bread, a reduction of one-fifth of a cent in the meager part the farmer shares in the total price of the loaf of bread.

Now, let us take a package of cigarettes. The retail price is 12.8 cents, the same this year that it was in 1940, and the farmer gets 1½ cents for the tobacco which goes into that package of cigarettes.

In the case of a cotton shirt or dress, the retail price is the same in 1941 that it was in 1940, but the farmer, who received 7.6 cents for the cotton in that $1 dress in January 1940, receives only 7 cents for the cotton that goes into the dress in 1941. Yet we are told by those opposing the pending amendment that the defense spending is going to take care of this situation. It just will not do it in the case of products formerly exported and of which we have great surpluses.

I ask to have this table printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farmer's share of consumer's dollar

Retail item	Unit	Retail price		Farmer's share		Percent farmer's share of retail price	
		January 1941	January 1940	January 1941	January 1940	January 1941	January 1940
		Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*		
White bread	1-pound loaf	7.7	7.9	1.2	1.4	16	18
Whole-wheat bread	1-pound loaf	9.1	9.3	1.1	1.3	12	14
Corn flakes	8-ounce package	7.1	7.0	1.3	1.2	18	17
Cotton shirt, dress	Each	100.0	100.0	7.0	7.6	7	7.6
Cigarettes [1]	Package of 20	12.8	12.8	1.5	1.5	12	12

[1] 1934 data used from special study by Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I might add a little item to what has been stated by the Senator. It takes now about 5 quarts of milk to make 1 pound of Cheddar cheese. In 1939 for the milk which went into a pound of Cheddar cheese the farmer received between 9 and 10 cents.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

THE FARMER ESSENTIAL IN DEFENDING THE NATION

Mr. President, it has been said here that we must curtail everything that is a nondefense item of expenditure. If there is any absolute essential in carrying on any war or any theory of defense it is food to eat and fiber to wear, and the lack of food and fiber has determined the result of more wars than all implements of death fashioned by the hand of man from the time the first club was carved or the first slingshot was made down to the tanks and airplanes of today. Food and fiber are absolute essentials. Go back to the tragic fratricidal strife of the sixties, when the Southern States were at war against the other States of the Union. That war might have lasted to this hour if Sheridan had not made the Shenandoah Valley uninhabitable and Sherman had not absolutely destroyed the great granary of the Confederacy—my own State of Georgia—by ravaging it with fire and sword. Hunger and rags defeated the South, not the immensely superior numbers and equipment arrayed against her.

During the World War, Germany, though ringed about with enemies, resisted them all for 4 years, until all of the food and the fiber were gone, and then Germany collapsed.

These modern implements for which we are spending huge sums are important, but the Greeks have shown that they are not absolutely essential to defense. Take food and fiber away from the Greeks and they would have to capitulate to the Italians tomorrow, though they have not lost a battle.

I make the prediction that when the present war comes to a conclusion it will not be brought to an end solely on account of the billions of dollars worth of airplanes and tanks we are manufacturing to send across the seas, but the war will end when Germany has a crop failure, or Russia cuts off their source of supply, and when either of those things happens, or both of them happen, the German people will get rid of Hitler much faster than they got rid of Kaiser Wilhelm in 1918, when they collapsed, hungry and naked. If there is any one thing which should be clear to any student of history, or any man so ignorant he could not read a history but has some common sense, it is the fact that food and fiber are absolute necessities in any defense program, to wage any war, or to aid any country that is engaged in war.

This amendment seeks to provide funds to keep in business the men who are able to furnish this country and those we would aid, with these absolute necessities.

Mr. President, I was much impressed by the solicitude of the Senator from Ohio for the President of the United States. He said that the Senate should defeat the pending amendment because it might compel the President of the United States to veto the bill. I stated yesterday that I did not know the views of the President of the United States on this matter, but I venture to assert that the President would not veto this bill if it carried twice as much money in it as it does for parity payment appropriations. When it is placed on his desk the situation in the farm homes of this country will be brought to his attention at the same time. I believe he would go much further than the Congress has shown a disposition to go when he studies the farm picture in detail.

I ask that the clerk read a statement, to me a very striking statement, from one of the President's most notable addresses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

> I would ask no one to defend a democracy which in turn would not defend everyone in the Nation against want and privation. The strength of this Nation shall not be diluted by the failure of the Government to protect the economic well-being of its citizens.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if this effort to protect the economic well-being of the farmers of this country is not in absolute accord with the expressed views of the President of the United States as stated by him last December, then I am unable to understand what that statement means.

There has been opposition, not only on the floor of the Senate, but in the press of the country, to this amendment. I have noticed in particular each year, when the Senate has been considering parity appropriations, that some of the great metropolitan press in the great cities of this country denounce efforts to obtain this small measure of justice for the farmers, particularly in New York, where, as I showed yesterday, the average wage scale is $1.80 an hour for skilled labor—and I do not begrudge a cent of it.

I have in my hand an editorial appearing in the New York Times of Monday in which they castigate the committee for recommending these suggested increases in appropriations. The editorial is headed "Nondefense extravagance" and employs very much the same argument as that used by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Virginia in opposing this amendment.

This article, however, does go further and say:

> Washington cannot hope to teach the Nation to make the sacrifices that are now necessary if it fails in its own actions to take the leadership.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator have any available statistics showing the number of hours the farmer works per day and what he receives per day?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not have such statistics with respect to all the commodities. I did go into that question with respect to cotton at one time, and I found it had been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that it required approximately 1 hour's toil to produce 1 pound of cotton, and at that time cotton was bringing 9½ cents a pound.

Mr. SMITH. I think such statistics would be instructive to those who have sense enough and patriotism enough to look at a thing without being governed by their localities and their bosses. I should like to have some real figures showing the number of hours the farmer works and what average pay he receives per hour. I have just returned from the Senate restaurant, and I saw some evidence of the farmer's production that helped me considerably, and I think it is helping others here.

What does the farmer receive per hour for his work and how many hours per day does he work? We ought to have figures on that. We also should have a comparison between the hours the farmer works and the amount he receives per hour, so we can make comparison with those in the cities who are working 40 hours a week and who are protected by the minimum-wage law. I should like to have those figures so a comparison can be made. I shall try to get them.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry, but I do not have them with respect to all the various agricultural commodities.

The editorial to which I referred, Mr. President, says that this is the hour of sacrifice, of national sacrifice, and that therefore this amendment in behalf of the farmer should be voted down in the name of the national sacrifice. It is said the funds carried in the amendment are not needed. But I happened to look in the Sunday magazine section of the same newspaper, the New York Times, and I saw an article written by a man who is evidently paid to write for the newspaper on agricultural subjects because they think he is an expert. He writes:

> None of the basic problems of agriculture will be solved by the stimulus war buying may give to the farmers' market and some thoughtful observers are apprehensive lest the war create new economic dislocations that will bring distress to producers of food and fiber.
>
> Surpluses are the chief problem of the American farmer. Surpluses keep down prices. When he sells his product at depressed price levels and buys the things he needs to buy at high-price levels, agriculture becomes groggy.

Mr. President, I might state that any other segment of national life would become groggy if it had to sell its products at depressed price levels and buy at high-price levels. This includes the New York Times.

> It (agriculture) has been groggy ever since the great depression, and the Federal Government has been prescribing a strong restorative compounded of crop loans and marketing quotas.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Whether due to overproduction or underconsumption, the fact remains—

This is written by a man the New York Times is paying to write for it as an agricultural expert—

> the fact remains that for more than a decade the farmer has not been able to find a market for his product at prices that covered the cost of production.

Yet I turn over to the editorial page and find an editorial which says that the farmer is so well off that we need not help him at all. Is it the view of this editorial writer that the farmer should be happy

to sell his products at less than it costs to produce them? I shall not read all this article, though it is tremendously interesting. It goes on to show how the war in Europe has intensified some of the adverse aspects of the farm situation.

[From the New York Times of March 31, 1941]

NONDEFENSE EXTRAVAGANCE

The Senate Appropriations Committee is advocating a farm bill that will cost $1,340,000,000. This is $450,000,000 higher than the House bill, $445,000,000 higher than the President's Budget recommendations and $304,000,000 higher than last year's appropriations. And the Senate committee has done this at the very time that the annual report of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration shows that farm buying power in the year 1939–40 was 72 percent above the level of 1932 and equal to that of 1929.

This tremendous and inexcusable farm subsidy—the largest in history is being pushed through the Senate at a time when, because of the terrific and unavoidable burden of defense, it is of the utmost urgency that nondefense expenditures be cut to the bone. It is being pushed through at a time when the President has repeatedly called for sacrifices from "every one of us." But the "national will to sacrifice" for which he has called has still to reach the appropriation committees of Congress. Our lawmakers and Government officials who are offering such fine precepts on this point are setting wretched examples. They are afraid to affront a single important pressure group. The members of these groups, so far from being among the "every one of us" who is to make sacrifices, are to get unprecedented subsidies from the Public Treasury.

Washington cannot hope to teach the Nation to make the sacrifices that are now necessary if it fails in its own actions to take the leadership.

Mr. President, I ask to have this editorial and extracts from this article printed side by side in parallel columns at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[From the New York Times of March 30, 1941]

OUR BASIC FARM PROBLEMS UNCHANGED BY WAR SPENDING—AMOUNT ESTIMATED FOR BUYING OF FOODS IS LOW AND SURPLUSES ARE STILL A BIG FACTOR

(By Luther A. Huston)

None of the basic problems of agriculture will be solved by the stimulus war buying may give to the farmers' market and some thoughtful observers are apprehensive lest the war create new economic dislocations that will bring distress to producers of food and fiber.

Surpluses are the chief problem of the American farmer. Surpluses keep down prices. When he sells his product at depressed-price levels and buys the things he needs to buy at high-price levels, agriculture becomes groggy.

It has been groggy ever since the great depression and the Federal Government has been prescribing a strong restorative compounded of crop loans and marketing quotas. Some argue that the cure has caused fresh ills, while others have professed to see signs that agriculture was coming back.

WAR A CONFUSING FACTOR

Whether due to over-production or underconsumption, the fact remains that for more than a decade the farmer has not been able to find a market for his product at prices that covered the cost of production. Curtailed consumption due to a subnormal national income, faulty distribution and other causes have reduced the farmer's income from domestic sales. A shrinking export market lopped off other dollars from his income. Debts and interest, mounting taxes, plant depreciation, and high-replacement costs were other factors in a situation that sent farmers clamoring for relief.

The war in Europe has intensified some of the adverse features of the situation but it promises a measure of alleviation for others.

The general outlook for the American farmer, in the light of the war situation, would appear to be about as follows:

His aggregate income probably will be increased by purchases of food commodities for the countries we have pledged ourselves to aid as a tenet of our national-defense policy, and by the market expansion that will result from our own defense program.

Producers of basic crops, however, will get no share or only a limited share of the increased income that will result from the war situation, particularly in the matter of export markets for crop surpluses.

Now the export market has virtually disappeared. Hitler has swallowed up countries that used to be customers for our wheat. Italy is not in the market any more. Britain finds it more advantageous to spend her money here for guns and get her wheat from Canada, which has a surplus large enough to supply all the world demands.

For every 3 bushels of wheat now for sale the world offers a market for only 1. War in Europe has tightened rather than loosened this situation, and the American wheat grower finds no answer to his problems in the war markets.

What is true of wheat is true also of cotton and rice and tobacco, in greater or less degree. Thus four of the basic products of American agriculture find no boon in wartime conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio, in his apparent effort to prejudice this question, has sought to prove that certain States and certain commodities receive all these parity payments. Everyone who knows anything about the farm program knows it has been a two-pronged program. The parity payment goes to certain basic products. The section 32 fund goes to take care of surpluses of other commodities. The Senator from Ohio in making the argument about the distribution of the parity funds did not even refer to the $235,000,000 that was appropriated to take care of all the other surplus commodities that might so accumulate as to have a depressing price effect. He will not be able to array the producer of one commodity against the producer of another or the farmers of one section against those of another. The farmers know too much about this bill to be deceived.

Mr. President, I cannot be impressed with the idea that this is the hour of sacrifice for the American farmer alone. This thing of national sacrifice has been discussed merely objectively, and in the abstract, until the agricultural appropriation bill was reached. When we had up the question here of drafting industry if it did not cooperate in the defense program, the Senator from Ohio voted against that amendment, implying that it was no time for any sacrifice on the part of industry, and that it was his desire that the Government should have no control whatever over industry that might not cooperate in the program. The New York Times denounced me and the draft industry amendment in several editorials without in anywise referring to need for national sacrifice.

When we had before us here the question of repealing the law which limited profits on defense manufactures, on tanks and ships, to 8 percent, and the proposal to repeal the measure that limited the profits on the manufacture of airplanes to 12 percent, I do not recall that there was any great discussion on the Senate floor that this was an hour of sacrifice, and that we should limit the profits of industry to 8 percent or to any other percent. Neither the New York Times or the Senator from Ohio found in that situation any occasion for sacrifice on the part of capital and industry.

The entire limitation on profits was repealed, and I think my voice, and that of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], and perhaps that of one other Senator, were the only voices that were raised against that repeal when it was pending on the floor of the Senate.

It is when we come down to the agricultural appropriation bill that we hear that this is the time of sacrifice, and the "Committee on National Sacrifices," going out to find the lamb to lead to the altar, have got the old-time lamb, that has been put on the altar and sacrificed over and over again—the American farmer—and who would be extinct today if he did not have more lives than are generally attributed to a cat.

When this "committee on sacrifices" went out, its members did not stop in front of the marble portals of capital and industry. I showed yesterday that the profits of industry and the dividends that were distributed in 1940 were greater than they had been since 1929. The members tip-toed past the solid temple of labor, where higher wages are being paid than labor ever received before in the history of this country.

They walked down the road and out in the hinterlands until they came to the humblest, poorest habitation in the whole land. They stopped there in front of this house with holes in its screens, if in truth the house had any screens on it at all. There was this house, with the windowpanes out and with pieces of cardboard in place of the windowpanes to keep out the winter wind. They stopped before this house, a house with holes in the roof and with its porch sagging. The committee stopped there, and I know they must have wondered if old Reuben was still alive in that house and able to live there. But there to that house they came to find the lamb to bring to the altar of sacrifice. And they said, "Reuben, are you there?" We can imagine Reuben saying, "Yes; I am still here, but I am in a mighty bad way." And when they found he was not altogether dead, they beat the tom-tom of economy and said, "Come out, Reuben, come out. Put on your old, patched overalls, your overalls on which you cannot tell where the patches begin and original material leaves off; get on your old hat with the hole in the crown; put on your shoes with your toes sticking out through the ends of them, and come out here, because we have signally honored you. You are going to be the sacrifice in the national-defense program.

"Some persons are asking for $150,000,000 for the 32,000,000 of you, and we decided that in the name of economy you are to be the sacrifice, and we want you to come out and accept this honor."

Mr. President, the farmer of the United States deserves much better treatment than that at the hands of the American Congress. I undertook to point out here yesterday how every element in this country had received the benefit of artificial devices that had been passed by the Congress, except the farmer. I am willing to join the Senator from Ohio who says we should have a different farm plan, if he will just get one. I also think we ought to have one. But we have not been able to get those suggested enacted into law.

The farmer should not be the only sacrificial offering. He has not yet had a single cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. It has not been necessary to repeal any limitation on his profits, for the producers of many commodities are selling below the cost of production. He has no farm board as the equivalent of the Labor Relations Board to protect him against speculators, unfair trade practices, and decreasing income. He has never gone on strike in an attempt to starve the consumer into higher prices. He has no floor under his wages nor ceiling over his hours, but in the nature of things toils unremittingly from daybreak until setting sun.

He pays his share of the cost of legislation to afford security to other groups without enjoying that security. He has received the lowest income and enjoyed fewer of the benefits and blessings of modern-day civilization than any other group in the United States. Despite this, he is still the bulwark of the Nation, and is impervious to the subversive influences which cause trouble and confusion in some other groups.

If the Congress does not assert itself, the farm population of this country will become slaves in our economic system, though they have the same guaranties of equality in our political system that are possessed by any other group or class.

The economist, Roger Babson, has never been particularly identified with those demanding farm relief, but in discussing the effects of defense spending recently and the distribution of these funds he said:

I don't see how labor and industry can look the farmer in the face.

When we compare this modest amendment with the staggering sum of $40,000,000,000 which has been provided for the entire defense program it is an infinitesimal contribution to the defense of the United States to assure that we shall have plenty of food and fiber for whatever may come.

I will say further, Mr. President, that this sum will go to a group of people who are inherently conservative and who have the welfare of the Nation at heart. They know what it is to make sacrifices, but they should not be called upon to be the sole goat to die on the altar of the national-defense program. I do not believe the sense of justice of the Senate will permit that to be done.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be agreeable to the Senator from Georgia for me to submit a conference report which we are anxious to transmit to the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. How long would it take?

Mr. ADAMS. It would take only a short time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16 and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "except to the extent that the head of the department concerned shall determine that articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Of the matter inserted by such amendment, strike out "June 30, 1942" and insert in lieu thereof the word "expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Of the matter inserted by such amendment, strike out "June 30, 1942" and insert in lieu thereof the word "expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 22, and 25.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado what disposition was made with respect to the controversy before the committee on the rehabilitation of a certain number of miles of the Alaskan Railroad.

Mr. ADAMS. That situation involved this problem: The railroad from Seward, which is a port, to a point in the neighborhood of Anchorage, where the new air base is being established, was said by the Army authorities and by the general manager of the railroad to be in an unsatisfactory condition and to be subject to sabotage. The Army authorities and the House recommended the construction of a new line from Portage Bay to a junction with the present railroad, the new line to be only 14 miles long. It was estimated that the new line would cost $5,300,000. The committee of the Senate and the Senate disagreed with the suggestion of the House. Our view was that the existing road could and should be put in usable condition at this time, rather than that we should undertake the building of a new line. The Senate conferees insisted on their position. The House conferees receded on every other amendment in the bill, with one or two minor exceptions, but they submitted a letter from the Secretary of War, together with certain other additional statements, and the House conferees would not recede. The Senate conferees were forced to recede, although believing that their position was correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the new road, the construction of which is contemplated, parallel the old railroad in Alaska?

Mr. ADAMS. It would form a junction with the present railroad. It would come from another bay, Portage Bay. It would mean the establishment of a new town and the building of tunnels which would be 2 or 2½ miles long.

Our view was that 2 or 3 years would be required to build the new road. My judgment was that the new line would cost more than was estimated and that, in addition, it would be necessary to put the old road in condition from the standpoint of national defense while the new construction was being made.

The Senate conferees were thoroughly convinced of the soundness of their position, but we were driven to the point where we had no alternative but to yield upon that one item. As I say, I am not supporting the view, but saying to the Senate, and to the Senator in particular, that I think it was an inescapable recession. In other words, the Senate could not say to the House that we must have everything as we see it.

Mr. LUCAS. I can appreciate the situation in which the committee found itself in conference with the committee of the House, but I should like to ask one further question. As I understand the position of the House of Representatives, it was based solely upon the testimony of the War Department officials.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct; and the Senate heard both sides.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, no individual from Alaska, including the delegate from Alaska who represents that Territory in the House of Representatives, took the position represented by the conference report.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct. The Delegate from Alaska was in accord with the position taken by the Senate and the Senate conferees.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator believe the new railroad would cost over and above what the rehabilitation of the old road would cost?

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, the Senator from Colorado is not an engineer. As an attorney, I have had some experience with estimates on construction, and I know that in my own State the construction of tunnels usually costs three times as much as the estimates.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood there was some testimony in the record along that line.

Mr. ADAMS. There were certain guesses. When a tunnel is dug, it is impossible to know in advance what may be encountered. Ordinarily estimates are made upon the assumption that there will be a continuity of conditions. Engineers told us that geological investigations had been made, as well as some drillings. Those who opposed the project said that there were certain glacial hazards.

It is with a good deal of reluctance that we admit that we could not persuade the House conferees to adopt what we were thoroughly convinced was a sound position.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Would not the construction of the tunnels and the new road put out of business the present town at the terminus of the railroad in Alaska?

Mr. ADAMS. That was the feeling we had, but the town of Seward is a small port, and I am inclined to think that during the next 2 years, while the tunnels are being constructed, the existing road will have to be put in shape to operate. My first impression was that the project would simply wipe out the town of Seward. Now, I am inclined to think that it will continue, because what little agriculture and grazing is in that area is on the line of the existing railroad.

Mr. TRUMAN. That was my understanding. I thought the expenditure was entirely unnecessary, and that it would probably cost more to build the new line than to put the old road in condition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4124, which was read, as follows:

In the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 3, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 6 and 22 to the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 to said bill and concur therein with amendments, as follows:

In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "or near"; and

After line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY—FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"Administrative expenses: In addition to the funds made available to the Federal Housing Administration for administrative expenses by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1941, not to exceed $390,555 of the defense housing insurance fund, created by the act entitled 'An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes,' approved March 28, 1941 (Public Law 24, 77th Cong.), is hereby made available for administrative expenses of such Administration for the fiscal year 1941, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1941."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 25.

The motion was agreed to.

ERVINE J. STENSON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 432) for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson, which was, in line 15, after the word "question", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 76, after line 5, as amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think we should have a record vote on this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Russell
Ball	Gurney	Sheppard
Bankhead	Hatch	Shipstead
Barbour	Hayden	Smith
Barkley	Herring	Spencer
Bilbo	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Byrnes	Lodge	Tunnell
Capper	Lucas	Van Nuys
Caraway	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wheeler
Connally	Maloney	Wiley
Danaher	Murdock	Willis
Ellender	Murray	
George	Norris	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 76, after line 5, as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that a vote of "yea" will be in favor of the committee amendment proposing to increase the appropriation, and that a vote of "nay" would restore the House provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and will vote. I vote "yea." If the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] were present, he would vote "yea," as I do.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent. I am advised that, if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

I also announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senators from Michigan and Pennsylvania are unavoidably detained.

I am advised that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—61

Adams	Guffey	Pepper
Aiken	Gurney	Reed
Andrews	Hatch	Russell
Austin	Hayden	Sheppard
Bailey	Herring	Shipstead
Bell	Hill	Smith
Bankhead	Holman	Spencer
Barkley	Hughes	Stewart
Bilbo	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Lee	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrnes	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McNary	Van Nuys
Caraway	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Wheeler
Connally	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	
Gillette	Overton	

NAYS—9

Barbour	Danaher	Green
Burton	Gerry	Lodge
Byrd	Glass	Taft

NOT VOTING—25

Brewster	Bunker	Clark, Mo.
Bridges	Chandler	Davis
Brown	Chavez	Downey
Harrison	Nye	Vandenberg
Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Walsh
McFarland	Schwartz	White
McKellar	Smathers	
Mead	Tydings	

So the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while there is a full attendance of the Senate, I wish to make a brief statement as to the program for the next few days.

Assuming that the pending bill be disposed of this afternoon, we shall have a session tomorrow, in the hope that we may dispose of the bill already passed by the House extending for a period of 2 years the so-called Guffey Bituminous Coal Act. The subcommittee has been holding hearings on that bill and has reported its decision to the full committee, which will meet tomorrow morning. I realize that in order to take up that bill tomorrow it will require unanimous consent, but I hope that it will be possible to obtain such consent. If we can dispose of that measure, and also dispose of a treaty between this country and Mexico with respect to the reciprocal use of airports, which was reported today by the Committee on Foreign Relations and is on the calendar, we will have nothing of any importance, so far as I can now see, until the 14th or 15th of April, which will be the Monday or Tuesday following Easter.

Under those circumstances, next week Senators will be free to return to their homes or to take such vacation as they may wish.

I desired the program to be outlined to the Senate so that Senators may understand that we hope to be able to obtain a short vacation, at least for the next week.

Mr. MCNARY. However, it may be said that recesses of the Senate will continue for only 3 days.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; we are not attempting to take and do not propose to take any 10 days' recess or even a week's recess; but it will be brought about by the usual 3-day process.

Mr. MCNARY. Of adjourning or recessing from Monday to Thursday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; of adjourning or recessing from Monday to Thursday and from Thursday to the following Monday. I hope we may be able to carry out that program.

Mr. MALONEY rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I overlooked the fact that the Senator from Connecticut has a bill, the defense-housing bill, which I hope we can take up and dispose of this afternoon following the consideration of the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

AMERICAN CONVOYS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not desire to take up much time, but I do wish to call attention to a letter which I received this morning. The letter is dated April 2, 1941, and is from a gentleman in Brooklyn, N. Y., whc says:

I am an Alabamian, a Democrat by birth.

He goes on to say:

Grenville Clark has just sent out a petition for signature of persons who advocate the use of American convoys. He is admitting in the petition that such measures are de facto war. I enclose a copy of the petition for your perusal. He is sincere in his position, but, as I see things, he's wrong.

The petition reads, in part, as follows:

MARCH 31, 1941.

A petition to the President of the United States

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undersigned citizens respectfully ask you to determine upon and direct prompt and decisive action to provide American convoys to the British Isles and other places where the British Commonwealth of Nations and its allies need food and materials of war to continue their struggle. We assign the following reasons—

I ask that the entire petition be placed in the RECORD, but I want particularly to call attention to a few statements in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, the petition will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WHEELER. I desire particularly to call attention to this statement:

We do not believe that the mere turning over of our merchant vessels or warships for use by the British with their crews, or other measures short of American convoys, will be enough to ensure successful resistance to Hitler's campaign against the British shipping.

Third. We recognize that the action for which we petition will involve a state of war, declared or undeclared. We think, however, that it is time to quit trying to have it both ways. We should no longer declare, on the one hand, our determination that Hitler must be defeated, and yet fail, on the other hand, to take the necessary practical steps to accomplish his defeat.

If we really mean to prevent a Hitler victory, and American convoys are, as we believe, essential to that end, let us go ahead without regard to consequence. * * * With so much at stake, we cannot be content with half-way measures of doubtful effectiveness.

There follows a place for the signatures.

I call attention to the fact that a petition is being circulated by Grenville Clark, one of the leading New York Wall Street lawyers, and one of the men who were in Washington during the debate on the draft bill urging the draft of the manpower of the Nation from 18, as I recall, to 65. He is also one of those who have constantly been urging steps "short of war," but now he comes out directly and says that he wants to see the President of the United States convoy shipments to the British Isles, or to any other country associated with Great Britain. He recognizes the fact that it means war, but he wants it done, whether it means a declared war or an undeclared war. In other words, here is a Wall Street lawyer asking the President of the United States to carry on an undeclared war in violation of the Constitution of the United States of America, for he admits, as a reading of the petition discloses, that it may be an undeclared war, notwithstanding the fact that the Constitution of the United States provides that only Congress may declare war. I realize the tremendous influence that Mr. Grenville Clark has

He is a very able and distinguished lawyer, and because he is an able and distinguished lawyer, and because he represents powerful clients in New York, and always has, this movement of his should be taken all the more seriously.

Some of us have said previously when certain legislation was pending in the Congress that each was a step toward war, and that nothing would satisfy certain people who were saying, first, that we should take steps "short of war," except an open war, whether it was declared or undeclared. This is exactly the same position, let me say, that was taken a short time ago by the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.

The people of the country can expect that this same crowd will constantly be pressing upon the President of the United States to carry on an undeclared war. Consequently, it behooves every Member of this body who is opposed to our getting into war, declared or undeclared, to let the people of America know what is actually going on.

I called attention yesterday to a statement made by the Archbishop of Boston, Cardinal O'Connell, in which he called attention to the fact that this was no time to toy with the American people. He stated that already, from his observation and from the information which he had received from throughout the country, the American people felt extremely suspicious of things that were going on behind the scenes to get us into the war.

I appreciate the fact that our leader said yesterday that he had no knowledge whatever that convoys were to be used; and yet, according to the press stories coming out of the White House, the President of the United States a few days ago stated that the use of convoys had been under consideration for something like 18 months. If the use of convoys has been under consideration for the past 18 months, and if, as the President says, convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war, then it would seem, if the President was correctly quoted in the newspapers, that he has actually been considering for the past 18 months the question of taking this country into war. Certainly there was no thought of such a thing prior to the election; and prior to the election nothing was said by any candidate about the use of convoys. No candidate for President upon any ticket said anything on the subject other than that he wanted to keep this country at peace, and keep it out of European wars.

I call attention to this matter because we hear so much about propaganda going on here, and about agents of foreign governments being active in this country. I again urge that the resolution which is pending, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], asking for an investigation of British propaganda and Nazi propaganda and Fascist propaganda in this country, be brought out of the committee, and that a full and thorough investigation be had as to those who are really behind this propaganda.

It is likewise stated that many of the strikes in this country are being aided by foreign agents. If that is true, the American people ought to know it. If it is not true, they ought to know that fact; and they ought to know who it is, if anybody, that is paying the persons in this country—whether they are newspaper columnists or radio commentators or lawyers—who are representing certain foreign governments.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I am wondering if the Senator can credit the press reports as to the President's statement. If I am correct, the Congress of the United States in the Neutrality Act forbade the entry of American vessels into the war zone, and forbade American citizens going on belligerent vessels within the war zone. So, if we have convoys, assuming that they would be used only if they were going into the war zone, to convoy an American vessel into the war zone would be in direct defiance of the act of Congress approved by the President. If the convoy was of a belligerent vessel, it would seem to be obviously an act of war and improper.

I wonder if the Senator really can credit the statement that the President has been thinking for 18 months and more of disregarding the acts of Congress.

Mr. WHEELER. I am frank to say to the Senator that I simply cannot credit that statement as being correct. In view of the President's statement that convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war, and in view of the fact that the President during the campaign repeatedly said that he was seeking to keep this country out of war, and that he was not going to send American sailors or pilots or soldiers to fight upon foreign soil or in foreign waters, it is inconceivable that he would say to the press of the country that the question of using convoys had been under consideration for 18 months. It seems to me there simply must be something wrong about it, and that the press must have misunderstood the President, or whoever was the White House spokesman, with reference to that statement.

I am glad the Senator from Colorado has called my attention to the matter, because the two things are completely inconsistent. I say that if anybody had suggested in the last campaign that we were considering getting into this war, whether it was Mr. Willkie or whether it was Mr. Roosevelt or anybody else, if he had said that we actually were considering at that time sending American convoys, and then had said that when we send convoys it means shooting, and shooting means war, I do not believe anybody who made such a statement to the American people before November 4 of last year could possibly have been elected to the Presidency of the United States. For that reason I cannot believe that the President made the statement which is credited to him in the press.

What I wanted particularly to call attention to, however, is that when we find men like Grenville Clark, with the influence and the ability that he has, and the great following that he has among certain interests in the city of New York, and his great financial backing and social prestige, sending out petitions to be circulated over the country urging the President of the United States to carry on a declared or undeclared war, I think it is something that the American people ought to know. They ought to know that these petitions are coming out of Wall Street, and they ought to know who is back of them, and they ought to know what is behind them, and they ought to know that what is advocated means war, just as Mr. Clark says.

EXHIBIT A

MARCH 31, 1941.

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undersigned citizens respectfully ask you to determine upon and direct prompt and decisive action to provide American convoys to the British Isles and other places where the British Commonwealth of Nations and its allies need food and materials of war to continue their struggle. We assign the following reasons:

First. The people of the United States, after full consideration and debate, have taken the position that in our own vital national interest, Hitler must be prevented from achieving victory in this war. This means that the British Isles must be protected from capitulation. This means, in turn, that the supply line to Britain must be kept open on a scale that will insure a constant flow of food, raw materials, and munitions adequate to sustain the strength of the British people and their vast war effort. If this supply line is cut off, the British people, no matter how brave and enduring, cannot keep up the battle and must succumb.

We do not believe the defeatist talk that Hitler is invincible. We believe that we have it in our power, if we will use it promptly, to maintain the bridge of ships to Britain, with every prospect of ultimate victory through the joint control of the seas by Britain and the United States and joint superiority in the air.

Second. The maintenance of the supply line to the British Isles requires American convoys as a minimum indispensable measure. By this we mean the use of American merchant ships, protected by American naval vessels, both manned by American crews; and we mean the use of American patrol planes and pilots. It is now apparent, we believe, that nothing less will assure the maintenance of the supply line to Britain. We believe this because, unless effectively checked, the cumulative effect of the continued sinkings will sooner or later cut off Britain and make our lend-lease program a futility. We do not believe that the mere turning over of our merchant vessels or warships for use by the British with their crews, or other measures short of American convoys, will be enough to insure successful resistance to Hitler's campaign against British shipping.

We are deceiving ourselves if we avoid this issue. The longer we delay, the more Britain will be weakened. At best, the greater will be the ultimate effort we will be required to make. At worst, if we longer delay, the position will become irretrievable and all our efforts to prevent the domination of the dictators will prove futile. It is time to face these facts.

Third. We recognize that the action for which we petition will involve a state of war, declared or undeclared. We think, however,

that it is time to quit trying to have it both ways. We should no longer declare, on the one hand, our determination that Hitler must be defeated, and yet fail, on the other hand, to take the necessary practical steps to accomplish his defeat.

If we really mean to prevent a Hitler victory, and American convoys are, as we believe, essential to that end, let us go ahead without regard to the consequence. A British defeat, with all its implications, would involve such grave danger to our future as to be intolerable. Our own self-interest alone obliges us to spare no effort in safeguarding Britain from isolation and forced surrender. With so much at stake, we cannot be content with halfway measures of doubtful effectiveness.

Accordingly, we urge you to act and act now while there is still time, lest we invite a catastrophe for the future of our country because our measures are too little and too late.

Name	Address	Occupation
Name	Address	Occupation
Name	Address	Occupation

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Disposal of surplus commodities", on page 80, line 24, after the word "section", to strike out "$100,150,000, of which not to exceed $150,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'" and insert "$135,000,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to have this amendment agreed to without there appearing in the RECORD a justification therefor, for I feel that it is very important that the conferees on the part of the Senate should have all possible support in their conference with the House on this amendment.

What the amendment proposes to do is to provide to the Surplus Marketing Administration the same amount of money which it had for its activities last year. Those activities relate to the distribution of commodities which the Secretary of Agriculture finds to be on hand in surplus amounts, and to be commanding excessively low prices, and therefore to be in need of support. It is that phase of the program of the Department of Agriculture and the administration which brings support to commodities not designated in the Triple-A program as basic commodities. In addition to that, Mr. President, it is increasing the diet of the underprivileged people of this country, including 2,700,000 school children. In view of the appalling statistics which have been revealed as the result of the examination of young men for the Army and their rejection because of physical defects, I think this program not only should be carried on at its existing level but should be carried on in an augmented way. All this proposal seeks to accomplish is the maintenance of the same amount of dollar appropriations as were provided in the past fiscal year.

Mr. President, I had intended to speak on the amendment at some length, and had prepared a statement for that purpose. I shall not, however, at this late hour of the day, detain the Senate, but I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred may be printed as a part of my remarks; and I ask, for the purposes of conference, that we may have a record vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being on objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., ON SURPLUS COMMODITIES AMENDMENT TO THE AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION PLAN

Guns are important, but they are only one aspect of national defense. Equally essential is the preparedness of all our people. Underfed and underclothed people cannot be expected to undertake the heavy tasks which our defense program demands of all of us. The most recent figures available show that in January 1941, 16,700,000 persons in the United States were receiving some form of public assistance. Of this number, 2,700,000 persons were receiving surplus commodities only.

One of the tragic ironies of this great land of agricultural plenty is the fact that millions of children and adults on the farms and in the cities don't get enough to eat. With cotton surpluses piled high they don't have enough of the clothes and bedding they need for health. If we can afford nearly $40,000,000,000 for engines of destruction we should be able to afford 1 percent of that for better nutrition among our undernourished here at home.

SURPLUS MARKETING ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS

The Surplus Marketing Administration has been doing its best, with the limited funds at its disposal, to bridge the gap between the plenty of our farms and the want of our lowest-income families.

The food-stamp plan, cotton-stamp plan, school-lunch program, and direct distribution of surplus commodities to needy people have been the bridges between farm surpluses and millions of our citizens who have been impoverished by years of depression. These programs provide a broader market for the farmer and give undernourished and underclothed people a chance to eat and to wear our surpluses.

In February 1941, 4,000,000 undernourished school children were getting free school lunches made in whole or in part from surplus foods. Through the food-stamp plan over 3,000,000 people in the same month were buying the rich, health-building foods on the surplus list which their small cash incomes make it impossible for them to afford otherwise.

Approximately 8,000,000 needy persons were receiving surplus commodities through the direct purchase and distribution program.

Under the food-stamp plan, direct-distribution program, and school-lunch program over 4,000,000,000 pounds of surplus foods are being moved into consumption during the present year.

The surplus food consumed by needy families under all of these programs includes millions of pounds of eggs, butter, pork, lard, white flour and cerials, corn meal, dry beans, citrus fruits, apples, pears, raisins, prunes, cabbage, potatoes, onions, tomatoes, carrots, and other foods.

Last year $235,000,000 was made available by Congress for the surplus-removal programs of the Surplus Marketing Administration. The House this year has authorized an appropriation of $200,000,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee, however, has added $35,000,000, which, if passed, would make available the same amount this year as last. At a time when we are appropriating billions upon billions for national defense, it seems to me that the appropriation for this purpose should be increased, since the need exists on the part of both farmers and low-income people. Another $125,000,000 would give us a food-stamp plan on a Nation-wide basis.

THE PLACE OF FOOD IN DEFENSE

Food plays a vital role in our defense effort. We need healthy people. We need well-fed young men to learn the skilled jobs they are being called upon to do. Underfed boys are not ready for the year's service in the Army they are being called upon to give.

The boys from the farms and the cities who come from the 12,000,000 of our families which exist on incomes under $1,000 a year have not been well-fed. The high percentage of draft rejections for medical reasons is the best evidence of this.

The Chief of the Medical Division of the Selective Service system has told the story in a few words: "Colonel Rowntree, Chief of the Medical Division of Selective Service system, told the Illinois State Medical Society that 32 percent of the registrants examined by local boards prior to January 31, 1941, were rejected as physically and mentally unfit for general military service and of these found fit by Selective Service physicians approximately 12 percent were rejected by Army physicians. Defective teeth cause 17 percent of the rejections by Selective Service medical examiners and 22 percent of the rejections by Army physicians." (From Office of Government Reports, "This Week in Defense," February 1, 1941, p. 8.)

Malnutrition is the most common cause of poor health and bad teeth.

This is a shocking and inexcusable situation in the richest country in the world.

I should like to call to your attention a significant experiment made in England between 1936 and 1938 which illustrates vividly what good food will do to restore health.

The experiment was made with a group of 900 English boys between the ages of 17 and 22 who had been declared physically unfit for the British Army. They did not measure up to the minimum health standards set. These boys were subsequently put through a reconditioning camp for an average stay of 9 weeks. They were given an abundance and variety of good food, plenty of sleep, and sound physical exercise. At the end of the reconditioning period 87 percent of the 900 boys were able to meet the Army's health standards. It's a national disgrace to have two out of five of our own boys rejected for military service for health reasons.

WE STILL HAVE HUNGRY PEOPLE

In spite of the new employment created by the defense program we still have millions of hungry people. The number of people throughout the country receiving some form of public assistance dropped from 20,430,000 in January 1939 to 18,040,000 in January 1940 to 16,700,000 in January 1941. There are still a lot of needy people.

We have 9,000,000 undernourished children in our schools in low-income areas. Less than half of them—some 4,000,000 are now getting one good meal a day at schools. Foods in surplus—fresh and dried fruits, vegetables, dairy and poultry products figure largely in these school lunches. They give underfed children a share of the protective

foods necessary to give these youngsters a fair start in life. But we should be reaching all 9,000,000—not just 4,000,000. Temporizing with hunger is hardly in keeping with a total defense effort.

The food stamp plan, which has received widespread support from groups all over the country—farmers, business, consumers—will soon be operating in 330 rural and urban areas and reaching nearly 5,000,000 needy people. Some 1,700 areas have requested this program. They cannot have it unless we make adequate funds available for the Surplus Marketing Administration to expand the food stamp plan.

Only 20 areas have the cotton stamp plan, although almost every area which has the food stamp plan (287 in March 1941) has asked for the cotton stamp plan.

The stamp plans are particularly effective ways of moving agricultural surpluses into consumption because—

1. They ensure that persons participating in them will continue to buy the amounts of food and cotton goods they normally bought before the stamp plans began. Under the food stamp plan people taking part buy orange stamps in the approximate amounts they previously spent in cash for food. These stamps buy food at any grocery store. For each dollar's worth of orange stamps bought an increase of 50 percent in food purchasing power is given free in the form of blue stamps. The blue stamps are good only for purchases of surplus foods. The cotton stamp plan operates similarly. Green and brown stamps are used. Participating families receive a 100-percent increase in cotton-goods purchasing power in brown stamps for every $1 worth of green stamps they buy. Thus the new purchasing power received through the stamp plan is for additional purchases of surplus foods or cotton goods.

2. The effective and aggressive merchandising drive made by the grocers has succeeded in moving more than $1 worth of surplus foods for every $1 worth of free stamps which the Government provides. The beneficial effects of this to American farmers are obvious.

3. By using all the normal channels of trade from farmer to ultimate consumer the stamp plan not only aids farmers and needy consumers, but it also stimulates the food trades and the cotton industry.

One of the great advantages of the stamp plan is the flexibility of the machinery through which it operates. That machinery can be expanded in time of need and contracted when the need for it decreases. We ought to have the machinery of the stamp plan set up in every county in the country. In my opinion, we will need the stamp plan on a national scale more than ever when the armaments boom tapers off. Last year a national stamp plan would have cost $360,000,000. Today it would cost only $260,000,000.

SURPLUS REMOVAL PROGRAMS ARE FARM PROGRAMS

The Surplus Marketing Administration programs are moving currently over 4,000,000,000 pounds of surplus foods per year into domestic consumption.

In considering our agricultural problems the tendency has been to concentrate on the basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, and rice. The producers of these crops have received special consideration by Congress and have been the direct recipients of benefit payments.

And yet during 1939 approximately 70 percent of farmers' total cash income from the sales of farm commodities came from sales of milk and dairy products, poultry and eggs, meat animals, fruits, vegetables and nuts. The prices received by farmers for their 1940–41 production of these products, except in the case of beef, veal, and lamb, have been substantially below parity.

Dairy and poultry products, fruits, vegetables, and meats are the protective foods which undernourished people particularly need. In recent years there have been large price-depressing surpluses of these foods—not because we had more of them than the country needs but because our low-income families could not afford to buy them. If all our people got the food they needed, we would need more of these crops, not less.

The farmers who produce the protective food crops are entitled to as much consideration as the producers of the basic crops. The surplus removal programs of the Surplus Marketing Administration have provided a market for the dairy and poultry products, fruits, vegetables, and pork, which went begging for lack of markets before these programs. It makes good sense to help our farmers by making these fine foods available to our needy people. The good food habits our people are learning now through the availability of protective foods will persist and will mean a future market for these foods.

The combined objectives of the Surplus Marketing Administration—to aid farmers in the disposal of surplus crops and to give underfed people a chance to eat the surplus—are worthy ones. They are improving the health and well-being of our people. The volume of surplus foods moved into consumption under the Surplus Marketing Administration programs is the best evidence of their effectiveness as farm programs.

The food-stamp plan and the school-lunch program are as vital to our total defense as are the planes, guns, and ships we are building. Democracy's greatest strength is in its people. Underfed and underclothed farmers and workers are not strong. To see to it that they get enough to eat and enough to wear is the soundest kind of national defense.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF THE SURPLUS MARKETING ADMINISTRATION BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, MARCH 1941

During the calendar year 1939 approximately 70 percent of the farmers' total cash income from the sales of farm commodities came from the sales of milk and dairy products, poultry and eggs, meat animals, and fruits, vegetables, and nuts. Except in the case of beef, veal, and lambs, prices received by farmers for their 1940–41 production of the numerous commodities included above have been substantially below parity. The percentages of parity prices which farmers are receiving for these various commodities are given in the following table:

Commodity:	Percent of parity
California oranges [1]	56.8
Florida oranges [1]	44.4
Florida grapefruit [1]	39.8
Texas grapefruit [1]	31.0
California lemons [1]	65.1
California Bartlett pears [1]	53.8
California winter pears [1]	18.8
California plums [1]	90.9
United States apples [1]	61.0
Northwest apples [1]	52.6
Walnuts [1]	67.6
Raisins [1]	65.9
California dried prunes [1]	57.9
United States onions [1]	86.5
United States cabbage (for market) [1]	79.2
United States tomatoes (for market) [1]	82.1
United States fresh peas (for market) [1]	70.2
Peanuts [2]	55.6
Potatoes [2]	62.3
United States dry edible beans [2]	62.0
Seedling pecans [2]	58.0

[1] For the season 1940–41, as of Mar. 10, 1941.
[2] As of Feb. 15, 1941, or most recent quotation available.

Commodity—Continued.	Percent of parity
Improved pecans [2]	45.0
United States peaches [2]	63.0
United States pears [2]	64.0
Eggs [2]	68.0
Butter [2]	76.0
Cheese [2]	78.0
Evaporated milk [2]	72.0
Hogs [2]	78.0
Beef cattle [2]	125.0
Veal calves [2]	117.0
Lambs [2]	125.0

[1] As of Feb. 15, 1941, or most recent quotation available.
[2] For the 10-month period May 1940 to February 1941.

SUPPLY TRENDS AND STOCKS

There are given below certain figures in respect to current production and existing stocks of some of the commodities referred to above:

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Total milk production in the 1940–41 season is estimated at 112,000,000,000 pounds, or 7,000,000,000 pounds more than the last five-season average. March 1 milk production was 3 percent larger than a year ago.

Dairy products production in February was above a year ago, as follows:

Butter, up 5 percent.
Cheese, up 6 percent.
Evaporated milk, up 7 percent.

Dairy products stocks (commercial) on February 1, compared with the 5-year averages, were:

Total milk equivalent, up 21 percent.
Butter (30,000,000 pounds), up 5 percent.
Cheese (125,000,000 pounds), up 29 percent.
Evaporated milk (189,000,000 pounds), up 28 percent.

EGGS AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

Reports issued by the Department of Agriculture in March 1941 indicate that "hatchery-chick production in February was 70 percent larger than a year ago, the number of eggs set was 25 percent larger, and the number of checks booked on March 1 for later delivery was also 25 percent larger." Furthermore, the cold-storage stocks of frozen poultry on March 1 were 13 percent larger than a year ago.

Pork fats and oil seeds

	Stocks as of Mar. 1		
	5-year average	1940	1941
Pork:			
Frozen	233, 181, 000	298, 638, 000	406, 892, 000
Dry salt [1]	81, 750, 000	85, 760, 000	107, 519, 000
Pickled [1]	285, 579, 000	266, 255, 000	275, 974, 000
Total	600, 510, 000	650, 653, 000	790, 385, 000

	Stocks as of Jan. 1		
	Average 1936–40	1940	1941
Lard	104, 349, 000	162, 105, 000	[2] 287, 009, 000
Cottonseed [3]	1, 108, 991, 923	1, 126, 800, 471	1, 052, 171, 700
Soybean [3]	87, 865, 599	241. 973, 825	201, 690, 722
Total	1, 301, 206, 522	1, 530, 879, 296	1, 547, 862, 422

[1] Includes both cured and in process of cure.
[2] Includes rendered pork fat.
[3] Stocks of seed at mills, crude oil and refined oil, all in terms of crude oil.

OTHER MISCELLANEOUS COMMODITIES

Beans: Stocks of dry edible beans as of March 1, 1941, were the highest on record, being 10,000,000 bags compared with 5-year average stocks of 7,000,000 bags.

Apples: The cold storage holdings of apples on March 1, 1941, were 17 percent above those of a year ago.

Potatoes: The holdings of potatoes on January 1, 1941, were 13 percent larger than a year ago.

Prunes and raisins: There are no official statistics as to current stocks of dried fruits. The September 1, 1940, carryover of dried prunes, including stocks held by governmental agencies, was about 84,000 tons which, if added to the 1940 crop estimated at 199,000, gave a total supply which is about 160,000 tons in excess of present prospective commercial market requirements during the 1940–41 marketing season.

In the case of raisins, the September 1, 1940, carryover, including stocks held by governmental agencies, was about 110,000 tons which, if added to the 1940 crop estimated at 164,000 tons, gave a total supply which is about 100,000 tons in excess of present prospective commercial market requirements during the 1940–41 marketing season.

Percentage of parity prices received by growers as of Feb. 15, 1941, for the 5 basic agricultural commodities

Wheat	59.9
Corn	68.1
Rice	92.5
Cotton	59.4
Tobacco [1]	72.1

[1] Percentage of parity for the period September 1940 to February 1941; quantity of sales during February too small to obtain representative prices.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 80, line 24.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Announcing my pair and its transfer as before I vote "yea." If the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], which I transfer to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably absent. I am not advised how these Senators would vote if present.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—56

Adams	George	Norris
Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Barbour	Holman	Sheppard
Barkley	Hughes	Shipstead
Bilbo	Kilgore	Spencer
Bulow	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tunnell
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maloney	Wallgren
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	

NOT VOTING—39

Ball	Gerry	Reynolds
Bone	Glass	Schwartz
Brewster	Guffey	Smathers
Bridges	Harrison	Smith
Brooks	Hatch	Taft
Brown	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Byrd	McFarland	Wagner
Chandler	McKellar	Walsh
Chavez	Mead	White
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Wiley
Downey	Reed	Willis

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Sugar Act of 1937", on page 81, line 23, after the word "Act", to strike out "$47,973,960, of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'" and insert "$47,923,960"; and on page 82, line 1, after the numerals "1943", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That conditional payments in connection with the 1941 sugar program shall not be made if, by proclamation under section 509 of said act, title II or title III shall have been suspended and shall remain suspended until July 1, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Crop Insurance Act", on page 82, line 21, after "(U. S. C. 1501–1518)", to strike out "$5,576,800, of which not to exceed $76,800 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'" and insert "$5,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farm Tenant Act—Farm Tenancy", on page 83, line 25, after the numerals "1941", to strike out "$2,499,962, of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'" and insert "$2,449,962."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire at this time to make a few brief remarks with reference to the provision on page 44, under the head "Acquisition of Lands for National Forests." I make these remarks at this time because two Members of the Senate are members of certain committees having to do with the acquisition of forest land, the National Forest Reservation Commission and the Joint Committee on Forestry, of which latter committee the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is the senior member. This item is an addition of $500,000 for acquisition of lands for national forests, with a recommendation that the Forest Service give special consideration to the acquisition of land abutting on Lake Tahoe for the Lake Tahoe, Nev., National Forest, in addition to the acquisition contemplated by the House bill.

The item to which I address myself has already been adopted by the Senate. The amendment of the committee has the approval of the Senate at this time. I only desire to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and the Members of the House, who are also members of the special committee, the importance of carrying out the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

In that respect I desire at this time to refer to Senate bill 2583, introduced by me in the Seventy-fifth Congress, which became and is now the law, authorizing the acquisition of certain lands for and an addition to the Lake Tahoe National Forest, in the States of Nevada and California. This was the Lake Tahoe, Nev., area which was considered. Following the introduction of that bill, its adoption by the Congress, and its approval by the President, on several occasions I brought the matter before the Appropriations Committee, with the approval of that committee. I may say that legislation for the acquisition of the lands surrounding Lake Tahoe was first introduced on June 7, 1937, and passed by the Senate August 10, 1937. The bill making this authorization then passed the House February 2, 1938. This authorization bill was approved on February 15, 1938, and became Public Law No. 428 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. Subsequently an appropriation of $325,000

was recommended, pursuant to the authorization, by the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 6, 1938, and was approved by the Senate. This item was stricken in conference June 8, 1938, after discussion on the House floor.

Later the appropriation of $325,000 was added to the second deficiency bill, and was approved by the Senate on June 10, 1938. You will note, Mr. President, that in each instance the item was lost in conference as this was again stricken on June 16.

There is no land today more desirable to be acquired by the Forest Service for the benefit of the people of this country than the lands surrounding one of the most beautiful lakes in the world. It is the Lake in the Clouds, the garden spot of the Sierras, where people from all over the world come to enjoy the glories of the snow-clad peaks surrounding the blue brilliance of Lake Tahoe. Privately owned, it is inaccessible to people who may come from far and wide, as well as inaccessible to Nevadans who would bask in the glorious beauty of the mountain lake. If it becomes forest land, it is made accessible, and one needs only to see it to know how superbly desirable it is to have this spot retained for the enjoyment and delight of as many as can find their way there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It so happens that I have been charged with the responsibility for handling the appropriation item to which the Senator has reference. The Senator from Nevada, as a member of the committee, conducted hearings on at least two occasions, at which the merits of this proposition were fully presented. The Senator from Nevada waxed so eloquent about the beauties of Lake Tahoe that he almost had the committee adjourning to move out to Nevada to see that fairyland, and we were in fact so impressed with the case made by the Senator, that the committee unanimously on two occasions approved appropriations sufficient to purchase these lands.

As one of the conferees on the part of the Senate, I debated this question with the conferees on the part of the House as earnestly as I knew how, and I am absolutely convinced that the whole proposition possesses great merit.

We have this year not written into the bill definite instructions as to the expenditure of the Senate increases with respect to this area, but we have in the report of the committee carried out the suggestions of the Senator from Nevada by requesting that this area, which is of great importance, and which has been so diligently fostered by the Senator from Nevada, might become a part of the common property of all the people of the United States. I hope that those who are charged with the responsibility for spending these funds will heed this recommendation of the Senate Committee on Appropriations so that all of us may have an opportunity to enjoy the glorious beauties of this great section of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the remarks of the able Senator from Georgia are so eloquent that it would be futile for me to add anything to them save and except to join with him, who has so diligently heeded me, as chairman of the subcommittee, in the request that the matter be carefully considered by the special committee, to the end that this land so essential to the welfare of the country may be acquired with the money appropriated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next committee amendments.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Liquidation and Management of Resettlement Projects", on page 85, line 21, after the word "act", to strike out "$749,939, of which not to exceed $11,250 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' " and insert "$738,689."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Land Utilization and Retirement of Submarginal Land", on page 86, line 9, after the numerals "1941", to strike out "$2,836,675, of which not to exceed $737,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' " and insert "$2,278,239."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 14, to reduce the total appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Farm Tenant Act from $6,086,576 to $5,466,890.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation", on page 86, line 18, after the word "farmers", to strike out "and to other needy persons"; on page 87, line 2, after the word "camps", to strike out "$53,846,130, of which not to exceed $147,845 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' " and insert "$66,000,000", and in line 15, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "newspapers, and press clippings", and insert "and newspapers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 15, to insert:

No part of the funds provided in this act under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be used to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes and naval-stores products) in competition with existing industries.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment. The program of rehabilitation which has been carried on by the Farm Security Administration is, in my judgment, one of the most successful efforts upon the part of the Government that has been undertaken during the entire period of the economic depression. The clients, so to speak, of the Farm Security Administration are the people at the bottom of the rungs of the agricultural ladder.

When the program was inaugurated, many persons in this country did not believe the people in this economic situation were capable of successful rehabilitation. It is most encouraging to note that the people in this unfortunate economic situation have demonstrated that, with assistance by the Government in the form of loans under proper supervision and the guidance of farm experts, they are as sound a risk as exists in our whole economy.

Mr. President, for a number of years, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, I have been investigating some of the economic changes which are taking place in the agricultural economy of the United States. I measure my words when I say that unless we take bold, sound, and constructive action to check the economic forces and trends which are changing the character of agricultural life in America, we shall witness as sweeping a change in that segment of our economy as was produced by the industrial revolution in our industrial economy.

Mr. President, the economic, the political, and the social consequences of our failure to check the undermining of agriculture as a way of life are beyond my humble powers of description adequately to portray. The only criticism I can make of the program of the Farm Security Administration is that, in relation to the magnitude of the forces which are undermining farming as a way of life, the program is inadequate, insofar as the funds available for its prosecution are concerned.

Let me briefly summarize what has been accomplished for those who have been fortunate enough to secure the benefits of the Farm Security Administration program. In the 5 years since the beginning of the program, rehabilitation loans amounting to more than $385,000,000 have been made to 800,000 farm families.

Many of the families were on relief at the time the applications for loans were made. Families to whom loans were made had been unable to obtain credit elsewhere. The great advantage of the farm-security program of rehabilitation is that the supervisors work personally with each borrower. They determine the expenditure of the loan and the method of repayment, and they increase the ability of the borrower to manage his own farm so that he may continue to be self-supporting after the loan is paid back. Mr. President, this is a form of relief—if we want to call it relief—which results in rehabilitating families and placing them upon farms where they are no longer a burden on the taxpayers and where they are welcomed back into the community of self-supporting, self-respecting citizens of the United

States as an integral part of our functioning economy.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if this type of relief has not a certain admirable peculiarity, in that it is relief granted before the needy have been kicked out into the highway, and while they still have a chance to save the farms on which, perhaps, generations have lived?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is one very admirable aspect of the program; but in addition families who have been ground down almost to the point of being pulverized and who have been the subject of direct relief benefits have been rehabilitated under this program and restored to the economy of the United States as self-respecting, independent citizens. Eighty-two and seven-tenths percent of the loans have been repaid with interest when they matured. Some States have records of repayments actually in excess of the maturities. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and Wisconsin. The failures to repay are mostly concentrated in the Plains States, and in most cases are the result of conditions which were beyond the control of the clients of the Farm Security Administration. They are in areas where protracted droughts have taken place and where no farmer, no matter how diligent, could meet his obligations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question about the——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am coming to the point of the amendment; but I want the Senate to understand the importance of this activity before I come to discuss the specific prohibition contained in the amendment. I will come to that if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. President, this has been accomplished at a cost of less than $75 per family helped. So far as the actual cost is concerned, the cost of such relief per family is lower than the cost of any similar activity carried on by the Government.

As most Senators know, these loans are predicated upon a basis of 5 years; but in the 4 years for which figures are available, 110,000 families have paid back their loans in full and are now discharged of all obligation to the Federal Security Administration. At the end of the 1931 crop year, 360,015 borrowers had increased their net worth, excluding debts and obligations to the Government, to the extent of $82,954,000 since loans were granted to them. The average increase in net worth per family has amounted to $230.42.

During most of the time this program was in operation the Farm Security Administration was in a position not only to make grants for rehabilitation purposes but also to permit the farmers, its clients, to borrow money for the purpose of engaging in cooperative enterprises. I should like to make it clear at the outset that it is the long-standing, established policy of the Government to provide the farmers of the country with credit at low rates of interest for the purpose of carrying on cooperative activities.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reason why this amendment appears in the bill is that three Members of the House of Representatives, namely, Hon. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL, of Minnesota, Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Hon. REID F. MURRAY, of Wisconsin, stated that the kind of credit to which the Senator has referred could be obtained and was being obtained in other ways.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not so, so far as the clients of the Farm Security Administration are concerned; and I shall prove it in a moment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The second objection was that cooperatives were being organized with these funds to put other farm cooperatives out of business.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not so either, and I have before me a letter from the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration in support of the activities carried on by the Farm Credit Administration. The point is that any group of farmers may go to any one of the cooperative bank districts in the United States and, if they have 40 percent of the entire amount which they wish to borrow to establish a grain elevator, a chain of oil stations, or a canning factory, they can obtain a loan from the Farm Credit Administration system. But this amendment proposes to deny such benefits to the farmers who are more in need of them than are the farmers who can put up 40 percent collateral.

Mr. HAYDEN. What about the statement by Mr. Murray, of Wisconsin, that the funds have been dissipated and used in the erection of canning factories in opposition to existing canning factories?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not so. It is true that when the Farm Security Administration had the statutory authority to do so it loaned money to farmers to establish small canning factories. But why should not clients of the Farm Security Administration, when they need canning factories, have as much right to obtain money from the Federal Government for that purpose as more fortunate farmers in some other area who can furnish 40-percent collateral? One of the things which helps the Farm Security Administration's client to rehabilitate himself is the privilege of enjoying the benefits and economies of cooperation.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that, as I said a moment ago, it is the established policy of the Federal Government, and has been for a long time, to provide loans for cooperative activity upon the part of farmers. With respect to furthering cooperative effort among low-income farmers, the Secretary of Agriculture said in 1940:

> In furthering cooperative effort among low-income farmers, we have felt that we were carrying out a well-established policy of Congress, which is actually of very long standing. That this is true is evidenced by various acts of Congress, such as the Capper-Volstead Act; the Agricultural Act of 1929; the United States Warehouse Act; the act of June 16, 1933, establishing the Farm Credit Administration, which includes the Central Bank for Cooperatives and 12 district banks for cooperatives empowered to make loans to cooperative associations; the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and similar legislation.

Mr. President, the small, low-income farmer, like his well-to-do neighbor, naturally turns to cooperation with other farmers when he tries to do a better job of farming; but the position of the low-income farmer who turns to cooperation, unlike that of the well-to-do farmer, is often a difficult one. He is a needy farmer, and he has to cooperate with others in order to meet basic needs which he cannot meet by himself.

The committee amendment, which adopts section 33 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1941, specifically discriminates against the needy farmer and bars the way to his participation in cooperatives, whose services are definitely essential to his rehabilitation. The restrictions imposed have effectively wiped away the chances of the needy farmer to get help from the Farm Security Administration in the form either of small participation loans or of direct loans to such cooperative associations in which he can participate. In the meantime, farmers with cash and resources of their own can meet the security requirements of private banks and of the Farm Credit System; and by setting up cooperatives can get the advantages of mass buying, handling, and selling—advantages which actually are denied to the little fellow.

Mr. President, I cannot see any more illogical position for the Congress to take than to establish a general policy of providing loans to farmers in order that they may have the advantage of cooperative efforts and endeavors in buying and selling, and at the same time to deny such advantage to those farmers who are clients of the Farm Security Administration, who are borrowing money for the purpose of rehabilitation, and who will be benefited and thus enabled to pay the Government if we give them the same advantages we are already extending to the well-to-do farmers.

The small farmer is already a casualty of a system of competition in which he lacks an equal chance. Competition in America presumes that all citizens have equal opportunities to compete. To discriminate against the low-income farmers who seek to cooperate in buying the necessities of farm production and in selling their farm products is not to preserve competition; actually it is to eliminate a large part of the rural population from the competitive system. Cooperatives give no advantages to low-income farmers that others do not have; they simply help to equalize competitive opportunities.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am very much interested in what the Senator has said. I desire to bring out the possible grave effect of the embargo on a certain group. Assuming that there is created by the

amendment a class of farmers who are discriminated against by the operation of the statute—if the amendment should become law—can the Senator say, from anything that appears in the record, how much money is involved in the way of loans that would be granted for the purpose of the purchase, establishment, relocation or expansion of mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale, articles, commodities, and so forth? In other words, of how much gravity is the amendment, in terms of dollars and cents?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not sure that that point was mentioned in the testimony before the committee. I do not think it was.

However, I have before me a letter writen on the same subject, when the same matter was under consideration in connection with the relief appropriation bill of 1940. It will be remembered that the Farm Security Administration appropriation was carried in the Relief Appropriation Act of 1941. The letter which I have is signed by the then Secretary of Agriculture. In the letter he protested against the same type of amendment. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

> Most of the loans we make to aid farmers to derive the benefits of cooperative efforts are to enable them to participate in small groups which provide purebred sires, heavy farm equipment, modest storage facilities for food and feed produced on the farm and similar facilities. Since the inception of the Farm Security program, we have aided in the establishment of about 13,150 such services, participated in by more than 260,000 families. Of this number of services 32 percent have been for purebred sires, 53 percent for heavy farm equipment, 5 percent for purchasing and marketing services, and 10 percent for miscellaneous services such as feed, grist, and sirup mills, other small types of processing equipment, and roadside vegetable stands. About 20 farmers on an average participate in each of the group services. Many of the groups do not have more than 5 or 6 members.

But in his letter there is no statement concerning the total amount of loans that have been made for those purposes. If such a statement was given in the testimony, I did not observe it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was developed that as of December 31, 1940, loans had been made in the total sum of $12,727,668 to individuals to participate in community and cooperative endeavors throughout the entire country. That statement appears on page 472.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, I will say that in my opinion, as the amendment was reported to the Senate, it would not in anywise interfere with such loans to individuals.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have before me some figures which were furnished me with reference to the number of grain cooperatives, and I believe the figures may bear upon the question now before the Senate.

Until the summer of 1940, in the United States, Farm Security Administration funds were loaned to farmers to set up 148 cooperative grain elevators at local country points. In 143 cases the farmers negotiated with the local private owners and purchased the facilities. In only 5 cases were new local elevator facilities constructed.

So the claim which is made that money is being loaned for the purpose of setting up new facilities in competition with existing grain elevators is justified in the Northwest in only five cases.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am satisfied that no competitive facilities have been set up except in such cases as the Farm Security Administration was convinced it was absolutely essential for the benefit of clients of the Farm Security Administration that they should have the additional facilities. I desire to say, furthermore, that a great deal of the apprehension and drive upon the part of the so-called grain trade against the activities of the Farm Security Administration is entirely misdirected, because the grain elevator and marketing activities which have been carried on by the Farmers Union, through the Farmers Grain Corporation, have been carried on as a result of loans obtained from the Bank of Cooperatives and not from the Farm Security Administration; yet when farmers can go to the Bank of Cooperatives and borrow money, as I think they should have a right to do, in order to set up their own facilities under a cooperative enterprise, it is now proposed to deny such privileges to the underprivileged farmer who is the client of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. President, I say that that cannot be justified under any circumstances. If we shall strike down the cooperative movement, if we shall take away the farmer's privilege of borrowing money at low rates of interest from governmental institutions for cooperative enterprises, let those privileges be taken away from all farmers; but let us not give such privileges to the well-to-do farmer and deny them to the farmer who is a client of the Farm Security Administration and who is making a heroic effort to rehabilitate himself and become once more a self-respecting member of our economy and of our society.

I desire to state the legislative history of the amendment. It got into the last relief appropriation bill because a few persons from North Dakota who had a chain of oil stations came to the Congress and said they objected to the competition created by farmers joining cooperatives in order that through the benefits of cooperative purchasing they might buy oil and gasoline for their cars and tractors.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. A moment ago I called attention to the fact that only five new facilities were set up. The five new facilities were financed by loans from the Farm Security Administration, and had a total capacity of only 200,000 bushels. The Senator can readily realize what a comparatively small amount that is, and that the elevators are relatively small. The argument that this program unnecessarily duplicates facilities, when so small a number were built, seems to me to be ridiculous. As a matter of fact, a 200,000-bushel capacity does not represent one-fourth of the wheat received at one little station in Montana, such as Brady, Mont., where th local receipts run as high as a million bushels a year. The total of these five facilities is only 200,000 bushels, one-fourth of what is received annually in the little town of Brady, Mont. So that the contention that this is competition with the great elevators is perfectly absurd.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Farmers' Union Oil Co. operating in Wisconsin, a cooperative enterprise of the Farmers' Union of that State, can go to the farmers' bank of cooperatives at St. Paul, and, if they have a sound proposition and have 40 percent collateral, can borrow money from the bank of cooperatives to extend their activities. That is not to be denied them, but it is proposed now to deny to other cooperatives who are not so well off and who are clients of the Farm Security Administration the same benefits of cooperative savings and cooperative activities.

Mr. President, that cannot be justified in any tribunal or any forum in the United States. If the benefit of low-interest money through the bank for cooperatives is given to well-to-do farmers, I say that, in all justice, we must also provide the benefits of cooperatives to the underprivileged farmer who is the client of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask the Senator if the law to which he has already alluded is Public Resolution No. 88 of the Seventy-sixth Congress making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is. That is the first place it crept into the law.

Mr. AUSTIN. That provision was somewhat different, was it not, from this?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It reads:

> No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency, to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes and naval-stores products) in competition with existing industries.

That is section 33, to be found on page 16 of the act.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator, because I had my eye on something else.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; there is another provision that no loans shall be

made to permit them joining cooperatives.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that provision reads:

No loan shall be made under this section to any person to enable him to subscribe or pay for stock or membership in any cooperative association or branch thereof not organized or in existence on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There were two prohibitions in the last law. This, perhaps, is as good a point as any for me to read from a letter which I have received under date of March 31, 1941, from Gov. A. G. Black, of the Farm Credit Administration. It has been claimed that these farm-security activities would interfere with the cooperative activities of the better-off farmers who had borrowed money to establish facilities under the provisions of the farm-credit set-up through the Bank of Cooperatives. I read the letter from Governor Black:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LA FOLLETTE: This is in response to your recent telephone inquiry relative to the activities of the Farm Security Administration in financing low-income farmers in their cooperative activities.

Let me point out first that there is no conflict between the cooperative financing programs of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Security Administration. These two agencies have over the last 5 years worked in close harmony with respect to their loan policies. In general, the Farm Security Administration finances only those cooperative associations which agencies of the Farm Credit Administration cannot finance properly for one reason or another. The Farm Security Administration has followed the general policy of referring applications from farmers' cooperative associations to the proper cooperative bank of the Farm Credit Administration before giving them consideration. Only when the bank for cooperatives has turned down the application has the Farm Security Administration made a loan. In some instances there has been joint financing on the part of the two agencies. Usually these efforts take the form of the Farm Security Administration making loans to individual farmers with which they can purchase membership or shares of stock in a cooperative association, while the Farm Credit Administration makes a direct loan to the association. It oftentimes requires the participation of both low-income and high-income farmers in a given community in order to furnish the volume of commodities necessary for the operations of a successful cooperative. Hence this joint effort on the part of the two agencies is necessary in many cases if a sound cooperative is to be organized for the benefit of all farmers in the community. The present statutes limit the loans which the Farm Credit Administration can make to farmers' cooperative associations for necessary facilities to 60 percent of the value of the security. This limitation in effect requires that the farmer members of these associations raise 40 percent of the total capital of the cooperative. It is impossible for many low-income farmers, especially those in the class of Farm Security rehabilitation clients, to obtain funds from their income or loans from private sources to an extent equivalent to 40 percent of the capital of most cooperative associations. In other words, the requirement that only 60 percent of the value of the security can be loaned by the Farm Credit Administration means that cooperative organizations cannot be had by many of the low-income farmers of the Nation.

I believe this shows without question that there is a real need for a special loan program which will enable the low-income farmers of the country to participate in cooperative activities. If the restrictions such as appeared in the appropriations act for the Farm Security Administration last year and the year before can be removed, the Farm Security Administration could then promulgate such a program.

Sincerely yours,
A. G. BLACK, *Governor.*

Mr. President, there are two ways by which this prohibition directly thwarts the efforts of the small farmer to get ahead. First it denies him the opportunity of buying necessary on-the-farm items, such as feed, seed, livestock, bottles, kerosene, gas, and oil at a saving and through mass purchasing. He is forced to remain a high-cost producer, if the recommendation of the committee is followed. That is what is proposed. It is proposed to deny to these farmers, the clients of the Farm Security Administration, the opportunity to get out of the high-producer class, and thus, first of all, successfully to rehabilitate themselves, and, secondly, to make them a better credit risk so far as the Government is concerned, which provided the original loan to them for the purposes of rehabilitation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will; yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Some of us do not know as much about operations of this kind as does the Senator from Wisconsin, and I ask his patient indulgence. I do not find in that particular section language which says that farm cooperatives cannot be operated for the acquisition of seed and supplies, for example; and I wonder if the Senator will help me in that particular. I do not so read the amendment; and I want the Senator to know that I am looking at it with a sympathetic eye.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the first place, let me say that the principal activity which these cooperatives carry on, as I pointed out in reading from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, is carried on by the small types of cooperatives which band together to purchase a sire or to obtain better breeding stock, or conduct small activities of that kind; but this amendment prohibits farmers banding together for the purpose of establishing, let us say, an oil cooperative, where they can buy and sell their gasoline and oil, and obtain the benefit of cooperative prices and mass purchasing. If there is a group of farmers who need an extra and added facility for the purpose of processing their products, such as a mill, as mentioned by the Secretary in his letter, or such as a grain elevator, if there should be a community in which one was not provided, the amendment bars the establishment of such a facility.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand the latter to be definitely the fact, as I read the amendment. All I had reference to was the Senator's particular statement as to a bar in the language of this amendment to an on-the-farm advantage from the cooperative.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. When I said "on the farm," I meant that the farmer is buying the facility for his own use upon his own farm. This amendment would prevent him from establishing in his community a facility in the form of an elevator or some other facility where a group of farmers could store and purchase their feed and their grain, in order that they might secure the benefit of purchasing commodities for use upon their farms.

The Senator knows that there are two types of cooperatives. Sometimes farmers or others band together for the purpose of mass buying. Sometimes they organize for the purpose of jointly marketing their products. Sometimes those two types of activity are combined. I know that in the case of many of the farmers' cooperative oil stations I have mentioned, financed through the Bank of Cooperatives at St. Paul, not only does the station sell oil but feed, tools, binder twine, repair parts for farm machinery, batteries, and all sorts of things that might be used on the farm. This amendment would deny that sort of activity to the clients of the Farm Security Administration, while at the same time we are permitting the well-to-do farmer who can raise 40 percent collateral to go to the Bank of Cooperatives and borrow money to establish exactly the same kind of a facility.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Directing the Senator's attention, please, to page 353 of the Senate committee hearings, it is there stated that there were 507,000 cases of persons known to be qualified and anxious for loans. The witness, Mr. Thatcher, continues:

I asked them how many new borrowers this proposed appropriation would service, and they said 61,000.

Does the Senator understand that the $125,000,000 represented by the language on page 88 will service only 61,000 new borrowers?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot believe that to be true because the net cost of the program on the average, according to the testimony I took out of the House hearings—and I have not the House hearings with me—was about $75 per family. Of course, if the average is $75, the cost of many is more than that sum, and the cost of some is less than that sum, but what the Senator suggests does not make sense to me.

Mr. DANAHER. It did not make sense to me, let me say to the Senator, and I tried to figure it out.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I can explain it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. For example, if in the northern part of North Dakota we put in, through this system of cooperatives, a durum flour mill that could sell durum wheat, that mill would take care roughly of perhaps 200,000 farmers and their families in the northern part of North Dakota alone. It would cost perhaps

$3,000,000 to do it. I might add that it would save 15 cents a bushel, too, on durum wheat.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will.

Mr. DANAHER. In the Senate committee hearings, I notice at page 448 a statement by Mr. MURRAY to the effect that canning factories—and there were some 20 of them to which he made reference—were constructed under the authorization contained in the W. P. A. Act which provided for farm security last year. This is his statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If he means that it was done under the 1941 act to which the Senator from Vermont just referred, that is not so, because that amendment stopped all cooperative activities of the particular type I have been discussing from going forward.

Mr. DANAHER. That was my understanding.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before this prohibition was put in the act, some canning factories were undertaken on a cooperative basis. I have the exact number here. I think there were 31 altogether. A total investment of $205,000 was made in 31 canning activities. There were 1 in Michigan, 8 in region 4, 7 in region 5, 7 in region 6, 1 in region 7, 8 in region 8, 1 in region 10, and 1 in region 11. I have also been informed that some of these activities were undertaken, prior to the time the rehabilitation program really got under way, by what may be termed relief projects. I know that there is only one in my own State, and that was undertaken before this entire rehabilitation program was under way. It was established by an organization largely for the purposes of relief, and the project has been liquidated; but that cannot be charged to the present policy or program of the Farm Security Administration as now constituted.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. It is probable that the Senator's last remarks apply peculiarly to this statement which appears in the hearings; for it says that five of these canning factories are being foreclosed at the present time, and that they run from $1,200 to $600,000 per canning factory.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I checked the latter statement as to the $600,000 amount, and I know that it is erroneous. I have given the total investment in the 31 canning operations—those that were built by the Farm Security Administration under its policy before the last act was passed, and those which it inherited from the Resettlement Administration, some of which I think, as I stated before, were merely relief projects. They were not really set up for the purpose of helping the farmers to rehabilitate themselves; and the total investment in all of those is $205,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will.

Mr. DANAHER. My next question and comment have to do particularly with what has been suggested by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] as a possible source of dilemma; and I think I correctly interpreted what was in his mind, for it is in mine. If we take the figure which the Senator from Wisconsin gave us of an average of $75 per family, when we read in the hearings that there are 507,000 families qualified, as I pencil it out, that totals only $38,025,000. If we take the 61,000 who are said to be serviced or available to be serviced under the pending $125,000,000, and apply a $75 average to each of the 61,000, it comes to only $4,575,000, or a total of less than $43,000,000 out of the $125,000,000 covered by this proposed section of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Just a moment, if the Senator will permit me. The question which I think the Senator from Vermont has doubt about, and the one that I have doubt about, is whether there is to be no limit of any kind on the extent to which there shall be participation in cooperatives, with that vast differential between $43,000,000 and $125,000,000 to play with.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is entirely wrong if he thinks that any such latitude as that exists. The entire amount of money which has been provided for any type of cooperative activity out of the $385,000,000 which have been loaned amounts to something over $12,000,000, as pointed out by the able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, handling the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not hear all the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut. Did the Senator refer to the 61,000 as being the number of loans which were current with the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. DANAHER. No. Let me answer the Senator by saying that on page 353 of the hearings before the Senate committee is a statement by Mr. Thatcher to the effect that he recently asked the Department "if they had ever made a survey of the people who are clamoring to the local county supervisors for rehabilitation loans who ought to have them, and they said, 'Yes,' that they had" and he testified "there were 507,000 such cases personally known to be qualified and anxious for loans." He continued:

> I asked them how many new borrowers this proposed appropriation would service, and they said 61,000.

That cannot be right. I cannot believe it is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that Mr. Thatcher is the head of a great farm organization, but that statement of his is in error. If the Senator will refer to page 460 of the hearings before the subcommittee, the statement of Mr. Baldwin, head of the Farm Security Administration, he will note that Mr. Baldwin stated that the $125,000,000 carried in the Senate committee's recommendation would provide loans for 105,000 new families, and 216,000 who already have loans who will receive supplemental loans.

Mr. DANAHER. That would make an average over the country of not over $100 a family, roughly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that loans in the section of the country from which I come do not average over $100. I do not know how much they average in other sections.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my information, which I obtained from the testimony before the House committee, I think, that the average over the 5-year period has been about $75 a family.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought it was slightly higher than that, but it certainly is not much more than $100.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is somewhere around that figure.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin permit a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am very sympathetic with what is being developed here, and I should like to be enlightened as to the language in the last two lines.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. "Other than those derived from the first processing"?

Mr. LODGE. No, the words "in competition with existing industries." Does that language mean that in an area where there is no cooperative at the present time a cooperative could not be established?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It means that if there is any kind of facility, whether it is a cooperative or whether it is a private facility, if it is operating anywhere within the area of competition, no loan could be made by the Farm Security Administration for the establishment of any cooperative facility.

Mr. LODGE. Even though the proposed cooperative would render a service which was not being rendered by an existing store, we will say, which is not a cooperative?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. There is no doubt in the Senator's mind about that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. None whatever. If there is any existing activity with which a proposed cooperative facility, through the Farm Security Administration, would come into competition, this would prohibit any loans for such purpose.

Mr. LODGE. There is no doubt about that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. None at all.

Mr. LODGE. Has that language been applied at all in practice in the past?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes. When section 33, which I have read, was incorporated in the last relief act, it put a stop to all loans of the type I have been discussing.

Mr. LODGE. It did?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. It is a clear-cut prohibition, if there is any competition, either private or cooperative or of any other nature, in the area in which the cooperative is to be established.

Mr. LODGE. Even though it does not render a comparable service?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct. The second way the prohibition would directly thwart the efforts of the small farmer to get ahead is that the restrictions would deny him the opportunity of processing and marketing his products smoothly, efficiently, and profitably through modern facilities. He would be forced to remain the low-quality, low-price producer. All the Government's efforts to assist in his rehabilitation would be imperiled if he could not maintain his legitimate place in the competitive markets.

I wish to emphasize that point, Mr. President. Our objective is to rehabilitate these farmers, not for 1 year or 2 years or 4 years; we hope that they are to go on permanently as self-supporting family units in the community; and that is an additional reason why they should have the benefit of the cooperative activity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming a farming section like that of Vermont, where the farming is diversified and on a small scale; would not this provision, if it were enacted into law, interfere with the private economy of a small farm, where one farmer may not afford a cold storage for his perishable products, which he needs right in his own household, and therefore he wants to join with the people on his road, or highway, and have a common cold-storage plant which would take care of household goods, to say nothing about the economy of a market place? Would not this interfere with the social objective of the farm-security law?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it would, and according to the former Secretary of Agriculture, now the Vice President, 10 percent of the loans for cooperative purposes which were made before the opportunity to make them was destroyed by the amendment in the last relief act were for miscellaneous services, such as feed, grist, and sirup mills, other small types of processing equipment, and roadside-vegetable stands, the type of thing the Senator has in mind.

Many examples could be cited to show that the restrictions have been directly discriminatory and harmful to the small farmer. In Phelps County, Nebr., for instance, where 182 families relied on the sale of poultry and poultry products for a large part of their livelihood, an effort was made by the families to establish a cooperative poultry marketing association. About 150 of the families, being small-farm operators without cash or sufficient credit, turned to Farm Security Administration for small loans to enable them to participate; the others could finance their own way. Farm Security Administration could not make the loans, and the cooperative was not established, with the result that not only the needy families but also the more fortunate ones were denied an additional 2 to 4 cents per dozen in the sale of their eggs and similar gains in the marketing of their other poultry products.

This is the type of case mentioned by Governor Black in his letter to me, in which he points out that previously some of the low-income farmers and some of the high-income farmers joined in the same cooperative. It is obvious that in this particular instance there were not enough high-income farmers to swing the proposition, and in order that that particular neighborhood should have the benefit of cooperative marketing for their eggs, it was necessary that the lower-income farmers and producers should also join in the activity, but because of this statutory prohibition, the whole enterprise had to be abandoned. I might mention other examples, but I do not wish further to delay the Senate.

In summing up, I wish to say that I think that in all justice the committee amendment should be rejected and there should be restored to the Farm Security Administration the power which it had prior to the enactment of the last relief law, to permit the low-income farmers to enjoy the benefits of cooperation, just as the higher-income farmers are now enjoying it under governmental policy laid down in the Farm Credit Administration law.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to add my voice to that of the Senator from Wisconsin. The amendment which is offered reads as follows:

> No part of the funds provided in this act under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be used to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes and naval stores products) in competition with existing industries.

In other words, naval stores and sweetpotatoes are excepted. It has been argued to me that the amendment does not prevent the Farm Security Administration from lending to cooperatives, but I am sure the amendment could be construed in that way. The language is:

> No part of the funds provided in this act under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be used to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills—

And so forth. If a broad interpretation is given the provision it must mean that loans cannot be made to a cooperative for the purpose of building an elevator, or for the purpose of buying an elevator, when its products come in competition with existing industries.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the Senator that I got the impression from Mr. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, that the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture had so ruled; in other words, that the Senator's contention is correct, that these funds could not be used for the purposes mentioned.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. As I said, it was argued to me that it did not have such a meaning, but I am frank to say that under this language the Solicitor would have to rule that loans could not be made to cooperatives under those circumstances.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would not language of this kind actually frighten any administrator who had such a project in mind?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think there is any doubt about it. If an administrator found that language in the law he would be afraid to make such loans. He might be afraid that the court would hold that such loans could not be made to cooperatives; that if he made such loans he himself, or the one who went on his bond, would be liable for violation of the law. Likewise, he would feel that he would probably be subject to severe criticism on the floor of the Senate or the House for having made such loans.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In other words, to put it very simply, these words actually negative the very purpose for which these various agencies were set up.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. As I said awhile ago, when the Senator from Utah was not in the Chamber, the contention was made before the committee by two Representatives in Congress that we were duplicating facilities. I called attention to the fact that until the summer of 1940 Farm Credit Administration funds were loaned to farmers to set up 148 cooperative grain elevators. In 143 cases the farmers negotiated with local private owners and purchased the facilities, so there was no duplication. In only 5 cases were new local elevator facilities constructed. Those new facilities duplicated did not exceed a total capacity of 200,000 bushels. To argue that this program unnecessarily would duplicate facilities when so small a number were built is, of course, ridiculous. Two hundred thousand bushels' capacity does not represent one-fourth of the wheat receipts at one little town in Montana where 1,000,000 bushels of wheat are taken in.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I am not concerned with the amendment except I think the interpretation which has been placed upon it overlooks its origin, its source, and its purpose. This language was taken from the relief bill. It was put in the relief bill originally because the relief administrator was employing people in some hosiery mills. I think that was the foundation. The relief administration wanted to give people employment. But this provision was put in to prevent the manufacture by relief employees of products which were to be put upon the market for sale. It permits sewing rooms and factories under the W. P. A. to manufacture certain products, and permits the products then to be distributed for relief purposes, but prevents the W. P. A. Administrator from establishing plants in which, under low wage conditions, products can be manufactured for sale in competition with private industry. I question whether such a provision has a place in this bill. Its purpose was clear in the relief bill. I think when that purpose is considered, the interpretation which the Senator from Utah puts on it really could hardly be sustained, because I think it would have to be construed in

the light of its origin and its original purpose.

Mr. WHEELER. As I said, two Representatives came before the committee to advocate this proposal. Representative YOUNGDAHL said:

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. If I may ask for permission at the start to revise and extend my testimony, I will appreciate it very much.

Senator RUSSELL. All right, sir; you may have that privilege.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I appear to respectfully request the committee to consider an amendment to this section known as Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation for the Farm Security Administration. As you gentlemen know, in the relief law of 1940, which provided for these funds, there was a restriction placed in the law by the Subcommittee on Appropriations in the House and passed by both the House and the Senate. The provision read substantially with the amendment I respectfully suggest be included in this bill, as follows:

"No part of the funds provided in this act under the caption herein 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be used to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes and naval stores products) in competition with existing industries."

This restriction was placed in the bill at that time because, as was stated on the floor of the House—and I am not familiar with the proceedings in the Senate—if we are to give direct grants and provide rural rehabilitation loans, the proceeds of these loans and grants should not be used to build increased business facilities in overcrowded territories at the present time. In the rural sections of the Northwest we have at the present time legitimate cooperatives which no one objects to. We also have the facilities of private enterprise which have been there for years and have aided in the building of many communities, by paying their share of local, State, and Federal taxes. Now then, we feel that to permit the use of relief funds to farmers who really need this money for relief and rehabilitation to buy shares in a new business cooperative to compete with the already existing business facilities is not the intent of the Members of the Senate or of the Members of Congress.

Mr. ADAMS. I merely rose to point out the inception of the matter and the wide distinction which exists. The W. P. A. employees are needy individuals. The W. P. A. puts them to work. It gives them jobs. The Rural Rehabilitation Administration makes loans. That Administration does not give money, does not employ people, but makes loans to needy farmers. On some loans it takes security. Some loans are made practically as gifts to those in the distressed class. Of course, it has always tried to move the distressed farmer over into the loan class.

I think this particular section does not fit into the program of rural rehabilitation. Someone construing the language might say, "Well, if Congress put that language in the measure it must have had some such purpose in mind," but in order to reach such a conclusion it would have to be drawn out of its normal wording, out of the origin from which it came, and applied to an entirely different situation.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand entirely that the provision was made originally because Mr. Tugwell bought and set up some factories.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Colorado is in error, however, as to the provision being made merely to prohibit the W. P. A. from building any factories or expanding any factories. The whole controversy grew out of hosiery mills which the Rural Credit Administration built in Tennessee and in certain areas in Alabama. Those mills were built under a theory which at that time imbued the head of the Rural Rehabilitation Administration and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, that it would be well to have a combined rural and industrial income for certain farm groups, and these hosiery mills were purchased or built with Rural Rehabilitation funds.

Mr. ADAMS. It contemplated a Government-owned and Government-operated plant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly. It is my contention that the language which appears in the committee amendment would apply only to a government-owned and operated plant. I do not think that by the wildest stretch of the imagination this language could ever be construed to prohibit a loan by the Farm Security Administration to a farmer for the purpose of buying stock in a cooperative; but it might be construed—though I think improperly—to prohibit a direct loan from the Farm Security Administration to a cooperative. However, by no stretch of the imagination could it be construed as prohibiting a loan to an individual farmer.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the Senator; but the point I am making is that the language does prohibit a loan to a cooperative, or, in my judgment, could very easily be construed as prohibiting a loan to a cooperative for the purpose of buying a facility or setting up a new facility.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the language would be stretched if it were so construed. I am using the same rule of construction which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] announced. In the first instance this language prohibiting the building of a plant by an agency of the Federal Government as such came into the bill which carried the provision for the Farm Security Administration. As I construe the language, that is all it would do now; but I concede that it is susceptible to the construction—even though it be a strained construction—that it would prohibit a loan to a cooperative.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have consulted with the head of the Farm Security Administration and with those connected with the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture, who will have to administer the law, and they think the language must be construed to prohibit loans to cooperatives for the purpose of setting up facilities if they compete with existing facilities.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think they are in error about that, but I can see how that decision could have been reached. So far as the language prohibiting loans to individual farmers to buy membership in or pay dues to a cooperative is concerned, I do not think it could possibly apply to such a case; and I do not think the language would reach all the cases which the Representatives appearing before the committee had in mind.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to say, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, what I said in my opening statement, that I think much of the opposition to the activities of the Farm Security Administration, and much of the support behind the amendment, are misdirected.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Because better situated farmers have been able to provide 40 percent of the security and go to the bank of cooperatives and borrow money for the establishment of grain elevators, oil stations, and other types of marketing and purchasing cooperative activities, many persons believed that such a condition was the result of activity of the Farm Security Administration, and I think it would be a great injustice to deny that right to the low-income farmer and continue it for the high-income farmer.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know whether the Senator has referred to it, but I understand that Mr. Baldwin, the head of the Farm Security Administration, gave assurances in his testimony before the committee that it was not proposed, even if this prohibition were stricken out, to construct other hosiery plants and manufacturing establishments of the character which provoked this legislation in the first instance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think Mr. Baldwin is undoubtedly sincere in that statement. I know that the criticism which resulted from the construction of the five plants referred to almost wrecked the entire Farm Security Administration program.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If Mr. Baldwin, the responsible head of the Farm Security Administration, did so state to the committee, and the statement that he would consider himself morally bound with that restraint is in the record, does the Senator from Georgia think that if the committee amendment were not adopted by the Senate there would be any substantial danger of the repetition of the sort of thing we have been talking about, which provoked the prohibition in the first place?

Mr. RUSSELL. Men come and go, but the policies of the Government run on. Mr. Baldwin might not be the head of the Farm Security Administration tomorrow. Someone having a different view of the subject might supplant him. I think Mr. Baldwin is about the fourth man who has headed the Farm Security Administration up to this time, and there might be another change.

Mr. PEPPER. When testimony is given before the Appropriations Commit-

tees by the Army Engineers or by the heads of different departments, has it not been customary for them to regard themselves as morally bound?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I think Mr. Baldwin would be morally bound, but I do not think that an administrator of a Government agency ought to be able to fix the policy by a mere declaration. That is for Congress to determine.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I agree with him in his last statement, that the head of the department should not necessarily be allowed to set the policy; but the language of the amendment is so plain that it does not seem to me that we have to turn to the head of the department, or his opinion. Only one thing is controlling, and that is the purpose for which the money is to be used. The borrower is not mentioned. There is no reference to the person to whom the loan is to be made. The only reference is to the purpose for which the loan is to be used. Therefore, if any borrower wanted to borrow for some other purpose than the purpose stated, and met the other qualifications, he could borrow; but if a cooperative wanted to borrow for one of these purposes it would be barred by the very language of the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. I concede that there is a possibility of such a construction. I was not discussing the question of the cooperative borrowing as a cooperative. I was referring to the fact that there is nothing in this language which would prohibit a farmer, as an individual, from using funds which he had borrowed from the Farm Security Administration to carry on a cooperative.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me add one word to supplement what I said as to the origin of this provision. It originated in the 1939 Act, which, as it came to us, provided that:

> No funds herein appropriated shall be used by the Farm Security Administration or any other Federal agency to establish hosiery mills on homestead or other projects in competition with existing industries.

That was the origin, and it has grown up into the present form from that origin. The original purpose was to meet a particular difficulty existing at that time.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. I wish to say, however, that when the matter was presented by Members of Congress they complained that the cooperatives were borrowing money from the Government to set up cooperatives in competition with existing facilities. They went on to explain that great injustice was being done, particularly in the Northwest, in Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Minnesota.

As I stated a moment ago, only five plants were set up which could be considered new facilities, and those five plants handled only 200,000 bushels of wheat, which was one-fourth of the amount handled at the little town of Brady, Mont.

I appreciate that the grain trade in Minneapolis has been fighting the cooperative movement for many years, and that is the reason why it is fighting this proposal. Captain Webster or somebody wrote a letter. Captain Webster represents the grain trade in the Northwest. He does not represent the farmers or the cooperatives. He represents the grain operators. It was the grain trade, or the so-called grain trust, which brought about the Non-Partisan League, and was responsible for the agitation among the farmers in that section. It was claimed—and I think justly—that the operators were improperly grading wheat. It was alleged that they were buying it as No. 4 and selling it as No. 1. In other words, they were not giving the farmers the grade to which they were entitled.

Within the past 5 weeks the private grain trade came to Washington and asked the Department of Agriculture for an extension of a very satisfactory grain-storage contract with the interested Federal agencies. That contract provides charges of 6 cents a bushel for storage, 1 cent a bushel for handling the grain, and 1 cent a bushel for its maintenance, or a total of 8 cents a bushel a year for the warehouseman and terminal market.

Is it any wonder that the private grain trade protested to the Secretary of Agriculture against a proposal for the Department to provide steel tanks for warehousing wheat? The grain trade asserted they would build the necessary facilities to meet the present demand for storage space. They could afford to do this, with such fat warehousing contracts.

The fact is, I am told, that the private grain trade in the spring-wheat area agree that if a normal wheat crop is raised in Montana, the Dakotas, and Minnesota this year, 50,000,000 bushels of wheat will be piled on the ground because of inadequate storage facilities. In Canada some 200,000,000 bushels are on the ground because storage space is not available. Only a limited portion of the Canadian farmer's wheat is stored. Available facilities are divided among all the wheat producers in Canada. American farmers are faced with this problem today: A farmer cannot get a loan on the wheat that is not properly warehoused. When the wheat is on the ground, there lies his year's labor. The private grain trade today state they will meet the situation by building additional storage facilities throughout the Northwest. Their tune has changed. A year ago, additional storage facilities were excessive. Cooperatives were destroying legitimate enterprise with duplication of facilities. Today we do not need cooperatives, because the grain trade can do and will do it. The fact is that the private grain trade feared competition from cooperatives. Excessive facilities was a charge, a tool to obtain such an amendment as the committee now proposes. That is why they do not want the Government to furnish steel bins for storage, and that is why they promise to build additional facilities. It is all right for them with fat contracts to do that which the cooperatives and the Government should not do.

The necessity for storage space is imperative. Realizing this, the Defense Commission recognized the plea of the private grain trade, and urged that the Treasury Department give favorable consideration to a proposition that would permit warehousemen building new storage facilities to charge off construction costs over a 5-year period.

One Minnesota Representative stated to the committee that the Farmers' Union at the present time was using Farm Security Administration funds to build storage facilities at two points in Montana, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., and at Superior, Wis. As a matter of fact, the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, a regional grain cooperative-marketing association in the spring-wheat area, which began operation on June 1, 1938, was aided in its creation by the Farm Security Administration. The farmers in the spring-wheat area were loaned $309,000 to help reestablish this important regional grain cooperative marketing association. It has been so successful in its operations of less than 3 years that the farmers who had borrowed the $309,000 from the F. S. A. have not had to pay 1 cent of interest or principal. The Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association from their net savings, which are very substantial, have made the current interest and principal payments for the farmers. Not only that, but their savings have been so substantial that they are now building needed warehousing facilities in my State of Montana. They are constructing one house at Lewistown, Mont., of over 500,000 bushels, and another one at Shelby, Mont., of over 700,000 bushels. Contrary to the testimony before the committee, the Farmers' Union is not building at Grand Rapids, N. Dak., but is building at Superior, Wis., on the lake. The capacity of this house will be over 3,000,000 bushels, with a most modern head house which will ultimately handle an additional 7,000,000 bushels of stored grain. Not 1 cent of this construction money has been or will be obtained from the Farm Security Administration. That is one of the things they thought perhaps they were preventing, I think; but, as a matter of fact, not $1 is coming from the Farm Security Administration.

The Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, from their own capital and net profits, plus a loan from the Farm Credit Administration, are building these facilities at a cost of $1,600,000. How are they doing it? In this way: They are writing their check for $400,000. They have other assets which will be pledged, and the facilities will be put up as collateral, so that they can easily and readily borrow, as any very successful cooperative can, from the Farm Credit Administration. They are making what is known as a facility loan, and they are making it under the law prescribed by Congress from the Farm Credit Administration.

The Minnesota Representative was totally misinformed as to the use of Farm Credit Administration funds for the construction program. The private grain trade is making a terrific fight against this very successful regional grain cooperative marketing association. The testimony is inaccurate, and the Senate must not be misled by it. What

other grain concern besides this cooperative is stretching its resources to build needed facilities to aid wheat farmers in the spring-wheat area? Warehouse facilities must be available if the farmer is to obtain loans. If the farmers cannot store the wheat it will go on the ground, and they will be unable to get a loan, unable to pay their bills, and unable to feed their families.

If neither the Farm Bureau nor the Grange will oppose this amendment, I am confident that those organizations do not know the facts. Any student of the wheat farmer's problem knows that the spring-wheat area may suffer the present debacle of Canada. Canadian wheat farmers have been unable to warehouse or sell their grain to the extent of millions and millions of bushels which lie on the ground. Surely the Farm Bureau and the Grange would oppose this amendment if they knew these facts.

The National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, operating in the Great Plains States and composed of 9 regional grain cooperative marketing associations, knows the seriousness of these facts. These 9 regional grain cooperative marketing associations serve over 1,000 country farmer cooperative grain elevators. They also operate terminal elevators in the spring- and winter-wheat area. They do and must know their business. All 9 of them are successful. These regional grain cooperatives serve farmers in Amarillo, Tex.; Enid, Okla.; Hutchinson, Kans.; Kansas City; Omaha, Nebr.; Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, Minn.; Superior, Wis.; Ogden, Utah; Denver, Colo.; as well as Portland and Spokane in the Pacific Northwest. That great aggregation of cooperative enterprises is in complete opposition to this amendment, as is also the National Farmers' Union. They are opposed because they know the facts and because they know the farmer's needs.

The question before the Senate is, Will the United States Senate support this amendment, which serves the private grain trade in the spring-wheat area, or will they support 20 years of congressional legislation which has encouraged and assisted the development and expansion of the cooperative movement? If the United States Senate is to be consistent, it should, if this amendment is adopted, pass legislation to repeal all the cooperative laws and abolish the Farm Credit Administration. If there is any value in the laws which have been enacted to provide credit for producers of agricultural commodities, certainly the United States Senate will not deny the use of Farm Security Administration funds for the benefit of low-income farmers who need assistance more than does any other group of farmers. Farmers without funds cannot borrow money from the local banks or from the Farm Credit Administration because they lack the necessary down payment. The Farm Credit Administration may loan only 60 percent of the cost of facilities. Where will the farmer get the other 40 percent?

The amendment is not in the interest of agriculture, and, judging from the testimony, it is offered in the interests of the too-often selfish private grain trade. It cannot honestly be said that rejection of this amendment would mean unneeded facilities. Remember, the private grain trade recently secured from the Secretary of Agriculture an agreement that the Government would not put up steel bins in the wheat area to meet the impending wheat-storage crisis. Remember, too, that the private grain trade has secured an extension of present storage-service charges on the promise that it would build additional storage space. The private grain trade, of course, is not at all interested in what happens to naval stores and sweetpotatoes, which are exempted by the present amendment.

In all good conscience the Senate must defeat this amendment or, to be consistent, it should repeal all the 20 years' laws of Congress which have sought to aid and develop the cooperative marketing system for agricultural producers.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected. If it is not rejected, it seems to me it will be a great injustice to the small cooperatives throughout the country, and particularly in the Northwest, where the farmers have had such a struggle and where they are the low-income farmers who are trying to get started and to establish a small cooperative so that they may save some of the profit.

As I have pointed out, some persons have said that the cooperatives are not a success; but here is one cooperative that has been a success and is a success, and the farmers in my State at least are getting great benefits from it.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I desire to make just a short statement on this matter. As a member of the subcommittee who heard the evidence, I have come to some definite conclusions, and believe I am right in desiring to have this amendment remain in the bill.

The amendment which Senators now seek to have stricken from the bill was included in the W. P. A. Act which expired on July 1 of this year. Now the item for loans and grants for rural rehabilitation is put in the agricultural appropriation bill to take effect after July 1, 1941. It was in the W. P. A. Act last year, and now it comes this year in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

The point I desire to bring out is that Federal funds are needed by these needy farmers to rehabilitate themselves. There are 5 times as many applicants for rehabilitation loans as there is money enough to go around and take care of them. The evidence is that about 101,000 farmers can be taken care of, and there are 507,000 applicants. Therefore, none of this money should be given to those who could take out of the money they receive investment funds to start a concern, and especially they should not start a concern which would compete with a small-town local industry such as an elevator, a creamery, or which would interfere with the small private businessman.

It is my belief that the small businessman is just as necessary to the welfare of my State and your State as is the farmer. This bill is to help the farmer with loans to rehabilitate himself, and with grants. That means grants of money for food for the immediate needs of his family.

In my State, farmers are getting as grants $25 a month. How can a farmer get out of $25 a month any money with which to establish a cooperative?

I am certainly in sympathy with the establishment of cooperatives; but there are other sources from which Federal money is available to start cooperatives in places where they are needed. As I see the matter, the Federal Government does not desire, under the terms of the agricultural appropriation bill, to loan money to farmers to provide competition for small businessmen, who certainly are as much a part of the community as is the farmer, and certainly not with money that is provided by the Government to get the farmer off relief.

If we desire to provide money to start cooperatives, let us do it in another way. We are doing it in another way, according to the evidence brought out by the chairman of our committee when he told us that $12,000,000 was provided as of December 31, 1940.

I believe that the small businessman has as much right to get along as has the farmer who desires to establish a cooperative industry. I call the attention of the Senate to page 446 of the Senate committee hearings, where the country elevators of the Northwest, speaking through the Northwest Country Elevator Association, expressed themselves as being very much in favor of having this restriction in this part of the bill.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated a few moments ago, in the colloquy between the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Connecticut, that the average amount of the loans made by the Farm Security Administration was approximately $100. At that time I was confusing in my own mind the Federal seed loans and the loans made by the Farm Security Administration. The average new loans of the Farm Security Administration were about $650, and the average supplemental loans referred to in the evidence are $225.

I merely wanted to make that statement to get the record straight.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not hear the Senator's statement. Unfortunately, I was out of the Chamber for a moment. Was the fact brought out that there are over 500,000 applications by poor farmers for these loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. There are 507,000 cases known to the county supervisors which are eligible for these loans.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And there is not enough money to supply those poor farmers with money?

Mr. RUSSELL. There are not nearly adequate funds to take care of anything like that number. The evidence showed that even with the increase in the funds for loans that was provided by the Sen-

ate committee, only 105,000 of those families could possibly be reached, even if all the funds were devoted to loans to farmers.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it not true that any diversion from that fund for the construction of industrial plants such as elevators will reduce the number of farmers who can be granted rehabilitation loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it will undoubtedly have that effect.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. But is it not possible, also, that the establishment of the cooperatives would help the poorer farmers by giving them, perhaps, better marketing facilities?

Mr. RUSSELL. It possibly would help the farmers who had the loans. The Senator from Alabama, if I understood his question, was asking whether, if the loans were spread out and used solely for the purpose of making crop loans, they would not reach more farmers; and I think that question should be answered in the affirmative.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I meant to elicit—that it is a method of helping the poorer farmers for the Farm Security Administration in some instances to encourage the establishment of cooperatives in a community.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar of my own knowledge with the effect of the cooperatives. I judge from the debate this afternoon that some of the cooperatives have been very helpful. The committee, in writing this restriction, was guided by the reasons stated by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], that there were so many farmers seeking these loans for purely rehabilitation purposes that the funds were not available for all of them, and the committee desired to spread the money as far as it could go for strictly rehabilitation purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator disposed to say whether the Farm Security Administration itself favors or does not favor this amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Farm Security Administration oppose any limitation whatever on their powers. I may say to the Senator from Florida that it is nothing new for any agency of the Government to take that position. Very few of them like to have any restriction on their powers.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I believe this amendment should be rejected. Fifty percent of the farmers of the country receive only 11 percent of the total farm income, and that is the group served by these loans.

The cooperatives in my State are doing a good service for the small farmer. If this amendment is kept in the bill a group of farmers could not form a cooperative and borrow money to set up a feed mill to grind their feed. They could not set up a little sawmill. They could not set up a cooperative cream station, or a cooperative oil and gas station. They could not set up a cooperative canning plant to can their tomatoes or their corn. They could not borrow money to set up a cooperative elevator if this amendment is placed in the bill. This is a move to eliminate them from borrowing on a cooperative basis.

As pointed out by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], the language found here was put in the W. P. A. Act in order to keep the Government itself from entering into competition with business when the Government owned and operated an activity, whereas this is a different proposition, wherein the Government would simply lend money to private individuals. The precedent is already set for that course under the R. F. C. and other Government lending agencies which lend to private business for the purpose of carrying on private business in competition with other business.

Therefore, I hope this amendment will be rejected, so that it cannot be brought up in conference as it was before. Such action will be a definite benefit to the poor farmer in his effort by cooperative methods to offset the disadvantage he has because his purchasing power is small, and will put him in a better position to compete with the greater buying and selling power of big business, and give him the advantage of the cooperative effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee. [Putting the question.] Frankly, the Chair is in doubt.

Mr. PEPPER. I call for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division has been demanded.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ADAMS voted in the affirmative.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. GEORGE. A point of order. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum comes too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The roll call is in progress, and it is too late to make the point of no quorum. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], which I transfer to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce a pair between the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. If present, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. AUSTIN. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

The following Senators are unavoidably detained:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—22

Adams	Connally	Maloney
Bailey	George	Radcliffe
Ball	Gerry	Russell
Bankhead	Gillette	Sheppard
Barkley	Gurney	Spencer
Bilbo	Hill	Van Nuys
Byrd	Lodge	
Byrnes	McCarran	

NAYS—31

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Holman	Shipstead
Austin	Hughes	Smathers
Barbour	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lee	Wallgren
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
Green	Norris	
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—42

Bone	Glass	Reynolds
Brewster	Harrison	Schwartz
Bridges	Hayden	Smith
Brooks	Herring	Taft
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bunker	Lucas	Tobey
Burton	McFarland	Truman
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Walsh
Davis	Overton	White
Downey	Reed	Willis

So the committee amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 319. An act for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Glen E. Robinson, doing business as the Robinson Marine Construction Co.;

H. R. 2788. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4124. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Cooperative Farm Forestry", on page 91, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$600,000"; in line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$700,000"; and in line 19, after the word "allotted", to insert "therefrom."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration", on page 92, line 18, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "and press clippings"; and in line 19, after the word "reports", to strike out "$3,923,425, of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'" and insert "$3,946,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 20, after the word "Administration", to increase the total appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, from $3,923,425 to $3,946,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farm Credit Administration—Salaries and Expenses," on page 98, line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$3,910,000, of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'" and insert "$3,810,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation", on page 102, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to offer a clarifying amendment, which does not affect the total of the appropriations carried in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the words "is a part" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "consists."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, line 19, after the comma following the parenthesis it is proposed to insert "and $1,955,500 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 by the act approved September 5, 1940 (Public, No. 780, 76th Cong.)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offer a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$321,950" and to insert in lieu thereof "$333,950."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment really was offered in behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and was overlooked by the committee in marking up the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is an amendment to an amendment already agreed to. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment of the committee was agreed to is reconsidered, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the committee on page 49, line 12.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 19, it is proposed to insert in lieu of the matter inserted by the committee the figures "$1,451,362, of which $10,000 shall be available for expenditure for future investigation and control of pear-leaf blight."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Mississippi that his amendment is an amendment to an amendment which has already been agreed to. It will be necessary, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, so that the Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement about the importance of the amendment, and after the statement I will not urge the amendment unless the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in charge of the bill, will accept it and take it to conference.

In the Southern States several hundred thousand dollars are invested in the pineapple-pear industry. For the last 3 years we have been seeking to find a remedy for the treatment of the pear-leaf blight in this industry.

I have in my hand a letter from the entomologist of the A. & M. College of our State who says it will be necessary for the Government to put a special man to work in the Southern States to carry on an investigation for a year or two in order to find a means of stopping this particular disease in this great orchard growth in our section of the country. He says one man, with this small appropriation, only $10,000 a year, should be able within 2 or 3 years to find the causes of the disease and the proper treatment to prevent its spread. It has already covered a great many counties in the Southern States, and is rapidly spreading and will mean the ultimate destruction of the entire industry unless it is stopped.

To those who know anything about the orchard business I can explain that after the trees have leaves in the early spring, a mould strikes the leaves which causes them all to drop from the trees, then a second growth of leaves comes out during the same season, which strikes at the very life of the tree, and weakens its vitality, until the tree is rendered almost fruitless, and in the course of a few years the result is the death of the tree.

We have been experimenting for the last 3 years, but so far have failed to find anything to stop the spread of this particular disease, which is destructive of the

great pear industry of the extreme Southern States.

We believe, on the advice of the entomologist of my State, that by this small investment we can put an expert on the job for 2 or 3 years, and it is believed it will be possible to control the disease.

If the Senator from Georgia is willing to accept the amendment and let it go to conference, I am sure the Department will approve it. I was not in the city when the bill was under consideration before the committee, which is the reason why I did not present the matter to the committee. It is such a small amount that I thought the Senator might accept it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is not a large amount considering the total of the bill. Of course, the Senator from Georgia likes to be agreeable whenever it is possible to be so, but I will say frankly to the Senator from Mississippi that in the absence of any hearings on this amendment I think it would not avail anything to take it to conference.

Mr. BILBO. I think I can secure a statement from the head of the Bureau of Plant Industry for the conference committee, approving the statement made by the Bureau of Plant Industry representative of my State.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, considerable sums are contained in this bill already for work of this character. There is an item in the first pages of the bill providing $2,400,000 to the States for experimental work. That work is set up and budgeted in the Department. I believe that if the Senator from Mississippi will see the representatives of the Department it will be possible for him to have this work done with funds which are already provided in this bill, either for the State college experiment stations or for the special research fund of the Secretary of Agriculture, for which a total of $1,400,000 was provided.

I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that, if he fails in securing that action, while I know that time is important—the Senator states that this has been going on for 2 or 3 years, and therefore it will not be disastrous to all the pear trees—if next year the Senator will provide me with a memorandum, I will examine the officials of the Department to see if we can justify doing more than putting the amendment in the appropriation bill and taking it to conference.

I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not insist on his request at this time. Two or three other Senators have spoken to me about securing appropriations of this nature, and if the bill is opened to one it will certainly provoke other amendments. I hope the Senator will not insist on his request.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude and spirit of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I hesitated to offer the amendment, knowing the rule of the committee and the desire to get the bill passed without any amendments from the floor. I appreciate the wisdom of the Senator's position, but I will take occasion to try to drive a bargain with the committee. If I am not able to get the department to allocate adequate funds for research in this great industry, I shall expect the support of the chairman of the subcommittee of a special bill to take care of that matter in the deficiency appropriation this session, because it is important that the work be done now.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Mississippi must recognize that the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who has the record of having taken more money from the Federal Treasury by bills which he has handled on the floor of the Senate than any man who ever lived, will have charge of any deficiency bill that will come before the Senate later on. I am a humble member of the Appropriations Committee, and if the Senator from Mississippi will bring up the scientists and specialists of the Department, and make a case as persuasive as he has made now, I, as a member of that committee, would feel disposed to support his proposal. The Senator from Colorado will undoubtedly want to reach an even more astronomical figure in the total amount of money he has taken out of the Treasury by appropriation bills since he has been handling these gigantic appropriations. I am sure that to protect his record and to prevent its being equaled in the future he will lend a very attentive ear to the request of the Senator from Mississippi for an increase. [Laughter.]

Mr. BILBO. I am perfectly satisfied with the response of the Senator from Georgia, and I entertain no doubt that I shall be able to persuade the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], to continue the spirit of liberality, which he has shown in such a dutiful way. I am sure that with the aid of the department and with the chairman's approval I shall be able to make out a perfect case.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think an explanation, going back to another bill, may be in order. An appropriation was asked for by the heads of three of the great scientific societies of the United States. An island was created in Gatun Lake by the construction of the Panama Canal. Congress set aside that island for biological research to protect tropical fauna and flora. Thirteen of the great universities have established laboratories there. They had been maintained by private contributions. The private contributions dried up somewhat. Congress authorized an appropriation of $10,000 for the purpose of repairing the docks and the buildings at the island for this scientific research, for the purpose of studying the fauna and flora, and endeavoring to obtain scientific knowledge for the benefit of humanity. After a good deal of effort, I succeeded in getting through the subcommittee and through the full committee an appropriation of $10,000 for this purpose. When we reached the conference committee—and this is the moral I wish to leave with the Senator from Mississippi—the conference committee refused to allow the appropriation. I pointed out to the members that there was no difficulty in securing appropriations not only of millions of dollars but of billions of dollars if they had for their purpose the destruction of human life and human property, and if the amount was large enough; but we could not get through the conference committee an appropriation of $10,000 for scientific research.

I merely wish to point out to the Senator from Mississippi that perhaps if he were to ask for more, and if he could point out that what he requested was for the benefit of national defense, and that it would create agencies of destruction, he would not have any trouble.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, with that statement I withdraw my amendment, and I assure the Senator from Colorado that I shall ask for enough.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Georgia for a moment. In the last day or two, after the bill was reported from committee, my attention was called to a desire on the part of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters to secure an increase of $10,000 in the amount provided in line 19, page 42 of the bill, for the purpose of making a study of costs and production in the lumber and other wood-using industries of the Lake States.

I have conferred with the Senator privately about this matter, and I understand he feels that such an amendment could not be considered because it has not been presented to the committee.

In order that it may ultimately be brought to the attention of the committee I ask to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement which was furnished to me by representatives of the American Federation of Labor, and I shall hope that at the next session of Congress there may be an opportunity for the consideration of this very meritorious item.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure that if the Senator from Wisconsin will bring the matter before the committee next year we will give it careful consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

THE LABOR SITUATION AND LUMBER INDUSTRY OF THE LAKES STATES IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

We desire to bring to your attention certain important weaknesses in the labor situation and the lumber industry in Wisconsin and the other Lake States that are not only of great significance with respect to the welfare of labor but which also are intimately related to the national-defense program.

For more than 2 years the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters has been endeavoring to get the Government to make a survey in the Wisconsin lumber industry to ascertain labor costs in the manufacture of lumber. In view of the strategic importance of lumber for defense industries and defense housing, it appears important that this study be made at this time. At the request of the Defense Commission a study has recently been completed in the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest, but the important timber-producing area in Wisconsin and neighboring States has not been covered by such an investigation. We earnestly hope that, even at this late date, you may be able to obtain an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill that will make available to the United States Forest Service not less than $10,000 for the conduct of this study in the State of Wisconsin. Because of its knowledge of the

problem and the related studies it has carried on in the past, we believe that the Forest Service is the governmental agency best qualified to make a fair and authoritative investigation.

We wish to emphasize that the A. F. of L. earnestly desires to assist in preventing the development of labor difficulties that may handicap our defense efforts. Unfortunately, there exist in Wisconsin and the Lake States certain long-standing conditions that may erupt into acute disturbances under the pressures of the current emergency. But at present there is nowhere available authentic and official information on cost of production in the industry, acceptable by both the industry and the union, which would serve as a basis for the settlement.

Some fundamental aspects of the present situation are as follows:

1. There are some 150,000 workers in the forest and woodworking industries of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Probably not more than half of these have full-time work. Wages and living conditions for many of the woods and mill workers are admittedly as bad as in any part of the Nation. Wages are often below the minimum set by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Furthermore, there is a concerted effort on the part of the lumbermen and some farm organizations to make the wage-and-hour law ineffective in the timber industry. Threat of such industrial strife at a time when the Nation is sorely in need of large quantities of lumber and millwork to meet its demands for the expanded defense program is a source of weakness.

2. Shortages of lumber and rises in lumber prices have already developed. The stoppage of large imports of pulp from the Scandinavian countries may make the pulpwood situation acute. The demand for crating material in connection with the national-defense program is enormous. Not all the present mills are working to full capacity. If these mills, together with many idle mills, could be put to work, the output of timber products by the region could be doubled. While most of the virgin pine timber has been depleted, the remaining hardwood supplies and the large reserves of aspen and jack pine could serve as a source of much-needed crating material, pulpwood, mine props, ties, telephone poles, and high-grade lumber. The revival of the lumber industry in the cut-over region of the Lake States, besides serving immediate national needs, would also be an important means of economic rehabilitation of a region which is now considered a "problem area" and is a weak spot in our national strength. The great demand for timber products, with our present uncontrolled cutting on private land, may speed up forest devastation and completely ruin the resource upon which the life of the industry and the livelihood of the woodworker depends. The interest of the workers in the preservation and development of our forests is very vital.

In order to prevent present unfavorable labor conditions from reaching an acute stage, to provide for employment of labor, maintain reasonable lumber prices, and increase production of timber products to full capacity, without destruction of the forest itself, an immediate study of costs of production as a basis for adjustment of wages in the woods and mills is urgently recommended.

The American Federation of Labor brings this matter to your attention because of its importance to national defense and in the hope that if you agree with it you will bring the matter to the attention of Congress and request that sufficient funds be included in the agricultural appropriation bill for fiscal year 1942 to insure that the work will be effectively done.

We understand this bill is already ready to be acted upon on the floor of the Senate.

Specifically, it would involve an amendment in H. R. 3735, page 42, line 19, strike out "$140,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

FOREST SERVICE

Forest economics

Page 42, line 19, strike out "$140,000" and insert "$150,000."

The purpose of this amendment is to provide funds for an immediate study of costs of production in the lumber and other wood-using industries of the Lake States, as a basis for adjustment of wages in the woods and mills, in order to forestall labor disturbances inimical to the national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks be authorized to correct all totals in the bill which may need correction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 3735) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3486.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3486) to authorize an appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, who has given this matter a great deal of consideration, whether the amount carried in the bill has not already been proved to be totally inadequate?

Mr. MALONEY. The amount originally appropriated?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; the amount provided in the bill for additional defense housing.

Mr. MALONEY. In reply to the Senator, I will say that there was no evidence before the committee to indicate that the amount was insufficient. We heard Mr. Carmody, of the Federal Works Agency; Mr. Palmer, Coordinator of Defense Housing; and the other officials who were concerned; and no one raised the question of the inadequacy of the amount of money.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have been informed that there is already an indication that, due to the concentration of defense projects, even with this additional sum of money, the housing congestion will be acute and that there will be a terrific shortage of housing facilities. I concede that the Senator is very much better informed than I am. I am not a member of the committee and have had no opportunity to investigate the matter.

Mr. MALONEY. Further in reply to the Senator, I will say that if the emergency should last for a considerable length of time and the need for housing for national-defense workers should continue, there might later be need for additional funds. In that connection, I will say that at this time the original $150,000,000 appropriated in the so-called Lanham Act of last year, to which this bill is an amendment, has been practically all allocated.

Mr. President, I shall be pleased to explain the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3486) to authorize an appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 (b) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, is hereby amended (1) by striking out "$3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,500" and (2) by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That all items of cost with respect to each such family dwelling unit shall be separately estimated with a view toward economy, and no movable equipment shall be installed in such units, unless the Administrator shall, in any particular case, deem such installation to be in the public interest."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of October 14, 1940, is hereby amended by striking out "$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the apparent confidence of the Senate and its willingness to trust my committee and pass the bill without an explanation, but I wish briefly to point out that this amendment to the so-called Lanham Act, which was passed by the Congress last year, provides an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing. The matter was thoroughly discussed in the Senate at that time. Senators are familiar with it, and I can understand why there is no need or desire for a reexplanation of the bill.

There is only one change. In the original act it was provided that the amount of money to be spent for a single unit should average $3,000 over the country. The committee unanimously increased the amount to $3,500.

The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was called away from the Chamber. He asked me to explain to the Senate that he

is very much in sympathy with this proposal, that he was in attendance at all the meetings of the committee, and that he is anxious to have his colleagues know of his intense interest in and desire to support the bill.

I have received a similar message from the able junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR].

Mr. President, I am prepared to answer any questions Senators may wish to ask about the bill, but at this late hour, knowing that we are to have an executive session, I do not wish to enter into any lengthy explanation unless the Senate so desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he does not think it would be wise to place in the RECORD at this point the report of the committee?

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his thoughtful suggestion. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 159) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3486) to authorize an appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The committee recommends that in addition to the increased authorization for an appropriation of $150,000,000, which was contained in the bill as it passed the House, the act of October 14, 1940, be amended so as to provide that the average cost of family dwelling units constructed under the act and located in the continental United States shall not exceed $3,500. This amounts to an increase of $500 per unit, as section 1 (b) of the present law fixes the average cost at not to exceed $3,000. The committee believes that this increase is justified and desirable in view of the testimony presented at the hearing held on March 26, 1941.

The proviso contained in the House bill relating to separate estimates of cost items and the installation of movable equipment has been incorporated without substantial change as a part of section 1 (b) of the act of October 14, 1940, and the title of H. R. 3486 has been changed in order to indicate that something other than an increased authorization of appropriation is recommended.

The general purposes of the bill are indicated in the following excerpt from the report of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds (H. Rept. No. 142):

"The act of October 14, 1940 (Public, No. 849), authorized a public housing program to the extent of $150,000,000 for defense needs, of which amount $10,000,000 was to reimburse the President's emergency funds for an equivalent amount previously made available for housing purposes. There was thus provided, under this act, a net amount of $140,000,000. Under this authorization, Joint Resolution No. 106, approved October 14, 1940, appropriated $75,000,000 and authorized the execution of contracts for the additional $75,000,000. The bill now under consideration would amend section 3 of said act of October 14, 1940, by increasing, from $150,000,000 to $300,000,000, the amount authorized to be appropriated.

"The testimony given before the committee by the Coordinator of Defense Housing showed that of the net authorization of $140,000,000, there was allocated or in process of allocation, as of February 20, 1941, a total of $133,871,500 to provide 33,040 family dwelling units (which includes 4,904 units for the families of enlisted men of the Army and Navy) and 2,445 units for single persons. The testimony further showed that, on the basis of current information in the hands of the Coordinator, it is evident that additional public housing facilities will be needed in approximately 65 localities where there has been, or will be, a material expansion of the national-defense program, in order to provide for industrial workers, including family dwelling units for approximately 44,900 families and dwelling units for approximately 1,400 single persons. These cannot be provided for by private capital, either because the extent thereof is beyond the capacity of normal building activity within the locality or the continuance of need is so uncertain or the obtainable rental so limited that private capital cannot afford to take the risks involved.

"Since the act of October 14, 1940, although primarily for the purpose of providing housing for industrial workers, permits the construction of housing facilities for the families of enlisted men of the Army and Navy (including the construction of such facilities on lands under the jurisdiction of such agencies), there are included in the estimates of need, upon which this authorization is based, 9,500 units for the families of enlisted men of the Army and Navy assigned to duty at permanent military or naval bases. The total estimate of additional need, therefore, is approximately 54,400 family dwelling units and units for approximately 1,400 single persons.

"While these figures, naturally, are subject to change as the national-defense program develops, the committee are satisfied that the facilities to be provided under current authorizations will be inadequate to meet urgent requirements for defense housing and that the increased authorization in this bill should be enacted."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3486) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, relating to defense housing, by authorizing an additional appropriation of $150,000,000, and for other purposes."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding officer appointed Mr. MALONEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTROL OF CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I regret to be compelled to report to the Senate what appears to be an unfortunate incident, which I hope will not reflect news of another great loss of life.

This morning at 8:15, trip No. 16 of the Eastern Air Lines left Miami, Fla., with 13 passengers aboard, and with sufficient gasoline to maintain it for 6 hours. It has not been heard from after 9 hours. The Coast Guard has been searching for it for hours.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority has just reported to me that there is no report from the ship, and that it must be down, because it has not sufficient gasoline to sustain it for 9 hours.

I make this report with the hope and prayer that life may have been spared; but I make it to bring again to the attention of the Senate the fact that six crashes have occurred in 8 months since the change in the civil-aeronautics law.

Whatever may have been the cause, and whatever may be the future conditions, a very unfortunate condition now prevails with reference to commercial and civil aviation in this country. For many months during the time the Civil Aeronautics Authority was in full power and the Air Safety Board was in operation there was not a crash or a loss of life. Eight months have now reflected six unfortunate incidents. I hope we shall not read in the newspapers tomorrow of a loss of life in this particular instance. However that may be, the incident reflects one thing, and that is that there is something wrong with the system.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of an agreement was submitted:

By Mr. GREEN:

Executive C, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the Inter-American convention on nature protection and wildlife preservation in the Western Hemisphere, signed on the part of the United States of America at Washington, on October 12, 1940, without amendment or reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO—RECIPROCAL TRANSIT OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the agreement, Executive D, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, an agreement between the United States of America and Mexico to facilitate the reciprocal transit of military aircraft through the territories and territorial waters of the two countries signed at Washington on April 1, 1941, which was read the second time, as follows:

AGREEMENT TO FACILITATE THE RECIPROCAL TRANSIT OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT

The Under Secretary of State of the United States of America, Sumner Welles, and the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Mexico, Dr. Francisco Castillo Nájera,

the former appointed by the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the latter by the President of Mexico, General Manuel Avila Camacho, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, and following instructions from their Governments, declare: that both countries, the United States and Mexico, in view of the exceptional circumstances which have arisen from the present European conflict, and taking into consideration the necessity of ensuring conditions of maximum speed for the movements required in the defense of the American Continent in matters of aviation, and desirous of organizing a substantial and efficient collaboration by both countries in their task to defend the Americas, and with the highest regard for their juridical equality and respect for the sovereignty of both countries, have agreed to permit the reciprocal transit of military aircraft through their territories and territorial waters, pursuant to the following clauses.—

FIRST.—The mutual concessions which the High Contracting Parties grant each other under this Agreement, will be effective only for the duration of the present state of possible threats of armed aggression against either of them and, if so required, in the opinion of both Governments, by the needs of their mutual defense.

SECOND.—In view of the resolutions of the Second Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Relations, held at Habana, the United States and Mexico will grant free transit through their respective territories and territorial waters of military airplanes and seaplanes of the other country, without restrictions as to type, number, frequency of flights, personnel or material carried.

THIRD.—Each Government agrees to give to the other, official notice, at least twenty-four hours in advance, of the departure from its territory of any such aircraft which it is desired shall fly over the territory of the other, and such notice shall specify the number and type of the aerial units, the flight routes, the land and sea airports on which the airplanes and seaplanes contemplate making regular landings, and the number of their crew and individuals carried.

FOURTH.—The airplanes and seaplanes of each Government shall use only the routes previously determined by the other Government with regard to the flights over land and territorial waters of the latter. The Governments will also determine the regular landing places within their respective territorial boundaries.

The flights to which this Agreement refers, shall not be made until the routes and places referred to in the preceding paragraph shall have been designated.

FIFTH.—Each Government assumes the obligation that none of its aircraft shall take more than 24 hours to transit the territory of the other, including the use of all land and sea airports within the latter's territory or territorial waters, except in case of *force majeure* when the stay may be prolonged for the time deemed necessary by the Government whose territory is being traversed.

SIXTH.—Any military aircraft of one of the Contracting Parties, landing on any of the points designated for that purpose in the territory of the other Party, will have the right to be furnished only such fuel, food, provisions, etc., as the latter country may be willing to furnish according to its own legislation. But in no event shall an aircraft be denied fuel, food, provisions, supplies, etc., sufficient to enable it to reach the nearest source of supply within the jurisdiction of its own country.

SEVENTH.—Each Government, within its own territory and by means of its own forces, shall protect the points designated on land or sea for the landing of aircraft. Should either Government be in need of material or equipment for this purpose which the other Government may be in a position to furnish, the matter shall form the subject of discussion and any material or equipment furnished shall be on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon.

EIGHTH.—Present conditions of possible threats of armed aggression against the American Continent will exist, in so far as the reciprocal concessions emanating from this Agreement are concerned, so long as the Governments of the United States and Mexico shall jointly deem them to exist; and it is expressly understood that the mere notification by one of the High Contracting Parties to the other that it considers that the state of affairs that has brought about this Agreement has disappeared, will suffice for the complete termination of the concessions and obligations herein contained. Such notification may be given through the usual diplomatic channels, or direct by one Government to the other. Aircraft of either Party in transit at the time such unilateral notification is given shall have twenty-four hours within which to leave the territory of the other.

NINTH.—This Agreement, when ratified by the Constitutional branch of each Government, will become effective as of the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place in the city of Washington as soon as possible.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, and with the powers hereinbefore stated, the Under Secretary of State of the United States of America and the Ambassador of Mexico, sign and cause their seals to be affixed to this Agreement, made in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, in the city of Washington, on the first day of April of the year nineteen hundred forty-one.

SUMNER WELLES [SEAL]
Sumner Welles
Under Secretary of State of the United States.

F. CASTILLO NÁJERA [SEAL]
Francisco Castillo Nájera
Ambassador of Mexico.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have discussed with both the majority leader and the minority leader the question of the ratification of the Mexican-United States agreement to facilitate the reciprocal transit of military aircraft. It is a very simple agreement. Both the State Department and the War Department advise that they are most anxious that there be speedy ratification of the agreement, for the reason that the Mexican Congress is now in session and perhaps is being held over until Monday in order to enable the Mexican Government to pass upon the agreement. The agreement provides only for the reciprocal transit of military aircraft across the territory or territorial waters of the two countries, under such conditions as may be agreeable to the two countries. The agreement is revocable on notice by either country, with only a 24-hour allowance for the aircraft of the other country to get beyond the territory of the country serving the notice.

As I have just said, this is an agreement desired by the State Department, for the purpose of promoting the common defense of the Western Hemisphere, and by the War Department, expressly for the purpose of procuring an inland route for the passage of military aircraft across the country of Mexico and its territorial waters, to the Panama Canal or to the lower Caribbean. I hope there may be ratification of the agreement without delay.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said "military aircraft." Does he also mean to include naval planes?

Mr. GEORGE. The agreement does include them. I was using the word "military" in the sense of including both Army and Navy planes. But the agreement does not include commercial planes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the treaty terminate by its own terms if the notice referred to is not given?

Mr. GEORGE. It will terminate when the two countries decide there is no longer a necessity for it. There is no termination provided, except by the agreement of the two countries on notice given by either of them.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is this the agreement about which the Senator from Michigan addressed the Senate this morning?

Mr. GEORGE. It is the agreement which the Senator from Michigan this morning went on record as favoring, with the further statement that it had been unanimously recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that this is a departure from the general policy of control of the air by the respective countries, in that the control of the air has not followed the rule of the freedom of the seas. I take it this is a decided departure, and probably the first departure this country has recognized, whereby the freedom of the air is accorded another nation, or a neighboring nation, so that its aircraft may cross the entire territory of the United States if it sees fit?

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, Mr. President; but under the agreement, the crossing can be made only along the route agreed to by the country concerned, and landings can be made only at points agreed to by the respective countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the agreement will be reported to the Senate.

The agreement was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive D, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, an agreement between the United States of America and Mexico to facilitate the reciprocal transit of military aircraft through the territories and territorial waters of the two countries signed at Washington on April 1, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the agreement is ratified.

THE COAST GUARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 4, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 31), 1941:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Howell Cone, of Statesboro, Ga., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga. Reappointment.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER

Arthur Loren Wardwell, of Vermont, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy) by promotion from aid (with relative rank of ensign in the Navy), vice Harold J. Oliver, retired.

TO BE AID (WITH RELATIVE RANK OF ENSIGN IN THE NAVY) BY PROMOTION FROM DECK OFFICER

John Thomas Guthrie, of North Dakota, vice Herman Applequist, promoted.

Howard Stapleton Cole, of Maine, vice William F. Deane, promoted.

Robert White McCarty, of New York, vice Edward F. Hicks, Jr., promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. Ebenezer Lattimore Compere, Adjutant General's Department, Arkansas National Guard, to be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States, from March 21, 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Arthur Poteete to be postmaster at Perryville, Ark., in place of A. W. Holmes, removed.

CONNECTICUT

Donald S. Burke to be postmaster at Unionville, Conn., in place of J. H. Morrissey, deceased.

GEORGIA

Alvin B. Crews to be postmaster at Temple, Ga., in place of Morine McColister. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1940.

ILLINOIS

Truman I. Myers to be postmaster at Naperville, Ill., in place of E. M. Dieter, retired.

INDIANA

Ernestine A. Deutscher to be postmaster at St. Paul, Ind., in place of Dora Hungerford. Incumbent's commission expired July 10, 1939.

Mildred B. Canfield to be postmaster at Shoals, Ind., in place of M. B. Canfield. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

IOWA

Dell C. Jacobsen to be postmaster at Walnut, Iowa, in place of F. A. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1940.

KANSAS

Thelma L. Harris to be postmaster at Americus, Kans., in place of W. L. Grimsley, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Glenn E. Wood to be postmaster at Lakeview, Mich., in place of F. E. Moore, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Elmer D. Wannebo to be postmaster at Buffalo, Minn., in place of J. H. Beutner. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1939.

Catherine I. Ackerman to be postmaster at Eden Valley, Minn., in place of C. I. Ackerman. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1939.

Paul J. Kelly to be postmaster at Fountain, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Carleton H. Leighty to be postmaster at Glenville, Minn., in place of C. H. Leighty. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1939.

Francis L. Brady to be postmaster at Lake Benton, Minn., in place of J. E. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Vera M. Parks to be postmaster at Nisswa, Minn., in place of V. M. Parks. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1940.

John C. Grimm to be postmaster at Perham, Minn., in place of C. W. Lotterer, removed.

MONTANA

Adolph L. Rachac to be postmaster at Conrad, Mont., in place of E. A. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1939.

Sylvia E. Dickson to be postmaster at Corvallis, Mont., in place of R. M. Birck, transferred.

NEBRASKA

Homer S. Yeakle to be postmaster at Fairbury, Nebr., in place of F. A. Moon, deceased.

Dale W. Karnopp to be postmaster at Union, Nebr., in place of G. L. Everett, removed.

Richard W. Keckler to be postmaster at Weeping Water, Nebr., in place of S. F. Amick, removed.

NEW JERSEY

Ruth F. Ballentine to be postmaster at Peapack, N. J., in place of N. T. Ballentine, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Charles K. Johnson to be postmaster at Hobbs, N. Mex., in place of M. M. Hardin, resigned.

NEW YORK

Mary J. O'Connell to be postmaster at Ocean Beach, N. Y., in place of Hannah Pearce. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

OKLAHOMA

Eddie A. Blackmon to be postmaster at Crescent, Okla., in place of E. A. Blackmon. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Wyatt N. Pierce to be postmaster at Davis, Okla., in place of L. C. Peterman, removed.

Pearl Brazell to be postmaster at Lamont, Okla., in place of Pearl Brazell. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1938.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ralph J. Allen to be postmaster at Du Bois, Pa., in place of J. J. McNany, deceased.

Lewis M. Kachel to be postmaster at Mohnton, Pa., in place of E. F. Miller, removed.

PUERTO RICO

Blanca de la Rosa to be postmaster at Isabela, P. R., in place of Eduvigis de la Rosa, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Harold W. Grace to be postmaster at Scotland, S. Dak., in place of O. C. Brubaker. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1940.

TEXAS

Servando Caballero to be postmaster at Benavides, Tex., in place of A. R. Caballero. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1940.

George J. Atkins to be postmaster at Bonham, Tex., in place of P. P. Wise, deceased.

Claude Thompson to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Tex., in place of Claude Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1938.

Oscar A. Truelove to be postmaster at Malakoff, Tex., in place of C. T. McWilliams, removed.

John Granville Hearn to be postmaster at Marble Falls, Tex., in place of J. J. Faubion, deceased.

Kate Shaw to be postmaster at Rhome, Tex., in place of C. B. Morris, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Ruth M. Graves to be postmaster at Cottage Grove, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Harold H. Peck, Lyons, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 31), 1941:

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE CHIEF GUNNERS

Wilfred Mitchell
William O. Dwyer

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Julianna Crippin Uphoff, Cisne.
Cecile S. Ballein, Hanover.
Richard Joseph Kreuser, Prairie View.
Banks Lambdin, St. Joseph.

NEW MEXICO

Enid D. McCargish, Reserve.

PENNSYLVANIA

Peter L. Tressler, Dalmatia.
Joseph Pugh, Jerome.
Eugene P. McCarthy, Johnsonburg.
John H. Nix, Polk.
Howard M. Reynolds, Sayre.
J. Brooke Althouse, Temple.
Edna S. Rankin, Vestaburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, our life and our salvation, whose mercies are new and free every day, be pleased to attend unto our prayer. Inspire us to abide in Thy tabernacle and trust in the covert of Thy wings. We thank Thee that the heavenly state can begin now. The righteous carry this undying truth about with them; the strength of the brave sustains them, the love of the pure ennobles them, and the blessed Lord is a refuge for all weariness. We praise Thee that these heavenly graces amid the gloom and the shadow of this evil age may brighten more and more the eternal day of God. For life we pray not from the depths of despair but from the heights of vision, rapture, and consecration. Grant that we may find in these approaching days an elevation of soul and not a depression of discouragement, a sense of the divine presence which the sons of men are ever seeking to express in deathless song. In thanksgiving and praise, may our souls glow fervently, our aspirations tender and strong against all selfishness and indifference. Since Thou art the bread and water of life for all, be all in all to those who carry the cross with many an ache. Breathe Thy peace upon us. Light up the paths toward which our feet are tending and let us rejoice that we do not fall out of the hands of the living God. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed without amendment to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House of Representatives until April 14, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 319. An act for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker; and

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2788. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I expect to explain the report, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16 and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "except to the extent that the head of the department concerned shall determine that articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Of the matter inserted by such amendment, strike out "June 30, 1942" and insert in lieu thereof the word "expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Of the matter inserted by such amendment, strike out "June 30, 1942" and insert in lieu thereof the word "expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 22, and 25.

C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4124) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Corrects a date so as to make effective a provision in the House bill under "Pay of the Army".

No. 2: Appropriates $12,400,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House, for "Regular Supplies of the Army".

No. 3: Appropriates $79,418,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $70,048,000 as proposed by the House, for "Clothing and Equipage, Army".

No. 4: The House bill contained a prohibition on use of the funds therein for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed. The Senate amendment modified this exception to include therein the factors of "satisfactory quality" and "reasonable prices." The conference agreement accepts the Senate amendment and changes the wording so as to clarify the intent thereof.

No. 5: Appropriates $150,852,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $137,630,000 as proposed by the House, for "Army Transportation".

Nos. 7, 8, and 9: Makes appropriations for "Military Posts" available until "June 30, 1942" as proposed by the Senate, instead of available until "expended", as proposed by the House.

No. 10: Appropriates $2,366,000 for "Barracks and Quarters, Army" as proposed by the Senate.

No. 11: Appropriates $49,807,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $46,714,000 as proposed by the House, for "Signal Service of the Army".

No. 12: Appropriates $982,236,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $888,236,000 as proposed by the House, for "Air Corps, Army".

No. 13: Appropriates $2,876,000, as proposed by the Senate, for "Medical and Hospital Department, Army".

No. 14: Appropriates $19,074,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $18,944,000 as proposed by the House, for "Engineer Service, Army".

Nos. 15, 16, and 17, relating to "Military construction, defense installations"; Makes

provision for the acquisition of land, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $98,250,000 as proposed by the House instead of $94,450,000 as proposed by the Senate; and makes the appropriation available until June 30, 1942, as proposed by the Senate, instead of available until expended, as proposed by the House.

No. 18: Appropriates $82,132,100, as proposed by the Senate instead of $82,039,000 as proposed by the House, for "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army".

Nos. 19, 20, and 21, relating to the limitation on the cost of temporary construction of housing units under the appropriation "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy": Places the limit on commissioned officer housing at $7,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,000 as proposed by the House; fixes the limitation on commissioned warrant or warrant officer housing at $5,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500 as proposed by the House; and places the limit on enlisted man housing at $3,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 23: Makes the appropriation for "Alterations to Naval Vessels" available until "expended", as proposed by the House, instead of available until "June 30, 1942", as proposed by the Senate.

No. 24: Inserts a title heading in the bill.

Nos. 26, 27, 28, and 29, relating to the Interior Department for the fiscal year 1941: Appropriates $2,000, as proposed by the Senate, for operation and maintenance of the irrigation systems on the Crow Reservation, Mont.; appropriates $80,000, as proposed by the Senate, for education, etc. of natives in Alaska; and appropriates $55,000 for operation and maintenance of the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 30 and 31: Appropriates $663,000, as proposed by the Senate, for national defense river and harbor projects authorized by the act of October 17, 1940.

No. 32: Appropriates $1,640,000 as proposed by the Senate for the East Hartford, Conn., flood-control project as authorized by the act approved October 15, 1940.

No. 33: Inserts a short title as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments in disagreement.

No. 6: Relating to military post construction.

No. 22: Relating to Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy.

No. 25: Appropriating $4,100,000 for temporary office quarters for department agencies in the District of Columbia.

C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the fifth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1941. It is a unanimous report from the conferees.

The bill carries in direct appropriations $2,299,767,920 and contract authorizations for $2,093,453,254, or a total of $4,393,221,174. As it stands now it is $37,702,943 less than the Budget estimates.

The principal Senate amendments added to the bill amounts totalling $312,871,000 principally for the Air Corps and for military-post construction under the Quartermaster Corps. This sum initiates the policy of the Army for increasing the Air Corps pilot-training program from 12,000 to 30,000, and the technician training from 45,000 to 100,000 annually. The funds provide for 36 new flying schools, including 12 for basic training, 21 for advanced training, and 3 for gunnery training, 6 replacement centers for the Air Corps, and enlarges the capacity of 2 technical schools already provided for. The amount also includes funds for tuition for the primary training course for the additional pilots in private flying schools.

The Senate struck out of the House bill the provision of $5,300,000 for changing the Seward terminus of The Alaska Railroad to a point on Passage Bay and put $1,500,000 in the bill to rehabilitate the existing line with Seward as the terminus. The conference agreement restores the House provision for changing the terminus.

I want to say on behalf of our distinguished friend the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] that he has been most persistent and most diligent and most deeply concerned about this matter which affects Alaska. He appeared before the conferees; he appeared before the committees of both Houses; he has talked to us individually and collectively, and I am sure that every one of us can attest his diligence and his concern about this matter. I am sure there is a feeling of regret on the part of the conferees that they could not take the position that the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] advocated, but we found ourselves in the position of having every responsible Army official, the Secretary of War, Chief of Staff, and every other one of them, telling us emphatically and unequivocally that the change in this railroad was vital to the defense of Alaska, and the defense of Alaska is vital to the defense of America. So we had no alternative.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. This item usually comes up under the Interior Department appropriation bill. Last year the subcommittee held hearings on that particular point. The mayor of Seward came to Washington to speak on behalf of those people who are now going to be isolated when this change is made. It did not seem quite right to the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations that consideration should be given before that committee, so that your committee might have had the information which we had. I feel that that should have been given consideration. If it is necessary and the best thing for the people of Alaska and the best thing for the people of the United States, I am glad it has happened, but I am not so sure that I altogether approve the procedure by which this was put into this particular bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, it is an emergency defense item. I think it is a real emergency defense item, not only in name, but in fact. Undoubtedly some of the residents of Seward will suffer economic loss because of the change of this terminus. When we brought the bill to the floor of the House the committee mentioned in the report the fact that the change in this railroad would undoubtedly affect the interests of some seven or eight hundred people who live at Seward and that perhaps some thought should be given to the question of attending to that situation.

Mr. RICH. That town will be a ghost town from now on.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is probably true, but the larger question of the defense and protection of these two large bases we are building in Alaska, bases which are so vital to this country, outweigh every other consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the Speaker but will take just enough more time to answer a few questions.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL-DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an additional question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is provision made in the bill for a continuation of the aviation courses at colleges which now give them?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Those courses will be continued in schools where they are established.

Mr. RICH. There was some talk at one time recently of doing away with courses at these colleges, but it is my observation that we get more flying instruction for the money expended at these colleges than from other schools.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sure they will continue these facilities.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Do I understand the conferees have unanimously agreed to recede on the action taken by the House in reference to Argentine beef?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The conferees unanimously agreed to the Senate amendment with some slight modifications which merely have the effect of clarifying the amendment. It is a unanimous agreement among the conferees.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It was the understanding of the conferees, then, that the American producer of beef would not be compelled to sell his

product on a competitive basis with foreign beef?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not undertake to interpret the amendment. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that as far as I can see I think the amendment ought not to be in there at all.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the modified agreement is practically the buy-American provision as it stands now; and I think that is as far as the Congress ought to go.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia has explained pretty fully the changes that have been made in this bill by the Senate and I shall not go into them in very great detail.

With reference to the change in The Alaska Railroad I might say that if it were a proposal for a strictly civilian situation I would not have gone along with it; but if we are going to maintain an Army base at Anchorage 50 or 60 miles above where ships come in at Portage, and if that is to be our main westermost air base it is absolutely necessary that we have the facilities to take care of that base. It will take some time, but this is a permanent airplane base at Anchorage and it is absolutely necessary if we are going to be able to head off any attack on the western part of our own country from an Asiatic source.

I do not believe we can afford to let it go. As far as the people of Seward are concerned it is a matter that will not come up for a couple of years because it will be that length of time before the new road can be in operation.

With this bill we have provided four billion, practically four hundred million in direct appropriation and contract authorizations. We shall have provided with this bill approximately $30,000,000,000 for national defense and aid to Great Britain. The Congress has done its part to the fullest. We are calling upon innumerable citizens to give of their services without pay. Enormous numbers of lawyers and doctors are giving their time without any compensation whatever on draft boards and boards of appeals in connection with the draft. While this is going on we are having strike after strike, we are having a helter-skelter administration of our defense program by the President. No positive definite setup has been made with one man in charge of procurement. No clean-up has been made of those incompetents who hold office in the Cabinet. A situation is presented where the President is still failing to cooperate with the defense program. At this time when we are having strike after strike designed, in my opinion, entirely to sabotage the defense program, because not one single strike is being called for the purpose of obtaining better working conditions or higher wages. In my opinion it is time for the President to begin to cooperate with the defense program. He has laid down on his job long enough.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I should like to say to the gentleman from New York that it is my opinion that the adjournment resolution adopted on yesterday was a mistake and ought to be revoked. If under the new order there can be any excuse for the Congress it is now. Public sentiment is going to be extremely critical of the Congress. It is going to be said that we are running away from the strike situation without doing anything about it. We are going to be accused of being a weak-kneed, self-interested aggregation of men and women, and a lot of people are going to believe it. May I say to the American people that now is the time for them to come to the aid of their country, that if their liberties are to be preserved they must band together and fight for them. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman to the extent that the Congress has been laying down on its job. I do not agree with him that the effect of the recess is going to be bad. I think the effect of the recess is going to be good because I think it will arouse in the American public such resentment that when we get back here we will get action, and that is what we want—action.

We have had dilly-dallying long enough. We have had men come in here from different committees in this House and try to camouflage their own inactivity by trying to put the thing up to the States. We have had every other kind of camouflage and dodging except meeting the responsibility. Now is the time for this Congress to meet it and I hope that when you Members go back home for this 10-day recess they will receive enough reaction, enough of the real sentiment of the American people so that we will get results when we come back here. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when Members of the House who are recognized as outstanding men take the floor and say that it is time for the President to cooperate with the defense program, they make statements that even the most casual reflection will show are inconsistent with the facts and the record. May I say that I have a profound respect for the gentleman from New York personally and as a legislator, but he does have very strong partisan views.

If ever a man has been a leader of the defense program, it has been Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1933 our Navy was negligible. We had a lot of naval vessels that were overage. From 1921 to 1933 we had very little naval construction. Why, Italy built 4 times as many naval vessels as we did; Holland built many more naval vessels than we did; Japan, Germany, and England built many times more naval vessels than this great country, whose first line of defense is the Navy. From 1933 on until the past 6 months there were over 120 naval vessels built and put into operation. Within the past 6 or 9 months we have put through this Congress under his leadership and recommendation a plan to increase our Navy by well over 100 naval vessels, bringing about ultimately a 2-ocean navy. Our Navy today is the most powerful in the history of our country due to the leadership of President Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt has been attacked by some who say he has not recommended appropriations for national defense, and those same people condemned him when he made the recommendation. The first $3,000,000,000 recommendation made by President Roosevelt was after Hitler went into Holland and Belgium, and it was only because of that fact that the President was able to make the recommendation and get public opinion to support it.

If the President had made a recommendation of $3,000,000,000 a week before he made the same, there would have been a revolution through public opinion in this country and the very gentlemen who condemn him now would have been vigorously opposing it. Every appropriation we have been able to put through under his leadership has been because of the danger that confronts us. Yet, under his leadership, this has been done and the very men who condemn him for delay know in their own minds that they condemned him from 1933 to 1939 when he tried to get through appropriations to increase our Navy and our Army.

Let us look at the strike angle. The President of the United States has created a Mediation Board. He is President of the whole country. He knows that we cannot indict all of labor for what a small group does. He knows that labor as such is patriotic. He has seen the example of England where labor was much more radical than in the United States, yet labor in England has been patriotic in this conflict. Certainly, none of us want to indict labor. We want to get at those who are wrong. We all agree on the Allis-Chalmers strike. Most of those men are all good Americans, but some are not. We know that the Communists are in there getting in their work. We know that the Communists are up to their old gag in that strike—that it is a small group of fine Americans out there who are being influenced by them—but they should awaken to the realization that there is Communistic leadership engaged in that strike, and they should awaken to the realization that the product of that factory up there is slowing down the naval program, because the output of that factory is very essential to the national-defense program of this country. This company, and its employees, make vital parts for destroyers. The strike has slowed down the Navy program. It is vital that this fact be realized. The President of the United States has met the bituminous-coal situation. He is doing everything he can, and he will continue to do that.

He is the President of the whole country. We represent a congressional district. He has got to see the whole picture, and I am satisfied, and I say this as an expression of my own personal opinion, that he will bear down in a constitutional way. If there is one man that labor is obligated to, it is the Presi-

dent of the United States. There are a few labor people who hate him. A few labor leaders hate him and would try to destroy him if they could. But laboring men in general are not ingrates, and when the President speaks, as he will, in my opinion, labor will respond to the leadership of the President, because they recognize in him the friend of organized and unorganized labor.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think it is about time for him to speak? [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and I am satisfied he is going to speak of those forces and of those elements that are agitating it; he is going to speak of those elements who are dividing; he is going to appeal to those influences, those fine Americans who will repudiate the leadership of division, the leadership of hate in labor. He is not going to speak against the great labor movement or to indict them; but to condemn those whom he knows and you and I know are trying to put into operation a chain of events for one reason or another, the result of which will be adverse to the national-defense program of our country.

I cannot quite agree with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia, in his statement. Certainly Congress is not lying down on its job. The Members of this Congress, Republicans and Democrats, have worked hard. They have done a great job this session to date. There has been a fine spirit of unity. We have and make our speeches here and there, and they are to be expected, but underneath it all, and pressing them aside, there has been a fine spirit of cooperation between the leadership on both sides of the aisle and the membership on both sides of the aisle. As majority leader, I publicly express my feeling in respect to the general unity that exists among the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle and the cooperativeness of the leadership of the minority party with the leadership of the majority party.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman believe the Congress owes something more to the national defense and to the country with respect to the labor situation than it has done?

Mr. McCORMACK. The matter is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COX. Yes; but Rome burns while we fiddle.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no greater respect for any man than I have for the gentleman from Georgia. If anybody undertook to harm him, I would rally to his defense quicker than anyone else. But let me say to my friend from Georgia that sharp reaction is not going to meet the problem. We are a nation of one hundred and thirty millions. Organized labor as such cannot be indicted. We cannot place ourselves in a position of saying to labor as such, "You are unpatriotic." We have to legislate, if necessary, to meet those forces in labor that are disorganizing our national defense. They are a small group. The Committee on the Judiciary, under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has been holding hearings for weeks on this subject, and we are awaiting their report. This House cannot act until a report comes out of a committee. To write labor legislation on the floor is wrong, and I say that not attacking the motives of any gentlemen who feel to the contrary. This problem has to be thought out soundly. The details of meeting the subversive efforts of the Communists cannot very well be worked out by Executive order, but resort will have to be had to legislation.

One thing is certain. Labor is patriotic. Another thing is certain, that there are certain small subversive groups disorganizing our national defense. It is our duty—and we will do it, but we will do it in a tolerant manner, after sound consideration, so that we shall not attack all of labor—to meet the subversive aims and objectives of the small groups, particularly the Communists, who are working in the labor situation at the present time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply sensible of the kindness of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] not only for his generous remarks about me personally, but also in affording me this time to speak on a subject which lies very close to my heart, namely, the welfare of the people of Seward and vicinity, who will be adversely affected by the passage of this bill; yet in this instance I can only emulate the prophet Jeremias and raise my voice in lamentation for evils existing and the greater evils to come to my people.

There is one thing that causes me equal concern, and that is the safety of Alaska, and through Alaska the safety of the Nation, with respect to the Alaska Railroad for the next 18 months or 2 years, or even longer, which will necessarily be consumed in laying out the new track and in driving the tunnels that are necessary to bring the line into Passage Canal. Absolutely no provision has been made in this bill and no provision has been made in any other bill which has so far come before Congress to take care of the necessary rehabilitation of the existing road, which must be used for the transportation of all of the military as well as the other supplies that go into the interior of Alaska until the new road is constructed.

The reason given and pressed so strongly by the War Department, as indicated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], for the building of this new terminus of The Alaska Railroad and the abandonment of the old one, is the national defense, the need of having a road that will not be readily subject to sabotage. Indisputably on the present road there are some wooden structures, high trestles and bridges built of wood over 20 years ago, the life of which is now practically exhausted, and which constitute a real danger to the national defense as far as supplying the Army air fields in Alaska is concerned.

Without criticizing anyone, either directly or by inference, and without questioning in the slightest the capacity of any of our military authorities, capacities for which I have the highest respect, it is singular nevertheless that all of the emphasis should be placed upon having national security with respect to this particular matter on or a long time after October 1, 1942, rather than securing an almost equal degree of national security within the next 6 months. To one who does not claim to be an expert on international affairs, it would seem that we need the greatest possible degree of national defense at the earliest-possible date. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that even though The Alaska Railroad be built to the head of Passage Canal in order to connect a point on tidewater at that place with Mile 66 of the present road, provision should be made now, and not tomorrow or next week or next month or next year, for the reconstruction in steel or in earth and rock fills of the present wood trestles and bridges on the present line of The Alaska Railroad between Seward and Mile 66. This reconstruction and rehabilitation can be completed during the summer of this year and thus we will have a degree of national safety so far as The Alaska Railroad is concerned which cannot be obtained on the proposed new line before October 1942 and probably not much before January 1, 1944.

Under the plans at present presented for building a new line of railroad from Mile 66 to the head of Passage Canal, our military establishments and air bases at Anchorage and at Fairbanks will be in hazard from interruption of transportation on The Alaska Railroad until the new line is completed.

It is at least reassuring to know from the remarks made here today that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress have given serious attention to the plight of the people of Seward and to the plight of the residents of the Seward area generally, including those of the Moose Pass-Sunrise-Hope region, when the Passage Canal line is completed and put into operation and the railroad between Seward and Mile 66 is abandoned and dismantled.

As I remarked a few days ago, the construction of the new line of railroad to Passage Canal and the abandonment of the road between Seward and Mile 66 spells almost complete economic disaster to most of the residents of Seward and of that general area. It is too bad that the administrative agencies of the Government, and particularly the Interior Department, have not shown equal concern for the condition of these sturdy American citizens. It would have been in harmony with principles of decency and equity and, indeed, of statesmanship, for the Interior Department to have insisted that the appropriation for change of terminus of The Alaska Railroad be accompanied by an adequate

appropriation for the aid and relief of the people of the region who will be economically ruined through the carrying out of the present plan. The suggestion made by the general manager of The Alaska Railroad that recourse may be had by these good citizens to the Federal Housing Administration or the United States Housing Administration or to some other lending agency of the Government is enlightening in its total indifference to the welfare of our Alaskan citizens who are being made homeless through a policy of the Government based upon considerations of national defense.

I am truly grateful that the House Committee on Appropriations manifested its deep interest in the welfare of the people of Seward by an appropriate paragraph in the House committee report on the bill and earnestly hope that some serious attention will be given to that recommendation followed by constructive action.

The project which is now being adopted upon grounds of the needs of national defense was first proposed and urged for alleged economic reasons. As I indicated a few days ago, that conclusion was fantastic and was arrived at only by ignoring one of the main economic factors involved. Of course, the project never would and never could have been approved by Congress upon economic grounds. Indeed, it appears certain that Budget approval could not have been obtained for it. It is therefore indisputable that the people of Seward ahd the surrounding region are being deliberately sacrificed so that the Nation may have a greater degree of safety. In all justice, that sacrifice should be lightened and made endurable by some form of adequate and reasonable compensation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides for more than $4,000,000,000 additional for national defense. I think the appropriation is in the public interest and I am for it, and I am for such taxes as may be necessary to raise all or part of that sum. However, I share the view of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Congress when I say that I want this money spent right and without waste or graft, and spent promptly for the defense of this country.

I believe the American people are tired of having their pleas for action in regard to the slow-up of the national defense answered with the statement that the situation is being investigated. The patience of the people is about exhausted. What the people of this Nation want is action—and action now. [Applause.]

I say that this hold-up of our national defense is nothing short of an outrage against the public welfare of our Nation. I hope the Mediation Board will act, and I hope the President will act and act with increasing firmness and promptitude. As for myself, I am ready for the Congress to supplement investigation with action—and action now—for the defense of our country.

In my opinion, the overwhelming majority of the laboring people, in both the organized and unorganized groups, share the views which I have expressed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for the distinguished majority floor leader. It is really a very rare occasion to find him as disconcerted as he was this morning. He was embarrassed by the very pointed and pertinent question posed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, when he said, "Is it not about time for him to speak?" The reference was to the President of the United States.

The majority floor leader gave us a very interesting historic résumé going back to 1932, but he failed to bring that historic résumé down to date by giving us anything of what might be considered contemporary or a statement of current events. The issue today is not what was done in 1933, but what is being done today. Or better still, what is not being done today by reason of the lag in production in the defense program. The truth of the matter is this question of sabotage of our defense program, as I see it, is not going to be solved by investigations or by bills that may come out of this House. It is going to be solved when the President, and the President alone, decides that the philosophy which he has been pursuing for the last 8 years has been a false philosophy, and when those agents and spokesmen of the administration who have advocated this false philosophy no longer hold the vantage points that they have occupied and that they still continue to hold. As long as the philosophy of the Hillmans, for instance, and those that share their views, as long as the philosophy that private enterprise must be punished, as long as the philosophy that private enterprise has been a failure, as long as the philosophy that private enterprise is an enemy of the American way of life—as long as that philosophy prevails we will have a continuance of what we are having at the present time in the way of sabotage. That philosophy has encouraged and continues to encourage the conditions from which we suffer today.

I believe the majority floor leader has a distinct responsibility here. I admire his courage. I am sorry that the exigencies prevent him from demonstrating the courage that he has. I believe the majority floor leader should get up here and not make a defensive speech of the President of the United States but make a challenging address to this Congress. He should serve notice on the White House that the Hillmans and the Dubinskys and the men who have been out trying to sabotage private industry and private enterprise from 1932 on should be dismissed from the vantage points they hold and that in their stead men of the type of the distinguished majority leader, who believe in the initiative and the enterprise and the courage of the American people, who believe in private enterprise, be permitted to have their place in the program of national defense. [Applause.]

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the shadow boxing be ended. Almost a year has elapsed since the President served notice on the Congress and the country of the imminence of danger. At that time, almost a year ago, we were warned of the woeful weakness of our national defense. We were challenged to join in a common purpose to make America strong. The industrial machine of America was to be geared for defense needs. The Congress was urged and, let it be said to its credit, responded generously to provide the funds and to delegate the power to give to the American people a sense of security in a world of bewilderment and chaos. Month by month anxiety has increased as the needs and demands for action, prompt and efficient action, have become more evident.

The Congress has not delayed the program. The business leadership of the Nation has not been dilatory. The delay, dangerous in its every aspect, is not due to legislative inaction or the unwillingness of the business leadership to adjust itself to the demands of the hour.

Nor is the delay due to the rank and file of the working men and working women of America. Labor is not at fault here. The fault lies with a few leaders who have persistently insisted that our social order must be reconstructed; that private enterprise should be eliminated; that private property deserved no recognition; that the profit motive had no place; in short, that some type of socialism—Government control and operation of industry as well as the control of the individual citizen—was the only answer to our problem. Those who entertain such views are in key positions today. Those views—the philosophy to which I have referred dictates the policy.

Day by day the country is shocked by the increasing delays in production. Calls are coming to us from all parts of the country that cannot be ignored.

But, Mr. Speaker, investigations will not solve this problem. It will only skim the surface. Legislation will be ineffective, no matter how carefully drawn or skillfully drafted, if the fundamental philosophy of the administration continues to be colored by the fallacious nostrums and illusory incentives that ruined France.

A few weeks ago, the President said:

> The great task of this day, the deep duty which rests upon us is to move products from the assembly lines of our factories to the battle lines of democracy—now.

The big word there is "now"—now—today—at once—immediately. I agree wholeheartedly with the President in that statement. And it is because I do agree with him that I urge the majority leader—not to have the President speak, but to have him act—as he alone can act—right now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the strike situation, and I want to assure the House that the Committee on Military Affairs, just a few minutes ago, concluded a meeting in which it laid plans to go into this situation very thoroughly, and to start next Monday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone in the United States realizes that this is a problem that needs attention. I am also sure that every sound-thinking Member of this House realizes at the same time that it is a problem that should not be attacked in a perfunctory or thoughtless or vindictive manner, but that it merits a careful investigation in which both sides should be investigated. If any legislation comes out of this it should come as the result of earnest, sober, and unbiased investigation of the matter. I am sure that a great many people in this country are concerned about the communistic influences in regard to strikes. I have in my pocket a statement of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board which bears on matters concerning the Allis-Chalmers strike, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein the report of this board.

The Axis Powers are constantly being assured, by their spies and agents in this country, that we are so disorganized by strikes, and so rotted by subversive elements that we cannot fulfill our promises to assist Britain, Greece, and China. There is no doubt but that this strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant is the result of communistic orders from Moscow. The statement of facts furnished by the Wisconsin Employment Board shows that this strike was engineered by stuffing the ballot box with 2,200 fraudulent votes. The time has arrived when we must demonstrate that we, as a Nation, can control the communistic influences within our borders if we are to remain a Nation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

[State of Wisconsin. Before the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board. *Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., complainant,* v. *Allis-Chalmers Workers' Union, Local 248, U. A. W. A. (C. I. C.), respondent.* Case VI No. 312 Cw–42]

MEMORANDUM ACCOMPANYING INTERLOCUTORY ORDER

This proceeding is based upon a complaint brought by the above-named complainant against the above-named respondent in which the respondent union is charged with having committed various unfair labor practices. Among the allegations contained in the complaint is one alleging that in calling and carrying on the strike now in existence at the West Allis plant of the complainant, the respondent union has relied upon a so-called secret ballot held on January 21, 1941, and that the balloting at that time was so conducted as not to constitute a vote by secret ballot to call a strike within the provisions of chapter 111 of the Wisconsin Statutes. At the conclusion of the testimony, the complainant moved this board to make an interlocutory order directing the holding of an election under the auspices of the board, among all of the employees in the bargaining unit involved, to determine whether or not such employees desire to strike.

The facts developed by the testimony disclose that the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. is a Delaware corporation, operating, among others, a plant in the city of West Allis, Wis., and employing some 7,900 employees. The respondent union is, and has been for some time past, the collective bargaining representative of the employees. Negotiations were carried on between the complainant and the respondent union for some time with a view to entering into a collective bargaining agreement. The bargaining committee representing the union, being dissatisfied with the progress of the negotiations, recommended to the membership that the proposals of the company be rejected and that the membership authorize the bargaining committee to call a strike, and the membership, at a meeting on January 19, voted to accept such recommendation of the bargaining committee. The vote at that time, however, did not comply with chapter 111 of the Wisconsin Statutes in that a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit did not vote in favor of a strike, a fact conceded by the union. As a result of this, the union caused notices to be posted on the bulletin boards in the complainant's plant that an election would be held on the 21st of January 1941, at which the employees of the Allis-Chalmers Co. were eligible to vote to determine such question. Such election was held, commencing at 6 o'clock in the morning, and continuing until 1 o'clock on the morning of January 22. The union officers and the election committee reported that at such election there were 6,759 votes cast, of which 5,958 were in favor of a strike, 758 opposed, and the balance were void or blank ballots. The original ballots claimed to have been used at such election were produced by the union at a previous hearing conducted by the board, in which the union was a respondent, and there marked as exhibits. At this hearing they were again offered in evidence, identified, and marked as exhibits.

Prior to the commencement of the hearing, counsel for the complainant had requested of counsel for the respondent permission to have such ballots examined by competent experts in the field of questioned documents. Respondent's counsel saw fit to refuse such request, and at the outset of the hearing complainant made application to the board for an order directing that Mr. John F. Tyrrel, such an expert, be allowed to make such examination. The board made an order directing an examination so to be made, and Mr. Tyrrel on the same day began his examination. He was shortly joined by Mr. Clark Sellers, also an expert in this field, residing at Los Angeles, Calif. The respondent thereafter retained Mrs. Katherine Keeler, another recognized expert, who, counsel reported to the board, made an examination and a report of her findings to the respondent union. As a result of such report, respondent moved that its answer be amended so as to admit that there were irregularities in the conduct of the January 21 election and that such irregularities were of such a nature as to establish that less than a majority of the employees in the collective-bargaining unit had voted to strike as provided by chapter 111 of the Wisconsin Statutes. The motion of the union to so amend was granted.

Both Mr. Tyrrel and Mr. Sellers testified over the objection of the respondent as to their conclusions and the facts upon which such conclusions were based. It was their conclusion that all of the 758 ballots cast against the strike were valid ballots cast by individual voters, but that of the ballots cast in favor of the strike, at least 40 percent of the original ballots delivered to the board were fraudulent—were not cast by individual employees, but were prepared by a small group on a mass-production basis.

The election was entirely in charge of a committee of the respondent union under the direction of the officers of such union. Taking the testimony of the committee members and the officers, it is apparent that they, and they alone, are responsible for the ballot stuffing and the fraudulent conduct of this election. We are thoroughly in accord with the statement of counsel for the union that probably no one was more injured as a result of the disclosure of fraudulent conduct in such election than the Allis-Chalmers Workers' Union. The disclosure of the gross fraud perpetrated upon the members of the union, upon the company by whom they were employed, and upon the general public has seriously weakened their position as a collective-bargaining group and damaged the position of organized labor in the minds of thousands of people in this country.

With the testimony so clearly establishing the fraudulent misconduct in this election, which misconduct is conceded by the respondent union on the record, it is clear that no legal vote authorizing a strike by a majority of the employees of the Allis-Chalmers Co. in the collective-bargaining unit involved has ever been held. There is thus presented to this board at this time the following question: What, if any, order may the board now make where a strike is actually in progress, the basis for such strike being an election conducted by the union which is concededly fraudulent? Though there have been proceedings before our board in which the question of whether a strike had been authorized by a majority of the employees of an employer was raised, we have never been called upon to pass on a question similar to the one here presented. Never have we had any other case in which there was either an allegation or proof of fraudulent conduct such as we have before us in this case.

It has been our position consistently that strike votes properly should be conducted by the collective-bargaining representatives of the employees, and we will in no case interfere with such elections without some strong showing of misconduct. We believe that our decisions in the past, particularly those in the cases of the Appleton Chair Co. and the Magidson Cigar Co., clearly show such to be our position. In these two cases, as well as others, we recognize the fact that in elections conducted by workers' organizations we should not expect the same degree of exactitude that regularly constituted election boards might be required to adhere to. In this case, however, we meet a situation where no attempt is made to conduct an honest election, but those in charge resort to gross misconduct for the purpose of perpetrating a fraud on the members of the organization they represented, as well as the company with whom the union was dealing on behalf of such members.

It is vigorously contended by counsel for the union that, notwithstanding the fact that the election conducted by the union was corrupt and of no effect, and the further fact that there has been no election held that complies or attempts to comply with chapter 111 of the Wisconsin Statutes, still this board has no power to call or conduct such a vote at this time, and that the only power of this board in the conduct of elections is to conduct such elections as those determining collective-bargaining unit and for the selecting of bargaining representatives.

Section 111.02 (11) defines an election; section 111.06 (2) (e) provides for the taking of a secret ballot prior to a strike; section 111.07 (4) provides that orders of the board may require the person complained of to take such affirmative action as the board may determine proper. Reading these sections of the statutes together and keeping in mind the declaration of policy contained in section 111.01, it seems clear to us that where a union has failed to hold such an election, or, as here, have held an election in form but not in fact, that necessarily this board does have power to take action and to hold

an election upon the basis of which employees as well as the employer may rely in determining their future course of conduct. The employees desirous of striking and cooperating with others in strike activities are entitled to the protection of the law in carrying on such activities, and may only have such protection in the event that they in the first instance comply with the law.

Counsel argued that this board was created for the purpose of seeing that there was a fair representation of workers in their relations with employers. With this statement each member of the board heartily agrees; and it is because of this duty imposed by law upon the board that we feel justified in holding an election at this time to determine whether or not the employees of the complainant desire to strike or whether they prefer not to strike, and to attempt to achieve their objectives in some other manner. It seems to us that by so doing we are performing the duty imposed upon us of seeing that the workers do have such fair representation, that their wishes are respected by their representatives, and that false representations of their wishes based on the misconduct of a few are not indulged in by such collective-bargaining representative.

Also it was contended that a vote today would mean nothing and that, even though a majority favor working and not striking, that neither this board nor anyone else can compel these men to work against their will. No one connected with this proceeding, other than counsel for the respondent union, ever made any contention or even suggestion that the result of this vote would be to compel anyone to give up his right to withhold his labor if he so desired. A vote today on the question of whether the employees desired to strike is merely giving such employees the right to legalize the present stoppage of work and to legally engage in the various concomitants of a strike usually engaged in, or to determine that they do not desire to carry on such activities and communicate such determination to everyone interested. Now it can be contended that to give an opportunity to those employees interested to freely and secretly express their views in an election honestly conducted when throughout the dispute no such opportunity has heretofore been given such employees, can be considered as meaningless or a part of a back-to-work movement is beyond our comprehension. Had there been an honest election in the first instance, we would under no condition attempt in any way to interfere with the results of such election. We have here involved nearly 8,000 employees who have never had an opportunity to tell the union, the company, and the public how and what they felt about the strike. In spite of the failure to give such employees such an opportunity, work recognized by all as vital in the defense program of the Nation has for more than 2 months been wholly suspended.

We, therefore, hold that it is our duty to conduct an election as promptly as possible; and we are, therefore, today granting the motion of the complainant and making an interlocutory order directing the holding of such election by this board within 15 days. We are satisfied that the vast majority of the employees of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. are loyal American citizens anxious to obey the laws of the State within which they live and work and that, whether they favor a strike against the company or whether they favor attempting to adjust their differences in some other manner, that they will cooperate with each other to the end that everybody may know the feeling and the desires of the majority of such employees.

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD,
By HENRY C. FULDNER, *Chairman.*
L. E. GOODING, *Commissioner.*
R. FLOYD GREEN, *Commissioner.*

[State of Wisconsin. Before the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board. *Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., complainant,* v. *Allis-Chalmers Workers' Union, Local 248, U. A. W. A. (C. I. O.), respondent.* Case VI, No. 312 Cw-42. Decision No. 186]

Appearances: Leo Mann, of Lines, Spooner & Quarles, on behalf of the complainant; W. J. McGowan, of Lines, Spooner & Quarles, on behalf of the complainant; Arthur W. Richter, attorney at law, on behalf of the respondent; W. O. Sonnemann, attorney at law, on behalf of the respondent.

INTERLOCUTORY FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER

The above-entitled matter having come on for hearing on the 14th day of March 1941, Chairman Henry C. Fuldner, Commissioners L. E. Gooding and R. Floyd Green being present; the parties being present and represented by counsel; and the full board having considered all of the evidence, the arguments of counsel, and being advised in the premises, do make the following interlocutory findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. That the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. is a Delaware corporation, engaged in the manufacturing business, having its principal office and plant at 1126 South Seventieth Street, in the city of West Allis, Milwaukee County, Wis.

2. That the respondent, Allis-Chalmers Workers' Union, Local No. 248, U. A. W. A. (C. I. O.), is a labor organization composed of employees of the complainant, and located in the city of West Allis, Wis.

3. Commencing on the 22d day of January 1941, said union and its members went on strike and have continued to strike up to the present time.

4. That on the 21st day of January 1941 said union conducted an election pursuant to notices posted on bulletin boards in the plant of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. on Monday, January 20, among the employees of the company to determine whether the recommendation of the bargaining committee of the union to reject the current proposals of the company, and to authorize the committee to call a strike, should be accepted.

5. That at such election the officers of local No. 248, to wit, Harold Christoffel, the president; Fred McStroul, the recording secretary; and Julius Blunk, the financial secretary, and the members of the election committee, caused at least 2,200 ballots to be marked as favoring the strike, and caused such ballots to be counted and reported as votes of individual employees of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. in favor of a strike.

6. That as a result of the misconduct of such election, less than a majority of the employees of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. in the collective-bargaining unit composed of production employees, voted in favor of such strike.

Upon the basis of the above and foregoing findings of fact, the Board makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. That a majority of the employees of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. have not voted by secret ballot to call a strike.

2. That such employees have, during the pending dispute between the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. and the Allis-Chalmers Workers Union, Local No. 248, had no opportunity to express their wishes in relation to striking or not striking by a secret ballot of any kind.

On the basis of the above and foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law the Board makes the following:

ORDER

It is ordered that an election by secret ballot be conducted under the direction of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board in Milwaukee County within 15 days from the date of this order, among all the employees employed by the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., engaged in the production unit, who in the past have been covered by a collective-bargaining agreement existing between the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. and the Allis-Chalmers Workers Union, Local No. 248, and who are described in the collective-bargaining unit ordered as the result of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board in 1937, who were employed on the 20th day of January 1941 to determine whether or not such employees desire to carry on a strike against the company.

Given under our hands and seal at the city of Madison, Wis., this 27th day of March 1941.

[SEAL]

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD,
By HENRY C. FULDNER, *Chairman.*
L. E. GOODING, *Commissioner.*
R. FLOYD GREEN, *Commissioner.*

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 6: On page 6, after line 22, strike out "$9,500,000" and insert: "including the acquisition of land, rights, pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein and temporary use thereof, without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 1136, and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 255; 31 U. S. C 529), and the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles, $193,821,000."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: On page 14, after line 19, insert:

"The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590–592), shall be applicable to the Public Works projects mentioned in this title."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: On page 16, after title 8, insert:

"INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

"FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

"Public Buildings Administration

"Construction of temporary office buildings: For the construction of temporary office buildings for general use on Government-owned land in or near the District of Columbia, including the construction of necessary heating plant, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, $4,100,000: *Provided*, That the contract or contracts for such construction may be entered into without advertising."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 25, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by such amendment, strike out the words "or near"; and after line 1 of the matter inserted by such amendment, insert the following:

"FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY

"FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"Administrative expenses: In addition to the funds made available to the Federal Housing Administration for administrative expenses by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1941, not to exceed $390,555 of the Defense Housing Insurance Fund, created by the act entitled 'An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes,' approved March 28, 1941 (Public Law, 24, 77th Cong.), is hereby made available for administrative expenses of such Administration for the fiscal year 1941, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1941."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think attention should be called to the fact that we are here providing the funds to carry out the program for guaranteeing $100,000,000 of mortgages on real estate that is devoted to defense housing in small amounts, provided for about 2 weeks ago. I also think that we should call attention to the fact that the Senate amendment for temporary office buildings is limited to the District of Columbia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

CARRYING CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS TO SURPLUS FUND OF TREASURY

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I call up the bill (H. R. 4239) to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States, and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury the balances now standing on the books of the Treasury to the credit of the following trust accounts:

12X8768—Philippine trust fund (processing taxes, miscellaneous), $813,811.42;

12X8769—Virgin Islands trust fund (processing taxes, miscellaneous), $929.94;

12X8770—American Samoa trust fund (processing taxes, miscellaneous), $1,613.82;

12X8771—Island of Guam trust fund (processing taxes, miscellaneous), $83.90;

12X8772—Canal Zone trust fund (processing taxes, miscellaneous), $21,218.38.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Treasury Department to cover into the Treasury approximately $840,000 which was collected as compensating taxes under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. This sum represents taxes paid on articles imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, Samoa, Guam, and the Canal Zone. The Agricultural Adjustment Act provided that these taxes were to be put in a special fund in the Treasury and paid over to the possessions from which the articles on which the tax was collected came.

In 1936 the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Butler* (296 U. S. 1), held section 9 of title I of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 unconstitutional. Section 9 is the section of the act which imposed processing taxes upon domestic articles. The compensating taxes involved in this legislation were imposed by section 15 of the act and the validity of that tax was not specifically passed upon by the Supreme Court. However, the Treasury Department decided shortly after the Butler decision came down that the effect of that decision was to invalidate the compensating taxes as well as the processing taxes. The Treasury based its decision upon the fact that section 9 and section 15 were so interwoven that when one section fell, the other of necessity fell also. After the Butler decision the Department of Agriculture submitted to the Comptroller General the question whether, in the light of the Butler decision, the compensating taxes which had been collected should be paid over to the treasuries of the several possessions involved. The Comptroller reached the conclusion that the Butler decision did not invalidate the provision of the act which appropriated the proceeds of compensating taxes for the benefit of agriculture in the possessions and that payment should be made in accordance with the act. Since the Treasury and the Comptroller General did not agree on the conclusion, the Secretary of the Treasury submitted the question to the Attorney General. In a letter dated May 17, 1938, the Attorney General in effect advised the Secretary of the Treasury that the question presented was not free from doubt, that there was reasonable support for both views, and that under the circumstances the safer course would be to submit the matter to Congress for further legislation.

H. R. 4239 was recommended to Congress by the Treasury Department in accordance with this advice of the Attorney General.

The Ways and Means Committee was of the opinion that the position taken by the Treasury Department was sound and that the funds in question should now be covered into the Treasury rather than paid to the possessions. In this connection it is pertinent to point out that the importers in the United States who paid these taxes were given the right under the Revenue Act of 1936 to file claims for refund of the amounts paid as compensating taxes. The Treasury Department advised our committee that many such claims have been filed and that a number of them have been allowed. Of course, payment on claims for refund which are allowed are made out of the general fund of the Treasury. It would seem, therefore, that the money collected in the first instance should also be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

It might be suggested that Congress by appropriating the proceeds of these compensating taxes for the benefit of agriculture in the possessions created a moral obligation to the farmers of our possessions. This view does not seem tenable. The farmers in the possessions are in no different position than the farmers of the United States were after the Butler decision. Many million dollars of processing taxes had been collected. The Agricultural Adjustment Act appropriated the moneys derived from such taxes for the benefit of agriculture in this country but that money was not used for the purposes for which it was appropriated after the Butler decision.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Is that for the purpose of trying to get these funds, which they do not know how to get back into the hands of the individuals who paid the taxes, into the general fund of the Treasury?

Mr. DISNEY. The gentleman's question does not permit of a categorical answer. The circumstances are these: Under section 15 of the Adjustment Act of 1933, which was invalidated by the Supreme Court, these compensatory taxes were to be returned to the island possessions. While the decision refers chiefly to section 9 of the act, under the

interpretation of the Treasury Department, the Treasury has not collected any further import taxes, and has held the fund subject to action of Congress.

Mr. RICH. I understand that those taxes were to be returned to the individuals, and that the Treasury is now unable to get them back to the hands of the individuals, so that the Government is now taking them over and putting them into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. DISNEY. Individuals have the right to and many of them have filed claims for refund. If they have made a case under the enabling legislation which we passed, subsequent to the invalidation of the act, they will get the refund. Those who have not filed or made a case to conform to the enabling legislation will not get the refunds and the balance goes into the general fund, keeping in mind that the processing taxes remain in the general fund.

Mr. RICH. In other words, they are trying to balance those accounts, so that they are not outstanding.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. To go back into the general fund.

Mr. DISNEY. That is true.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will bear in mind I am sure that any of these refunds that are made necessarily come out of the general fund of the Treasury. The purpose of this is to put these funds in the Treasury, in the general fund.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4239 is the transfer of certain trust funds derived from processing taxes.

The original Agricultural Adjustment Act imposed processing taxes on certain commodities.

Compensatory processing taxes were imposed on imports of same commodities.

In the case of imports coming from United States possessions, it was provided that the money collected in compensatory taxes should be placed in a trust fund and turned over to the treasury of each possession in accordance with the amount collected.

It will be recalled that the Agricultural Adjustment Act was subsequently declared unconstitutional.

The question then arose as to whether the compensatory taxes were invalid as well as the processing taxes on domestic products.

The court's decision did not pass upon question of compensatory taxes.

The Department of Agriculture requested an opinion of the Comptroller General.

He held that compensatory taxes were not affected by decision. Then the Treasury Department took opposite stand, holding that both taxes fell together.

The Attorney General was asked for an opinion, but he said there was argument on both sides, and that Congress should be asked to settle the question of what to do with funds collected from compensatory taxes on imports from United States possessions.

This bill provides that funds be covered into general fund of Treasury, on theory that compensatory tax became invalid by reason of invalidation of processing tax.

Of course, valid claims for refund are not affected by the transfer.

If allowed, they will be paid out of general fund of Treasury.

The Treasury contends that our possessions have no right to funds collected any more than United States farmers had right to processing tax funds which court said were illegally collected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING TEMPORARY INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES ON FIRST-CLASS MATTER

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 105, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 105

Resolved, etc., That section 1001 (a), as amended (relating to temporary increase in first-class postage rate), of the Revenue Act of 1932, and section 2, as amended (authorizing the President to modify certain postage rates), of the act entitled "An act to extend the gasoline tax for 1 year, to modify postage rates on mail matter, and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1933, are further amended by striking out "July 1, 1941" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1943."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following committee amendment to correct a clerical error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGHTON: In line 11, before the period, insert a comma and the words "and by striking out June 30, 1941, wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof June 30, 1943."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I cannot quite understand why you only extend this act to July 1, 1943. The gentleman from North Carolina and every Member of Congress knows that this first-class-mail increase from 2 cents to 3 cents brings in $100,000,000 a year.

Mr. DOUGHTON. About $103,000,000.

Mr. RICH. It was put on there for the purpose of trying to take care of the exorbitant expenses during the past few years. But what happened? Because the Post Office Department received that great revenue, they sought new legislation, you passed it, and they used it up in their own Department. The Post Office Department goes in the red from forty to fifty million dollars a year. You know we cannot do away with that revenue, and it should be permanent law. It should not be extended only to 1943. It is wrong for you to bring it in here for 2 years, when it should be made permanent. This you do each year or so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Probably that is true. I do not know. But that is the request from the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General explains that this extension is necessary. I have no quarrel with the gentleman's statement. It is probable that it will be necessary to continue this 3-cent postage rate on first-class mail matter indefinitely. But it was requested by the Post Office Department that it be extended for 2 years. However, as far as the Post Office Department bringing in all kinds of expenditures here, indicating waste of money——

Mr. RICH. No; it was on account of laws that Congress passed.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The only reason that the expenditures and receipts are not in balance now is on account of the fact that free service is rendered to so many Government departments. Take out the free service rendered by the Post Office Department as directed by Congrss and we would have a surplus of $18,000,000.

Mr. RICH. We ought to do away with this free service, but I make this observation: I would not be surprised that in 2 years the Post Office Department will come in here and say we need a 4-cent postage rate on first-class mail, and probably they will recommend to Congress to do away with a lot of this free service and put the Post Office Department on a real business basis.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I would be greatly surprised that the Post Office Department should pursue any such course as that, because it has been an efficient administration. It is the first administration that has brought the receipts and expenditures to anything like balance. It has been a real businesslike administration. There is no question about that. The gentleman cannot challenge that.

Mr. RICH. You have received $103,000,000 a year from 3-cent postage. That helped to make it a business administration. The public paid the bill. It was not Jim Farley. It is not the present Postmaster General. It is the public that put up the money and paid it into the Post Office Department. As long as the public pays through the nose you can still operate.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If there is any waste, as indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he should point out where it is. He should specify and not make wholesale charges of waste and maladministration, when the facts are that this is one of the most businesslike administrations in the history of this Government. There is no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a table giving the disbursements and receipts in the Post Office Department, which I am sure will be very interesting to the entire membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE I.—*Recapitulation of allocations and apportionments of postal revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1940, to the classes of mail and special services*

Fiscal year 1940	Revenues	Expenditures	Excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues	Excess of revenues over apportioned expenditures
1	2	3	4	5
SPECIAL SERVICES				
Registry				
Paid registrations	[1] $10,029,315.67	$16,388,509.44	$6,359,193.77	
Free registrations:				
For the Post Office Department		3,705,431.20	3,705,431.20	
For other branches of the Government		879,121.94	879,121.94	
Total, registry	10,029,315.67	20,973,062.58	10,943,746.91	
Insurance	[2] 5,829,199.49	7,268,036.88	1,438,837.39	
Collect on delivery	4,774,749.73	9,020,372.91	4,245,623.18	
Special delivery	10,898,251.40	11,488,257.02	590,005.62	
Money order	24,425,847.23	34,942,560.84	10,516,713.61	
Postal savings	10,817,131.05	4,802,894.98		$6,014,236.07
Total, special services	66,774,494.57	88,495,185.21	21,720,690.64	
Total, mail and special services	750,551,047.16	795,396,828.84	44,845,781.68	
Unassignable:				
United States savings bonds		1,249,174.54	1,249,174.54	
Adjusted-service bonds		158,705.05	158,705.05	
Custodial services for other departments		7,503,223.00	7,503,223.00	
Miscellaneous	14,671,121.80	3,002,852.63		11,668,269.17
Total, unassignable	14,671,121.80	11,913,955.22		2,757,166.58
Total, related [3]	765,222,168.96	807,310,784.06	42,088,615.10	
Unrelated	2,793,158.90	2,929,902.31	136,743.41	
Grand total, all operations	768,015,327.86	810,240,686.37	42,225,358.51	
Revenue credits (act of June 9, 1930):				
Penalty matter other than that of Post Office Department:				
Postage	39,905,033.00			
Registrations, including surcharges	1,628,477.00			
Franked matter:				
By Members of Congress	1,217,346.00			
By others	215.00			
Second-class matter—free in county	606,260.00			
Free matter for the blind	254,001.00			
Publications exempt from zone rates	316,952.00			
Expense credits (act of June 9, 1930): Aircraft service		9,402,887.52		
Grand total (adjusted to the act of June 9, 1930)	811,943,611.86	800,837,798.85		11,105,813.01
Expense credit, nonpostal custodial services		7,503,223.00		
Net surplus from Postal Service operations				18,609,036.01

[1] Includes $645,854.41 revenue from return receipts for registered mail.
[2] Includes $20,976.07 revenue from return receipts for insured mail.
[3] Service of the United States, exclusive of the Territories and island possessions.

NOTE.—The above segregations of the computed total expenditures chargeable to second-class, fourth-class, foreign, penalty, and franked matter, and to registry service, and of the revenues from fourth-class matter have been developed by processes of approximation.

TABLE II.—*Revenue and expense per piece and per pound, with loss or gain*

Classes of mail (domestic)	Revenue	Expense	Excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues	Excess of revenues over apportioned expenditures
First-class:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Per piece	2.71328	1.75692		0.95636
Per pound	110.03708	71.25211		38.78497
Air mail:				
Per piece	7.37798	10.81808	3.44010	
Per pound	177.07714	259.64204	82.56490	
Second-class:				
Per piece	.54513	2.41065	1.86552	
Per pound	1.82188	8.05665	6.23477	
Third-class:				
Per piece	1.35182	1.82505	.47323	
Per pound	18.71822	25.27081	6.55259	
Fourth-class:				
Per piece	18.78963	21.85485	3.06522	
Per pound	3.84437	4.47151	.62714	
Penalty matter:				
Per piece		1.46771	1.46771	
Per pound		9.56339	9.56339	
Franked matter:				
Per piece		2.02683	2.02683	
Per pound		8.13565	8.13565	

Revenue and expense per transaction, with loss or gain

Special services	Revenue	Expense	Excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues	Excess of revenues over apportioned expenditures
Registry:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Paid	23.32361	38.11218	14.78857	
Free		38.11218	38.11218	
Insurance	7.20247	8.98028	1.77781	
Collect on delivery	13.81995	26.10841	12.28846	
Special delivery	11.30748	11.91964	.61216	
Money order	9.56217	13.67922	4.11705	

TABLE III.—*Expense for initial and terminal services for classes of mail and for registry service*

Item	Expense per piece	Expense per pound
	Cents	*Cents*
First-class	1.48063	60.04713
Air mail, domestic	2.34409	56.25987
Second-class	1.67742	5.60612
Third-class	1.55621	21.54826
Fourth-class	9.68747	1.98206
Foreign		6.75050
Air mail, foreign		49.14436
Penalty	1.15738	7.54132
Franked [1]	1.51029	6.06228
Registry	28.59575	

[1] Includes free for the blind.

TABLE IV.—*Expense for transportation and distribution in transit for classes of mail and for registry service*

Item	Expense per piece	Expense per pound	Expense per pound-mile	Expense per cubic-foot-mile
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
First-class	0.40656	14.31743	0.02989	0.57421
Air mail, domestic	8.47399	203.38217	.14531	2.47233
Second-class	.81748	2.60706	.00533	.10095
Third-class	.31663	4.38249	.00723	.13309
Fourth-class	12.67451	2.54745	.00583	.06539
Foreign		8.95801	.00872	.12606
Air mail, foreign		1,453.43103	1.12446	18.23926
Penalty	.36483	2.37675	.00377	.08165
Franked [1]	.57345	2.41499	.00432	.09979
Registry	11.19899			

[1] Includes free for the blind.

TABLE V.—*Originating mails, local and nonlocal pieces, by classes, and copies of second class; and special-service transactions*

Classes and subclasses of mail	Pieces	Weight per piece	Copies	Weight per copy
DOMESTIC				
		Ounces		*Ounces*
First-class				
Letters (other than local delivery) and sealed parcels	8,746,748,545			
Letters for local delivery	3,999,621,437			
Government postal cards	1,953,081,852			
Private mailing (post) cards	524,673,787			
Air mail	259,188,781			
Total, first-class	15,483,314,402	0.399		
Second-class:				
Exempt from zone rates	900,800,437	2.344	1,140,927,416	1.851
Newspapers, dailies	1,709,841,190	5.072	1,918,963,903	4.519
Newspapers, other than dailies	797,697,906	4.132	1,131,852,454	2.912
All other publications	1,125,542,402	6.760	1,834,238,909	4.148
Total, publishers' second-class	4,533,881,995	4.784	6,025,982,682	3.599
Transient	42,905,913	5.175		
Total all second-class	4,576,787,908	4.787		
Third-class:				
Regular rates	5,550,908,781	1.152		
Book mailings, at 1½ cents per pound	4,990,722	4.787		
Total, third-class	5,555,899,503	1.156		
Fourth-class:				
Zone rates	683,403,588	78.047		
Book mailings, at 1½ cents per pound	28,124,541	81.956		
Total, fourth-class	711,528,129	78.201		
Penalty matter	1,157,320,599	2.456		
Franked matter	44,975,397	1.722		
Free for the blind	1,507,228	71.543		
Total, domestic	27,531,333,166	3.384		
FOREIGN				
Outgoing (originating):				
Miscellaneous	161,475,131	3.436		
Publishers' second-class	43,131,450	6.669	57,332,378	5.017
Air mail	13,527,457	.671		
Total, foreign	218,134,038	3.904		
Grand total, all mail matter	27,749,467,204	3.389		

Special services	Transactions
Registry:	
Paid	43,000,709
Free	12,029,101
Insurance	80,933,331
Collect on delivery	34,549,686
Special delivery	96,380,909
Special handling	2,523,983
Miscellaneous—foreign mail	1,262,995
Money orders	255,442,583
Postal savings	2,800,128

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, the 3-cent rate on first-class postage, other than local delivery, expires July 1.

The purpose of this resolution, House Joint Resolution 105, is to continue the 3-cent rate for 2 more years, or until July 1, 1943. Unless the act is extended, the rate will revert to 2 cents. This would cause a revenue loss of $101,860,000. It is obvious that the Treasury can ill afford to lose this amount of revenue.

The rate was originally increased from 2 cents to 3 cents under the Revenue Act of 1932 as a revenue measure.

The law originally provided that the rate would go back to 2 cents on July 1, 1934, but instead it was extended for 1 additional year by joint resolution passed in 1933; thereafter additional 2-year extensions were made in 1935, 1937, and 1939.

This will be the fifth extension of the 3-cent rate.

I call attention to the fact that first-class mail is the only class that pays its own way.

Profit on first-class mail—other than local-delivery letters—was $122,000,000 last fiscal year.

Profit on local-delivery letters was $23,000,000—carried at the 2-cent rate.

Loss on air mail was $8,916,000.

Loss on second-class mail was $85,000,000.

Loss on third class, $26,000,000.

Loss on fourth class, $21,809,000.

Loss on foreign mail, $8,394,000.

Departmental mail cost the Government $16,986,000.

Franked mail by Members of Congress cost $745,000.

Loss on special services—registry, insurance, special delivery, money orders, and so forth, $21,720,000.

Total operating deficit in fiscal year 1940 was $42,000,000.

If the 3-cent rate is not continued, the total operating deficit would be increased by over $100,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 14, 1941, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate; and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses, which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE C. ELLIS MOORE

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that I learned of the death of the Honorable C. Ellis Moore of Cambridge, Ohio.

Mr. Moore served in Congress from my district for 14 years with commendable success. In politics he was fair and honorable. His private life was beyond criticism. His loyalty to his country was unexcelled. The death of such a man in this critical time is a great loss, not only to his family and his friends, but to the great democratic Nation he so passionately loved.

With affection and respect he will always be remembered by those who knew him.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty and to incorporate therein newspaper items from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, under date of April 1; also another item giving a list of organizations opposed to the project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by seven newspaper organizations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BEITER, Mr. BLACKNEY, Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. BROOKS were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: First, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject, Will the United States Follow France?; and, second, to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Real Estate Board of Detroit on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter received by me from Allen Hayward in denial of charges made against him by the Dies committee. I am doing this in the interest of fair play.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address on the ability of the American railways to handle the transportation problem arising out of the present emergency. The address is by Mr. Gormley, vice president of the American Railways Association, who is considered one of the greatest transportation authorities in the country.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to the U. S. S. *Washington*, named after the State of Washington, and to include therein a letter from Rear Admiral S. M. Robinson, United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein certain editorial and congressional comments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, furious propaganda is now being promoted in this country by interventionists urging that the United States follow the convoy route to war. Each of you knows in his heart, as does the President, that when they ask you to send our ships they also ask you to send our sons to total, bloody, shooting war on foreign battle fronts. Because I am opposed to thrusting this country into war, and because Congress and the country are opposed to it, I have today introduced a bill in the House to prohibit the use of convoys.

It is time for clear thinking and plain talking, Mr. Speaker. The crimson corrolary of convoying material in merchant ships is convoying troops in transports, and the final convoy of the slow returning fleet carrying the rough pine boxes with the lifeless bodies of dead American soldiers and sailors coming home from a rendezvous with death 3,000 miles away. If America goes to convoying, America goes to war; as President Roosevelt has truthfully said, "convoying means shooting, and shooting means war." Members now have a chance to make good their pledge to keep America out of war. I commend my no-convoy bill to your support. [Applause.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FULMER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] may be permitted to place two separate extensions in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on Feeder Air Lines appearing in the magazine Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]?

There was no objection.

LABOR IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read to the House a telegram received by me a few moments ago which is one of many letters and telegrams I am receiving upon the same subject. This comes not as a result of inspired propaganda but reflects the spontaneous sentiment of patriotic Americans who are concerned only with the defense of their country at this critical time, and I am in complete sympathy therewith.

This telegram is dated Bryan, Tex., April 3, and reads as follows:

BRYAN, TEX., *April 3, 1941.*

Hon. LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Inasmuch as our boys are conscripted for defense at $21 monthly, we, the undersigned, do not believe that labor on defense industry should be allowed to nullify our preparedness progress by selfishly striking for unreasonable demands or petty differences. We respectfully request immediate action by Congress.

Coulter Hoppess; H. P. Dansby, Jr.; Mrs. Geo. A. Adams; F. R. Rogers; R. Henry Harrison; W. S. Higgs; Robert R. Wilcox; M. C. Atkins; C. E. Jones; R. B. Sweet; D. Mike; W. B. Cline; G. S. Parker, Jr.; E. L. Williams; J. A. Williams; N. C. Baker; Theo. H. Thomsen; H. D. Mayfield, Jr.; Vergil Dupree; W. J. Coulter; H. C. Spencer; K. Halsell; Ross M. Sherwood; C. C. Doak; John S. Caldwell; Walter Sayiers; Mrs. Lee J. Roundtree; Thurman B. Srader; Sam P. Kennedy; E. E. Yeager; Mit Dansby; J. D. Benson; R. C. Dansby; Charles S. Myers; E. R. Bryant; Noah W. Dansby; C. G. Wetter; Jeff Hefley; Travis B. Bryan; Chas. F. Hillier; Homer Norton; R. M. Vidk; W. F. Davis; W. G. Sims; E. P. Humbert; W. S. Smith; J. L. Sowell; C. S. Martin; Hy T. Schovajsa; Mrs. E. Griesser; F. C. Bolton; Calvin E. Moore; H. C. Seale; Chas. N. Shepardson; C. W. Crawford; Ed Bouestein; Fred W. Jensen; T. D. Brooks; W. R. McCullough; James Whaley; W. C. Vanderwerth; Mark M. Norton; James Lynch; M. F. Dansby; E. R. Canady; F. H. Murray; R. M. Dansby; R. C. Franks; R. C. Stone; Mills P. Walker; Ivan Langfor; J. F. Casey; J. N. Dulaney; W. B. Roman; C. C. Hedges; J. M. Bullock; Ide P. Trotter; J. W. Batts; P. A. Woodard; Luke Patronella; W. B. Orr; C. E. Griesser; Allan Kraft; Sam C. Houle, Jr.; A. M. Waldrop, Jr.; G. E. Potter; F. E. Giesecke; Seldon Henslee; J. H. Binney; O. W. Kelley; Richard J. Dunn; M. C. Hughes; P. A. Tardy; William S. Evans; Mayon Ricks; John Sidney Smith, Jr.; Paul Dansby; S. V. Norwood; P. W. Bruner; D. M. Dansby; H. L. Whitley.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a separate statement with reference to other matters, also letters with reference to this same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

CREATION OF WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 324, to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the White County Bridge Commission (hereinafter created and hereinafter referred to as the "commission") and its successors and assigns be, and is hereby, authorized to acquire, by purchase or otherwise, from its owners, and to maintain and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River at or near the city of New Harmony, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act. For like purposes said commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to acquire, maintain, and operate all or any ferries across the Wabash River within 1 mile of said bridge, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the commission and its successors and assigns the right and power to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use said bridge and such real estate and other property in the State of Illinois and the State of Indiana as may be needed for the acquisition and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purposes in said State, respectively.

SEC. 3. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge and such ferry or ferries in accordance with the provisions of this Act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War as provided by the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge as may be acquired and its approaches (including any approach highways which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and such ferry or ferries as may be acquired and the necessary land, easements, and appurtenances thereto by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest at the rate of not more than 6 percent per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds and any premium to be paid for retirement thereof before maturity shall be payable solely from the sinking fund provided in accordance with this act and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of such bridge and its approaches. Such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be in such form not inconsistent with this act, shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 20 years from the date of approval of this act, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine. The commission may repurchase and may reserve the right to redeem all or any of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices, not exceeding 105 percent of the principal amount thereof and accrued interest, as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. The commission, when it deems it to the best interest of the commission, may issue refunding bonds to repurchase and redeem any outstanding bonds, before the maturity thereof, which it may issue: *Provided*, That the refunding bonds shall mature at such time or times, not exceeding 25 years from date of approval of this act, as the commission may determine. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bond or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect of the maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge and/or the ferry or ferries, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

Said bonds shall be sold in such manner and at such time or times and at such price as the commission may determine, but no such sale shall be made at a price so low as to require the payment of more than 6 percent interest on the money received therefor, computed with relation to the absolute maturity of the bonds in accordance with standard tables of bond values, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge and its approaches and the land, easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, and in the event the ferry or ferries are to be acquired, also the cost of such ferry or ferries and the lands, easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith. The cost of the bridge and approaches and approach highways, and ferry or ferries, shall be deemed to include all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying, and other expenses incident to the acquisition of the bridge or the acquisition of the ferry or ferries, and the acquisition of the necessary property, and incident to the financing thereof: *Provided*, That the cost of acquisition of said bridge and approaches and approach highways, and ferry, shall not exceed the sum of $945,000. If the proceeds of the bonds issued shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the sinking fund hereinafter provided. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates with or without coupons of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery.

SEC. 5. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity as herein provided. All tolls and other revenues from said bridge are hereby pledged to such uses and to the application thereof as hereinafter in this section required. After payment or provision for payment therefrom of all such cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating and the reservation of an amount of money estimated to be sufficient for the same purpose during an ensuing period of not more than 6 months, the remainder of tolls collected shall be placed in the sinking fund, at intervals to be determined by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge, so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in the application thereof to all traffic falling within any such reasonable class, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge for traffic except upon payment of the tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the commission or the Government of the United States or any State, county, or municipality in the United States while in the discharge of their duties, or municipal police or fire departments when engaged in the proper work of any such department.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall require the commission or its successors to maintain or operate any ferry or ferries purchased hereunder, but in the discretion of the commission or its successors any ferry or ferries so purchased, with the appurtenances and property thereto connected and belonging, may be sold or otherwise disposed of or may be abandoned and/or dismantled whenever in the judgment of the commission or its successors it may seem expedient so to do. The commission and its successors may fix such rates of toll for the use of such ferry or ferries as it may deem proper, subject to the same conditions as are hereinabove required as to tolls for traffic over the bridge. All tolls collected for the use of the ferry or ferries and the proceeds of any sale or disposition of any ferry or ferries shall be used, so far as may be necessary, to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and any residue thereof shall be paid into the sinking fund hereinabove provided for bonds. An accurate record of the cost of purchasing the ferry or ferries; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 7. After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held for that purpose, the commission shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the commission in and to the bridge, that part within Illinois to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency thereof as may

be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereinafter referred to as the Illinois interests) and that part within Indiana to the State of Indiana or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereinafter referred to as the Indiana interests), under the condition that the bridge shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Illinois interests and the Indiana interests, as may be agreed upon; but if either the Illinois interests or the Indiana interests shall not be authorized to accept or shall not accept the same under such conditions, then the bridge shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the commission, and the rates of tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management, until such time as both the Illinois interests and the Indiana interests shall be authorized to accept and shall accept such conveyance under such conditions. If at the time of such conveyance the commission or its successors shall not have disposed of such ferry or ferries, the same shall be disposed of by sale as soon as practicable at such price and upon such terms as the commission or its successors may determine.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act, there is hereby created the White County Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession; may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or other property and apply same to the purposes of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

The commission shall consist of Julius C. Kern, Jennings F. Marlin, and J. Madison Pomeroy, all of Carmi, Ill. Such commission shall be a body corporate and politic. Each member of the commission shall qualify within 30 days after the approval of this act by filing in the office of the Federal Works Administrator an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this act, and each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in like manner within 30 days after his appointment. Any vacancy occurring in said commission by reason of failure to qualify as above provided, or by reason of death or resignation, shall be filled by the Secretary of Agriculture. Before the issuance of bonds as hereinabove provided, each member of the commission shall give such bond as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, conditioned upon the faithful performance of all duties required by this act. The cost of such bonds shall be deemed an operating expense of the commission. The commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from its members, and may establish rules and regulations for the government of its own business. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 9. The commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the commission shall be entitled to compensation for their services, but the maximum compensation of the chairman in any year shall not exceed $1,200 and of each other member in any year shall not exceed $600. The members of the commission shall also be entitled to receive traveling expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the commission. The commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and other such experts, assistants, and employees as they may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon shall have been paid and all other obligations of the commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payment shall have been made as hereinbefore provided, and after the bridge shall have been conveyed to the Illinois interests and the Indiana interests as herein provided, and any ferry or ferries shall have been sold, the commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the commissioner of public roads made upon his own initiative or upon application of the commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a public hearing in the city of Carmi, Ill., notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once, at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in the city of Carmi. At the time of such dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the commission shall be divided into two equal parts, one of which shall be paid to said Illinois interests and the other to said Indiana interests.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the commission shall have full power and authority to negotiate and enter into a contract or contracts with the State Highway Department of Illinois and the State Highway Commission of Indiana, whereby said highway departments, or either of them, may operate and maintain or participate with the commission in the operation and maintenance of said bridge and approaches.

SEC. 11. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or permit the commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds provided by this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be an obligation or liability of any member or members of the commission but shall be chargeable solely to the funds herein provided, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 12. All provisions of this act may be enforced or the violation thereof prevented by mandamus, injunction, or other appropriate remedy brought by the attorney general for the State of Illinois, the attorney general for the State of Indiana, or the United States district attorney for any district in which the bridge may be located in part, in any court having competent jurisdiction of the subject matter and of the parties.

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the commission, in its discretion, shall have power at any time to sell, transfer, and convey such bridge and approaches thereto either to the State of Illinois or the State of Indiana, or to any public agency, or any political subdivision of either of such States within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly: *Provided, however*, That if such bridge shall be sold, transferred, and conveyed to the States or public agencies or political subdivisions thereof or to either of them, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same, and after a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. In the event of the acquisition of such bridge pursuant to the provisions of this section, an accurate record of the amount paid for the acquisition of the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. No such sale, transfer, or conveyance shall be made except for a consideration sufficient to enable the commission to retire all of its outstanding bonds and obligations and unless prior to or simultaneously with such sale, transfer, and conveyance all outstanding bonds of the commission shall be called for redemption and moneys sufficient to effect such redemption deposited and irrevocably pledged for that purpose.

SEC. 14. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 9, line 8, after the word "necessary", insert the word "solely."

Page 10, line 16, strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "Federal Works Administrator."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from the Omaha World Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

THE BONNEVILLE YARDSTICK

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, April 1 has for centuries been designated as All Fools' Day. Last Tuesday, April 1, however, was anything but that to the residents of Ellensburg, Wash. It was a red-letter day of congratulations and rejoicing, for on that day Bonneville power was delivered to them at the low-cost-plus rates now available from this dam. If these rates were applied all over our State of Washington, it would save the people of our State over $10,000,000 annually, as you can see from the table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1941. These rates will prevail in our State when all the generators proposed at Coulee Dam are installed and operating.

The powerful power companies of our State, "the big four" controlled by Wall Street wealth, said a decade ago that the power possible of development at the then proposed Bonneville Dam could not be disposed of. Administrator Paul J. Raver has stated time and again that he has offers of contracts for twice the power now generated at Bonneville. When the potential power at Coulee Dam is generated, even though the power generated in our State will be one-fifth of that in the United States, it will be all utilized in factory, home, and on the farm because of the reasonable rates. For these beneficial results we can be grateful to the present administration and a far-sighted Congress, which believe in planning for the future welfare of all the people.

[Bonneville Power Administration, Information Service]

The Bonneville Power Administration's 64-mile transmission line through the Yakima Valley will be energized on Tuesday, April 1, for the purpose of serving the municipally owned electric-distribution system of Ellensburg, Wash.

Ellensburg, a pioneer municipal system, executed a contract with Bonneville Power Administrator Paul J. Raver on August 1, 1940, calling for delivery of Columbia River power to the city by April 1. During the winter months the Power Administration has pushed construction of a 115,000-volt transmission line from its Midway substation on the Columbia River in south central Washington to Yakima, Wash., and from Yakima to Ellensburg.

Power delivery over this line will be made to a substation located on the outskirts of Ellensburg. Power Administration officials said the Ellensburg line would be energized on April 1, according to terms of the contract, although the city may not take delivery of power for a few weeks. Manufacturing difficulties in the East, which held up delivery of equipment to Ellensburg, has caused some delay on the part of the city in installing necessary facilities to receive the power, they said.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a release from the Bonneville Power Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute that I might read a letter written to me by the Secretary of Labor, dated November 26, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 27, 1940.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter to the President concerning the strike at the Vultee airplane plant, Downey, Calif., was referred to me so that you might be informed as to what the Government was doing to bring about a settlement. John R. Steelman, Director of Conciliation of this Department, settled the controversy yesterday and work has been resumed in the plant.

As you know, the President announced yesterday, following a conference with Army, Navy, and labor representatives, that it is the policy of the Government to keep factories engaged in defense work open and that the problem of dealing with the labor situation in connection with national defense is under daily consideration.

Very truly yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

Mr. Speaker, it is noticeable the policy referred to above was announced more than 4 months ago; the people of my district and the American people are anxious that the policy mentioned above be carried out now. As I said in a statement which appeared in the RECORD a few days ago, I desire that action be taken immediately to prevent delays in our national-defense program.

STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND FEDERAL JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4276, the State, Commerce, Justice, and Federal judiciary appropriation bill, 1942.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4276, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the time consumed yesterday in the debate on this bill was as follows: The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], 1 hour and 25 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], in charge of the time on the minority side, 1 hour and 23 minutes. Therefore there was practically an even division of the time. There was some misunderstanding as to the position of the gentleman from Michigan as to having time yesterday, and for that reason I now ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] be permitted to proceed for 25 additional minutes, and that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday I discussed the conditions and facts pertaining to Camp Blanding. Today I wish to discuss conditions in Camp Meade, Md., which I visited during the week of March 3. Camp Meade is a former World War camp, situated some 20 miles north of the city of Washington and a short distance from the city of Laurel, Md. Plans and photographs of National Army cantonments issued by the Construction Division of the War Department in 1918 state that this camp at that time had a total area of 9,349 acres; that the number of buildings erected in 1917 was 1,460, and that the camp capacity during the World War was 42,830. The total area of the land of the present project is 15,000 acres, a part of which is being purchased from various owners by the Real Estate Division of the Construction Quartermaster General's office. The land is rolling, half clay and half sand.

The estimated cost of the project upon which this original appropriation was based was $9,053,187. It is now estimated that it will cost $23,117,000.

The original fee fixed for the contractor was $274,312, or 3.03 percent, while the original fee fixed for the engineer contractor was $40,120, or 0.55 percent. I have no information as to whether additional fees were granted since the original fee was fixed.

The contractor is the Consolidated Engineering Co., Inc., of Baltimore, Md. This contracting firm has had years of experience, having been organized in 1911. Numerous contracts have been completed aggregating $38,500,000 during the past 5 years, exclusive of Camp Meade and Puerto Rico projects. This work included contracts at Camp Greene, Charlotte, N. C.; Fort Storey, Cape Henry, Va.; the new Congressional Library; the new House Office Building; and the Department of Commerce Building. There is no one in the executive personnel who has not been with the company at least 20 years. The president has been with the company 33 years. The record shows that this company is well qualified to do the kind of work it is called upon to do.

The architect engineer is J. E. Greiner Co. of Baltimore, Md. This company has operated continuously since 1908 and designed and supervised over $300,000,000 worth of work, including such jobs as the Pennsylvania Turnpike, Susquehanna River bridge, Potomac River bridge, and numerous other projects. Its senior partner, John E. Greiner, is honorary member of the Society of Civil Engineers and is also a member of several other societies. I have the qualifications of each of the men. These, together with their experience, show that it is a reputable firm of many years standing and is qualified to do the work specified in this contract.

I want to discuss each subject pertaining to the camp separately.

LABOR

The maximum number of men on the pay roll was approximately 19,900, of whom approximately 8,113 were drawing carpenters' pay, 627 were plumbers, 317 were electricians, and 185 were steam fitters, and 8,596 were day laborers, the remainder were miscellaneous workers. Of the 8,113 carpenters, it was estimated that 10 percent were finished carpenters, 55 percent were what might be called rough carpenters, and 35 percent were not carpenters.

ORGANIZATION OF MEN

There are seven section or area superintendents who had up to 3,000 men in each section. Each carpenter foreman had 20 buildings with 400 men. Pusher foremen had 20 men to each crew. It was claimed that all foremen, including pushers, were carpenters. Time was checked 4 times a day—in the morning,

midforenoon, at 1 o'clock, and midafternoon.

Each crew did specific jobs, that is, one crew built forms, another crew built joists, and a first-floor crew built the frames, and so forth. The best carpenters did the finishing work.

An electric sawmill was used where the frames were cut with power saws. The frames were then delivered to the site. Inch lumber, including siding, flooring, was sawed with power and hand saws on building site.

FORT MEADE A CLOSED SHOP

While I was interested mainly in construction costs, and while union dues were paid out of wages after the Government had paid those wages and did not enter into the cost of the project, I did obtain the following information: This was a closed shop and all labor was obtained through the union including common labor. The union operated an employment office and no one was hired for more than 3 days without a permit from the union. While I did not attempt to get the amounts of all union fees and dues I was given what purported to be the amount of fees of the carpenters' and common laborers' unions. These two unions represented by far the largest number of men on the job. I was informed that the carpenters' unions charged $57.50 initiation fees. Some men paid cash, some made a part down payment, and it is claimed that some were permitted to make the first payment of 50 percent out of the first pay check, the balance was collected within 1 week if possible, but fees were not collected on the job. If a worker did not pay, he lost his job. Cards were not issued until full amount was paid. The laborers' union charged $25, $5 out of first week's pay, balance $5 a week. This union had no probationary period.

The contractor informed me that while he had to hire through the union he could fire anyone he wanted to fire for any cause without interference by the union. It was naively suggested that the more men he fired the more fees the union collected.

All of the above information was given me by the representatives of the contractor and engineers and did not come from any union officials or from anyone representing a union organization.

INCREASE IN COST BECAUSE OF INCREASED LABOR RATES

The contractor informs me that there was no material increase in the cost of the project because of increase in wage scale after the original determination was made by the Secretary of Labor.

INCREASED COST BECAUSE OF OVERTIME

The total increased cost because of overtime on this project was $1,808,320 up to February 25, 1941, or approximately 8 percent of the total cost of the job.

The Bacon-Davis Act provides that the Secretary of Labor must fix the scale of wages to be paid on a project. Madam Perkins, Secretary of Labor, fixed carpenters' pay at Camp Meade at $1.25 an hour while at Fort Belvoir, Va., they are fixed at $1.62½ an hour. Electricians' pay was fixed at $1.50 an hour at Camp Meade and $1.80 an hour at Fort Belvoir. Laborers were paid 62 cents an hour at Meade and 80 cents an hour at Belvoir. Plumbers were paid $1.37 an hour at Meade and $1.65 an hour at Belvoir, and so on through the entire wage schedule. The result was that the real craftsmen and mechanics flocked to Belvoir and left Meade. The contractor claims he was compelled to add enough overtime to the workers pay roll to make up the pay they would have received at Belvoir or adjoining areas and that much of this overtime was paid because of this wage difference. How Madam Perkins could have fixed the prevailing wages at a higher rate at Fort Belvoir, Va., than at Fort Meade, Md., and still follow the prevailing rate paid in those areas is beyond me. Camp Meade is some 20 miles north and Belvoir some 20 miles south of the city of Washington.

RAILROADS

A mile and one-half of railroad siding was built at a cost of $38,288. One hundred-pound rails were used which were purchased by the Quartermaster.

SUBCONTRACTS

I have photostatic copies of three lowest bids on all subcontracts. However, they are too voluminous to place into the record. There were two fixed-fee subcontracts.

EQUIPMENT

The appraised value of the equipment on this job was $1,114,422. Rentals paid for equipment was $418,822, and it was estimated that $50,000 more would have to be paid to complete the job, making the total $468,822. Rentals paid were in most instances from 100 to 200 percent higher than those fixed by the Associated General Contractors schedule. The contractor took bids for the furnishing of equipment and awards were made and contracts negotiated on the lowest of the bids received. Equipment was checked as to fitness before it was accepted, by both the experts of the Construction Quartermaster and of the contract engineer. Each piece of equipment, including trucks, was numbered and checked four times a day by time checkers in the same manner as men were checked. Operators' time was also checked by time keeper and record was kept if equipment went to repair shop.

UTILITIES

The total amount allotted for utilities in original estimates was $766,264. The estimate of total final costs is $2,630,550. The following shows an itemized breakdown:

Utilities	Amount of estimate or allotted in contract	Quantity actually installed	Estimate of total final costs
		Feet	
Water lines	$204,000	138,133	$802,448
Electric lines	128,264	182,000	256,213
Sewer lines	204,000	146,000	602,520
Roads	205,000	[1] 20	931,081
Railroads	25,000	[1] 1.57	38,288
Total	766,264		2,630,550

[1] Miles.

Approximately $1,864,000 of the increased cost of this project will be due to increased costs of utilities.

LUMBER

Approximately 52,000,000 feet of lumber was purchased for this project—15,652,000 feet were purchased by the contractor at an average price of $41.50 per thousand while 26,395,000 feet were purchased by the Procurement Division of the Quartermaster General's Office at an average price of $38.29 per thousand. A great portion of the lumber purchased by the contractor was secured from local stock and was delivered to the exact site of the building operations while that purchased by the Procurement Division was delivered f. o. b. and had to be hauled from the railroad cars to the lumberyard and then reloaded and hauled by truck to the building site at an additional expense.

All lumber was checked as to quality and moisture content by the architect-engineer and rechecked by the construction quartermaster. The forms were used and reused as long as they could be reused. Lumber left over when a building was completed was moved to the new site and only lumber unfit for building was sent to a salvage pile, where it was turned over to the construction quartermaster to be used for duck boards and other purposes for the Army.

BUILDINGS

The original estimate was supposed to provide for 992 buildings to house 1,195 officers and 22,491 enlisted men. The completed contract provides for 1,142 buildings which will house 1,414 officers and 24,372 enlisted men.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ARCHITECT-ENGINEER

When I called attention to the site, the arrangement of buildings, and the failure to use World War camp facilities, to the architect-engineer, I was informed that the Army had not followed their recommendations. I asked them to place in writing the list of recommendations made by the architect-engineer which were not followed by the Army. The architect-engineer reported as follows:

List of recommendations made by the architect-engineer which were not followed:

Upon retention of the J. E. Greiner Co. as the architect-engineer for the design of the Fort Meade cantonment, officials of that company visited the reservation and made an inspection of the area as a whole. Based on their observations it was their recommendation that the new cantonment be laid out and constructed in the western portion of the reservation where the terrain is better suited for construction, where rehabilitation of existing utilities would cost less than construction of entire new systems, where considerable well-constructed roads were available, where sites were more accessible and drainage presented less difficulties. The eastern portion of the reservation, except at the southern end, is more rolling and a considerable portion heavily wooded; there were practically no utilities, no roads, and sewerage and drainage presented difficult problems. However, acting under instructions of Government officials, the cantonment was laid out and constructed in this area.

The hospital, as constructed at the northern end of the eastern portion, was built under the most difficult natural conditions,

adding considerable to the cost thereof, whereas if the site in the more central portion of the reservation as recommended by the J. E. Greiner Co. had been utilized, considerable saving would have been effected. This site is indicated on the print of the World War cantonment attached.

The areas for the Tank and Antitank Battalions, contrary to the recommendation of the architect-engineer, were placed in a rather heavily wooded, hilly site. Not only were the soil conditions indescribably poor, but in order to serve these areas with sewers it was necessary to run same in a tunnel approximately 35 feet under ground for a distance of about 1,200 feet. The location recommended by the architect-engineer did not present the above difficulties.

It was the recommendation of the architect-engineer that the incinerator be located in the warehouse area where roads and other utilities were available. However, on the insistence of Government officials, this building was located in the hilly northeastern section of the reservation, requiring the grading and construction of 1,500 feet of roads, and water lines, sewers, and electric-service lines of the same length.

EXCESS COSTS

I called the attention of the contractor, the Consolidated Engineering Co., to what seemed to me the extremely excessive cost of this project and asked them to give me their statement why such costs were excessive. They furnished me the following statement:

STATEMENT OF SOME OF THE FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE EXCESS COSTS OF THE PROJECT

(a) The requirements to work over 8 hours per day, nights, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays on an overtime basis, in order to meet the dates set for the arrival of troops.

(b) Increased costs due to a great number of priorities established from time to time for housing the National Guard and other troop arrivals in their permanent locations rather than in quarters already provided elsewhere.

(c) Requirements to finish certain sections of the camp for the housing of the troops who participated in the Presidential Inauguration.

(d) Requirements to work 24 hours per day, also Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays on an overtime basis for the Seventieth Tank and Ninety-third Anti-Tank Battalion—arrival prior to any completion date set and months prior to any date set up in the contract.

NOTE.—Relative to items (b), (c), (d), above it should be noted that the contractors were required to complete buildings widely separated and in six separate sections of the camp causing a disruption of the normal routine set up by the contractors to construct the work in an orderly and economical sequence.

(e) Cost of temporary electric wiring and lighting required for the extensive night work.

(f) The incompetency and unqualified character of mechanics and laborers which the contractors were forced to engage, due to the fact that sufficient qualified workmen were not available in this territory. They could not be obtained due to the great amount of defense work going on at the same time in the immediate vicinity.

(g) The selection of the camp site, which covers a total distance from 4½ to 5 miles, necessitated many additional miles of roads, water, sewer, and electrical lines and added tremendously to costs. Furthermore, the terrain and soil conditions on the site selected is such as to increase building costs very considerably beyond what costs might be expected under normal conditions. For instance most materials required for over 50 percent of the camp site had to be dragged through mud on improvised sleds drawn by tractors to the building sites.

(h) The selection of the site for the camp not only involved considerable additional length of utility installations but the nature of ground conditions encountered made these installations much more expensive than if a more suitable site had been selected on the reservation. The cuts on the sewer lines were as deep as 25 feet or over and in a section for a distance of 1,200 feet the overburden was so great that it required a tunneling and dewatering operation.

(i) Road construction, due to the tremendous amounts of fills and cuts required and the lack of natural drainage, was very much more expensive than if the site of the camp had been selected elsewhere. Many thousands of tons of additional crushed stone and slag were required to suitably stabilize roads satisfactorily, due to the depth of the mud encountered.

(j) The season during which this camp was built was attended by severe frosts followed by thaws, creating a mud condition that was a very serious obstacle to overcome. In addition to this, it required that High Early Strength cement be used in lieu of normal cement, and many thousands of dollars were spent in protective measures for the prevention of freezing of the concrete work.

(k) The rolling character of the terrain throughout most of the camp site required in excess of 150 percent additional concrete foundation work over and above that shown on the contract drawings.

This also increased the quantity of sheathing between the grade and the first floors of the buildings proportionately; likewise the X-bracing of the high concrete piers with steel angles to counteract wind pressure was added.

(l) The selection of the site for the magazines, incinerator, laundry, and other special buildings was a large factor in increasing the cost of the project. The magazines and incinerator were built in a very swampy section, requiring additional cost for installation of roads, drainage, fills, and the distance from the main utilities, necessitating longer lengths of additional water, sewer, and electric lines. To get to these sites it was also necessary to build temporary corduroy roads before the permanent roads could be installed.

(m) The exterior of all buildings throughout the camp are being painted one prime and one finishing coat, which was not contemplated in the original contract and is not considered a change in scope. Along this same line the specifications for the roofing felt was changed from 55- to 90-pound materials.

SITE

I have in my possession a photostatic copy of the World War map, referred to by this engineer, showing the locations of these World War buildings, which also shows which part, if any, of the World War camp was used by the construction quartermaster for building sites during the present emergency. I went over the entire site three times, the first time alone, the second time accompanied by the camp construction quartermaster, the engineer, and the representative of the contracting firm, and a third time alone.

I do not know why the Army did not use this World War site unless it was perhaps because they had a golf course on a small portion of one end which they did not want to disturb. The golf course is a nice level piece of land where Army officers and others could play golf without much exertion. It was not a course that would appeal to a Scotchman who loved his hills.

The present contemplated site will cover approximately 15,000 acres, including the World War area. A part of the new area is now in the process of acquisition.

On the one side I saw a ghost town where 43,000 World War troops had been cantoned and trained in 1917. The buildings were all gone, but the site was still there. On the other side I saw the new camp being built on what was practically a complete new site. On the one side I saw miles of World War streets and roads including some concrete roads leading through sites where World War buildings, barracks, and so forth, had once stood, and on the other side I saw where new roads were being built at a cost of over $931,000. On the one side I saw miles of main and lateral sewer lines used in the World War, and on the other they were spending over $600,000 constructing 146,000 feet of new sewer lines. On the one side I saw acres of level land where the old streets were laid out and where World War barracks had stood, while on the other I saw them grading and clearing land for streets, roads, and building sites at an estimated cost of $536,000.

I wish especially to call attention to the proposed location and the actual location on the map of the antitank unit and the hospital. The camp construction quartermaster and the engineers proposed to build these two units on what was a part of the old World War site, easily accessible with roads ready and ground leveled without expense. They were overruled by the Army authorities and the hospital and antitank unit was built on the present location. I was informed that the two units were built near the divide between the Severn River watershed and the Patuxent River watershed; that one unit was built on one side and the other unit was built on the other side of the divide, necessitating the construction of a 1,200-foot sewer tunnel through the hill to connect the two. This tunnel was from 35 to 40 feet underground. I was also informed that the Government could have saved the expense of building 1,500 feet of sewer line, trunk electric line, telephone line, and roads had the World War site been selected. The increased cost of the new hospital site was estimated as high as $1,000,000.

The engineers informed me that the old concrete roads were in good condition; that a thin coat of asphalt would have made them as good as new; that the sewer lines were in good condition and that they actually used a small portion of them; that all they required was cleaning. The World War water lines were wood mains and, in my opinion, could not have been utilized.

In my judgment, hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money could have been saved had the old site been utilized as it was utilized in some of the other projects. I am informed that a similar situation exists at Camp Grant, Ill., a camp which I did not visit.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much said in days past regarding the fact that our public credit is our first line of national defense. We recently increased the national debt limit to $65,000,000,000 and are told that with the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease appropriation recently made

to aid England and other requirements that the debt will in the near future exceed $75,000,000,000. The State and local debt of this Nation is over $20,000,000,000. All of this will in the near future bring our total public debt—national, State, and local—up to nearly $100,000,000,000. The assessed valuation of the 48 States was $134,000,000,000 in 1930. Last year we passed a tax bill increasing the tax levy and reducing the exemption of married and single men. We are now requiring a W. P. A. clerk who gets $800 a year to file a return if he has no dependents. I voted for this measure. The President recently told us that we would have to tighten our belts, dig down still deeper, and make more sacrifices all in the interests of national defense, as nearly as possible with "pay as you go" taxes. Unless we do this I can see nothing ahead but inflation, financial bankruptcy, and ruin.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke yesterday of the conditions at Camp Blanding, Fla. The construction quartermaster of the United States Army admitted before the Military Affairs Committee recently that the Army spent $5,000,000 more than was contemplated at Camp Blanding because of the site that was chosen. This is, in my judgment, a confession of incompetency, and inefficiency resulting in waste and extravagance that is unpardonable. Millions more were wasted, in my judgment, on that project on purchases, overtime labor, and so forth. Here at Camp Meade we find similar evidence of waste and extravagance due to incompetency and inefficiency.

Mr. Chairman, speaking calmly, deliberately, and in an impersonal way, I say here and now that the officers in the United States Army who, in the face of the tax and debt burden that is being placed upon the shoulders of our people, their children, and their children's children, and in the face of the present emergency, are responsible for this willful, extravagant, and outrageous waste of the taxpayers' money, ought to be court-martialed and kicked out of the Army. If among those responsible there are civilians, they should be kicked out of the Government service and prosecuted if criminal laws have been violated.

SUMMARY

Cost

The estimated cost of this project was $9,053,187. The actual cost will be $23,117,000.

Utilities

The original cost of utilities was estimated at $766,264, whereas these utilities will actually cost $2,630,550. A part of this excess cost of $1,884,000 was due to the failure of the War Department to follow the advice of the contract engineers.

The site selected was hilly and uneven. The camp was laid out in an L form instead of on a square, concentrated plan. The L form extended the length of the camp to nearly 5 miles for a 1-division camp of 25,000 men. This required practically double the length of main sewer, electric power, and telephone lines, roads, main roads, and so forth, and accounted in part for the fact that the utilities cost was nearly 4 times that originally estimated.

The hilly nature of the site selected necessitated cutting one sewer line as deep as 25 feet and further necessitated the construction of a 1,200-foot tunnel from 35 to 40 feet underground, which would have been eliminated had the site recommended by the engineers been adopted by the Army.

Grading and clearing

The grading and clearing cost of $536,000 could have been materially reduced had the proper site been selected. This includes the additional cost due to the fact that material used on 50 percent of the camp site had to be dragged through mud on improvised sleds drawn by tractors to the building site.

LUMBER COSTS

Lumber prices were from 20 percent to 25 percent above current trade prices. The lumber was purchased at above the average prices paid at other camps.

EQUIPMENT RENTAL

The rental paid on equipment was from 100 percent to 200 percent above the Associated General Contractors' schedule. Then rental paid on this equipment was 42 percent of its value and 2 percent of the total cost of the job.

LABOR

The ratio between labor and material on this project was 65.5 percent labor to 34.5 percent material. This was out of all reasonable proportion even after one considers weather and emergency conditions.

OVERTIME

The amount of premium paid for overtime on this job was $1,808,320. This means that 13.7 percent of the money paid on the pay roll was paid for services which were not actually rendered. This represents 8 percent of the total cost of the job.

Priorities demanded by the Army, some of which could have been avoided, account for considerable additional expense. In at least one instance, I am informed, the troop commander refused to house the troops in barracks provided for because, while these barracks were ready for occupancy, they had not been built for his organization.

Mr. Chairman, in the time I have left I shall be pleased to yield for any questions.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Who is responsible?

Mr. ENGEL. I understand the General Staff selects the site, and it is approved by the corps area commander. I was told that the corps area commander overruled the contract engineer's recommendation regarding the hospital and antitank battalion site and said, "Here is where it is going, and that is where it went."

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman, after making this 2-week investigation as to Army camp construction activities, is convinced that the waste and inefficiency and extravagance are comparable to what took place during 1917 and 1918, when Army camps were constructed during the World War? The gentleman recalls that the Graham committee report made in 1920 indicated that about 40 percent of the entire cost of constructing the camps during the World War was waste.

Mr. ENGEL. I spent 19 days on this work and drove day and night. I put in a full day in each camp. I began at 6 o'clock in the morning and at 7 a. m. I joined the caravan going into the camp.

I am going to report on each of the 13 camps. It would not be fair to make a blanket statement of inefficiency. In some of these camps they did a good job, and I want to say so when the time comes. I have some information regarding the cost and what these camps should have been built for, and will give this information to Congress later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. The gentleman stated that the contractors at Fort Meade had to pay overtime to meet the higher rate paid at Fort Belvoir.

Mr. ENGEL. I gave the reason the contractors and the officers at Fort Meade gave for paying overtime.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Of course, these men actually performed overtime work for their overtime pay, did they not?

Mr. ENGEL. No. The $1,800,000 premium I referred to was pay in excess of time actually worked. In other words, if a man worked an hour overtime, he got 2 hours' time—1 hour for which he worked and 1 hour for which he did not work. The $1,800,000 was paid for the time these men did not actually work.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Are any steps being taken in Congress or by the gentleman or otherwise to fix the responsibility for this situation at Camp Meade and to carry out the program of discipline or punishment the gentleman has suggested?

Mr. ENGEL. That is up to the Army. I had no authority to call witnesses. May I say, however, that the contractors, the engineers, and the Army officers at the post cooperated in every instance. They gave me all the information I asked for.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yesterday we passed a resolution authorizing the Military Affairs and the Naval Affairs Committees to investigate the matters about which the gentleman is speaking. Last January several resolutions were introduced concerned with learning how the taxpayers' money was being spent. I had hoped at that time that a special committee would be appointed, so men just like the gentleman from Michigan could be placed on the committee to find out about all this waste and extravagance.

Mr. ENGEL. There are some very able men, including lawyers, on the Committee on Military Affairs and on the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am ready and

willing to turn over anything I have to any committee which is investigating this matter.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. In searching into the question of cost and the effect that strikes and undercover agents may have on this question, may I ask the gentleman whether in his judgment David Saposs, of Milwaukee, Wis., who was a star student under John R. Collins in our State university, is or is not a Communist?

Mr. ENGEL. While the question the gentleman from Wisconsin asks is perhaps not entirely pertinent to the issue at hand, I will try, nevertheless, to answer it as fairly as I can. Like me, others reading various reports, including newspaper reports, I was under the impression that Dr. David Saposs was a Communist. I had an opportunity of going into the matter more or less carefully in connection with my work as a member of the Federal Security Agency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles the National Labor Relations Board appropriation. Dr. Saposs was employed by that Board at the time. I am very much afraid that in many cases people pass judgment too hastily as to whether or not an individual is a Communist. I am afraid that many people form their opinions something like this: If a person is a Jew, it is strike one. If he comes from Russia, it is strike two. And if the individual is at all liberal and the third ball comes anywhere near the plate, it is strike three and you are out, as a Communist. David Saposs was born in Russia; he came to America when he was 9 years old. He worked his way through elementary school and college selling papers and doing shorthand work. His father settled in Milwaukee, and I believe there is some evidence that he joined the Socialist Party when Victor Berger was Socialist mayor of Milwaukee. This was the same Victor Berger, who was at one time a Member of this House. Dr. Saposs was later professor of labor economics, holding various positions. He is, in my judgment, one of the best posted men on labor economics in the United States. I am satisfied that David Saposs is not now or ever has been a Communist. Mr. DIES, of Texas, the chairman of the so-called Dies committee, told me personally that his committee had no evidence that he was a Communist. I have a letter written by Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in which he expresses the same opinion. But the real reason why I believe that David Saposs is not a Communist is because his entire life's work has been inconsistent with the theory of communism. His whole life has been devoted to the interests of common labor. He believes in free organized labor, the right to strike, the right of representation on the part of labor by individuals of their own choosing, and the right to organize. He believes in every right that free labor can exercise in a free country. His every effort has been to maintain, sustain, and establish those rights. These rights cannot be exercised and are not exercised; in fact, they are denied to labor in Communist Russia. David Saposs could not be a Communist without being inconsistent with the work that he has done during his entire lifetime.

Being prolabor he should not be placed in a position where he can decide an issue between the employer and the employee, but as a labor economist representing labor in a Government action before the Wage and Hour Division, the National Labor Relations Board, or some other board pleading the cause of labor, he would be invaluable, particularly if some corporation would have sitting across the table a paid economist to represent its side of the case.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I believe the gentleman ought to be commended for the interest, the time, and the money he has spent digging up all this information.

Mr. ENGEL. My actual expenses are being paid out of a fund the Appropriations Committee has for that purpose.

Mr. ARENDS. As soon as the House Committee on Military Affairs starts its investigation, I hope the gentleman will come before the committee with all this information and make it available to the committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I will be glad to cooperate with both committees. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday we were told that your committee reporting this bill had spent 9 consecutive weeks conducting hearings relative to many of the items herein submitted. About 200 witnesses appeared before your committee, over 800 items were considered, and the bill now contains 100 pages or more. You can see, therefore, it would be impossible to discuss the various items and provisions of the bill within the space of 5 minutes. I would like to say at the outset I am sure all of the members of the subcommittee do not subscribe to the appropriation for every item within the bill. However, it was necessary for a majority of the members to endorse these various proposals. It is appropriate that we discuss some few of the controversial matters before proceeding further. I think the proponents should be heard as well as the opponents, because this is the democratic way of obtaining sound and fair legislation.

It has already been stated that your subcommittee increased the appropriation for civilian pilot training $7,000,000 over the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. This is rather unusual, but I am sure I voice the sentiment of the committee when I say this action was taken because it felt that similar activities in the Army and the Navy should be implemented by civilian pilot training, the theory being that if the present emergency should terminate soon these pilots would be needed in commercial life and if the emergency should not be terminated, undoubtedly they would then be needed in our military organizations. This was one reason the committee saw fit to increase the appropriation for civil pilot training.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was not that also out of consideration for the splendid work already done by the Civil Aeronautics Division?

Mr. HARE. There is no doubt the committee recognized the very valuable work this Division has been doing, but it was not for the purpose of compensating the Division for what has been done, but for the purpose of continuing the very valuable service it has rendered the public and country.

CULTURAL RELATIONS

Some objections have been made to the appropriation for cultural relations program in the State Department. I am frank to say there are a number of items in this particular appropriation that appear to many of us to be of little or no value, but I have a suspicion that probably a number of these activities will be somewhat like our speeches here on the floor. They will deviate somewhat from the subject. That is, it may be a hard matter to determine all of the activities that will be engaged in by the mere title for which the appropriation is made.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman who is addressing the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is a member of the committee and yesterday, through an oversight on my part, I did not call on him to express his views to the committee. I therefore ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Cultural relations program—some may ask why there should be such a program. It is a pertinent question. The reply is the appropriation is being requested for use in developing a more friendly and a larger business relationship with the Latin republics in South America. This is not denied.

The next question is why should this be necessary, what have we done to the Latin republics in South America to incur their displeasure? Why should it be necessary for this Congress to appropriate this large sum of money to develop friendly relationships with these republics that have been our neighbors from the very beginning?

This is another pertinent question. And let me say in reply, I am not here to criticize the policies of the past. It is not my purpose to criticize the policies of those who have preceded me in Congress, but I am convinced we have lost the business friendship and business cooperation of the South American republics as a result of our own business folly—our own acts and activities in an effort to protect and build up the business of our own country.

That is, Congress heretofore has constructed tariff walls around this country so high that our neighbors were unable to trade with us or have business relations with us. Naturally they went elsewhere and traded with countries who were willing to trade with them. In other words, Congress has in the past said, in effect, to the South American republics and to the businessmen of those countries: "We do not need your business friendship, we do not need friendly relations with you, we do not need the business of your country, and we will try to get along without it." Consequently, as we have said, they have gone to other countries with their business. They have naturally and logically gone where they have received greater and more friendly consideration than they have at our hands. Now we find ourselves very much in need of their support and cooperation and it looks as if we are going to have to pay for it. Our Government is simply paying for its own past folly. The tragedy is that those who are having to pay the bill are not those who received the benefits therefrom. However, this is not the time to argue whether we have heretofore acted wisely or unwisely. We are now confronted with a serious situation and the purpose of this program is designed to meet it. Whether it will succeed we do not know but a majority of the committee felt that the effort was worth while. Regardless of the outcome the picture that presents itself before us at this time should serve as a lesson to us as well as to those who may fill our places in the future.

PRETRIAL PROCEDURE

Another matter which gave members of the committee some concern was the inauguration of a policy in our judiciary relative to pretrial procedure in our Federal courts. It may be I have not fully caught the full import of this policy, but with my information I am not prepared to subscribe fully to this procedure. As I understand, it would suggest to our Federal judges a policy of having some employee or officer of the court to inquire into the facts involved in both criminal and civil actions brought to court and report them to the court, with the idea of effecting adjustments or settlements of the matters involved without having to go to the time and expense of hearing and deciding them in open court. My first thought is that a great majority of the judges will not be willing to act and stake their reputation upon findings and reports submitted by an employee or junior officer of the court. If they do not, this appropriation will be a useless expenditure of money. If they should adopt the policy, I see a fertile field in our judicial system for bribery and corruption which has heretofore never found its way into our courts except possibly in extremely rare cases. I am not sure that the policy would be any cheaper or cost less money than now provided for our judiciary, and I do see where it is possible that such a policy would lower or destroy the confidence in our courts, the real bulwark of our liberties. Therefore I am not, as I have already stated, ready to fully subscribe to the proposed pretrial procedure as provided for in this bill. I have no quarrel with those who may think otherwise, but so far I have not been fully convinced of its wisdom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." They are to be found in the first section of the bill, and they are put into each appropriation bill that we bring before the Congress. You just fool the Congress, and you fool the American people, because all we need to do is to look at the annual or the daily statements of the Treasury Department to find out that there is nothing in the Treasury; that it is empty as old Mother Hubbard's cupboard.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I suggest to the gentleman that the day has gone by for such a playful attitude. This is not the 1st of April.

Mr. RICH. Oh, you have been fooling the people for 8 years, and I think it is time that we stopped. We ought to stop fooling the people, because some of these days we are going to get the greatest jolt this Nation ever received in all its history—a wrecked Treasury. I call attention now to the statement of the Treasury gotten out by Mr. Morgenthau, and take the one dated March 31. This shows that our income for the month of March was $1,566,408,308.85. That is the largest income we have ever received in a month. It is over $632,000,000 more than the same month last year. I do not believe that we have ever gotten more in any one month than that. That is because we enacted three tax bills last year. The people must pay. If we should receive that amount of money each month for a year, we would receive over $19,000,000,000, but our income for the year is only going to be about six and a half to seven and a half billion dollars. Here is the sad part of the whole picture: Notwithstanding that great amount of income for the month of March, we have spent it all during the month of March, so that during the other months of this year we are just in the position of a person who went to Mother Hubbard's cupboard. We go there to get something, and it is all gone. Then you have to go to the people of this country and tax them; and I would not be a bit surprised if you would give us a property assessment before the next 3 or 4 years. You surely will, or we will have a wreck on our hands.

Mr. RABAUT. Oh, the gentleman is like the preacher who scolded those who came to church for the ones that stayed away, when he talks about conditions and expenditures of money. After long hearings on the matter we reported this bill $31,016,989 below the appropriations in the 1941 bill.

Mr. RICH. Oh, but the gentleman knows that last year we put everything under the hat. We went sky high, and any reduction now might seem good from the standpoint of keeping the bill below the Budget, but just look at who the Budget officer is and what the Budget means. It is so far above the pocketbook of the American people that you will never balance the Budget until you get in a new Congress in this Federal Government, and a new Budget officer. You cannot run business in that way.

I think the Budget officer should pare these appropriations down and more and more, each and every one of them. We talk about national defense. We are spending our money for national defense. Look at the extravagance which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] showed us a few minutes ago.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield now. You will take all of my time. I want to get this across to the American people, that we are in a terrible condition. We raised our national debt limit to $65,000,000,000. You will have to increase it again before the year is over. Then what will happen? When we get a debt of eighty or ninety billion dollars, which will be within a year or two at the rate we are going now, then—bang! boom! All the things that you made for national defense, all your Army, all your Navy, and all the things of our Government will go crash. It is a terrible situation that we have to face. This administration is responsible for getting us into that position. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two matters.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American and Subversive Activities will be delighted to make available its files and all pertinent information which it has with reference to un-American and subversive influences slowing our national-defense program, to the chairman and members of the House Naval Affairs Committee and the House Military Affairs Committee, which were empowered to conduct an investigation under House Resolution 162, by act of this House on yesterday, with only one dissenting vote.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the people of this country were thrilled over the news from Yugoslavia; thrilled that a relatively weak country had the courage to stand up defiantly against one of the bullies of Europe. The sudden and sharp

crystallization of antitotalitarian sentiment in the little kingdom of the Serbs may one day be set down as the decisive turning point in the battle of democracy against dictatorship. But there was one thing which marred the event; the Communists of Yugoslavia immediately staged riots throughout the country. As though the hands of the new Government of Yugoslavia were not already full with the crucial problems of combatting the brown Fuehrer of Berlin, the "red" fuehrer of Moscow and his Yugoslav agents entered the picture to do all within their power to weaken democratic resistance to Nazi dictatorship. Our own Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, boastfully printed the accounts of this dastardly behavior of the Yugoslav Communists.

I plead with the Members of this House to heed what we on the Dies committee have been saying for more than a year: The Communists are the allies of Hitler. The Stalin-Hitler pact was not an empty document. It was crammed with sinister import for the world. In view of this incontrovertible fact, I want to say that appeasement of Stalin is appeasement of Hitler. Appeasement of Communists, whether they be in our labor unions or elsewhere, is a form of aid to Hitler.

We have been saying for almost 3 years that the program of the Communist Party is a program of civil war—civil war which waited only upon the arrival of a great national emergency. That program of civil war is now in operation. I challenge anyone to find a more accurate word for the situation into which the Communist labor leaders are now plunging this country. The members of the Dies committee have not been merely guessing during all these months that we have issued our warnings against the Communist Party's program of civil war. We have backed our statements with indisputable facts from the record. We shall continue to do so.

A few days ago, when I placed in the RECORD the facts about Kenneth Eggert, the leaders of the C. I. O., from Mr. Philip Murray down, chose to remain silent about these facts, which they did not dare dispute. I repeat—for it will bear frequent repetition—that Kenneth Eggert was sent by the Communist Party to Moscow to take training at the Lenin Institute so that he might master the tactics of civil war; that he returned to this country to become the section organizer for the Communist Party in Toledo, Ohio; that he was commissioned by the national leaders of the die-casters' union, of the C. I. O., to go to California to lead a strike in the Harvill plant at Inglewood; that he adopted the shabby fraud of trying to conceal his Communist identity by changing his name. Does Mr. Philip Murray dare to deny these facts?

The facts about Kenneth Eggert are not singular. All over the United States today, wherever there is opportunity to sabotage our program of national defense, the Communist Party is working night and day under the auspices of the C. I. O. Mr. Murray has evaded the issue and resorted to a campaign of abuse against those who have called the country's attention to the Communist menace in the ranks of the C. I. O.

We have also called attention to the grave situation in the plants of International Harvester, a situation which now borders on civil war, if, indeed, it is not already civil war in actuality. The leader of the International Harvester strike, Grant Oakes, is a leading figure in the American Peace Mobilization. During the coming week end the American Peace Mobilization will hold a gigantic mass meeting on Randall's Island, N. Y. That organization is as completely under the control of the Communist Party as any that the agents of Stalin have ever set up in this country. Its sole aim is to sabotage our program of national defense. Grant Oakes has publicly endorsed the forthcoming meeting at Randall's Island. The Daily Worker announces that 40 of the strikers at International Harvester are going by bus to the Randall's Island meeting. Under the guise of labor unionism on the one hand and under the guise of peace on the other hand, the Communist Party is working through such leaders of the C. I. O. as Grant Oakes. Our committee's records show that the entire leadership of the International Harvester strike is Communist controlled.

In Milwaukee, at the Allis-Chalmers plant, we have had what amounts to civil war during the past few days. Already we have called attention to the fact that Harold Christoffel, a Communist, is head of the Automobile Workers Union in the Allis-Chalmers plant. The whole country now knows that the present civil war in Milwaukee had as its prelude a gigantic ballot fraud when the strike vote was first taken. Now we learn that the chairman of the Milwaukee Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., Meyer Adelman, is contemplating a general strike in all industries and C. I. O. unions in the city of Milwaukee. Meyer Adelman is one of the signers of the call to the forthcoming meeting of the American Peace Mobilization on Randall's Island. I also wish to call the special attention of Mr. Philip Murray to the fact that Meyer Adelman was a delegate to the national C. I. O. convention, representing the Steel Workers Organizing Committee. I hold in my hand a copy of the call to the Randall's Island meeting of the American Peace Mobilization. This document bears on its face the unmistakable marks of the Communist Party. The overwhelming majority of its signers are either members of the Communist Party or well-known fellow travelers of the party.

The other day, the chairman of our committee placed in the RECORD a list of 75 C. I. O. leaders who have records of affiliation with the Communist Party or its front organizations. His list extended only through the letter "M." Today, I wish to add to that list the following names: Joseph Mitton, South Jersey Industrial Union Council; Morris Muster, United Furniture Workers of America; Frederick N. Myers, National Maritime Union; Eleanor Nelson, United Federal Workers of America; Samuel Nesin, International Woodworkers of America; Grant Oakes, Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee; O. M. Orton, International Woodworkers of America; Arthur Osman, United Retail and Wholesale Employees of America; Cecil Owen, member of the Committee on Press and Publicity in the 1940 C. I. O. convention; Charles Palmer, Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America; Victor Pasche, American Newspaper Guild; Max Perlow, United Furniture Workers of America; John A. Phillips, Pennsylvania State Industrial Union Council; Morris Pizer, United Furniture Workers of America; William Plunkert, United Federal Workers of America; Irving Potash, International Fur and Leather Workers Union; Lee Pressman, General Counsel, C. I. O.; Harold Pritchett, International Woodworkers of America; Michael J. Quill, Transport Workers Union; Armando Ramirez, Cigar Workers Union; Mervyn Rathborne, American Communications Association; Ben Riskin, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers; Reid Robinson, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers; Robert Robinson, State, County, and Municipal Workers of America; William Ross, Greater Newark Industrial Union Council; John Santo, Transport Workers Union; Marcel Scherer, Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicans; August Schoole, Sandusky, Ohio, Industrial Union Council; Henry Schmidt, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Association; Joseph P. Selly, American Communications Association; William Sentner, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America; Alex Sirota, United Furniture Workers of America; Anthony Wayne Smith, Cincinnati Industrial Union Council; Arthur Stein, United Federal Workers of America; Alfred E. Stevenson, Cleveland Industrial Union Council; George Stewart, United Furniture Workers of America; Herman Stuyvelaar, San Francisco Industrial Union Council; Carl Swanson, Flint, Mich., Industrial Union Council; Ray Torr, National Maritime Union; Joseph Vejlukek, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America; Douglas Ward, American Communications Association; Estolv E. Ward, Alameda County, Calif., Industrial Council; Morris Watson, American Newspaper Guild; Joseph R. Weber, Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee; Henry Wenning, State, County, and Municipal Workers of America; Patrick B. Whalen, Baltimore Industrial Union Council; Owen H. Whitfield, United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America; George Wilson, San Francisco Industrial Union Council.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE AND COMMUNISM

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, supplementing what has been so well said by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], I would like to make a statement at this time. There is no doubt but what the work of the Dies committee

has done much in the way of advising our people relative to organized efforts and influences looking ultimately toward the destruction of our democratic system of government, especially the activities of the Communists. All true Americans are greatly interested and many of us are alarmed at the headway made by these agencies in organizing many of our people under a misleading or misdirected idea. I am sure the committee has found a large number of our people who are nominally identified with communistic and socialistic organizations without the knowledge or suspicion of being identified with such an organization. The promoters have been extremely subtle in their tactics. They have taken advantage of some of our honest, sincere, and beneficial governmental activities and distorted the policy or practice a little here and a litte there with the idea that within the course of time many will find themselves unconsciously and unwittingly advocating and urging the adoption of a policy or policies that must eventually, if adopted and followed, destroy our system of government and result in the establishment of a socialistic or a communistic system, or a combination of both.

In nearly every section of the country today we find a few people who have been misled and insist that the Government owes them a living. They seem to have the idea that the Government is something like a big corporation, separate and distinct from themselves, and that this corporation is under obligation to provide for the individual. As a matter of fact, the Government is made up of such an individual, his neighbor, the adjoining neighbor, and their more-distant neighbors, including all his neighbors in the United States. Of course, no one is willing to admit that any one person is under any legal obligation to provide for the support of his neighbor and that no two neighbors or three neighbors or any other number of neighbors individually or collectively are under a legal obligation to provide and support any one individual or any number of individuals acting collectively or in a group.

The Government is no more legally bound to support or provide for any one person than any other individual's obligation within the group. However, our Government, in one way or another, for many years has had a growing tendency to adopt a practice followed by many individuals of the group. For example, there are but very few people in our country who have a neighbor who, on account of conditions or circumstances over which he has no control, finds himself in needy circumstances but who are willing to contribute part of their earnings or are willing to contribute their services to assist such needy person. However, such a neighbor is under no legal obligation to do so, but solely through sympathy and willingness to assist his fellow man in distress or in need is willing to share part of his earnings with a friend who has been or is less fortunate. Such good neighbors or individuals in many localities have heretofore pooled their contributions in a collective way and contributed to the welfare or interest of their less fortunate friends and neighbors, the community chest being an illustration. The idea or spirit which prompts such action has enlarged to the point where the group or the entire collection of individuals, known as the Government, in recent years adopted a policy of making some contributions to unfortunate individuals which, in time, becomes a governmental policy with the knowledge, consent, and ratification of the whole group. However, the unified and collective action of the whole people does not warrant the conclusion that by such action they are admitting, nor do they undertake to say by such action, that they are legally bound to make such contributions and they do not subscribe to the theory that they actually owe such contributions to any individual or group of individuals, because if they did it is easy to see where it is possible that within the course of time one group would be lawfully bound to provide and take care of another group, regardless of their contributions to the funds needed for these purposes. But Communists and Socialists, taking advantage of this good-neighbor policy, have in some instances propagandized the less fortunate into the idea or belief that their neighbors, acting through their organization known as the Government, are under legal obligations to furnish the necessities of life to those who may be in need, regardless of their efforts or failure to support themselves. It is not hard to see, therefore, why some people say that the Government or their neighbors owe them a living. Without taking the time or the pains to inquire more fully into our system of Government, they unknowingly, as we have said, subscribe to the theory that they are legally entitled to a living or support from the Government. This, in short, is a communistic doctrine and, when carried far enough, will displace our democratic system of government where the individual is no longer a sovereign with the responsibility and the duty of providing for himself.

We are not inclined or even disposed to criticize the previous actions of our Government, which is nothing more than the collective action of the people in devising plans and means to assist those who may be in need, but, on the contrary, it may prove to be commendable that such assistance can be made in a collective way, but the point we are trying to make and emphasize is the danger that such a policy unexplained to all the people affords a most fertile field for the Communists to deceive many, and if permitted to go undisturbed, will eventually grow to such proportions that it will substitute socialism in place of our cherished democratic system of government. It is not surprising to hear the Dies committee saying day after day that our system of government is in greater danger from enemies within than from those without our Government. The committee has said time and time again that influences boring from within are more likely to destroy our Government than enemies from without. That is, if the communistic teachings and subversive influences within our own borders are allowed to continue and grow, the time is not far distant when many of our governmental institutions protecting the inalienable rights of all individuals will be destroyed and a system of socialism or communism which would take away the property a person is legally entitled to and give it to another on the theory that the former owes it to the latter, like one owes a debt to another, because the latter happens to be in need or because he wants it regardless of the reasons therefor.

We feel, therefore, that the Dies committee is not only making a valuable contribution for the welfare of our country in exposing the organized efforts of foreign and communistic agencies looking for the absolute destruction of our Government but it is rendering a great service to all the people by emphasizing the fact that our good intentions and our domestic good-neighbor policy at home may, in the long run, if not properly safeguarded and protected, prove to be our own undoing, and the tragedy of the whole matter will be that we may be destroyed by our own desires and efforts to aid and assist one another.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the course which President Roosevelt has chosen for the present in dealing with the strike situation in defense industries. The Mediation Board set up by the President, as everyone knows, derives whatever power and influence it may have by the force with which public opinion may implement it. Having elected to follow the course of mediation in the earnest hope that industrial strife may be abated, it is wise, whatever may subsequently be done, to continue to request cooperation for a reasonable time until controversy has ended, or it becomes apparent to the country that the President's request has been spurned.

The Congress has elected to recess for a few days. When it convenes again I hope that it will find that in the interim those who have the power to conclude these controversies will have remembered that 17,000,000 men are ready to patriotically and unselfishly separate themselves from family and civil life, and that, according to figures given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor we have lost an average of almost a million man-days a month, occasioned by strike-enforced idleness for January, February, and March of 1941. With the time lost in January and February we could have built 541 Navy bombers or 1,238 pursuit planes. When these lost working days are thus translated it is startling. We have here in America more of everything than can be found in any other nation on earth except one thing, and that is time. We have not a corner on time, and we must not permit anything to slow us down. No one here wishes to outlaw strikes or to deprive labor of any of its rights. American industry must wholeheartedly accept collective bargaining and lend its cooperation also. Labor and industry are having

their day now in the court of public opinion. Within the next week their cases can be won or lost. May God grant that within the coming week all will follow the splendid example of the American Federation of Labor, which in a release which came to my desk on yesterday promises solemnly that there will not be any stoppage of work on account of jurisdictional disputes between any of the building and construction trade-unions on any building or construction project essential to speedy completion of the national-defense program.

Here in America we first request, then entreat, and only failing then, resort to compulsion. The Members of this honorable body will find when they get home that their constituents feel just that way. Let no man nor group of men, capital or industry, Main Street or Park Avenue, feel for a single moment that in times like these that the Congress of the United States will continue to go on subservient to any circumstance that threatens its plans for the defense of the country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, last year when this same appropriation bill was under consideration, I praised the administration of Mr. Thurman Arnold as head of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice. I said at that time he was the most useful man in the administration. What has gone on in the last year proves that I was correct then, and I repeat that statement now. Mr. Arnold's notable service to America should be hailed and acclaimed by both the country and the Congress.

It is worthy of note that the Antitrust Division is one of the few self-sustaining agencies in the Government. Last year it collected in fines and penalties $2,700,000—more than twice as much as was appropriated for it. In addition, it should be noted that this Division has saved the consumers of the United States untold millions in various fields. In that connection, I suggest a reading of the hearings and the report of this very able committee, headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. Also the able, comprehensive speech made yesterday by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] on this question.

I wish to commend this able committee for its foresight and patriotism in increasing the appropriations to Mr. Arnold's section, in the sum of $750,000 over the Budget. In making this increase it has shown both patriotism and wisdom.

I wish in this connection to recommend to Mr. Arnold's Division the continued study of the monopoly in the dairying field. There is no producer group in America that has been so thoroughly exploited by barefaced and criminal monopoly as the American dairymen. Mr. Arnold is now conducting a grand-jury investigation in the city of New York on this question, and I feel sure that with this additional money at his disposal he will bring these law violators to book and secure the hard-pressed dairyman a living price for his product. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] for his answer to the question that was asked him as to whether or not David Saposs was a Communist. The gentleman made a straightforward answer and said he did not believe so; in fact, he stated that David Saposs was not a Communist, and that he had investigated the matter.

David Saposs may look like your conception of a Communist, but he is not a Communist. I noticed that the exoneration of Mr. Saposs by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] met with almost stony silence. If the RECORD shows applause, it was I who was applauding alone.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I joined the gentleman in that applause.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I was joined in the applause by the gentleman from Massachusetts. It does show, however, a pretty serious situation. If you wave your arms around here and shout that a certain man should be hung and quartered, that he is a Communist, you can receive pretty resounding applause; but when you have the courage to brave popular sentiment and say a man is not a Communist, and exonerate him, you are met with no applause. I think, with all the hot-headedness that is going around, with all the hysteria, we, the elected Representatives of the people, ought to try to keep cool. These are times when the Nation needs the full support and loyalty of its working people. It needs to encourage the conviction that the laboring man will be respected. No more serious damage could be done to the Nation than to seek to destroy the faith of the working people in Washington and in the fairness of this Government and this Congress. What I am coming to specifically is that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1941, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], chairman of the Committee on un-American Activities, included the name of Ralph Hetzel in a list of labor—I quote:

> Persons who are either card-holding members of the Communist Party or fellow travelers whose records show that they follow the party "line" in supporting the party's front organizations.

I know Mr. Ralph Hetzel, and have known him for a long time. I know him personally. I know he has been unjustly accused. This man is the American-born son of the president of a large American university, Pennsylvania State College. His father is a well-known and respected citizen.

Mr. Hetzel attended the Pennsylvania State College, from which he was graduated in 1933. His activities there are testified to by the fact that he was the valedictorian of his class, the president of the senior honor society, the managing editor of the college newspaper, the editor of the college literary magazine, and the holder of a fellowship granted for graduate study.

Following his graduation from college, Mr. Hetzel became confidential secretary to the then Governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gifford Pinchot. He was a member of the Republican Party. He was secretary to the Governor until the end of the Governor's term.

Mr. Hetzel then took up his fellowship in order to study political science and economics at the London School of Economics in the University of London, England. He studied there for a year looking toward a doctor of philosophy degree under the tutelage of leading English scholars.

In August 1937 Mr. John L. Lewis employed Mr. Hetzel to act as the secretary to the president of the C. I. O. He has remained in that capacity with the additional duties placed upon him first as director of the unemployment division, and then as director of the economic division.

I personally know that Mr. Hetzel has been most active in seeking decent provision for the unemployed. In this work he has gained the friendship and respect of many Members of this House and the Senate. His judgment on matters of unemployment, production economics, and education and training is widely sought in the Government and in professional circles.

Mr. Hetzel is frequently called upon to speak at professional, religious, educational, and other public meetings.

He was in August 1940 elected a member of the Executive board of the United Office and Professional Workers of America. Mr. Hetzel belongs to no other organizations. He does not now have nor ever has had any connection with the Communist Party or with any organizations connected with the Communist Party. His only affiliation is with the labor movement.

I know him to be an honest, decent American, loyal to this country, whose only crime is devotion to the improvement of the lot of the American working people; and I am glad to rise at this time and correct the misstatement which appeared in the RECORD. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have stated before that I feel the State Department is to be congratulated upon the excellent work of its regular Foreign Service officers. I notice a certain item in the bill for ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary. I think the House should serve warning in making this appropriation that these representatives of our Government in foreign countries are not to commit this country to any union now with Great Britain.

Perhaps many of you read the following astounding news dispatch from London in the Washington Times-Herald of April 2. I say "astounding," but it is more shocking than that. It is so overwhelming, so threatening, so astonishing, especially in view of our recent lend-lease legislation, that I believe every

Member of this House and the Senate should know its contents and meaning.

The headline of the dispatch reads:

Churchill to be asked about union with United States.

The dispatch reads:

LONDON, April 1.—The question of forming a union between the British Empire and the United States will be put to Prime Minister Churchill soon by William Craven-Ellis, a Conservative Member of Parliament. Craven-Ellis said today he intends to ask Churchill whether he will suggest to President Roosevelt that the British Commonwealth and the United States should consider a solemn act of union, becoming one nation with joint foreign, financial, and economic policies.

I want to repeat that last phrase—

a solemn act of union, becoming one nation with joint foreign, financial, and economic policies.

Since the Honorable Craven-Ellis intends to ask the Prime Minister regarding union of the British Commonwealth and the United States, I now ask the President of the United States to inform this House of any plans or intentions he has regarding such a union.

It is one thing to aid Great Britain at this crucial time. It is another for the United States to join such a union as suggested by Mr. Craven-Ellis.

Members of the House, this is the opening alarm which may lead to another Paul Revere riding through not only every Middlesex village and farm but through every State in the Nation.

Do you value sovereignty? Your forefathers and mine fought to establish this sovereign Nation dedicated to liberty and freedom. Is it not time for General Washington and his heroic Continental Army to rise and march again? [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STOP VENEREAL-DISEASE SABOTAGE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, we have been doing a lot of thinking lately about sabotage. I should like to recount some facts about the success which has been had in a fight against certain types of saboteurs in this country during the past 4 years. I am talking about the national program for the control of venereal diseases—a subject on which I have reported to you in previous years. Syphilis and gonorrhea, gentlemen, are saboteurs of our manpower.

In the spring of 1938 Congress enacted the Venereal Disease Control Act. What have we accomplished as a result? I have secured figures on the status of the problem in the first 6 months of 1939 and contrasted it with the situation during the first 6 months of this fiscal year.

Since 1939 there has been a 178-percent increase in the number of blood tests made for the detection of syphilis, the number of tests increasing from 2,300,000 in the first 6 months of fiscal 1939 to 6,500,000 during the same period of 1941. Meanwhile there has been a 62-percent increase in the number of doses of drugs distributed by State health departments to physicians and clinics for the treatment of syphilis.

In addition to the increasing number of patients being treated by private physicians through the stimulus of the control program, clinic records show that there has been a 75-percent increase in the effectiveness of case-holding activities of clinics. The number of persons actually under treatment for syphilis has increased from 210,000 to 368,000, despite the fact that the number of new admissions has remained constant. This situation is particularly healthy in the light of the previous tendency of persons under treatment to lapse before the maximum benefits from therapy were obtained.

Meanwhile, the extension of facilities for the treatment of syphilis through the country is demonstrated in a 34-percent increase in the number of clinics treating venereal diseases. Where there were only 2,300 preceding passage of the Venereal Disease Control Act, there are now 3,100. The increased laboratory facilities have proved particularly valuable in providing routine blood tests for all selectees. True, this unprecedented uncovering of syphilis in a limited period of time has tended to overcrowd existing treatment facilities. But if the opportunity for early treatment of infected persons which arises as a result of mass blood-testing program as a part of the physical examination can be pursued to a cure for these infected young men it will represent a major victory in control.

I am told that to date approximately 1,000,000 selectees have had a blood test for syphilis. Although only preliminary data are available it appears that some 50,000 of these tests were positive for syphilis.

When I stood before you in 1938, the outlook for gonorrhea control was very dark. Today there has been a dramatic upturn in the prospects of controlling this disease. This new hope came with the advent of the sulfonamide compounds. I understand that treatment with these drugs is enabling the general practitioner to tackle this problem in his own community. The use of these drugs means that less time is required for treatment, the cost of treatment has been decreased, less time will be lost from work, and, what is more important, cures can be accomplished in practically all cases regardless of the duration of infection. All of this means that, if we push the control of gonorrhea at this time, the community and the individual can be promished a great saving in both time and money.

I have at my disposal a few facts on gonorrhea paralleling those which I have given you for syphilis.

The records from State health departments show that there has been a marked rise in efforts to find people with gonorrhea. There has been a 92-percent increase in the number of tests performed for the detection of this disease. In the first 6 months of 1939, 300,000 tests were performed. The number rose to almost 600,000 in the same period of 1941.

Because of this improvement in treatment methods and increase in detection efforts, a larger number of persons with this disease have been treated with existing medical facilities over a shorter period of time.

In short, research in the newer methods of treating gonorrhea is being translated into immediate action. Physicians in private practice, as well as those in public clinics, are being aided by Federal grants to States. These grants enable State health departments not only to make tests for gonorrhea but also to distribute these drugs to all treatment sources.

In 6 months of the fiscal year 1939 one and three-fourths million tablets of these new drugs were distributed. In the corresponding period of 1941 the number rose to 3,700,000 tablets.

Now, for the first time, we are moving in an organized way against gonorrhea, but we are still in the stage of tooling up machinery to control this disease and must continue this effort if we are going to capitalize on these early achievements.

Research in medical science and public health methods has now opened the way not only for the effective control of syphilis but of gonorrhea. We know what to do, but we still are not doing it—I mean—with sufficient force to stop the sabotage of syphilis and gonorrhea. The job is well begun. The continuation of this work is vital, not only to protect the civilian population but also to protect military manpower. [Applause.]

I leave you with this information for your consideration. I may have occasion to extend these remarks in more complete form at a future time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on March 21, 1941, the President of the United States transmitted to this Congress the text of an agreement between the United States and the Government of Canada, providing for the construction of dams and power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and providing for completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway. President Roosevelt has described the project as one of "vital necessity to the defense of the United States." But this project is more than one of defense alone; it is one whose peacetime value alone merits its being placed into operation.

I would like to bring before you the defence aims of this great project, its peacetime utility, and to answer those who challenge its need and practicality.

From the standpoint of transportation, the project should not be viewed as a new project, but, rather, an enlargement and completion of a continuous waterway to the sea—a waterway in which we have already completed several links. The United States and Canada have already a big stake in this waterway. They have collectively spent more than

$50,000,000 in deepening the channels between Lake Superior and Lake Erie. In addition, Canada spent $90,000,000 in constructing the Welland Canal. Already connecting channels have been provided in the St. Marys River between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, in the St. Clair River between Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie, and around the Niagara River between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. The value of all of these channels and other improvements will be enhanced many times by completing the final link in this great artery of commerce.

In addition to the stimulation of the flow of commerce, the St. Lawrence development will make available 2,200,000 horsepower of additional hydroelectric generating capacity at the International Rapids, and an additional 787,000 horsepower will be realized by the redevelopment of the Niagara River. This one project will be the largest single source of electric energy in North America.

This is a defense measure. We have plenty of precedent for the creation of sources of power during a time of increased industrial activity. Muscle Shoals—the predecessor of T. V. A.—was developed originally as a war measure, as a large and constant source of electricity needed for producing nitrates used in manufacturing explosives.

We need this source of power today in the heart of our industrial areas near the iron ore, the copper, the tools, the factories, and the skilled mechanics; near all of these essentials that produce the modern units of national defense. Electric power is needed in an ever-increasing volume as our industry reaches greater intensity. More and more power is demanded to make the aluminum, the chemicals, heat the furnaces, and run the machines that are turning out our tanks, shells, and airplanes.

Today we need ships. The current weekly average of ships sunk in the war is over 68,000 tons. There have been lost in the first 18 months of the war over 5,000,000 tons of the world's shipping. This is 500,000 tons more than was sunk in the last war. The Great Lakes region, 1,200 miles from the coast line, offers a peaceful haven in which to build ships and to recondition them. There they have the iron and the steel, the men and the machines, the skill and the power to build vast fleets of ships. More than that, there are already there 15 ways and 15 drydocks of 500 feet or more on the American side and 9 ways and 4 drydocks on the Canadian side. A battleship could be started simultaneously with the proposed waterway and both would be completed about the same time, and could then sail out uninterruptedly to the sea to take its place in the naval forces of our country.

Vital to the peacetime business and commercial pursuits of 40,000,000 of our people is this great waterway. Long after the wars are over, this waterway will continue to lend its usefulness to our country.

War or no war, the commercial development of the area around the international rapids has been arrested by the lack of power, power in quantity and at a comparable price with other sections of the country. Already many industries located in that section are building their plant additions near other sources of power.

The Aluminum Co. of America is building a $15,000,000 plant expansion near Knoxville.

B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co. started a $1,500,000 plant at Clarkesville, Tenn., last December.

Stinson division of the American Aviation Manufacturing Co. has built a new million-dollar plant at Nashville, Tenn.

One could call the roll of many organizations having their traditions and central organizations established in northwest New York, Ohio, and Michigan areas that are expanding to the other areas where there is an abundance of cheap electrical power.

The single advantage of a continuous water route from the lake ports to the trade routes of the world alone is reason enough for completion of the project. It has been estimated that the savings to farmers alone in a single year would equal the capital cost of the waterway. The waterway will directly affect the people in 26 States having a population of 50,000,000 and be an indirect benefit to the 80,000,000 in the other 22 States by giving them ready access at low transportation costs to this great market of the North Central States.

The project would provide a new seacoast for the United States 3,576 miles in length, upon which Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other lake cities would become seaports.

While it is true that making these great lake cities seaports will place them in an advantageous position for export, it will also make them equally available for imports from other States. It will provide an avenue on which will flow the commerce of the 48 States. Freighters that have left laden with Michigan-made automobiles, furniture, lumber, and ores will return laden with California oranges, grapes, and figs; Texas melons and grapefruit; rice and cane sugar from Louisiana; products of the Florida citrus belt; Georgia peaches and pecans; tobacco from the Carolinas; coal and rayon materials from Virginia; shoes and clothing from Maryland; coal and steel from Pennsylvania; manufactured articles from New Jersey and New York; watches from Connecticut; and potatoes from Maine. This is not only an artery of commerce for the States exporting, but also a waterway made available to the other States of the Union tapping a section of our country that is so inherently rich in materials and products that despite being 1,200 miles from a seaport it produces a major portion of our exports. The automobile industry is our greatest single exporting industry. It is estimated that the waterway will mean a saving in transportation cost of each motor unit of $28 from Detroit to London. On export wheat alone it is estimated that the farmers would save $20,000,000 annually. This saving would go into buying other products that are grown and manufactured by native producers. This area imports 61 percent of the rubber imports of the country—200,000 tons. The waterway would save on this item alone $1,000,000 annually—a savings that would accrue to every purchaser of a motor car.

On the previous occasions when this proposal has been before the Congress for consideration it has been opposed on the basis of sectionalism or private interest. This time on the subject of national defense we are all united, and the arguments that were formally presented against the completion of this great waterway should not again be advanced. However, since they are readily answered I will attempt briefly to reply to the three paramount arguments that were advanced in the past.

It is worthy of mention that cost has seldom been made of any moment in the discussions of this great project as the cost in comparison to the obvious benefits, and in comparison with expenditures for similar projects is so favorable to the project.

Its opponents claim that the period of use is limited to such a short sailing season. The season stated varies from 5 months, as claimed by its opponents to the statement by the United States Department of Commerce that ships engaged in shipping of goods on the waterway need not lose more than a month and a half during the year. It is not the length of the sailing season that should govern the value of the project but rather the number of tons that will be shipped during the season that is available. In refutation of the arguments of the opposition may I point out that the Detroit River which has a sailing season of a length comparable to the one of the proposed waterway has a greater tonnage of traffic than the Panama, Suez, and Kiel Canals combined. The latter group has almost a continuous season, the former a curtailed one.

Its opponents state that many of the present-day craft could not use the canal if it had only a 27-foot depth as proposed. The Department of Commerce states in a report that with the proposed depth it will be sufficient to permit use by 90 percent of the present-day craft of the world. Even if this figure were high the new craft being built for use on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway would be built with a draft that would make it possible to use the waterway.

One criticism that has legitimacy is that the greater portion of the seaway is along waters that are completely controlled by a foreign government. I have introduced a bill that is designed to obviate this criticism and which I should like to recommend to the Congress. It is H. R. 4163 and also House Concurrent Resolution 23, both of which have as their objects the acquisition by the United States of the land lying between the United States and the St. Lawrence River—the former through the powers of the lend-lease bill and the latter requesting that the President negotiate for outright purchase of this territory.

The adoption of either of these two measures would give us control of half of the St. Lawrence River to its mouth. It would lend vitality and force to the eco-

nomic development of the acquired property, would extend our northern boundaries to their natural limits, and would make secure our newly created artery of commerce leading to the geographical and industrial heart of our great Nation.

It was a defense measure that gave us the Panama Canal, which is now a great peacetime asset, and it was a defense measure that fostered the Tennessee Valley Authority. Both of these great engineering projects were marked changes in our national policy—neither would have been passed in normal times, yet both have proven to be among our greatest national assets. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, I am confident, will experience the same history—defeated in peacetime, we will unite on this great defense measure and complete it. It will remain forever as one of the greatest achievements of our time and will be one of the most valuable of national assets, benefiting all the people of our Nation. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CAN THE PHILIPPINES INVOLVE US IN WAR?

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, can the Philippines involve us in war? What is the legal and international status of the Philippine Commonwealth? What is our responsibility in and for the Philippines today?

These are very timely, very vital, and very acute questions, overshadowing, in my judgment, all other Philippine-American questions of strategy, economics, and politics.

They need authoritative answers to guide our actions and to clarify our obligations. I make bold to say that the average Member of Congress, by reason of his heavy duties, has but a nebulous conception of our present relations with the Philippines, and yet we hear from day to day of plans and events that prove that those islands are very much an integral part of our international concern.

The question of complete independence is not involved here. By law, if not modified in the meantime, a Philippine republic will come into existence in 1946.

Mr. Chairman, I am a new member of the House Committee on Insular Affairs, and it is my duty to inform myself on the Philippines. So I asked an old friend, Mr. Vicente Villamin, distinguished Filipino attorney, who is well versed in economic and political questions, both national and international, to give me his ideas and thoughts upon the three queries that I propounded, and I have his reply.

But before quoting his statement I wish to say that he is not, and never has been in the Government service, although I understand that about a dozen years ago he was asked to be a member of his country's cabinet, and he has the distinction of being the only Filipino who was offered by our Government in 1932 to become Vice Governor General of the Philippines under the Jones law. His intellectual background and experience are quite impressive. He has lectured on the subject of the Philippines and general economics before many American audiences and a number of European centers of learning, including the University of Berlin, and has written for American newspapers and magazines, his article in the Saturday Evening Post in 1926 being the best known, because it set forth prophetically what is happening today in the Far East and what his countrymen are now thinking, talking, and doing.

Mr. Villamin's reply to my three queries follows:

In answering your queries I shall go in for the virtue of simplification and trust that I don't fall for the vice of oversimplification.

(1) Can the Philippines involve the United States in war? My answer is it can involve the United States in war only to the extent that a State of the Union could under the Constitution, and that is legally nil.

Under the Philippine Independence Act, any law of the Philippine government that has a foreign-relations aspect to it requires the approval of the President of the United States before it could go into effect, and the President could suspend in a summary manner any Philippine law, contract, or executive order that might cause financial failure to the Philippines or violate treaty obligations of the United States.

Stated succinctly, the Philippines is internationally a part of the American national domain, and any attempt by any foreign power to effect the fragmentation of that domain would be resisted to the limit.

I must add that many people think of the Philippines primarily from the standpoint of its alleged military weakness, but the monumental fact remains that the mere presence of the American flag there, regardless of the islands' strategic vulnerability, has been sufficient to keep it free from foreign aggression during the last 41 years, or since that flag was unfurled over those islands.

(2) What is the legal and international status of the Philippine Commonwealth? My answer is that the Philippine Commonwealth is but the creature of Congress, invested by it with certain powers, prerogatives, and privileges which it can legally take back or extend, contract, or expand.

The Philippine Commonwealth does not possess international personality or international juridical existence.

The Constitution did not follow the flag to the Philippines. The Philippines were acquired by the United States under a treaty of cession with Spain.

The Filipino people, although authorized by Congress to exercise acts of sovereignty, are not sovereign constitutionally. Filipinos owe allegiance to the United States and are loyal to the American Government and institutions.

Sovereignty over the Philippines resides in the United States. In the language of the Supreme Court, that sovereignty is absolute, supreme, and plenary.

By the act of Congress generally known as the Independence Act the Philippine government was further democratized, extending to the Filipino people a well-nigh complete local autonomy and self-government, but in doing so American sovereignty did not suffer a scintilla of diminution or impairment.

Filipinos are neither citizens of nor foreigners to the United States. Federal and administrative treatment of their real status is often confusing, suggesting the necessity of a uniform treatment. For instance, under the opinion of the Attorney General, Filipinos are aliens under the Alien Registration Act, although the Philippines are protected under that act, while in a recent decision of the United States district court in New York Filipinos are technically Americans under the Neutrality Act. Filipinos in America get it in the neck coming and going when looking for work.

(3) What is the responsibility of the United States in and for the Philippines? My answer is that with American sovereignty goes inherently and correlatively American responsibility. That is an elemental truism.

If the Philippines are attacked from without, America will defend them with all its might. If they are attacked from within, America will come to the aid of the Philippine government to repel the attack. The President of the United States has the authority to call into the service of the American armed forces in the Philippines all the military forces organized by the Philippine government.

If the Filipinos desire to stay with the United States indefinitely or longer than the law provides, Congress will give their desire thoughtful consideration. If they wish to separate from the United States before 1946, Congress may or may not find a good reason to act on it. There is absolutely no probability that the Filipinos would ask for an earlier separation. On the contrary, an increasing number of patriotic Filipinos are publicly suggesting that a longer stay with the United States would be highly advisable.

The Filipinos under the American flag today enjoy freedom and liberty, democracy and self-government, progress and prosperity, peace and security.

Recapitulation: The United States is still sovereign in the Philippines; the Philippines is not yet an independent nation, although it has many sovereign attributes; the United States is internationally responsible for the Philippines and will protect them from foreign aggression or internal insurrection; the Philippines has local autonomy and self-government; the President of the United States has the power to prevent the Philippine government from involving the United States in international complications; the Filipinos owe allegiance to the United States, loyal to its Government and institutions, and are financing and supporting their own Philippine government.

Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Villamin's statement is very clear. Members should take time to read it. I want to emphasize the fact that the Philippines are still with us, still under our flag, still entitled to our earnest thoughts. In these critical days, with war involvement in the Pacific a possibility, we should think of the Philippines and the other islands in the Pacific Ocean for which we recently appropriated funds for their fortification. They are a part of our national domain and our international concern.

I believe it relevant, Mr. Chairman, to discuss briefly the oft-heard criticism that our Government, under the present set-up, with so much autonomy given to the Filipinos, is in the unenviable position of "responsibility without commensurate authority," and I wish to quote here a press statement issued by Mr. Villamin on the very subject following a debate before the American Forum of the Air recently here in Washington.

Mr. Villiman wrote in part:

Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., favoring complete Philippine independence, presumably even before 1946, contended that under the

Independence Act the American Government has been placed in the dangerous position of responsibility without commensurate authority.

To fortify his contention he quoted Professor Hayden, of the University of Michigan, as follows: "Ideally, both the [American] High Commissioner and the [Philippine] Commonwealth President will feel that the former has the three rights, and only the three rights, attributed by Walter Bagehot to the British constitutional sovereign—the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn."

If Colonel Roosevelt had quoted the pertinent provisions of the law instead of a treatise he would have concluded that the United States, besides having these three rights, has also the power to implement those rights, the source rights and the derivative rights, as well as the power to make them prevail.

There are several provisions in the Independence Act, not to mention the powers inherent in American sovereignty, that could be quoted to prove that American authority in the Philippines is clear and concrete, effective, and purposeful, but the most patent and potent of them is contained in section 7 (2), viz:

"The President of the United States shall have authority to suspend the taking effect of or the operation of any law, contract, or executive order of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands which in his judgment will result in a failure of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands to fulfill its contracts or to meet its bonded indebtedness and interest thereon, or to provide for its sinking funds, or which seems likely to impair the reserves for the protection of the currency of the Philippine Islands, or which in his judgment will violate international obligations of the United States."

If this is not authority, it would be difficult to know what authority is. The President is empowered to nullify a Philippine law in a summary manner. When exercising this power he will incarnate in his person the trinity of powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States under the Constitution, and that means effective authority effectively and efficiently exercisable.

The comparable provision in the previous organic act, the Jones law, was in practice not as sweeping and efficient, and yet there was no criticism under it of responsibility without adequate authority. Section 19 of that law provides, among other things, that "all laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same." This power might not be exerted until long after the law complained of has been in operation for months, even years.

The plan and intent of the Independence Act is to endow the Philippines with local autonomy and self-government. But as the United States retains in the premises its sovereignty intact and its responsibility undiminished, provisions were made that the Philippine Government shall not be free to weaken that sovereignty or shatter that responsibility, thereby insuring the United States against involvement in international complications.

The Independence Act has been in operation since November 15, 1935. The American High Commissioner, the representative of the President, and the Filipino President, and other officials have worked together cordially. Outside of minor differences, the delimitation of their respective powers has not been the subject of controversy. As the record stands, the scheme of government now in operation in the Philippines has worked, worked smoothly, worked successfully.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration a bill covering about 100 pages. So far this afternoon we have had considerable discussion of matters not relating to the bill. Members have asked to proceed out of order, and no objection has been raised, but I am going to ask the Members now to confine themselves to the subject matters of the bill, for we are anxious to proceed with its consideration; and I will thank the Members for their cooperation.

(Miss RANKIN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation, Foreign Service: To pay the traveling expenses, including travel by airplane when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State, of Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers, and other employees of the Foreign Service, including Foreign Service inspectors, and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, of their families and expenses of transportation of effects, in going to and returning from their posts, and in removing the family and effects of any such officer or employee from any foreign post, and thereafter transporting such family and effects to his post of assignment, to whatever extent may be determined necessary by the Secretary of State by reason of emergency conditions in any country that in his opinion may endanger the life of such officer or employee or any member of his family including automobiles as authorized by the act of April 30, 1940 (54 Stat. 174), and storage of effects while such officers or employees are absent from their permanent posts of duty, including also not to exceed $190,000 for expenses in connection with leaves of absence; attendance at trade and other conferences and congresses under orders of the Secretary of State as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931 (22 U. S. C. 16, 17); preparation and transportation of the remains of those officers and employees of the Foreign Service, who have died or may die abroad or in transit while in the discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant for interment, and for the ordinary expenses of such interment, and also for payment under the provisions of section 1749 of the Revised Statutes (22 U. S. C. 130) of allowances to the widows or heirs at law of Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers of the United States dying in foreign countries in the discharge of their duties, $717,200, of which amount not to exceed $50,000 shall be available until June 30, 1943, for disbursement for expenses of travel under orders issued by the Secretary of State during the fiscal year 1942: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available also for the authorized subsistence expenses of Consular and Foreign Service officers while on temporary detail under commission.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying amendment. On page 9, line 10, after the word "family", insert a comma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: Page 9, line 10, after the word "family", insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contracts entered into in foreign countries involving expenditures from any of the foregoing appropriations under the caption "Foreign Intercourse" shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying amendment. On page 16, strike out lines 15 to 19, inclusive, and insert the same immediately following line 11 on page 17.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: Page 16, strike out lines 15 to 19, inclusive, and insert the same immediately following line 11, on page 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA AND ALASKA AND CANADA

To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain in respect of Canada, signed February 24, 1925; for salaries and expenses, including the salary of the Commissioner and salaries of the necessary engineers, clerks, and other employees for duty at the seat of government and in the field; cost of office equipment and supplies; necessary traveling expenses; commutation of subsistence to employees while on field duty, not to exceed $4 per day each, but not to exceed $1.75 per day each when a member of a field party and subsisting in camp; for payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary line clear, not to exceed $500; and for all other necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by the United States in maintaining an effective demarcation of the international boundary line between the United States and Canada, and Alaska and Canada under the terms of the treaty aforesaid, including the completion of such remaining work as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties between the United States and Great Britain, and including the hire of freight- and passenger-carrying vehicles from temporary field employees, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State, $43,000.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOREN: Page 26, line 13, strike out line 13 and all succeeding lines down to and including line 12, page 27.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, of course, would abolish the useless Commission on Boundary Disputes between the United States and Canada. Presumably the justification for the existence of this Commission is to keep a sward 20 feet wide cut in the area between the two countries, or that part of the boundary that might be timbered, so that the border patrolmen can lock up and down that 20-foot strip. After carefully reading the testimony, it is very difficult to find very much more than that to justify its existence.

The ground on which I present this amendment is simply this: In the pending bill under an appropriation for border patrol we make a generous appropriation to provide 712 border-patrol officers for the boundary between the United States and Canada to do the work that this Commission claims it is doing. I think it is generally understood in the House that this Commission has long been just about as useful as a tooth brush and a tube of Pepsodent would be to a hen.

I hope the Committee will seriously consider adopting my amendment. I hope the time may come soon when we can cut out something that we all know is absolutely and utterly useless.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. Chairman, this particular matter to which the gentleman refers, the International Boundary Commission between the United States and Canada, was set up by treaty between the two countries in 1925. We cannot nullify a treaty on the floor of this House by a 5-minute talk. Both countries contribute equally. There is an amount appropriated in this bill for that particular activity, and a similar amount is appropriated by the Dominion of Canada. A statement in reference to the peace between the two countries ought to enjoy the attention of this House, especially when we consider what the conditions are abroad. That is about all I have to say about this.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. Is it not true that Canada has not always appropriated an equal amount with the United States, as is shown by the testimony in the hearings now before us?

Mr. RABAUT. We can spend only an equal amount to that appropriated by the other nation; an equal amount is appropriated by both nations. There was a difference, I believe, at one time, of $1,000. I believe that occurred last year. The reason, I do not know. We appropriated a certain amount, but they did not spend all of the money, and the Commission did not spend any more money than half of the amount provided by Canada.

Mr. BOREN. The treaty does not indicate that a certain amount of money might be appropriated and for what specific purpose it is appropriated. The Canadian Parliament has seen fit to reduce or raise this amount and the United States Congress has also seen fit to reduce or raise this amount without any consideration of what the other country might do.

Mr. RABAUT. This is a boundary-line proposition. It marks the boundary line and keeps it clear. It is the line of demarcation between the two countries. I make an appeal to my friend on the ground of peace between the two countries.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that this amendment is an attempt to abrogate a solemn treaty that has existed for more than 100 years between Canada and the United States?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Whenever Canada failed to appropriate a certain amount of money one year it was made up the next year?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to make the statement that in my opinion the Senate will place in the bill the $10,000 recommended by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor and the Budget to expended for sending some women to South America in order to discuss the labor conditions for women there as well as to discuss economic conditions in South America and in this country. In November a conference was held with women representatives of the American republics. They are enthusiastic about this plan. South America has excellent labor laws, but they are not enforced very well. I believe it would be of interest to South America and to this country if there could be a meeting of the women who are interested in employment and in the economic conditions for women of the two countries. There are very friendly relations between the Americas today. Those friendly relations should be fostered and increased. The appropriation is small and nothing but good could come of it.

I shall not offer an amendment at this time, because I feel very sure that the House will concur in the amendment that will be placed in the bill in the Senate. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Special and technical investigations: For an additional amount for necessary special or technical investigations in connection with matters which fall within the scope of the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, traveling expenses, procurement of technical and scientific equipment, and the purchase, exchange, hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, $48,500, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State, who is authorized to transfer to any department or independent establishment of the Government, with the consent of the head thereof, any part of this amount for direct expenditures by such department or establishment for the purposes of this appropriation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question in reference to the waterway treaty between the United States and Canada. Is there anything in this provision that has to do with the St. Lawrence Waterway?

Mr. RABAUT. No. This relates to boundary waters between the two countries.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arbitration of Claim Between the United States and the Netherlands: For the expenses of the arbitration under the convention between the United States and the Netherlands, signed March 18, 1938, of a claim which arose in November 1917, as a result of the requisition by the Government of the United States of certain military supplies of the Government of the Netherlands, including the share of the United States of the honorarium of the neutral arbitrator and of other joint expenses of the two governments, including fees; compensation of employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; stenographic reporting and translating services, by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; rent; traveling expenses; cost of necessary books and documents; stationery; official cards; printing and binding, and such other expenditures as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, $14,000, to be available immediately.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "civil-service and" in line 16, on page 30, that they are legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order will lie against these words.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to carry out the purposes of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics," approved August 9, 1939, and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $70,000 for printing and binding; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; tuition, compensation, and monthly allowances while not in travel status, all to be fixed by the Secretary of State, and traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, and internes, who are citizens of the United States or the other American republics; traveling expenses of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 249a); hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; recording and sound-tracking of motion pictures; and purchase of books and periodicals, $545,000; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American republics not exceeding the following amounts, respectively: Department of Agriculture, $35,000; Department of Commerce, for the Civil Aeronautics Board, $10,000, for the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $10,000, for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, $32,000, and for the Weather Bureau, $15,000; Federal Security Agency for the Public Health Service, including not to exceed 2 additional regular active commissioned officers, $40,000, and the Office of Education, $12,500; Department of the Interior, for the Geological Survey, $50,000, and for the Travel Bureau, $20,000; Department of Labor, for the Children's Bureau, $15,000; Library of Congress, $35,000; Smithsonian Institution, $41,500.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 31, after the semicolon in line 12, strike out the remainder of the line and down to and including the word "republics", in line 19.

On page 31, line 25, after the comma, strike out "$545,000" and insert "$444,000."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to stop the payment of tuition to South American students who are attending universities in the United States. In the past we have paid the transportation of North American students going to South America but never have we paid for the transportation of South American students.

It is claimed that by bringing South American students to the United States we can preserve the American way of life or bring about the American way of life in South America. May I point out that many thousands of students from France came to this country on scholarships without any transportation being paid by the Government, and with all these thousands of students who came to this country, that did not save the French Republic from going down the road of socialism and fascism. I think all that might be hoped from this program is that they may be able to do some good when they finish their 4 years of training here. However, 4 years is too long for anybody to get started to do the job we need done today. I believe we are whistling past the cemetery when we hope that these students will be able at the end of 4 years to go back to South America and convince their relatives in South America that they should line up with the American republics. Anything we need to have done needs to be done immediately, and not 4 years from now.

The amount of $545,000 would be cut to $444,000 by my amendment and would leave the same amounts for the same categories as were spent last year.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What would the total be then?

Mr. JONES. Four hundred and forty-four thousand dollars.

Mr. RABAUT. How does the gentleman arrive at his reduction of $101,000?

Mr. JONES. The item of $545,000 includes several other categories of the cultural-relations program and I have set the amount of $101,000 cut in order to give notice to the State Department that only the amounts that were spent last year will be spent for travel grants for educational, professional, cultural, and artistic leaders of the United States and other American republics, for travel grants for students and for visiting professors and students to be loaned upon invitation to other countries. I have used this means to get done the thing that should be done, without trying to present an amendment that would be legislation in an appropriation bill, which would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some years ago the United States and various South American republics had a most-important meeting in Buenos Aires, its purpose being for the promotion of friendly international relations between the attendant nations, and in that meeting the idea of cultural relations was discussed, and its great importance was duly evaluated. This Buenos Aires international agreement was in the nature of a solemn treaty and the matter of cultural relations was agreed upon along with other important questions involving the welfare of the people of the Western Hemisphere. These nations undertook not only to engage in those activities which would enhance their economic welfare, but they solemnly stressed the spiritual point of view which would be elevating and beneficial to all the nations.

We are spending a great sum of money in promoting these relations. The $101,000 referred to is simply the amount we are spending to bring the boys and girls from the various countries here so that they may be taught something about our institutions and our Government and learn those things in our country which will appeal to them, and enable them to go back to their homes with a love and a high respect for our country.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I refer my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] to page 13 of the report. We have reduced the item for travel grants for educational, professional, cultural, and artistic leaders of the United States and other American republics from $60,000 to $45,000.

In the second item to which the gentleman has referred, travel grants for students from the other American republics who have received scholarships from educational institutions in the United States, we have cut that item from $50,000 to $40,000.

I understand now that the gentleman proposes to cut that $38,000, which would leave $2,000, of the original request of $50,000.

The next item for visiting professors and specialists, and so forth, we have reduced to $32,000 and the gentleman proposes to cut that by $33,000, which would leave the item $1,000 in the red.

These items have all been explained by the State Department and they have been studied by the committee. The committee itself has cut one of the items from $60,000 to $45,000 and another item of $48,000 to $32,000 and therefore the gentleman's proposal to cut the items still further seems to me to be entirely out of place.

Mr. KERR. In deference to what the chairman of the subcommittee has said about the record in respect to this matter, I insist we ought not to further reduce this item, which I think is as desirable and as powerful an item as we can put into the matter of promotion of cultural relations, as well as the economic welfare of the great nations of the Western Hemisphere. [Applause.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the time of the Committee, but I cannot resist the temptation to speak against this amendment on general principles. It seems to me that some of us in the House have the idea that the other nations of the Americas are going to fall into the lap of cooperation with the United States just because we want them to. Now, suppose these students are not going to graduate from American colleges for 4 years—maybe not—but right now is the time when the other nations of the Americas are going to make up their minds what they think the attitude of the United States is toward them. Right now is the time when every single act we do here in the Congress is going to be gaged by these people to determine whether the good-neighbor policy is merely a matter of speech-making or whether it is a matter of constructive and cooperative action on our part with regard to those countries.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman know how many students came to the United States from South American countries without any subsidy?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I heard the gentleman speak yesterday and he gave us the figures that there were 1,100 students who came here, I believe, in 1 year, and this amount of money took care of a dozen students or such a matter.

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman think that is a frugal expenditure of the money of the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman thinks investments in international good will with other American nations are perhaps the best investments that can be made by the United States [applause]; and I furthermore would point out to my good friend from California that the 1,100 students who come here at their own expense can only be people of the very most fortunate economic group in the Latin American nations. The purpose of this money here—and I wish it were twice as much, I will say to the gentleman—is to enable some of the worth-while young people of South America who have not these private financial resources to come to the United States for study; and may I point out that at this very moment Europe, which is the place where they used to go for their education in many cases, is now closed to them; that if there is any policy on the part of the United States that commends itself to any foresighted Member of the House it is the policy of opening the educational institutions of America to these South American students in order that the cultural relationships may be an American relationship, North and South, instead of one between South America and Europe.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield? I do not want to interrupt the gentleman unduly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am through.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman wants our educational institutions opened to these students of South America, and they are opened to them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right from a tuition standpoint, and

many of our universities have been very generous in that respect.

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman advocate the policy of trying to purchase good will from the South American countries?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not at all. I think that we will get just as much value received from having these people come here for their education instead of going to Europe as it will ever cost us.

Mr. KERR. Does not the gentleman know that many of these institutions are giving to these boys and girls coming here from South America free scholarships——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly; and is it not true that this money is for the purpose of enabling them to take advantage of those free scholarships?

Mr. KERR. If we cut out this appropriation, would it not nullify what we attempted to do at Buenos Aires?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly; and that is what I am trying to say.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to add to what the gentleman has said that I had the privilege of attending a university where we had about 25 or 30 students from South and Central America, and I believe I had first-hand experience there, and it was the greatest thing in the world in building good will between this country and the countries represented by those students. Since that time I have maintained a correspondence with a great many of those boys, and the same thing has been done by many of our fellow students.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And did not the gentleman find that perhaps there are many things we might learn from them as well as teach them? [Applause.]

Mr. BOGGS. That is right exactly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words to say to the gentleman who attended college with 25 of these students that I am not criticizing their coming here, but I want to say to him that they came at their own expense.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Our schools are open. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. As a matter of fact, half of those men came on scholarships offered by the university. They did not pay their own expenses.

Mr. CARTER. They did not come at Government expense.

Mr. BOGGS. No; but this program will be most helpful in bringing boys who cannot afford to come.

Mr. CARTER. I might agree with the gentleman if there happened to be any money in the Treasury of the United States to pay the expenses of these students. The gentleman must know, if he has read the Treasury statement at all, that about two out of every three dollars that we are going to expend in bringing these students here consists of borrowed money. I wonder how gleeful his taxpayers down there in his country are going to be when he goes back home and says, "Yes; I voted this additional burden on you in order to bring students from foreign countries into the United States."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I cannot yield now—when many of the students are coming anyway. I think this is a very fine thing to do. I am not unmindful of that. It is a neighborly thing; it is a splendid thing; but, as for myself, I owe a much greater duty and obligation to the taxpayers of this country than I do to the residents of a foreign country, however desirable they may be, and as far as I am concerned in the deliberations of this committee I have endeavored to cut down that amount because it was shown before the committee, as I stated here yesterday, that several hundred students are coming here, not at the expense of the Federal Government—perhaps by scholarships, as the gentleman has said, perhaps at their own expense—but they are not coming at the expense and at the strain of a depleted Treasury. That is my only objection to this now. If our fiscal condition were good, I would be just as stanchly for this proposal as my good friend from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and the other gentlemen who are advocating it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Why doesn't the gentleman ask them where they are going to get the money?

Mr. CARTER. Oh, I leave that to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that there are a great many thousand students in America, our own American citizens, who are denied opportunity for higher education even under our American system of government, and here we are talking about giving to the citizens of some other country that which we deny our own people here at home?

Mr. CARTER. I think that is true.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CARTER. In just a moment. I think here is something to the observation of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], but I think we ought to take care of our own folks first. If the condition of the Treasury permitted I would be willing even to enlarge this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think that the granting of funds to bring 10 or a dozen or 1 percent of boys that come up here through United States funds will whet the appetite and make them all want to come on funds of the United States—the 1,100 who used to come at their own expense will not come unless we provide the Federal funds to take care of them?

Mr. CARTER. I hope it will not have that effect, but it is possible that it will.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested yesterday to notice that there was a provision for students. There was one aspect of the question that occurred to me, and that was this: Already in some of the colleges not connected with the Government we have plans for exchanging students. That is, a student in junior year at Smith College, for instance, exchanges with a student in the corresponding year at the Sorbonne in France, let us say. That system, with the assistance of the Government, might be used very conceivably, it seems to me, so that our people could go to South America and learn Portuguese and Spanish, and their students come here and learn American, increase the cultural relations; and by using the exchange system the same amount of appropriation, if you have Government funds, could be stretched a great deal further. This Government assistance, if you wish to assist them, could bring several students, whereas at present you have to pay their tuition at much greater expense.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Under the convention with the countries in South America, 14 of which have ratified, we make exchanges of students and professors along the very line you have been speaking.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. May I add that from my personal experience I have known of authors who went to school in England. Some of the best known authors in Brazil are very influential in spreading the British culture. Artists who went to the Sorbonne in France have been very influential in promoting French trade. As long as we are spending so much money with the idea of promoting trade between the two countries, it is a good idea for the Government to use the student-exchange plan rather than to undertake to pay the entire expenses of a few South American students. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised that this particular part of the cultural-relations program with South America should be attacked on the floor of the House. Many times during the hearings it was my privilege as chairman of the subcommittee to ask the question, "Where will this activity take place? What particular groups will be the recipients of this particular work on the part of your division of the Government?" This was asked concerning the taking down to South America of pictures for the movies which were going to be shown in some drawing room some place, to which I was very much opposed.

But anything you can do to carry the idea of democracy to the masses, not to

the caviar class, but to the bread and butter eaters, then you ring the bell. I do not mean to do something that will be a matter of polite discussion in the parlor for four or five people, but to carry it to the masses. That is the very thing that this exchange of students is going to do. This is bringing this activity to the poor boy—to the boy who is in a similar condition in South America—to the less fortunate lads upon the streets of my city, whose parents I told, "My picture has been shown in the window of your home. You have not placed it there in vain."

I want to read from the hearings, page 446, the following:

But in many cases the cost of travel prevents students from taking advantage of these fellowships and scholarships. This has been the case in connection with the 25 scholarships offered during the past year by the colleges in the city of New York.

That is a very case in point. Twenty-five scholarships were offered in the city of New York and the most worthy boys could not take advantage of them because they did not have the travel money.

Reading further:

The appropriation requested will make it possible for students who are well qualified, but whose families are not wealthy, to profit from these advantages.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is this done in connection with the national youth program at all?

Mr. RABAUT. This is done in connection with the cultural-relations activity.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It occurs to me it might be worked out so that you could add traveling expense and exchange students under the sponsorship of the National Youth Administration.

Mr. RABAUT. That, of course, is another subject.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Has there been consideration before your committee with representatives from the National Youth Administration?

Mr. RABAUT. No; not on this program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the charge that the selection of airports essential for national defense has not been made with that sole objective in mind.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. To what part of the bill is the gentleman addressing himself?

Mr. BOREN. I offered a pro forma amendment. If the gentleman wishes to insist——

Mr. RABAUT. I am very willing that the gentleman talk about this subject, but I suggest that we go along in an orderly way. The item which the gentleman wishes to discuss is found on page 42 of the bill, whereas we are now on page 30.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object. I am merely trying to expedite consideration of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the chairman of the subcommittee made an announcement awhile ago relative to proceeding out of order, saying he was going to insist that Members address themselves to the bill. Are we to understand he has discarded that?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if there is any particular reason for taking up this item at this particular time, when we have not yet reached that part of the bill?

Mr. BOREN. I am glad to answer the gentleman's question, Mr. Chairman. I have been in the House this afternoon with the intention of offering three or four amendments which I felt very keenly should be adopted to reduce a lot of unnecessary items in the bill, but after making one effort on that score, and having found the sentiment of the House on the subject, I felt there was no use in continuing to offer these amendments. I wanted to save my personal time and leave the floor by simply announcing my position on the question.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to insist on speaking out of order, but the time will come when I will insist that we investigate the method of selection that has been used as indicated, beginning at page 599 of the hearings.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. CARTER. Just a moment. I understand I have the floor. I reserved the right to object to a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BOREN. I understood I had the floor.

Mr. CARTER. A unanimous-consent request was submitted and I reserved the right to object, which, as I understand the situation, gives me the floor.

Mr. BOREN. I am willing to accept that situation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection whatsoever to the gentleman's speaking out of order at this point or any other point so far as I am concerned. All I want to know is what I am to expect. The chairman of the subcommittee announced some time ago that from that point on there would be no speaking out of order. If the chairman now desires to recede from that position, it is entirely agreeable to me, but I want to know what the program is going to be.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. In order to accommodate my colleague, I will object.

Mr. CARTER. It is no accommodation to me in the least.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma will proceed in order.

Mr. BOREN. Do I understand my pro forma amendment has been declared out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer the amendment but he must discuss the amendment and nothing else. The gentleman from Oklahoma will proceed in order if he cares to proceed.

Mr. BOREN. I do not care to proceed, Mr. Chairman. I am going to yield the floor, but some day I will bring up this question of a few cocktails at a bar influencing the location of airports supposedly for national defense.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 32, lines 13 and 14, strike out "Department of the Interior for the Geological Survey, $50,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee a while ago made the statement that there was no use lecturing anybody here because everybody was in favor of economy. We have 70 Members on the floor and I am now going to see whether they are for economy.

If a Member of the House dies and we want a funeral sermon preached we do not go out and get the Attorney General to preach the sermon, we get the Chaplain of the House. If in my own business we wanted somebody to investigate minerals we would get a man versed in minerals, we would not take the head bookkeeper. So in this bill, wanting someone to do some geological survey work for us in South America we should go to the Department of the Interior in the Bureau of Mines where they have experienced mining engineers, rather than expect the State Department to look after the minerals necessary to national defense.

Another thing: I would not duplicate my work; I would try to simplify it; and I would put it all in one department. The situation is just this: Last year in the Interior Department bill we appropriated for this particular purpose.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Not just now. I want to get this in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I quote from the Interior Department hearings on the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, 1941:

The work of the Bureau's foreign mineral specialist assigned to South America requires almost constant traveling to mining and industrial centers of all principal South American countries for the purpose of gathering first-hand information not otherwise available on production and utilization of mineral commodities.

As I say, we appropriated money for this purpose last year in the Interior Department. In the justification of the Interior Department under the Bureau of Mines we have an item for the Foreign Mineral Division for this year to do the same work as proposed in this bill:

To provide the foreign mineral specialist with an assistant to speed up surveys of mineral industries in the Western Hemisphere

that are of strategic importance to the United States; and to expand compilation of statistics on farm production and international trade in minerals other than fuels.

Now, the Department of the Interior is sending men down there to make this investigation, and I believe it is a good thing; but, in my opinion, it has no place in this particular bill in the State Department. It does not have anything to do with this bill or this Department. I request that it be put in the Department of the Interior bill so that they may appropriate money to do this work. That is businesslike, it is sensible, and it is the proper thing to do if you do not want duplication.

I hope the Committee will accept my amendment, and we will see that the Department of the Interior carries this out.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I feel a quorum should be on the floor to consider this bill, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. Chairman, with reference to this item of $50,000 for the Geological Survey that is so exercising my colleague who has just preceded me on the floor, may I refer the Committee to page 32 of the print of the bill, and ask their attention particularly to line 6 where we have the Department of Agriculture participating in this program. That is not in the Department of State. In line 7, we have the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is not in the Department of State. In line 8 we have the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which is not in the Department of State. We also have the Weather Bureau which is not in the Department of State, nor the Public Health Service, nor the Office of Education, nor the Geological Survey, nor the Children's Bureau, nor the Library of Congress, nor the Smithsonian Institution. Every last one of them are in this bill, and are doing something in relation to our activities in South America. They all perform services in this country, analogous to those they will perform in South America, but the point is that this is an integrated program of bringing about a better understanding between our country and the South and Central American republics, so we carry each of these appropriations under the State Department. We have been given unequivocal assurances by the officials of the Department of State that these Departments are neither supplementing nor duplicating the work specifically provided for under this appropriation. The whole thing is tied up in this program, and why the gentleman should single out this particular item involving the Geological Survey is more than I can quite understand.

Mr. RICH. Just because I am a member of the subcommittee having to do with the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. I know that Department is doing exactly what you say in here you are going to do with that money. They are doing the same thing down there, and I want to stop duplication, that is all.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to the gentleman that they are doing no such thing in South America. They are doing it up here, but not in South America.

Mr. RICH. We have been sending men down there. We sent them down there last year for the same purpose.

Mr. RABAUT. They must have been on vacation. They were not doing this work.

Mr. RICH. Absolutely; they were.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 20, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The President, in his discretion, may assign officers of the Army or Navy or officers or employees of the Treasury Department or Federal Works Agency for duty as inspectors of buildings owned or occupied by the United States in foreign countries, or as inspectors or supervisors of buildings under construction or repair by or for the United States in foreign countries, under the jurisdiction of the Department of State, or for duty as couriers of the Department of State, and when so assigned they may receive the same traveling expenses as are authorized for officers of the Foreign Service, payable from the applicable appropriations of the Department of State.

This title may be cited as the "Department of State Appropriation Act, 1942."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, all I want to say to the chairman of the committee having charge of this bill and to that side of the House is this: I do not think you mean what you say. There are less than 100 Members on the floor here. When you say you are for economy in government, I do not believe it at all, and your vote does not show it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Civilian pilot training: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 855), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; operation, maintenance, repair, and overhaul of aircraft; hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $210,000 of this amount may be transferred to the appropriation "Enforcement of Safety Regulations, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," for expenditure in connection with payment of salaries and travel of aeronautical inspectors engaged in supervision and promotion of the safety features of the civilian pilot training program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 41, line 19, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$18,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to put the bill back to the Budget estimate and save $7,000,000 for something I do not believe contributes in the slightest to national defense. May I say that the boys who are taking this civil-aeronautics training cost the Government upward of $300 apiece? They go through the elementary course; then if they go into the Army, they have to go through the elementary course again.

When the committee was considering this matter it had hearings on the subject. Officers of the Army appeared before us and they told the committee—pages 678 to 692 of the hearings—that after these boys had gone through this civil-aeronautics course they started them in in the elementary course.

What is the sense of our doing that sort of thing? The Army tried giving these boys some credit because of the preliminary training they might have had under Civil Aeronautics, but found that the percentage of failures was so much larger than they were used to that they could not afford to do it. Then, as they told me today when I called them up, they miss 33 percent of the training that they get under the Regular Army training for pilots. They are not anywhere near so well fitted to be officers.

I cannot see the sense of spending all this money, calling it national defense, and having a program on this scale when the Army will not accept and give any credit for the amount of time that the boys have spent on it. I think it is about time for us to stop fooling our money away on everything that somebody comes along and calls national defense. I am willing to go along on things that are national defense and for which a case can be made, but this certainly does not make a case. It is a waste of money.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Does not the gentleman recall that in the examination and discussion of this matter General Johnson, before the committee, said that this was a very valuable service and added a great deal to the efficiency of the men who went into our air service?

Mr. TABER. The Army will not give them any credit, after trying it out. We had the Army officers before the deficiency committee just the other day, and they repeated their position. They have 1,300 of these boys and, with the exception of 63, every single one of them has been denied any credit; and of these 63 a larger percentage failed than where the Army's regular course was completed. I believe we ought to give the boys who are going into the Army the kind of training they will need to be pilots in our fighting forces instead of giving them the kind of training that will not contribute largely to that end. I cannot find anything in here, and I could not get out of General Johnson when he appeared before the deficiency committee the day before yesterday anything to justify this appropriation, and I feel that I must oppose it.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I have been informed that the Army and the Civil Aeronautics

Authority have agreed that the Army shall give the same credit the Navy gives at this time. I believe that is 33 hours.

Mr. TABER. I was told just within a half hour that the Army hereafter is going to give no credit whatever. We were told that in the deficiency committee the day before yesterday. I do not believe we are at all justified in going along with any elaborate program of civilian-pilot training under the Civil Aeronautics Authority, because it does not, to my mind, make a substantial contribution to national defense or to the supply of available and useful pilots.

Mr. KERR. Does the gentleman believe that our Civil Aeronautics Authority program is a useful function?

Mr. TABER. Insofar as we need to train boys who would not otherwise be trained as civilian pilots, perhaps yes, but when it comes to saying that we should have any such elaborate program as spending $25,000,000, I believe it is absolutely going at it wrong-end-to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute, in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman know that the planes that are used by the Army for training purposes—I want the gentleman to weigh these words—cost more money than the whole Civil Aeronautics Authority training program?

Mr. TABER. I believe that probably is so. I believe it is absolutely necessary, if we are going to have the boys trained in such a way that they can become successful pilots, to give them the type of training the Army is providing, and I believe that is far beyond what is given by these people. I do not believe the training they get under this program is of a type that contributes primarily to building successful fighting pilots. For that reason, I do not believe we should go ahead on such a large scale. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very badly that I must rise in opposition to an amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. TABER, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that the civilian-pilot-training program is real national defense. It was originally organized for the purpose of making America air-minded, and that was its purpose until the emergency arose. Now we are crying for Army and Navy pilots. Last year, we appropriated $37,000,000 for civilian pilot training. This program has proved a great success. The C. A. A. came before the Budget and asked for $42,000,000 to continue this program for the next fiscal year because there is great need for pilots, not only in our land but the world over. The Authority was given an arbitrary cut to $18,000,000 by the Budget, which would not only disrupt the program but, in my opinion, ruin it entirely and handicap our desperate effort to turn out pilots for national defense.

I went into great length on this subject in my remarks yesterday. I made the statement that you would be horrified if you knew the truth about how many fighting pilots have been killed in the last 4 months and how desperately we are in need and the world is in need of pilots. I could tell you today that Army experts have told us off the record that the time would come when we would not quibble over a little argument between the Army, the Navy, or some other branch of the service relating to national defense, and we would have to go to civilian life for many of our pilots. We would not have to pass legislation stating that only 25 percent of our pilots need have a college education, but we would have to go to civilian life to get our potential Rickenbackers and Lindberghs. But the Budget would wreck this program by this decrease from $37,000,000 to $18,000,000, when the Authority had asked for $42,000,000.

What is this program doing? We are training pilots in 900 centers in the United States and turning out partially trained pilots at the rate of 4,000 a month. Twenty-two percent of the pilots training in our Army today have come from the civilian-pilot-training program. In a few short months the civilian-pilot-training program has proved itself a success.

I know General Johnson. He is my intimate friend. He is one of the greatest flyers of our time. He is conducting a great program in our Army Aviation Corps. He will make Army flyers from these C. A. A. boys. I know something about his experience in France. He is chief of the training in our Army Air Corps. I also know something about General Connelly, who is chief of the training of our civilian pilots. He is a West Pointer, a classmate of General Johnson. They are two great men. I have also talked to men who are in charge of training pilots in the Navy. Representatives of these three branches, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Army, and the Navy, have assured us that this is a great program.

We on the minority side who are fighting against excessive expenditures would not want to vote for this increase if it were not necessary for our defense program. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be defeated. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to cut this appropriation down to the Budget request, and since there is not a syllable of testimony that you can read in the record of an official character from either the Navy or the Army Air Corps with respect to this appropriation, it can be assumed that the Budget request represents what the combined civilian, Army and Navy aviation advisers of the President think about this item. The Army does not give any credit at all for civilian-pilot training. The Navy gives a 33-hour credit, it is claimed in the hearings, eliminating 43 hours of flying. How much did these C. P. T. graduates fly to get 43 hours' credit with the Navy? Somewhere between 75 and 100 hours.

I started to fly 25 years ago. I have been a State aeronautical official, and I think I know something about this matter. This C. P. T. program has been a fake from the start. In 1939 it was offered as a scheme for providing aviation and the export plane business a sort of W. P. A. under the name of national defense. I offered an amendment at that time that would have required these trainees to agree to go into our armed services if the occasion demanded. That was defeated.

What is the situation now? If we are to believe the hearings, out of about 37,000 of these C. P. T. trainees 4,000 have been coaxed and cajoled and pleaded with to volunteer to enter one of our services—about one out of nine have gone into some form of national-defense flying. Of course, the girls, these cuties with the shorts on that you see in the pictures, they probably could not enlist.

Here is what Mr. Hinckley said about the purpose of this training at page 349 of the hearings. He compared it with studying chemistry and said it was just as important and then he went on to say:

> The same is true with aviation; it is essential—economically, socially, and politically—that the youth of today know something about aviation. It makes no difference whether they ultimately become real-estate operators or engineers.

Then he says:

> Now, in addition to that, there are a great number of them who will go into the military service whether we want them to or not.

So at least with this evidence by Mr. Hinckley before us, we can cut this thing down to size and in a time of national emergency make our subsidized flying have something to do with national defense. While we are carrying on the training programs of the Army and the Navy that have something to do with defense we can cut down this program which is denominated by the head of it here as being "economically, socially, and politically" a nice thing to do.

We have all been saying here in Congress that we are going to cut down on nondefense expenditures; at least, let us trim this one down to the size the Budget suggests and not continue this social and political activity in times of emergency under the fake guise of national defense.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. After a boy receives his private license, in order to maintain it he must fly a certain number of hours per year. Is not that correct?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. HANCOCK. What facilities are offered that boy to put in the necessary amount of flying? In other words, is it possible for the ordinary boy to maintain his license?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do not think it is. That was not the intention of this program. The real purpose, when this started out, was to get boys and girls to rent or buy private planes, and cheap private planes, after they received their training so that they would

fly around and we would have a lot of interest in aviation. Certainly there is no reason for continuing this sort of subsidized social and political private interest in aviation at a time when we want thousands of men to go into the combat air services.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I say to the gentleman that I was one of the Members who helped draft the act and I heard the evidence and it was not entirely for civilians, but it was deemed important to provide a number of civilian fliers who could be used for our national defense.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman is correct as to the alleged purpose of this activity. May I say that the phrase was used, "A reservoir of pilots for national defense." The gentleman will recall that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That reservoir has run so dry that, according to the figures in the hearings, one out of nine is volunteering for national defense, and that is such a poor reservoir that we had better stick to the training systems provided for the combat services, and if we are to train them, make sure they are going to be available for national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Referring to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who just spoke, and being against the amendment, I quote from the hearings, from the statement of Commander Lynch, in charge of Reserve Aviation, Bureau of Navigation, United States Navy:

Mr. RABAUT. Commander Lynch, we asked someone to come here this morning to talk to us about the civilian pilot-training program under the Civil Aeronautics Administration. We have been told that we are spending a lot of money on this program, and that when the boys are sent over to the Army and the Navy they are told to forget everything they have learned and "listen to us." We want to know if that is the attitude and if there is any reason for that attitude; and if it is not the attitude, we want to know that. Tell us something about it.

Commander LYNCH. That is not the attitude, Mr. Chairman. We are very glad to get these boys. Our only complaint is that we do not get more of them. If we could get 10 times as many as we do get, we would be very happy to take them.

That is the answer to the gentleman from Ohio, who said there is not a syllable of reasoning in the whole thing.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I feel that this is a desperate attempt to destroy the civilian-pilot-training program. The membership of this House should know that on March 1, 468 C. A. A.-trained instructors were teaching at Army schools, 27 at Navy schools, 117 at Canadian schools, and 207 had gone to the air lines as replacements. As of March 1 the C. A. A. program had fed nearly 1,000 civilian instructors to other defense activity in addition to producing partly trained pilots at the rate of over 4,000 a month.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman for his observation. We do not take statements out of the air, but we bring the facts before this body. I further quote from the report:

The safety record obtained in the operation of this civilian-pilot-training program is, indeed, a tribute to its management. Out of a total of some 40,000 students that have been given some form of training, only 17 fatalities have resulted. During the first year of the program there was only 1 death out of 10,000 in training, and that fatality resulted from a structural failure.

The whole program is to make America air-minded, and if you want to be convinced about it make a study of the situation in Germany, where boys were taught to divide a plane, not to divide an apple; where they were told, design a plane; and they learned to design planes at the age of 8 or 9 years and up to 14; and from 14 to 18 they joined glider clubs, 100,000 of them a year. It was at a time when power planes were reduced to a minimum under the Versailles Treaty. Then they entered into the flying game, and they produced 25,000 pilots a year; and today their record has been written in the public press, to the consternation of the world. Now, are we going to stand in this House and act on the suggestion of those who would strike from the bill the very funds appropriated for this worthy program to make America air-minded? Let the committee decide. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 16, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $50.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 43, line 21, strike out "$50" and insert "$100."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, acting on the advice of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I express thanks to the gracious gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for accepting the amendment. Perhaps a little explanation is necessary. My good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and I just got off a plane that left Atlanta at 10 o'clock this morning, where we had been in session on the Select Committee Investigating Airplane Accidents. As we went up to Candler Field at Atlanta we found, after the boys who brought us in got gasoline and secured the necessary gadgets that add to the safety of flying, that the outlay was in excess of $50, and the result was that before we could take off they had to hustle around and get some necessary bids.

Obviously, speed is one of the things that expedites the annihilation of distance. When you take 45 minutes to go to the Atlanta Airport in the morning, you do not want to wait at least an hour before you can take off, to have two or three people bidding on gasoline and bidding on the repairing and checking up of the motor. So the reason for offering the amendment to provide for a $100 limitation instead of $50 was to provide certain flexibility and latitude for those working in the field under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and Civil Aeronautics Board so that this matter can be expedited.

So much for the amendment, and I am grateful that the subcommittee saw fit to adopt it. But let me say a word about the work of the select committee which has been in the field for 2 weeks. We started at Cincinnati. Last Sunday we went to Atlanta and have been there this week. Some of the members are still there. It has been rather interesting work. No one can engage in that sort of work, do night flying around, and checking up some of these airports where crashes have taken place, or go out to a hospital and interview a great flight man like Eddie Rickenbacker, or see the tremendous amount of aviation interest as far as we have gone without recognizing the fact that America today is definitely air-minded.

Last Saturday and Sunday at Atlanta there were over 1,800 procedures from that single field. That means that the flight plans that were filed by commercial air carriers, Army and Navy take-offs and itinerants for 2 days, Saturday and Sunday, totaled over 1,800 take-offs and let-downs. That thing is growing in America. You will find it at St. Louis and Cincinnati. You will find it at LaGuardia Field. You will find it in Chicago. You will find it in California. You will find it everywhere. Today America is definitely air-minded, and there is upon Congress a great responsibility to make certain that every proper safety is provided.

Probably the first component of safety is structural certainty of the plane. We have gone a long distance in that respect. We have set up the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at Langley Field and a subsidiary at Moffett Field, at Sunnyvale. So all the researches in aerodynamics are being made available to the industry that it may move forward and so perfect the structure of the airplanes that there will be no danger of structural failure.

Probably the second component in the field of safety would be the pilot. I am frankly amazed at some of these pilots who have been trained out there. Boys who have been at this game a long while,

with nerves of steel, most of them under 30, who take these 25,000-pound ships through the air at night and who land them, ofttimes under a ceiling of 300 feet, bring down a great live cargo of passengers and express to the ground with almost unerring safety. My hat is off to the air-carrier pilots. It is one of the amazing things about the development of flight in this country. But for the two and a half million who flew in 1940, and for the 12,000,000 who probably will fly, according to estimates, in 1945, I, for one, am not going to be niggardly about expenditures for the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board. [Applause.] When you are sitting up there at an altitude of 4,000 or 8,000 feet, sometimes above and sometimes below the clouds, oftentimes the radio transmission does not work too good, you cannot get the ground station, or communication station a hundred miles ahead, you somehow hope that there will be a paternal sympathy and interest in everything that attends this whole business of aerial transportation, so that not a single stone will be left unturned in the direction of safety.

I believe this civilian-pilot-training program is a contribution in that direction. I would not expect a youngster to learn all that there is to be known about the science of aeronautics, but at least he gets the feel of the plane. I believe everybody who has been in the air will know what I mean. When you have taken your first flight and she skids off this way a little or that way a little, you will get just as nervous as can be. After awhile the feel comes to you. I believe the greatest contribution that the civilian-pilot-training program can make to the whole science of navigation in the air is to teach these boys the sense of security when they are sitting in the cockpit, coursing over the airways, knowing full well what a little skid that way or this way will do, and knowing also how to handle the instrumentalities of radio reception and transmission, so that they feel at home at all times. If that is all they learn, I will be satisfied, as far as that program is concerned.

The third factor, of course, in this whole field of safety is this question of directional aids from the ground. You cannot live with the operations of the Civil Aeronautics Administrator or the Civil Aeronautics Board, examine the traffic-control system, see the way in which they will pick up planes 200 miles out and bring them into port, or pick up 4 or 5 coming in at the same time, or maybe a dozen, creating what you might call a bottleneck, and safely stagger them one on top of the other 2,000, 3,000, or 4,000 feet, then have them circle until all is in readiness for them to land and bring their people down to earth, without recognizing the imperative need for the best safety aids that can be provided.

Congress cannot do too much for a thing like that, cannot do too much for the setting up of all these air controls and radio beams where you could put on your head phones and catch the "A" signal on one side and the "N" signal on the other side and know you are flying on the course; and I am ready to spend the money that is necessary if it is contingent on my vote to see that that thing is perfected, so that if you never see the terrain you will have a sense of security, along with the other millions who are going to fly in America, because this Nation is going to take to the air more and more.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to say to my colleague from Illinois that I am intensely interested in what he has to say in the matter of safety devices, especially the radio beam and some of the difficulties encountered with it under certain atmospheric conditions. I am sure the gentleman will be interested to know that the subcommittee in this bill has provided sufficient funds to continue with the ultra-high-frequency beam which eliminates static and gives practical assurance of continuous wave indication at all times. I am sure the gentleman will agree that these experiments are very good.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Having learned something of aeronautics I look back at the temerity with which some years ago I opposed certain items in the independent offices appropriation bill; and along about that same time I took it on my own responsibility to take a little money out of the Weather Bureau appropriation. Heaven help me, I will never do it again as long as I live. I will say that to you.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me to make an observation. I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Illinois, who is a keen student of legislation, say what he has just said. His support for aeronautics will be most helpful.

I call to the attention of the membership this afternoon the experiences of two men on opposite sides of the aisle, one no longer with us, the other still here. The late distinguished Representative from Michigan, Carl Mapes, was one. I had the opportunity of riding with him when he first went into the air. It was in a stratoliner test, and we were at a height of 22,000 feet. I remember that prior to that time he had not looked with favor on many appropriations for aeronautics. After that interesting flight and as he took additional rides and studied the problem, Carl Mapes became a strong supporter of aviation legislation. On this side of the aisle is the gentleman from Missouri, CLARENCE CANNON, ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. Until he took a trans-Atlantic flight he was not an enthusiast for the cause of aviation in this House. From that time he became a leader for proper aid to aviation in its many phases.

I venture the suggestion that just as soon as more Members of this body have the opportunity to partake of the advantages of travel in the air just that soon shall we begin to have needed legislation on this subject received with greater support. The challenge of aviation increases in this country. Let all of us assume our responsibility to adequately provide for its growth and carefully study its problems.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, that he must go further than that. I do not believe the gentleman himself, I, or anyone else, gets an appreciation of what flight means until we have noticed how the Civil Aeronautics Administrator and the Civil Aeronautics Board has been operating. For instance, in the matter of air-carrier inspectors I was amazed at Cincinnati, where we held 4 days' of hearings, to learn that we have but 27 expert inspectors of air carriers for the entire United States and that part of Canada in which we run, and that part of South America in which we operate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Twenty-seven expert air-carrier inspectors, most of them former pilots who were getting up to that age where they knew they necessarily had to find themselves another job constitutes the entire inspection force on the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, the portion of our lines that go into Canada and South America—in fact for all our flying operations in the Americas. It is an outrageous condition when you stop to think about it; and as the Civil Aeronautics Administrator fails to disclose that problem to the Congress or we fail to take cognizance of it they and we are derelict in our duty in making proper contribution to the whole field of air safety.

The thing sums itself up into these few components: First ofall safe structures, safe airfields, and skilled pilots, adequate ground directions such as weather directions or traffic control, and so forth; and finally the necessary airports. Anyone can get one of these crates or planes into the air, there is no trouble about getting off the ground any more. The real responsibility comes when you try to bring your plane down to earth. There is the danger that enters into it, and one of the factors advanced is adequate airport space. Our good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HESS] sitting over here, was with us most of the time that we spent in Cincinnati.

There is a peculiar situation at the Cincinnati field, for at one edge of the field is a 20-foot levee running along one side that bellies out at spots where the Little Miami River formerly came in from time to time. It just juts out there as a great obstruction and constitutes a great hazard. The accident that happened there on the 10th of March, or whenever it was, was the result of some gusty weather and a squall. The pilot made an excellent landing with his plane, but the runway lighting was bad to begin with and he could not see the guide lights at the far end. He ran off the run-

way and bogged down over on the levee, crashing up the plane and sending a lot of people to the hospital. That could happen to any pilot. It could happen to any plane.

There is one thing that the Congress can do. It can insist upon certain uniform standards so as to augment in every possible physical way those markers and those directional signals on the ground that will give the captain of a ship every opportunity to land it in safety. So I say that airports figure largely in the scheme of safety. When the select committee comes back after making further research and examinations, it will have a very constructive report to render to the Congress.

Let me pay tribute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], chairman of that committee, and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PEARSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. There is nothing in the nature of publicity being sought by the committee. The newspapers were a bit miffed when we said there would be closed hearings. We told them the committee, its staff, and a witness would be in the room; that we were not out to get publicity. This worked beautifully, it seems to me, and I am satisfied we will make a real constructive contribution when the time comes to file the necessary preliminary and final reports.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman making a survey of the number of emergency landing fields in the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee, in my judgment, will not overlook a thing that may be conducive to air safety.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. On page 18 of the hearings there is a schedule of miles flown during the past 5 years, 1936 to 1941, and the mileage runs something like this: 164,000,000, 177,000,000, 227,000,000, 268,000,000, and 343,000,000 miles. This is a rapidly expanding industry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. America is air-minded and this will be one of the greatest industries within the next few years. Once more let me pay my compliments to Chairman Nichols and the members of this committee. He and his colleagues are doing an excellent and constructive job. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Observations, warnings, and general weather service: For necessary expenses incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, aerological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $7,203,000, of which not to exceed $1,500 may be expended for the contribution of the United States to the cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Meteorological Committee, and not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said Bureau.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 63, line 6, strike out "$7,203,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,240,000."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose of restoring $37,000 which was included in the Budget estimate for the enlargement of weather stations at Billings, Mont., and Seattle, Wash. For some reason or other, this item, together with some other items making up an amount for the enlargement of weather bureaus, was eliminated from the bill.

In the hearings it appears at page 278 that this amount should have been included.

Commander Reichelderfer testified as follows:

For transportation, business, industry, commerce, and so on. Our districts in the West are too large for the district forecaster to give adequate attention to weather conditions in all individual localities, and to prepare specific forecasts.

We have airways weather centers at Billings and Seattle at the present time, and with this increase we will be able to staff those centers so we can organize two new districts for service to the general public with centers at the same places.

The Billings district will include Montana, North and South Dakota; the Seattle district will include Washington, Oregon, and the northern part of Idaho.

The new districts will benefit not only the people within those districts. Adjacent districts are thereby made smaller and the service accordingly is intensified in these other districts that are reduced in size—the San Francisco district and the Denver district.

Mr. Chairman, may I state that the Billings district covers two very large States besides Montana. The mileage covered from east to west, I believe, would be approximately 1,300 miles, and north and south approximately 700 miles. Apparently for no reason whatsoever this amount was eliminated from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, while I am speaking I am going to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that I have introduced H. R. 62 to prohibit the convoying of vessels with supplies to war zones. I am doing this upon the theory, and it is my judgment, that the convoying of ships will mean war, and I quote the President of the United States, when the lend-lease bill was under consideration:

If we did convoy ships, it will start the shooting.

Well, I will say that when the shooting starts somebody will be killed—and if it is an American boy the fight is on; our people would become inflamed, and in we would go. It would be a repetition of a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. Chairman, I am not absolutely certain that the remarks of the gentleman were directed to his amendment or to the question of convoying ships. However, the committee eliminated the item referred to for the reason that the testimony was to the effect the recommendation of the Weather Bureau was to transfer part of the services now furnished by the San Francisco and Denver districts to Billings, Mont., and Seattle, Wash., which would reduce the work in the former districts. The committee thought that if the work was to be transferred the personnel should go with it and additional personnel would not therefore be required. For this reason the appropriation was eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, detection and prosecution of crimes (emergency): For salaries and expenses, during the limited national emergency, in the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General; purchase and exchange not to exceed $135,000, and hire, maintenance, upkeep, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only on official business; firearms and ammunition; such stationery, supplies, floor coverings, equipment, and telegraph, teletype, and telephone service at the seat of government or elsewhere as the Attorney General may direct; not to exceed $3,000 for taxicab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this paragraph and to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (Public, No. 839), and regulations promulgated thereunder; traveling expenses; payment of rewards when specifically authorized by the Attorney General for information leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice, including not to exceed $100,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure as he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been xpended; and including not to exceed $1,059,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; $8,750,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein under the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee, except fingerprint classifiers.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 70, in line 13, after "$8,750,000", insert "of which $200,000 shall be available exclusively to investigate the employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government, who are

members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government, and report its findings to Congress."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared this amendment for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the public that after the Dies committee published the names of the members of the American League for Peace and Democracy nothing further was done about the matter. The F. B. I. has never received or never taken into its office the business of further investigating those on the Federal pay roll who might belong to subversive groups.

I believe the people of America generally have a peculiar way of thinking that the problem is solved once the facts are exposed. They can all agree that it should be done, but the minute the facts are before them they say, "Yes, I agree with that," and they go ahead and let the solution go. That is just what has happened in this case.

The Dies committee, which has had the overwhelming support of this House, has done a worthy job in bringing to the attention of the public the officials on the public pay rolls, paid by the tax dollars of the American people, who are members of subversive groups, perhaps some innocently, but it should be the business of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make sure that nobody is working on the inside, high up, perhaps in publicity activities. By the way, some of the publicity and some of the brochures that come from the several departments, especially the new spend-lend agencies, reflect the philosophy of neither the Republican nor the Democratic Party, but rather a policy of pinkish hue that nobody would want to uphold.

I hope the House will sustain this amendment so that the Federal Bureau of Investigation will make sure that within our own gates, and in the capital of this country, subversive activities are not being carried on, while millions of boys are being inducted by conscription into the armed forces and while we spend $39,500,000,000 to aid, assist, and defend our own Government and to aid, assist, and save the alleged democracies of the world. Why can we not spend $200,000 on the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make sure that we do not lose our form of government from within? The chance is too big a chance to take, not to make someone chargeable with this responsibility.

I sincerely hope that regardless of partisanship we will rise to our responsibility and our duty today and not let happen in America what happened in several countries of Europe. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist on his point of order against the amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I further reserve the point of order so that I may have a chance to speak to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the genial gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] once told a delightful story in the well of the House about a certain Negro preacher who elucidated very eloquently on the scriptures each Sunday morning, but he did it in glittering generalities, so the congregation demanded his resignation because he did not get down to brass tacks and "specify wherein."

The Dies committee for the last 3 weeks has been taking the floor every day, practically, and specifying wherein certain labor leaders with Communist backgrounds, Communist affiliations, and Communist objectives have been influential in bringing about strikes in defense industries, thereby delaying the production of defense goods. Names have been named and evidence has been advanced to show the Communist affiliations and background of these labor leaders in most of these cases.

About 2 years ago, as a member of the Dies committee, I named six employees of the Federal Government, holding influential positions, who were also active officials of the local chapter of the League for Peace and Democracy, as it was known then. At that time, because I named names and "specified wherein," I was accused of trying to smear the New Deal. The cartoonists even pictured me as taking a paint brush and painting red paint on the donkey. If they had given a true picture, they would have painted me as a school teacher with a pointer, pointing to the red spots on the donkey that the donkey had received from close contact with "reds." That would have been a much better presentation of the situation.

About a year later, after a great deal of effort, we published a list of 563 employees of the Federal Government who were members of the local chapter of the league. The publication of that list was called, if you remember, "a sordid procedure."

Mr. Chairman, the day has come in this defense effort of ours, in view of the danger this Nation faces, to "specify wherein." Not only labor leaders with Communist backgrounds and Communist affiliations but employees of the Federal Government with Communist backgrounds and Communist affiliations should be pointed out and named and the evidence produced. It is the purpose of this amendment to get the F. B. I., who is equipped and staffed for doing that work, to undertake that job. I believe this Congress and this House should certainly vote "aye" on this amendment.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The Dies committee and other committees having presented to the President evidence of the fact that subversive influences are at work among Government employees, is it not directly up to the President to settle this question?

Mr. MASON. I will answer the gentleman in this way: The House took action on the name of one of those men that I named 2 years ago, David Saposs, and cut him off the Federal pay roll by action of the House, and I believe that is the only way we will be able to separate these Communist people from the Federal pay roll.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Is not that gentleman back on the Government pay roll?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I have talked with other members of the committee, and I would like to have the pending Jones amendment read again.

The Clerk again read the Jones amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, while the amendment could be opposed, I attempted upon the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], who is a member of our committee, to obtain from Mr. Hoover's office information concerning this list that has been referred to by the Dies committee, and I have been informed that they have never seen the list. If the gentleman from Ohio would change his amendment and make it in the sum of $100,000, I would accept the amendment as so modified.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I accept the modification of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified and the amount reduced, as indicated, to $100,000.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] a question. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under his amendment it will be necessary for the F. B. I. to investigate every employee of the Federal Government?

Mr. JONES. It is my understanding it will only be necessary to investigate those who are under suspicion or have been reported by the Dies committee or by anyone else that they may know of.

Mr. RAMSPECK. As I heard the amendment, it does not so read, and I think it would require the F. B. I. to investigate every employee of the Government, and there are about 1,000,000 of them, which, of course, would be utterly impossible under the gentleman's amendment, due to lack of money.

Mr. JONES. My amendment refers to those who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman is satisfied with it, it is all right with me, and I have no objection.

Mr. JONES. I am satisfied with it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In fact, I would court an investigation by the F. B. I. or any other agency of anybody in the Government service who might be under reasonable suspicion, but I do happen to know that a great many of the employees of the Government have already been investigated not only by the F. B. I. but in many cases by the Naval Intelligence, the Army Intelligence, and the Civil Service Commission investigatory staff, and it would be a waste of money to investigate them again.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, what is the status of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been modified and the point of order was withdrawn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does the reserving of a point of order deprive other members of the Committee from pressing the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Debate has ensued.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not, I will say to the gentleman from New York, up to the time it was withdrawn, but the amendment has now been modified. Any other Member could have renewed the point of order at the time it was asked to be withdrawn.

Mr. TABER. And debate has ensued since then.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment, I will say to the gentleman from New York, had been modified and debate has been had.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But no announcement was made by the gentleman from Michigan that he was withdrawing his point of order and I submit that the reservation of a point of order was continued under that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked the gentleman from Michigan if he insisted on his point of order, and the gentleman asked for time to consult with the gentleman from Ohio; and later on the gentleman said he was willing to accept the amendment if it was modified and a modification of the amendment was made by unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in view of the fact that the gentleman did not state he was withdrawing the point of order, that permitted any other Member of the committee to insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It was manifest that there was a withdrawal of the point of order when the gentleman agreed to a modification of the amendment. At that time if the gentleman from New York or any other Member had insisted on the point of order he would have been within his rights; but in view of what has happened since that time, with full knowledge of the committee, that was tantamount to a withdrawal of the point of order and, therefore, any point of order now would come too late.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, if I may submit a further point of order, in order to modify the amendment, it would have to be done by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair put the unanimous-consent request, and it was not objected to. There was no objection so far as the modification of the amendment was concerned, but the amendment itself has not been agreed to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then it would not be in order to raise a point of order against the amendment at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this time, the Chair will state to the gentleman.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], has already indicated that he would object to any further remarks out of order.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Permit me to say this, so that I shall be in order speaking on something that is germane to the subject: I had the privilege of working in the Department of Justice for about 4 years before I became a Member of Congress, and I look back on that period in my life with a great deal of satisfaction. I think I know whereof I speak when I say something about the Department of Justice, and I think that no amount of money that we might entrust with Mr. Hoover would be foolishly spent. The thing about it is that we should not grant him too little money with which to do the job that we want him to do. I know how Mr. Hoover would go about it, and we all know that he would go about it in an orderly manner. He figures things out, and he acts with dispatch; and if you give him a job to do, it will be well done.

Permit me now to speak on another subject. As the poet says:

> To him who in the love of Nature holds
> Communion with her visible forms,
> She speaks a various language.

In the wisdom of the House, we have decided to take a 10-day recess so that the Senate may catch up with us in the work that is necessary. We have done such a good job that we feel that we can be idle for a few days and allow the Senate to catch up with us. This is a compliment to the fine work which the membership of this House has done under such able leadership on both sides. Mr. Chairman, I represent the most beautiful district in the United States. [Applause.] At this time of the year we have the most abundant and most prolific display of azaleas and other native flowers. Tomorrow we take a few days off to bask in the sunshine of the South, in the warmer climate, and I invite each and every one of you on both sides of the aisle, because this is the time of love, and we all love each other, to come down to the First District of South Carolina and see the magnolia gardens and the cypress gardens, see Charleston and Savannah, the Mateeba Gardens, Middleton Place Gardens, Summerville, Walterboro, and the countless other garden spots that are too numerous to recount; and all of us will be as happy as a lark to have you come.

Mr. HOUSTON. And I suppose you will still be happy to charge us $2 to get in the gardens.

Mr. RIVERS. Oh, I will be very glad to pay for the gentleman's entrance, and, in fact, I will pay his fare and that of his family if they will only come down. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service: For all expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, alien registration, and Chinese exclusion; including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; care, detention, maintenance, transportation, and other expenses incident to the deportation, removal, and exclusion of aliens, and persons subject to the Chinese exclusion laws, in the United States and to, through, or in foreign countries; payment of rewards; purchase, exchange, and rental of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including electric typewriting machines; traveling expenses, including attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (including exchange), hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, boats, and aircraft; fire arms and ammunition; lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, including the exchange thereof; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable; mileage and fees of witnesses subpenaed on behalf of the United States; operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto; and allowances (not exceeding $1,700 for any one person) for living quarters, etc., as authorized by the act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), $15,800,000: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may transfer to, or reimburse, any other department, agency, or office of Federal, State, or local governments, funds in such amounts as may be necessary for salaries and expenses incurred by them in rendering authorized assistance to the Department of Justice in connection with the administration and enforcement of said laws: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $200,000 of this appropriation may be expended for the employment of personnel, exclusive of attorneys, without regard to the Civil Service Act and regulations: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization may contract with officers and employees for the use, on official business, of privately owned horses: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the field when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $50.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language contained in lines 2 to 6 on page 72 as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, so that all of the necessary language shall go out, I make the point of order to the language on page 72, beginning with the word "Provided" in line 2, down to and including the word "regulations" in line 6, being legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon the point of order. The committee realizes that a point of order will lie against this particular language, but there is a reason why the committee felt the language should be incorporated in the bill. This language deals with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. There is a set-up in this Service of 200-odd field-service employees, to work on the 5,000,000 alien-registration cards. The idea is to have someone do this alien work who at least has a sympathetic approach to the alien problem. It will require a person who is able to speak the language of the alien, and we felt it is such an activity that you cannot just put your hand in a hat and draw somebody out who is competent to do this work simply because he happens to have passed the civil-service examination. The language, of course, is subject to the point of order. The alien problem is one that has been kicked around this country for a great many years. It should not be

settled by the police department or by investigators for the F. B. I., but by a special staff properly equipped and having in its personnel individuals with a sympathetic understanding of the alien situation. In that way proper contact would be made with the alien and this is desirable in view of the alien registration, since nearly 5,000,000 have been registered. This is a problem of contact and understanding rather than a police problem.

The alien registration far exceeded the number that was expected to be registered. It exceeded it by over a million. In view of the fact that we have almost five million of them, we felt that the approach by the proper parties with the necessary qualifications and sympathy toward the problem was necessary. Those that are undesirable should be put aside. Those that are of a caliber that we would welcome to our midst should be taken in. That is the reason for this language in the bill. It is all well and good for you to strike it out. It is all well and good if you are playing around with the alien problem, but if you are downright sincere about it, you should leave this language in the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman calls attention to the fact that approximately 5,000,000 aliens are residing in the United States. I should like to call attention also to the fact——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not arguing the point of order. He is making a speech on the merits of the language and not presenting to the Chair an argument with reference to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] will proceed in order and confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman has yielded to me.

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It has been found that only 21 percent of the 5,000,000 aliens——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not completed his statement. The Chair cannot tell whether he is proceeding in order or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was trying to ascertain whether the gentleman was discussing the point of order or not.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I did not realize that I was getting into a point of order when I asked the gentleman to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was not reserved. The gentleman made a point of order. So it would be improper for either of the gentlemen to discuss the merits of the language, but only the question of the point of order. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. No, Mr. Chairman, except to say that I was explaining the attitude of the committee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order must be disposed of first.

A point of order has been made against the language contained, on page 72, beginning in line 2, with the word "provided" and ending in line 6, with the word "regulations," which language reads as follows:

Provided further, That not to exceed $200,000 of this appropriation may be expended for the employment of personnel, exclusive of attorneys, without regard to the Civil Service Act and regulations.

Evidently that provision of the bill is, in effect, a repeal of existing law and is therefore legislation and cannot be engrafted upon an appropriation bill.

The chairman of the subcommittee concedes the point of order. The Chair holds, in compliance with the rule, that the point of order is good and should be sustained, and it is sustained.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take 5 minutes, but in reply to what was said by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], I want to say to the House again that it is my intention to scrutinize carefully every appropriation bill brought in this session, and to make a point of order against any civil-service exception where I think it will lie.

The general civil-service law provides for just such matters as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has referred to, in that it gives the right to the President of the United States to make exemptions wherever a case is made out. If they need any people in connection with this alien problem, who cannot properly be secured through the civil-service procedure, I am sure they will find the President willing to listen to them and to issue an order for the necessary exemptions.

I therefore want the House to understand that it is my purpose to continue to make these points of order against this kind of exemption.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I want to follow through the thought I was expressing when the point of order was made when the gentleman from Michigan was speaking. Of the 5,000,000 aliens in the United States today, we are led to believe by a study of figures that only 21 percent of that number have even signified their intention of becoming citizens of the United States. Certainly only 21 percent making declaration of intention to become citizens brings a problem before us. It is found also that on the average those people have lived in the United States for 14 years.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I was not familiar with those facts, but I do think we have a rather serious problem on our hands to deal equitably with this question.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MASON. From my own experience, I know that a large percentage of those that have not applied are so old and their educational qualifications are so lacking that they could not meet the requirements.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I really know very little about the alien question and am not attempting to discuss that particular question. I do think, however, that we ought to deal with it as intelligently as we can and as sympathetically as we can; but at the same time with the purpose in mind of protecting the United States of America first, last, and always. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of directing a query to the members of the committee with reference to the rather peculiar situation in regard to the Bridges hearing that was conducted before Judge Landis.

The able ranking member on the minority side yesterday put into the RECORD the statement that appears in the hearings with reference to the Harry Bridges case, and I want to quote to you a statement that appears in the report of the committee:

The committee developed testimony in the course of the hearings indicating that some of the witnesses in the Harry Bridges case had perjured themselves in testimony given before Mr. Landis at the time he conducted his investigation and hearing. It now develops, however, that it will be impossible to prosecute those witnesses for such perjury because of the fact that under the power of appointment given Mr. Landis he did not have authority to administer oaths. The committee is not advised as to who is responsible for such a grossly inexcusable oversight, but whoever was responsible should be brought to account.

My query is this: Is this where the matter is going to end, here in the committee hearings and committee report? Or is the committee going to follow this through and see that those who are responsible are brought to account? I ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question.

Mr. RABAUT. It is up to the F. B. I.; it is not up to the committee. All we do is to take the hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the chairman of the subcommittee agrees with me that we are all very happy that the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization has been transferred to the Justice Department out of the Department of Labor; but I should like to know if the committee intends to pursue this question further, or do we let the matter drop right here?

Mr. RABAUT. We do not do any pursuing. The committee brings to the House what occurs before the committee, and the House can take such notice of it as it wants to.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Can the chairman suggest any action the House may take?

Mr. RABAUT. I may say also that such matters as are placed in the report

by the committee are placed there as notice to the departments concerned. This particular reference will come to the attention of the law-enforcement agency. Other matters will come to the attention of other departments involved.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. We are very happy to know that the F. B. I. is now conducting an investigation of a rather undesirable alien, and I hope he does not remain much longer in the country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman that the country heaved a sigh of relief when the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization was taken out of the Department of Labor. It will now become something that can really function without the manacles that have been tied around it; but is the gentleman so optimistic as to believe that Harry Bridges will be deported?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I will say to the gentleman that I am not that optimistic, but I live in hope.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman that I do not think Australia will take Harry Bridges back, that he will be with us a long time.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I do not care where he is sent just so long as he is sent out of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $862,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in accordance with the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923 (as amended), judges' secretaries being classified in the senior clerical grade and law clerks in the senior subprofessional grade: *Provided further*, That none of this fund shall be used for the pay of a law clerk appointed by a district judge unless the senior circuit judge of the circuit (the District of Columbia being considered a circuit) in which the district where the clerk is needed, is situated, shall certify to the necessity of the appointment: *Provided further*, That not to exceed three law clerks to district judges shall be appointed in any one circuit.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: Page 93, strike out all of the paragraph beginning in line 24 extending down to and including line 15, on page 94, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $862,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of judges' secretaries shall be that of the senior clerical grade and salaries of law clerks shall be that of the senior subprofessional grade: *Provided further*, That none of this fund shall be used for the pay of a law clerk appointed by a district judge unless the senior circuit judge of the circuit (the District of Columbia being considered a circuit) in which the district where the clerk is needed is situated shall certify to the necessity of the appointment: *Provided further*, That not to exceed three law clerks to district judges shall be appointed in any one circuit."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question will be ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4124) entitled "An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes;" and that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate, No. 25, to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled "Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from E. W. Tinker, of the American Pulp and Paper Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on raw sugar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on the 5th of February, which I have not printed, may take their regular place in the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Polish Army Veterans of America with respect to aid to Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a weekly traffic bulletin on the Tennessee River, prepared by the River Transportation Division, Commerce Department of the T. V. A., dated March 24, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

NAVIGATION ON THE TENNESSEE RIVER

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with a minimum 6-foot channel available from Paducah, Ky., to Chattanooga, Tenn., a distance of 464 river miles, and before the development of general-use terminals, the improved Tennessee River has already developed important new long-haul freight traffic in petroleum products, grain, pig iron, and automobiles, all of which are expected to be continuing movements. These are in addition to movements in forest products, iron and steel, sand and gravel, brick, clay, coal and coke, cement, machinery, cotton, and fertilizer materials. River freight in 1939 reached 91,000,000 ton-miles, breaking the all-time record prior to T. V. A. improvement by more than 20,000,000 ton-miles, and the traffic in 1940 was considerably in excess of 100,000,000 ton-miles. These figures represent increases of 30 percent for 1939 and at least 45 percent for 1940, in comparison with 1935, the best year ever experienced previously.

settled by the police department or by investigators for the F. B. I., but by a special staff properly equipped and having in its personnel individuals with a sympathetic understanding of the alien situation. In that way proper contact would be made with the alien and this is desirable in view of the alien registration, since nearly 5,000,000 have been registered. This is a problem of contact and understanding rather than a police problem.

The alien registration far exceeded the number that was expected to be registered. It exceeded it by over a million. In view of the fact that we have almost five million of them, we felt that the approach by the proper parties with the necessary qualifications and sympathy toward the problem was necessary. Those that are undesirable should be put aside. Those that are of a caliber that we would welcome to our midst should be taken in. That is the reason for this language in the bill. It is all well and good for you to strike it out. It is all well and good if you are playing around with the alien problem, but if you are downright sincere about it, you should leave this language in the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman calls attention to the fact that approximately 5,000,000 aliens are residing in the United States. I should like to call attention also to the fact——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not arguing the point of order. He is making a speech on the merits of the language and not presenting to the Chair an argument with reference to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] will proceed in order and confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman has yielded to me.

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It has been found that only 21 percent of the 5,000,000 aliens——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not completed his statement. The Chair cannot tell whether he is proceeding in order or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was trying to ascertain whether the gentleman was discussing the point of order or not.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I did not realize that I was getting into a point of order when I asked the gentleman to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was not reserved. The gentleman made a point of order. So it would be improper for either of the gentlemen to discuss the merits of the language, but only the question of the point of order. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. No, Mr. Chairman, except to say that I was explaining the attitude of the committee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order must be disposed of first.

A point of order has been made against the language contained, on page 72, beginning in line 2, with the word "provided" and ending in line 6, with the word "regulations," which language reads as follows:

> *Provided further*, That not to exceed $200,000 of this appropriation may be expended for the employment of personnel, exclusive of attorneys, without regard to the Civil Service Act and regulations.

Evidently that provision of the bill is, in effect, a repeal of existing law and is therefore legislation and cannot be engrafted upon an appropriation bill.

The chairman of the subcommittee concedes the point of order. The Chair holds, in compliance with the rule, that the point of order is good and should be sustained, and it is sustained.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take 5 minutes, but in reply to what was said by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], I want to say to the House again that it is my intention to scrutinize carefully every appropriation bill brought in this session, and to make a point of order against any civil-service exception where I think it will lie.

The general civil-service law provides for just such matters as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has referred to, in that it gives the right to the President of the United States to make exemptions wherever a case is made out. If they need any people in connection with this alien problem, who cannot properly be secured through the civil-service procedure, I am sure they will find the President willing to listen to them and to issue an order for the necessary exemptions.

I therefore want the House to understand that it is my purpose to continue to make these points of order against this kind of exemption.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I want to follow through the thought I was expressing when the point of order was made when the gentleman from Michigan was speaking. Of the 5,000,000 aliens in the United States today, we are led to believe by a study of figures that only 21 percent of that number have even signified their intention of becoming citizens of the United States. Certainly only 21 percent making declaration of intention to become citizens brings a problem before us. It is found also that on the average those people have lived in the United States for 14 years.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I was not familiar with those facts, but I do think we have a rather serious problem on our hands to deal equitably with this question.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MASON. From my own experience, I know that a large percentage of those that have not applied are so old and their educational qualifications are so lacking that they could not meet the requirements.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I really know very little about the alien question and am not attempting to discuss that particular question. I do think, however, that we ought to deal with it as intelligently as we can and as sympathetically as we can; but at the same time with the purpose in mind of protecting the United States of America first, last, and always. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of directing a query to the members of the committee with reference to the rather peculiar situation in regard to the Bridges hearing that was conducted before Judge Landis.

The able ranking member on the minority side yesterday put into the RECORD the statement that appears in the hearings with reference to the Harry Bridges case, and I want to quote to you a statement that appears in the report of the committee:

> The committee developed testimony in the course of the hearings indicating that some of the witnesses in the Harry Bridges case had perjured themselves in testimony given before Mr. Landis at the time he conducted his investigation and hearing. It now develops, however, that it will be impossible to prosecute those witnesses for such perjury because of the fact that under the power of appointment given Mr. Landis he did not have authority to administer oaths. The committee is not advised as to who is responsible for such a grossly inexcusable oversight, but whoever was responsible should be brought to account.

My query is this: Is this where the matter is going to end, here in the committee hearings and committee report? Or is the committee going to follow this through and see that those who are responsible are brought to account? I ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question.

Mr. RABAUT. It is up to the F. B. I.; it is not up to the committee. All we do is to take the hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the chairman of the subcommittee agrees with me that we are all very happy that the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization has been transferred to the Justice Department out of the Department of Labor; but I should like to know if the committee intends to pursue this question further, or do we let the matter drop right here?

Mr. RABAUT. We do not do any pursuing. The committee brings to the House what occurs before the committee, and the House can take such notice of it as it wants to.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Can the chairman suggest any action the House may take?

Mr. RABAUT. I may say also that such matters as are placed in the report

by the committee are placed there as notice to the departments concerned. This particular reference will come to the attention of the law-enforcement agency. Other matters will come to the attention of other departments involved.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. We are very happy to know that the F. B. I. is now conducting an investigation of a rather undesirable alien, and I hope he does not remain much longer in the country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman that the country heaved a sigh of relief when the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization was taken out of the Department of Labor. It will now become something that can really function without the manacles that have been tied around it; but is the gentleman so optimistic as to believe that Harry Bridges will be deported?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I will say to the gentleman that I am not that optimistic, but I live in hope.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman that I do not think Australia will take Harry Bridges back, that he will be with us a long time.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I do not care where he is sent just so long as he is sent out of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $862,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in accordance with the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923 (as amended), judges' secretaries being classified in the senior clerical grade and law clerks in the senior subprofessional grade: *Provided further*, That none of this fund shall be used for the pay of a law clerk appointed by a district judge unless the senior circuit judge of the circuit (the District of Columbia being considered a circuit) in which the district where the clerk is needed, is situated, shall certify to the necessity of the appointment: *Provided further*, That not to exceed three law clerks to district judges shall be appointed in any one circuit.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: Page 93, strike out all of the paragraph beginning in line 24 extending down to and including line 15, on page 94, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $862,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of judges' secretaries shall be that of the senior clerical grade and salaries of law clerks shall be that of the senior subprofessional grade: *Provided further*, That none of this fund shall be used for the pay of a law clerk appointed by a district judge unless the senior circuit judge of the circuit (the District of Columbia being considered a circuit) in which the district where the clerk is needed is situated shall certify to the necessity of the appointment: *Provided further*, That not to exceed three law clerks to district judges shall be appointed in any one circuit."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question will be ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4124) entitled "An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes;" and that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate, No. 25, to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled "Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from E. W. Tinker, of the American Pulp and Paper Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on raw sugar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on the 5th of February, which I have not printed, may take their regular place in the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Polish Army Veterans of America with respect to aid to Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a weekly traffic bulletin on the Tennessee River, prepared by the River Transportation Division, Commerce Department of the T. V. A., dated March 24, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

NAVIGATION ON THE TENNESSEE RIVER

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with a minimum 6-foot channel available from Paducah, Ky., to Chattanooga, Tenn., a distance of 464 river miles, and before the development of general-use terminals, the improved Tennessee River has already developed important new long-haul freight traffic in petroleum products, grain, pig iron, and automobiles, all of which are expected to be continuing movements. These are in addition to movements in forest products, iron and steel, sand and gravel, brick, clay, coal and coke, cement, machinery, cotton, and fertilizer materials. River freight in 1939 reached 91,000,000 ton-miles, breaking the all-time record prior to T. V. A. improvement by more than 20,000,000 ton-miles, and the traffic in 1940 was considerably in excess of 100,000,000 ton-miles. These figures represent increases of 30 percent for 1939 and at least 45 percent for 1940, in comparison with 1935, the best year ever experienced previously.

The freight movement of the 91,000,000 ton-miles reported in 1939 was made up of these general classifications: Petroleum products, 33.3 percent; forest products, 25.7 percent; sand and gravel, 22.6; grain, 2.9; and miscellaneous, 14.5.

An outstanding development in the 1940 increase was the beginning of the movement of automobiles in December, when 130 cars were loaded onto a barge at Evansville, Ind., and shipped 500 miles via the Ohio and Tennessee Rivers to Guntersville, Ala., for overland distribution to Alabama and Georgia points. The second shipment of 117 cars arrived at Guntersville on January 25, 1941.

In 1939, 1,115,000 tons of freight moved on the Tennessee; in 1940, preliminary estimates indicate that more than 2,000,000 tons moved, an increase of 90 percent over 1939. The 1940 tonnage through November, as itemized by the United States Army Engineer Department, is as follows:

Brick, 2,100; cement, 475; Clay, 24,590; coal, 4,070; coke, 6,835; construction equipment, 6,974; cotton, 625; gasoline, 77,011; grain, 27,554; gravel, 835,186; pig iron, 10,493; scrap iron, 1,025; kerosene, 5,373; barged logs, 863; rafted logs, 250; lumber, 33,401; machinery, 685; poles, 6,301; sand, 670,535; fabricated steel, 3,342; steel products, 735; structural steel, 2,400; stone, 100,000; railroad ties, 75,894; others, 1,461.

Additional tonnage which moved on the river in December, as estimated, is as follows: Automobiles, 165; clay, 300; coke, 500; gasoline, 8,000; grain, 3,500; pig iron, 2,000; steel, 200; forest products, 3,500; sand and gravel, 100,000; others, 1,000.

In the past 2 years some 60,000,000 gallons of gasoline has been barged from the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Tennessee River points. The barge rate is about 30 percent of the rail freight rate, and the savings from the Ohio River to Chattanooga amount to about 2 cents a gallon. Late in 1939 the Interstate Commerce Commission permitted the railroads to reduce their rates on petroleum products moving from the New Orleans-Baton Rouge group to points on the portion of the Tennessee River that has been made navigable. Two of the major oil companies have constructed terminals at Perryville and Chattanooga, Tenn., and Sheffield, Decatur, and Guntersville, Ala. Grain is barged from St. Louis to Chattanooga at about 50 percent of the rail freight rate, a saving that has amounted to as much as $6,500 in a single shipment. The first movement of 130 automobiles to Guntersville in December 1940 was accomplished at a saving estimated at $2,000. The Tennessee Valley Authority has utilized the river as one of the means of transporting materials and machinery at substantial savings in money.

While there are private terminals for oil, grain, sand and gravel, forest products, and other commodities on the Tennessee River, public-use terminals are limited and for the most part consist of rail inclines. To meet the requirements of a traffic that is already growing despite the inadequacy of terminal facilities, representatives of Tennessee River communities formed in June 1940 the Tennessee Valley Waterways Conference in the interest of developing a unified terminal system. The Tennessee Valley Authority is cooperating in technical and advisory capacities.

A plan of development for the system of terminals, as adopted by the waterways conference, involving financial aid by the States of Tennessee and Alabama, is to be presented to the Tennessee and Alabama State administrations for consideration and approval.

Today, with the development as yet incomplete, the Tennessee River is navigable the year around to a minimum depth of 6 feet the entire 464 miles between Paducah, at the mouth, and Chattanooga. The navigable channel now actually extends 65.8 miles upstream from Chattanooga to the site where Watts Bar Dam is being built. From Pickwick Landing to Watts Bar, 323.2 miles, the portion of the river for which dams are completed and functioning for navigation, the complete standard 9-foot channel is already available except for a few short strips where channel depth is still to be increased, principally by dredging. The further remaining development of the Tennessee for navigation consists of three dams under construction: First. Kentucky Dam will provide the 9-foot channel for a distance of 184.3 miles on the lower river to Pickwick Landing Dam. This is the longest navigable channel provided by any dam of the Authority. Second. Watts Bar Dam will extend the 9-foot navigable channel 72.4 miles from the upstream limit of the Chickamauga Reservoir to Fort Loudoun Dam. Third. Fort Loudoun Dam will carry the channel the remaining 45.7 miles to Knoxville, Tenn., linking into the navigation system one of the principal areas for the origination and receipt of river freight. Completion of the 9-foot channel through the entire 650 miles of the Tennessee's length is scheduled for 1945, when Kentucky Dam will be completed.

The improved Tennessee River will be capable of handling a minimum of 10,000,000 tons of freight a year for the entire length of the waterway with ease and economy. In the World War congestion of transport was one of the main obstacles to the mobilization of the Nation's resources. The Tennessee River channel will provide a means of transporting large amounts of defense materials, releasing a proportionate amount of rail equipment to haul the materials for which the railroads are the most efficient means of transportation.

I invite the attention of the House to the Weekly Traffic Bulletin, Tennessee River, prepared by the River Transportation Division, Commerce Department, T. V. A., dealing with shipments on the Tennessee River for the weeks of March 24 and 31, respectively. These reports will show in a striking manner the diversity of the cargoes being handled on the Tennessee River. They also speak eloquently of a growing two-way traffic which will tie the Tennessee Valley region to the Ohio River Valley, the Great Lakes region, the upper Mississippi and Missouri, and the Gulf area.

The reports follow:

WEEKLY TRAFFIC BULLETIN, TENNESSEE RIVER

(Prepared by River Transportation Division, Commerce Department, T. V. A., March 24, 1941)

Another new movement comes to the Tennessee. On March 22, a shipment of soda ash, towed by the *Anita D*, of New Orleans, entered the river en route to the new aluminum plant of the Reynolds Metals Co., under construction near Sheffield, Ala. This shipment of about 1,300 tons, loaded into barges at Lake Charles, La., moved to the Tennessee by way of the Gulf Coast Intracoastal Canal and the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers.

The *Betty Gardner*, of the Roberts Towing Co., arrived at Guntersville, Ala., March 21 with another shipment of approximately 120 automobiles. The cars, which were loaded onto barge at Evansville, Ind., were for distribution throughout northern Alabama and Georgia.

Four barges of Gulf gasoline, towed by the *Destrehan*, entered the river on March 18. This gasoline was unloaded at terminals of the Gulf Refining Co., located at Perryville, Tenn., and Sheffield and Guntersville, Ala., for distribution into the adjoining regions.

The *Clyde*, of the Arrow Transportation Co., passed Wilson Dam March 21, with two heavily loaded barges of pig iron. This pig iron, originating in the Birmingham district, was transferred from rail to barge at Decatur, Ala., for shipment downstream to the Ohio River.

On March 22 the *Tennessee No. 3*, of the Clifton Towing Co., passed Wilson Dam en route downstream with 2 barges of forest products. The shipment, composed of almost a half million feet of pine timber, is from Town Creek in the Guntersville Reservoir and is destined for Paducah, Ky., where it will be transferred to rail. Since the opening of the Guntersville Lock to navigation in January 1939, 11 landings have been established on the shores of the Guntersville Reservoir, where forest products are loaded onto river craft.

WEEKLY TRAFFIC BULLETIN, TENNESSEE RIVER

(Prepared by River Transportation Division, Commerce Department, T. V. A., March 31, 1941)

The *Betty Gardner* of the Roberts Towing Co. entered the Tennessee River on March 28, towing a barge of automobiles and two barges of coke. The cars will be unloaded at Guntersville, Ala., for distribution into the Southeast. The coke is for the T. V. A. Fertilizer Plant at Wilson Dam, Ala.

A barge of Texaco gasoline, under tow of the *Louis Igert, Jr.*, having entered the Tennessee River on March 28, arrived at destination, Sheffield, Ala., on March 30. This gasoline is being unloaded into storage tanks of the Texas Co. for distribution into the adjoining region.

The *Clyde*, of the Arrow Transportation Co., passed Johnsonville, Tenn., this morning headed upstream with a barge of grain. This grain will be unloaded at the O. J. Walls Elevator, Guntersville, Ala., for reshipment by land to Birmingham, Atlanta, and other points in the region.

Two barges of Gulf gasoline, towed by the *Bull Frog*, of Lea River Lines, passed Savannah, Tenn., early today en route to one or more of the Gulf Refining Co.'s distribution terminals located at Sheffield, Decatur, and Guntersville, Ala.

Four additional barges of gasoline, under tow of the *Destrehan*, passed the Kentucky Dam today headed upstream to terminals of the Gulf Refining Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a

verse written by a constituent, Col. Roger Wood, of Leesburg, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for 20 minutes today may be vacated and that I may have the same time on Monday, April 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL-DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 172

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 113 of the present Congress, incurred by the Select Committee to Investigate National Defense Migration not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this has the unanimous report of the Committee on Accounts. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET McLAUGHLIN

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 173

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Margaret McLaughlin, widow of Edward J. McLaughlin, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said Edward J. McLaughlin.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two occasions, and in one extension to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I just desire to make a brief announcement that a week from Monday, on April 14, several bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia will be called up for consideration, but I understand they are not controversial bills. I make this statement for the RECORD so that Members may be advised that nothing else will be considered on that day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not suppose that at this time the gentleman can tell us about the program for the remainder of that week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry, but I am unable to do so. I know of nothing else now. I wanted to make this announcement so that Members might govern themselves accordingly for that day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman could give notice to the whips 4 or 5 days before we reconvene as to just what may be expected, so that the Members may be informed and govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should be very glad to do so. I do not know of any measure to come up on Tuesday that will be controversial. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts and I may have an understanding that on Monday and Tuesday nothing controversial will be considered. On Monday, April 14, I shall be in a better position to tell as to the program for later in the week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The chances are it will be Wednesday before anything of a controversial nature is taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I ask the gentleman if the Members had better come back next week in the event an emergency should arise then?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is one of those "if" questions, as the President would say.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We understand, of course, that if an emergency does arise the program is subject to change.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I add my assurance to that of the majority and minority leaders to the Members of the House that the measures to be called up by the Committee on the District of Columbia on Monday, April 14, are necessary in that Congress must allow the business of the District of Columbia to go forward, but the bills are not controversial.

Mr. McCORMACK. If they are controversial, I assure the Members they will not be called up.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I assure the gentleman they are not controversial.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have an understanding to that effect?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; and I always keep my understandings with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I have to keep my agreements with the Members of the House.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I believe the minority leader ought to be informed that on Monday I have a special order to address the House for 20 minutes, and I am sure a great many Members will be here to listen to my remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection to that. We will have a quorum then.

READING OF JEFFERSON'S FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to order of the House of March 19, 1941, the Chair designates the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] to read Jefferson's first inaugural address on Monday, April 14, 1941.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WELCH (at the request of Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a couple of newspaper articles and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of safety of life at sea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the

Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled "Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power;" to the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4124. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 6. An act for the relief of Maude Wilcox;

S. 86. An act for the relief of Worth Gallaher;

S. 192. An act for the relief of the Johnson Flying Service, Inc.;

S. 245. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. E. Purtyman and Mrs. B. H. Russell;

S. 246. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Leyvas;

S. 247. An act for the relief of Hilda C. Allstrom;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Elmer Lindrud;

S. 283. An act for the relief of Rudolph Mundt;

S. 302. An act for the relief of Clayton W. Curtis;

S. 304. An act for the relief of the Missoula Mercantile Co.;

S. 307. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc.;

S. 319. An act for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker;

S. 417. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry H. Denhardt, deceased, of Bowling Green, Ky.;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten;

S. 430. An act for the relief of Addie Myers;

S. 431. An act for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey;

S. 433. An act to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees in respect of certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status;

S. 441. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

S. 527. An act for the relief of Ernest H. Steinberg;

S. 706. An act for the relief of Blanche W. Stout;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette;

S. 790. An act for the relief of M. Seller & Co.;

S. 791. An act for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley, Ernest H. Tarpley, and Pearl Tarpley;

S. 933. An act for the relief of John McAlister, Inc.;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Glen E. Robinson, doing business as the Robinson Marine Construction Co.;

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely; and

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the inter-American coffee agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 26, the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Friday, April 4, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1037, to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families. Open hearing.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions), relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, new House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

395. A letter from the executive assistant and budget officer, Federal Housing Administration, transmitting Seventh Annual Report, Federal Housing Administration (H. Doc. No. 162); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

396. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting certain amendments of certain estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942 for the legislative establishment, Architect of the Capitol, involving an increase of $1,600 (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

397. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under caluse 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TOLAN: Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens. House Resolutions 63 and 629 (76th Cong.) and House Resolution 16 (77th Cong.). Resolutions to inquire into the interstate migration of destitute citizens, to study, survey, and investigate the social and economic needs and the movement of indigent persons across State lines; without amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRANGER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3987. A bill to provide relief for, and to promote the interests of, the landowners on the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 69. A bill to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4083. A bill to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to dispose of property coming into his possession; without amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4131. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 172. Resolution authorizing the expenses to conduct the investigation authorized by House Resolution 113; without amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 173. Resolution granting a gratuity to Margaret McLaughlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4. A bill to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zoharia; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1542. A bill for the relief of Adolf Leon and his wife Felicia; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H.R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Karl Eduard von Vietinghoff-Scheel; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3810. A bill for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; without amendment (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1727. A bill for the relief of Fay Perkins, Jimmie M. Perkins, Harry Howell, Florence Howell, J. P. King, Eva King, Albert L. Jones, and Howard L. Perkins; with amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 4305. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Diamond Anniversary Convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Columbus, Ohio, September 14 to 19, inclusive, 1941; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 4306. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near Mount Vernon, Posey County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4307. A bill to amend section 3114, Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOXEY:

H. R. 4308. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to provide for a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in maintenance of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4309. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims with right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate and enter judgment in all claims which the Miami Indians of Indiana had and have against the United States under treaty of June 5, 1854, ratified August 4, 1854 (10 Stat. L. 1093), and as to the lineal descendants, or issues of said Miami Indians, pursuant to said treaty of June 5, 1854, and so forth, ratified and promulgated August 4, 1854; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4310. A bill to amend Public Law No. 718, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4311. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4312. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Loosahatchie River, Tenn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4313. A bill to protect American agriculture by imposing duties and taxes on certain competitive products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 4314. A bill authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin jointly or separately to acquire bridges now existing or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 4315. A bill to legalize the construction by the Big Creek Bridge Co., consolidated, of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at Nolan, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4316. A bill to authorize the retention in the service on a full pay status for treatment, with their consent, of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States whose term of enlistment shall expire while they are suffering from service-connected disease or injury requiring further treatment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 4317. A bill for the conservation of lobsters, to regulate interstate transportation of lobsters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 4318. A bill to authorize the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4319. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making of grants of aid; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 4320. A bill relating to legal residence of Government employees in the classified civil service and without for taxable purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 4321. A bill for the benefit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to prohibit the use of armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for convoy purposes to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution for the relief of the distressed and starving men, women, and children of Poland, and other countries subjugated by aggressors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THILL:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINTER:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 12, with reference to House bill 2791 and the settlement and development of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 34, with reference to marine hospitalization for fishermen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Martin A. King; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Lemuel Phillips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 4324. A bill for the relief of the estate of James M. Bennett, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4325. A bill for the relief of Cyrus A. Bennett and Burton M. Bennett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4327. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Edward Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Stewart Hatch; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Alice R. Swett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 4332. A bill granting a pension to Hiram Russell Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4333. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4334. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wetmiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

666. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. George W. Freeman and other residents of Liverpool, N. Y., urging favorable consideration of the recommendations of the Sentinels of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

667. By Mr. MAAS: Concurrent resolution of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

668. Also, resolution of the council of the city of St. Paul, Minn., requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact, and the President to approve, legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing existing barriers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

669. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Maritime Association of the port of New York opposing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

670. Also, resolution of the Albany Chamber of Commerce, Albany, N. Y., opposing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

671. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California urging the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 84, or such other legislation as it deems suitable to accomplish the purpose of extending the benefits of marine hospital service to maritime fishermen, and the President of the United States is respectfully petitioned to approve such legislation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

672. By Mr. HARRINGTON: Petition of the Forty-ninth General Assembly, State of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the early consideration and passage of Senate file 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 1941

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast blessed us with a land fair and fertile among the nations: Grant us, we beseech Thee, so to dwell therein that her beauty may daily increase, and her bounty become a benison to all the world. Grant that our ideals and aspirations may be in accordance with Thy holy will, and that our words and deeds may further that same will. Give us a broader vision of our Nation, fair though she may be; a land of brotherhood in which all serve together as brethren; a land of justice wherein the weak need no protection save their weakness; a land of peace wherein order shall not rest upon force, but upon a common consecration to Thee, the Source of all love, justice, and peace.

More especially, we beseech Thee to grant to these Thy servants, into whose hand has been committed the destiny of our Nation, the faith and daring of the Kingdom of God, that they may neither faint nor falter in Thy holy warfare for freedom and the rights of men, that the whole world may become the Kingdom of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, April 3, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4239. An act to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States;

H. R. 4276. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

CONGRATULATIONS OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE TO VERMONT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, there is a kinship of spirit between the State of Texas and the State of Vermont which is expressed most graciously in the following manner: I read from a letter headed "The Senate of the State of Texas, Austin, April 1, 1941." The letter bears also the facsimile of the seal of the State of Texas and the return address, E. Harold Beck, District No. 1, Texarkana. It is addressed to me and reads:

The Honorable WARREN R. AUSTIN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith you will find a certified copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 35, which was unanimously passed by the senate and house of representatives, congratulating the State of Vermont upon the occasion of the celebration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of its admission to the Union.

I am,
Very truly yours,
E. HAROLD BECK.

The resolution referred to in the letter reads:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35
(By Beck)

Whereas 150 years ago, on the 4th day of March 1791, Vermont was admitted to the Union of States; and

Whereas prior to its admission it had for 14 years asserted its independence and exercised the prerogatives of a complete and self-sustaining sovereignty; and

Whereas Texas for almost 10 years prior to its admission as a State was similarly constituted as a republic and was in all respects an independent Commonwealth, as was Vermont; and

Whereas we are mindful of the genuine contribution that Vermont has made to the upbuilding and maintenance of the fundamental principles of government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That we extend congratulations to the Governor and the Legislature of Vermont and to the people of the State upon the occasion of the celebration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of its admission to the Union.

COKE R. STEVENSON,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 35 was adopted by the senate March 26, 1941.

[SEAL]
BOB BARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

HOMER LEONARD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 35 was adopted by the house of representatives March 26, 1941.

E. R. LINDLEY,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the resemblance in the gallant fight for liberty conducted by the pioneers of both Texas and Vermont is one of the causes of the cherished relationship between these States.

On behalf of the State of Vermont, I express concurrence in the fundamental principles expressed in this resolution, which I regard as absolutely necessary to keep government free, and I express sentiments of gratitude and of lasting friendship on the part of the State of Vermont for the State of Texas.

ARMY DAY PARADE

Mr. SHEPPARD. While under the proclamation of the President next Monday, April 7, will be Army Day, I am advised that the parade will be held tomorrow, Saturday afternoon. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD the Army Day proclamation issued by the President, and also a letter received by me from Edwin S. Bettelheim, Jr., adjutant general of the Military Order of the World War.

There being no objection, the proclamation and letter were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY DAY—1941

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session (50 Stat. 1108), provides:

"That April 6 of each year be recognized by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America as Army Day, and that the President of the United States be requested, as Commander in Chief, to order military units throughout the United States to assist civic bodies in appropriate celebration to such extent as he may deem advisable; to issue a proclamation each year declaring April 6 as Army Day, and in such proclamations to invite the Governors of the various States to issue Army Day proclamations: *Provided*, That in the event April 6 falls on Sunday, the following Monday shall be recognized as Army Day."

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, pursuant to the aforesaid concurrent resolution, do hereby declare Monday, April 7, 1941, as Army Day, and invite the Governors of the 48 States to issue Army Day proclamations; and, acting under the authority vested in me as Commander in Chief, I hereby order military units throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions to assist civic bodies, as far as may be practicable, in the appropriate observance of Army Day.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 7th day of March A. D. 1941, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-fifth.

[SEAL] FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President.

CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WAR,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1941.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with the Army Day resolution adopted by the Seventy-fifth Congress, President Roosevelt on March 7, 1941, issued a proclamation calling on the citizens of America to pay tribute to the United States Army.

On Saturday afternoon at 1:45 p. m. the annual Army Day parade will cross the Capitol Plaza, starting its march up Constitution Avenue, to culminate in passing in review before the Secretary of War at Sixteenth Street and Constitution Avenue.

Cordially yours,

EDWIN S. BETTELHEIM, Jr.,
Adjutant General.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

A joint letter from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War, the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, submitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, with an accompanying report on Foreign Trade Zone No. 1, for the year ended December 31, 1939; to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by a Senator, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Board of Aldermen, of Malden, Mass., approved by the mayor, favoring elimination of the provision limiting employment under the W. P. A. to a period of 18 months, and so forth; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Woodbury, N. J., and approved by the mayor, favoring that provision be made to provide suitable hospital facilities for veterans in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from D. McCartney and other citizens of Mount Lebanon, Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, providing for an advisory war referendum; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of sundry citizens, women of Grangeville, Idaho, praying that the United States keep out of foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Common Council of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution N

"Resolution requesting Congress to investigate conditions on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation and relieve needs existing there

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring):

"Whereas upon petition of the Sioux Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation, who testified at a joint hearing of the senate Indian affairs and house Federal relations committees that the general situation on the reservation is bad and that the ration system as used on their reservation has failed, and recommended that moneys appropriated by the United States Congress for rations be disbursed through State relief channels, as for white people, who take their grocery orders to the merchant, selecting from staple foods authorized, the legislature, by resolution House Concurrent Resolution G, authorized an investigation of the conditions existing in that area of the reservation lying within the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas a special joint committee visited Fort Yates, Cannonball, and Porcupine Subagency, examined witnesses, and personally saw the deplorable, wretched conditions under which these Indians are existing, and as shown by report and testimony on pages 235–238 of the Senate Journal for February 8, 1941, which report is incorporated herewith by reference thereto and hereto attached, and also by photographs of a few of the cases referred to in the committee report attached hereto and made a part of this resolution; and

"Whereas the report of this committee indicates that many of these unfortunate people live on food allowances of the value of $3.45 per month and families of four on a double ration, amounting to $6.90 per month, with perhaps occasional surplus commodities, inequitably distributed; green coffee, and no fruit, dairy products, nor milk for children; with only a very limited amount of dead cottonwood and willow timber and driftwood for fuel, burned in stoves not worthy of the name; wholly inadequate medical facilities; inability to contact the superintendent; school children with no other garments than one dress, a coat, stockings, and shoes; old women gathering their own wood; and many entire families huddled in poor, leaky tents, with no furniture and inadequate bedding, nearly freezing in subzero weather; and that many other intolerable conditions were found to be the rule and not the exception; and many of the most miserable tents and huts were within a stone's throw of the beautiful brick office and residential buildings of the agency at Fort Yates and the subagencies at Cannonball and Porcupine; and

"Whereas such living conditions are demoralizing to both the younger and older Indians, and it appears that this situation is not known to Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we respectfully request Congress to authorize an immediate and thorough investigation of the conditions that exist on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; and that adequate food, clothing, shelter, fuel, medicine, and other urgent needs be supplied at the earliest possible moment to these destitute, hungry, and homeless Indians and American citizens; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to Senator ELMER THOMAS and Representative WILL ROGERS, chairmen of the Senate and House Indian Affairs Committees; to Senators NYE and LANGER and Representatives BURDICK and ROBERTSON; and to the press."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate resolution introduced and adopted by the senate March 17, 1941

"Whereas for the purpose of preserving the cane-sugar refining industry in the State of New Jersey, and to protect the millions of consumers in the State of New Jersey from an artificial sugar scarcity and from exorbitantly high prices; and

"Whereas there is sufficient sugar on hand or in the nearby tropical islands to meet any demand that the consuming American public may make; and

"Whereas any change in the existing law that would grant to the highly subsidized beet-sugar industry additional millions of dollars to those already paid would further increase the burden on the American consumer: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Congress be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized, urged to oppose any change in the existing law that would add additional burdens on the already overburdened consumer, cause further unemployment in the State of New Jersey, or disrupt in any way our good-neighbor policy with South and Central America; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the present Congress from the State of New Jersey, and that they be urged to use their best efforts to accomplish the purpose of this resolution."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas the duly accredited representatives of the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada have now

consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence River and the improvement of the water route of the Great Lakes so as to permit the free passage of oceangoing ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and the heart of the Northwest and of the American Continent; and

"Whereas the Presidents of the United States for more than 20 years have committed themselves to the promotion of this great development, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal and as a vital necessity as a defense measure, and will now ask the Congress of the United States to ratify the agreement as made and provide funds for the completion of the work; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for more than 20 years has affirmed its continued support of this project, and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has consistently endeavored to bring about the realization of the hopes of the people of this State for this development; and

"Whereas we believe that the St. Lawrence project is a vital necessity for the development and stimulation of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, and has already been too long delayed, and that great economic advantages will result not only to Minnesota but to the Nation from the improvement of this natural avenue of commerce: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the house of representatives (the senate concurring) commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent, and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without delay, to approve and ratify the agreement already concluded with the Dominion of Canada, to provide the necessary funds for the work, and thus promote the speedy completion of this great project as a vital economic and defense necessity.

"That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Minnesota.

"Approved March 28, 1941.

"HAROLD E. STASSEN,
"*Governor of the State of Minnesota.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution to request the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America to adopt an act or joint resolution to include Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., as qualified under the Grandfather Certificate Act (Public, No. 706, 75th Cong., ch. 601, 3d sec., S. 3845, p 16, title 4; Economic Regulations for Air Carriers, sec. 401 (e) (1), Existing Air Carriers (2) (1) (f)).

"Whereas Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., maintained itineraries during the period called grandfather certificate, the line having begun on a fixed itinerary on April 21, 1938, having operated and flown during the number of months required in said act from May 14, 1938, to August 15, 1938, wherefore said corporation is qualified under the clauses of the Grandfather Certificate Act; and

"Whereas said Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., maintained its itinerary of twice a day on the routes from San Juan to Ponce and Mayaguez, twice a week from San Juan to Vieques, and three times a week from San Juan to St. Thomas and St. Croix, V. I., except when prevented by force majeure as is the case with any other company of this nature; and

"Whereas Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., was not duly notified by the Aeronautics Civil Board, as all other air-line or air-service enterprises with fixed itinerary were notified, sending them even last-minute telegrams requesting their acceptance under the clauses of Grandfather Certificate Act, thus making it unnecessary for them to make application for a certificate for convenience and necessity; and

"Whereas from April 21, 1938, to January 12, 1939, said corporation transported 12,037 passengers for pay with a record of no accident, one apparatus having flown 170,000 miles without having to make landings outside its bases; made approximately 3,500 descents and take-offs on water on the routes of the Grandfather Certificate Act; and at present covers said route with a Grumman amphibian of the latest model; and

"Whereas said corporation has carried correspondence without an air-mail contract, but with a special permit from the Post Office Department of the United States of America since April 23, 1938, having thus rendered a valuable service to the community showing the convenience and necessity for an air-mail route, which permit had been requested from the Post Office Department in Washington, D. C., since November 1937; and

"Whereas Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., has been the initiator and pioneer of commercial aviation in Puerto Rico, having the brothers, Narciso and Horacio Basso, directors of said enterprise, initiated the transportation of passengers by air between San Juan and other points of the island in 1932, and made other efforts which ended in the incorporation of said enterprise in 1936; and

"Whereas the principal objective of said enterprise has been, since its foundation, the development of commercial aviation in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, within the best standards of efficiency, safety, and rapidity; and

"Whereas said corporation from its beginning has kept the best and most modern air equipment, in spite of the high cost of same, and of being away from the continent; and in spite of not having had the financial support which a mail contract affords, and which contracts, under similar circumstances have been available to other enterprises in other parts; and

"Whereas said corpiration, from its beginning aroused the interest in commercial aviation of Puerto Ricans as well as of continental Americans from the United States living in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and its efforts ended later in another campaign whereby 500 persons in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Vieques bought stock of the new corporation; and

"Whereas Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., after having made thorough studies as to which would be the best air-line equipment suited to the topographic conditions in Puerto Rico, Vieques, and the Virgin Islands, and since no landing fields approved by the Civil Aeronautics Authority are available, it acquired a Grumman twin-motor amphibian, G–21A, the same kind as are used by air lines in various countries, and by the air forces of the Government of the United States. Said Grumman amphibian has a radio telephone equipment identical to the equipment used in air lines of the United States having all modern improvements, affording greater safety in aerial navigation, building a hangar of its own, and providing bases at each stopping place, and other appurtenances; and said type of Grumman amphibian clipper fulfills all the safety requirements of a modern air line as required by the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

"Whereas the type of amphibian used by Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., enables it to make use of its own bases, apart and independent from the military bases, wherefore said enterprise is not at the mercy of revocable permits but to contribute indirectly to the national defense, avoiding the transportation of passengers from military fields, and not making compulsory the construction of costly airports whose acceptance air-line regulations make so difficult, but affording facilities that may be used for service in case of a national emergency; and

"Whereas the service rendered by said enterprise, besides solving the problem of rapid and safe transportation in commercial, social, and other activities, it is of incalculable advantage in case of war, epidemics, cyclone, earthquake, or any other national emergency, it being able to make use of numerous bays, lakes, and rivers, besides being able to descend on land or water in any island of the Caribbean; and in this manner it can render numberless services of aerial transportation to the advantage of the community in general; and

"Whereas Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., has operated and made flights with cargo, passengers, and mail with the special permission of the Post Office Department from May 14, 1938, to August 15, 1938, having begun on April 21, 1938, the fixed itineraries from San Juan, Ponce, and Mayaguez; San Juan to Vieques, and San Juan to St. Thomas and to St. Croix, with a stop in Vieques on the way over, except such stops as provided in said law of interruptions, over which the applicant had no control, and rendered safe and efficient service with a seaplane of the latest type and with general safety without accident of any kind; that said Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., did not apply in due time for its certificate because it was never notified to that effect: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico*, To request from the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

"1. The adoption of an act or joint resolution including Aerovías Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc., as qualified under the Grandfather Certificate Act; and

"2. That a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States of America, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Postmaster General, the Director of the Division of Territories and Insular Possessions, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington, D. C., and the postmaster in San Juan, P. R."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, the Honorable President of the Senate, and the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Honorable Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fifteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the industry of fur sealing has been conducted in the Territory of Alaska, and particularly in the Pribilof Islands, by treaty between the United States Government, the Government of Japan, and the Government of Canada, whereby 70 percent of the net proceeds goes to the United States, 15 percent to Canada, and 15 percent to Japan; and

"Whereas during the fiscal year 1939, the catch of fur seals on the Pribilof Islands amounted to 60,473 pelts which were sold in the market at St. Louis, Mo. These pelts were sold at the following prices: Black, at

the May sale $16.13, and $18.61 at the October sale; Sasari Brown, at the May sale $17.18, and $19.07 at the October sale; Metra Brown, at the May sale and October sale, $34. During the same year, 244 white and blue fox furs were taken and disposed of; and

"Whereas the cost of treating and dyeing such furs is about $11 per pelt, or a total of $665,203; and

"Whereas it is the belief of your memorialist that the expenditure of this vast sum should be made in the Territory of Alaska, and that a tanning and dyeing establishment should be constructed, equipped, and maintained to handle this business in the Territory instead of shipping the pelts out: Now therefore

"We your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, fifteenth regular session assembled, do hereby petition the Representatives of the Government, mentioned above, to take the necessary steps to provide for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a fur-tanning and dyeing establishment in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"House Joint Memorial 12

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the Honorable President of the Senate and to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of Alaska, respectfully represents:

"Whereas on March 25, 1935, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, by Executive Order No. 905, promulgated regulations for the use of highways in Alaska and the operation of motor vehicles and section 2 of which required the payment of a toll on freight being transported over the Richardson Highway; and

"Whereas, pursuant to the said Executive order, toll as provided therein has been collected on freight crossing the McCarty Ferry on the Tanana River; and

"Whereas the result of such toll and its collection, under the conditions mentioned in the said Executive order, works an undue hardship upon the people of interior Alaska and particularly those residing or operating in the vicinity of Fairbanks, Alaska, by compelling them to pay a higher rate for their commodities than otherwise would be necessary; and

"Whereas the continuance of the collection of this toll, at the point mentioned, is discriminatory in that the only freight taxed in this way is that crossing the ferry, since no toll or tax is charged on any freight between Valdez and the said ferry; and

"Whereas the continuation of the policy of collecting tolls at this point permits the Alaska Railroad to charge and collect rates on freight handled between Tidewater and Fairbanks that are out of all proportion to what such freight rates should be if open competition were permitted by the use of the Richardson Highway; and

"Whereas the Fairbanks Building Trades Union, a representative body of residents of interior Alaska, with headquarters at Fairbanks, Alaska, has presented a resolution to the members of the legislature protesting against the condition that exists and particularly state:

"1. That the freight and passenger tariff charged by the Alaska Railroad between Seward and Fairbanks is abnormally excessive and unjust.

"2. That these rates retard the normal development of the interior of Alaska and cause unnecessary hardship to residents thereof.

"3. That such residents have protested against these excessive rates but without success.

"4. That the imposition of the toll on freight over the Richardson Highway has also been protested against.

"5. That the legislature appoint a joint committee to investigate the entire subject matter, both as to the management of the Alaska Railroad and the imposition of tolls over the Richardson Highway; and

"Whereas the members of the Alaska Territorial Legislature are well acquainted with the conditions protested against by the Fairbanks Building Trades Union and agree that the conditions protested against should be remedied by the reduction of freight and passenger rates over the Alaska Railroad and the revocation of Executive Order No. 905 so that the collection of tolls over the Richardson Highway be discontinued: Now therefore

"Your memorialist respectfully prays that appropriate action be taken by the officers of the United States Government to remedy the situation, as presented in this memorial.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 10

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress to set aside a suitable area for recreation purposes on the shore of Lake Tahoe, in the State of Nevada

"Whereas all the shore areas on the Nevada side of Lake Tahoe are being rapidly acquired by individuals who are using the same for commercial purposes; and

"Whereas there is only a small area of Government land available on the Nevada side of Lake Tahoe that can be acquired for recreational purposes; and

"Whereas the population of the State of Nevada in the western part thereof is rapidly growing, and the people feel that the natural beauty and scenery of the shores of Lake Tahoe ought to be used for the health and recreation of the people of the State of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to take the necessary steps to have set aside for health and recreational purposes, a suitable area upon the easterly side of Lake Tahoe in the State of Nevada, as recreational grounds for the public, to be placed under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, United States Forest Service; and be it further

"Resolved, That our Senators in Washington and our Representative in Congress be petitioned to use all honorable means to carry into effect the purposes and the intents of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and our Representative in Congress, that they may have evidence of the wishes of the people of the State of Nevada.

"STATE OF NEVADA EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

"Approved March 28, 1941.

"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor.*"

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 3, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 6. An act for the relief of Maude Wilcox;

S. 86. An act for the relief of Worth Gallaher;

S. 192. An act for the relief of the Johnson Flying Service, Inc.;

S. 245. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. E. Purtyman and Mrs. B. H. Russell;

S. 246. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Leyvas;

S. 247. An act for the relief of Hilda C. Allstrom;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Elmer Lindrud;

S. 283. An act for the relief of Rudolph Mundt;

S. 302. An act for the relief of Clayton W. Curtis;

S. 304. An act for the relief of the Missoula Mercantile Co.;

S. 307. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc.;

S. 417. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry H. Denhardt, deceased, of Bowling Green, Ky.;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten;

S. 430. An act for the relief of Addie Myers;

S. 431. An act for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey;

S. 433. An act to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees in respect of certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status;

S. 441. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

S. 527. An act for the relief of Ernest H. Steinberg;

S. 706. An act for the relief of Blanche W. Stout;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette;

S. 790. An act for the relief of M. Seller & Co.;

S. 791. An act for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley, Ernest H. Tarpley, and Pearl Tarpley;

S. 933. An act for the relief of John McAlister, Inc.; and

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1306. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to prescribe rules and regulations providing for the inclusion of defense features in Federal public buildings hereafter constructed; to the Commiteee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1307. A bill to authorize flood-control works on Tombigbee River and tributaries; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HERRING:

S. 1308. A bill for the relief of Harry Glaser and his brother William Glaser, to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1309. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for the purpose of exempting from the minimum-wages and maximum-hours provisions of such act employees of certain organizations having their capital investment mainly in property used in agricultural pursuits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4276. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 4239. An act to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States; and

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. VAN NUYS (for Mr. WHEELER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. WHEELER to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Under the heading "Weather Bureau," in the paragraph commencing with the words "Observations, warnings, and general weather service," strike out "$7,203,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,240,000."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER ON SALE OF WAR MATERIALS TO JAPAN

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the sale of war materials to Japan, delivered by him on March 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR BILBO AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day address delivered by him at Minneapolis, Minn., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN C. PAGE ON HYDRO POWER AND IRRIGATION

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on hydro power and irrigation, delivered by Hon. John C. Page, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, at the convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D. C., March 28, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM F. CULBERTSON AT INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE, HABANA, CUBA

[Mr DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "The Reign of Law," delivered by Hon. William F. Culbertson before the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association at Habana, Cuba, on March 26, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL BY JUDGE ALBERT W. JOHNSON ON THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Democracy—The Most Efficient Government in the World," written by Judge Albert W. Johnson, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 16, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPINIONS OF SUPREME COURT IN UNITED STATES *v.* THE COOPER CORPORATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *United States of America, petitioner,* v. *The Cooper Corporation et al.,* No. 484. October term, 1940, together with the dissenting opinion of Justices Black, Reed, and Douglas in the same case, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR., ON AVIATION

[Mr. WALLGREN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on April 2, 1941, relative to aviation, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVOLUTION—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Revolution Is On—Stop It Who Can," published in the New York Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

CATALOG OF PUBLICATIONS OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a catalog of publications of the T. N. E. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF VENEREAL DISEASE AND PROSTITUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President I feel that the Members of the Senate will rejoice with me in the announcement made yesterday by the Bureau of Public Health that the problem of venereal disease, with which we have struggled so long, is finally being controlled.

Upon this occasion I have the great pleasure of bringing to the attention of the Senate the outstanding record of the State of North Dakota. The militant fight against venereal diseases and prostitution began there on January 2, 1917, and has continued unceasingly and relentlessly ever since.

I believe much can be learned from what was accomplished there. At that time the State law provided for a State board of health of three members, consisting of the attorney general, the State health officer, and a licensed physician, with the attorney general serving as ex officio chairman. Ever since, every attorney general elected in the State has been wholeheartedly for the enforcement of the law. Now, after 20 years of active law enforcement, supported and reinforced by the work of the State health department, the National Bureau of Public Health, and assisted financially by the Rockefeller Foundation, we have the remarkable showing made recently when among 2,760 selectees for the Army examined prior to March 1, 1941, only 7 showed a positive blood test.

When it is considered that the average for the entire United States is 5 percent, and that 7 out of 2,760 is only one-fourth of 1 percent, we see a splendid testimonial to the work of the law-enforcement, public-health, medical, educational, and religious agencies of the State. Alvin Strutz, the present attorney general, and Dr. Maysil Williams, State health officer, working in cooperation with and under the direction of the Public Health Service here in Washington, have not even used all the money that is available; and today, in the Bank of North Dakota, there is a fund of $30,000 on hand for use in a continued fight to wipe out the one-fourth of 1 percent. Here we have direct refutation of those who maintain that bawdy houses are a necessity. The real fly in the ointment here is, of course, those who live off the profits of prostitution. In North Dakota prostitution is now relatively unknown.

The great work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Association, the various ministerial associations which cover the State like a network, the high general educational level of the people of the State, the cooperation of the medical and hospital people, and the splendid public-health educational program carried on by the State public health department, have made North Dakota a splendid object lesson in this field. It is my considered belief that legalized prostitution must be absolutely abolished on a national scale, and there is no reason why it cannot be done.

North Dakota was also one of the earliest States to adopt a law requiring premarital physical examinations. To make the law even more effective, it was amended in 1939 to provide for the filing of positive reports of premarital laboratory tests with the State board of health. This is a valuable aid in following up infectious cases. One of the special strengths of the law is the feature which provides that the only laboratory approved is the laboratory of the State department of health.

RECONCENTRATION OF COTTON, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 262) regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was, on page 4, after line 14, to insert:

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall repeal or set aside a provision of existing law requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to keep in storage not less than 300,000 bales in New England warehouses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the amendment originally offered in the House did not comply with the law on the subject, which authorized and directed the Commodity Credit Corporation to make not more than 300,000 bales of cotton available in New England. Instead of following the language of the original act, which was "not more than," the amendment said "not less than." So I will move to concur in the amendment of the House with an amendment, simply correcting it to conform to the law. I will say to the Senate that there is no objection by the author of the bill and of the amendment in the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama to the amendment of the House of Representatives will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend by striking out section 7 and, in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

Nothing in this act shall repeal or set aside the provision of existing law directing the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer to warehouses in or near cotton-manufacturing centers in New England, not to exceed 300,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House with the amendment just stated.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT OF 1937

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4146) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; and I submit a report (No. 169) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BONE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4146) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I join the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in offering an amendment which was submitted to the committee which considered the bill now before the Senate, designed to extend the so-called Guffey Coal Act for 2 more years. What the amendment seeks to do is to place the wholesale cooperative organizations dealing in coal on the same footing as wholesale coal dealers who do not operate on the cooperative principle. I ask that the amendment may be stated at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. The last paragraph of subsection (1) of part II of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"It shall not be an unfair method of competition or a violation of the code or any requirement of this act (1) to sell to or through any bona fide and legitimate farmers' cooperative organization duly organized under the laws of any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or the United States whether or not such organization grants rebates, discounts, patronage dividends, or other similar benefits to its members; (2) to sell to or through any bona fide and legitimate consumer cooperative organization which performs the functions of a distributor, as provided in subsection (h) of part II of this section, which are owned by bona fide and legitimate retail cooperative associations and which in turn are owned by household consumers of coal, whether or not such organization grants rebates, discounts, patronage dividends, or other similar benefits to its members; (3) to sell through any intervening agency to any such farmers' or consumer cooperative organization; or (4) to pay or allow to any such farmers' or consumer cooperative organization or to any such intervening agency any discount, commission, rebate, or dividend ordinarily paid or allowed, or permitted by the code to be paid or allowed, to other purchasers for purchases in wholesale or middleman quantities: *Provided*, That any discounts, commissions, rebates, or dividends paid or allowed to any such cooperative organizations, which perform the functions of distributors, shall be equal to the discounts or price allowances that may be made by code members to distributors, as provided in subsection (h) of part II of this section."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, when the original Guffey Coal Act was passed, it provided in subsection (i) of part II of section 4 special consideration so far as the farmers' cooperative organizations were concerned. As is well known to every Senator, it has been the policy of Congress and the Federal Government over a long period of years to offer assurances to farmers' cooperative organizations that they will not be discriminated against in legislation which has the effect of regulating ordinary commercial activities. Furthermore, as I mentioned yesterday in another connection, it has been the policy of Congress, through the Farm Credit Administration, to provide, in the Bank of Cooperatives, financing for farmers' cooperative organizations. What is sought to be accomplished by this amendment is to give to consumer wholesale cooperatives, or to consumer-and-producer wholesale cooperatives, the same discounts which are enjoyed by wholesalers generally in the distribution and sale of coal.

However, Mr. President, since the presentation of this amendment the House of Representatives has taken a 10-day recess. I am one of the original supporters of the Guffey Coal Act; and it has been urged upon me that if this amendment should be adopted, in view of the recess which has been taken by the House of Representatives, there might be a delay of such a nature as to jeopardize the legislative extension of the Guffey Coal Act, and if that should happen, under the law all the proceedings which have thus far taken place in the way of hearings and the issuance of regulations, as I understand, would have to be reinaugurated.

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I believe this amendment presents a perfectly legitimate request. It does not seek to confer any special benefits upon wholesale cooperatives engaged in the distribution of coal. What it seeks to do is to place them on an equality, and I am certain that the Congress never intended, and does not intend, to enact legislation which will act as a deterrent to the organization of cooperaive activities.

For my own part, I am convinced that the advancement of sound, legitimate cooperative activity in the economic field is one of the ways by which we can further buttress and strengthen the entire democratic process not only in the economic field but in the political field as well.

Realizing, as we all must, the challenge and difficulty which democracy now faces and will face in the future, I believe Congress should do everything in its power not to give special privileges and advantages to cooperative activities, but to remove any legislative discriminations which may inadvertently have crept into enactments by Congress.

Mr. President, I further have been informed that in all probability legislative action amending certain provisions of the Guffey Coal Act will probably be submitted at the present session of Congress. Therefore, while I do so with the greatest reluctance, in view of the legislative situation which confronts those of us who want to see the Guffey Coal Act extended, but who at the same time wish to see the cooperatives placed upon a fair basis of competition with other wholesalers in coal, I have come to the conclusion that I should not press the amendment at this time. But I shall reoffer the amendment as a separate bill; I shall hope that I may have the cooperation of the Committee on Interstate Commerce in further consideration of it; and I shall seize any legislative opportunity which may present itself in the form of substantive amendments to the Guffey Coal Act to press upon the Senate the consideration of what I believe to be a very important and a very fair effort to place the cooperative wholesalers on an equal competitive footing with the other wholesalers in the distribution of coal.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I will not press the amendment at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that mean the Senator is withdrawing his amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I shall withdraw the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not withdraw it immediately. This is the first time I have heard that it was to be withdrawn. I realize, the statement coming from the sponsors of the amendment, that it would be useless to try to have the amendment adopted; but I desire to make some remarks on it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall await the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska before withdrawing the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator had not indicated that he intended to withdraw it, I was about to make a brief statement concerning the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. If there is any reason to support what the Senator from Wisconsin has stated he intends to do, I should like to know about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I will claim the floor for a brief statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place, I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Wisconsin not only in offering his amendment but in the attitude which he takes toward it, in view of the circumstances.

The Bituminous Coal Act first passed by Congress was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The law was reenacted in an attempt to carry out the suggestions of the Supreme Court with respect to the regulation and the stabilization of the coal industry.

Going all the way back to the World War, the coal industry of this country for many years was in a chaotic condition. That grew in part out of the almost unprecedented increase in the development of coal mines as a result of the high prices received during the World War. The situation was the same as that which existed in many other industries, even in agriculture itself, and resulted in very bad conditions following the World War. It was impossible for the coal industry to engage in any sort of self-regulation which would eliminate cutthroat competition. As a result, coal

was being sold for less than it cost to mine it, wages of miners were low, and in many sections of the country the miners were unemployed; and where they were employed they obtained only about 1 day's work a week. In an effort to stabilize the coal industry and to see if it could not be put on its feet, the Coal Act was passed. As I stated, the first act was declared unconstitutional, and the present law was enacted later.

The Bituminous Coal Commission, in an effort to obtain facts upon which it might carry out the provisions of the law with respect to a price structure, held hearings, and issued a regulation fixing a price structure for bituminous coal. There were certain objections to the structure set up by the Commission, and the matter went to court. While the Supreme Court did not declare the act unconstitutional it held that the Bituminous Coal Commission had not held sufficient hearings and obtained sufficient information upon which to base a price structure which the Court could sustain. Therefore they nullified the act of the Coal Commission in fixing a price structure. Whereupon the Commission proceeded to hold hearing. and to make further investigation, and, in view of the Court's decision, they felt as if they had to hold long hearings and detailed hearings in order to ascertain all the facts necessary to sustain a price structure which the Commission might inaugurate.

Before the Commission took any action, the Reorganization Act was passed, and the President issued his order transferring the functions of the Bituminous Coal Commission to the Department of the Interior, and it has since been functioning as the Bituminous Coal Division of the Interior Department, the Commission as created by Congress having been abolished.

It was not until last October that the Bituminous Coal Division was able to set up what the law contemplated, a price structure for bituminous coal, and that has been in operation now for less than 6 months. The law will expire on the 26th day of this month, so that it is essential, in order that the efficacy of the law and its administration in the stabilization of the coal business shall have a fair trial, that the law be extended for not less than 2 years, as is provided in the bill before the Senate. I think it is obvious that it has not had a fair trial so far, and it has been impossible to gain the experience which might be a guide to the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department, or would have been a guide to the Commission if it had remained in existence. So in order that a longer period may be afforded in which to try out this legislation a 2-year extension is asked for.

If the measure which is now before us, which provides for a 2-year extension, is amended in any fashion it must go back to the other House, and the House cannot take it up and act upon it until the 14th or 15th of this month, which leaves only a few days in which to make the extension and also to obtain the appropriation necessary for the administration of the act so it will not lapse. So there is a time element, which, it seems to me, ought to militate against any amendment at this time.

On the merits of the La Follette amendment I do not wish to enter into any discussion particularly. The subcommittee, of which the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] was chairman, held hearings on this bill providing for a 2-year extension and reported it to the full committee with a favorable recommendation and without amendment. I think the subcommittee realized that such a proposal as that made by the La Follette amendment, which would bring a new element into the distribution of coal, should have more attention and more consideration than the subcommittee was able to give it at this time, because of the time limit to which I have referred.

The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin goes further than the present law. That part of his amendment which applies to farm cooperatives is already in the law. He would merely reenact the section in which the farm cooperatives are provided for, but extend it to consumer cooperatives in the cities and towns, where they do not now exist.

In addition to that, I think it should be stated that, whereas the law permits farm cooperatives, made up in good faith of farmers who are members of the cooperatives, to distribute coal to their own members, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin goes further than that with respect to consumers cooperatives, and permits them to distribute coal to the general public in competition with the existing agencies which are selling bituminous coal in various sections of the country. That brings a new element into the situation, and it is one to which I think a committee ought to give careful consideration, in order to determine whether merely because we have authorized farm cooperatives to receive rebates and benefits which may accrue to them for the benefit of their members only, we are to extend that theory to the cities, so as not only to permit formation of consumers' cooperatives to distribute coal among bona fide members, but permit the cooperatives to sell coal in competition with the private companies or private individuals who have built up their businesses in the communities and are engaged in the sale of coal to the public.

That is a new element which is not in the farm-cooperative situation, all of which emphasized, it seemed to the committee and the subcommittee, the necessity for further consideration of this matter before it could be recommended for passage.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator from Kentucky also point out that the measure continuing the act, as it comes to us from the House, sets up the office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel with somewhat broadened powers. I think that is a wise provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a result of various decisions and acts which resulted from the passage of the law the Consumers' Counsel was thrown out the window in some way, and we are reestablishing that office now in this measure. The House put that provision in the bill. The Consumers' Counsel, with all its duties, as contemplated in the original act, is reestablished as the office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel; so when this measure, providing for a 2-year extension, shall have been passed the office of the Consumers' Counsel will be recreated, and will have the duties to perform in behalf of the consuming public which were contemplated in the original act.

I think it is likely, though I cannot anticipate, that as the result of the experience gained by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Interior Department in the administration of this law, it may be necessary to amend it further. That is what the Senator from Wisconsin referred to. If that be so, the matter will have to come before the same committee which reported the pending legislation. The time element would not enter into the matter, in all likelihood, and the committee would be given opportunity to look into this phase of the question more fully than it has been able to do now.

Mr. President, for these reasons, sympathetic as I am with the cooperatives—and my record shows I have voted to encourage them and create them—sympathetic as I am with the cooperative theory and movement, I believe it would be a mistake, without further consideration, to put this amendment in the bill, which might result in the failure of the legislation providing the extension. I think it is a subject of sufficient importance to justify the Committee on Interstate Commerce giving it very careful and earnest consideration when and if legislation to amend the act is before that committee, or if no further legislation to amend the act is proposed, to consider it on its merits by itself.

That is the situation which I feel I ought to call to the attention of the Senate, and I hope that, under the circumstances, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will not be adopted, much as I appreciate his sincerity, and his generosity, and the attitude which he assumes toward the proposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator who offered the amendment feels that under the circumstances it ought to be withdrawn. I do not know whether there was any possibility of the amendment being agreed to even if it had been discussed and acted upon on its merits, but since an understanding seems to have been reached, it would, of course, be useless to reoffer the amendment. I realize that any Senator could do so, but all the psychology would be against it, and it perhaps would be a useless expenditure of time.

Mr. President, the reason for the withdrawal of the amendment was not because anything is wrong with it or that it is not just and fair, but it is said the parliamentary situation is such that the proposed legislation could not be enacted prior to the time the Coal Commission law would expire by limitation of time.

I understand it will expire on the 25th day of April at midnight. The parliamentary situation comes about because the other House could not consider the matter until after the 15th, when the House will reconvene for business.

Mr. President, this is not the first time such parliamentary conditions have been used to defeat what I believe to be good legislation. It is not the first time those interested in extending laws have waited until the eve of expiration and then said, "You must take it just as we give it to you or havoc will result when this law expires on a certain date." It is stated that the House, having taken a recess, will not be able to pass on the matter until it reconvenes. That is true. But if the House wanted to take the matter up it would have 10 days in which to do it. We know how expeditious the House can be when it wants to be. We all know it would not take the House more than an hour, if it felt inclined to consider the amendment, to dispose of it.

Mr. President, I was one of the supporters of the original Guffey Coal Act. I supported it both times it came before the Senate. I supported the measure which was declared unconstitutional, and also supported the measure which was passed to remedy the defect which the Supreme Court found in the law. I think it was necessary legislation.

The bituminous coal industry had been sick for a good many years. We all realized that. We realized that something had to be done. The Guffey Coal Act was the response of Congress in the effort to do that something. I think it was passed in the best of faith; and while I have been very greatly disappointed in its operation in some respects, on the whole I think it has performed a very useful service.

Even if I could do so—and I realize that I could not even if I would—I would not take any action or do anything that would disrupt it or cause it to go out of existence and make it necessary to pass it again, and reestablish the rules and regulations. But I do not believe it is now necessary for us to take cognizance of that danger. When the House reconvenes on the 14th of the present month and is ready for business, if it should fail to act we could at any time recall the bill, and if we should amend it today, take out the amendment. It seems to me we ought not to back out of that dilemma now and say that the House will have only 10 days, and will not get around to the bill within 10 days.

In the first place, I realize that the time may be short, but it is not short for the House. The House does not have unlimited debate, as does the Senate. Under its rules the House can stop a filibuster before it gets fairly started, if it so desires. It does so whenever it wishes. I do not say that in criticism, but in commendation of the way the House can do business when it so desires. It does not seem to me to be fair to the people who would be affected by the proposed amendment to say, "We will now let it go over, without making a struggle, even though we may have a fair chance of winning." We know from our experience that when technical considerations succeed in defeating action by the Congress in connection with some important law, the proposal is done for at the time.

I do not expect to see the Guffey Coal Act amended if the proposed action is taken. I hope it may be; but from our experience I think it can safely be said that if we abandon this effort, we shall probably not have another opportunity to amend the law so that consumers' cooperatives may receive the benefit of the law.

Mr. President, I may be consuming the time of the Senate in a useless effort, but I should very much regret the action which is proposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I omitted to state a while ago that the House Committee on Ways and Means, in which this proposed legislation originated, and which it must originate because of the tax, has already appointed a subcommittee to consider amendments to the act; and I am sure that subcommittee will proceed promptly to consider not only this matter, but others.

Mr. NORRIS. If some other method of amending the act can be found, it certainly will not hurt me if it is done in that way. I have no pride. I am not originating anything. If the House is ready to give us this amendment when it rains, I have no objection to waiting until it rains to get it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not finding fault with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say further that the parliamentary situation which brings the time element into play is not a matter for which the Senate is responsible. The bill did not pass the House until the 27th of March, a week ago.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, the House adjourned.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill came over here, and the subcommittee felt that it ought to hear witnesses who did not object to the extension, but who were interested in some amendments. A hearing was held for 2 or 3 days, but the subcommittee did not feel that it had obtained sufficient information to enable it to pass on the amendments which were being considered.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not questioning the good faith of the committee or of the subcommittee. They may be entirely correct. But, Mr. President, I saw the cooperative movement start in its infancy before I came to Congress. I remember when it first originated in my own State. Before I had studied it I did not think much of it. But I saw it operate, and I studied it further when the Congress later took it up.

We have been studying the cooperative movement ever since I have been in Congress. We sent a committee to Europe to study it there. Many Senators and Members of the House went to Europe to study it on the ground in Denmark, Sweden, and Ireland, not particularly as to coal, but as to other necessaries of life. The others of us, who were not honored by being appointed on the committee, and who did not have money enough to go over there and study it on the ground, have read what those wise men who did go have said. They have said a great deal. There is much wisdom in what they have said.

The advantages of the cooperative movement are now fairly well understood. It is not a new subject. The law as it now stands permits farmers' cooperatives to receive the benefits of the law, but its benefits are not extended to consumers' cooperatives. Why should not consumers have the same right to the benefits of the law as have the farmers? What is wrong about cooperatives among consumers? The most modern governments in the world have passed laws permitting them to operate without hindrance. In the cooperative movement America is behind the civilized world, or was until the beginning of the present disruptive World War. The operations of the cooperative movement have not brought injury to anybody. I have seen the cooperative movement gradually grow from nothing until it has now reached enormous proportions in some respects in the United States.

If I had known that the amendment was to be withdrawn, I should have tried to prepare myself with some evidence on the colossal proportions of cooperation in the United States today, and what wonderful things it has accomplished in the way of savings to its members without injury to anybody else.

I hope the Senator from Kentucky is correct in his statement that the House of Representatives is anxious to study cooperation and has a committee ready to consider it. It seems to me that that committee might consider the proposed amendment, and in 10 days be ready to decide what it wants to do. If they decide that they cannot approve the amendment, we can withdraw it rather than to have the operations of the Guffey Coal Act suspended or annihilated. It seems to me, Mr. President, that it would be a great disappointment now to have to abandon the prospect, which I thought was rather bright, of changing the bill in this one respect.

Other amendments have been proposed. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, evidently this amendment was not considered in the House. To my mind, this amendment is more important than any amendment proposed in the House. I think the House has done well to restore the provision for a consumers' counsel. When the Guffey Coal Act was first passed the public got a great deal of information as a result of the stand taken by the consumers' counsel upon the various activities of the Commission. He went out of office after he had stood there, it seemed to me, like a stone wall, and fought for the interests of the consumers of bituminous coal, of whom there are millions.

The Consumers' Counsel to whom I refer was Mr. John Carson, whom most of the Senators know. He was formerly the secretary to the late Senator Couzens, whom all of us knew. I thought Mr. Carson was doing an exemplary fine job. Perhaps when this bill is passed it will provide for another consumers' counsel, but it will not be John Carson. I am satisfied that one wish of those who have

opposed this law all the time will be gained by this extension; namely, that they will get rid of the consumers' counsel who called the attention of the public to some of what I thought were vicious things, and prevented them from being done.

Some of the poorest people, who can ill afford to pay the high prices they must pay for coal—a necessity of life in almost every section of this country—will be injured, and are being injured now, because consumers' cooperatives cannot operate under this law. I think consumers' cooperatives are just as important as are farmers' cooperatives. No reason has been given that I have ever heard why they are not as important, and why they should not get the benefit of cooperation among themselves, as well as any other organization or class of citizens.

The farmers' cooperatives cannot sell to anybody but their own members. This amendment would extend that prohibition; but why should they not do so? What would be thought of us if we should say to independent operators, coal dealers, having a right to do certain things in the coal industry, "You cannot sell to cooperative members"? Yet that is what we say when we apply the present law to cooperative members: "You cannot sell to anybody but your own members."

Why should they not sell to anybody? There is no intention on the part of cooperatives to discriminate against anyone. In fact, nondiscrimination is one of the foundations of cooperation. Those who fear it feared the first cooperative organization that was ever organized. I presume they were honest in their fears, but their fears disappeared and were dissipated. Many years ago, when the farmers of my State undertook to organize cooperative elevator companies, and there was a bitter fight against it, and, as I said awhile ago, I had not studied the matter to any great extent, I thought the cooperators were wrong about it; and when they first started they had to travel their tedious way to the Supreme Court in order to get an elevator. The railroad companies would not recognize them, would not give them an elevator siding; and they got it only after a struggle in which the matter was taken to the supreme court of the State. They were not admitted to boards of trade. They were ostracized, and in many respects they had to get the rights to which they were entitled one by one, through the long and tedious process of going up to the Supreme Court to get them. It was expensive. It cost the farmers a great many dollars to win their fight; but, so far as that cooperation went, they won it, and it has not hurt anyone. It has been beneficial to everyone, unless someone in a particular locality had a monopoly of the coal business and, taking advantage of that fact, was charging exorbitant prices. It benefited not only their members but everyone else.

That is what would happen under the amendment, in my judgment. I look with a great deal of favor upon the amendment of this law in the respect in which the proposed amendment would amend it. I confess that it seems discouraging and very disappointing that we have to let the opportunity pass by and let the peculiar parliamentary situation deprive millions of our citizens of a benefit to which, it seems to me, they are honestly and justly entitled.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I inquire if the amendment has been withdrawn?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been withdrawn.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I supported the amendment in the committee. It appeared in the committee that what the cooperatives asked for was the privilege of getting the same benefit of the law as that accorded the wholesaler in the purchase of coal from the producer. A private corporation engaged in the wholesale selling of coal, under the rulings of the Coal Commission, is allowed to add to the price a certain amount or to get a reduction in price, whichever the case may be, in order to pay the expense of the wholesale transaction. The cooperatives ask to have their central agency, which is also a buyer, accorded the same privilege that is given the private corporation wholesaler. That was the gist of the contention. Of course, there was objection by coal dealers and other powerful interests that it would enable the cooperatives to enjoy the same advantage through their agency the wholesale cooperative, in dealing with the coal producer as a private corporation in the wholesale business now enjoys.

As I have said, I supported the amendment in the committee, and I would support it now. However, there was some contention whether or not a bona fide cooperative could sell to anyone but its members. There was objection to cooperatives selling to anyone not a member. I shall not argue that point; I shall not take the time of the Senate on that; but I wish to say something on the bill pending before the Senate. I voted against it when it passed the Senate 2 years ago, because I anticipated what the effect would be on the interior of the country, and my anticipation and fears have been fulfilled. Because the price of coal at the mine is based upon the cost to the mine plus the rail rate to its destination, those in the interior are deprived of the benefits of water transportation on the rivers.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit, not a question really, but an observation on that point? I forgot it entirely when I had the floor a few moments ago.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. I had a conversation a little over a week ago probably with Mr. Childe, of Omaha. Many Senators know him. He has a national reputation as a transportation expert, and what I am now saying is said with him as authority. I only had a few minutes with him when he had to take his train, and I could not go into detail with him, but he promised me that when he reached home he would write me a letter and call my attention to some things which I ought to have known, which I think are in the record already but which had either escaped my mind or I never did know about them. The Senator's remark just made me think of it.

What he said was that under the operation of the law the Commission fix for the coal the price the purchaser has to pay the operator, but if he intends to ship the coal by water, a cheap method of transportation, he is charged enough more so that it would be cheaper for him to ship it by rail; and that there was no way around it. Is that the Senator's idea?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am not sure that they charge more than by rail. I have not any substantiating facts, so far as I am concerned, to make that statement, but I know they fix the price at the mine plus the rate by rail, and, as a result, the coal coming by the millions of tons into the Midwest territory, including approximately 14 or 16 States, costs, depending on the various kinds of coal, from 40 cents to $1.60 a ton more than it would if they were allowed to take advantage of the river rates, which are now becoming available because we have finished the 9-foot channel on the Mississippi River.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him there?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. We have gone to enormous expense, millions of dollars——

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. To make the rivers of our country navigable. The reason we did it was to give cheap rates to the consumer.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. The fact is that in the case of coal we cannot get the benefit of those reduced rates, because the charge equals the amount of the rail freight. The advantage of the rail freight over water freight, of course, is that the rail freight is a little quicker; that is the only advantage; and a man would naturally ship over the railroads if other conditions were equal.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator has anticipated a part of the statement I had intended to make. However, coal does not require rapid transport. Winter coal can be hauled all summer.

Now, let me call attention to the fact that, as the Senator said, we spent several hundred million dollars to develop the waterways; we wanted them developed for several reasons, principally to get competitive water rates by the rivers in order to meet the monopoly prices on the Great Lakes in the transportation of commodities, particularly coal to Duluth, which is a monopoly. The rates on the Great Lakes for the freight carried by boats of the large steamship corporations, and large coal companies have not been based on the same principle as have the rates on the rivers which were to furnish a competitive avenue of traffic. There has been very grave discrimination in granting relief by the Commission. The Northern States Power Co., the greatest public utility in Minnesota, has been granted relief, and the relief has been granted because——

Mr. NORRIS. Because they are a monopoly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And because their plant is on the river bank and therefore

they were told that they could be given relief. There are 16 municipal plants in Minnesota in some of the larger cities outside St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth that cannot get that rate because they are not on the water. There are other private utilities that produce electricity that cannot get it because they are not on the water. These utilities, both municipal and private, which sell electricity and power to farmers' cooperative companies, are barred from getting the benefit of the lower transportation and cost for coal used in producing electricity.

Now the Commission says if they can show that before the present law was passed they were beneficiaries of water transportation they can come in with a petition and ask to have that benefit continued. There was very little water transportation up until last year because there was not any channel. So, comparatively few, if any—I do not know of any—could say that they had any material amount of coal shipped in by water, for water navigation was very hazardous; it was intermittent because of lack of water; and, therefore, there are very few who, under the theory of the grandfather clause, can claim the right of which they were deprived on the ground that they had been receiving this benefit and this relief before the act went into effect. This is ridiculous. The waterways were developed for the benefit of those who had not had the benefit of water transportation. Now they are told they cannot have it for coal because they did not have it before this law was passed. But the man who wants to avail himself of it now, and wholesale dealers and consumers, cannot get it in competition with Northern States Power unless each consumer comes in and states his case, so the Commission says.

These hearings are very expensive. They consume a great deal of time and very few corporations are powerful enough to afford them. The farmers cannot come; they cannot afford it. Only the large, financially strong corporations can hire attorneys and come to Washington and attend the hearings. The Commission gave relief to the Northern States Power Co. They also gave relief to the University of Minnesota for their heating plant. They also gave relief to the Stillwater State Prison; but their plant is not on the water. They have to truck the coal away; but the Commission gave them relief. But all these other two and one-half million persons, so far as my State is concerned, have had no relief and no benefit of water transportation under this ruling. Each individual consumer must come down here and put in his application and present his case, and then the Commission decides whether or not he shall have relief. So there is no equality in the price of coal.

I have mentioned three instances in which the Commission has granted relief.

We are sympathetic with those who mine coal and those who are in the coal business, and we should like to see them make a living wage. We should like to see them prosper; but we do not like to have it done by blackjacking us to pay more for coal than we would have to pay if we had the benefit of the Government expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars to develop water transportation. It has resulted in discrimination between consumers. I dare say that the increased cost of the great amount of coal that is shipped into that midwestern territory can hardly be estimated. Our freight rates have been so high that consumers and farmers have been suffering for something like 20 years, not only up there but also down through the South; and I am protesting the passage of this bill, as I protested the passage of the original measure.

The condition I have described has also had the effect of driving coal out of the market in favor of substitutes in the form of oil and gas. While at the present time, when the so-called defense-production program is in effect, I presume the coal industry will have an upswing in production; up until the time this program went into effect the coal industry was going down in production. Coal has been driven off the sea. The railroads are using oil. Private individuals in homes are finding it cheaper and more convenient to use oil and gas.

I realize that the condition in the Congress at the present time is such that it is useless to offer an amendment. An amendment that would be of any benefit or give any relief to the people of the interior of the country would have to be so drastic that it would nullify the act. The political and financial forces who favor it have overwhelming support for it. They have the votes. Therefore, I shall content myself with voting against the extension of the Bituminous Coal Commission Price-Fixing Act.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish the Senator would help straighten me out on the last point he has been establishing here.

Last spring, I think, about a year ago, the Senator had some friends here who showed us a moving picture in the District Committee room and undertook to display to us photographs of a channel—I think a 9-foot channel—from St. Louis to the Twin Cities, and a series of dams which had been built at a cost, as I recall, of about $124,000,000.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. One hundred and sixty million dollars.

Mr. DANAHER. One hundred and sixty million dollars; and I think the lesson was also brought home to us that several thousand freight-car loads of coal were in fact shipped by that channel into Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Does not the advantage of that water transportation accrue to the people of Minnesota in respect of the coal movement at all, in any fashion?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. So far as we are now situated, we do not derive the benefit we should because of this law. A certain grade of coal is shipped in by one company, and some little coal is shipped in by the Federal Barge Line. There has been a reduction in the price of coal; but since this ruling went into effect the Senator can see that there is small advantage in shipping by water. There may be an advantage for the purpose of loading and unloading, because so much more coal can be hauled at one time by water than by rail that there are some persons who are in the business and competing. There are two companies that I know of on the upper Mississippi; one is a private company and the other is the Federal Barge Line; but I know that before the effect of this ruling became apparent, after the 9-foot channel was finished last year, there were millions of dollars ready to go into transportation on the river with barges and tows that are not now being invested. The prospective investors are afraid to go in, because if they cannot buy coal at the mine on a basis of equality with other purchasers in different parts of the country, and have to transport it, and then have to pay the rail rate whether they ship by water or not, the Senator can see that that would hamper the development of the business of bringing in coal by water. There is some coal coming in, but it is very little compared to the total amount we use.

Mr. DANAHER. I was just thinking in retrospect of the moving picture I had witnessed, and the story we were told at that time that thousands and thousands of carloads of coal were being shipped by water. It seems to me, from what the Senator now says, either that we ought not to be shipping by water at all, and therefore we ought to have saved the $125,000,000 which has been expended for building the 9-foot channel all the way up the Mississippi to the Twin Cities, or we ought to get the benefit of it; one or the other.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, that picture was taken 2 years ago, or before this act went into effect.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am talking about the effect that we see it is having and is going to have in the future, even on this year's coal prices. It seems a strange situation, when we loan money to farm cooperative electric companies, that we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to develop waterways so that, if we are permitted to do so, we can go by water from the headwaters of the Mississippi down to the Ohio and as far east as Pittsburgh; we can go into all those coal areas; we can go down to the Illinois River and up the Illinois River; we can go to Chicago; we can go to New Orleans; we can go down to the Tennessee River and up to Memphis, and soon we shall be able to go up to the coal fields of Knoxville; but under this law, for all practical purposes, these waterways will not do us much good so far as coal is concerned. This is a law to blackjack the farmer and other consumers in the Mississippi Valley for the benefit of the coal industry.

The Commission's attitude, and that of those who favor this bill, is that it is necessary to put the coal industry in a strait jacket and lock it in the situation in which it now finds itself. I should be very willing, and I have asked the Commission if they could suggest some other method of stabilizing the coal industry for the benefit of labor and the producer. We are not antagonistic to

the industry or to labor, but we do not want the benefits to be taken out of us by compelling us to pay the rail rate on coal which we can ship by water.

That is the reason why I shall again vote against the extension of this act. Hearings were held for two days. No farmers appeared to fight for cheaper coal. No officer or representative of any farm organization appeared to defend cheap coal for the farmers. Powerful financial interests filled the committee room with their representatives. This bill will pass. I was opposed to it before. I am opposed to it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BILBO in the chair). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4146) was passed.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

DESECRATION AND MUTILATION OF THE UNITED STATES FLAG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 218) to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the act of February 8, 1917 (39 Stat. 900, U. S. C., title 4, sec. 3), be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That any person who (1) in any manner, for exhibition or display, shall place or cause to be placed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, drawing, or any advertisement of any nature upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America; or (2) shall expose or cause to be exposed to public view any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign upon which shall have been printed, painted, or otherwise placed, or to which shall be attached, appended, affixed, or annexed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, or drawing, or any advertisement of any nature; or (3) shall manufacture, sell, expose for sale or to public view or give away or have in possession for sale or to be given away or for use for any purpose, any article or substance being an article or thing for carrying or transporting merchandise, upon which shall have been printed, painted, attached, or otherwise placed a representation of any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, to advertise, call attention to, decorate, mark, or distinguish the article or substance on which so placed; or (4) shall publicly mutilate, deface, defile, or defy, trample upon, or cast contempt, either by word or act, upon any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court. The words 'flag, standard, colors, or ensign,' as used herein, shall include any flag, standard, colors, ensign, or any picture or representation of either, or of any part or parts of either, made of any substance or represented on any substance, of any size evidently purporting to be either of said flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America or a picture or a representation of either, upon which shall be shown the colors, the stars, and the stripes, in any number of either thereof, or of any part or parts of either, by which the average person seeing the same without deliberation may believe the same to represent the flag, colors, standard, or ensign of the United States of America.

"SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts of Congress in conflict with the provisions of this act be and the same are hereby repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ANDREWS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to recur to Calendar No. 139, and have the vote by which the bill was passed reconsidered, as there is a clarifying amendment I should like to offer. I ask that the votes by which the bill ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDREWS. I now ask that the vote by which the amendment of the committee was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 and the quotation marks in line 6. On page 3 it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks in lines 17 and 19.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment striking out lines 3, 4, and 5, on page 2, is to prevent the proposed act from being confused with the act of 1917, having reference to the District of Columbia. I dare say many who have not looked into the matter will be surprised to find there is no national law at present prohibiting the use of our national flag for commercial purposes or its mutilation or desecration. There is no national law on that subject except the act of 1917, which applies only to the District of Columbia. The bill now proposed would apply to the whole United States and the Territories. There are 48 different State laws in the United States on this subject now in force in the various States. That leads to confusion; and inasmuch as the United States flag is our national emblem, it seems to me we should have a national law protecting it.

I move that the amendments I have offered be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida to the amendment of the committee.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Re.. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 935) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to commodity loans and marketing quotas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVERTIBLE DOOR MANUFACTURING CO.

The bill (S. 1091) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that Calendar No. 167, House bill 3860, is an identical bill. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3860) for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co., which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1091 will be indefinitely postponed.

REDEMPTION OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE BONDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1090) to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whereas in effecting the distribution and redemption of adjusted-service bonds in the years 1936 and 1937, as authorized by the act of January 27, 1936, chapter 32, as amended by the act of June 3, 1936 (ch. 482, 49 Stat. 1099, 1936; 38 U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. V, secs. 686-688b), certain misdeliveries and erroneous payments were made, due for the most part to circumstances beyond their control, by certain postmasters and postal employees designated at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury to perform such fiscal agency service pursuant to the provisions of said act of June 3, 1936, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Treasurer of the United States, and the Postmaster General are authorized, in those cases where it shall be jointly determined by the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury that such misdeliveries and erroneous payments occurred without negligence upon the part of the

postmaster or postal employee charged with the error, to relieve them of such charges. There are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effect the relief hereby granted, not to exceed, however, the aggregate sum of $3,000.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this is a legislative bill, and on page 2 I find the phrase "there are hereby appropriated." It seems to me that should be amended so that the bill would contain the customary clause that "there are hereby authorized to be appropriated." Therefore I move that after the word "hereby" in line 11, there be added the words "authorized to be."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 11, after the word "hereby", it is proposed to insert the words "authorized to be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL STEELE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1166) for the relief of Daniel Steele, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "waived", to strike out "in the case of Daniel Steele, of Flint, Mich.; and, in the administration of such act, as amended and supplemented, any present disability of the said Daniel Steele shall be held and considered to be directly attributable to a traumatic injury sustained by him on September 30, 1935, while in the performance of his duties in the course of his employment in the Works Progress Administration. The United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim heretofore filed, or which may be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, by or on behalf of the said Daniel Steele for compensation on account of such disability", and to insert "and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, if filed within 6 months after the approval of this act, the claim of Daniel Steele, of Flint, Mich., for disability allegedly directly attributable to an alleged injury to his eye incurred by him on September 30, 1935, while in the performance of his duties in the course of his employment in the Works Progress Administration, and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended and supplemented, are hereby waived, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, if filed within 6 months after the approval of this act, the claim of Daniel Steele, of Flint, Mich., for disability allegedly directly attributable to an alleged injury to his eye incurred by him on September 30, 1935, while in the performance of his duties in the course of his employment in the Works Progress Administration, and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. W. CARLTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 755) for the relief of W. W. Carlton, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,250" and insert "$300", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. W. Carlton, of Columbia, Tenn., the sum of $300, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of the car which he was driving having been struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck operated by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps near Waynesboro, Tenn., on February 2, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JULIA NEVILLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1190) for the relief of Julia Neville, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$300"; on line 7, after the word "injuries", to strike out "together with medical and hospital expenses incident thereto", and to insert a proviso at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Julia Neville the sum of $300 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, as a result of a collision of an automobile, which Julia Neville was operating, with a United States Army truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps on United States Highway No. 91, about 1 mile north of Kanosh, Utah, on June 23, 1939, said collision being due entirely to the negligence of the driver of said truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY TO ASIATIC PETROLEUM CO.

The bill (S. 166) to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant to the Asiatic Petroleum Co. (Philippine Islands), Ltd., its successors and/or assigns, an easement for rights-of-way for oil and/or gasoline pipe lines, and appurtenant ramp for rolling drums, over, across, in, and upon the Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.: *Provided*, That such easement shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same shall be in the public interest of the United States in the property affected thereby: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such easement may be annulled and forfeited by the Secretary of War if the property is needed for governmental purposes or for failure to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant hereunder, or for nonuse or for abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof: *And provided further*, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY TO STANDARD-VACUUM OIL CO.

The bill (S. 167) to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. R., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant to the Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., its successors and/or assigns, an easement for rights-of-way for oil and/or gasoline pipe lines over, across, in, and upon the Camp Wallace Military Reservation, Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That such easement shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same will be in the public interest of the United States in the property affected thereby: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such easement may be annulled and forfeited by the Secretary of War if the property is needed for governmental purposes or for failure to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant hereunder, or for nonuse or for abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof: *And provided further*, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 658) authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War was announced as next in order.

Mr. GERRY. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NATIONAL CEMETERY NEAR PORTLAND, OREG.

The bill (S. 793) to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 165) to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HILL. I am not the author of the bill, and I ask that it go over temporarily.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that it go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN FORT MISSOULA MILITARY RESERVATION, MONT.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 198) to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain land located within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation, Mont., for certain land owned by the Missoula Chamber of Commerce of Missoula, Mont., which had been reported from the Commitee on Military affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and directed"; in line 4, after the word "conditions", to insert "covenants, reservations, and exceptions"; and on page 3, line 5, after "seven-tenths", to insert the word "feet", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to transfer, subject to such conditions, covenants, reservations, and exceptions as he shall prescribe, to the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, of Missoula, Mont., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land, described in subsection (a) of this act, located within the boundaries of the Fort Missoula Military Reservation, Mont., in exchange for title to certain land, described in subsection (b) of this act, from the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, of Missoula, Mont.

(a) The following-described land, located in section 31 township 13 north, range 19 west, Montana principal meridian, containing ninety-one and fifty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less: Beginning at a point on the south section line of section 31, township 13 north, range 19 west, fifty-nine and eight-tenths feet east of the south quarter corner of said section 31; said section line also being a part of the third standard parallel north of the Montana principal meridian; thence north fifty-one degrees ten minutes east a distance of one thousand nine hundred seventy-six and nine-tenths feet; thence north fifty-seven degrees forty-three minutes west a distance of one thousand eight hundred fifty and three-tenths feet; thence south thirty-one degrees thirty minutes west a distance of six hundred sixty-two and nine-tenths feet; thence south seventy-seven degrees forty-six minutes west a distance of one thousand seventy-five and seven-tenths feet; thence south thirty-six degrees fourteen minutes west a distance of four hundred ninety and eight-tenths feet; thence south thirty-eight degrees nine minutes east a distance of two hundred ninety-six and eight-tenths feet; thence south twenty-eight degrees eighteen minutes east a distance of four hundred fifteen and three-tenths feet; thence south sixty-six degrees twenty-four minutes east a distance of two hundred ninety and one-tenth feet; thence south fifty-four degrees twenty minutes east a distance of two hundred sixty-four and seven-tenths feet; thence south thirty-three degrees seventeen minutes east a distance of two hundred eleven and one-tenth feet; thence east along south section line of said section 31, township 13 north, range 19 west, a distance of seven hundred forty-four and one-tenth feet to the point of beginning.

(b) The following-described land, containing four hundred acres, more or less: The west half of the northeast quarter and the west half of section 8, township 12 north, range 20 west, Montana principal meridian.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

The bill (S. 1200) to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work", approved April 24, 1939, is amended by striking out "$300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$555,000."

WIDOW OF ARTIS J. CHITTY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 991) for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who reported the bill on behalf of the Committee on Claims, does not seem to be on the floor at the moment. I am particularly interested in the bill because of the fact that the late Artis J. Chitty, a United States marshal, was a resident of my home city, and was murdered in the performance of his duties. I introduced the bill giving his widow $10,000. I had hoped that the committee would report the bill favorably with the original amount contained in it. I am not especially familiar with the course this particular type of legislation takes in the Senate committee, but it seems to me that $5,000 is rather a small sum to pay to the widow of a man who was beaten to death while he was performing his duties as a law-enforcement officer.

I have no desire to delay the consideration of the bill. I had hoped, as I said, that the committee would report the bill containing the full amount of $10,000. I do not know whether any member of the Committee on Claims is present in the Senate at this moment. If there is, I should like to know what the usual practice is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Claims, but I will say that there has grown up a sort of custom or rule in the House and Senate Committees on Claims, I think, that in situations such as this $5,000 is the maximum amount allowed. Whether that is just in every case may be open to question, but it has been rather the custom.

Mr. BONE. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have been advised by friends of mine in the House that it is the common practice there in circumstances of this kind to allow $5,000, and not to exceed that amount.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is the rule.

Mr. BONE. I wondered whether any rule had grown up in the Senate parallel to that in the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. The custom is not regarded so rigidly in the Senate, but it has almost attained the force of law. The rule in the House is that the maximum allowed is $5,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may suggest that if the Senate should reject the amendment of the committee, the award would be $10,000, and then if it be the fact that the House has a rule of limitation of $5,000, it is possible the House would apply the rule. The Senator, however, would have the opportunity of requesting what is so frequently done with other amendments, having the matter worked out in conference. I therefore suggest that the Senator consider asking Senators present to reject the committee amendment.

Mr. BONE. That has been my purpose. It is a small bill, but it can be considered by the conferees. If the House has established that sort of rule by common consent, and will not agree to the larger amount, I would have to abide by its decision. But I would ask my friends to be generous with me in this regard. The man who was murdered was one of my best friends. He was brutally murdered in the performance of his duties.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I understand the Senator to say he was a United States district attorney?

Mr. BONE. He was a United States marshal. He had charge of two notorious bank robbers who were being tried for bank robbery, and while he was in the performance of his duties and had them in charge they assaulted him and literally beat him to death. He died within a few minutes. These bank robbers were subsequently convicted of murder and given life imprisonment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 7.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, at the end of the bill, to add a proviso, as follows:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the widow of Artis J. Chitty, late a United States marshal for the western district of the State of Washington, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States on account of the death of her husband, who was murdered on August 22, 1940, in the State of Washington while in the performance of his duty as a United States marshal: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

OIL AND GAS LEASES ON CERTAIN LANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 178) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after "southeast" where it first appears, to strike out the word "quarter" and insert in lieu thereof the word "quarter" and a comma; and on page 2, line 8, after "1918", to insert "and shall inure to the benefit of all parties having contracts with the lessees or operators under such placer-mining claims as their interests may appear", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue leases under the provisions of section 19 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, except as otherwise provided in this act, covering lands within the area in Niobrara County, Wyo., described as follows:

Southwest quarter section 25; south half section 26; southeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter section 27; east half section 34; north half and southeast quarter section 35, all the foregoing in township 36 north, range 65 west, of the sixth principal meridian, and west half northeast quarter section 28, township 36 north, range 64 west, of the sixth principal meridian.

Such leases shall be issued to the respective oil and gas operators in possession of lands within the area described above on and prior to January 1, 1940, under placer-mining claims initiated prior to October 16, 1918, and shall inure to the benefit of all parties having contracts with the lessees or operators under such placer-mining claims as their interests may appear. Each lease shall be dated as of January 1, 1940, and shall be for a term of 10 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. Each lease shall reserve as royalty to the United States 12½ percent of all the oil and gas produced except oil or gas used for production purposes or unavoidably lost. No lease shall issue unless (1) an application for lease be made within 6 months from the effective date of this act; (2) the application covers all of the lands in the possession of the applicant within the area described above; (3) the applicant shows aggregate expenditures prior to January 1, 1940, by the applicant and his predecessors in interest of not less than $10,000 on or for the benefit of each claim upon which the application is based; and (4) the applicant shall pay to the United States as royalty 4 cents per barrel for all oil and one-fourth cent per thousand cubic feet for all gas produced from the claim prior to January 1, 1940, except oil or gas used for production purposes or unavoidably lost.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF REFUGE LANDS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 850) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase refuge lands within the State of South Carolina for the perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey and to provide pure-blood brood stock for restocking within its native range, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 2, line 9, after the word "therewith", to strike out "to" and insert "in", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, gift, or lease, or, subject to the provisions of sections 302, 303, and 304 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 381), by exchange, approximately 30,000 acres of privately owned or State- or county-owned land, including improvements thereon, rights-of-way, and easements connected therewith, in the State of South Carolina, or such part thereof as he may determine to be necessary and best suited as a national wildlife refuge primarily for the protection and perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey, and to construct, operate, and maintain thereon such structures and other improvements as he may deem necessary for the appropriate development of the area for such purposes: *Provided*, That public domain and Federal lands within or contiguous to the areas acquired hereunder and not otherwise specifically reserved are also hereby authorized to be administered as part of said refuge if found by the Secretary to be suitable for the purpose.

SEC. 2. That the lands acquired in accordance with the provisions of this act shall constitute the national wild-turkey refuge and shall be maintained as a refuge and breeding place for wild animals and birds under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe from time to time for the administration of wildlife refuges: *Provided*, That upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine to be for the best interests of the Government, including sale in the open market, and under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, he may permit such selective cutting and lumbering operations as are not inconsistent with the well-being and effective management of wild turkeys on said refuge: *Provided further*, That in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies, or with associations, clubs, organizations, or individuals, he may distribute, sell in open market or otherwise, or exchange surplus wild turkeys from said refuge for stocking, restocking, or propagating purposes, and may accept funds and other aids and enter into agreements with landowners in the development of the program authorized by this act for the perpetuation and restoration of wild turkeys, including such original or cooperative research in the problems of wild-turkey management as may be necessary to efficient expansion and promotion of the program herein authorized: *And provided further*, That out of any money received by the Secretary of Agriculture from the grant, sale, or disposition of any timber, wild animals, wild birds, or other products or privileges in connection with the administration of this refuge, or as a bonus upon the exchange of such animals, birds, products, or privileges, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay any necessary expenses incurred in connection with and for the purpose of effecting the removal, grant, disposition, sale, or exchange of such animals, birds, products, or privileges; and after such deductions from gross receipts, the Secretary of the Treasury shall distribute 25 percent of the net receipts of such refuge during each fiscal year to the county or counties in which the refuge is located, proportional to its area in each county, to be expended for such purposes as the county authorities or the State legislature by appropriate legislation may direct, and deposit the remaining 75 percent in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. That the acquisition of such land by the United States shall in no case be defeated because of rights-of-way, easements, and reservations, which from their nature will in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture in no manner interfere with the use of the lands so encumbered for the purposes of this act; but such rights-of-way, easements, and reservations, retained by the grantor or lessor from whom the United States receives title under this act, shall be subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the occupation, use, operation, protection, and administration of such land as a refuge for wildlife; and it shall be expressed in the deed or lease that the use, occupation, and operation of such rights-of-way, easements, and reservations shall be subordinate to and subject to such rules and regulations as are set out in such deed or lease or, if deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture, to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by him from time to time.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture may do all things and make all expenditures necessary to secure the safe title in the United States to the land that may be acquired under this act, including purchase of options or leases when deemed necessary, and expenses incident to the location, examination, and survey of such areas, and the acquisition of title thereto, and, except in the case of a lease, no payment for such land shall be made by the United States until title thereto is satisfactory to the Attorney General.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such expenditures for construction, equipment, maintenance, repairs, and improvements, including necessary investigations, and expenditures for personal services and office expenses at the seat of government and elsewhere, and to employ such means as may be necessary to execute the functions imposed upon him by this act and as may be provided for by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 6. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000 to provide for the location, selection, and inauguration of this project, including surveying,

optioning, and supervision of the lands involved, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such further sums as the Secretary of Agriculture may estimate and the Congress shall appropriate from time to time for the acquisition, establishment, operation, and maintenance of said refuge and to effectuate the provisions of this act; and any money appropriated hereunder for land acquisition and expenses incident thereto, including the initial appropriation hereunder, shall remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING OF CERTAIN COTTON FROM NORMAL CHANNELS OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

The bill (S. 1250) to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce cotton of the 1940 and previous crops which is owned by the Government or which is pledged as security for Government loans, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not sure whether the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] desires to have this measure considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have been approached by representatives of those producing other crops of which there is a surplus. It is very essential for the trade to know whether these vast holdings are to be flooded into the channels of trade, to the detriment of current crops. As the cotton in question is already paid for, and it will not be necessary to ask for any appropriation, and as bills are now pending looking to increasing loans on these crops, which will also increase the hold-over, I thought it would be well if we could assure the trade that this cotton would not be turned into the channels of trade. That would have a very beneficial effect on the current prices and lessen the need for appropriations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have not committed myself to the philosophy which is involved in the proposed legislation, but I have received numerous letters, telegrams, and telephonic communications from producers of corn and other crops who have made loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation, and who would like to have the same benefits conferred upon them. I do not care to discuss the matter particularly today.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the bill had better go over until we can get more complete knowledge of what is involved. While I am on my feet I wish to say I have been informed that grain, such as corn and wheat, held over an indefinite period will deteriorate, whereas cotton, if kept away from fire and water, is just as good a century afterward as it is the day it was picked.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, permit me to say a final word. I wish to say for the benefit of the able Senator from South Carolina, who is tremendously interested in all farm problems, that this bill should be considered in the light of the bill introduced by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], which was placed on the calendar a few days ago. That bill proposes to increase commodity loans to a state of parity. Whether it pertains particularly to free cotton, I do not know. Probably it pertains to cotton on which there is a loan. I think the Senator from South Carolina realizes that we must study these two bills together before we make up our minds as to the legislation we want to offer the cotton maker.

Mr. SMITH. I have agreed that the bill go over, but I think it will appeal to every Senator that it is necessary to remove the menace of this almost infinite surplus. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS IN CONNECTION WITH SUPPLY CONTRACTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1059) to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after "793", to strike out "shall not apply to any contract", and insert "may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be waived with respect to contracts"; and on the same page, line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "contract" and insert "contracts", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be waived with respect to contracts for the manufacturing, producing, furnishing, construction, alteration, repair, processing, or assembling of aircraft, munitions, matériel, or supplies of any kind or nature for the Army, regardless of the terms of such contracts as to payment or title: *Provided*, That, as to contracts of a nature which, at the date of the passage of this act, would have been subject to the provisions of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), the Secretary of War may require performance and payment bonds as provided by said act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the bill merely provides that in the discretion of the Secretary of War bond may be waived in connection with contracts for the completion of orders for supplies. As the bill was originally drawn, waiver of the requirement for bonds would have been permanent, but the committee felt that that should not be done, and that the contracts should be considered in the light of the ability of contractors to live up to them, and that the decision as to whether bonds should be demanded should be left with the Secretary.

I must say further that the need for this proposed legislation came about as the result of the ruling made by the General Accounting Office, which made it necessary to apply to purchases of small supplies the rule which was laid down in regard to performance bonds in connection with great public works. That put a burden upon the War Department which makes it extremely difficult and costly to the Government in case bonds are demanded. After having three separate hearings upon the bill the committee decided to report it. I think it should be passed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. As I understand the Miller Act, it is designed to protect the Government on contracts of the very type contemplated to be executed under the terms of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not the very type. The Miller Act refers to public works, such as bridges, roads, and other great building projects with respect to which, of course, a performance bond is necessary. The General Accounting Office ruled that if small supplies are manufactured, they are public works in the sense that the supplies are being manufactured for the public; but they are not public works in the sense or spirit of the Miller Act. The Miller Act applies to bridges, buildings, roads, and things of that type.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. On page 2 of the report the statement is made that:

The Comptroller General and the Attorney General have ruled that contracts for supplies which contain provisions for partial payments to be made as the work progresses are contracts "for public work of the United States" within the meaning of the above act, since title to the work in progress passes to the Government upon the making of such payments.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is the point I have been trying to make. That ruling made it necessary for the War Department, in buying such supplies as shoelaces, socks, and undershirts, to demand of each of the manufacturers a performance bond. If I may speak rather lightly about these things, the result was almost a bond racket, because no one expected regular manufacturers who are continually making and delivering goods to be put to the inconvenience of furnishing bonds, or that the Government would be put to the great expense involved in paying for the bonds.

Mr. DANAHER. Did the Secretary of War ask for the proposed legislation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The bill was submitted by the Secretary of War. The Assistant Secretary of War appeared at one of the hearings. The War Department has explained the matter to the committee time and time again. The committee became very cautious about the bill, because it seemed as though we were waiving what is a good business practice, and we did not want to do that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the bill as amended by the committee confers upon the Secretary power to exercise his discretion with respect to each individual procurement. The bond may be waived when it is perfectly ridiculous to take the time to procure a bond. Practice shows that sometimes a month or more is required to procure a bond for a very minor transaction. To say nothing of the

money cost, the red tape and delay which are involved interfere so greatly with national-defense orders for supplies such as those spoken of by the Senator from Utah that the committee thought this was a wise relief from an interpretation with which many of us did not agree. The members of the committee did not think that the interpretation applied to contracts for such supplies as shoelaces was correct. We thought that to call such a thing a public work would be stretching the Miller Act beyond its original intent. Many of us strove very vigorously for the adoption of the principle in the Miller Act, and are much in favor of preserving it.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank both Senators who have undertaken to explain this matter to me. Let me say, however, that many of us did not know that the calendar was to be called today and have had no previous opportunity to check the bills on the calendar, either to understand them, analyze them, or seek the background for them. Therefore, it has taken a little more time for some of us to understand these matters. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senators who have borne with me.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am very glad the Senator from Connecticut brought up the point, because the Senator from Utah and the Senator from West Virginia, who does not happen to be present, were responsible for a long series of questions put to the War Department with regard to the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1059) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah subsequently said:

Mr. President, in connection with Calendar No. 173, Senate bill 1059, a statement explaining the measure was prepared. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in the RECORD following the remarks I made explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO S. 1059

Section 1a of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), commonly known as the Miller Act, provides that "before any contract, exceeding $2,000 in amount, for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work" is awarded, the contractor shall furnish a performance bond for the protection of the United States, in an amount satisfactory to the contracting officer, and a payment bond, for the protection of persons supplying labor and material in the prosecution of the work, with sureties satisfactory to the contracting officer and in an amount specified in the statute. It is customary to require performance bonds in an amount at least equal to 10 percent of the contract price. Payment bonds must by statute be in penal amount equal to 50 percent of the cost of the work in contracts below $1,000,000; 40 percent for contracts from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000, and in penal amount of at least $2,500,000 in larger contracts. From the phraseology, "public building or public work" of the act, it would appear that the requirement for these bonds was intended to relate only to contracts for buildings, river and harbor improvements, camps, cantonments, and such other real estate projects, or the alteration or repair thereof.

In construing the act of August 1, 1892, known as the Heard Act, the predecessor of the Miller Act, the Supreme Court of the United States, in 1910, held that a boat was a public work and that whether a work is "public" or not does not depend upon its being attached to the soil, but, if it belongs to the representatives of the public, it is a "public work." Following that reasoning, the Attorney General of the United States, in 1932, expressed the opinion that work on a vessel owned by the United States was a public work within the meaning of the act. Again in 1936, the Attorney General ruled that contracts exceeding $2,000 in amount, for the alteration or repair of United States Coast Guard vessels, boats, and aircraft, since the property belongs to the United States, were contracts for public work. He further stated that contracts for the construction of such craft which provide for the passing of title to the United States during the progress of the work as partial payments are made are within the meaning of the term "any public work." Extending the analogy, he held the same year that a contract for making cotton mattresses from materials owned by the Government was public work.

It was but a step further for the Comptroller General to find that any Army contracts for supplies which provide for partial payments as the work progresses are contracts for public work, since title passes to the Government when the first partial payment is made, requiring performance and payment bonds under the Miller Act. By this reasoning, all sorts of contracts involving partial payments for supplying aircraft, machine guns, tanks, clothing, neckties, shoe laces, and other articles, must be classified as contracts for public works, making it incumbent upon the contractor, no matter what his financial strength may be, or whether the bonds are deemed to be necessary for the protection of the United States, or of laborers and materialmen, to furnish the performance and payment bonds specified by the Miller Act. The decisions of the Supreme Court, the Attorney General, and the Comptroller General are binding upon the War Department, and compliance therewith is mandatory. The same reasoning did not apply to Navy contracts since they only take a legal lien (under a statute passed in 1911) instead of title when partial payments are made.

Believing that Congress originally intended that the Heard Act and later the Miller Act should apply only to construction contracts, the War Department has submitted to the Congress a draft of legislation designed to clarify the meaning and application of the Miller Act to make it inapplicable to supply contracts for the Army. The proposed legislation was embodied in S. 1059, the present bill, as originally introduced. It was the view of the committee, however, that to center responsibility it would be better to permit the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to waive the requirements of the Miller Act as to bonds, so that the bill was amended and reported in its present form. The proposed act does not affect construction contracts.

NECESSITY FOR SUCH LEGISLATION

The national-defense program, calling for almost unheard-of quantities of material and equipment for the men entering the military service by voluntary enlistment and by induction under the Selective Service Act, the manufacture and construction of aircraft, munitions, tanks, guns, and supplies of every sort, has taxed the industrial resources of the United States to such an extent that private capital is unable to finance to completion thousands of supply contracts, many of them running into forty or fifty millions of dollars each. Increased facilities must first be constructed, new machinery purchased, and countless new employees engaged. The contractor then finds his resources expended and must seek additional financing of his Government supply contracts on a scale never before encountered. To meet this situation the Government has provided for advance payments, when necessary, at the beginning of the contract, and partial payments as the work progresses, to simplify private financing.

As a result, however, of the interpretation given the Miller Act, an inconsistent situation has grown up. If by the terms of a contract 100 airplanes are paid for on completion of the contract, no Miller Act bond is required. If 100 airplanes are paid for as each airplane is delivered, no Miller Act bond is required. If the contract is let on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, no Miller Act bond is required. If, however, partial payments are made on a lump-sum contract to help the contractor finance the work in progress prior to its delivery, Miller Act bonds must be supplied. This mandatory requirement for performance and payment bonds where partial payments are made to help finance the work in progress has resulted in serious difficulties and delays in the financing and progress of the defense program.

The final execution and approval of a number of large aircraft contracts has been delayed from 2 to 5 months because of the inability of certain companies to obtain Miller Act bonds.

In some cases as many as 13 or more bonding companies have had to be called upon to provide a single bond, necessitating sending it from place to place for signature. In other cases the Government waited while the surety company made a long financial investigation and extracted the last ounce of security from the contractor's free assets. In some cases the contract had to be rewritten on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis or with partial payments eliminated so that bonds could be waived. In one case a contract for $13,115,138.13 for furnishing 341 airplanes was executed September 14, 1940. It was not possible for the contractor, a reliable but tremendously expanded corporation, to furnish the necessary bonds. The bond requirement was finally removed in February 1941 by eliminating the partial payments provided by the contract, resulting in a delay of 5 months before a complete contract could be obtained. With the elimination of partial payments, financing to a total of $6,000,000 was needed to finance this contract to the delivery stage.

In another instance, involving an original contract and a change order for 3,000 airplanes, at a total cost of $34,717,082.50, a delay of 6 months occurred before a legal contract could be finally approved, and it was necessary to eliminate partial payments by appropriate change order because no bonds could be furnished. Such examples might be multiplied many times.

The other side of the picture involves difficulties that have occurred when bonds have been furnished.

In many instances surety companies, claiming to be financing institutions within the meaning of the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940 (Public, No. 811, 76th Cong.), are requiring contractors to give them assignments of all rights under supply contracts on which bonds are given. If a bank loan is necessary to enable the contractor to finance his work and an assignment to the bank is contemplated, the fact that the bonding company claims a priority hampers bank financing. Although the Judge Advocate General of the Army has ruled that bonding companies are not financing institutions within the meaning of the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, nevertheless many banks are reluctant to make defense loans in the face of prospective litigation with a surety company. In this situation, the Government

supply contractor meets practically insurmountable obstacles in getting private financing.

Other surety companies are demanding from contractors indemnity for the bonds written by them and are requiring the deposit of collateral security or the giving of mortgages or other liens on the contractor's plant and equipment. This practically strips the contractor of available bankable security when a loan is necessary to finance operations under the contract.

The use of partial payments, because of the necessity for giving performance and payment bonds under the Miller Act, has been practically discontinued by the War Department as a means of financing Ordnance contracts and some Air Corps contracts. Frequently, if partial payments are not used, the contractor must have financing up to 50 or 60 percent of the amount of his contract prior to receiving payments from the Government for articles completed. Banks hesitate to make loans in such amounts. Advance payments under existing law are authorized only up to 30 percent of the amount of the contract. If the Government makes an advance of 30 percent, the banks necessarily feel that they are not required to make loans to take up 50 or 60 percent, because their claims are subordinate to the advance payment. These are practical difficulties experienced in financing contracts for carrying out the defense program.

In endeavoring to solve the difficulties in obtaining bonds for large Air Corps contracts, reduction in the penalties of performance bonds to 5 percent of the total contract price was attempted by the War Department. This resulted in refusal by the surety companies to give performance bonds to small contractors because the business was not considered sufficiently profitable or attractive. This situation compelled the Air Corps contracting officers to the penal amount of the performance bonds at the dictation of the surety companies.

Surety companies have, in some instances, required agreements from contractors to the effect that no more contracts will be undertaken until the ones on which bonds already have been written are completed. In one case a surety company refused to write additional bonds until an existing contract was completed, with the result that the contractor was too late to bid on pending invitations and lost the opportunity to undertake additional defense work. Necessarily, this resulted in retarding and delaying procurement under the national-defense program. How many other instances of this kind actually exist is not known, but they are constantly being mentioned orally to contracting officers. Written complaints are stated by an Air Corps report to be relatively few for fear of black list.

The original purpose of the Miller Act was to protect laborers and materialmen with respect to Government construction projects, since no mechanics' or materialmen's liens attach because of Government ownership. Ordinarily lien protection does not exist and is not needed with respect to contracts for supplies, as distinguished from construction, between private individuals in the business world. Necessarily, the producer or manufacturer must pay his laborers weekly or at least twice monthly. It is the last claim he fails to pay. The individual labor claim, therefore, if any, is small in event of bankruptcy and has a priority there. There seems to be little logic in requiring payment bonds for laborers employed by contractors with the Government, when such laborers are protected by the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act as to wages, hours of labor, and methods and times of payment.

Likewise, materials usually are sold on a 30- to 60-day basis, cash on delivery, or only after satisfactory assurance of sound credit standing on the part of the purchaser. Materialmen can protect themselves and are better protected by adequate financing of the contractor insuring performance of the contract than by bonds. With respect to performance bonds for the protection of the United States, it may be said that the Government is its own insurer in other matters, and there is little likelihood of substantial loss in connection with the furnishing of supplies payable on the installment plan, since the payments do not exceed work successfully nearing completion.

The need for legislation such as S. 1059 is considered by the War Department to be urgently needed at this time in order properly to expedite the national-defense program under the new appropriation acts. The bill as reported would permit the Secretary of War to require performance and payment bonds in any case of supply contracts where he deems them to be necessary. The War Department requires performance bonds in many cases where that requirement is not mandatory by law, and S. 1059 as reported would permit the same practice with respect to the bonds that would be authorized to be waived thereunder when the interests of the Government so require.

TRANSFER OF LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION TO CITY OF BILOXI, MISS.

The bill (H. R. 538) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF SONS OF CERTAIN SOLDIERS, ETC., TO MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to Calendar No. 162, Senate bill 658, which was passed over on the call of the calendar. Unfortunately, I was called out of the Chamber when the bill was reached on the calendar, and objection was interposed to its consideration. I have talked to the Senator who interposed the objection, and he has agreed to withdraw it. I ask that the bill be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill 658 at this time?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 658) authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of the act of June 8, 1926, entitled "An act to establish a department of economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., and to amend chapter 174 of the act of Congress of April 19, 1910, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes'" (44 Stat. 704), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the number of cadets now authorized by law at the United States Military Academy, and the number of midshipmen now authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy, are each hereby increased by 40 from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, including members of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active service by the War Department or Navy Department, who were killed in action or have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated in line of duty during the World War: *Provided*, That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of death shall be final and conclusive and shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

CONTINUATION IN SERVICE OF ENLISTED MEN BEYOND THE TERM OF THEIR ENLISTMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] asked a question about Calendar No. 164, Senate bill 165, and asked that the bill go over. I have since talked with the Senator from Connecticut, and I think he has no objection to the bill. If that be the case, I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 165) to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment, those suffering from service-connected disease or injury, and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That hereafter any enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States in the active service, whose term of enlistment shall expire while he is suffering disease or injury incident to service and not due to misconduct, and who is in need of medical care or hospitalization, may, with his consent, be retained in such service beyond the expiration of his term of enlistment, and any such enlisted man shall be entitled to receive at Government expense medical care or hospitalization and his pay and allowances (including expense money authorized by law and credit for longevity) until he shall have recovered to such extent as would enable him to meet the physical requirements for reenlistment, or until it shall have been ascertained by competent authority of the service concerned that the disease or injury is of a character that recovery to such an extent would be impossible, whichever is earlier: *Provided*, That any enlisted man whose enlistment is extended as provided therein shall be subject to forfeiture in the same manner and to the same extent as if his term of enlistment had not expired, and nothing contained in this act shall prevent any enlisted man of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, from being held in the service without his consent under, respectively, the provisions of the one hundred and seventh article of war, the act of August 29, 1916, as amended (40 Stat. 717), and section 1, subsection (a), of the act of May 26, 1906, as amended (50 Stat. 547).

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STUDIES OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR REPORTING

The resolution (S. Res. 72) submitted by Mr. OVERTON on February 13, 1941, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time for making report to the Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 299, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the United States Maritime Commission, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and the Maritime Labor Board of their studies of workmen's compensation with a view to its applicability to seamen is hereby extended from February 15, 1941, to July 1, 1941.

GRADING AND CLASSIFICATION OF CLERKS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The bill (S. 1123) to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 26 (d) of the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended by the act of April 24, 1939, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

"(d) When any Foreign Service officer has reached the age of 65 years and rendered at least 15 years of service he shall be retired on an annuity computed as prescribed in paragraph (e) of this section: *Provided*, That any Foreign Service officer who has reached the age of 50 years and rendered at least 30 years of service may, in the discretion of the Secretary of State, be retired on an annuity computed as prescribed under paragraph (e) of this section; or if any Foreign Service officer has reached the age of 50 years and has rendered at least 15 but less than 30 years of actual service, exclusive of extra-service credit as provided in paragraph (k) of this section, he may, at the instance of the Secretary of State, be retired on an annuity based on such actual period of service: *And provided further*, That the President may in his discretion retain any Foreign Service officer on active duty for such period prior to his reaching 70 years of age as he may deem for the interests of the United States."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month following the expiration of 60 days from the date of its approval by the President.

TRANSPORTATION OF MATERIALS TO LEASED NAVAL AND AIR BASES

The bill (S. 768) to amend the Neutrality Act of 1939 to permit the transportation by American vessels of articles and materials to certain naval and air bases leased by the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials to any port in the Western Hemisphere, if such transportation is in connection with or necessary for the construction, maintenance, or operation of naval or air bases in the Western Hemisphere which are acquired or leased by the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the calendar.

REDECORATION OF THE SENATE CHAMBER, ETC.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 91, which I submitted on March 24, 1941, now lies on the table. I should like to have it considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by title.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

A resolution authorizing a study of the lighting systems of the Senate Chamber, and the Senate Office Building, and of the redecoration of the Senate Chamber.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator whether the resolution should not be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds rather than to have it taken up without consideration by any committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. As a matter of fact, the resolution was submitted to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. This seems the best way to reach the subject, because if the resolution should be referred to the committee and they reported it back, naturally we would be the ones who would consider it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to say for the information of the Senator from Florida that at the last meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the resolution was discussed, and a subcommittee was appointed to look into the very matters mentioned by the Senator and to make a report.

Mr. ANDREWS. Either I was not present at the time the subcommittee was appointed or I had forgotten that one had been appointed.

Mr. GREEN. It has already been appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida withdraw his request for the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ANDREWS. I withdraw the request.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senate goes into executive session I desire to make a brief observation. We have completed the legislative calendar so far as it is necessary to do so at this time, and when we have completed the business of the day it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next. From Monday the Senate will be asked to adjourn until Thursday, and from Thursday to the following Monday.

The Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill has gone over for discussion until Monday, April 14. However, there was no agreement that it would be taken up on that day; it simply went over, not to be taken up before that. In view of the fact that Monday, April 14, is the day following Easter, and that it is probable that many Members of the Senate will be away, I think it fair to advise the Members of the Senate that, barring some unforeseen emergency, no business will be transacted until Tuesday, April 15; so that Senators are free to disport themselves as they may see fit between now and the 15th day of this month.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. BULOW, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON NATURE PROTECTION AND WILDLIFE PRESERVATION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on the calendar is Executive C (77th Cong., 1st sess.), the Inter-American Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, signed on the part of the United States of America at Washington, on October 12, 1940, and reported favorably without amendment or reservation and with a printed report (Executive Report No. 5, 77th Cong., 1st sess.).

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has just indicated to me that he desires to have this matter go over, unless there is some emergency regarding it.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. MCNARY. I have just communicated to the Senator from Kentucky the fact that I should like to have the convention go over until the day when the Senate will resume its regular sessions, week after next. I may state to the Senator from Rhode Island that two Members of the Senate made request to that effect, and I am speaking for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BILBO in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island withdraw his request?

Mr. GREEN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island withdraws the request. The convention will go over.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—HOWELL CONE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report favorably the nomination of Mr. Howell Cone, of Georgia, to be collector of customs at the port of Savannah, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination. This is a

reappointment of an officer who has been in the service for 7 or 8 years, and there is no objection by either of the Senators from Georgia; in fact, the appointment is expressly approved by both the Georgia Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted to another matter. What is the request?

Mr. GEORGE. I have made a favorable report on the nomination of Mr. Howell Cone to be collector of customs at Savannah, Ga., and I have asked for immediate consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howell Cone to be collector of customs for customs-collection district No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters reported favorably today be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that all nominations which have been approved by the Senate be forwarded immediately to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 7, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 4, 1941:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Howell Cone to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Arthur Poteete, Perryville.

KANSAS

Thelma L. Harris, Americus.

OKLAHOMA

William H. Balentine, Tahlequah.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Harold W. Grace, Scotland.

TEXAS

Servando Cabellero, Benavides.
George J. Atkins, Bonham.
Claude Thompson, Breckenridge.
Oscar A. Truelove, Malakoff.
John Granville Hearn, Marble Falls.
Kate Shaw, Rhome.

WEST VIRGINIA

Carl E. Sage, Anawalt.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1941

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, who, of Thy tender love, hast sent Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to take upon Him our flesh and to suffer death upon the cross that all mankind should follow the example of His great humility: Grant to us, whose forefathers founded this Nation on sound principles of liberty, equality, and justice, a rededication to the cause of liberty for all the human race and a new zeal for Thy Holy Word. Teach us to fight and not to heed the wounds, to toil and not to seek for rest, to give and not to count the cost, to labor and not to seek for any reward save that of knowing that we do Thy will. So shall we learn to follow the example of His patience as we rebuild to Thy glory a world broken, torn, and crucified. Grant this, O Heavenly Father, in the name of Him who died and rose again for us, Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 4, 1941, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President may have the power to sign bills and resolutions during the recess or adjournment following today's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIFFORD K. BERRYMAN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr President, one of the most famous and best-loved cartoonists of America recently celebrated his seventy-second birthday. For 44 years he has drawn and published cartoons of men and women in American life, and has yet to offend anyone who has been the subject of his pungent but kindly drawings. To the contrary, he has gained esteem, prestige, and friends not only for himself but for the newspapers for which he has worked. As a token of the affection and respect in which he is universally held, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a poem inscribed to Clifford K. Berryman, by one of his colleagues.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO CLIFFORD K. BERRYMAN

I always like a merry man,
A fellow like Cliff Berryman,
  To give my soul its zest;
A man who smiles right merrily
Whose soothing laughter, verily,
  Doth set my soul at rest.

If I were but a dairyman,
I'd hire this fellow, Berryman,
  To be my only herd;
And sell, in all my blindliness
His milk of human kindliness—
  I would, upon my word.

Or if I were a cherryman
I'd also hire Berryman
  To help me spread my cheers;
Big bowls of cherries, nice and ripe,
Instead of all this awful tripe
  They hand us through the years.

For Clifford, now at 72,
Has always known just what to do
  To make our lives seem glad—
And that is why I pen these lines
To the merriest man, by all the signs,
  The teddy bear's sweet dad.

—*John Jay Daly.*

APRIL 2, 1941.

WILLIAM MITCH, OF BIRMINGHAM, ALA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the RECORD of March 31 there was an extension of remarks in the Appendix by Representative DIES, of Texas, setting out a list of names of officers of different organizations of the C. I. O. whom he charged with being either members of the Communist Party or, as Mr. DIES puts it, fellow travelers, whose records show that they follow the party line in supporting the party's front organizations. The last name in the list was that of Mr. William Mitch, of Birmingham, Ala., president of the Alabama Industrial Union Council.

Mr. President, I know Mr. Mitch. I have known him well for a number of years. He has labored all his life for the cause of human welfare. Whether or not in his labors he has contacted some organization which has not proved as worthy as it appeared to be, as many good Americans with all good purposes have done, I do not know. This I do know, however, that Mr. Mitch is a loyal, patriotic American, and any charge or insinuation that he is not is absurd and ridiculous and grossly unfair and unjust. The Birmingham Age-Herald of April 2, 1941, under the caption "A good name smeared," bears testimony to Mr. Mitch as a man and a citizen in the following language:

William Mitch has lived and worked in Birmingham long enough for us to learn to know the man. Even those who have met him as an antagonist in the field of labor controversy grant his complete personal integrity and honesty of purpose, however they may have criticized or may now criticize his handling of some specific issue. But no one who really knows Mr. Mitch could regard Mr. DIES listing of him as a Communist—or as a fellow traveler of Communists—as other than hysterical or ignorant.

The Birmingham Post, a Scripps-Howard paper, bears similar testimony in support of Mr. Mitch, as does John Temple Graves, of Alabama, brilliant and independent columnist. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an editorial from the Birmingham Post of April 2, 1941, and an excerpt from Mr. Graves' column in the Birmingham Age-Herald of April 3, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post of April 2, 1941]

OFF THE DEEP END

The American public has a right to expect a greater degree of responsibility on the part of its Representatives in Congress than that exercised by Representative DIES when he attempts to label William Mitch as a Communist or fellow traveler on the party line.

"Communist" is a smear word used all too carelessly. In the past it could be overlooked, but today it carries implications too serious and too dangerous to be treated lightly.

We have known Bill Mitch since he came to Alabama as head of the United Mine Workers and to us and to most Alabamians with whom he has had dealings Mr. DIES' Communist label is absurd.

[From John Temple Graves' column, Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald of April 3, 1941]

The dangerously loose methods of MARTIN DIES were never more evident than in his pinning of a Communist label on William Mitch. Mr. Mitch happens to be one of the most enlightened and thoroughly American labor leaders in all this land. If more of his fellows were like him, and more of his opponents, relations between capital and labor in this country might long ago have become as sound and scientific as they are in England. An excellent reason for believing that the present difficulties between miners and operators in Alabama (which are merely an automatic reflection of difficulties up North) are going to be settled without any unpatriotic lapse in coal production is the nature of the two leaders—William Mitch and David Roberts, Jr. They are top-notch men, both of them, and both good Americans. Their will to have this thing settled as quickly and amicably as possible is a major force in the direction of settlement.

Mr. DIES would be amazed to know how much some of the important coal operators of this district resent his charge against Mitch. They may fight Mitch like the devil on occasion but they know he is no Communist and they know that their side is not helped by absurd charges that he is. But DIES is now a past master at such charges. Recently when he charged 27 individuals on the Steel Workers Organizing Committee pay rolls with being Communists, C. I. O. President Philip Murray was able to point out that 11 of the individuals named had never been on the pay rolls at all, 15 had not been there for the past 3 to 5 years, and he (Murray) had no evidence that any of the 27 were what DIES said they were.

How are we going to get rid of hateful communistic influences in this country if the vital business of putting them out is crippled and made suspect by such stunts as charging Bill Mitch with communism?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I fully concur in the statement made by my colleague about Mr. William Mitch. No one who really knows Mr. Mitch would assert or intimate that he is a Communist. It is unfair and unfortunate that such a charge against him has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ON PASSAMAQUODDY PROJECT (S. DOC. NO. 41)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 62, Seventy-sixth Congress, a report prepared by the Bureau of Engineering of the Commission on the Passamaquoddy tidal power project, Maine. The report will be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed with illustrations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on February 2, 1939, the Senate adopted a resolution which had been submitted by me calling upon the Federal Power Commission to make a report on the Passamaquoddy tidal power project in Maine. The report has arrived this morning, and been laid before the Senate by the Vice President. Of course, it is more or less a museum piece, inasmuch as this crazy idea has been laughed out of any countenance in the United States; but lest, in the emotion of the moment, it might be revived some day I wish to call attention to the fact that the Federal Power Commission says that it would cost $87,854,000 to complete at Quoddy the moonbeam scheme to produce hydroelectric current; that it would cost only $14,891,000 to build a steam electric power plant to achieve precisely the same power results.

I call attention also to the fact that the tidal scheme would produce energy at a cost of 10.47 mills per kilowatt-hour, whereas a steam electric plant at the same point could produce power for 5.57 mills per kilowatt-hour.

I also call attention to the fact that the Commission concludes that there is no local or export market for the power, anyway, no matter how it might be developed.

I further call attention to the fact that the Power Commission indicates that there are many rivers in Maine which are inviting hydroelectric development on a rational basis if there be any desire for expansion at that point in this commodity.

I hope, Mr. President, that this is the final obituary on the Passamaquoddy project.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, I came into the Chamber just as the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was closing his comments on the Federal Power Commission's report on the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. I do not question that there is in the report authority for everything the Senator from Michigan said. I do not necessarily have the same confidence in the report itself. I take it the report must comprehend at least a hundred pages, and I have had opportunity to read not more than half a dozen of those pages.

One thing which troubles me is want of knowledge as to just what project the report relates to. There have been various tidal projects at Passamaquoddy, at Eastport, and the first thing that attracts my attention as I pick up the report is the statement that it does not deal at all with the international project. That was the project which, in the minds of those originating this plan, had in it the largest merit, had in it the possibility of a cheap power rate which might be available not only in that vicinity but in other parts of the country. What else is not considered, I have not yet learned.

Passing by that question, I come to certain long-range views to which the writer of the report makes reference, and I wish to insert two or three excerpts from the report on that phase of the question, the long-range view of it. I quote this:

> It may confidently be assumed that the power potentially available in the Passamaquoddy tides will ultimately be developed. The event seems certain; the only uncertainty is in point of time.

Then, speaking to the same subject, the long-range view of the project, the report states:

> Tidal power has its infirmities, as may readily be gathered from a reading of the section of this report captioned "General characteristics of tidal power." * * * It also possesses notable advantages, of which there should be no lack of appreciation. The water supply is dependable and always definitely predictable, and the head, while varying widely, has definitely known limitations.

Again, the report says:

> Unaffected by droughts, floods, or ice jams, the tides provide the most dependable and most permanent source of power known to man. These unique advantages are not to be cast aside lightly.

Then, coming to the conclusions, I find this, which is of interest to me, as it will be of interest to others who have been concerned with this project from the beginning:

> Tidal power, while not economically feasible of development at this time, possesses certain distinct advantages over other sources of power, the water supply being thoroughly dependable and always definitely predictable, with head limitations definitely known. Unaffected by droughts, floods, or ice jams, the tides provide the most dependable and most permanent source of power. As high-grade fuel prices increase concurrently with expanding power markets in the Northeastern States and contiguous Canadian territory, the development of tidal power will, at some time in the future, become economically feasible and desirable.

I call attention to the following:

> The fact that the development and utilization of tidal power is contraindicated at this time should not preclude thorough exploration of the possibilities of a large international tidal power project at Passamaquoddy by the Governments of the United States and Canada.

I desired to put these comments in the RECORD, in addition to what the Senator from Michigan has inserted, because I see in the report something of hope and something of promise to the people of the section of the country directly concerned, who have been so vitally interested in this matter over the years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very happy, indeed, that the able senior Senator from Maine has clothed the "Quoddy" debate with a pleasant and kindly word about this project. I merely observe that the Senator practices the human habit of speaking only good of the deceased at a funeral. [Laughter.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 40)

A communication from the President of the United States, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1941, for the War Department, for flood control, general, to remain available until expended, amounting to $1,640,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the operations of that Administration under its program of mortgage and credit insurance for the calendar year 1940 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Henry Beil, of the Bronx, New York City, N. Y., praying that the United States keep out of foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Letters in the nature of petitions from several citizens of the United States, praying that the United States keep out of foreign war and do not employ its own convoys or armed forces for the benefit of belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

"Whereas Iowa was developed primarily as an agricultural State and is at the present time one of the greatest agricultural areas in the Union; and

"Whereas farming in Iowa is primarily a way of living which in the past has provided a place for ambitious and thrifty families to live in peace and security and provide for themselves the necessary and desirable things in life; and

"Whereas the advent of power machinery and equipment, together with the application of the Triple-A program, has made it possible for certain individuals, companies, and corporations to farm ever-increasing areas of good farm land at a profit; and

"Whereas this practice is depriving thousands of Iowa farm families from their only way of living and is forcing many of them onto relief rolls; and

"Whereas an additional 5,000 families will be deprived of their way of livelihood again this year and will be forced to leave their present homes; and

"Whereas through the drifting of these landless farmers from State to State in search of land and homes the solution of this great evil has passed beyond the control of the various States and the problem has become national in character and extent; and

"Whereas through governmental agencies aid has been extended to home builders in urban districts by governmental guaranty of loans of such homes; and

"Whereas farm homes for these dispossessed farmers are at least equally as important to the tranquillity and security of our Nation as are the homes for urban residents and at the present time no provision has been made to early or adequately relieve this ever-growing cancer in our body politic; and

"Whereas it has long been the established policy of our Federal Government to provide homes and homesteads for our farm-minded people to which policy much of our national progress may be ascribed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (and the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States that they by amendment of the Federal Housing Act or by the enactment of new and appropriate legislation make available to farmers, and especially to farm tenants who are without farms, governmental aid equal to that afforded to urban residents in order that they may be able to obtain sufficient land and decent homes in which to live and maintain their families; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Vice President and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to each Member of the Congress.

"The foregoing resolution was adopted by the House and the Senate of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the outside fishing operations off the coasts of Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia catch a substantial portion of the silver and chinook salmon originating from the streams in Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia; and

"Whereas all fishermen operating in the inland waters are being subjected to rigid regulations for the conservation of the species of salmon supporting the commercial fishing in outside waters; and

"Whereas the outside fishing is entirely unregulated, taking unlimited numbers of chinook and silver salmon in any season, and many of them immature: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled*, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the present international salmon treaty by expanding the duties of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission to include the investigation of all species of salmon in outside waters from the State of California to Cape Scott on Vancouver Island; and be it further

"*Resolved*, To provide that commercial fishing in said waters come under the jurisdiction and regulation of said Commission at the time said Commission is given power to regulate the Fraser River sockeye in accordance with the terms of the present covenant; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable President Franklin D. Roosevelt and to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington."

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by the convention of the Michigan Federation of Labor, favoring the Federal building and operation of farm labor camps in the counties of Berrien and Van Buren, Mich., and such other counties where need exists and funds may be available; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the annual convention of the Michigan Federation of Labor, favoring enforcement of all labor laws in connection with defense work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for suspension of the wage-and-hour law and establishment of the open shop in defense industries during the existing emergency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition of sundry citizens, voters of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan, praying for adoption of the Townsend national recovery plan for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the Cross Roads Club, of Kalamazoo County, Mich., praying for the suppression of vice and the sale of alcoholic beverages in the vicinity of military and naval training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Adrian, Mich., praying for an appropriation for the erection of an adequate new post office building in that city; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

CANE-SUGAR-REFINING INDUSTRY IN NEW JERSEY—RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY SENATE

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the New Jersey Senate on March 17, 1941, in opposition to any change in the existing law affecting the cane-sugar-refining industry in New Jersey.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Senate resolution introduced and adopted by the Senate March 17, 1941

Whereas for the purpose of preserving the cane-sugar-refining industry in the State of New Jersey, and to protect the millions of consumers in the State of New Jersey from an artificial sugar scarcity and from exorbitantly high prices; and

Whereas there is sufficient sugar on hand or in the nearby tropical islands to meet any demand that the consuming American public may make; and

Whereas any change in the existing law that would grant to the highly subsidized beet-sugar industry additional millions of dollars to those already paid would further increase the burden on the American consumer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be, and it is hereby respectfully memorialized, urged to oppose any change in the existing law that would add additional burdens on the already overburdened consumer, cause further unemployment in the State of New Jersey, or disrupt in any way our good-neighbor policy with South and Central America; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the present Congress from the State of New Jersey, and that they be urged to use their best efforts to accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred three joint resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature.

The first resolution memorializes the Congress of the United States to stabilize the dairy industry;

The second resolution relates to compensation of school districts for taxes on lands taken over by the Federal Government; and

The third resolution relates to the procurement of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received, appro-

priately referred, and printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to stabilize the dairy industry

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has in past years set up machinery to stabilize the wheat, corn, and cotton markets, as for example, the wheat farmer may have his granary sealed after his wheat is threshed and get cash to pay his bills by securing from the Federal Government a loan on his stored wheat of from 85 to 90 percent of its then value, plus a bonus of 7 cents a bushel for holding his wheat off the market until the following May; and

"Whereas such a policy on the part of our Government has had a stabilizing and helpful effect toward creating a uniform market in these products by preventing a depressed market at harvest time when the farmer is at the mercy of the speculator; and

"Whereas the dairy farmer under present conditions is not receiving a sufficient return from the sale of his products to permit him to meet his obligations in the face of rising prices for farm equipment and living expenses; and

"Whereas the butter and cheese market is so held down during summer months when production is at the peak and quality at its best that the speculator has a free hand to load up with high quality goods at a low price; and

"Whereas it is suitable and proper that the Federal Government do for the dairy farmer what it has been and is now doing for the wheat farmer: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States enact legislation to the end that the dairy farmer and manufacturer of natural cheese and butter be granted the right to receive loans from the Federal Government on as liberal terms as are now being given to the wheat farmer; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

To the Committee on Finance:

"Joint Resolution 5, Assembly

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to compensate school districts for taxes on lands taken over by the Federal Government for national forests and other purposes

"Whereas 1,301,108 acres of Wisconsin land have been purchased by the Federal Government for national forests and other purposes; and

"Whereas such lands constituted a large proportion of the taxable lands in many school districts and thereby seriously crippled their source of necessary revenue; and

"Whereas such school districts find themselves in a position where they must soon cease to operate unless some aid is forthcoming; and

"Whereas it seems just and equitable that since the Federal Government's taking over such lands has caused such financial embarrassment to such districts, that the Federal Government should appropriate sufficient money to each such school district so as to make up the loss in taxes to them by virtue of the loss of such lands from the tax rolls: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide some means whereby school districts in this State will be compensated by the Federal Government in an amount each year equal to the amount that would be realized in school taxes from lands taken over by the Federal Government for national forests and other purposes as though such lands had remained subject to such taxes; be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, each House of Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Joint Resolution 13, Assembly

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps for the procurement of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas the exigencies of war have created an entirely new atmosphere in which the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project can be discussed by the United States and Canada; and

"Whereas a special committee of high officials of both countries have under discussion the feasibility of such a project; and

"Whereas the placing of heavy war orders and the needs of future preparedness require new electric power; and

"Whereas there would be certain conveniences and economy in having oceangoing vessels proceed directly into the Great Lakes rather than having a double handling of commodities; and

"Whereas it is best that all factions of both countries forget their past differences for the common defense; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt, in a recent message to Congress, said, 'It is urgent that the project (Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project) be undertaken at the present time not only from the point of view of our own defense but also in terms of those of our neighbor, Canada': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to proceed at once to the end that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway be made a reality; be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3252. A bill to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 170).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1254. A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters; without amendment (Rept. No. 171); and

S. 208. A bill relating to the terms of the District Courts of the United States for the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky; without amendment.

By Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution directing the Comptroller General to readjust the account between the United States and the State of Vermont; without amendment (Rept. No. 172).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REED:

S. 1310. A bill to exempt certain local newspapers from the wage-and-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1311. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, with respect to the location of the nautical school at the port of San Francisco; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 1312. A bill for the relief of the dependents of the late chief radio electrician Thomas C. Thrasher, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. HARRISON) introduced Senate bill 1313, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1314. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the dignity and honor of the uniform of the United States," approved March 1, 1911; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE (for himself, Mr. BALL, and Mr. CAPPER):

S. 1315. A bill to amend section 4 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1316. A bill to provide for the control and utilization of the armory for the Militia of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. REYNOLDS also introduced S. J. Res. 64, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in the midst of our great and urgent program of national defense it is necessary that we give due consideration to the aspects of defense necessary to the training of our people, both for direct defense activities and for sustaining on a high level our economic and civic life. In order to do this we must look to the long future. The children of today are the men and women of tomorrow on whom the Nation must rely for its very existence. Talent, health, and physical fitness neglected today will take their toll tomorrow. It is futile to think that the education of our children can be delayed until they have

reached maturity and are needed immediately to meet an emergency.

It was recently pointed out by the American Youth Commission, Mr. Owen D. Young, chairman, that as a nation we have launched a program of selective service through which we set aside a group of our most promising young men "who will be trained to kill and to take the risk of being killed in order that the democratic community of free people may continue to exist. When the obligation of the citizen to the state is thus carried to the utmost extreme of duty that can be asked of him, it is imperative for all of us to reexamine the extent to which the state is carrying out its obligations toward the citizen."

In 1937 the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], jointly with the then chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. BLACK] introduced a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for public education. That bill was favorably reported after extensive hearings by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. While the bill was before the House Committee on Education, and hearings were being held, the President requested the Advisory Committee on Education, previously appointed by him to study Federal aid for vocational education, to give more extended consideration to the whole subject of Federal relationship to State and local conduct of education, and to prepare a report. Thereafter the Congress took no further action in the matter pending the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education.

On February 8, 1938, the President's committee transmitted its report to the President. The report was published by the committee and also as House Document No. 529, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. The committee found by unanimous agreement that "The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the Nation's children are below any level that should be tolerated in a civilized country," and that "unless the Federal Government participates in the financing of schools and related services, several millions of children in the United States will continue to be largely denied the educational opportunities that should be regarded as their birthright."

The Senator from Mississippi and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee. After extensive hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the bill S. 1305 was reported to the Senate with the recommendation that it "do pass." Because of several circumstances which it is not necessary to relate here, the bill died on the calendar of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Recently, circumstances have made it imperative that the Congress give new consideration to the whole subject of Federal aid to the States for education of children and youth. Accordingly, I am now introducing for myself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] a new bill on the subject, entitled "A bill to strengthen the national defense and promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in meeting financial emergencies in education and in reducing inequalities of educational opportunities."

CURRENT CONDITIONS NECESSITATING FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

There are at this time five distinct and measurable needs for financial assistance to the States for public schools: First, for school facilities for children recently removed to the areas of defense activities and industries; second, for the financial support of schools for Negroes in States maintaining separate schools for Negroes, made legally imperative by recent Federal court decisions interpreting the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States as affecting equal rights to educational opportunities; third, for the equalization of elementary and secondary school opportunities among and within the States; fourth, for the children of migratory workers, particularly of workers engaged in seasonal occupations largely agricultural; and fifth, for the children of Federal employees residing on Federal reservations and properties.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN DEFENSE AREAS

It is a well-known fact that thousands of families are being transferred into defense areas. The Senate, through Senate Resolution 324, October 9, 1940, took notice of this situation as it affects the public school opportunities of the children of these families by calling upon the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War "to make a full and complete study and investigation of all school facilities at or near naval yards, Army and Navy reservations, and bases at which housing programs for defense workers are being carried out or are contemplated." Accordingly the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War requested the United States Commissioner of Education to make the necessary investigation. The Commissioner, through his staff, has made the investigation, and his report has been placed before the Senate and published as Senate Document No. 20, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

There are two types of situations, one in which the children affected reside on Federal reservations, and the other in which the children reside on private property. In the first case the children are from families connected with military or naval reservations and bases; in the second case the children are from families employed in an essential defense industry privately owned. In most cases Federal housing programs are under way to accommodate the families affected.

The report of the Commissioner of Education revealed the following facts and conclusions:

First. With few exceptions the concentration of additional families in defense areas necessitates additional school facilities. There is or will be prior to September 1, 1941, at least 264,400 children for whom school facilities must be provided and the cost of new school facilities, including capital outlay and current expenses, will be at least $115,000,000, of which about $85,000,000 will be needed for capital outlays for sites, buildings, and equipment and transportation equipment.

Second. Local school administrative units in defense areas are faced with the problem of providing school building facilities and teachers for a large number of additional children of school age without the authority or the ability to obtain through customary channels additional funds for these needs.

Third. There is urgent need for a definite policy by the Federal Government to provide funds for capital outlay and current expenses for schools in these defense areas.

The numerous local congested situations resulting from activities of the national-defense program are, in many instances, very acute and the immediate school problems they create cannot be solved by local school administrative units or even by these units and the States.

The Federal Government has an obligation to provide school facilities to accommodate children of personnel connected with projects essential to this program.

In areas over which Federal jurisdiction is exclusive, States and local governmental entities, such as local school administrative units, cannot legally provide public services, including public education.

Although State and local authorities of their own free will often grant education privileges to children residing on Federal reservations, such children have no legal right to attend public schools of the respective States. Generally, Federal reservations are not integral parts of local governmental entities such as local school administrative units.

Equity demands that the Federal Government assume responsibility for providing educational facilities for these children.

ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS FOR NEGROES

Recent Federal court decisions interpreting the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States as it affects equal educational opportunities for Negroes have created an urgent need for funds to make these decisions effective.

Seventeen States provide by law for the maintenance of separate schools for Negro pupils. In all cases where the question of the constitutionality of providing separate schools has been before the Supreme Court of the United States it has been held that the States have the power to require and maintain separate schools for Negroes. The question of maintaining separate schools is not a legal issue and there is no probability that it will again become such. The question of equality of educational opportunities for Negroes is, however, a live and pressing issue.

The Supreme Court has said that the laws providing separate schools meet the requirements of the Constitution if equal privileges are provided for children of the separate races. In practice, however, equal facilities have been furnished only rarely. The States maintaining separate schools for Negroes are, for the most part, States with the least economic ability to raise funds for public education. The schools for white pupils have been financed with great difficulty and the schools for Negroes have been given even less support than those for white pupils.

In the Negro schools the buildings have been poorer, school terms have been shorter, teachers' salaries lower, and teachers' loads heavier than in schools for white pupils. White teachers and educational leaders have deplored this situation but have lacked the funds to correct it without leveling down the none-too-generous program of public education for white pupils.

The last 20 years have seen considerable progress toward improving the status of the Negro schools. But improvement has been so slow that leaders among the Negro race have undertaken to invoke their constitutional rights as a means of speeding up the process of reform. The years of 1938, 1939, and 1940 each produced at least one major court decision favorable to the Negro litigants—one in the field of higher education; two affecting the elementary and secondary schools.

In the case of *State of Missouri* v. *Canada* (59 S. Ct. 239) the Supreme Court held that since the State of Missouri does not maintain a law school for Negroes, a Negro citizen of Missouri, otherwise qualified, cannot be excluded from the law school of the State university for whites unless the State maintains equal facilities within the State for Negroes. The Court said that the obligation of a State to give the protection of equal laws can be met only where its laws operate, and therefore the equality of right must be maintained within the State. The Court affirmed that the student's right to the education sought was a personal one, and that as an individual he was entitled to equal protection of the law, whether or not other Negroes sought the same opportunity. While this case did not deal with the rights of Negroes to high-school advantages, there can be no doubt that if the issue comes before the Court it would be held that Negroes must be offered equal facilities for high-school advantages.

In two recent cases the Federal courts have held that Negro teachers must be paid salaries equal to those paid white teachers if they have equal qualifications and responsibilities. In the case of *Mills* v. *Board of Education of Anne Arundel County* (*Md.*) (30. F. S. 245) the court granted an injunction to restrain the Anne Arundel County Board of Education, after September 1, 1940, from making any distinction solely on the grounds of race or color in fixing the salaries of white or colored teachers. In the case of *Alston* v. *Board of Education of the City of Norfolk* (*Va.*) (112 F. (2d) 992) the court held that the policy of paying lower salaries to Negroes than to whites, for services of the same kind and character—

> Is as clear a discrimination on the ground of race as could well be imagined, and falls squarely within the inhibition of both the due-process and the equal-protection clauses of the fourteenth amendment.

An appeal to the United States Supreme Court for a review of this decision was denied by the Supreme Court.

It is not possible to make an exact statement of what will be the cost of making effective the requirements of the Federal court decisions in the financing of Negro schools. In the 15 States having the heaviest Negro population it will require $25,000,000 annually in additional funds to raise the average salary of Negro teachers to the average of white teachers. This additional amount would represent about 80 percent more than is now spent for salaries of Negro teachers. One of the studies of the President's Advisory Committee on Education shows that for 17 States, if the average amount per pupil for current expenses had been the same for Negro pupils as for white pupils in 1936, about $56,000,000 additional funds would have been required. If expenditures for buildings and equipment are taken into consideration, about $80,000,000 annually in additional funds would be required. If Negro pupils should attend school in the same relative numbers as white pupils, the additional annual amounts required would be $100,000,000. If school-building facilities are to be equalized, it will be necessary to make capital outlays amounting to about $325,000,000.

Taking all these facts into consideration, it is safe to say that not less than $50,000,000 is needed annually to begin to make effective the fourteenth amendment as it affects equal educational opportunities for Negroes, and that this amount may be expected to increase until it passes well over $100,000,000 annually—a sum in excess of 20 percent of the total expenditures for elementary and secondary schools in the States affected.

In the light of the economic conditions of long standing in the States having the heavy Negro population and in light of the superior effort of these States to support schools, there is no likelihood that they will be able by their own effort to raise the additional funds. But funds must be had or eventually a considerable part of the money spent on white pupils must be spent on Negro pupils. Any destruction of standards in the best white schools of the South would be an economic and social calamity of concern to the entire Nation as well as to the South. The problem is one that must be faced by the Congress of the United States if it is intended that the constitutional requirement for equal opportunities is to be more than a scrap of paper.

EQUALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AMONG AND WITHIN THE STATES

Two years ago the Committee on Education and Labor, after extensive hearings, concluded on the basis of incontrovertible evidence that without a reasonable amount of Federal assistance to the States for the support of public education, there is not the faintest hope that any fair degree of equality of educational opportunity will or can exist in these United States. In substantiation of this conclusion, I wish to quote some of the facts presented in the report of the committee, Report No. 244, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. There have been no significant changes in conditions since the time the report was made.

INEQUALITIES OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The average school term ranges from nearly 9½ months in the highest State down to barely 6½ months in the lowest States. In fact the average length of term for all rural schools in the United States is a month less than in urban schools. The average rural pupil in the Nation attends schools less than 7 months per year. In seven States, with large rural populations, the average number of days attended per year by rural pupils is less than 6 months.

If high schools were universally available and attended, the high-school enrollment should constitute about 33⅓ percent of the total school enrollment. In the highest State the high-school enrollment is now 30.9 percent of the total enrollment, while in the lowest State it is only 10.6 percent. On the one hand, seven States have over 27 percent of their total enrollment in high school, while on the other hand, eight States have less than 15 percent of their enrollment in high school.

Between 800,000 and a million children of elementary-school age are not enrolled in school at all, mainly because of lack of facilities in many scattered rural areas that are impoverished and isolated. For these children freedom and opportunity has proved to be chiefly freedom and opportunity to grow up in ignorance.

In the United States there are still more illiterates than college graduates and about half as many illiterates as high-school graduates. There are in this country approximately 3,600,000 totally illiterate persons and about 15,000,000 other adults who cannot read a newspaper nor write a simple letter. In one State only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the population over 10 years of age is illiterate, while in another State 14.9 percent is illiterate. The first State is about 3 times as able financially to support schools as the second and spends about 3 times as much per capita for education.

Average annual expenditures per pupil for current operation of schools range from $134.13 in the highest State down to $24.55 in the lowest State. In this respect there are 10 States in which the average expenditure per pupil exceeds $90, while there are 11 States that fall below $45.

The average annual salary per teacher in the highest State is $2,414, and in the lowest State $504. In these same 2 States the average salaries of rural teachers were $1,337 and $430, respectively. There are 11 States in which the average annual salary exceeds $1,500, while there are 9 States in which the average is less than $750.

The value of public-school property per pupil enrolled in school ranges from $443 in the highest State down to $75 in the lowest State.

There are 10 States that have in excess of $300 per pupil invested in school property while 11 States have less than $150, 6 States having less than $90.

The differences in breadth of educational opportunity resulting from the statistical data cited above are correspondingly great. Hundreds of rural schools can be found which are the merest shacks, in which the children are huddled together in makeshift desks, using a small number of dirty and worn-out textbooks under the direction of teachers who themselves have hardly finished high school. One-fourth of the teachers in

our one-room rural schools have never had a day of work in a school beyond the high school. In thousands of these schools it is virtually impossible to provide the health, welfare, guidance, and other services that children need in addition to instruction. On the other hand, in some wealthy communities there are public schools which would seem almost perfect, where the buildings are the finest specimens of modern architecture, where teachers are well trained, well paid, and competently supervised, where the children are given individual attention, and where everything is done to foster their physical and mental development. Although equality of opportunity is a fundamental tenet of our democracy, inequality of opportunity is at present the dominant characteristic of our educational system when viewed from the national standpoint.

Education can be made a force to equalize the condition of men. It is no less true that it may be a force to create class, race, and sectional distinctions. The evidence indicates clearly that the schools of the United States, which have hitherto been regarded as the bulwark of democracy, may in fact become an instrument for creating those very inequalities they were designed to prevent. If for a long period of years each succeeding generation is drawn in disproportionately large numbers from those areas in which economic conditions are poorest, if the population reserves of the Nation continue to be recruited from economically underprivileged groups, and if the inability of the depressed economic areas and groups to provide proper education for their children is not corrected by aid from areas and groups more prosperous, the effect on American civilization and on representative political institutions may be disastrous. (Report of the Advisory Committee on Education.)

DIFFERENCES IN ABILITY OF STATES TO SUPPORT SCHOOLS

The differences in educational opportunities enumerated above are almost entirely due to economic conditions arising from differences in per capita wealth, income, and taxpaying ability and the great differences in the relative number of children to be educated.

In wealth per child enrolled in school the States range from $21,582 in the highest State to $2,819 in the lowest, there being 12 States that have in excess of $12,500 in wealth back of each child, while 11 States have less than $6,600 per child. With respect to income, there are the same relative differences. The highest State has $3,766 per child enrolled in school, as compared to $495 in the lowest State. The 11 highest States have in excess of $2,500 income per child, as compared to less than $1,200 for the lowest 11 States.

The national experts employed by the President's Advisory Committee on Education to determine the relative taxpaying ability of the several States applied the model tax plan proposed in 1933 by the National Tax Association to each of the States at uniform reasonable rates. The results of this scientific work show that the richest State has a per capita taxpaying ability to support schools about 12 times as great as the poorest State, and that the 12 richest States can raise at least 4 times as much revenue per pupil as the 12 poorest States.

These studies further show that if each of the States should undertake to support a program of education equal to the average for the Nation, the poorest State would have to spend for schools alone 190 percent as much revenue as it could raise, leaving nothing whatever for any other type of State or local governmental service. On the other hand, the richest State would require only 4 percent of its tax resources for schools. No one of the 5 richest States would require more than 25 percent of its tax resources to support an average educational program, while the poorest 9 States would each require more than 100 percent of its resources for that purpose.

DIFFERENCES IN THE RELATIVE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE SEVERAL STATES

The States differ not only in the financial resources with which to support education but also in the number of children the average adult or family has to rear and educate. Almost invariably the smaller the per capita taxpaying ability in a State, the larger the number of children in ratio to the number of adults. For example, South Carolina, a poor State, has 739 persons 5 to 17 years old to each 1,000 adults 20 to 64 years old—the productive ages—while in California the ratio is only 319 to 1,000. For the Northeast section of the United States the ratio of children to adults is only 420 to 1,000, while for the Southeast the ratio is 603 to 1,000. Thus, the educational burden of the people of the Southeast is 1.45 times the burden of the people of the Northeast. The nonfarm population of the Northeast part of the United States have only twice the total number of children that the farmers of the Southeast have, but the Northeast has 21 times as much annual income with which to rear and educate its children. Taking the Nation as a whole, the farmers have 31 percent of the children and only 9 percent of the national income.

Population experts have shown that it is from these poorer agricultural States that the richer industrial States, whose birth rates are not sufficient to replace their population, receive a large part of their immigrations necessary to maintain a stable population and to staff their offices and industrial plants.

It is well known that those sections of the Nation least able to support public schools are those largely devoted to agriculture. Yet these sections are producing practically all of the Nation's future increase in population and a considerable percentage of the future population of our cities. These conditions occur because of the differences in birth rate in rural and urban areas. In 7 largest cities, the population of which consists chiefly of American stock, the birth rate is 40 percent short of the rate required to maintain a stable population; in all cities having over 100,000 in population the deficiency in birth rate averages over 20 percent; and in the smaller cities the deficiency is about 8 percent. On the other hand, farm families are producing about 50 percent more children than required to replace the farm population, and the rural nonfarm families rear children at the rate of 30 percent greater than the number required to replace themselves.

A comparison of the proportionate number of children in the total population with the expenditure per pupil for education shows clearly that as a Nation we are bestowing our best educational opportunities upon sections that have the fewest children, and upon children who in turn will produce the fewest children. Although this policy may not be intentional, it is a very successful method of committing cultural and economic suicide.

EFFORT OF STATES TO SUPPORT SCHOOLS

The evidence is conclusive that if all the States "put their fiscal houses in order," differences in educational opportunity would be approximately as great as they now are. In fact, the evidence is conclusive that many of the States that have already done most to "put their fiscal houses in order" are the poorer States, as for example, Mississippi, Kentucky, North Carolina, West Virginia, Alabama, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and South Carolina. For the most part, the poorer States have the most diversified tax systems and highest rates.

On the whole, the poorer States spend larger proportion of their tax resources for education than the wealthier States. If all the States put forth the national average effort to raise revenue, 33 States would raise less revenue per pupil than the national average. Of these 33 States 31 are actually spending more per pupil than they would raise if they only exerted average national effort to raise revenue. On the other hand, of the 15 States that could raise more revenue per pupil than the national average, only 10 spend more per pupil than they could thus raise. It is beyond question that the poorer States are taxing themselves much more heavily for education than the wealthier States. In spite of this fact about 20 percent of the Nation's children live in States where more than $75 per child could be provided for education without heavier-than-average taxes. On the other hand, another 20 percent live in States where not more than $25 per child could be provided without heavier-than-average taxes. An expenditure of $50 per child of school age would be considered low by city standards almost anywhere, yet more than 60 percent of the children in the United States live in States that on a State-wide basis could not provide $50 per child for public schools without more than average effort.

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF MIGRATORY WORKERS

It has been known for a long time that there are several hundred thousand migratory workers engaged in seasonal occupations, chiefly the harvesting of agricultural products, that these workers have unusually large families, that these children are frequently exploited for their labor, and that their education is largely neglected. Recently a great deal of attention has been given to the general problems of these migratory workers through the hearings conducted by the select committee to investigate the in-

terstate migration of destitute citizens, House of Representatives. These hearings reveal that there are approximately 4,000,000 of these migrants, and that about one-third of them are children. The number of these children needing special provisions for educational facilities is not known, but the data collected by the select committee should give some idea as to the number involved. It is certain that there are several thousand children for whom special provision should be made and that local school districts do not, and in most cases cannot, make the provisions needed. Such a large part of the problem is interstate in character that it is evidently a problem for the Federal Government in cooperation with the States and local communities.

At least one thing is certain; the Nation cannot afford to neglect the education and welfare of a million or more children and permit many of them to grow up in a state of ignorance.

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN RESIDING ON FEDERAL PROPERTIES

The Federal Government reserves throughout the Nation considerable territory from State and local government control. Many families with children of school age reside legally on such reservations. Since the reservations are federally controlled, the Government property, the property of individuals, and the local incomes of residents thereon are not subject to State and local taxation. The Federal Government has no general policy regarding educational provisions for children on these reservations. For some Congress makes excellent provision; for some the use of Federal funds is authorized; while for others absolutely no provision is made by the Federal Government. As a result, the responsibility for educating thousands of children living on such reservations falls on the parents or is transferred by them to the adjacent State public schools. The taxpayers of school districts adjacent to reservations provide schooling for such children at a cost exceeding a million dollars annually. In many instances school facilities are entirely lacking for children whose parents reside on property under the control of the United States Government.

Of course, this problem is very much akin to the problem of providing public-school facilities in defense areas, but many of the children residing on Government property are not necessarily in defense areas.

There are in normal times at least 25,000 children residing on Federal properties. The Advisory Committee on Education found that about 7,500 of these children in scattered areas now obtain education only through payment of tuition in public or private schools, or in schools maintained through the contributions of the Federal-employee communities.

It seems probable that at least $3,000,000 annually is required to take care of the educational facilities for children residing on Federal properties, exclusive of children in defense areas.

PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The bill now introduced by me and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] proposes to provide funds to assist the States and Territories in taking care of the situations I have presented.

The bill would authorize annual Federal appropriations of $300,000,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, to the States to provide educational facilities for children in defense areas, and for the equalization of educational opportunities among and within the States, taking into consideration the children of migratory workers and the children residing on Federal reservations.

It is provided that not more than one-fourth of the funds be used to provide schools in areas affected by defense industries and activities, that of the remaining three-fourths not more than one-fourth may be used by the States for the construction and equipment of school buildings.

It is provided that the States, through their respective legislatures—or the Governor if the legislature is not in session—accept the provisions of the Federal Act and provide for administration of the funds. Each State, either through its legislature or its State superintendent or commissioner of education or State board of education, will provide a plan for apportioning the funds among its local school jurisdictions so as to take care of the special educational needs in defense areas, to provide school facilities for the children of migratory workers, to provide for children residing on Federal properties, and to reduce substantially inequalities of public elementary and secondary schools, especially among school jurisdictions serving rural children and children of minority races for whom separate schools are maintained.

Three other important features provided are:

First. The States having separate schools for Negroes shall provide that the Negro schools shall receive not less than their pro rata share of Federal funds without reduction in the proportion of State and local funds they now receive; second, in order to qualify for Federal funds States must not reduce the amount of State funds going to public schools in 1940; third, control of the schools is reserved to the States and their local school jurisdictions and prohibited to Federal officials.

The Federal funds are to be apportioned to the respective States on the basis of their need for additional funds. Need is to be determined on the basis of such factors as financial ability, the number of children, the need for additional public-school facilities. Using such factors, a board of apportionment appointed by the President will determine the amount of funds to go to each State. This board will have no other function. All administrative matters having to do with State and local officials will be in the hands of the United States Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner has no voice in determining the amount of money a State will receive; the board has nothing to do with school administration.

I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

(Introduced today by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. HARRISON).)

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1313) to strengthen the national defense and promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in meeting financial emergencies in education and in reducing inequalities of educational opportunities, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Educational Finance Act of 1941.

FINDING OF FACT

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that public elementary and secondary schools available throughout the Nation for all children and maintained in keeping with American standards of life and education are essential to the national program of total defense; (2) that because of shifting of population due to the exigencies of national defense, because of the time required to add new property developments to local tax rolls, and because of the burdens already imposed upon property taxes from which public schools are largely supported State and local school jurisdictions in many cases are unable to provide adequate educational opportunities in the areas adjacent to defense activities and industries; (3) that millions of children, especially those who reside in rural areas of diminished natural resources, children residing on Federal reservations and properties with inadequate or no public-school facilities, and the children of migratory workers, most of whom are engaged in agricultural pursuits, and for the children of whom no provisions of public-school advantages are made, are in areas and school districts in which the public-school facilities are wholly inadequate; (4) that the States, because of insurmountable differences in taxpaying ability in relation to the number of children of school age, and notwithstanding greater efforts by the States having the least financial ability, are unable to reduce substantially these inequalities of educational opportunity.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, without Federal control over the educational policies of States and localities, to assist in providing adequate educational facilities for children in receiving affected by the influx of population due to the exigencies of national defense, and to provide for the equalization of educational opportunities of all children in need of action to that end, especially for children residing in rural areas, children residing on Federal properties and reservations, and the children of migratory workers, insofar as the grants-in-aid to the States herein authorized are sufficient to do so. The provisions of this act shall be so construed as to maintain local and State initiative and responsibility in the conduct of education and to reserve explicitly to the States and their local subdivision the organization and administration of schools, the control over the processes of education, the control and determination of curricula of the schools, the methods of instruction to be employed in them, and the selection of personnel employed by the State and its agencies and local school jurisdictions.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. For the purpose of providing additional public education facilities in areas affected by defense activities and industries and for effectively equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States, especially for children residing in rural areas,

children residing on Federal reservations and properties, and the children of migratory workers, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $300,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for each fiscal year thereafter. The sums herein authorized shall be used for making payments to States which through their legislatures have accepted the provisions of this act and which have complied therewith: *Provided*, That in any State in which the legislature has not taken action as herein specified, the Chief Executive of said State may, until such action has been taken or until 6 months after the adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature in such State following the date of enactment of this act, whichever first occurs, take such action for such period as is herein required to be taken by legislative enactment.

APPORTIONMENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created in the Federal Security Agency a Board of Apportionment (hereinafter called the Board) to be composed of five members, to be appointed by the President of the United States, not more than two of whom shall be full-time Federal officials. Members of the Board, not full-time Federal officials, shall receive $25 per day for actual time devoted to the work of the Board (not to exceed 60 days in any one fiscal year) and necessary travel expenses and the rate per diem for other expenses allowed to government employees while absent from official headquarters. Members of the Board who are full-time Federal officials shall receive no additional compensation but shall be reimbursed for any necessary expenses incurred in carrying on the work of the Board.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Board: (1) To determine the need for funds to provide for school buildings, equipment, and current expenses for public schools for children in the areas affected by the shifting of population because of the exigencies of national defense. In determining such need the Board shall take into account other Federal appropriations for school-building purposes, the ability of the local school jurisdictions to provide for public educational facilities, and the availability of State funds to finance the public-school program in the areas affected. (2) To determine the nature and extent of the educational inequalities existing among the States because of the number of children in rural areas, the number of children residing on Federal reservations and properties, and the number of children of migratory workers. In determining such inequalities the Board shall take into consideration such factors, but without limitation, as the availability of free elementary and secondary school advantages, the number of children of school age in average daily attendance, the provision for instructional materials, the adequacy of school buildings and equipment, the adequacy of facilities for pupil transportation, the expenditure per pupil for free public school opportunities, the need for additional or better qualified teachers particularly in schools serving rural areas of low taxable resources, and the need for equalization of educational opportunities for minority races, taking into consideration the financial implication of Federal court decisions interpreting the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States as it relates to equal rights to educational opportunities. (3) To estimate the financial ability of the respective States to support reasonable standards of free public elementary and secondary school facilities according to a uniform procedure applied to all the States in such way as to determine the amount of revenues which could be raised from a uniform tax plan applied to all the States. (4) To determine, on the basis of the data obtained pursuant to clauses (2) and (3) of this subsection, the financial need of the respective States for Federal grants-in-aid for the support of public elementary and secondary schools in such amounts as will most effectively equalize educational opportunities.

(c) On the basis of its findings, the Board shall allot to the respective States before the beginning of each fiscal year, or as soon thereafter as possible, such amount for that year as may have been appropriated by Congress under this act; except that (1) not to exceed 25 percent of such amount shall be allotted to the States for use for public-school facilities, including buildings, equipment, and land, in areas in need solely because of the exigencies of national defense; (2) not to exceed 25 percent of such amount shall be allotted to the States for land, and the construction, improvement, and equipment of school buildings other than buildings specified in clause (1); and (3) not to exceed 2 percent of such amount shall be used for the expenses of the State departments of education.

CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 5. The Board shall certify regularly the amounts allotted to each State which has complied with the provisions of this act to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount certified for each fiscal year in four equal installments as soon after the first day of each quarter as may be feasible, beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1941. Each such treasurer shall account for the moneys received as a trustee of funds of the United States, and shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority. A copy of each such certification shall be deposited with the United States Commissioner of Education (hereinafter called the Commissioner).

STATE ACCEPTANCE PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act, a State—

(1) Through its legislature, shall (a) accept the provisions of this act and provide for the administration of funds to be received; (b) provide that the State treasurer, or corresponding official in that State, serve as trustee for funds paid to the State under this act; (c) provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of funds received; (d) provide for an adequate system of auditing by the State educational authority of the expenditure of funds received and apportioned to local school jurisdictions, or other State educational agencies, and for an adequate system of reports from local school jurisdictions and other educational agencies of the State to such authority; (e) provide that the State educational authority shall make such reports to the Commissioner with respect to the expenditure of funds received and the progress of education generally in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may require; (f) in States where separate public schools are maintained for separate races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds for the benefit of public schools maintained for minority races, without reduction of the proportion of State and local moneys expended for current expenses (not counting moneys expended for the construction or equipment of school buildings or the purchase of land) during the fiscal year ended in 1940 for public schools for minority races; and

(2) Either through its legislature or through its State educational authority, if the legislature so directs, provide a State plan of apportioning the funds received under this act in such manner as to assist effectively in carrying out the purposes for which funds are appropriated under this act, and so as to reduce substantially inequalities of public elementary and secondary schools especially among school jurisdictions serving rural children and children of minority races for whom separate schools are maintained by law, taking into account the educational load, the total tax load, and the financial ability of the respective local jurisdictions to support public education, and the State funds available to such jurisdictions: *Provided*, That each such plan may be revised or amended by giving notice to the Commissioner; and

(3) With respect to acceptance of funds under this act, shall transmit through its State educational authority to the Commissioner official notice of acceptance and certified copies of the enactments and apportionment plans required herein in connection with such funds. Any amendments of such enactments and revisions of such apportionment plans shall in like manner be promptly transmitted to the Commissioner.

(b) The funds appropriated under the authorization of this act shall be allotted only to those States which, during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the apportionment is made, have provided from State revenues for all public elementary and secondary school purposes a total not less than the total amount spent for such purposes in the fiscal year ended in 1940: *Provided*, That if any State fails during any year to comply with the conditions specified in this section due to acts of God or other circumstances over which such State has no control, the provisions of this section shall not apply.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. The funds paid to the States under section 5 shall be available for disbursement by each State for any or all of the following purposes: (a) To local school jurisdictions or other State educational agencies, in order effectively to reduce inequalities of educational opportunities, for all types of expenses of public elementary and secondary schools (which may include through the fourteenth grade) and their auxiliary services; (b) to local school jurisdictions for the purchase of land and for the construction, improvement, and equipment of school buildings as the State educational authority finds to be in the interest of greater efficiency and economy; and (c) for expenses of the State department of education necessary for the efficient administration of the funds received under this act, if the appointment and tenure of the personnel of such department (other than members of boards within the State, elected officials therein, and the chief State school officer) is upon the basis of merit and efficiency and without regard to political considerations.

AUDITING

SEC. 8. The Commissioner shall cause an audit to be made of the expenditure of funds under this act by each State educational authority and to review audits made by such authority with respect to its local jurisdictions. If the Commissioner finds that any portion of such funds is expended by any State in a manner contrary to any provision of this act, or shall otherwise be lost or unlawfully used, an equal amount shall, after reasonable notice, be withheld from the next ensuing payment to any such State unless such amount is replaced by such State and expended for the purposes originally intended. All funds expended under the provisions of this act shall be expended only for public purposes through public agencies and under public control.

SEC. 9. In auditing the expenditure of funds allotted under this act to the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam, as provided in

this act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services of employees of any Federal Department or agency by agreement with the head of such department or agency.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend payments under this act to any State whenever the Commissioner certifies, after notice and hearing, that any such State has failed to replace funds received under this act which are lost or unlawfully used or expended in a manner contrary to the provisions of this act or has failed to make required reports with reasonable promptness. Upon certification of the Commissioner that any such State has rectified such failure, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to such State the amounts so suspended. The sums authorized to be allotted to any State under this act shall, when certified for payment, remain available for not to exceed 1 fiscal year after the fiscal year for which such certification was made.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMINISTRATION AND RESEARCH

SEC. 11. (a) For services and other expenses necessary to the administration of this act and for the making of necessary surveys and other studies in connection with the best utilization of the grants to States authorized in this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year an amount equal to 1 percent of the total amount authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year under the provisions of section 3 of this act. Any of the funds authorized under this section may be allocated by the Commissioner to State departments of education for surveys or other studies pertinent to the best uses of the funds received under this act. Such allocations shall be made by joint agreement between the Commissioner and the chief State educational authority. The amounts thus allocated shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Commissioner, and shall thereupon be paid to the cooperating State departments of education. Suitable provision for audits, reports, and repayment to the United States of amounts unexpended, lost, or misapplied shall be incorporated into the joint agreement.

(b) The Commissioner shall, so far as feasible, lend such advice and counsel as the States may request in working out legislative or administrative plans for expenditure of funds received through this act so as most effectively to lessen inequalities of educational opportunity within the States.

REPORTING

SEC. 12. The Commissioner shall publish annually a full and complete report showing accurately the status of education in the United States. Each such report shall include an analysis and summary of the legislative and administrative provisions adopted by each State for the expenditure of funds received through this act and also statistical information showing the degree to which each of the States has accomplished the improvement and equalization of educational opportunity in comparison with previous years, especially as measured for the various local school jurisdictions by availability of elementary and secondary education, length of minimum school term, the proportion of children of school age in average daily attendance, provision for reading and other instructional materials, provision for pupil transportation, and average expenditures per pupil, and, in States maintaining separate schools for separate races, the degree of equalization obtained, and other information pertinent to the status and progress of education. In all such reports relating to the status of education in States where separate educational facilities are maintained by law for any minority racial group data relating to such separate educational facilities shall be separately reported. The Commissioner shall also make an annual report in writing to the Congress, giving an account of all money received and allocated by him under this act.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 13. (a) The Commissioner, subject to the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, is authorized to make such rules and regulations, not in conflict with the provisions of this act, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) No political or civil rights or activities of any teacher or school administrator shall be restricted or affected in any way because of any financial benefit accruing to such teacher or administrator from funds appropriated pursuant to this act.

(c) Title to school buildings and equipment constructed or bought with funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall remain in the United States, unless purchased by the State or local school jurisdiction, if the construction or acquisition of such buildings or equipment was made necessary by the establishment or enlargement of an industry performing work in connection with national-defense contracts.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 14. As used in this act—

(a) The term "State" shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam.

(b) The term "legislature" means the State or Territorial legislature or other comparable body, except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands it shall mean the Governor.

(c) The term "minority race," or "minority racial group," shall mean any race or racial group that constitutes a minority of the population of the continental United States.

(d) A just and equitable allotment or distribution of the funds provided under this act for the benefit of a minority racial group in a State which maintains by law separate educational facilities for such minority racial group means any plan of apportionment or distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group, of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State.

(e) The term "State educational authority" means, as the legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands it shall mean the Governor.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or application thereof to any State, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provisions to other States, persons, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 26, after line 12, add the following:

"Fence construction on the boundary, New Mexico: For construction of fence along the international boundary as authorized by the act of August 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 660), $45,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of lands or easements for sites for boundary fences except for procurement of abstracts or certificates of title, payment of recording fees, and examination of titles."

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO THE ARMY ON ARMY DAY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the timely and inspiring message addressed by the President of the United States to the Army on Army Day.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the United States Army:

Army Day provides an occasion for me as Commander in Chief to extend a welcome to hundreds of thousands of you young men who have recently joined the Army of the United States. You have entered the ranks of our armed defenders with a singleness of purpose and an enthusiasm that are an inspiration for all Americans.

Your transition from civil life to military service has been accomplished in a manner that is a credit to our democracy. You have quickly adapted yourselves to your new life and you have already become good soldiers. I am sure that you will find your service highly beneficial to you as individuals as well as to your country.

To the officers and men of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Reserve Corps, I want to express my grateful appreciation and that of the people of America for the patience, the consideration, and the skill shown in receiving and training the new men entering the military service.

You have devoted yourselves wholeheartedly to this important duty and you have accomplished marvelous results. While you merit and will receive the sincere gratitude of your countrymen, your greatest satisfaction will doubtless come with your own knowledge of a difficult duty well performed.

To all of you who wear the uniform of the United States Army I extend an affectionate greeting.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN ON PRODUCTION PROBLEMS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on Saturday evening in New York City, in connection with the celebration of Army Day, Mr. William S. Knudsen made an important and decperately significant address, under the auspices of the Military Order, Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mr. Knudsen is at the head of the Office of Production Management—at least he is half of its head. He is responsible for making national defense work. He is responsible for making aid to the Allies work, so far as production is concerned, and production is the heart of this emergency.

Speaking generally, I want to join myself to Mr. Knudsen's discussion and suggestions. There may be disagreement regarding details. I speak of objectives. I disagree, for example, that it would be wise to concentrate control of labor disputes in defense industries in the Department of Labor, under its present auspices and direction. But I agree that a mandatory cooling-off period without

interruption of production, and with findings retroactive to the time of complaint, should be required by law ahead of any strike in a defense industry for the duration of this emergency. In the same connection I believe that all use of force or violence or duress by either party to a labor dispute in a defense industry should be outlawed for the duration of this emergency. Otherwise, the duration of the emergency may too easily outlive our capacity to meet it. No citizen, remembering France, can lightly dismiss Mr. Knudsen's warning that "90 percent of strikes must be eliminated or the defense program fails." Its failure would cost labor all the gains it could hope to make through contemporary strikes, and all the gains it has made since unionism started in America. Its failure would cost the country its very life.

I regret that Mr. Knudsen and his associates did not sooner sound their warning. At least until very recently Congress actually has been told that all is well, and that new emergency legislation in this field of action would probably do more harm than good. I very respectfully regret that the powerful President of the United States has not spoken as vigorously upon this score as upon some others of our war factors. I believe that a firm admonition from him would go far in its pacifying influence. His new Mediation Board bids fair to produce helpful results, and for this I join in thanksgiving. But the situation is so fraught with hazards to the common welfare of our whole people that millions of our citizens—often including men in the ranks of labor—are demanding new statutory protections which shall minimize a danger which Mr. Knudsen now says is a 90-percent threat to national defense, which is to say to the life of the Nation itself.

A continuation of the widespread spectacle of paralyzing strikes in defense industries, as witnessed during the past fortnight, will soon precipitate a demand for action which, under the impulse of emotion, may go too far—much too far—in curbing wholly legitimate strike rights. A stitch in time saves nine. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. It is, of course, easy to smear legitimate organized labor, in such a situation, with the black tar of communism. That should be avoided. But it is not easy to close our eyes to the palpable fact that every subversive agency in the United States is eagerly embracing these disturbances, nursing them, encouraging them, and using a labor issue as the smokescreen to hide its treason. Indeed, this may be a preview of disasters yet to come. This makes it doubly vital for the country's sake—yes, and for the sake of labor itself—that the situation should be taken in hand before it is too late. There is no room in America, in or out of labor, for subversion and sabotage; and whatever has to be done to stop it should be done without further delay.

I return to Mr. Knudsen's discussion. Some of his suggestions, at least, the spirit of them, are embraced in S. 683, introduced on January 31, 1941, by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. Upon inquiry, I am advised that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has never had a meeting on that bill. It has had no hearings upon any phase of this supercritical problem. I respectfully suggest that it should proceed to its tasks, not only in connection with the Knudsen suggestions but in connection with all others dealing with the problem. I ask that Mr. Knudsen's statement be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are all in the Army now. This is Army Day and we have all seen the parade and had our spirits lifted by the display, but most of all by the feeling that somebody like Uncle Sam is here for the protection of our homes and our shores. Wars are fought for aggression or for protection, and in our particular case we have no use for aggression. We arm for protection only, and when we extend aid to other people, it is for protection only. We are not in the business of giving aid to aggressors, large or small.

Wars have changed in the last century. No longer can the warrior fight his jolly way ahead and live on the invaded country. When that was the custom wars could be fought over long periods. We know about the Thirty Years' War and the Seven Years' War and the Napoleonic wars. Nowadays the war requires an enormous amount of material, and the warring forces are merely disposing of this material according to their best judgment and technical knowledge.

War has also changed in the respect that where before it was fought by armies of men pitted against each other today with the airplane in its present position as a nerve-breaker, one important part of it is to prepare the noncombatants and civilian population for the attack to follow. In other words, where women and children once were spared the horrors of war, war is now presented to them right on their front doorstep with the idea of making their men run for cover and open the gates for the invasion. At the start this scheme worked pretty well in the present war. For one side had practically all the planes and the other side practically none, but as the war progressed certain people in Europe came to the conclusion that they might as well resist and not accept slavery lying down, and we have the magnificent example of Britain and Greece fighting tooth and nail for their independence and (for a wonder) making a real fight of it.

We, on the other side of the ocean, felt we had no particular quarrel with anybody. However, as the horror of this new-fangled warfare of killing women and children first progressed to its present stage, the feeling of our American people was aroused. Under the leadership of our President and Congress they decided that we would help with matériel the people who were willing to fight for their liberty so that in part of the world, anyway, the individual still would have some rights and not be put in a uniform from the age of 4 to demise, violent or otherwise.

THE QUESTION OF MATERIAL

The background for all this is that war is today a question of matériel. The technical progress of making war has advanced to such a stage that 1 man in the field requires the backing of 10 men at home—not only men but machines and raw material as well. Therefore, we are particularly fortunate in having an abundance of men, machines, and materials to put to work to back up our forces for home protection, but we also have a surplus potential with which to help others.

Over across the ocean a battle of life and death is being fought—in the field, in the air, and in the shop. Over here, thank God, we have only the battle of the shop, but it is just as serious, just as important, just as indispensable, that we may not be in a bad position here. We must plan and work to help the men who are fighting for their liberty and when we do that with all our might, we are getting in shape to protect ourselves for what might come later, if it becomes necessary.

I sometimes am afraid that we haven't quite realized the seriousness of the battle against time. The next 4 months might be crucial in the whole history of the world, and if we can only save part of a month in these 4, it might mean everything in our future and the future of our children.

The launching of our program was started last June. Previous to that time small quantities of British and French orders had been placed in the United States, but mostly for aircraft, machine tools, and base materials. With the American defense program instituted in June, it was possible to place over $12,000,000,000 worth of contracts promptly, Congress giving final authority in early September, so that we have placed today practically all the equipment required for 1,200,000 men and heavy equipment—meaning guns, tanks, and planes—for 800,000 additional. This we hope to have finished by the end of 1942. The additional load caused by the lease-lend bill and the British orders still unfilled adds 60 percent to the total, so that we are faced with a production job, the approximate size of which is 28,000,000,000 man-hours to do in 27 months.

This is the biggest job ever undertaken by any country in that length of time, and it will require the maximum cooperative effort of every man and woman in the United States to get it done on time.

We have done a lot of plant construction in the last 8 months, and will have to do a great deal more, particularly on explosives; but the main job of metalworking in this added program will and must be to find existing factories where, by piecing out or farming out, so-called, we can use tools we now have to do machine and assembling work. We just haven't time to build all the new factories necessary and supply new tools. You might be interested to know that during the last 7 months we have actually started and more than 60-percent completed new factories at a cost of over $2,000,000,000, of which a billion dollars and a half was furnished by the Government and the balance privately financed. All these plants will be in operation within the next 4 to 6 months.

They cover everything from gun powder to airplanes and are only a percentage of what is in work today. Many private facilities employed by thousands of contractors are actually at work producing shells and guns and motors and small arms ammunition. All the existing shipyards have been commandeered and seven new ones started. Ships and planes and guns—there is the story in a nutshell. We must have more and still more. Every machine shop and foundry in the United States which can make even a piece of something must be enlisted for the duration.

Everybody knows that America is the greatest mass producer in the world. Not everybody knows that mass production inevitably takes time to get started.

We are mass producers of peacetime products and it is a big shift to defense materials. It requires many new plants, hundreds of millions of dollars of machine tools and complete retooling in nearly every case.

On aircraft we got a pretty fair production in January and February quite close to schedule, but to meet our goal these monthly

figures have to double by August and keep on doubling until the end of the year.

Thirty-caliber machine guns are close to schedule. Fifty-caliber are right up to the notch, but in the former case we are striving for a 500-percent increase in monthly production by the end of the year and in the latter case nearly a thousand percent. These figures roll off one's tongue pretty easily, but just try to increase something tough a thousand times.

The medium-tank program as you probably know has been deliberately held up because of the necessity of giving machine-tool priority to other more critical items. Nevertheless, we will start making a few of the 26-ton tanks in April or May and are now turning out the 13-ton tanks, which is the so-called light tank, at a fair rate. Even so, our present schedule must be doubled by the end of the year.

I sometimes wonder who invented the name "medium" and "light" tanks. They are certainly not medium or light by any other standard. The transmission alone of the medium tank weighs 7,600 pounds—as much as the combined weight of two automobiles.

PRODUCTION OF EXPLOSIVES

Powder production and TNT have been big jobs and, for that matter, still are, but, nevertheless a vast area of new explosive plants are going into production right on schedule, which is a great credit to all who have been concerned with their construction and equipment.

Small arms, such as rifles and submachine guns, are, I am happy to say, running ahead of schedule, but one can never be satisfied, for here again the production of the one has to be stepped up a hundred percent before the end of the year and of the other about 500 percent.

Next to the management problem in production there is a raw-material problem as well. All of these things require vast quantities of material, some of them very special and difficult to obtain. In spite of our wealth and national resources we are largely dependent on imports for our supplies of 14 strategic materials. We have been acquiring stock piles of most of these materials, but many obstacles had to be overcome. Tungsten comes from China and must move over the Burma Road. Chrome comes from Turkey and already there is a shortage of available shipping.

Fortunately most of the needed products can be produced here at home. Great increases in domestic production have already been effected. Greater increases are under way. A year ago we were producing 25,000,000 pounds of aluminum ingots a month. Today the monthly production exceeds 40,000,000 pounds. Great additional plants are under construction, and by the end of the year the American output of aluminum should approximate 70,000,000 pounds a month.

Similarly there is a great increase in the demand and for magnesium, partly due to the increased production of airplanes, but chiefly because of the development of the incendiary bomb. Capacity of this industry has already been doubled and plants now under construction should further increase it sixfold.

Now I come to the items which can be produced more easily, those which are somewhat akin to our normal civilian needs.

Supplies and equipment of every conceivable character—from food and clothing to X-ray machines—are being furnished, and for the most part the procurement, distribution, and storage are satisfactory.

Army and Navy construction is better than half behind us. Group housing—three-quarters of a million dollars worth—44,500 buildings and 95,000 tent frames and utilities are in the final stages of completion. Much of the basic work for the naval base facilities, air fields, storage depots has been completed and during the next few months many of these new facilities will be available for service.

The ship program presents quite a problem. Over 3,400 ships, ranging from small boats and patrol craft to large tanker cargo vessels and on to battleships, are to be built. Along with this is the conversion and modification of hundreds of existing craft. A gratifying start has been made—some new ships already being delivered ahead of schedule. On the other hand, it is only a start—this program outstrips anything ever attempted as to time, volume, and complexity. The urgency for speed is extreme.

Skilled workers, materials, machinery, apparatus, and management are the essential components, and even though the time elements in shipbuilding are long, the outlook is encouraging.

TELLS OF SHOP CENSUS

It naturally takes time to organize an effort of this kind, but we are making progress. First, we get the general contractor, the man who takes the order from the Government, to subcontract all he can from the people he knows. Next, we are tabulating every community or rather taking an inventory of the shops and equipment in every community with the help of State and local manufacturers' associations to spot every place where equipment is idle and useful. This information is transmitted to the Government contractors so as to make it possible to spread their work still more and get the widest possible distribution of the man-hour load I mentioned previously. Naturally, there is going to be a tremendous amount of education required to get the drawing and engineering data spread around and the proper understanding by the contractors and their men of the requirements and limits on Government work. It could not be done from a central office, but working through the general contractors and making the idle talent available to them will make the job a success, providing we have real cooperation from everybody and what I call the will to win, which in this case, means the will to get the job finished well and on time.

Time is the great factor. It is the one thing we never have enough of when we are well, and always too much of when we are sick. On how we use the time when we are short depends the success of our undertaking. Trains run on time against schedule. Sometimes they get away late and catch up, but they catch up only if all the factors which made them late in the first place are eliminated. A clear track and lots of steam is the only remedy. We are today in the position of having gotten off to a late start. We didn't have enough steam when we started and the track had to be cleared first. Now that the President has told all of us to get going full speed ahead, I feel we will get up more steam to help us get to our last stop, which is the arsenal of the world, and on time.

On the Fourth of July we celebrate our independence. There are just 89 days to that day. If we can put on a little steam in these 89 days and save 10 days, we might save a lot of blood later on. If we have, roughly, a billion hours a month to spend in the next 27 months and we could gain a month in that time that billion hours would mean that we had gained the equivalent of 10,000 medium-sized bombers with motors and that would certainly be worth trying for. I believe that if we all work together we can do it—manufacturer, engineer, mechanic, helper, clerk, and apprentice.

AGAIN WARNS ON LABOR

The labor situation during the last month has grown worse mostly due to organizational and jurisdictional strikes. Strikes like the Lackawanna, International Harvester, and Bethlehem at Johnstown, and Ford are purely for the purpose of speeding up the union organization effort in the plants. The Allis-Chalmers strike after starting out as a closed shop strike wound up as a union security strike after a lot of confusion in wording a so-called referee clause which, to say the least, was ambiguous.

The conciliation service of the Labor Department, the O. P. M., and the union tried for 2 months to find a way of settling the argument, only to find at last that the original strike vote was fraudulent and that the strike, at least technically, was called without the consent of the membership. A thing like this is very hard to deal with. The fact that the strike vote was fraudulent was gone over lightly. The fact that a large number of men came back to work in support of the defense job was given no consideration. The fact that 4,000,000 hours of time is lost in order to find out what happens to a union man who isn't paying his dues was not even important—the important part was that the radical leaders with the help of other unions in Milwaukee and vicinity could show the State and the Nation where to get off—and have both our friends and their foes across the water have this wonderful piece of morale builder served with their next morning's breakfast.

Many small strikes in specialty shops often tie up production in large factories. Recently a strike in a small foundry on the coast threatened the whole airplane production in that area. We have just got to get over this strike epidemic which we have had since January. The hours lost can never be made up, and they are precious. Let us settle the disputes, large and small, around the table and keep the plant going. The larger percentage of the men went to work and helped defense.

The new Mediation Board will undoubtedly perform a great service if it can induce the disputing parties to work while the dispute is being analyzed. The O. P. M. had some early successes along this line, but as soon as the parties to the dispute found out that there were no penalties behind the effort, they soon began to delay and hinder the efforts of the O. P. M. in order to get more concessions.

WANTS STRIKES AT MINIMUM

I do not believe that legislation against strikes is necessary or enforceable, but I do believe that during the emergency period a definite procedure should be followed in order that strikes can be held to a minimum. For instance, I believe that strike votes should be taken under the supervision of the Labor Department; I believe a certain minimum of dispute, both by the conciliation service and the Mediation Board, and that after the Board gives its findings, a period of time should be allowed before the strike is actually called. With a procedure like this, 90 percent of the strikes will be eliminated—and they must be or our program will fail.

That wages may rise in a period of high industrial activity is an accepted fact. The problem is to hold the rise in proportion to the rise in living cost, and prevent a spiral from which it is extremely hard to recover. The desire on both sides to hold wages and prices in the proper relationship is the No. 1 problem in economics and requires goodwill and extra measures.

I am getting all out of patience with all this talk about money. This is no time to ask for quotations on the defense of the United States. If we are going to put it on a dollars-and-cents basis, how much more per day or per share is this defense job worth, how much of a down payment do we all want on the protection of our shores and our homes and our democratic institutions? This job can't be handled with money. It must be handled with our hearts.

I was very much interested a short time ago to meet Sir Walter Citrine, secretary of the

British Trade Union Congress, who said time should be allowed to sift the something which made a deep impression on me. Sir Walter is wholly labor minded, and his work is wholly on labor's side, but still he said: "It is perfectly clear that it would be utterly foolish in a war in defense of democracy to insist upon the maintenance of certain trade-union restrictions modeled for the purpose of restraining the employer during peacetime and apply these restrictions to the effort of the Nation to equip itself with the means of resistance."

This remark tells a powerful story, coming from a man whose life has been spent either as a workingman or as a leader of workingmen. The reports from Britain tell an eloquent story of how "thumbs up" was started by British labor and is kept alive by labor.

A production job like ours, I say "ours" advisedly, will call for sacrifices from everybody. "Work and save" must be our slogan. The impact, economically, of an undertaking of this sort can only be softened by work and by savings. To conserve, to plan, to think, and to be careful about it is the best antidote for worrying about what is going to happen now of after the emergency is over.

I remember being in France in 1936 and 1938 and being able to observe the difference on both sides of the border. It gave everyone the creeps to see the difference in the strike picture. The foundation for the debacle of the French defense program was certainly laid in the years of 1936–39 and it was with a great deal of sorrow that I heard how the French workmen and their women and children had made the extreme effort in the spring of 1939, only to find that it was too late and the battle was lost. We haven't got much time, but I think, thank God, we can still prevent anything like that from happening over here.

In our work in Washington we contacted the services—the Army and the Navy. The services are our customers. Every so often somebody intimates that things are terribly wrong with either one of us or all of us. I think this is as good a place as any to make the flat declaration that as far as I am concerned there isn't anything much the matter with any of us.

We are moving ahead and I am sometimes reminded of the fellow in the park who stumbled and was laughed at by some of the fellows sitting on the bench. He turned and said, "Well, maybe I stumbled, but I am going somewhere. You fellows won't stumble because nobody ever stumbles sitting down."

My relations with the services have been most pleasant. I find the highest type of hard-working men in the Army and in the Navy; men who undoubtedly in private industry could command great positions, but stick to the service of their country through tradition or through ideals. The planning these men did was of great assistance in getting the program under way. They are always available, night or day, with knowledge or advice and willing to go anywhere or do anything which will help the service and the country. I get an inspiration out of this. They don't wear uniforms or medals as they do in other countries, but when they put the uniform on and go out to work at their trade I know that every one of them will give his country everything and, with these few words, I think it behooves the rest of us—yes, all of us—to go and do the same.

We can do it, I know we can do it if we all put our hearts and our efforts into the job—engineer, manufacturer, mechanic, and clerk. This is our land—the land where democracy was really born and will live forever, so let's go full speed ahead—a green light on the track—this is "America's special," and we must also help to get in on time.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to say, for the Committee on Education and Labor, that the bill referred to by the Senator from Michigan is going through the same process through which every bill goes that is introduced and referred to that committee. We have received reports from some of the departments, but not reports from all the departments consulted. I do not think it is a new thing in the history of the Senate for committees to consider in a serious way legislation which is sent to them and have it referred in the ordinary normal way. When a Senator attempts to point out that a committee of the Senate is backward in its duty, he is taking himself slightly seriously.

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR HERRING

[Mr. HERRING asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him in Des Moines, Iowa, upon the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL JACKSON BEFORE COMMON COUNCIL FOR AMERICAN UNITY

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Attorney General Robert H. Jackson on April 3, 1941, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, before the Common Council for American Unity, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOUTHERN ECONOMY IN THE DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY CHESTER C. DAVIS

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Chester C. Davis, member of the National Defense Advisory Commission, before the Southern Governors Conference in New Orleans, La., March 15, 1941, on the subject The Southern Economy in the Defense Program.]

NEW INDUSTRIES FOR THE NEW SOUTH—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, at the Southern Scientist Symposium held at Mobile, Ala., March 20, 1941, on the subject New Industries for the New South.]

NEW USES FOR AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Textiles from Milk" by Dr. Harry E. Barnard, director of research, National Farm Chemurgic Council, printed in the Kiwanis Magazine for April 1941, and an article in the Christian Science Monitor for April 2, 1941, relating to laboratory research, which appear in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY SENATOR REYNOLDS ON FLYING FARMERS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him entitled "Flying Farmers," published in the April 1941 issue of the Southern Agriculturist, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERFERENCE WITH DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, along the line of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an article by Walter Lippmann. He reaches the conclusion that it will be difficult to eliminate industrial disputes until there is in the country an overwhelming unanimity of conviction not merely that strikes must stop, but that the Nation must be defended.

Men in the same boat, if there is danger, will pull in unison. Apparently there is not that sense of danger among the conflicting parties in America today.

A recent Gallup poll indicates that a large percentage of the people are in favor of outlawing strikes during the period of the present emergency; but strikes come. Yet we must realize that there are undoubtedly over a hundred men engaged in production where one man strikes. The situation calls for perspective and understanding and patience, patience with the problems of America, especially the labor problem. We must be careful in this situation to see that the pendulum does not swing away over to the other extreme resulting in the destruction of legitimate rights and privileges. We must remember that sometimes right is on one side and sometimes on the other.

This article by Walter Lippmann is indeed an illuminating one. He calls attention to the fact that—

> In the soft-coal industry there is an old, well-established system of collective bargaining. Yet production has been stopped. In the Ford plant there is an old, strongly established system of nonunionism. Yet production has been stopped. At the Allis-Chalmers plant there is in operation the machinery of the Wagner Act, plus many State and Federal agencies for conciliation. Yet production has been stopped.

We are hoping that the news today means that production in the Allis-Chalmers plant will begin tomorrow.

Thus Mr. Lippmann drew the conclusion that with full-blown collective bargaining, with full-blown individualism—that is, as found in the Ford case and in the Allis-Chalmers case, which combined pre-New Deal, New Deal, and post-New Deal laws, boards and committees—effective, uninterrupted production was not guaranteed.

The President sold the country on the need for the lease-lend bill and on the appropriation of $7,000,000,000. This was done on the theory and in the belief that the country was in jeopardy; that we needed the bill and the money for defense; and, according to the polls, approximately 90 percent of the people of this country were in favor of aid to Britain. Yet a recent poll, announced yesterday, indicates that 87 percent are not in favor of war. But now, in this strike situation, we have two explanations; first, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Michigan that there may be some sabotage in our defense production. It will be remembered that Hitler said that America would destroy herself, referring to his ability to divide us into warring factions, as he did in other countries which he has weakened and then overrun. It will be remembered that a recent poll showed that 72 percent of the people were of the opinion that many labor-union leaders were racketeers, 14 percent disagreed, and 14 percent had no opinion. Secondly, that both manage-

ment—and this is the point I believe in—and labor, or one or the other, as the case may be, do not comprehend the full force of the emergency argument which put over these two measures. As Mr. Lippmann says, these combatants still cling to their rights, they dwell on their grievances, and hug their prejudices. They will behave as they are accustomed to behave in normal times. They will not rise above ordinary habits of ordinary times.

America is making great sacrifices. The taxpayer will have to make tremendous sacrifices; he will have to pay "through the nose." Speaking in Philadelphia several weeks ago to a group of women, I called attention to the fact that in less than 3 months we had appropriated $16,000,000,000. Not one woman blinked an eye. But the mayor of the city was sitting next to me, and I asked him the assessed valuation of Philadelphia and he replied, "A little over $2,000,000,000." Then I said, "We have appropriated eight Philadelphias in less than 3 months." That got the picture before them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me repeat at that point—and I am in complete harmony with the Senator's exhibit—the defense appropriations thus far made for the next fiscal year and the remainder of the present fiscal year, represent, in their total, the entire assessed valuation of the State of New York, plus the State of Pennsylvania, plus the State of Connecticut.

Mr. WILEY. I can add that in less than 90 days we appropriated more than three Wisconsins, in fact, about four Wisconsins.

We have no assurance that America comprehends the extent of the sacrifices these tremendous expenditures will require. But I had started to say that I hold to the second idea I have suggested, that there is lack of comprehension and lack of appreciation of the situation which has caused our boys now in the camps, many of whom have been making $1,500 or $2,000, and even $2,500 and $3,000 a year, to be conscripted at $21 a month.

What do we need? We simply need a realization, if it is a fact, that this country is in jeopardy. We need to be told by the people who sold America on the proposition of the lease-lend bill and on these vast appropriations that we have to pull together for production; and we have to realize that production is the nub of the matter. When that point is reached, I am satisfied that both management and labor will cease contending, except in those instances where, as it has been suggested, there are "fifth columnists," or racketeers, or foreign influences at work. Where that situation exists, it is the business of the Government to step in with the strong arm of the Government and see that such activities cease.

Mr. President, these strikes have not been all loss. There is coming to the fore in American consciousness the thought that the public has the big interest in the picture.

Heretofore only management and labor were consulted. They had the whole say. Now the public is becoming audible. This will mean legislation giving consideration to the rights of the public.

Every strike causes loss to the public.

Mr. President, this is no time to permit the pendulum to swing so that it will obliterate legitimate rights and privileges. The question is not onesided. So long as man continues to be man, the battle for economic power will go on. We have known of instances where labor, generaled by racketeers, has overplayed its hand. We have seen instances where the employer through stubbornness and lack of comprehension that he was living in a changing world has missed the mark.

But, as indicated by the polls, this country of ours is in no frame of mind for a stoppage in its production. It is calling out to all Americans for sacrifices. It is asking citizens everywhere for sacrifices. It is time for labor unions, employers, youth in the Army, taxpayers, for all to realize that this is no period for business as usual, no time for labor or management to be swayed and governed by grievances and prejudices. When the house is on fire it is no time for the fire department to go on a vacation.

Britain is fighting for her life. Women, for the first time in English history, are being conscripted. Production there is on a 24-hour schedule. Labor knows, management knows, and women know that if Britain falls, it means slavery for the British race.

There is something here that dissolves all pettiness, all minor differences. There is something there that unifies, that makes for a spirit of national cooperation. That something is national safety—the safety of home and loved ones, the safety of democratic principles. It is a question with them now of liberty or death.

Mr. President, when I came back from Europe, realizing the world emergency situation, I said on the floor of the Senate, "if I were in the councils of labor and wanted to advance unionism and labor's rights, I would advise the leaders of labor to issue a pronouncement in substance stating that during the period of the emergency there will be no strikes."

I believe if that course had been followed labor would have advanced itself very far. I do not want to see labor prejudice its gains. In this country it has a membership of between seven and nine million. Both labor and management must recognize that there is a great responsibility owed by both to the rest of our citizenry. In this great Nation no individual or group lives unto itself alone. There are great obligations to be fulfilled by all.

If the recent polls are correct, and I have no reason to distrust them, there is a clear indication that the public does not approve of what has been done. I am not acquainted with the merits of any of the strike situations. I pass no judgment on the merits. I only know that if the national situation is as bad as we were told it was in the lend-lease debate—and we know that Britain needs all the aid in the shape of material that we can give her—then no one has the right to stop defense production, because defense production, then, is a national matter in which 131,000,000 people are involved—not simply labor and management.

Therefore, it is not unreasonable, unpatriotic, or un-American for a government to say to management and labor, "Carry on, open up the factories, labor go to work and allow negotiations to go on while production is going on." It is fair to both management and labor that government in each such case give assurance that the questions in issue will be settled quickly.

We must not forget, as I have stated before, that we are living in an unusual period, an emergency period. All of us will have to make sacrifices.

There is not involved in the present situation the right of labor to enjoy the American standard of living at a fair wage or the right of capital to receive a reasonable return. There is involved the duty and obligation and right of government to speak definitely and clearly on a vital subject that involves the security of the lives and the property of 131,000,000 people.

I am not one of those who are pessimistic. I want this strike situation settled quickly. If I were asked my personal opinion I should say that if the President of the United States 4 or 6 or 8 weeks ago had plainly told all the people of the country the situation as he saw it and told labor and management what each should do in no uncertain terms, this matter would not have developed as it has. There is a distinction between Executive leadership that guides the people, that dares to speak out clearly and if necessary strongly instead of waiting to permit violence and bitterness to come into being. If the President had spoken then he would have done a real service to the country. His failure to speak was a disservice to labor. No one can tell to what extent that disservice will extend. And an injury to one class of our society cannot help but injure all. We are all brother Americans.

I ask that, following my remarks, the entire article written by Mr. Lippmann be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE INDUSTRIAL STOPPAGES

In the soft-coal industry there is an old, well-established system of collective bargaining. Yet production has been stopped. In the Ford plant there is an old, strongly established system of nonunionism. Yet production has been stopped. At the Allis-Chalmers plant there are in operation the machinery of the Wagner Act, plus many State and Federal agencies for conciliation. Yet production has been stopped.

It is evident, I submit, that there is no single principle of industrial relations which as such can be relied upon to insure uninterrupted production in the defense industries. We see in the case of Mr. John L. Lewis that

full-blown collective bargaining does not guarantee uninterrupted production, and in the case of Mr. Henry Ford that full-blown individualism does not guarantee it, and in the case of Allis-Chalmers that the combined pre-New Deal, New Deal, and post-New Deal laws, boards, and executive committees do not guarantee uninterrupted production. We see all the known varieties of normal industrial relations and none of them works.

A workable policy can be arrived at, it seems to me, only if we start thinking from this actual and demonstrated fact. It is in the highest degree important that public opinion, in order that there be light and not merely heat, take account of the objective fact that not one system of industrial relations but all systems at once are in certain cases failing to work.

If we had a stoppage only in the thoroughly unionized soft-coal industry, where collective bargaining is unchallenged in principle and has long been practiced, we could look for the underlying cause of the trouble in collective bargaining. If there were a stoppage only in the Ford plant, we could look for it in the refusal to recognize independent unions for purposes of collective bargaining. If we had to think only of the stoppage at Allis-Chalmers, we could look for the cause of trouble in some defect of the Wagner Act or the machinery of adjustment. But, taking the facts as they are, it is evident that we shall not mend matters unless we find and deal with a cause which is common to all three of these very different disturbances.

In fact, we shall surely make matters much worse if, forgetting that in some places all the systems are working badly, we fix our attention on any one of them alone, and go about cracking down by words and by laws—on the unions if we are thinking only of Mr. Lewis, or on nonconforming employers if we are thinking only of Mr. Ford, or on the machinery of adjustments if we are thinking about the New Deal or anti-New Deal. For while in these instances all the systems are working badly, there are many more industries where all of them are working quite well. We have uninterrupted production with collective bargaining in many plants, with the open shop in many plants, with the Wagner Act and the conciliation machinery in many plants. Thus, if our one and only concern is to achieve uninterrupted production, we shall deceive ourselves if we think that any one policy or any one piece of machinery is as such and in itself either the cause of the trouble or the cure for the trouble.

We must look, not at labor policy as such or the machinery of adjustment as such, but at the state of mind of men and of communities, and we shall conclude, I believe, that where there is trouble, there is no full conviction that the national emergency is real, no urgent belief that nothing matters but the progress of national defense. Any policy can be made to work among men who believe that the security and independence of the Nation are at stake; they will lay aside everything else as soldiers lay everything else aside, they will compromise and adjust their difficulties because they feel themselves enlisted in the common cause.

But where this conviction does not exist, when men do not believe the Nation is in jeopardy, where they are disposed to think that the defense effort is hysterical warmongering, there is neither the spiritual incentive or a good reason for subordinating all their other views and interests to the Nation's needs. The only ground on which it can be held that employees and employers and Government officials must at all costs, no matter how but somehow, keep production going is that they are called into the service of their country in a time of great emergency. If they do not think that there is such an emergency, they will cling to their rights and dwell on their grievances and hug their prejudices. They will behave as they are accustomed to behave in normal times. They will not rise above the ordinary habits of ordinary times.

Whenever men are in this state of mind, they will not make the sacrifices which are required for uninterrupted production. Mr. Lewis is used to bargaining with the coal operators while the mines are closed down. He continues now to do what he has always done. Mr. Ford is used to running his plant without collective bargaining. He continues to conduct his business as usual. Yet what is being asked of all employers and all employees, of managers and labor leaders, is that they do something very unusual. They are not being offered a solution of the problem of industrial relations. There is not time for that. They are being asked to act as if the problem were solved, to proceed on the belief that all of them, and not only most of them, the minority among them as well as the majority of them, must put the maintenance of uninterrupted production above every other consideration.

The minority will not do that unless they are convinced that uninterrupted production really does and really must come ahead of every other consideration. And they will not be convinced that it does and must come ahead until either there is a tidal wave of patriotic feeling, or until disaster and danger are so close and so obvious that everyone is aware of them. These disputes which plague us today reflect the fact that a substantial minority among businessmen, workers, and politicians are either openly opposed to, or at least are unconvinced about, the Nation's policy. It is inevitable that this division of opinion, kept open by sincere and reputable men and women, should stultify in some considerable measure the effort to put the national defense above everything else. If three doctors tell a man to give up drinking, and one doctor tells him that they are excited teetotallers, he will be strongly tempted now and then, when the craving is strong, to take a drink.

It will, therefore, be difficult to eliminate industrial disputes until there is in the country an overwhelming unanimity of conviction, not merely that strikes must stop, but that the Nation must be defended. That unanimity has not yet developed, and until it does, many will not see why they should sacrifice a private interest or a private preconception, why they should change their normal habits of conducting business as usual.

But when that unanimity does exist—either because the people find leaders who inspire them or, failing that, because they are faced with imminent disaster—when public sentiment is wholehearted and single-minded, these troubles will subside. Men who are in a state of mind to get on with the national defense will find ways of making any theoretical policy or any piece of machinery work. But insofar as they are not in this state of mind, any policy and any piece of machinery will be made unworkable because there will be men who are not much concerned to make it work.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I read the article by Walter Lippmann referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and I, too, thought it was very good. Its main theme was that the laboring man did not realize the danger which threatens America. Therefore responsibility must rest on those false prophets who continue to tell the American people that America is not in danger, who continue to ridicule the idea of peril threatening this country. They must take the responsibility for misleading those who do not appreciate the situation which confronts us.

When they go on the radio and charge that the "international bankers" are responsible for the steps which have already been taken to protect America, when they go on the air and make the charge that those who are leading in the defense program are "Judases" who are undertaking to betray America, they are resorting to an old trick of the evildoer himself making the charge of which he himself is guilty before honest men have made that charge.

Mr. President, I liked Walter Lippmann's article. I am convinced that if the American laboring man realized fully the danger which confronts us, he could not be persuaded to take part in any industrial activity that would slow down production. I am convinced the heart of labor is sound. I am convinced the laboring man himself is patriotic. He is a citizen; he has children, some of whom are covered under the draft law. He has relatives; he has friends; he has his interests here. Therefore he is interested in the welfare of the Nation. But if he is misled by false prophets who continue to assure us that we are secure behind 3,000 miles of ocean, as though the ocean itself were a protection, then he might be persuaded to enter the lists against the employer in order to maintain his rights.

In that regard I wish to read a few lines from the Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round, published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 2 last, under the subheading "Employer obstruction":

While labor has been hitting the headlines for defense obstruction, less publicized but equally obstructive has been the attitude of certain business elements, among them the shipbuilders, who dickered endlessly with the United States Maritime Commission regarding the construction of 200 desperately needed cargo vessels.

This program was adopted in January, but to date the Commission has not been able to complete negotiatons for quite all the 200 ships.

The Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., of Baltimore, for instance, battled the Commission for 2 months over a fat fee.

The Commission proposed a $110,000 base fee per ship, to be reduced to $60,000 if not delivered by a certain deadline, or increased to $140,000 if produced ahead of time. But Bethlehem rejected the penalty clause, vigorously insisting on a fixed fee regardless of when the ships were produced.

For weeks, while the shipping crisis daily grew more critical, the controversy raged. Finally, on March 18, the company backed down and accepted the Commission's terms.

Under them Bethlehem-Fairfield stands to collect a total fee of $5,500,000 on the 50 ships assigned it. In addition, it also garnered a $7,838,000 Government contract for 13 ways and other construction paraphernalia.

Meanwhile, 2 precious months went by and not a lick was turned on these frantically needed cargo vessels.

The box score on the Commission's dragging negotations, begun early in January, on the 200 ships is as follows:

Oregon Shipbuilding Co., 31 ships; California Shipbuilding Co., 31 ships; Houston Shipbuilding Co., 25 ships. Like Bethlehem-Fairfield, all these firms signed on March 18. North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., 25 ships, contract signed March 13; Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co., 13 ships; and Louisiana Shipbuilding Co., 25 ships, contracts not closed.

Mr. President, in the last Presidential campaign the people of America passed

on a program of national defense and aid to the defenders of liberty all over the world. It was perhaps the plainest plank in both platforms. The nominees of both political parties spoke out definitely and plainly on that question. More people than had ever passed on any political issue in the history of the Republic placed their stamp of approval on those planks, and on one of the candidates who had announced himself in support of that program of aid to the defenders of liberty.

Then Congress assembled and a measure was proposed to translate into action that proposition of aid to the defenders of liberty, namely, the lease-lend bill. Because we were democratic, we took precious time to debate freely that question in the Senate. We did not even undertake to put any limitations, other than by unanimous consent, upon that debate. Finally the Congress passed the lease-lend bill.

Mr. President, our course is charted. The die is cast for national defense. The program has been stamped with approval by the American people. The measure to energize that program has been passed by both Houses of Congress and is today law. Yet there are those who are still going about stumping the country in an attempt to destroy unity in America. So today America is divided into two groups—the great majority consisting of those who would aid the defenders of liberty, and a small minority consisting of those who not only would but actually are aiding Hitler. The Hitler helpers and the Hitler lovers are not satisfied that we have passed on the question of aid to the defenders of democracy, but they speak over the radio and do everything possible to play upon every discordant note in America.

We stood for it in the Senate. Not a single opportunity was overlooked to tear open an old wound. Quotations from statements of the past campaign, which were made in the heat of the campaign, were repeated in order to inflame prejudice here, and every Senator who had had any difficulty in previous times was on the floor of the Senate reminded of an attempt made to defeat him, or an attempt to purge him, and whenever opportunity was afforded effort was made to bring about division in the United States.

America has her Quislings as have other countries. Hitler said he would have them. He said:

> We don't even have to buy them. They will come to us of their own accord. Pride, confused thinking, political animosity are their chief motives.

Today they are going about this country telling the people in so many words to sabotage our defense program. Mr. President, I will measure my record and my efforts to prevent war profiteering against those of any other man in the United States. So far as I can prevent, there will be no war profits. In this defense program there is no room for war profiteers; there is no room for Communists; there is no room for any subversive element in our country today, nor is there time for strikes in America today.

Mr. President, I say to the laboring man, clear your own ranks of unpatriotic members. Set your house in order. You are depriving your friends, who have fought your battles, of the only weapon we have with which to fight your battles. That is public opinion.

When you walk out on a strike at this critical time you disarm us. What can we say to those who ask us what is going to be done about these strikes? Do not be misled by the false doctrine that is coming from the false prophets who have been wrong every step of the way since we started on our defense program. I do not accuse them of being in Hitler's pay, because Hitler himself has said, "I will not even have to buy them. They will come to me. Political animosity is their chief motive."

I say the time has come to look with suspicion upon the patriotism of a citizen of the United States who undertakes to divide us. Hitler has said:

> We need armies. But we shall not use them as in 1914. The place of artillery preparation for frontal attack by infantry in trench warfare will in the future be taken by revolutionary propaganda, to break down the enemy psychologically before the armies begin to function at all. The enemy people must be demoralized and ready to capitulate, driven with moral passivity, before military action can even be thought of. * * * Mental confusion, contradiction of feeling, indecisiveness, panic, these are our weapons.

There are those today who are giving every urge and impetus to Hitler's psychological assault to break down the strong unity of America. Hitler has also said:

> It will be a simple matter for me to produce unrest and revolts in the United States so that these gentry will have their hands full of their own affairs.

Is he making good? American labor, listen to those who have fought your battles. Do not be misled either by the forensic saboteurs in this country or the organizers who have stealthily sneaked into your organizations. America is in danger. Who has been right? To whom will you listen?

General Pershing says that America is in danger. General Marshall says that America is in danger. Secretary of the Navy Knox says that America is in great peril. Secretary Stimson says that time is of the utmost importance. Mr. Knudsen has lately pointed out the need for full speed ahead. President Roosevelt, whose words should have prophetic force with respect to the foreign situation, has said that America is in greater danger today than ever at any time in the history of the Republic. American labor, whom are you going to believe? Are you going to believe these men, or the men who said from this forum that there was not going to be any war; the men who said that the war in Europe was a phony war; the men who said that Norway and Denmark would not become involved in the war; the men who said that Hitler could never get his 70-ton tanks across the Albert Canal; or the men who said the Maginot line was impregnable and that Hitler would never take France? Whom are you going to believe?

American labor, what chance do you think you would have to keep your gains in a Hitler-dominated world, when every article you produce would be sold in competition with slave labor? The enemy ideas of national socialism would invade America even if we should build a concrete wall around this country.

Ever since the last war I have fought against war profiteers. By the eternal, I intend to continue that fight. I intend to do everything possible, so far as I am concerned, to prevent profiteering, and then, to recover by taxes the profits which may slip through such regulations as are made.

No man in the history of the world has ever done more in the same period of time for the laboring man than has Franklin D. Roosevelt. Surely, laboring men, you must see that industrial strife at this time is embarrassing this great champion of your own cause. Your cause may be right. I ask you to submit it to the proper authority which has been set up to pass upon it. Surely you can trust this administration to give you a square deal. I ask you to submit your cause to the proper authorities, but to keep the wheels turning. It is for your own cause, your own children, and your future.

Walter Darre, Reichminister of Agriculture, at Hitler's instance, made this statement:

> We are going to win this war, and here are our aims. * * * A new aristocracy of German masters [Herrenvolk] will be created. This aristocracy will have slaves assigned to it, these slaves to be their property and to consist of landless, non-German nationals.
>
> Please do not interpret the word "slaves" as a parable or as a rhetorical term; we actually have in mind a modern form of medieval slavery which we must and will introduce, because we urgently need it in order to fulfill our great tasks. * * *
>
> The United States, also, will be forced by Germany to complete and final capitulation. Our superior industrial products will be sold at very low prices to the whole world and will cause the United States to have not 7,000,000 but 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 unemployed. Mr. Roosevelt will then beg the Fuehrer on his knees to purchase from the United States not manufactured products but raw materials at prices which we shall dictate.

Yet there are those who, on the radio and through other means of expression, are misleading the laboring man into making him believe that it is a peaceful summer day and that there is no storm on the horizon. But the old Nazi serpent, which in the past few weeks has been quietly coiling itself, has struck again, and with the warm months ahead it will continue to strike. The false prophets in this country who have been preaching Hitler's propaganda have taken advantage of this lull to make the people believe that the trouble is all over, and are saying: "America has nothing to fear."

There is a striking similarity between the language used in the statement Hitler made yesterday, which I read in the newspapers, in his effort to justify the invasion of Yugoslavia, and the statements which are being made on the radio and from the public platform by the forensic saboteurs who are doing everything in their power to sabotage the American defense program. Incidentally, Hitler's same old Goebbels' propaganda statement had a very hollow, if familiar, ring to it in his effort to justify the dastardly attempt to destroy another small neighbor. When

he could not do it by his seductive methods of intrigue, he then resorted to brute force. He called the British "warmongers."

Have we heard anybody in this country using that language? It is strangely familiar. Then he said, "We are fighting against the capitalists and plutocrats." Have we not heard certain aid-Hitler speakers in this country say on the radio that all our present effort is the result of the activities of "international bankers" and "Judases"?

They simply have seen themselves in the mirror, and have rightly described what they saw but they put the brand on the wrong person. Certainly there are those who would betray America with a kiss of death by misleading American laborers into believing that there is time for them to walk out on strikes, that there is time for long-drawn-out quarrels and industrial strife.

It is not all on one side, because the employer in some cases is taking advantage of this opportunity, when he knows he has the advantage of labor, under the sharp lash of a call to patriotism, to drive a harder bargain than before, and that is why proper authority has been established for settling these questions.

I say, "Laboring man, do not play into the hands of the labor baiters and labor haters who are only glad for this opportunity to crucify you on the cross of national emergency. Do not play into their hands; but, most of all, do not play into the hands of Hitler, who announced 2 or 3 years ago that he could stir up industrial strife in America; that he would so tie the hands of this Government as to render it impotent in just such a crisis as this." I call upon you, labor, not to fall into that trap which has been set and baited for you. If you have some Communist or subversive leaders in your organizations, purge those organizations. You have a great record for patriotic service in the World War. Do not throw that record out the window. You have the sympathy of the American people. Do not throw that good will out the window. Keep the wheels turning. Keep the stream of defense weapons going to the defenders of liberty.

One of the most heart-breaking scenes of history was the one of Dunkerque, where the gallant British boys made up in courage what they lacked in weapons. Hemmed in on three sides by walls of steel, bombed from above, guns empty, they fought on, hurling bodies of flesh and bone against Hitler's engines of death. They fought on. Anthony Eden took the radio and said to America, "Send us guns! Send us planes! Send us tanks!"

Is there a man in America whose soul is so dead that he would withhold weapons of defense from the gallant men who today are holding the line of liberty? Democracy itself is at death grips today. The opportunity to be free, the opportunity to have collective bargaining, is at this very minute in the balance. We must keep the weapons going in an ever-increasing, ever-augmenting, ever-accelerating stream to the defenders of liberty who are holding the line over there. That line grows thinner and thinner by the hour. We must not play into Hitler's hands by division today. He has predicted it. He has boasted that he would create confusion here in America and thereby render our efforts ineffective. That boast must not come true.

SUBVERSIVE ELEMENTS IN LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a moment ago I was looking over the columns of today's issue of the Washington News. I find there a great deal of space consumed by articles pertaining to strikes which are taking place in virtually every section of our country; and, as a matter of fact, I dare say that one cannot pick up any newspaper published in any section of the United States without finding headlines relating to strikes that are now in progress, or strikes that have been settled.

I have said for many months that much of this trouble is certainly attributable to foreign elements that have seeped into our labor organizations. I have stated time and time again that I believe that a great deal of this trouble has been occasioned by the fact that many alien Communists, Bundists, and Fascists have seeped into labor organizations and have been successful in securing for themselves the key positions in these organizations. From all that I can read, from all that I can hear, from everything that I learn, I am more thoroughly convinced today than ever before that it is the foreign elements affiliated with our labor organizations that unquestionably are at the seat of the difficulty and the trouble we are having today.

I cannot bring myself to believe that it is the typical American-born laboring man who is creating the trouble we are now experiencing. Anticipating that when we should become involved to the extent we are now involved, in all probability there would be trouble in store for our Government particularly in regard to the national-defense program, last year I introduced in the Senate a resolution designated as S. J. Res. 275. I desire to read it, in order that it may be printed in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that the American people may know that I anticipated this difficulty last year. I may add, that unfortunately the joint resolution never came out of the committee. I believe that if it had come out of the committee and had been passed, a great deal of the trouble we are now experiencing never would have occurred.

In connection therewith, prior to reading the joint resolution, I desire to cite the fact that for a number of years in this body I have advocated the passage of a law that would make mandatory the registration and fingerprinting of aliens. At this time I see in the Senate Chamber Hon. JOE STARNES, of Alabama, from the district in which Gadsden is situated, which congressional district he represents with great credit to himself and honor to his constituents. I make mention of Mr. STARNES being here now because he is a member of the Dies committee. He has been more deeply interested in the matter of the deportation of alien criminals and the fingerprinting of aliens than any other man I know of in the Congress of the United States. If 5 years ago we had enacted the registration and fingerprinting law which I advocated over the years, I dare say that today we would not be bothered by the number of spies and saboteurs who seem to be operating in the country at this hour, as a result of which the very excellent Director of the Bureau of Investigation was occasioned to call upon the Congress of the United States to provide additional funds for that division of the Government. So I say I believe that, if such a law as that which I had in mind last year had been passed, today we would not be having trouble with a number of units of labor in this country.

I desire to have recorded in the RECORD the joint resolution to which I have referred, and I may add at this juncture that I take this opportunity to reintroduce it as it was introduced in this body last year. I will read it:

Joint resolution to provide for the national defense by prohibiting labor organizations from employing certain persons as officers or agents

Whereas it is common knowledge that "fifth column" activities in various European countries contributed largely to their defeat; and

Whereas such activities consisted in part of sabotage in key industries and propaganda disseminated among the workers of such industries; and

Whereas such activities are now being carried on in this country and will gather more momentum in the future, thus undermining our national defense; and

Whereas because of their key positions in our industrial mobilization plans, officers and agents of labor organizations should all be American citizens whose allegiance to their country is unquestioned and who can be depended upon to cooperate with the Government in stamping out such treacherous activities: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it shall hereafter be unlawful for any labor union or other labor organization which represents, or purports to represent, in any manner the interests of any persons employed by any business enterprise which is engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the production of goods for such commerce or for national-defense purposes, to have as an officer or agent any person who is not a citizen of the United States, who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi bund organization, who has been at any time within the past 2 years a member of or affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi bund organization, who is ineligible to hold public office, or who has lost his rights to United States citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of each such labor union or other labor organization to use due diligence to determine whether any of its officers or agents is a person who is prohibited from being such an officer or agent under the provisions of section 1 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this joint resolution, the term "labor union or other labor organization" shall include any group which is a part of or affiliated with any labor union or other labor organization which is national in scope or whose jurisdiction extends to more than one State.

SEC. 4. Any labor union or other labor organization willfully violating any of the provisions of this joint resolution shall, upon

conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000; and each such violation shall be deemed to be a separate offense.

Mr. President, I respectfully request that the joint resolution be referred to the proper committee for consideration, and I trust, in view of the circumstances existing in our national-defense program as a result of strikes, which I allege have been partly brought on by those who have obtained high positions of one sort or another in some labor organizations that the joint resolution will be promptly considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received out of order and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) to provide for the national defense by prohibiting labor organizations from employing certain persons as officers or agents, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I recall that recently I had a talk with a friend of mine who lives in my home town of Asheville, N. C. He was one of the heroes of World War No. 1, and he recently fought with the French until their defeat, after which he returned to American shores and to his native commonwealth. That gentleman told me that France was greatly weakened prior to its entrance into the war on September 3, 1939, indeed, he said that France, prior to its entrance was virtually destroyed from within. He stated that the French Republic had permitted Communists and others of that ilk and type to come from Russia and Spain into France, and that they had brought about tremendous destruction within the confines of the French Republic. That is why I have harped upon the theme of stopping, at least for the time being, all immigration into this country because, as I have stated heretofore, I am told that 1 out of every 25 or certainly 1 out of every 50 refugees who come to this country is a Nazi or a Communist agent, and I think it high time that we in the Congress give some attention to that matter, which is of vital importance to the American Republic at this hour.

I have before me an article which, to my mind, is distressing, insofar as the American laboring man, in whom we profess so much interest, is concerned. Weekly there are coming to this country hundreds of refugees. I feel sorry for them; I feel sorry for all people who are persecuted; but my first sympathies are with the people of the United States of America; and, insofar as I am concerned, I want now to stop the influx of immigrants and refugees into our country. If safety is that which they seek, then, let them seek it in some part of the world other than the United States of America.

At this time, in conjunction with this particular theme, I desire to read from an article which I clipped from today's Washington News while sitting here:

SEEK TO DISTRIBUTE REFUGEES IN UNITED STATES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

A most interesting experiment in resettlement of uprooted peoples is going on in connection with refugees who have fled to this country from Nazi persecutions in Europe.

The National Refugee Service in New York, headed by William Rosenwald, sees the present refugee movement as an opportunity, for the first time in American history, to absorb immigrants in a planned and purposeful manner. He foresees a long-range program to be carried on for some years.

In other words, he foresees a program which will admit into this country from Europe hundreds of thousands of refugees, who will be here at the expiration of the present war to compete with the twenty or thirty million natural-born or naturalized American citizens who may then be unemployed. Against that I protest. The article continues:

The objective is to prevent as far as possible the concentration of refugees in New York and other cities in the East, and to locate them in smaller communities throughout the country where they can make best adjustment to the American way.

PLAN MAKING HEADWAY

This, it is realized, meets difficulties at the outset, chiefly the natural desire of a stranger in a new land to cling to the colonies of refugee friends in the bigger centers. Some 70,000 to 75,000, about half of the present refugee population of the country, have remained in New York.

But the resettlement plan is slowly making headway.

Volunteer committees have been created in 900 communities, and the National Refugee Service has helped to resettle 10,000 persons in a new life.

"Retraining" is the heading of the next paragraph, following which the articles goes on to say, in conclusion:

Placing foreign physicians has been the most difficult problem, because all but four States have some restrictions on their practice—some, laws requiring American citizenship; some, laws requiring graduation from American colleges; some, restrictions by State boards—while resentment against their practice has been encountered in some circles, despite the need for doctors.

Of course, we all feel sorry for the persecuted people of the world; but I repeat that I am beginning to feel sorry for the people of the United States, because into this country there are coming weekly and monthly thousands of refugees from all parts of Europe, to take the jobs which rightly belong to American citizens; and, unless something is done now, aliens will take this country away from us as we took it away from the Indians. I say that the present, of all times, is the opportune time to do something about this matter, especially since with every 25 or 50 refugees who come there are agents of Hitler and Stalin; and, of course, we are not going to continue to put up with that.

I recall that the other day, on the floor of this Chamber, I mentioned a situation which existed as a result of the action of certain shipping lines flying the American flag, at which time I stated that there were in foreign ports thousands of Americans who could not secure passage to American shores for the reason that aliens and refugees had booked all the shipping accommodations. At that time one of my colleagues read a letter he had received from the Maritime Commission to the effect that they had investigated the matter, and found that there were plenty of ships plying the Atlantic and the Pacific to provide accommodations for Americans.

Yesterday I accepted an invitation issued by two ladies of the National Women's Party of America to attend a tea at their clubhouse here on Capitol Hill. At that time I saw several of my colleagues. I was very happy to have been provided the opportunity, through their invitation, of attending this meeting of leading American women who are interested in America. I was particularly happy in view of the fact that I had the honor and the pleasure of meeting Miss Paul, the founder of the National Women's Party of America, who has but recently returned from abroad, and who for the past several months, according to my recollection, had resided in Switzerland. The ladies there assembled questioned Miss Paul about certain matters in which they were interested; and during the course of her remarks she happened to mention the fact, according to my recollection, that she was obliged to remain in Lisbon, Portugal, for several weeks, for the reason that it was impossible for her to secure passage aboard a ship returning to American ports. She stated that finally, after much effort, she had been successful in booking passage aboard a foreign passenger ship, and that on that ship were some three or four hundred aliens, and my recollection is that she was the only American aboard the ship.

I mention the statement made by her in substantiation of the allegation I made upon the floor of the Senate the other day, at which time I introduced a bill which provided that shipping lines flying the American flag must provide passage for American citizens before allotting passage for aliens.

I was happy to go to the meeting yesterday because I then became more impressed than ever before with the part that American women are playing in American life today. They are playing no little part in American life. I dare say American women, especially those who are active politically, are more thoroughly interested in maintaining for us the American way of life than are any other group of which I know.

That brings me to a form letter which I have received on the letterhead of Women United, suite 2438, 11 West Forty-second Street, New York City, addressed to me at the Senate Office Building. The author of the letter first apologizes for sending me a mimeographed letter, after which she goes on to say:

But Women United are working not with elegance, but with economy and, we hope, efficiency in the short time that may be left us to keep our country out of war.

Women members of 54 national organizations and women affiliated with no organization have united to hold Nation-wide simultaneous meetings on the evening of April 14, to secure the four freedoms in the United States, and to oppose the involvement of the United States in the wars of Europe and Asia.

That letter was signed by Mrs. Geraldine Buchanan Parker, executive secretary of Women United. It was

accompanied by a printed form letter which I am pleased to read:

DEAR FELLOW CITIZEN: This takes only 30 seconds to read.

It tells what all of us can do now to help save the lives of our men. It is not too late.

On Monday, April 14, at 8:30 p. m., simultaneous meetings will be held all over the United States to oppose the involvement of our country in the wars of Europe and Asia.

The New York City meeting is at Carnegie Hall. If you are near enough to come—come by all means. Senators and Representatives will be there to tell us what to do.

To keep our country out of war, we'll be on the air; we'll be in the newspapers. If you can't come, then organize meetings in your own community or in your home. Get local speakers, show the free film, Which Way, America? but surely tune in on the Carnegie Hall meeting, Monday, April 14, at 8:30 p. m. eastern standard time, national hook-up.

You will hear Senators C. Wayland Brooks, Bennett Champ Clark, David I. Walsh, Congresswoman Frances Bolton, Clarence Budington Kelland, Charles Corwin White, Señora Aimée de Ramos Mejia, and other nationally known speakers.

From every meeting resolutions and letters must be sent to the President, the Congress, and the local press opposing any and all measures which will lead our country into the horror of war, bring tragedy into the American home, and disaster to our form of government.

* * * * *

We are working to keep America out of war. We are opposed to Bundists, Nazis, Communists, Fascists, and all others who place the welfare of foreign governments above the welfare of America.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours.

GERALDINE BUCHANAN PARKER,
Executive Secretary.

I take this opportunity publicly to congratulate Mrs. Parker and her associates upon their sincere endeavor to aid other groups in our great Nation to keep this country, not from being involved in war—because that we already are—but from being actually, physically at war. I am inspired to know that mothers in every section of the United States are doing everything they possibly can to prevent their sons from being slaughtered upon foreign soil in somebody else's war which is not our war. In that connection, I recall that a few days ago I brought to the attention of the Members of this body a resolution signed by 527 fine, patriotic American women of Greensboro, N. C., all of whom are taxpayers, and all of whom protested against our actual physical involvement in the war which now unfortunately rages in Europe.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McNARY. Has the routine morning business been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair really had not inquired whether there was further morning business.

Mr. McNARY. I thought so. I object until we conclude the other order. It will take but a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business is in order at any time.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Oregon desires to transact any other business, I shall be glad to withhold the motion. I had thought that any business any Senator had in mind was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. We always observe the rule respecting the transaction of the routine morning business. I think we should continue to observe that rule. If there is no further morning business, then properly we come to the consideration of executive business. I thought morning business had not been concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following executive report of the Committee on the Judiciary was submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE:

Claud N. Sapp, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina (reappointment).

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON NATURE PROTECTION AND WILDLIFE PRESERVATION

Mr. HILL. There is on the calendar a treaty which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is very anxious to have considered at this time, and I understand there is no objection to it.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive C, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the Inter-American Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, signed on the part of the United States of America at Washington on October 12, 1940, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION ON NATURE PROTECTION AND WILDLIFE PRESERVATION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

PREAMBLE

The governments of the American Republics, wishing to protect and preserve in their natural habitat representatives of all species and genera of their native flora and fauna, including migratory birds, in sufficient numbers and over areas extensive enough to assure them from becoming extinct through any agency within man's control; and

Wishing to protect and preserve scenery of extraordinary beauty, unusual and striking geologic formations, regions and natural objects of aesthetic, historic or scientific value, and areas characterized by primitive conditions in those cases covered by this Convention; and

Wishing to conclude a convention on the protection of nature and the preservation of flora and fauna to effectuate the foregoing purposes, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

Description of terms used in the wording of this Convention.

1. The expression "national parks" shall denote:

Areas established for the protection and preservation of superlative scenery, flora and fauna of national significance which the general public may enjoy and from which it may benefit when placed under public control.

2. The expression "national reserves" shall denote:

Regions established for conservation and utilization of natural resources under government control, on which protection of animal and plant life will be afforded in so far as this may be consistent with the primary purpose of such reserves.

3. The expression "nature monuments" shall denote:

Regions, objects, or living species of flora or fauna of aesthetic, historic or scientific interest to which strict protection is given. The purpose of nature monuments is the protection of a specific object, or a species of flora or fauna, by setting aside an area, an object, or a single species, as an inviolate nature monument, except for duly authorized scientific investigations or government inspection.

4. The expression "strict wilderness reserves" shall denote:

A region under public control characterized by primitive conditions of flora, fauna, transportation and habitation wherein there is no provision for the passage of motorized transportation and all commercial developments are excluded.

5. The expression "migratory birds" shall denote:

Birds of those species, all or some of whose individual members, may at any season cross any of the boundaries between the American countries. Some of the species of the following families are examples of birds characterized as migratory: Charadriidae, Scolopacidae, Caprimulgidae, Hirundinidae.

ARTICLE II

1. The Contracting Governments will explore at once the possibility of establishing in their territories national parks, national reserves, nature monuments, and strict wilderness reserves as defined in the preceding article. In all cases where such establishment is feasible, the creation thereof shall be begun as soon as possible after the effective date of the present Convention.

2. If in any country the establishment of national parks, national reserves, nature monuments, or strict wilderness reserves is found to be impractical at present, suitable areas, objects or living species of fauna or flora, as the case may be, shall be selected as early as possible to be transformed into national parks, national reserves, nature monuments or strict wilderness reserves as soon as, in the opinion of the authorities concerned, circumstances will permit.

3. The Contracting Governments shall notify the Pan American Union of the establishment of any national parks, national reserves, nature monuments, or strict wilderness reserves, and of the legislation, including the methods of administrative control, adopted in connection therewith.

ARTICLE III

The Contracting Governments agree that the boundaries of national parks shall not be altered, or any portion thereof be capable of alienation, except by the competent legislative authority. The resources of these reserves shall not be subject to exploitation for commercial profit.

The Contracting Governments agree to prohibit hunting, killing and capturing of members of the fauna and destruction or collection of representatives of the flora in national parks except by or under the direction or control of the park authorities, or for duly authorized scientific investigations.

The Contracting Governments further agree to provide facilities for public recreation

and education in national parks consistent with the purposes of this Convention.

ARTICLE IV

The Contracting Governments agree to maintain the strict wilderness reserves inviolate, as far as practicable, except for duly authorized scientific investigations or government inspection, or such uses as are consistent with the purposes for which the area was established.

ARTICLE V

1. The Contracting Governments agree to adopt, or to propose such adoption to their respective appropriate law-making bodies, suitable laws and regulations for the protection and preservation of flora and fauna within their national boundaries, but not included in the national parks, national reserves, nature monuments, or strict wilderness reserves referred to in Article II hereof. Such regulations shall contain proper provisions for the taking of specimens of flora and fauna for scientific study and investigation by properly accredited individuals and agencies.

2. The Contracting Governments agree to adopt, or to recommend that their respective legislatures adopt, laws which will assure the protection and preservation of the natural scenery, striking geological formations, and regions and natural objects of aesthetic interest or historic or scientific value.

ARTICLE VI

The Contracting Governments agree to cooperate among themselves in promoting the objectives of the present Convention. To this end they will lend proper assistance, consistent with national laws, to scientists of the American Republics engaged in research and field study; they may, when circumstances warrant, enter into agreements with one another or with scientific institutions of the Americas in order to increase the effectiveness of this collaboration; and they shall make available to all the American Republics equally through publication or otherwise the scientific knowledge resulting from such cooperative effort.

ARTICLE VII

The Contracting Governments shall adopt appropriate measures for the protection of migratory birds of economic or aesthetic value or to prevent the threatened extinction of any given species. Adequate measures shall be adopted which will permit, in so far as the respective governments may see fit, a rational utilization of migratory birds for the purpose of sports as well as for food, commerce, and industry, and for scientific study and investigation.

ARTICLE VIII

The protection of the species mentioned in the Annex to the present Convention, is declared to be of special urgency and importance. Species included therein shall be protected as completely as possible, and their hunting, killing, capturing, or taking, shall be allowed only with the permission of the appropriate government authorities in the country. Such permission shall be granted only under special circumstances, in order to further scientific purposes, or when essential for the administration of the area in which the animal or plant is found.

ARTICLE IX

Each Contracting Government shall take the necessary measures to control and regulate the importation, exportation and transit of protected fauna or flora or any part thereof by the following means:

1. The issuing of certificates authorizing the exportation or transit of protected species of flora or fauna, or parts thereof.

2. The prohibition of the importation of any species of fauna or flora or any part thereof protected by the country of origin unless accompanied by a certificate of lawful exportation as provided for in Paragraph 1 of this Article.

ARTICLE X

1. The terms of this convention shall in no way be interpreted as replacing international agreements previously entered into by one or more of the High Contracting Powers.

2. The Pan American Union shall notify the Contracting Parties of any information relevant to the purposes of the present Convention communicated to it by any national museums or by any organizations, national or international, established within their jurisdiction and interested in the purposes of the Convention.

ARTICLE XI

1. The original of the present Convention in Spanish, English, Portuguese and French* shall be deposited with the Pan American Union and opened for signature by the American Governments on October 12, 1940.

2. The present Convention shall remain open for signature by the American Governments. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Pan American Union, which shall notify their receipt and the dates thereof, and the terms of any accompanying declarations or reservations, to all participating Governments.

3. The present Convention shall come into force three months after the deposit of not less than five ratifications with the Pan American Union.

4. Any ratification received after the date of the entry into force of the Convention, shall take effect three months after the date of its deposit with the Pan American Union.

ARTICLE XII

1. Any contracting Government may at any time denounce the present Convention by a notification in writing addressed to the Pan American Union. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of the receipt of the notification by the Pan American Union, provided, however, that no denunciation shall take effect until the expiration of five years from the date of the entry into force of this Convention.

2. If, as the result of simultaneous or successive denunciations, the number of Contracting Governments is reduced to less than three, the Convention shall cease to be in force from the date on which the last of such denunciations takes effect in accordance with the provisions of the preceding Paragraph.

3. The Pan American Union shall notify all of the American Governments of any denunciations and the date on which they take effect.

4. Should the Convention cease to be in force under the provisions of Paragraph 2 of this article, the Pan American Union shall notify all of the American Governments, indicating the date on which this will become effective.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, having deposited their full powers found to be in due and proper form, sign this Convention at the Pan American Union, Washington, D. C., on behalf of their respective Governments and affix thereto their seals on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

For Bolivia, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) LUIS F. GUACHALLA.
For Cuba, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) PEDRO MARTÍNEZ FRAGA.
For El Salvador, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) HÉCTOR DAVID CASTRO.
For Nicaragua, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) LEÓN DE BAYLE.
For Peru, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) M. DE FREYRE S.

*Spanish, Portuguese, and French texts not printed.

For the Dominican Republic, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) JULIO VEGA BATLLE.
For the United States of America, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (S) CORDELL HULL.
For Venezuela, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) DIÓGENES ESCALANTE.
For Ecuador, October 12, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) C. E. ALFARO.
For Costa Rica, October 24, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) LUIS FERNÁNDEZ.
For Mexico, November 20, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) F. CASTILLO NÁJERA.
For Uruguay, December 9, 1940:
[SEAL] (F) J. RICHLING.
For Brazil, December 27, 1940:
[SEAL] (A) ARNO KONDER.

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original, with the signatures affixed thereto up to the present date, of the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, deposited in the Pan American Union and opened for signature by the American States on October 12, 1940.

Washington, D. C., January 9, 1941.
[SEAL] PEDRO DE ALBA,
Secretary of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union.

LIST OF SPECIES TO BE INCLUDED FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE ANNEX TO THE CONVENTION ON NATURE PROTECTION AND WILD LIFE PRESERVATION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Woodland Caribou (*Rangifer caribou sylvestris*).
Sea Otter (*Enhydra lutris*).
Manatee (*Trichechus latirostris*).
Trumpeter Swan (*Cygnus buccinator*).
California Condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*).

Whooping Crane (*Grus americana*).
Eskimo Curlew (*Phaeopus borealis*).
Hudsonian Godwit (*Limosa haemastica*).
Puerto Rican Parrot (*Amazona vittata*).
Ivory-billed Woodpecker (*Campephilus principalis*).

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the calendar was called Friday and we reached the head of treaties, I objected to the consideration of this convention because a Member of the Senate had informed me that he desired to consider the matter further. I have received word that there is now no objection to the convention, there is a unanimous report from the committee, and I am willing that action be taken on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive C, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the Inter-American Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, signed on the part of the United States of America at Washington on October 12, 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. The nominations in the United States Public Health Service being routine, I ask unanimous consent that they be confirmed en bloc and that the President be notified forthwith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

That concludes the calendar.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 10, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7, 1941:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Ward L. Mould — James R. Shaw
Terrence E. Billings — James Watt

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, April 7, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, in whose embrace all creatures live, in whatsoever world or condition they be, we thank Thee for him, our brother beloved and late companion of our way, whose name and dwelling place and every need Thou only knowest. Gently Thou hast pressed the tired lids to rest, for so Thou givest Thy beloved sleep. We bless Thee for his service to his country and his God; and do Thou grant that his life, so full of purpose here, may yet unfold itself in Thy sight and find sweet employment in the spacious fields of eternity.

Upon the members of his family and all who are near and dear unto him we pray Thy tenderest blessings. Do Thou fold them closer to Thy mercy's breast and deliver them from every power of ill. May they know that when they pass through the waters Thou wilt be with them, and through the rivers they shall not overflow them; when they walk through the fire they shall not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon them; for Thou art the Lord their God, the Holy One of Israel, their Saviour.

And now, Lord, support us all the day long of this troublous life, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes, and the busy world is hushed, and the fever of life is over and our work is done. Then in Thy mercy grant us a safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a matter of national defense, and, the Chair is sure, in conformity with what would be the wishes of our deceased friend, the Senate will receive at this time messages from the President of the United States.

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

PURCHASE OF FOREIGN MERCHANT VESSELS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE (S. DOC. NO. 42)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

There are now in our ports a large number of foreign merchant vessels which have been here for considerable periods of time and which, because of war conditions, have not seen fit to depart.

Section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended by the act of August 7, 1939, authorizes the Maritime Commission, whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable or during any national emergency declared by proclamation, to requisition or purchase any vessel or other watercraft owned by citizens of the United States, or under construction within the United States, or to requisition or charter the use of any such property, and provides that the owner thereof shall be paid just compensation for the property taken or for its use. The same section provides a method by which compensation shall be determined. There does not appear to be any comparable provision with respect to foreign-owned vessels lying idle in our ports.

In view of the growing shortage of available tonnage suited to our national needs, I am satisfied, after consultation with the heads of the interested departments and agencies of the Government, that we should have statutory authority to take over any such vessels as our needs may require, subject, of course, to the payment of just compensation.

It is obvious that our own ultimate defense will be rendered futile if the growing shortage of shipping facilities is not arrested. It is also obvious that inability to remove accumulating materials from our ports can only result in stoppage of production with attendant unemployment and suspension of production contracts. It is therefore essential, both to our defense plans and to our domestic economy, that we shall not permit the continuance of the immobilization in our harbors of shipping facilities.

I attach as of possible assistance to the Congress a draft resolution designed to accomplish the purposes above outlined. It will be noted that the draft contemplates the use of funds appropriated by the "Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941," approved March 27, 1941.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 10, 1941.*

DEATH OF SENATOR SHEPPARD

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it becomes my sad and painful duty to announce to the Senate the death of my colleague the senior Senator from Texas, Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD.

I offer the resolutions, which I send to the desk, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 93) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 93

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of 21 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the second resolving clause the Chair appoints the following Senators to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator: Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. WHITE, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BILBO, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. SPENCER.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, arrangements have been made for the body of the late Senator SHEPPARD to lie in state in the Senate Chamber from 3 p. m. until 6 p. m. this afternoon.

As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1941, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of April 7), 1941:

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF WAR

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of War, as provided for in the act approved July 2, 1926.

John J. McCloy, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of War.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

DENTAL CORPS RESERVE

First Lt. S. Kingdon Avery, Dental Corps Reserve, to be first lieutenant, Dental Corps, with rank from date of appointment.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Clement Augustus Trott, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. George Veazey Strong, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. Irving Joseph Phillipson, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. Daniel Isom Sultan, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. Innis Palmer Swift (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.
Brig. Gen. James Preston Marley (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.
Brig. Gen. Richard Donovan (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.
Brig. Gen. John Piper Smith (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.
Brig. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Henry Church Pillsbury, Medical Corps.
Col. Henry Clay Coburn, Jr., Medical Corps.
Col. William Richard Dear, Medical Corps.
Col. George Harris Paine, Field Artillery.
Col. Charles Peaslee George, Field Artillery.
Col. John Ashley Warden, Quartermaster Corps.
Col. John Blackwell Maynard, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. John Mitchell Willis, Medical Corps.
Col. Edwin Hall Marks, Corps of Engineers.
Col. Wallace Copeland Philoon, Infantry.
Col. Philip Stearns Gage, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. Francis Page Hardaway, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. George Lane Van Deusen, Signal Corps.
Col. George Marshall Parker, Jr., Infantry.
Col. Harry Dwight Chamberlin, Cavalry.
Col. James Irvin Muir, Infantry.
Col. Charles Hines, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. Emil Fred Reinhardt, Infantry.
Col. Wilmot Alfred Danielson, Quartermaster Corps.
Col. George Luberoff, Quartermaster Corps.
Col. John Emmitt Sloan, Field Artillery.
Col. Fred Livingood Walker, Infantry.
Col. Rapp Brush, Infantry.
Col. Gustav Henry Franke, Field Artillery.
Col. Harold Floyd Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. Karl Slaughter Bradford, Cavalry.
Col. James Blanchard Crawford, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. Ira Thomas Wyche, Field Artillery.
Col. John Louis Homer, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian, Field Artillery.
Col. William Clayton Rose, Adjutant General's Department.
Col. Claude Martin Thiele, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. Kenneth Thompson Blood, Coast Artillery Corps.
Col. Harry Lewis Twaddle (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.
Col. Lehman Wellington Miller (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.
Col. Howard Calhoun Davidson (lieutenant colonel), Air Corps.
Col. Ralph Royce (lieutenant colonel), Air Corps.
Col. William Ord Ryan (lieutenant colonel), Air Corps.
Col. Joseph Taggart McNarney (lieutenant colonel), Air Corps.

UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. William P. Seaver, of New York, as Assistant Administrator in charge of Project Development of the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Col. Julian C. Smith to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941.

The following-named lieutenant colonels to be colonels in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Harold S. Fassett
Louis R. Jones

The following-named majors to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

William C. Hall	Floyd W. Bennett
Moses J. Gould	Norman E. True
James L. Denham	

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Ernest E. Shaughnessey	James F. Shaw, Jr.
Theodore B. Millard	William W. Benson
Benjamin F. Kaiser, Jr.	Raymond C. Scollin
Francis B. Loomis, Jr.	Samuel S. Jack
Robert H. McDowell	Henry R. Paige
	Joseph W. Earnshaw

First Lt. William S. McCormick to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1940.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty, ever-living God, infinite Spirit, whose love and goodness we adore, who art the crown of every joy, our abiding shelter in every time of sorrow: At this holy Eastertide, we beseech Thee to strengthen us with the spirit of the Risen Christ, that, lifted above whatever cares may dim the mind, we may overcome those selfish inclinations to which we are so prone.

Help us to set our affections on things above, to our more abundant living in heavenly places on the earth, that, being done with mediocrity, our lives may reflect some happy resurrection from narrower to broader thought, from feebler to stronger will. So raise us up, we beseech Thee, that we may stand erect whatever wind may blow. Make us more generous, more patient, as Thou openest our hearts to all the gladness, to every gleam of sunshine, and do Thou keep them calm and brave in the dark and cloudy day. We ask it in the name of Him who is the Resurrection and the Life, Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, April 7, 1941, and of Thursday, April 10, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On April 7, 1941:

S. 6. An act for the relief of Maude Wilcox;
S. 86. An act for the relief of Worth Gallaher;
S. 390. An act relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks;
S. 431. An act for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey;
S. 527. An act for the relief of Ernest H. Steinberg; and
S. 717. An act for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette.

On April 10, 1941:

S. 192. An act for the relief of the Johnson Flying Service, Inc.;
S. 245. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. E. Purtymun and Mrs. B. H. Russell;
S. 282. An act for the relief of Elmer Linrud;
S. 307. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of J. H. Redding, Inc.;
S. 319. An act for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker;
S. 430. An act for the relief of Addie Myers;
S. 432. An act for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson;
S. 706. An act for the relief of Blanche W. Stout;
S. 791. An act for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley, Ernest H. Tarpley, and Pearl Tarpley; and
S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely.

On April 11, 1941:

S. 246. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Leyvas;
S. 247. An act for the relief of Hilda C. Allstrom;
S. 304. An act for the relief of the Missoula Mercantile Co.;
S. 417. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry H. Denhardt, deceased, of Bowling Green, Ky.;
S. 429. An act for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten;
S. 433. An act to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees in respect of certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status;
S. 441. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;
S. 933. An act for the relief of John McAlister, Inc.;
S. 957. An act for the relief of Glen E. Robinson doing business as the Robinson Marine Construction Co.; and
S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

On April 12, 1941:

S. 283. An act for the relief of Rudolph Mundt; and
S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that, under authority of the order of the 7th instant, he had affixed his signature

on April 9, 1941, during recess of the Senate, to the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries;

S. 432. An act for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson;

H. R. 538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi;

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; and

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1939–40.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1941.*

(NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.)

M. SELLER & CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 790, a bill for the relief of M. Seller & Co.

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to refund to M. Seller & Co., Portland, Oreg., certain penalties (additional duties) in the amount of $5,210.36, which were assessed and collected on merchandise imported from Germany by the above-mentioned firm in 1921. Because the value of the merchandise was understated in its entries, the importer incurred additional duties under the provisions of paragraph I of section III of the Tariff Act of October 3, 1913.

I know of no circumstances which indicate special merit in this case and do not believe that the field of special legislation should be opened to relieve importers of additional duties incurred for undervaluation. Such legislation would accord to certain importers special privileges which are not enjoyed by all under the general law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1941.*

CLAYTON W. CURTIS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 45)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 302, entitled "An act for the relief of Clayton W. Curtis."

This enrolled bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Clayton W. Curtis, of Great Falls, Mont., the sum of $100 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damages to his automobile resulting from a collision between his automobile and a truck operated by a Civilian Conservation Corps enrollee.

Provision for the settlement of claims of this sort is contained in the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 319). Pursuant to such act, Mr. Curtis' claim has been twice considered by the Department of the Interior and has been allowed to the extent of $25.38, the amount determined to be the actual damages sustained.

Since settlement of Mr. Curtis' claim to the full extent to which settlement thereof should be made is provided for by existing law, I am convinced that the approval of S. 302 would not serve the public interest.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1941.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

FOREIGN INTERCOURSE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 43)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation pertaining to the salary appropriations of the Department of State appearing under the heading "Foreign intercourse" in the State Department Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years of 1941 and 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EXPENDING OF CERTAIN FUNDS ALLOCATED TO PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by a Senator, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A paper from Mrs. Dollar, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to Federal taxation and the activities of the Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution by the Board of Supervisors of Rensselaer County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 2245, and for recognition of the advantages of Rensselaer County as a location for the veterans' hospital proposed in the bill referred to; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from 25 citizens, mothers of Eckerty, Ind., remonstrating against the United States entering into war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Letters in the nature of petitions from several citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the United States convoying vessels through belligerent zones; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Ina MacDonald, of Seattle, Wash., praying that the United States take over and annex the Dominion of Canada in the interest of the defense of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation to complete the St. Lawrence seaway project as outlined by the President and thus remove the economic barriers which now afflict the Midwest and the Nation as a whole; to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. WILEY.)

A petition of several citizens, original locators on two oil placer mining claims consisting of 160 acres each situated in Niobrara County, Wyo., praying for certain relief, adjustment and adjudication in the premises; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 22

"Relative to construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River

"Whereas it is contemplated that the delta islands in the San Joaquin River below Stockton will be utilized as a base for large armed forces due to the defense emergency; and

"Whereas these islands are in constant danger of flooding during the winter months due particularly to the flood and storm waters carried into the San Joaquin River by the Stanislaus River during the winter period; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to construct a dam on the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River in order to retain the usual annual excess flow of water of the Stanislaus River; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 34

"Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress in connection with legislation to provide marine hospitalization for fishermen

"Whereas maritime fishermen have heretofore received the benefits of marine hospital services since 1875, but have recently been precluded therefrom by a ruling of the Comptroller of the United States; and

"Whereas the extension of the benefits of marine hospitalization now available to other maritime workers to include fishermen appears to be in line with the established policy of the United States; and

"Whereas H. R. 84 is now pending in the Congress and is designed to include within

the definition of seamen in the act entitled 'An act to promote economy and efficiency in the Marine Hospital Service' (18 Stat. 485) persons operating on board, or employed on board, vessels in fishing operations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to enact said H. R. 84, or such other legislation as it deems suitable to accomplish the purpose of extending the benefits of marine hospital service to maritime fishermen, and the President of the United States is respectfully petitioned to approve such legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from California."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of South Carolina; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"House resolution memorializing the President of the United States of America and the Congress to take such immediate action as is necessary to put an end to strikes

"Whereas the dictators of the world are doing all in their power to overrun weak nations and to destroy the democracies; and

"Whereas the United States of America has recently appropriated huge sums of moneys for the purpose of aiding these unfortunate countries being trampled upon by the dictators; and

"Whereas, to carry on this humane undertaking to save the liberty of the peace-loving people of the United States and the democracies of the world, it is necessary that the entire people unite in one common purpose by laying aside every selfish motive and contributing their patriotic services to that general end; and

"Whereas the production of guns, tanks, airplanes, and war materials of various kinds is being delayed by strikes in various parts of the country, instigated in many instances by so-called 'fifth columnists'; and

"Whereas it is the sentiment of the people of South Carolina, expressed by this body, that these deplorable strikes be immediately taken in hand by the President of the United States and Congress, and that such legislation and means be promulgated as will wipe out these 'fifth columnists' who are today endangering the peace and safety, not only of the democracies abroad but of the United States itself: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby, memorialized to enact such legislation as may be necessary to immediately put an end to all existing strikes and to prevent the occurrence of strikes during the present emergency; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, and each Member of the Congress from South Carolina."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution expressing gratitude and appreciation for the naming of one of the new-type heavy cruisers *Hawaii*

"Whereas it has been announced by the Navy Department that one of the new-type heavy cruisers now under construction will be named *Hawaii;* and

"Whereas the recognition of this Territory in such manner is a signal honor accorded the people of this Territory: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, Twenty-first Legislature, regular session of 1941 (the House of Representatives concurring), That it does hereby express its gratitude and appreciation to the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and to the Navy Department for naming one of the new-type heavy cruisers *Hawaii;* and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Navy, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Senate Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for a more adequate system of mine-to-market roads as a part of the defense program of the Nation

"Whereas a program of national defense has been inaugurated the objective of which is to utilize various important functions of our economic life, to the end that the best interests of all be served; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has adopted an extensive preliminary program for the defense of the Nation and as a part thereof has made appropriations for the construction and reconstruction of highways designed for the direct use of military units, but has overlooked all consideration of the basic industry of mining and the making of an appropriation for improving secondary or mine-to-market roads as a part of such defense program; and

"Whereas mining is a basic industry in supplying essential elements for the manufacturing of munitions, armaments, and in the supplying of other products which must be immediately available as an indispensable part of national defense; and

"Whereas the benefits which may be derived from and the usefulness of mining products are in direct proportion to the facility with which such products may be transported from mines to the points of milling and use, and an adequate system of feeder roads from mines to markets must be provided if the mining industry is to take its proper place in any measures for defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress be memorialized to make an adequate appropriation for the immediate construction and the improvement of mine-to-market roads for the rapid transportation of mining products to the points of milling and use, as a part of the national defense; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Senate of the United States, and to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Nevada congressional delegation, and to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as the authorized national-defense agency, and to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency.

"STATE OF NEVADA,
"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
"Approved March 28, 1941.
"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor.*"

"Senate Joint Resolution 13

"Senate joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to allot moneys for the construction of highways strategic for national defense on the basis outlined in the Federal Aid Highway Act or on a basis more favorable to the States

"Whereas the Federal Government has embarked upon a Nation-wide program of defense in which the construction of adequate highways is recognized as a primary factor; and

"Whereas a survey has been made of the highways embraced in the strategic network as established by the national-defense agency; and

"Whereas this survey has shown the need for improvement of these highways to meet the standards established by the national-defense agency; and

"Whereas the improvement to the accepted standard of mine-to-market and farm-to-market roads is as essential in a program for national defense as the improvement of the primary network of war-defense highways; and

"Whereas the expense of providing an adequate system of national-defense highways, including farm-to-market and mine-to-market roads, is primarily the obligation of the Federal Government, representing as it does the interests of all our people, and Federal expenditures for such a highway system are proper charges in the defense program; and

"Whereas the matching of Federal funds with State funds has been on a fixed basis under the Federal Aid Highway Act for a sufficient period to indicate the reasonableness of such apportionment to both the States and the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to allot the moneys appropriated in connection with its defense program for the construction of highways strategic for national defense on the same basis as that in effect in the making of allocations to the States under the Federal Aid Highway Act or on a basis even more favorable to the States, because of the national character of highways involved; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Senate of the United States, and to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Nevada congressional delegation, and to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as the authorized national-defense agency, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency.

"STATE OF NEVADA,
"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
"Approved March 28, 1941.
"E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor.*"

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Joint Memorial 13

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fifteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas word has come that the House of Representatives of the United States has accepted the recommendation of the War Department to transfer the terminus of the Alaska Railroad from Seward to Passage Canal, sometimes known as Portage Bay, where a new port is to be established; and

"Whereas it may be anticipated that the United States Senate will shortly concur and the transfer thereby become law after signature by the President; and

"Whereas this move was recommended on the basis of a national-defense need, in that the shorter haul from Passage Canal to the new Army base at Fort Richardson would give the United States armed forces and supplies surer ingress and egress to the interior, with diminished danger from interruption of said traffic; and

"Whereas this change will spell ruin for the people of Seward since they will be deprived of virtually the only industry the

town now possesses, namely, the loading and unloading of steamships; and

"Whereas it is clearly desirable from the standpoint of national defense that a road connection be established between Seward and Anchorage; and

"Whereas such road connection would tend to alleviate the economic disaster which will come to the people of Seward when their access to the interior is cut off, as it will be as soon as the connection by rail no longer exists; and

"Whereas the road from Seward to Sunrise and Hope, on Turnagain Arm, some 75 miles in length, built by the United States Bureau of Public Roads, already exists; and

"Whereas continuation of this road by bridge across Turnagain Arm from Sunrise to Bird and thence to Anchorage has been pronounced a wholly feasible project by competent engineers, which can be constructed at a cost roughly estimated to be one million and a quarter dollars; and

"Whereas the cost of this project is approximately only one-quarter of the estimated cost of the establishment of a new port at Passage Canal and the construction of 13 miles of road through the mountains to connect with the Alaska Railroad at mile 67: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the legislature request the Congress of the United States authorize this road and bridge and appropriate the money necessary for this project, and that its construction be commenced immediately so as to insure its completion at the time when Seward and the Kenai Peninsula as a whole will be no longer connected with the interior of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution of Vincent V. Picard Post, No. 234, the American Legion, of Northboro, Mass., favoring prompt revision of the Selective Service Act so that all men now 21 not now subject to the act, and all men reaching the age of 21, be made subject to the act, and that all men over 25 now registered under the Selective Service Act be placed on a deferred classification and not subject to call unless the United States enters war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens, members of St. James Methodist Church, of Stoneham, Mass., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE—Y. M. C. A. BUSSES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to exempt Y. M. C. A. busses from the provisions of the Federal Motor Transportation Act.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to exempt Y. M. C. A. busses from the provisions of the Federal Motor Transportation Act

Whereas busses owned by the Y. M. C. A. have been ruled by the Interstate Commerce Commission as common conveyors under the provisions of the Federal Motor Transportation Act, thereby subjecting them to the Interstate Commerce Act and to the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission governing common carriers; and

Whereas section 203 (B) 9 of part 2 of the Motor Transportation Act exempts various motor vehicles from the provisions thereof, including school busses and private motor vehicles which do not generally but occasionally and usually transport passengers across State lines; and

Whereas the Y. M. C. A. bus is used primarily in interstate operation and to furnish transportation at cost or less to members participating in its activities; and

Whereas if such busses are required to comply with the exacting provision of the Federal law governing common conveyors, an undue financial hardship will fall on the Y. M. C. A. and similar welfare organizations, which do not in any way compete with common carriers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact an amendment to the Federal Motor Transportation Act exempting Y. M. C. A. and other welfare organization busses from the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and Motor Transportation Act affecting common conveyors; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Members thereof.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.)

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution, file No. 71267, relative to the St. Lawrence waterway, adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee under date of March 24, 1941.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

File No. 71267

Resolution supporting the St. Lawrence seaway

The Midwest is vitally concerned in a deep-water outlet to the high seas. The State of Wisconsin having 22 lake harbors entering the inland oceans, known as the Great Lakes, has championed such a project for many years. The city of Milwaukee, having the largest harbor in point of water-borne commerce on Lake Michigan, has never ceased its efforts to secure the improvement of the St. Lawrence River as an efficient connecting link between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean.

The people of the Widwest are conscious of the fact that a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives them of an economical, expeditious, and free outlet for their factory and farm products to the markets of the world. The deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel, as advocated by successive Presidents of the United States, will prove an economic advantage to the Nation as a whole. It will bring the Midwest a thousand miles nearer the high seas and that much nearer to the markets of the world.

While the project must be regarded as one of the highest importance under normal conditions it assumes a special significance at a time when the Nation is deeply concerned in the same as a defense measure. While the eastern section of the country is seeking more power service the Mdwest must have greater navigation freedom.

There can be no doubt that the great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region forms a vital part of an entire Nation, and, therefore, should not be hampered or hindered in rendering a maximum service. The shipbuilding industry in the Great Lakes region deserves encouragement. Such industries not only have their advantage in being centrally located, but at a time when the Nation is dealing with the matter of defense they are more secure if located in the midcountry.

Thus, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project does not only possess power potentialities, navigation advantages, but also forms an important factor as a defense measure: Therefore it be

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee herewith formally and respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as outlined by the President of the United States and thus remove the economic barriers which now afflict the Midwest country and the Nation and as whole; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of the foregoing preamble and resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives of the National Congress, and to the mayors of the important sister cities throughout the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 15. A bill to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District; with an amendment (Rept. No. 173).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 342. A bill establishing overtime rates for compensation for employees of the field services of the Navy Department and the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 179);

S. 993. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer, without cost, to the estate of Rolland H. Denny a triangular parcel of land containing one-half an acre situated at Seattle, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 176);

S. 1109. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy certain land known as Ward's Bank Training Wall and the right-of-way adjacent to the South Jetty at the entrance to the St. Johns River, Fla., and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a title in fee simple to the Ward's Bank Training Wall and the South Jetty property, Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 177);

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212); without amendment (Rept. No. 175);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 174);

H. R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel

of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 178); and

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 180).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS—VIEWS OF MINORITY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is to come before the Senate tomorrow, as I understand, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, House bill 3205, which has been reported from the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce and also a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, has prepared minority views. In his name and on his behalf, I present the minority views on a certain item—the so-called McKellar amendment, providing appropriation for American export air lines—contained in the bill referred to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the views of the minority will be received and printed—part 2 of Senate Report No. 142.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On April 4, 1941:

S. 319. An act for the relief of Virginia Bowen, Willie W. Hudson, and John L. Walker;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Glen E. Robinson, doing business as the Robinson Marine Construction Co.; and

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes.

On April 9, 1941:

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; and

S. 432. An act for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy and in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1317. A bill to provide for the establishment of a district forecast office of the Weather Bureau in Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1318. A bill for the relief of Sherman W. White; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1319. A bill granting an increase of pension to Earl W. Newlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

S. 1320. A bill to add certain lands to the St. Joe National Forest, Idaho, in order to protect the watershed of the town of St. Maries; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1321. A bill for the relief of the Gros Ventre Nation or Tribe of Indians of Montana; and

S. 1322. A bill to provide for payments by the United States to the several States with respect to certain Indians lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Emil Guertzgen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1324. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act in such manner as to provide for the insurance of producers of cotton against loss in yields of cotton due to unavoidable causes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1325. A bill to provide for insurance by the Farm Credit Administration of loans made by financial institutions for the purpose of enabling borrowers to purchase livestock for restocking or herd-foundation purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. HARRISON):

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Bertha Stephenson Hale; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. Mr. McNARY:

S. 1327. A bill for the relief of Lincoln County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clairmon Brooks; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES:

S. 1329. A bill to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Santee and Cooper Rivers in the Counties of Berkley, Clarendon, and Orangeburg, S. C.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1330. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1913, as amended, with respect to eligibility requirements for the office of Commissioner of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1331. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals, lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Philip Kaye; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1333. A bill to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Olympic National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to provide for the participation of the United States in the Florida Centennial and Pan American Exposition to be held in the State of Florida during the year 1945; to the Committee on Commerce.

W. R. LARKIN AND DORA LARKIN—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to H. R. 4064, for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall irrigation project, Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Second Chance," delivered by the Vice President before the Foreign Policy Association in New York City on April 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY SENATOR DAVIS ON STEEL SCRAP AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on steel scrap and national defense, written by him and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 6, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERREGIONAL FREIGHT RATES

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of Industrial Development and Interregional Freight Rates, delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Third Annual Transportation Conference of the University of Nebraska on April 7, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH HON. JAMES A. FARLEY ON TRADE WITH SOUTH AMERICA

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Hon. James A. Farley by John F. Coggswell on conditions in and trade with South America, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIALS ON JAPANESE-RUSSIAN PACT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times, an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, all of Monday, April 14, 1941, relative to the Japanese-Russian pact, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE MARVIN B. ROSENBERRY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Tolerance in Time of Crisis," delivered by Chief Justice Marvin B. Rosenberry, of the Wisconsin Supreme Court, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY GROVER LOENING ON OCEAN AIR CARGOES

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ocean Air Cargoes in the Predictable Future," written by Grover Loening, and published in the April 1941 issue of National Aeronautics, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE ON CENTRALIZATION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD portions of a statement which appeared as an advertisement in the Washington Post of last Wednesday, April 9. On that day and the succeeding day, Thursday of last week, the Governors of 11 Southern States met in Washington—the Governors of Alabama, North Carolina, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Florida, Arkansas, South Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Georgia, and Texas. They met here for the purpose of calling the attention of the National Defense Commission and others to their States—to the South. I wish to read portions of this advertisement, which appeared in the Washington Post on the date I have just stated:

We, the Governors of the Southern States, call to the attention of the President and others in authority the dangerous and unwarranted centralization of national-defense production in the older and more congested industrial areas.

Up to January 31, seven and one-half billions of national-defense contracts (excluding shipbuilding) had been let, of which only 7 percent were placed in 11 Southern States. Of a total of 302 new plants, only 24 were located in the South.

Of the eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded up to February 15, a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies, or financially interrelated groups of companies. This short-sighted policy of centralizing national-defense contracts is dangerous to the welfare of the Nation, because it will inevitably result in:

1. A shortage of labor, and therefore the movement of large labor reserves out of the South into highly industrialized areas, making for more congestion and creating vast economic problems when the emergency is over.

2. Create intolerable bottlenecks in transportation of both raw materials into the congested industrial areas and in the shipment of finished products.

3. Create vast plant and production facilities in areas already overbuilt industrially, which will become idle and useless when the need for defense production is at an end.

We believe that it is to the best interest of the Nation to decentralize production for national defense; to establish plants where raw materials supply and loyal labor are readily available, where power and transportation facilities are ample, where climatic conditions are most favorable for year-round production, and where such plants will be needed for other production uses when the needs of national defense have been fulfilled.

The South offers these and many other industrial advantages and is ready and willing to use its full resources for national defense.

The best interests of the Nation can be served only if full use is made of the South's resources by industrial plants established in this area. And the same holds for other sections of the country where resources and labor are plentiful and where industrial congestion is not a liability. We further believe immediate steps in this direction are necessary.

SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed. The consideration of bills on the calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations received by the Senate on the 10th instant, and on today, the 14th instant, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on the 10th instant, and also received today, the 14th instant, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no further business to be transacted today, and I am not able to make any announcement as to tomorrow. It was understood that the Post Office and Treasury Departments appropriation bill would be taken up then; but the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], in charge of that bill, probably will not be here because of illness, and I shall not know until tomorrow whether that bill will be taken up or will be put over for a few days. So, there being nothing further to do today, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 14, 1941.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Merlin Louis DeGuire, Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1937.

First Lt. Franklin Kemble, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1937.

First Lt. William Menoher, Field Artillery (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from August 1, 1935.

First Lt. Ray Allen Pillivant, Coast Artillery Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1938.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Charles Junious Harrison, Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Second Lt. Victor Charles Warren, Infantry (first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from June 14, 1938.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM APRIL 1, 1914

Lt. Col. Alden George Strong, Coast Artillery Corps (colonel, Army of the United States).

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Nell C. Phillips, Eclectic, Ala., in place of N. C. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Lucille C. Land, Gilbertown, Ala., in place of L. C. Land. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

James Byron Hull, Lineville, Ala., in place of J. B. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

FLORIDA

Claude Dougar Boring, Arcadia, Fla., in place of C. D. Boring. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1941.

Rowena E. McDaniel, Ocoee, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

ILLINOIS

James L. Brown, Chebanse, Ill., in place of J. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1941.

Emanuel J. Shafranski, Lemont, Ill., in place of E. J. Shafranski. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1941.

Mayme F. Brooke, Matteson, Ill., in place of M. F. Brooke. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1940.

INDIANA

Sherard Theodore Henry, Lowell, Ind., in place of S. T. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

KANSAS

Earl C. Biggs, Lebanon, Kans., in place of E. C. Biggs. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

MAINE

Edward J. Doyle, Calais, Maine, in place of E. J. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired August 13, 1939.

MASSACHUSETTS

Richard B. Murphy, Dennis Port, Mass., in place of R. B. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

James D. Cleary, Feeding Hills, Mass., in place of J. D. Cleary. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Thomas D. Cudihy, Marblehead, Mass., in place of T. D. Cudihy. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Joseph Daniel Scully, Medfield, Mass., in place of J. D. Scully. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Owen W. Gallagher, North Abington, Mass., in place of O. W. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

MISSISSIPPI

Lottie W. Beazley, Raymond, Miss., in place of L. W. Beazley. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

MISSOURI

Dale S. Vencill, Galt, Mo., in place of D. S. Vencill. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

John Frank Hughes, Jr., Greenville, Mo., in place of J. F. Hughes, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Edna M. Geisinger, Jerico Springs, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Isaac M. Horn, Memphis, Mo., in place of I. M. Horn. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Genevieve M. Pratte, St. Marys, Mo., in place of G. M. Pratte. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Arthur Earl Thurman, Steelville, Mo., in place of A. E. Thurman. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

William H. D'Arcy, Cranford, N. J., in place of W. H. D'Arcy. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1939.

Harold B. Hofford, Hohokus, N. J., in place of Frederick Baxter, deceased.

Edward von Kattengell, Red Bank, N. J., in place of Edward von Kattengell. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1941.

NEW YORK

John P. Hayes, Albany, N. Y., in place of E. P. McCormack, deceased.

Martin Carey, Castile, N. Y., in place of Martin Carey. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Eleanor Ann Coonan, Champlain, N. Y., in place of E. A. Coonan. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Charles A. O'Brien, Fayetteville, N. Y., in place of C. A. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Francis Arthur Fagan, Herkimer, N. Y., in place of F. A. Fagan. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Robert E. Lindsay, Mattituck, N. Y., in place of R. E. Lindsey. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Margaret T. Scott, Piermont, N. Y., in place of M. T. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

August J. Portanova, Purchase, N. Y., in place of A. J. Portanova. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

James O. Bennett, Silver Creek, N. Y., in place of J. O. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Arthur D. Driscoll, Whitney Point, N. Y., in place of A. D. Driscoll. Incumbents' commission expired February 9, 1941.

NORTH CAROLINA

Rufus Jennings White, Conway, N. C., in place of R. J. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

OKLAHOMA

Elmer J. Solomon, Kingfisher, Okla., in place of E. J. Solomon. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Myrtle Lee Autrey, Norman, Okla., in place of M. L. Autrey. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert C. Laird, Downingtown, Pa., in place of R. C. Laird. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Walter S. Cressman, Gwynedd Valley, Pa., in place of W. S. Cressman. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1940.

PUERTO RICO

Rita M. Rodriguez, Guayanilla, P. R., in place of R. M. Rodriguez. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1940.

Leyla R. Ramirez, San German, P. R., in place of Enrique Rossy, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Thurman F. Eldridge, Bradford, R. I., in place of T. F. Eldridge. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John C. Fowler, Gaffney, S. C., in place of J. C. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Robert H. Billings, Lancaster, S. C., in place of R. H. Billings. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

TEXAS

Volney D. Phillips, Celina, Tex., in place of V. D. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Neil M. Hall, Greggton, Tex., in place of N. M. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Hail Thou once despised Jesus! Hail Thou Galilean King! O Spirit of God, descend upon our hearts and touch them with gratitude divine. Help us to live in the joy of Thy resurrection, who by Thy death hath destroyed death, praising Thee who hast passed the eternal gates, uniting with the deathless voices of the sons of glory. As Thou alone canst inspire spiritual vision, rich-toned and forward looking, setting before us a deathless ideal, we pray Thee to increase our zeal to approach it. Persuade us, blessed Lord, that religion is the noblest aspiration of the heart of man, meditating upon the unworded things of God. Grant us this day the grace and the challenge of our tasks, sustaining us in the presence of every temptation, and may we not be blinded by evil passions or swayed by impulses which are wrong. It is Christ in us, the living Saviour; by Him may we attempt to live; by Him may we peacefully die and go on forever with our Lord. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 23, 1941:

H. R. 533. An act to amend section 4 (f) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide for extra compensation for overtime of inspectors in charge and radio inspectors of the Field Division of the Engineering Department of the Federal Communications Commission.

H. R. 2703. An act for the relief of the estate of Joe L. McQueen.

At 11 a. m.:

H. R. 3155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

At 12 o'clock noon:

H. R. 3325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3440. An act for the relief of Edith Platt.

H. R. 3441. An act for the relief of Daisy Fitzpatrick.

On March 27, 1941, at 10:50 a. m.:

H. R. 4050. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

On March 28, 1941:

H. R. 3575. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

On April 1, 1941:

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell.

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt.

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

On April 2, 1941:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicsville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor.

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles.

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican.

On April 3, 1941:

H. R. 3546. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes.

On April 5, 1941:

H. R. 2788. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4124. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

On April 7, 1941:

H. R. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him.

On April 11, 1941:

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes.

On April 12, 1941:

H. R. 538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 93

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of 21 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1941.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress, from the Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. SAM MASSINGALE, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WICKERSHAM appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1941.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives:

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to by the House of Representatives on April 3, 1941, the Clerk of the House received the accompanying messages from the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment of the House.

Yours very truly,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

A message from the Senate, received on April 4, 1941, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi;

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; and

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; and

S. 432. An act for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3486. An act to authorize an appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MALONEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3735. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A message from the Senate, received on April 7, 1941, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 165. An act to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization;

S. 166. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.;

S. 167. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.;

S. 178. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands;

S 198. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain land located within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation, Mont., for certain land owned by the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, of Missoula, Mont.;

S. 218. An act to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States;

S. 658. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War;

S 755. An act for the relief of W. W. Carlton.

S. 768. An act to amend the Neutrality Act of 1939 to permit the transportation by American vessels of articles and materials to certain naval and air bases leased by the United States;

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 850. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase refuge lands within the State of South Carolina for the perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey and to provide pure-blood brood stock for restocking within its native range, and for other purposes;

S. 991. An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty;

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts;

S. 1090. An act to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds;

S. 1123. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended;

S. 1166. An act for the relief of Daniel Steele;

S. 1190. An act for the relief of Julia Neville; and

S. 1200. An act to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 262. An act regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on April 3, 1941, he did on April 7, 1941, sign the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi;

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes;

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; and

S. 432. An act for the relief of Irvine J. Stenson.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (10 U. S. C. 1052–a), I beg to advise you that I have appointed the following members of this committee as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy for the calendar year 1941: Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER, Hon. DAVID D. TERRY, Hon. JOE STARNES, Hon. D. LANE POWERS, Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Very cordially yours,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

FOREIGN MERCHANT VESSELS (S. DOC. NO. 42)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

There are now in our ports a large number of foreign merchant vessels which have been here for considerable periods of time and which because of war conditions have not seen fit to depart.

Section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended by the act of August 7, 1939, authorizes the Maritime Commission, whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable or during any national emergency declared by proclamation, to requisition or purchase any vessel or other watercraft owned by citizens of the United States, or under construction within the United States, or to requisition or charter the use of any such property, and provides that the owner thereof shall be paid just compensation for the property taken or for its use. The same section provides a method by which compensation shall be determined. There does not appear to be any comparable provision with respect to

foreign-owned vessels lying idle in our ports.

In view of the growing shortage of available tonnage suited to our national needs, I am satisfied, after consultation with the heads of the interested departments and agencies of the Government, that we should have statutory authority to take over any such vessels as our needs may require, subject, of course, to the payment of just compensation.

It is obvious that our own ultimate defense will be rendered futile if the growing shortage of shipping facilities is not arrested. It is also obvious that inability to remove accumulating materials from our ports can only result in stoppage of production with attendant unemployment and suspension of production contracts. It is therefore essential, both to our defense plans and to our domestic economy, that we shall not permit the continuance of the immobilization in our harbors of shipping facilities.

I attach as of possible assistance to the Congress a draft resolution designed to accomplish the purposes above outlined. It will be noted that the draft contemplates the use of funds appropriated by the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, approved March 27, 1941.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 10, 1941.*

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (H. DOC. NO. 170)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1939–40.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1941.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to special order of March 19, 1941, the Chair requests the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to now read the first inaugural address of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi read the address, as follows:

Friends and Fellow Citizens:—

Called upon to undertake the duties of the first executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me, that in the other high authorities provided by our constitution, I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal, on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amid the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussion and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the nation, announced according to the rules of the constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; that this should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all republicans—we are federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us, then, with courage and confidence pursue our own federal and republican principles, our attachment to our union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them including honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship, with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and

the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the *habeas corpus;* and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this, the greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence reposed in our first and great revolutionary character, whose preëminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love, and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional; and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a consolation to me for the past; and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe, lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

EXPENDITURES OF NEW DEAL

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD, including certain notations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business today and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business today, following the address of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], I be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address by Mr. Pressman. I have at this time an estimate from the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and one other special order, I be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in the C. I. O. News of April 14, Harold Christoffel, the communistic president of the local C. I. O., U. A. W., which tied up production in the Allis-Chalmers factory for 75 days, is quoted as saying:

> We have defeated the combined efforts of the police, the courts, the employers, and Washington to break the strike, and we won a real victory.

Mr. Speaker, how long are we going to permit these communistic labor racketeers in the C. I. O., whose chief objective is to sabotage our defense program, to defy the courts and municipal, State, and Federal authorities? Unless the loyal and patriotic American citizens, who make up the rank and file of organized labor, clean house and get rid of these communistic labor leaders, the public will not long condone a law that forces employers to deal collectively with such leaders. If the C. I. O. does not get rid of these subversive elements, Congress, in the interest of national defense, must protect the employers who attempt to stamp out of their plants these subversive, communistic elements. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address and an article written by Hon. Jacob Ark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRIKE LEGISLATION

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been the recipient within the last few days of hundreds of letters, and every letter strenuously objects to the way the present administration is handling the labor situation. These strikes are deplorable, especially when they tie up our national defense in such a manner that it becomes thoroughly disgusting to the people of this country, and particularly the constituents of my district. I am acutely conscious of the fact that the American workingman is loyal, sincere, and patriotic. He does not want to strike, but under the leadership of cheap, chiseling, unscrupulous racketeers the American laboring man has been bludgeoned, browbeaten, and subjugated through intimidation and bodily harm.

I am one who firmly believes that additional legislation is not necessitated to stop these strikes. I am fully convinced that we have adequate legislation, and I ask the present administration and the Secretary of Labor to enforce this legislation in such a way that the American people will be the recipients of all the benefits, rather than have the unpatriotic labor leaders, who have no regard for the obligations that the average laboring man wants to discharge in the nature of loyal service to his country, provoke these strikes.

The inequity of the entire situation resolves itself into this: We are asking

the flower of our American manhood to enlist in the Army for a measly $21 a month and to offer the supreme sacrifice if it becomes necessary; then why should we permit these racketeers who control labor organizations to demand in a day and a half what these boys are given in 1 month?

I ask that this be given your very serious consideration. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of a radio address delivered by myself over N. B. C. April 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio address I made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COAL MINERS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week end I went into the coal field of West Virginia to get some first-hand information. I am glad to report to the House that I found, everything considered, a very fine spirit among the mining people in that coal-mining district. From the best examinations that I could make on the ground in the length of time that I was there I was convinced that the heart of the individual coal miner is sound. These are the people Mr. Lewis says I am in favor of electrocuting. Of course, that is perfectly ridiculous. I shall ask to be printed at the conclusion of my remarks what I did say. I do not want a single one of the upstanding people with whom I talked to believe I ever said any such thing as Mr. Lewis is quoted as saying I said. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lewis is a very prominent gentleman, but really I was not looking over his shoulder at the rank and file of organized labor when I was making the observations referred to, twisted much in the reference. [Applause and laughter.]

As I went through these mining communities, not a wheel turning, men, machinery, mines paralyzed by an organization domination I could discover no element of democratic control. I wondered as I saw these people and these idle mines if history is to repeat itself here in this country, if it is repeating itself and recording the fact that we too are winning for our enemies, in these paralyzed mines and factories the decisive battles of the war into which we are rapidly moving. I want these miners to know what I said and see for themselves whether it justifies the appeal to their prejudice made by Mr. Lewis.

The matter above referred to follows:

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. I am sure I speak the sentiments of all in this Chamber when I say we have been moved very deeply, indeed, by the gentleman's very great statement. We recognize also the powers that are vested in the administrative branch of the Government to put a stop to the strikes in defense industry during the period of the emergency. We recognize also the possibility of labor and management, if they were not too hard-headedly selfish, to get together and work out a moratorium on their differences; but the question that is tearing my heart out now is this: In the event that one or the other of these opportunities is not seized either by labor and management or by the administration, can this Congress count on the gentleman's committee to bring in legislation letting Congress assume responsibility and go ahead?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will say this to my friend—he has asked a very pertinent question—the Committee on the Judiciary believes it is advising itself with regard to the facts in this situation. We have had a good deal of experience in legislation. We do not agree with the general popular misconception that you can bring about results merely by passing a law. We do not want to embarrass the administrative agencies of the Government. Things have been drifting along possibly without those in responsibility being conscious of how far they have gone.

It is absolutely essential that the loyal element in labor if possible, and it is possible, be cut away from those who would do this country hurt. It is a pretty delicate matter to be dealt with. In large measure that is a job for their own thinking and for public opinion. Public opinion is rapidly coming to the conclusion that a better method than strikes afford must be found to settle disputes in these industries which are producing essential materials. Labor had better heed the warning which I presume to give as a friend: That it is throwing away the support of public opinion so rapidly that soon public opinion will not consider as "scabs" people who are going in to work in these closed-down industries. They will consider them as patriots responding to the call of their country's need and those who would obstruct them as "scabbing" against their country's interest. I would not be afraid to wager my life on that prophecy.

I will say to my colleague, for whom I have great respect and appreciation, that the Committee on the Judiciary—I think I can speak for each of them—is doing its level best to let the people know what the facts are, to give public opinion an opportunity to get into action to separate the vast majority of labor which is loyal from the minority which is not; to unite the people under a consciousness of a common danger, to be useful to the executive agencies of the Government. When that time comes, when that part of the job shall have been finished—and nobody knows when it will be, nobody knows, but it must be soon—we may make a mistake; but when that time comes, and, I repeat, it must come soon, and the administrative agencies of the Government are failing their action, when that time comes when it is necessary to deal with the enemies of this Nation whether they be in the factory or elsewhere, I believe the sentiment of the Committee on the Judiciary is to bring in whatever legislation is necessary; and if it is necessary to send them to the electric chair in order to preserve the liberty of this country, I do not believe there is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary who would hesitate one split second to do it. [Applause.]

Of course, the person who refuses to work cannot be classified as an enemy to his country, and not a member of the Judiciary Committee would, but there are enemies to this country planted in strategic industries against whom it may be necessary to invoke the extreme power of government to preserve its security. About them there must be no hesitancy.

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to look over the shoulder of anybody, as was stated by the Member who just spoke, when I make an observation in criticism of Mr. Ickes, who termed Charles A. Lindbergh as the No. 1 Nazi dupe. In Chicago on Saturday he declared that—

> Charles A. Lindbergh was the No. 1 United States Nazi fellow traveler and that every act of his and every word * * * proves that he wants Germany to win.

I defy that statement of Mr. Ickes in every way. It is not honest; it is not true; it is a cheap, unwarranted accusation. I believe that Charles A. Lindbergh is just as good an American citizen as anybody in this country [applause], and that he wants to do the right thing. He speaks his own mind. He has a right to criticize what this administration does. Mr. Ickes, being the chief spokesman of the administration, does not mean that we are all Communists or that we are all against America when we criticize this administration, does he? I think Mr. Lindbergh is right. I defy Mr. Ickes to call me a Tory, or a copperhead, or economic royalist, or back stabber, or prince of privilege, or character assassin, or some of the other names that he has called other good, honest, loyal American citizens. He should know better. [Applause.] Why is it that Mr. Ickes speaks for the administration in condemning anyone who disagrees with them? We hope we have free speech and free press in America. I opposed the lease-lend bill and the $7,000,000,000 accompanying it. I am glad I did. The American taxpayers will be glad later. The American people will be glad later, especially if we get into war. I do not want a dictator in America, neither; but be careful lest it befall us. I want a free America, a liberty-loving people, a peaceful nation. No war for me, especially in Europe or Asia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a radio talk made by one of the members of the Wisconsin Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese-Soviet nonaggression pact is the inevitable result of our militant interventionist policy in the Far East, as was the Japanese-Nazi-Fascist military alliance. Instead of helping China, it is beginning to look as if our bewildered policy of quarantining Europe and Asia has brought ruin and disaster wherever we intervened.

The American Minister at Belgrade, Mr. Lane, reported the day before Yugoslavia went to war that he had 15 interviews with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, presumably telling them all about the lend-lease bill and assuring them of our immediate support.

Our confused interventionist policy, based on diplomatic promises, led Yugoslavia to fight the mighty Nazi armies without our raising a finger to help them. Either our State Department is ignorant of the strength of the Nazi air force and military machine, or does not care if it is responsible for urging small nations to commit suicide.

Whenever we have meddled in Europe, such as in Poland or France, those nations have paid in blood and tears. We are not prepared for war ourselves and will not be for another year, until we have equipped our own Army. Let us, in the meanwhile, cease trying to involve other nations in the bloody shambles of Europe and make America and this continent invincible.

Let us continue to supply Great Britain with war supplies, even at the risk of incurring Axis enmity, but not to convoy ships or to get into war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Senator BRIDGES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Dr. C. C. Pierce, of the United States Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution adopted by a convention held in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make two separate extensions in the RECORD and to include in one certain letters from constituents, and in the other an article from the magazine the American Forest.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, evidently those who have spoken on the strike situation today did not hear the testimony of Mr. Knudsen when he was before the committee that has been authorized by resolution of this body to investigate the national-defense program. If they heard that fine gentleman they would not have made the intemperate remarks against labor today. Let me say that I think the Government must be clothed with the sword of authority, but that. We have placed authority in the it should be tempered with the bridle of restraint in this serious emergency. This present administration has done just hands of those responsible for the administration of government and they have used it only with the proper restraint.

I have sometimes wondered why those who now condemn labor did not speak up when industry went on a sit-down in the beginning of the national-defense program and insisted on many things before they would cooperate. They were strangely silent then but now that labor insists on being heard they think the working man should be driven by bayonets and guns.

Do you know that there are only 11 factories out of hundreds of thousands affected by strikes?

Let us have the facts before blowing off steam. Find out why these things are happening. There is no need for further legislation on these strikes. They are being adjusted. My advice is to keep cool, calm, and collected. This present administration has done a fine job under the leadership of this House and the President of the United States. We need the cooperation of all and with it we will win. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

NEWS SERVICE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, news—local news, national news, international news—is of great import to every Member of Congress these days. Spot news is of primary importance.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Accounts should place in the lobby of the House or some accessible room a bulletin board on which should be posted as it happens, as it comes over the wires, the latest spot news for the benefit of the Members of Congress so we could have up-to-date information on what is going on in the world. It is done in almost every department of the Government but not in the Halls of Congress. Let us keep up to the minute, literally, on the news. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent editorial from the Oxford (N. Y.) Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa with regard to national defense and its relation to the farmer and agricultural products.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a eulogy on a late Member from Minnesota, Mr. Tiegan; and also extend my remarks on the subject of irrigation in the Dust Bowl area.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] on the night of Thursday, April 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution from the Senate of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Fort Wayne News Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the legislative business and other special orders on tomorrow or the next day the House is in session I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKES AND THE FISCAL SITUATION

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 3-week visit to my own district. I left the last day of the week we appropriated $11,000,000,000 and after I had voted "nay" on the $7,000,000,000 aid bill.

I conducted 18 meetings in my district and the people asked questions and argued issues. My people are with me. They cannot understand why our Government is unable to handle these strikes; and they are interested secondly in how we are going to pay for all of these expenditures. They are not scared of Hitler's coming over here. They are not for sending convoys nor our boys abroad at all. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE FORD STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] just told the House what he found the sentiment to be in his district when he was home last week. I, too, went home. I also went to Detroit.

Let me congratulate the leadership of the Democratic Party on the success of its conspiracy with Communists and wreckers at the Ford plant, the C. I. O.'s control of the highways by pickets, its success in beating up the employees of the Ford plant and in forcing Ford with the aid of the administration and Governor Van Wagoner, to take back the men who destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of property in the plant. I want to congratulate the Democratic Party on that wonderful wrecking campaign. It equals, if it does not surpass, the frightfulness of a Hitler. If it is the end of liberty of government the party is seeking, it is well on the road to victory.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Knudsen denied that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care what Mr. Knudsen said. I went up there and I saw what they did, what was being done. I have read some of the testimony of witnesses before Federal Judge Tuttle. That testimony shows what they did and if the gentleman is here tomorrow I will read for his benefit some of the transcript of the testimony taken by the court stenographer.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the gentleman, from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is with those boys. I do not yield to him. Does the gentleman condone what happened in Detroit? Does he condone head cracking, the kidnaping? They kidnaped a man there. And the State police stood for it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter sent out by the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I did not think we would be able to adjourn until we heard the gentleman from Michigan again assail and attack labor organizations. Of course, in his eyes any man who advocates the cause of labor is a Communist and a "red."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand those words be taken down. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my demand, but the gentleman ought to be careful what he says.

Mr. SABATH. I am always careful.

Mr. Speaker, it is manifestly unfair to hear a half-dozen Members day in and day out attack organized labor. Taking everything into consideration, I feel that labor, with very few exceptions, is showing a real cooperative spirit. Only a few minutes ago I inserted in the RECORD a statement from the American Federation of Labor urging its affiliated unions to cooperate to the fullest extent in carrying out the national-defense program. It is my sincere hope that the same course will be followed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations. These half dozen Members who have been constantly attacking labor organizations endeavor to create the impression that the defense program is being very seriously delayed as a result of an unusually large number of strikes. The facts are, taking into account the number of people employed and the conditions under which they are employed, that there are fewer strikes at present than under normal times.

Mr. Speaker, I was immensely pleased with the settlement of the annoying strikes at the plants of the International Harvester Co. at Chicago, the Allis-Chalmers at Milwaukee, the Ford Co. at River Rouge, Mich., and the bituminous-coal strike. The gentleman from Kansas should know that the newly created National Mediation Board has functioned most effectively in bringing these strikes to an end. The Board and the administration are doing everything humanly possible to avert differences between labor and industry, and I hope the day is not far distant when all strikes will be eliminated and that in the interest of our Nation labor and industry will cooperate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR TO ACCEPT GIFTS FOR FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H. R. 4057, to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the Freedmen's Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered by the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Security Administrator is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States gifts made unconditionally by will or otherwise for the improvement, maintenance, or operation of the Freedmen's Hospital in the District of Columbia. Conditional gifts may be so accepted if recommended by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and the principal of and income from any such conditional gift shall be held, invested, reinvested, and used in accordance with its conditions, but no gift shall be accepted which is conditioned upon any expenditure not to be met therefrom or from the income thereof unless such expenditure has been approved by act of Congress.

SEC. 2. Any unconditional gift of money accepted pursuant to the authority granted in section 1 of this act, the net proceeds from the liquidation (pursuant to section 3 or section 4 of this act) of any other property so accepted, and the proceeds of insurance on any such gift property not used for its restoration shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and are hereby appropriated and shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Treasury for the benefit of the Freedmen's Hospital, and he may invest and reinvest such funds in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. The income from such investments shall be available for expenditure in the improvement, maintenance, or operation of the Freedmen's Hospital, subject to the same examination and audit as

provided for appropriations made for the Freedmen's Hospital by Congress.

SEC. 3. The evidences of any unconditional gift of intangible personal property, other than money, accepted pursuant to the authority granted in section 1 of this act shall be deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury and he, in his discretion, may hold them or may liquidate them whenever in his judgment the purposes of the gifts will be served thereby. The income from any such property held by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be available for expenditure as is provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. The Federal Security Administrator shall hold any real property or any tangible personal property accepted unconditionally pursuant to the authority granted in section 1 of this act and he shall permit such property to be used for the improvement, maintenance, or operation of the Freedmen's Hospital or he may lease or hire such property, and may insure such property, and deposit the income thereof with the Secretary of the Treasury to be available for expenditure as provided in section 2 of this act: *Provided*, That the income from any such real property or tangible personal property shall be available for expenditure in the discretion of the Federal Security Administrator for the maintenance, preservation, or repair and insurance of such property and that any proceeds from insurance may be used to restore the property insured. Any such property, when not required for the improvement or operation of the Freedmen's Hospital, may be liquidated by the Federal Security Administrator whenever in his judgment the purposes of the gifts will be served thereby.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the benefit of Freedmen's Hospital. At the present time there is no authority for the acceptance of bequests, and so forth, left to the hospital, and it is deemed advisable that such authority be given at this time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECREATIONAL BUILDINGS FOR AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 145, authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered by the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the work of the American Red Cross among the patients of the St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia during the past 22 years and the cooperation of the American Red Cross with the superintendent of the St. Elizabeths Hospital has been of substantial therapeutic value and has promoted the humane care and enlightened curative treatment of the insane of the Army and Navy of the United States, the District of Columbia, and other patients of the institution; and

Whereas on the 4th day of February 1941 the building occupied by the American Red Cross on the hospital reservation was completely destroyed by fire; and

Whereas it is considered essential to the accomplishment of the purposes of the St. Elizabeths Hospital that the work among its patients heretofore carried on by the American Red Cross be continued in facilities suitable for such activities: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit the American Red Cross to construct or have constructed upon the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation in the District of Columbia such building or buildings as he may deem advisable to be used by the American Red Cross in cooperation with the superintendent of such hospital in providing recreational facilities and activities for the patients and personnel of such hospital. Any amounts hereafter appropriated and any other moneys made available for the operation and maintenance of the St. Elizabeths Hospital may be used for the provision of necessary heat, light, water, telephone, and other facilities incidental to the work of the American Red Cross among the patients of the institution.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational facilities on the grounds of St. Elizabeths Hospital. A building owned by the Red Cross there was destroyed by fire last February, and that organization has now allocated $75,000 to replace the destroyed building.

In connection with this request I desire to say that the building destroyed was not of fireproof construction, but the proposed building will be. This serves a real need at the hospital and is maintained by the Red Cross without cost to the Federal Government.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLOTTE E. HUNTER

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4221) for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter, and ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered by the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920, as amended, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to place on the retirement list of teachers retired under the provisions of such act the name of Charlotte E. Hunter, formerly a teacher in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and to pay, out of the fund established by such act, to the said Charlotte E. Hunter an annuity computed as provided in such act, as amended; and the said Charlotte E. Hunter shall be accredited with and entitled to count, for such purposes, in addition to all other periods of service to which she may be lawfully entitled, the period of her employment as such school teacher from February 5, 1895, to April 12, 1919, both dates inclusive. Payment of such annuity shall begin from the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to grant the privileges of the Teachers' Retirement Act in the District of Columbia to one Charlotte E. Hunter. It is felt that the circumstances in this particular case are deserving of special consideration.

Miss Hunter was supervisor of kindergarten work for many, many years, without compensation, and also directed a home for the blind without receiving any salary. Both the Commissioners of the District and the Board of Education believe this measure is desirable and urge its passage.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is she now conducting work in these schools?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; she is not, at the present time.

Mr. RICH. She has retired?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; and I may say this legislation passed the House and the Senate on a previous occasion. The President vetoed the bill, but we have reliable information that he vetoed it because of an old report which was given to him in the preparation of that veto.

Mr. RICH. And that report was erroneous?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; it absolutely was or we would not have brought the bill back after having passed it on a previous occasion.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENLARGING POWERS OF PROPERTY CLERK OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4083, to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia, to dispose of property coming into his possession, and ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered by the House as in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 412 and 413 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (18 Stat. 48, pt. 2) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. He may administer oaths and certify depositions which may be necessary to establish the ownership of any property or money lost, abandoned, or returned to him under the directions of the Board of Commissioners, including such property or money so returned which is alleged to have been feloniously obtained or to be the proceeds of crime.

"SEC. 413. (a) Upon satisfactory evidence of the ownership of property or money described in the preceding section he shall deliver the same to the owner, his next of kin, or legal representative and to him or them only. If, in any case, it is proven impracticable for such owner, next of kin, or legal representative to appear, the property clerk may deliver such property or money to any person having a duly executed power of attorney from such owner, or his next of kin, or legal representa-

tive, upon the filing of such power of attorney in the office of said clerk and the signing of a receipt for such property or money.

"(b) In the event two or more persons claim ownership of any such property or money, the property clerk may give notice by registered mail to all such claimants of whom he shall have knowledge of the time and place of a hearing to determine the person to whom the property or money shall be delivered. At the time and place so designated the property clerk shall hear and receive evidence of ownership of the property or money concerned, and shall determine the identity of the owner. After such hearing the property clerk shall deliver the property or money to the person who the property clerk determines is the owner, his next of kin, or legal representative, and to him or them only. If, in any case, it is proven impracticable for such owner, next of kin, or legal representative to appear, the property clerk may deliver such property or money to any person having a duly executed power of attorney from such owner, his next of kin, or legal representative, upon the filing of such power of attorney in the office of said clerk and the signing of a receipt for such property or money.

"(c) The property clerk shall not be liable in damages for any official action performed hereunder in good faith.

"(d) Except as provided in sections 420, 421, and 422 hereof, no property or money in the possession of the property clerk alleged to have been feloniously obtained or to be the proceeds of crime shall be delivered under this section if it is required to be held under the provisions of section 415 hereof; nor shall it be delivered within 1 year after the date of receipt of said property or money by the property clerk unless the United States attorney in and for the District of Columbia shall certify that such property or money is not needed as evidence in the prosecution of a crime."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this measure is to permit the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to return, without liability, to the person he determines to be the owner, property which has come into his possession as the proceeds of crime. Under the present law, this clerk is not protected by statute but is liable in damages for the property in the event of an error. Therefore, to protect himself, he must require of the one claiming ownership to obtain an order of court, give a bond or secure a release from the other claimants. This has resulted on many occasions in the real owner of property being put to unnecessary trouble and expense.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia consider the measure desirable and necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If this bill is passed, it will permit the claimants to make affidavit that they are the owners of that material?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right; that will be provided in the procedure.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4131) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in section 6 (c) of the District of Columbia Traffic Act is amended by inserting, after the comma following the phrase "Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives", the following: "the tally clerk of the House of Representatives."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Commissioners of the District to permit the issuance of a congressional tag to the tally clerk of the House, who is frequently obliged to use his automobile for the business of the House. Your committee believes this privilege might properly be granted.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SALOONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia be permitted to proceed for 1 minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the newspapers the other day the recommendation of certain persons in the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, that the saloons with the brass rail be permitted to come back in the District—the old bar. As I recall, a few years ago—1933, to be exact—when the President and Congress did away with the eighteenth amendment, Congressmen said they would never permit the saloons with the brass rail to come back in this country. If you permit the saloons to come back now, you will have the same conditions you had before the eighteenth amendment was passed; we will have saloons, and we do not want to start that in the District of Columbia. It is reported in the papers that the gentleman from West Virginia, the mayor of Washington, is in sympathy with that measure. Are we to expect that legislation of this character will come before the House? I hope the District Committee will bury deep such legislation, and the liquor interests should help you bury it deep, if they want temperance as they said they do.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania concerns certain recommendations which the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board for the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Commissioners have made. These recommendations will come to the Committee on the District of Columbia for proper legislation, if it is deemed desirable to consider it there instead of before this House. It is my understanding that the recommendation for so-called stand-up drinking was made only after such a change had been approved by Chief of Police Ernest W. Brown and the Federation of Citizens Associations. Very frankly I can say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, speaking for myself, I would not be in favor of the old saloon coming back any more than he would be in favor of it. There is a wide difference of opinion today, however, on stand-up drinking. It is said that the man at the bar will know whether you have had too much and he will not serve you, whereas if you sit down you can keep on taking drink after drink and he will not know it. I am not going to get into an argument on it today, but I do want to say that your Committee on the District of Columbia, in whom you have confidence, would consider very carefully any legislation of this type before bringing it to this floor.

Mr. RICH. We have confidence in the merit of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but wo do not want the old saloon back. We will not have it back. The people of America will not permit it long. I advise you and the liquor dealers to watch your step in such legislation. It will react to their disadvantage and to their ruin if they try it. We had the saloons once; they were outlawed, and they were promised never to return. Let us remember.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute in order to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, can the majority leader tell the House what the tentative program is for the remainder of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program at all. If the unanimous-consent request I submitted earlier in the day had been agreed to, of course, there would have been nothing between now and Thursday. I can see nothing now that will come up. Of course, we will adjourn from day to day; that is all that can be done. I do not want to commit myself as to the program beyond Thursday, but until Thursday I know of nothing that will be brought up, and there is no intention of bringing up anything.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, if the House meets tomorrow and Wednesday, it will meet and adjourn?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COMMODITY PRICES

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we all want the United States to keep out of war. We intend to keep our country out of this war, but what are we going to do to keep the war out of the

United States? There are two ways in which war threatens to invade the United States. One is war hysteria in the field of public opinion, with intolerance and witch hunting, and the other is war hysteria in the field of commodity values, with speculation, rising prices, and an increased cost of living.

One of the great problems facing the American people today is to retain for the American workingman the benefits which should flow from the vast industrial program of the present emergency and to see to it that the present boom, if it may be called that, is not a boomerang.

Millions of dollars a day are being expended in the national-defense program. The unemployment list is dropping, and I think that this body is duty bound to see to it that the money which goes into the pockets of the workingman, whether he be a laborer in industry or a farmer, shall not be snatched from his pockets by inexcusable and artificial rises in price.

We are committed under our way of life in America to a system of free competitive enterprise. If during this period prices are artificially fixed, the working people who should benefit by this enormous increase in national-defense activity will lose the ordinary gains which they have every right to expect.

In times of crisis the problem of the American wage earner has always been intensified. Ordinarily a consumer depends upon private enterprise to give him goods at competitive prices. Suddenly he finds a new buyer in the market in the form of government, with its power of mass buying. At the outbreak of the World War a drop in prices and a short period of general distress was quickly followed by inflation, and in the inflationary period the American workingman lost the benefit of the war boom. Money which he should have received was transferred to other pockets, and a few people made large fortunes. Today people who in recent years had no money with which to buy are again purchasing in the American market.

It is a primary duty of those in the seats of government to see to it that the expenditures of both the Government and the average wage earner are made in a free, competitive market under free competitive conditions and that prices are right. The only other alternative is a militarized economy, of which Germany under Hitler is an example. In Germany there was a great consumer movement just prior to the rise of Hitler. The economic planners in Germany killed that movement. They killed it because they had little faith that a centralized industrial nation could ever by ordinary processes be transformed into an agency which would pass on to the people the benefits of centralization. The only solution they saw was for the Government to take over completely this highly centralized economy. Consequently the maintenance of a free market becomes one of the first concerns of every democracy.

The study on war and prices by the T. N. E. C. demonstrates quite clearly, if the point needed demonstration, that war is inevitably a dislocating factor in national and world economy.

The testimony there adduced showed very clearly what was done to prices. By the time we entered the last war cost of living was up to about 125, or about 25 percent higher than it had been before the war was declared in 1914. From that time on there was a continuous rise, and at the time of the armistice the cost of living had increased 60 percent. After the armistice was declared wholesale prices fell sharply, but the cost of living hardly dropped at all. The cost of living continued up to 108 percent in the summer of 1920, then fell to a level of 72 percent at the end of 1921.

As far as the economy in general is concerned, war periods are periods of apparent prosperity. There is usually full employment, great activity; and all the superficial characteristics which we use to determine prosperity are present. After the war, there is always a depression with employment and activity declining.

Today we are faced as we were 25 years ago with the same dangers of a price blitzkreig. Let us remember that only a small handful gain from skyrocketing prices. As the T. N. E. C. pointed out the losers are Mr. and Mrs. America. It is the wage earner who is pinched by the rising cost of living. The rank and file of labor, particularly the great mass of common labor and the vast group of clerical labor in white-collar jobs, are caught in a vise. Their wages and salaries invariably lag behind prices. In fact wages and salaries never rise as quickly nor as far as prices.

But price inflation is not necessary—even in these times. It is not inflicted by some superhuman power. We are not helpless and it can be prevented. Let us see to it that whatever is to be gained by the increased activity be passed on to Mr. and Mrs. America. Let us see that price rises and the cost of living do not outdistance the wage of the workingman.

Many of the price rises are not necessary. Many of them are unrelated to capacity. It has been demonstrated that quite as much new capacity in most lines would have been brought into production had the price increases been much less.

As one of our leading statisticians has said:

> Forgetting the ethics or the morals or anything else concerning price rises, if you think of it solely in terms of the welfare of the Nation as a whole—the total economy—the price you have to pay after you are through is so great that by and large I can't feel that anybody that looks at the thing realistically can justify any of the advantages that you think you are getting while periods of spectacular price rises take place.

But I am not interested alone in what history has taught us concerning wartime prices and the evils which flow of how the few gain and the many suffer from them. I am interested in what makes them rise. Personally I am going to raise my eyebrows when such commodities as wheat and corn and pork and cotton, of which there is no shortage—commodities which do not have to be brought over in foreign bottoms—start going up. I am interested not alone in getting for the American wage earner the benefit of a price rise if it must come. I am also interested in knowing whether a particular price rise is in any way related to the supply of that commodity; that is, whether it is in any sense justified on the merits. But I am for going further even than that. I am interested in the American people are interested in knowing the fairness of prices now being charged for many commodities, whether the prices on these commodities rise or whether they stay where they are. Is the price of any given commodity which is a necessity in the American home too much in excess of the production cost? What is the relation of cost to sales price?

I am thinking today of thousands of men who last year were unemployed and who this year are working. I am thinking of whether they will reap the reward of employment or whether the price of their bread and their calicos and their medicines are to be fixed arbitrarily so as to snatch from them the gains to which their toil entitles them.

Many agencies of the Government have in the past, and are now concerning themselves with various specialized phases of this problem. The Temporary National Economic Committee has produced extremely valuable material in its investigation of the concentration of economic power. That, however, is only one phase of the problem—the problem of monopoly with which the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has also been concerned. The problem of the average workingman and woman has received little attention. In the volume devoted to that subject, published by the T. N. E. C., the emphasis was laid on the development of consumer organizations and the extent to which they have been effective in satisfying the consumer's need for reliable and informative facts about the goods and services for which he spends his money. Questions of adequate labeling, honesty in advertising, and so forth, were gone into. But the problem is broader than that. The people's interest goes beyond the problem of finding out the quality of the article they buy. It goes beyond the question of what they get for their money. Their problem today is and will continue to be, particularly during the national-defense program, one of how much money they spend to get it, and whether the price that they pay is a price determined by ordinary competitive conditions in a free market, or a price which is artificially fixed.

The Consumers' Counsel in the Department of Agriculture has been interested for several years in questions of consumer organizations; officials in the National Defense Commission have likewise devoted considerable study to various phases of the consumer problem.

It is a problem now receiving the attention of several other agencies in the executive branch of Government. Whether legislation is indicated, I do not know, but it is quite possible that it may be. During the last war many governmental controls, such as the emergency rent laws, were introduced in order to keep prices from soaring far beyond any justifiable limits. A watched pot does not boil, and it is my conviction that, regardless of how many agencies in the execu-

tive departments are interested in prices, a committee in the legislative branch should make it its duty to act as a watchdog in the interest of decent prices for vital goods—particularly those necessities of life, such as food, and clothing, and medicine.

The problem goes beyond that of monopoly. It goes beyond the problem of securing for the American people adequate information about the commodities which they purchase. It goes beyond the enforcement of the antitrust laws through prosecution in specific cases. This committee which I propose should be dedicated to a study of all factors which keep the American wage earner from purchasing goods at a decent and fair price in a competitive market.

I am thinking of thousands of men who today are working in the defense industries. I am thinking of the men in the airplane plants who next Saturday night will cash their checks at the counter of some local merchant. I am thinking also of the farmer, and the Government worker. Let us do all within our power to see to it that this great mass of our people gets a square deal in the American market. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point three articles from three newspapers here in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 2, 1941]

GOING UP

Prices are going up, and the rate of increase has been markedly accelerated during recent weeks. Even the comparatively insensitive wholesale price index compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics advanced nearly 1 percent during the week ended March 22 to a figure 5 percent above the level of a year ago. This was the highest point attained in over 3 years. The more sensitive index of the New York Journal of Commerce was also higher last week than at any time since October 1937 and almost 5 percent above the February level.

An examination of the detailed data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that farm products, foods, and textiles have led all other commodity groups in the rapidity of their advance. Rising prices of foodstuffs and clothing mean increased living costs for everybody. Therefore, defense officials have good cause to feel apprehensive about such developments. But their hands are tied in regard to this vastly important sector of prices. They are supposed to stabilize prices and protect consumers against unwarranted price increases in articles of necessity, raising the prices of basic farm products close to parity by liberalizing the present system of price-pegging loans. This plan would lift prices considerably. If, for example, loans equal to the parity price for cotton were to be made, farmers would demand about 16 cents for their cotton, instead of the 9.4 cents per pound they were receiving in February. Similarly, wheat would bring the farmer a return of about $1.13 per bushel instead of the 68 cents he obtained in February. And, of course, these increases in price would be passed along in the form of increased production costs to processors of food and manufacturers of cotton goods, and eventually to the consuming public, in the form of higher retail prices for food and clothing. In point of fact, it is the fear that Congress will pass this scheme, or something like it, that accounts in good part for the sharp upturn in agricultural prices during the past week.

Thus we witness the curious spectacle of defense officials striving to keep down the cost of the defense program and prevent inflationary advances in prices of strategic defense materials, while Congress is considering plans for further boosting prices of important farm products. Such working at cross purposes is all too characteristic of much of our governmental effort to order our economic affairs. Effective control over prices will be impossible unless authority to act is centered in a single responsible agency able to follow a consistent policy without being checkmated by legislative interference.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 1, 1941]

YOU AND THE COST OF LIVING—NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT AGAINST UNJUSTIFIED INCREASES IN PRICES

There have been brief flurries of panicky buying, but no dangerous rise in the American cost of living since the present European war began.

Right now, however, those who watch price trends see signs of trouble that may be averted.

They are calling on the two groups that will suffer most if prices soar again as in the World War period—the retail merchants and the millions of customers whose incomes are in low and middle brackets—to be shock troops in the battle against unjustified price increases.

EIGHT PERCENT RISE ALREADY

Since Germany invaded Poland, the Labor Department's big index, based on wholesale prices of nearly 900 commodities, has risen more than 8 percent.

The cost of living has risen less than 3 percent.

When wholesale prices rise they pull retail prices up, usually more slowly. But determined efforts to keep retail prices down can do much to prevent unnecessary wholesale price increases.

TIME TO ACT

Here are some reasons why price watchers say the time has come to use those efforts:

1. Recently the Labor Department index of prices of 28 basic commodities has increased its rate of climb, due largely to influence of a few commodities which are imported or in which there are temporary production bottlenecks.

2. Some of the nearly 900 wholesale prices in the big index are beginning to react to these basic commodity increases.

3. This, if it continues, will affect some retail prices. Danger is that the public will conclude all prices are about to go up. Enough buyers acting on that impression could force prices up.

4. Many people may believe now is the time when general price boosts become inevitable. The first World War was in progress about a year and a half before the American cost of living began to jump. The present war has been on for a little more than a year and a half.

DOESN'T NEED TO BE

So some observers fear events are shaping for another price boom—for speculation in commodities, for a competitive rush by merchants to stock up their stores and warehouses, for similar rush buying by consumers and another cost-of-living skyrocket.

But it doesn't need to happen.

Conditions are profoundly different from those at this stage in the other war.

When this war began we had huge surpluses of most necessary materials. We still have them—11,000,000 bales of cotton, 700,000,000 bushels of corn, 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, and so on through a long list. Our raw-material resources are vastly greater; we are far more self-sufficient, and far less dependent on imports.

FEW SHORTAGES

When this war began we had large manufacturing facilities only partly used. As we move toward full use of those facilities we are rapidly adding enormous new ones.

When this war began we had a great surplus of manpower—8,000,000 or more unemployed workers. Many have found jobs. Others will get jobs soon. But we still have surplus manpower, with shortages only in certain skilled trades.

We have enough of most things to build our own defenses, to give promised aid to Britain and Greece and China, and still provide good living standards for more people than have enjoyed them in recent years.

SOME PRICES WILL RISE

There will be shortages of some imported goods. There may be temporary shortages of a few domestic goods, while production is being adjusted to the double task of defense plus normal production.

A few prices may rise sharply. Many may rise gradually. Some prices should rise—farm products, for instance, should move toward more profitable levels. If they can move in orderly fashion, with a minimum of artificial stimulation, that will be best for the country and best, in the long run, for the farmers.

Not fate—only our own folly—can compel us to do again what that people of this country did in the War of 1812, the Civil War, and the first World War. We don't have to climb painfully up another cost-of-living peak—and then plunge disastrously down another precipice of deflation.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

PRICE CONTROL

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Strap by strap the war harness is being buckeled on us. The latest one is labeled "price control." Leon Henderson, who is an able man at the job, has been tapped to get the price-control strap around us, and you get an idea of the kind of man he is on learning that within an hour after he was appointed to his work by the President he cracked down on somebody.

He cracked down, to be exact, on the cadmium industry.

Cadmium is a metallic element close to zinc in the atomic scale, and it is of great importance to the national defense as an alloy with almost all metals.

Cadmium-copper wire, cadmium-gold points, and cadmium-nickel and steel parts, especially bearings, are common throughout industry. Cadmium is even used to make alloys for tooth fillings.

Mr. Henderson, who has long since noted that Germany has been consuming about three times as much cadmium as this, the greatest industrial nation in the world—says the United States industry is going to have its price stamped on it if it doesn't behave.

Very soon he is going to say something of the same sort to the iridium industry.

Iridium is mixed with platinum to make it hard and durable for such uses as contact points, screws, and other parts in magnetos for airplanes and automobile engines.

There is a very neat situation in iridium which has caused our British friends to complain, and our own airplane part makers to complain even louder. Mr. Henderson will be angry and will act.

Not long after that he will take a pop at another price. Pretty soon, tough and sturdy and iron-fisted as he is, Leon Henderson will

be like a fisherman fighting mosquitos. He will be swatting in every direction.

Will he be hitting anything? Ah, that is the question.

Price control is not a simple proposition. There is more than one school of thought about it.

Here is why it must be at all in times like this:

To build the plant and produce the goods for what is called national defense, we must spend a great deal of money. Of course, it is money borrowed against our own future, and if we survive we will have to replace it. But at the moment we are flush with cash to spend.

Great gobs of this fall into the hands of ordinary people, as well as into the pockets of those who have especially designed against such a day. With the cash in hand these all go into the market to shop for what they want.

But, you see, national defense not only strews cash around in quantity. It eats up the goods of the Nation in even greater quantity.

Wheat, meat, steel, silk, paper, leather, wood—all these are burned and blown up and sunk at sea in such affairs as the present. In consequence there is less available than ordinarily

And so people with heavy pocketbooks are ready to pay more for less than ordinarily.

It is on this account that buyers of cadmium, iridium, and other items are ready to bid up. They hope to get a lot of the limited-quantity stuff—use some, hold more against another market rise, and generally speculate.

That kind of thing upsets the even flow of national affairs. In addition to speculative bidding for limited quantities of defense goods, there is another factor. Say the Government is throwing so much money into the stream of commerce the American people earn $85,000,000,000 this year all the way across the boards. But there is opportunity for them to spend only about $75,000,000,000 for all purposes. The difference, unless it is blotted up in taxes, is sure to set prices on a crazy whirl. And those whose incomes have not risen with the prices will suffer.

But how to control the price behavior? Mr. Henderson is starting out on the principle of batting down individual items as they pop up. That is supposed to be enough to meet the situation at present. Is it enough for the whole? Will it do as the defense program gets into heavy going?

No, according to the school of thought headed by Bernard M. Baruch, who controlled our economic effort in the last war. Mr. Baruch says that when price control goes into effect it should lie as a ceiling upon the whole pre-war price structure, so that every price stays in its previous relation to every other.

He also advocates taxes to sop up the cash that lies over after the public has bought up all available goods at the fixed prices. And he further advocates cutting down drastically on the goods available.

In war, he says, the thing to do is introduce people to economy. They find out how many things there are to live without.

Mr. Henderson may be really working toward Mr. Baruch's formula, after all, first by demonstrating that fighting individual price pop-ups is impossible, then by proposing the full, heavyweight harness of wartime price fixing and goods rationing.

Nice weather we're having, isn't it? And, incidentally, wholly beyond anybody's control.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. And may I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that today I am introducing a resolution asking that there be established a committee to study the prices of the necessities of life, to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I appreciate that lately the President has named Mr. Henderson as chairman of a price-fixing board, but that does not necessarily mean that they will go into the prices of all of the necessities of life. They will have quite enough to do to determine whether or not prices of defense materials are going up at much too fast a rate.

The principal duty of this committee would be to investigate the cost of the necessities of life which the average man and woman have to buy and see to it that they do not have to pay exorbitant prices.

We ought to have a legislative committee of this House of Representatives, composed of five members to be appointed by the Speaker, who will study this all-important problem, so that we may have our finger on the pulse of things and so that the House of Representatives may not be merely a committee on appropriations. I think we should study, I think we should find out about these things, and bring back recommendations that this body and the Senate may act on them in order to protect the constituents of all of us, Mr. and Mrs. America. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under special order the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] for 5 minutes.

TO PUT IDLE DOLLARS TO WORK

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of common knowledge that we have had and still have a serious unemployment problem on our hands. When the extraordinary stimulation of the defense program is withdrawn, as it must be eventually, it is highly probable that the problem will confront us in even more acute form. It is also a matter of common knowledge that during the last 5 or 6 years there has piled up an enormous number of idle dollars, represented very largely in record-breaking bank deposits. The owners of those dollars, the depositors, for some reason or other, do not put them to work by investing them in productive enterprises. Obviously, idle dollars mean men, for if productive enterprises are not supported financially and enabled to expand healthily there can be no work to do. Our sympathy goes out to those men, and we have been doing our best to carry them along in the hope that with a returning prosperity they will find useful jobs. But we are not doing anything about the idle dollars. Unless we do we may have to abandon the institution of private enterprise and adopt the principle that every man must look to the Government for a living and obey the orders of the Government in the earning of it. Normally a large portion of idle dollars is put to work when their owners have a fair opportunity to invest in securities, stocks, and bonds, offered to the public by business concerns seeking new capital. Without an adequate flow of capital into industry there can be no expansion of the going concern, nor can new enterprises be started. In other words, we have stagnation, and the man who suffers most is the man who wants a job and cannot find it. Why is it that capital is not flowing freely into industry? Until we find the answer to that question and, having found it, take measures which will help solve the problem, millions of men will remain unemployed, and free enterprise in this country will die a slow but certain death by starvation.

Intent upon informing myself as accurately as possible, I made up my mind in the early autumn of last year to embark upon an inquiry which might bring out the facts. I directed my inquiry to a large number of persons associated officially with corporations engaged in business activities, asking them to inform me of their respective experiences in endeavoring to obtain capital through the sale of securities, and especially to tell me of the effects, if any, of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as well as the effect of the regulations issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission. My inquiry has not been sent to bankers, investment bankers, brokers, dealers, or underwriters. It has been directed solely to men engaged in the conduct of a productive business. The answers have come in large volume from all over the country—some from large concerns, but a much greater number from small concerns. In the aggregate they present an exceedingly instructive picture. From it I gather that certain provisions of our laws and of the regulations are exceedingly and needlessly onerous, especially as they affect the little fellow. The expense of complying with the requirements for registering a security for sale to the public, and the long delays which frequently attend that effort, have discouraged a large number of firms, especially small firms, from even attempting to put their securities upon the public markets. Some have given up the attempt entirely, some depend upon bank loans whenever they can get them, and a larger number resort to selling their securities privately—generally to an insurance company or to a bank or to a small group of such institutions. This private placement of new securities has become an outstanding feature in recent years and is greatly to be regretted. I find also that some of the regulations and practices of the Securities and Exchange Commission extend, in my judgment, considerably beyond the intent of the Congress and are having the result of establishing a sort of reign of terror over honest men who, fearful of the whims and strange interpretations of the Commission, are afraid to go ahead with their enterprises lest they be pilloried before the public and their reputations injured. In short, the replies I have received point at least to some of the causes for the steady and discouraging decline in the volume of securities passing in and out of the public markets, as well as for the jittery thinness of those markets. I ought to say that not one of my correspondents urges the repeal of the securities laws. All agree that it is the duty of the Congress to protect the investor against fraudulent practices of every kind and description. They do believe, however, that certain provisions of these laws, together with certain regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, are inflicting se-

rious injury upon the economy of the country without adding in the slightest degree to the protection of the investor. My concern about these things is so deep, and the information which has come to me is so enlightening, that I am today introducing a bill proposing certain amendments to our securities laws, the adoption of which, I believe, will help to put both dollars and men to work, and thus to fortify our free institutions.

And let me add this observation: It is imperative that we enact laws stemming only from the people as represented in the Congress, rather than laws conceived behind the closed doors of commissions and bureaus or of self-serving financial interests. In writing them the Congress should seek its information out among the people and should legislate for their benefit alone, rather than for the enhancement of bureaucratic power or for the advantage of special interests. This is fundamental, and unless we do this we shall fail in our duty. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] for 40 minutes.

PROPOSED INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, it has been my good fortune, honor and privilege to serve on the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House with the distinguished gentlewoman of Ohio, Representative BOLTON. I have always found her to be very well informed and sympathetic to the cause of the Indian, although I doubt if she has an Indian in her district. The distinguished gentlewoman called my attention to a statuary group on the right pedestal of the main stairway of the National Capitol entitled "The Rescue," presumably personifying civilization or settlement, taking the position, and rightfully so, that in justice to the Indian it should be removed. With the gentlewoman I heartily agree. Upon a cursory examination of the statutary group one is struck instantly with the incongruity of the same as personifying either civilization or settlement. Accordingly, I have introduced House Resolution 176, asking, the Senate concurring, that the said statuary group be removed from the stairway of the National Capitol.

I deem it only right to give a short history of an ancient and outstanding group of people, the first Americans, in order to show that the statue is a continuing insult to these people.

The origin of the American Indian is still a matter for speculation, but anthropologists agree that all of our Indians are essentially of one racial type, and that it is probably the same basic type from which the Mongolian peoples of Asia also come. Looking at a globe, the North and South American Continents appear as a great extension of the Asiatic Continent. Anywhere from ten to forty thousand years ago, when the great ice sheets were receding into the north, ancient peoples from Asia pushed across the narrow straits between the Asiatic and North American Continents, and found a vast unoccupied New World. These primitive newcomers were hunters and fishermen. In the course of centuries, as they followed food supplies of animal herds, fish, and wild plants, they pushed their way through Central America and into the fartherest reaches of South America.

In the extreme north and the extreme south of the Americas there are still Indians who have remained primitive hunters and gatherers. In the region of middle America, however, as population increased, new plants were utilized, and eventually many of these came to be artificially cared for. It was the independent development of agriculture, based on unique plants, which started the American Indian on the high road of cultural progress which culminated in the great civilization of the Mayas and the Andean empire of the Incas.

In Central America the highest degree of civilization was attained by the Maya Indians, whose numerous descendants still dwell on the peninsula of Yucatan and in the highlands of Guatemala. The Mayas built great cities of stone decorated with beautiful and intricate carving. They created works of art in jade and pottery and invented a calendar system superior in accuracy to that we use today. They recorded important dates in stone carvings, and their monuments today serve as one of the most important factors in unravelling the complex story of New World ancient history.

The Indians of the southwestern United States and the mound-building peoples of the Mississippi Valley developed primitive cultures of their own, but never reached the attainments of the great city states and empires of Mexico, Central America, and western South America.

When European conquerors appeared on the scene they were superior to the peoples of the New World in methods of destruction. But the native Americans had developed agricultural systems superior to those of Europe at that time. They had developed elaborate systems to irrigate dry areas and to prevent soil erosion. Their arts and political systems were well adapted to the land of their development.

It has been said that when the white man came to this country there ensued an exchange of courtesy, culture, bullets, and disease between the newcomers and the Indians, and that the bullets and disease went mainly in one direction—that is, from white to Indian. Many people think of the Indian as being on the receiving end so far as culture is concerned, too, but they fail to recognize the extent of Indian gifts to the white immigrant. The American Indian gave to Europe many of its most important present-day food crops and medicines. We cannot imagine northern Europe without corn and potatoes—man the world over without rubber and tobacco, the Tropics without quinine. Yet each of these products was developed by the American Indian through thousands of years of experimentation and toil.

The list of food plants which the Indians had cultivated long before the Europeans came to the New World reads like an inventory of our own daily foods—arrowroot, lima beans, string beans, kidney beans, buckwheat, cocoa, cranberries, strawberries, maize, maple sugar, melons, peanuts, pears, peppers, pineapples, sweet and white potatoes, pumpkins, squash, tapioca, vanilla, and many others.

Had the Indians not taught the early colonists how to plant, raise, fertilize, and store corn, those colonists might not have survived to celebrate the first Thanksgiving, and the settlement of America might have been delayed for many years.

The Indians of South America knew rubber and used it. Cotton was a part of their life, and they knew the medicinal values of many herbs which are still valued by medical science—cocaine, quinine, cascara, witch hazel, and arnica.

Our recreational life is full of Indian culture. The Indian taught the white man to use canoes, snowshoes, toboggans, hammocks, tents, and moccasins. The Indian did not hand over to the white man an uncharted continent. It was honeycombed with trails—trails to the best camp and water sites, to the best hunting and fishing grounds, trails over the easiest mountain passes and along the easiest ridges, trails through the safest water courses.

These and many others are material gifts. We can only speculate about the intangible gifts. But we know that the first white settlers found in the New World at least two human ideals that we like to think of as typically American. First, an ideal of physical perfection, of courage and athletic prowess; and second, a social ideal of self-reliance, equality, and democracy. Some students of ethnology claim that the very form of our Federal Government was built on the pattern of the Iroquois Confederacy.

And so our debt to the original American is something that cannot be measured in terms of land or money. It is a debt which cannot be repaid and for which payment is not asked. The Indian simply shared his knowledge and his possessions with the white man, as he would share them with his own family or tribe. But we can acknowledge the debt and we can approach the Indians now with the same generosity and good will with which they approached our forefathers.

It may also be said that the Indians had the courage, resourcefulness, and incredible physical stamina which enabled them to survive under conditions that would have killed the hardiest of white men. They were deeply religious, practicing their beliefs fervently and making religions an integral part of their daily lives. They were kind to children and animals; they tenderly cared for their orphans and sick and old people. Capital punishment was unknown. Criminals were rare and were punished by banishment from the tribe. Such ostracism from his people was the worst possible punishment for an Indian, essentially a social creature. Despite popular belief, the Indians were cheerful and given to laughter and joking among themselves. Their silence in public, which earned for them the reputation of being stoical and taciturn, was considered by them to be a mark of self-control and manhood. Honesty was a byword with the redman. No one had to lock his tepee at night or when absent. Promises were kept at all costs. There

is no instance of Indians breaking treaties.

Following the conquest of the Indians, they were herded together on reservations—given land so poor that their conquerors did not want it. They were expected to become farmers overnight when they had existed for centuries on wildlife and rather small cultivated areas, preyed upon by unscrupulous whites, and expected to substitute overnight the ways of white man's civilization for the free life of their ancestors. They learned little from the white man except his vices, and contracted from him tuberculosis, smallpox, and other diseases.

Their spirit was nearly broken, their pride gone, and they had little incentive to help themselves. They did not understand white men who said their God was better than the Indians' when those same white men robbed and persecuted others less fortunate. Among the Indians everything was shared and spiritual rather than material values were stressed. A man was not great because of money, property, or position, but because of the good he could do for his people. The rank of chieftainship was considered an honor and an incentive to work for the common good, not as a vantage point from which to exploit the poor and the weak. These and many other wide divergences of viewpoints between the two races made for neither tolerance, understanding, nor sympathy.

Despite the handicaps under which he has labored for so many years, the Indian has made remarkable progress. The race has produced many great writers, athletes, and statesmen. Charles A. Eastman, of the Sioux Tribe, achieved world-wide recognition as an author and lecturer; Chief Standing Bear, another Sioux, is also well known as a writer; and everyone knows of Jim Thorpe, sometimes called the greatest athlete of all time. The Carlisle Institute football teams ranked among the best in the country, and this school turned out Indian citizens who would be a credit to any nation. Our immortal Will Rogers was part Cherokee—too bad we are denied him today, as he, with his common sense and inimitable humor, might save us from ourselves. Former Vice President Curtis had Kaw blood in his veins, and one could cite many other examples of Indians who have gone down in history as outstanding Americans.

I wish to say something about the Indians in the first World War. It should be remembered that the Indians at that time were not subject to military service, although they were registered under the draft law. By an act of November 6, 1919, Indians who had served during the war were declared eligible for citizenship. All Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States were declared citizens by the act of Congress of June 21, 1924.

The number of Indians registered in the first registration, June 5, 1917, the second registration of June 5 to August 24, 1918, and the third registration, September 12, 1918, totaled 17,513. The second report of the provost marshal general to the Secretary of War, 1918, states:

It is beyond doubt that many Indians voluntarily registered who were not bound to do so.

Also many of the Indians inducted into service—the total given in this report was 6,509—were probably noncitizens. The report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1918—dated September 30, 1918—estimates that over 8,000 Indians entered some branch of the military service. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated that out of this number approximately 6,500 are in the Army, 1,000 in the Navy, and 500 in other military work. It is also significant that fully 6,000 of these entered by enlistment. Moreover, it should go into the record that many Indians from our northern reservations enrolled in Canadian military organizations before the declaration of war by the United States. Their letters from cantonments or abroad are full of interest and in unpretentious language sound a note of steadfast courage, optimism, and a broadening view of the great events in which they mingle. Considering the large number of old and infirm Indians and others not acceptable under the draft, leaving about 33,000 of military eligibility—including noncitizens, of course—their representation of 8,000 in camp and actual warfare furnishes a ratio to population unsurpassed and unequalled by any other race or nation.

According to the 1918 report of the provost marshal general, only 228 Indians claimed deferment prior to September 11, 1918. On the basis of the figures cited—

It will be seen that the ratio of Indians claiming deferment was negligible as compared with the average for all registrants; and that the ratio of Indian registrants inducted was more than twice as high as the average for all registrants.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs in his 1918 report stated:

I reluctantly withhold a detailed account of the many instances of tribal and personal patriotism and of individual valor and achievement by our Indian soldiers in the service of both Canada and the United States that came to my attention during the year, for no record here would seem fittingly impartial that did not include the hundreds of noteworthy and authenticated incidents on the reservation, in the camps, and in France that have been almost daily recounted in the public prints. The complete story would be a voluminous narration of scenes, episodes, eloquent appeal, stirring action, and glorious sacrifice that might better be written into a deathless epic by some master poet born out of the heroic travail of a world-embattled era.

President Coolidge sent magnificently engraved certificates to 207 jurisdictions from which Indians went to the World War, expressing the thanks of the Nation for their unswerving loyalty and patriotism, the splendid service rendered and the willing sacrifices made.

Many Indians rendered distinguished service and received awards. No accurate figures are available, but the Indian Office at one time had records of 321 casualties, 262 wounded, 54 decorated, 64 officers, 1 surgeon, and 14 young women nurses among the Indians who served in the World War.

Some years ago, the Indian Office reported that Indians served as officers, privates, sailors, marines, clergymen, nurses, and in the air; and in America, Europe, Siberia, and the Philippines. Indians were very much at home in Army life. Those who had attended schools were accustomed to marching, drilling, atheltics, music, games, and so forth. They were good drivers of motorized vehicles, having been well trained in automobile factories, and they spoke and wrote English. It was found that messages sent in Indian dialects could not be decoded by the Germans, and Indian signallers proved of great value to the American Army.

Indians raised important food crops during the war and subscribed $25,000,000 for Liberty Bonds. They also cooperated with the Red Cross and other agencies to acquire war relief funds. Otis Leader, Choctaw, was selected as the typical American soldier and his portrait hangs in the French Federal Building of Paris.

The mightiest representatives of the most important nations of the world were shown no greater honor at the ceremonies of the entombment of the Unknown Soldier than were the Indians.

I wish to quote from the Associated Press:

A plain soldier, unknown but weighted with honors as perhaps no American before him because he died for the flag in France, lay tonight in a place where only martyred Presidents Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley, have slept in death.

We know not whether that body is white, red, or colored—neither does it make any difference.

Marshal Foch and his staff came in with all his war medals across his breast. General Jacques, the Belgian chief, also came and the two strolled about the marble colonnade behind their boxes exchanging greetings. General Diaz of Italy joined them. Together the three moved with the Japanese Mission to the place where the body lay.

Ambassador Geddes, in full British diplomatic uniform, brought flower offerings for the dead from England's King, with a guard of British officers.

Chief Plenty Coups, of the Crow Indians, attired in full war regalia, feathered bonnet, furs and skins of variegated colors, was seated on the platform, joining the group of distinguished military leaders from Europe. Thus the uniform of the first Americans took its place with those of its Allied Powers in the last war. A group of Indian braves appeared in the audience, tiptoeing in their beaded moccasins down the aisle to their seats.

The simple words of the burial ritual were said by Bishop Brent; flowers from war mothers of America and England were laid in place.

For the Indians of America, Chief Plenty Coups came to call upon the Great Spirit of the Red Men with gesture and chant and tribal tongue that the dead should not have died in vain; that war might end; peace be purchased by such blood as this. Upon the casket he laid the coup stick of his tribal office and the feathered war bonnet from his own head. Then the casket, with its weight of honors, was lowered into the crypt.

Speaking parenthetically, Chief Plenty Coups was selected by the Government as the chief of all chiefs to represent the Indians at the ceremonies incident to the entombment of the Unknown Soldier.

For nearly 300 years the people of the United States dealt with the Indians on the assumption that they were a dying

race. From the beginning we took away their best lands. We broke treaties and promises. But we could not break their spirit. Those who know Indians today know that they are human beings like ourselves, with all the same powers and potentialities. Today there are 361,000 Indians in the United States, and the Indian population is increasing at almost twice the rate of the whole population.

Can we not still learn from this great and ancient people if we but pause and take the time? I wish at this time to quote from the Indian creed:

He believed in the unseen spirits; he accepted the idea of one supreme spirit who was everywhere all the time, whose help was needed continually, and might be secured by prayer and sacrifice.

He believed in the immortality of the soul, and that its future condition was to be determined by its behavior in this life.

He reverenced his body as the sacred temple of his spirit; and believed it his duty in all ways to perfect his body, that his earthly record might be the better.

He believed in the subjection of the body by fasting whenever it seemed necessary for the absolute domination of the spirit, as when in some crisis that spirit felt the need for better insight.

He believed in reverence for his parents; and in old age supported them, even as he expected his children to support him.

He believed in cleanliness of body.

He believed in purity of morals.

He believed in beautifying all things in his life. He had a song for every occasion—a beautiful prayer for every stress. His garments were made beautiful with painted patterns, feathers, and quill work. He had dances for every fireside. He has led the world in the making of beautiful baskets, blankets, and canoes; while the decorations he put in lodges, weapons, cloths, dishes, and dwellings, beds, cradles, or grave boards were among the countless evidences of his pleasure in the beautiful as he understood it.

He believed in the simple life. He held, first, that land belonged to the tribe, not to the individual; next, that the accumulation of property was the beginning of greed that grew into monstrous crime.

He believed in peace and the sacred obligations of hospitality.

He believed that the noblest of virtues was courage, and that, above all other qualities, he worshiped and prayed for. So also he believed that the most shameful of crimes was being afraid.

He believed that he should so live his life that the fear of death could never enter into his heart; that when the last call came he should put on the paint and honors of a hero going home, then sing his death song and meet the end of physical life in triumph.

How has the Government treated the Indians?

In his official report of 1878, General Sheridan summed it up in a paragraph:

The Government made treaties, gave presents, made promises, none of which were honestly fulfilled. We took away their country and their means of support, broke up their mode of living, their habits of life, introduced disease and decay among them, and it was for this and against this they made war.

My colleagues, has not the time arrived for the removal of the statuary group known as The Rescue, which is an atrocious distortation of the facts of American history and which is an insult to the great race of people which has made such valuable contributions not only to American civilization but to the culture and economy of the whole world.

While I am speaking of the American Indian I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House a bill which I introduced providing for the creation of an Indian Claims Commission empowered to air and determine the claims of all Indians. This same bill has been heretofore introduced by Senator THOMAS in the Senate. Its purpose and provisions are in accordance with the pledge given the American Indian by the Democratic Party in convention assembled, in Chicago, in 1940. I quote:

We favor and pledge the enactment of legislation creating an Indian Claims Commission for the special purpose of entertaining and investigating claims presented by Indian groups, bands, and tribes in order that our Indian citizens may have their claims against the Government considered, adjusted, and finally settled at the earliest possible date.

I take pleasure in quoting also from the Republican platform adopted at its convention in Philadelphia the same year:

We pledge an immediate and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation.

Let us now see whether our two great major parties meant what they said when they gave these pledges to the Indian people or whether it was just "campaign oratory" to get the Indian vote.

In conclusion, my colleagues, let us do the just and honorable thing by this great class of people by passing these two resolutions. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. YOUNGDAHL, for 4 days, on account of funeral of his secretary.

To Mrs. NORTON, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. SANDERS, for 10 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may be permitted to sit during the remainder of the week while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Military Affairs Committee may sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi;

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; and

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 4, 1941:

H. R. 2788. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4124. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

On April 9, 1941:

H. R. 538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Biloxi, Miss., to the city of Biloxi;

H. R. 3860. An act for the relief of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; and

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes.

THE LATE SENATOR MORRIS SHEPPARD

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 174

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, a Senator of the United States from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Naval Affairs will hold hearings on Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10: 30 a. m., on H. R. 4139.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions), relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4088, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to charter and purchase available vessels of domestic and foreign registry and to provide necessary insurance and reinsurance for such vessels and their operations.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, new House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

398. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to exempt Philippine articles shipped from the Philippine Islands to Guam from the Philippine export tax in certain cases; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

399. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the municipal councils in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

400. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report relating to divisions of awards for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

401. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title to certain lands of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway widening purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

402. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John on February 26, 1941, petitioning the Congress of the United States to permit all internal-revenue taxes collected on liquors and articles arriving from the Virgin Islands into the United States to be credited to the municipal treasuries of the government of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

403. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of division of awards for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

404. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

405. A letter from the president, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

406. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

407. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting recommendation of the Attorney General with regards to the suit instituted by the United States Government with regards to removing the cloud on the title of approximately 2,900,000 acres of land claimed by the Northern Pacific Railway Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

408. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer certain lands; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

409. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain lands on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

410. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the Honolulu Plantation Co. certain Government-owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

411. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for refugee relief for the fiscal year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 169); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

412. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting 33 supplemental estimates of appropriations, totaling $728,767,000, for the military activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, together with 4 proposed provisions of appropriation language (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

413. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to $500,000 (H. Doc. No. 168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

414. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, to remain available until expended, in the amount of $1,000,000, for the Veterans' Administration, for hospital and domiciliary facilities (H. Doc. No. 171); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

415. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Temporary National Economic Committee (H. Doc. No. 173); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

416. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision making available $580,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture from funds appropriated by the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, under the heading "Water conservation and utility projects" (H. Doc. No. 174); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

417. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, in the amount of $30,000, for the Veterans' Administration for printing and binding (H. Doc. No. 167); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

418. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office, for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to $1,130,000 (H. Doc. No. 172); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4173) granting a pension to Grace McGrath, and the same was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 4335. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment to States of an average of $15 per month per capita for all recipients of old-age assistance, under the several State plans, who are 65 years of age or older and not inmates of a public institution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4336. A bill to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Olympic National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4337 (by request). A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to disabled men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4338. A bill to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4339. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions, thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4340. A bill to provide for payments by the United States to the several States with respect to certain Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4341. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4342. A bill to authorize blackouts in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 4343. A bill to improve the efficiency of the Army and Marine Corps by advancing first sergeants to the first pay grade and to provide the allowances for the first pay grade for all Army and Marine Corps first sergeants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 4344. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended,

the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 4345. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property for public use in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4346. A bill making further provision for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4347. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-Day Adventists; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4348. A bill to authorize the construction of public works on the Los Angeles River watershed in the interest of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4349. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4350. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska and Hawaii applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territories; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the select committee appointed to investigate interstate migration; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. Res. 175. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. Res. 176. Resolution to remove, the Senate concurring, the statuary group entitled "The Rescue" from the pedestal of the main staircase of the National Capitol and substitute in lieu thereof a fitting statue; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 177. Resolution to create a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAY:

H. Res. 178. Resolution providing expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 179. Resolution providing expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 8, with reference to proper observance in the year of 1943 of the Old Oregon Trail; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolutions Nos. 12 and 13, with reference to more adequate system of mine-to-market roads as a part of the defense program of the Nation; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 9, with reference to amendments to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 13, with reference to the construction of a road and bridge; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 13, with reference to educational facilities, schoolrooms, equipment, and teachers for the children of those employed in the defense-work program; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Resolution No. 176, with reference to the social-security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 13A, with reference to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 5A, with reference to public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 29A, with reference to dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated April 4, 1941, with reference to strikes and the present emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 22, relative to construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House file No. 4, Resolution No. 3, with reference to the American market for the American farmer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 16, with reference to public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a law which will provide for national old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14, with reference to the naming of one of the new-type heavy cruisers "Hawaii"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 4351. A bill for the relief of the McClellan-Walters Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Ohio:

H. R. 4352. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Doll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 4353. A bill for the relief of George Harrison Outerbridge; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4354. A bill for the relief of D. H. Dantzler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. R. 4355. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear and determine and render judgment upon the claim of Bella Cosgrove; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4356. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of George H. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 4357. A bill granting a pension to Orin Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Anna Jennings; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4359. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PADDOCK:

H. R. 4360. A bill for the relief of Adolph Kluver and Anna Oszter Kluver, his wife; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 4361. A bill for the relief of John Schild and the estate of James Schild; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 4362. A bill for the relief of Max H. Dreyer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

673. By Mr. DEWEY: Petition of Local No. 1, American Security Union of the United States, signed by F. Hughes Johnston, of Chicago, Ill., and several hundred constituents of the Ninth District, favoring Work Projects Administration appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

674. By Mr. DOMENGEAUX: Resolutions of the Rotary Club of Louisiana and Franklin (La.) Lodge No. 1387, B. P. O. E., on the subject of strikes in national-defense plants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

675. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution adopted by South Carolina Oil Jobbers' Association, Columbia, S. C., submitted by S. R. McMaster, of Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Labor.

676. Also, senate resolution submitted by James Fowles, clerk of the senate, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., endorsing the Russell amendment in the National Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

677. Also, concurrent resolution, submitted James Fowles, clerk of the senate, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., endorsing the farm security program and urging its enlargement and continuation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

678. Also, house resolution submitted by J. E. Hunter, Jr., clerk of the house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., memorializing the President of the United States of America and the Congress to take such immediate action as is necessary to put an end to striking; to the Committee on Labor.

679. Also, resolution submitted by James D. Walters, secretary-treasurer, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Columbia, S. C., requesting the Senators and Congressmen from the State of South Carolina to sponsor, endorse, and/or support such legislation in Congress as will prevent the stoppage of industrial production throughout our Nation; and that congressional action be taken immediately to prevent subversive activities throughout our Nation as effectively as may be possible; to the Committee on Rules.

680. By Mr. GAVAGAN: Resolution of Division No. 2 of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, requesting favorable consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of House Resolution 150 and passage of said resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

681. By Mr. IZAC: Petition of the executive committee of the San Diego, Calif., branch of the National Women's Party, Josephine Irving, Mary Riling, Cora Babbit Johnson, Irene Thull, Ella Robbins, Bessie Bretz, Irene Clark, and Emily N. Ziegler, secretary, requesting that their views in favor of the equal rights amendment be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that, accordingly, immediate and favorable action be taken thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

682. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, requesting the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation proposed by Senate bill 710, as speedily as possible; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

683. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, requesting the Congress of the United States to replace the $35,000,000 reduction in appropriations for the Surplus Marketing Administration with provision that this fund be allocated to fruit crops adversely affected by loss of foreign markets, and that the appropriation be increased by another $100,000,000 for the specific expansion of the stamp plan, so that the underprivileged two-thirds of the Nation unable to afford adequate diets can be assisted by the Federal Government to the point of absorbing otherwise unabsorbable surpluses of fresh, canned, and dried fruits; to the Committee on Appropriations.

684. Also, petition of the Carl H. Kren Post, No. 1123, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, requesting all Senators and Representatives from the State of California to assist in the amendment of the Selective Service Act so that ex-members of the Navy and/or the Marine Corps may be granted such equal deferment as the Army and to begin any action necessary with reference to deferment in connection with the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

685. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of California, requesting the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to enact such legislation or to take such other steps as may be necessary to provide that meat and meat products inspected and passed under the California meat inspection law may be sold to and purchased by the United States and its agencies on the same footing as meat and meat products produced under Federal inspection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

686. Also, petition of the Assembly of the California Legislature, respectfully memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to construct a dam on the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River in order to retain the usual annual excess flow of water of the Stanislaus River and protect the delta islands in the San Joaquin River below Stockton, Calif., which will be used for large armed forces due to the defense emergency; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

687. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of the Forty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Iowa, urging the Congress of the United States and the Federal Bureau of Roads to liberalize the regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the various States for the purpose of building farm-to-market roads and to particularly liberalize the rules limiting the highways upon which such funds can be expended for the improvement thereof, and that the various States through the appropriate authority created by them for that purpose and in Iowa particularly, the State highway commission, rather than the Federal Bureau of Roads, be given more authority to supervise the expenditure of such funds as may be allocated to a given State for the construction of farm-to-market roads; to the Committee on Roads.

688. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the United Irish-American Association of Westchester County, N. Y., heartily endorsing House bill 1796, designating the Friday before Easter, in each year, as a legal holiday, and urging its passage and enactment into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

689. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of Rev. Albert Allen Bird and members of the Penfield Presbyterian Church, Penfield, Pa., urging the safeguarding of the morals of the young men inducted into military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

690. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Woodbury, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to additional hospital facilities for veterans within the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

691. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Rensselaer County, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2245, concerning a veterans' hospital in the Twenty-ninth Congressional District; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

692. Also, petition of the Scranton Building and Construction Trades Council, Scranton, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

693. Also, petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his petition with reference to the impeachment of the Honorable D. Lawrence Groner, Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

694. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, Grand Rapids, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

695. Also, petition of the Fort Worth Building Trades Council, Fort Worth, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

696. Also, petition of the Green Bay Building and Construction Trades, Green Bay, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

697. Also, petition of the executive committee of the Slovak League of America, Luzerne, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an address on the international situation made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as well as his address in the House of Congress on the state of the Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

698. Also, petition of the Texas Dental College, Houston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Selective Training and Service Act and national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

699. Also, petition of the Southern Traffic League, Nashville, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence power and waterway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

700. Also, petition of Wesley K. Wiker, heir of M. R. Wiker, Niobrara County, Wyo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to mining claims situated in Niobrara County, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art the author of peace and lover of concord, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, whose service is perfect freedom: Help us to show the reality of our prayers by our endeavor to realize them. Let not the power of any habit grow too strong for us; but do Thou deliver us from bondage to our former ways by adjusting us to the means of grace and instruction which Thou hast placed before us.

Above all, make us ready and anxious to serve. Direct us in thought and feeling, that harmony and not dissonance may characterize the response of our lives to the pleadings of mankind for peace. Teach us how to be fully and heartily in the world, yet not of it; how to keep ourselves allied and responsive to the Infinite, while yet no touch of mundane sympathy is lost.

Finally, do Thou gird us for the battle in behalf of truth and righteousness, enabling us to feel the sorrows and the burdens of humanity without losing aught of the joy of service in Thy kingdom. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 14, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Morris Sheppard, late a Senator from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4057. An act to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the Freedmen's Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts;

H. R. 4083. An act to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department

of the District of Columbia to dispose of property coming into his possession;

H. R. 4131. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended;

H. R. 4221. An act for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter; and

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CONTRACTS UNDER NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] a member of the special committee to investigate the national-defense program, in place of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], resigned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEGISLATION BY THE COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of amendments adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

TRENT TRUST CO., LTD., ET AL., *v.* THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 46)

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to resolution of the Senate, a certified copy of the special findings of fact, conclusion of law and opinion, rendered by the Court of Claims February 3, 1941, in re *Trent Trust Company, Ltd., et al.*, v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 17747 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the forestry section, Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, at Atlanta, Ga., favoring the amendment of existing law so as to extend Federal cooperation only to those States in which forestry work is in charge of competent technically trained men, graduates of recognized schools of forestry; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolutions of the building- and construction-trades department, American Federation of Labor, and the Alliance of Building Trades, of Tulsa, Okla., pledging that there will be no stoppage of work on account of jurisdictional disputes between any of the building and construction trades on any building or construction project essential to the speedy and successful completion of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions of the building- and construction-trades department, American Federation of Labor, and the Alliance of Building Trades, of Tulsa, Okla., stating that, under employers who are recognized as being fair to organized labor, when any or all of the building- and construction-trades organizations are unable to supply a full force of building-trades men to man defense projects, every organization affiliated with such labor organizations agrees that a union employer shall be privileged to employ others than members of the building and construction trades affiliated with such labor unions until such time as the labor organizations so affiliated can replace nonunion men with members of their organizations, or until such nonunion men are requested to become members of the respective unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Camden, N. J., Industrial Traffic Club, protesting against the enactment of legislation for the construction of the St. Lawrence River development; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Relative to memorializing Congress to allocate funds in surplus marketing budget for 1942 to California fruit growers because of loss of normal export markets due to the war

"Whereas the fruit industry of the United States, including growing, processing, and canning, has become concentrated in the State of California, which produces 40 percent of the fruit crop of the Nation, although only 5 percent of the country's people live here; and

"Whereas California fruit growers are dependent on national and foreign markets to gain a living from these crops; and

"Whereas 18 percent of California fruit production normally goes into export with certain specialty crops showing an extremely high percentage; hardy pears, 90 percent; prunes and apricots, 40 percent; raisins and canned pears, 30 percent; and

"Whereas this foreign market has been almost completely cut off by the European war and home markets are unable to absorb the huge surpluses of these special crops which growers produce each year; and

"Whereas this situation constitutes a grave danger to owners of the 235,000 acres of orchards which have been developed over long years to provide the 1,000,000 tons of fresh, canned, and dried fruit normally going into export; and

"Whereas the families of these thousands of growers, their employees, workers engaged in canning, processing, transporting, and warehousing these crops are also adversely affected and with them the merchants and professional groups in their respective communities; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives, over the protests of members of the California delegation, saw fit to reduce the Budget for the year 1942 for disposal of surplus commodities by $35,000,000, providing a total of only $200,000,000, compared with over $235,000,000 for this department in 1941; and

"Whereas the agricultural appropriation bill is now before the Senate of the United States for consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to replace the $35,000,000 reduction in appropriations for the Surplus Marketing Administration with provision that this fund be allocated to fruit crops adversely affected by loss of foreign markets; and be it further

"Resolved, That the above appropriation be increased by another $100,000,000 for the specific expansion of the stamp plan, so that the underprivileged two-thirds of the Nation unable to afford adequate diets can be assisted by the Federal Government to the point of absorbing otherwise unabsorbable surpluses of fresh, canned, and dried fruits; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully urged to support the legislation herein outlined."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 13

"Memorializing the President and Congress to enact legislation proposed by United States Senate bill 710, providing a basis of recovery for claims of California Indians based on early treaty arrangement

"Whereas the Indian occupants of California by various treaties ceded their tribal lands to the Federal Government in return for treaty agreements that were never fulfilled; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States by Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY a bill a known as S. 710, which provides for an equitable basis for compensation to the California Indians for the lands that were taken from them without compensation; and

"Whereas all the prospective Indian recipients of such consideration have expressed their approval of the basis of recovery provided in said bill S. 710; and

"Whereas said bill leaves the handling of the claims of said Indians in the United States Court of Claims, in the hands of the attorney general of California in accordance with enactments of our State legislature to that effect; and

"Whereas Attorney General Warren accepted said authorization as a part of his official duties and now has deputies of his office working earnestly in behalf of securing recovery for said Indians as speedily as possible to the best interests of said Indians of California and to the best interests of the State of California; and

"Whereas the enactment of said bill will be a forward step toward the economic rehabilitation of Indian citizens of California who have not had quite an equal chance with other citizens of California; and

"Whereas such legislation would redound to the honor of our State and our Nation and to the benefit of society in general: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby respectfully urge the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the legislation proposed by S. 710 as speedily as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That the conduct of such litigation as shall be authorized by said bill, S. 710, be left in charge of the attorney general of California in justice to said Indians of California, who in justice to them should not be charged with the usual heavy expense of such litigation; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Indian Affairs in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and to each Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States and that such Senators and Representatives from California be and are respectfully urged to support such legislation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolution 3

"Resolution memorializing Congress to stabilize prices on farm products

"Whereas widespread dissatisfaction exists among the producers of farm commodities in Minnesota and neighboring States relative to the losses incurred in ordinary farm operations; and

"Whereas the American farmer is forced to sell the major portion of what he produces on a world market and purchase all of his necessities on a highly protected stabilized domestic market; and

"Whereas the spread between the value of the commodities the farmer sells and those he buys places him at a serious disadvantage in the market places; and

"Whereas this price disparity has existed for over 5 years and promises to continue indefinitely and create disaster among agriculturists; and

"Whereas the prices of agricultural commodities are not on a parity with prices of other products and especially with the prices of those commodities which the farmer must buy; and

"Whereas the financial returns from the farming industry have been such that the people engaged in that industry are practically bankrupt, demanding immediate drastic action; and

"Whereas the farmers are the largest buyers of commercial products in the Nation and a return of their purchasing power is essential before we can have any general and lasting return of prosperity; and

"Whereas in view of the price-fixing opportunities given by national legislation to industry, and in view of the curtailment of farm production; and

"Whereas to encourage, create, develop, and maintain a stable, prosperous, and permanent system of agriculture in the United States, it becomes necessary that agriculture should enjoy the same protection in price stabilization which is enjoyed by industry; and

"Whereas our present economic system does not operate to protect the farmer when there is an exportable surplus of agricultural products, thereby resulting in the world price being paid on not only the exportable surplus of such agricultural products but on that consumed domestically as well; and

"Whereas the existence of an exportable surplus of a vitally important food crop is a national necessity and from the consumer's standpoint nothing could be more dangerous than to create a deficiency in our stable food commodities through curtailment of production; and

"Whereas to remove the disparity in prices and to guarantee equality to agriculture with industry and labor, it is wholly essential and absolutely necessary that the American farmer should receive a price for commodities which he produces which will assure him cost of production and in addition thereto an amount sufficient to pay taxes, interest, debts, and living expenses: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring)*, That Congress of the United States, at its present sitting, be, and the same is, urgently petitioned and requested to enact such legislation as will meet our agricultural crisis; that will insure cost of production plus an amount sufficient to pay taxes, interest, debt service, and living expenses; that will place agriculture on a parity with those engaged in industry; that will retain the American market for the American farmer; and that will fix an adequate minimum price on farmer's products; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved April 4, 1941.

"HAROLD E. STASSEN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress for the Territory of Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, Senator from the State of New York, did, on August 14, 1940, introduce Senate bill 4269 in the Senate of the United States, and on the same day the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Congressman from the State of Massachusetts, introduced a like bill in the House of Representatives, H. R. 10384, which said bills provided for amendments to the Social Security Act so as to include employees not now covered by said act, and particularly extending the provisions thereof to the old-age and survivors insurance provisions to State and local government employees and non-civil-service employees of the Federal Government: Now, therefore,

"We your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fifteenth regular session assembled, respectfully endorse the principle included in the two bills and prays that said Senate bill 4269 be speedily enacted into law.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution of the Townsend Club of Welborn, Kans., favoring the enactment of pending legislation embodying the principles of the Townsend recovery plan; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens of Marion, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens, students of the Senior High School, of Hagerstown, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for registration of privately owned firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Hampstead and vicinity, in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A petition of sundry citizens, residents of Dickinson County, Mich., praying the amendment of existing law so that the 30-day layoff period for workers under the W. P. A. after 18 months of employment may be abolished; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the Detroit Chapter, America First Committee, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against involvement in the existing European war, and also against all acts which might invite or provoke an outbreak of hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions of the Mayor and Common Council of the City of Ypsilanti; Muskegon Lodge No. 32, Knights of Pythias, of Muskegon; and Council No. 8 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, of Detroit, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the St. Lawrence River development; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WALSH:

Resolutions of the Board of Aldermen of Malden, approved by the Mayor, and the City Council of Woburn, both in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to abolish the 30-day layoff period after 18 months of employment under the W. P. A.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Springfield and vicinity, in the State of Massachusetts, praying that the United States keep out of foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions of the Common Council of the City of Everett, approved by the Mayor and the City Council of Lawrence, both in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the prompt dispatch of foodstuffs and other necessities to the Irish Free State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Arlington Committee to Defend America, of Cambridge, Mass., and vicinity, favoring the delivery of ships, food, and war materials to countries now fighting the Axis Powers, even by the use of the United States Navy, if necessary, for the delivery of such aid; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A memorial of several citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against every step which may lead the United States toward involvement in war; to the table.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, at the request of the Associated Industries of Alabama, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the board of that organization in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas an impartial and exhaustive study of the proposed St. Lawrence power and seaway project was made at the request of the board of directors of the Associated Industries of Alabama by a representative committee of Mobile citizens, composed of executives of industrial, banking, ocean carriers, railroads, terminal operators, and all other classes of port interests within the port of Mobile for the purpose of ascertaining the effects of the proposed development on the State of Alabama and the port of Mobile; and

Whereas a unanimous report of this committee's findings has been submitted to the board of directors of the Associated Industries of Alabama and has received careful study by a subcommittee of the board; and

Whereas the study made by the Mobile committee and that of this board's subcommittee has disclosed that:

(1) The proposed St. Lawrence power and seaway project would adversely affect the port of Mobile in which the State of Alabama has made large investments, by diverting export and import traffic from existing trade routes.

(2) Any effect of the project on Alabama's major coal industry because of development of hydroelectric power would be adverse, and any adverse effect on Alabama's coal in-

dustry would adversely affect Alabama's railroads, farmers, cattle growers, dairymen, and in fact nearly every citizen of the State of Alabama.

(3) The project would deprive already distressed railroads operating in Alabama and adjacent States of substantial revenue as results of freight to and from the Middle West, and now moving through the port of Mobile, being diverted to and through the Great Lakes ports.

(4) The project would retard and injure Mobile's expanding shipbuilding industry.

(5) The project would adversely affect the Federal Barge Lines, a governmental agency, which has an established service on the Mississippi River system.

(6) The project would in no way contribute to national defense, because the estimated time required for its completion would be approximately 6 years.

(7) The project will involve the needless and unwarranted expenditure of several hundred millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Whereas the board of directors of the Associated Industries of Alabama concurs in the foregoing findings of the committee of Mobile citizens and its own subcommittee: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Associated Industries of Alabama hereby records its opposition to the St. Lawrence power and seaway project as an unsound and unneeded development, which would be inimical to the best interests of the port of Mobile, the State of Alabama, and the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, which is hereby adopted, be sent to Alabama Senators and Congressmen and to other Senators of the United States with the earnest request that they vote again, as they voted overwhelmingly when the subject was originally submitted to the Congress, against the proposal.

Unanimously adopted this 13th day of March 1941.

GOOD FRIDAY PETITION FOR BLOCKADE VICTIMS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD the Good Friday petition for blockade victims which the Food for Europe Pilgrimage presented to the Department of State on April 11. It is a petition of 6,400 persons, for transmittal to the British and German Embassies, urging that a way be found to allow food ships to pass unmolested to Holland, Belgium, France, Finland, Denmark, Poland, and Norway. The petition, sponsored by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, was also presented to me with the request that I present it to the Senate. The petition was brought to Washington by a group of about 100 American citizens who walked 128 miles from Wilmington, Del., as a protest against the failure thus far of the United States to persuade European belligerents to adopt a plan to save from famine and pestilence millions of children, mothers, and aged people in the occupied lands, such as was successfully carried out in Belgium and France throughout the last war.

Among the well-known persons signing the petition for themselves, but not as representatives of organizations, are the following:

The Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor, Riverside Church, New York City.

Bishop Ralph Spaulding Cushman, Methodist bishop, St. Paul, Minn.

The Right Reverend W. Appleton Lawrence, Episcopal bishop of western Massachusetts, Springfield, Mass.

Dean L. A. Weigle, Yale Divinity School; president, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Edwin Grant Conklin, biologist, Princeton, N. J.

William Henry Chamberlin, writer, Cambridge, Mass.

The Very Reverend Bernard Iddings Bell, canon of Providence, Providence, R. I.

Prof. Roland H. Bainton, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Albert E. Barnett, Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.

Judge John Beardsley, superior court, Los Angeles, Calif.

The Reverend Charles F. Boss, Jr., secretary-general, Conference Commission on World Peace, Methodist Church, Chicago, Ill.

Prof. Robert L. Calhoun, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The Reverend Allan Knight Chalmers, pastor, Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York City.

The Reverend Russell E. Clay, pastor, Vermont Square Methodist Church, Los Angeles.

The Reverend Albert Buckner Coe, pastor, First Congregational Church, Oak Park, Ill.

The Reverend Henry H. Crane, pastor, Central Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.

Prof. Earl Cranston, University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.

Prof. Walter S. Davison, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Reverend Albert Edward Day, pastor, First Methodist Church of Pasadena; vice president, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Pasadena, Calif.

The Reverend Harold E. Fey, field editor, the Christian Century, Chicago, Ill.

Prof. C. H. Hamlin, Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N. C.

Prof. George W. Hartmann, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

The Reverend John Haynes Holmes, pastor, Community Church, New York City.

The Reverend Allan Hunter, pastor, Mount Hollywood Congregational Church, Los Angeles.

The Reverend Harold Jensen, pastor, First Baptist Church, Seattle, Wash.

The Reverend E. Stanley Jones, world evangelist, New York.

President Willis H. King, Gannon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.

Prof. Cornelius Kruse, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

The Reverend John Howland Lathrop, pastor, Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Prof. Kenneth Scott Latourette, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Miss Grace Lindley, former secretary, Woman's Auxiliary of Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City.

Mrs. Mary Ely Lyman, dean, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.

The Reverend D. P. McGeachie, pastor, Decatur Presbyterian Church, Decatur, Ga.

The Reverend Elmore M. McKee, rector, St. George's Episcopal Church, New York City.

The Reverend N. C. McPherson, pastor Peachtree Road Methodist Church, Atlanta, Ga.

Prof. Ernest Merritt, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

The Reverend A. J. Muste, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York City.

President Albert W. Palmer, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

The Reverend James Austin Richards, pastor, the First Church, Oberlin, Ohio.

The Reverend Richard Roberts, former moderator, United Church of Canada, New York City.

The Reverend John Nevin Sayre, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York City.

The Reverend Paul Scherer, pastor, Holy Trinity Church, New York City.

Prof. Vida D. Scudder, professor emeritus, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

Gale Seaman, Y. M. C. A. secretary, retired, Los Angeles, Calif.

The Reverend Frederick K. Stamm, pastor, Clinton Avenue Community Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Prof. Arthur L. Swift, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Reverend Ernest Fremont Tittle, pastor, First Methodist Church, Evanston, Ill.

The Reverend Luke M. White, rector, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Montclair, N. J.

Prof. Frank G. Williston, College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Wash.

Howard Wilkts, secretary, Y. M. C. A., Portland, Oreg.

The text of the petition reads:

Whereas 37,000,000 people in Holland, Belgium, France, Finland, Denmark, Poland, and Norway are badly in need of food; and

Whereas no conclusive evidence has been produced that shows that the plan which fed Belgium and France during the first World War cannot be used successfully today; and

Whereas we in this country have surpluses of food: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Ambassadors of Great Britain and Germany to urge upon their Governments the finding of a way to allow food ships to pass unmolested to the above countries as soon as arrangements can be made to insure against misuse of relief food.

The petition and pilgrimage were organized by the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

John Nevin Sayre, secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, in presenting the pilgrims and the petition of the Food for Europe Pilgrimage, made this statement:

On this Good Friday, nearly 2,000 years after the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, famine and pestilence unnaturally nurtured by man, are closing in upon the populations of European countries caught between the millstones of military occupation and blockade. We therefore beg that the Government of the United States will use its utmost influence to discover promptly a way to end this inhuman situation.

We beg that you will do all you can about it in the Senate.

We remember that during the last World War Prime Ministers Lloyd George and Clemenceau cabled to President Wilson

urgently requesting him not to allow a threatened discontinuance of civilian feeding in German-occupied Belgium and northern France and that 10,000,000 persons were fed by this work which President Wilson supported.

We are convinced, furthermore, that the conscience of the plain people of America today wants our country to send food—certainly not guns alone—to Europe.

These Pilgrims for Humanity have brought with them to Washington this petition, signers of which include eminent leaders in our churches and universities. But the thing that has impressed me most as I have read each of the two volumes of names signed to the petition is that they are indicative of a goundswell of conscience against war and all its works and of a desire to do the works of mercy that is surely stirring in the rank and file of the American people.

Conscience is an intangible but potent force once it is thoroughly aroused. It has actuated the bearers of this petition to come to Washington on foot and in the spirit of prayer and penitence to express by their words and deeds the cry of perishing multitudes in Europe who may yet be saved if America will listen to Christ's command, "Give ye them to eat."

Dr. J. Holmes Smith, of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, gave expression to his views as follows:

The purpose of the food-for-Europe pilgrimage has been to demonstrate by symbolic action the concern felt by many of our fellow citizens for the plight of the 80,000,000 men, women, and children of the small countries of Europe who are caught between the upper and nether millstones of invasion and blockade and are therefore menaced by starvation and pestilence. We pilgrims started on foot 6 days ago from Wilmington, which may be considered the arsenal of the arsenal of democracy. We are convinced that if our country is preoccupied with armaments to the neglect of such humanitarian issues as food for Europe she may save her hide but lose her soul.

You, sir, represent a State which is one of the many in our fair land which raise surplus stocks of food. On the way to your office we paused in front of the Bureau of Surplus Commodities of the Department of Agriculture for a few moments of silent prayer of penitence and petition, that out of our abundance a way might be found to duplicate what was done so successfully in Belgium in the last war.

This being Good Friday, we cannot help thinking of the millions of innocent victims of invasion and blockade who are being crucified on a cross of starvation.

At your suggestion we have presented to the Department of State a petition of some 6,440 names of persons, many of them prominent, who feel as we do on this issue and urgently request the authorities concerned to do their utmost to find a way to save these people. Other powerful groups have done the same. We urge you, sir, to use your good offices to the same holy purpose.

WAR EXPENDITURES AND TAXATION
(S. DOC. NO. 47)

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on March 18 I asked the Treasury Department for a statement showing what is being done in other English-speaking democracies by way of taxation to maintain national solvency in the face of the expenditures of war. Under date of April 12, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John L. Sullivan has given me a comprehensive and completely illuminating and a highly significant reply. I think the information should be made available to the Congress and to the country.

We in America face the inevitable burdens of heavily increased taxation, and I mean heavily, and I mean at once, if we shall maintain a sound public credit, which, in the final analysis, is the first line of national defense. Our people in this generation have yet to learn that there is no such thing as painless or inexpensive war or preparation for war, in its ghastly and modern technique. It is time our people began to face this problem in its grim realities, because Congress, acting upon its responsibility, cannot evade or avoid the unpleasant task of soon reaching into every American pocketbook for new and heavy contributions with which partially to meet our defense expenditures. Mind you, Mr. President, I am speaking only of preparedness expenditures. If we should become an active belligerent, the contemplation would multiply in its terrific burdens.

The Treasury report, which I have received today through the courtesy of Mr. Sullivan, is, of course, authentic. It is a preview, Mr. President, of what we ourselves confront. Therefore I shall ask that this letter from Mr. Sullivan be made a Senate document, but before that is done I desire to point out one or two high spots for the RECORD.

I wish to point out from Mr. Sullivan's letter that the British budget, referring to the estimates for 1940–41, show revenues of £1,360,000,000 and expenditures of £3,466,000,000. In other words, the United Kingdom, even under the present pressure of its desperate situation, is nearly on a 40-percent pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. Sullivan's figures for the Australian budget, dealing with the estimates for 1940–41, show revenues of £151,000,000 and a slight surplus. In other words, the Australian Government, in spite of its heavy contribution to the war, is practically on a complete pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. Sullivan's letter shows that the Canadian budget, dealing with the estimates for 1940–41, indicates a revenue of about $650,000,000, ordinary expenditures of about $1,148,000,000, a deficit of $498,000,000, plus an indeterminate amount which may bring the figures of the deficit to $700,000,000. In other words, even on the latter basis, Canada is practically on a 50-percent pay-as-you-go basis.

So we face the contemplation that the United Kingdom, at war, is practically on a 40-percent pay-as-you-go basis; Canada, at war, is on nearly a 50-percent pay-as-you-go basis; Australia, at war, is on practically a 100-percent pay-as-you-go basis; but the United States, Mr. President, though theoretically at peace, is probably not better than on a 20-percent pay-as-you-go basis. It is rather difficult to make a dependable American estimate because our figures are shifting so rapidly and our appropriations and authorizations are piling up so constantly; but here is a preview, I reassert, of the challenge which Congress has got to confront in the near future and which the American people have got to confront by way of increased taxation unless we are ready to surrender to national insolvency which can destroy every value in the land.

Let me give one exhibit on the question of increased taxation. Mr. Sullivan's letter to me shows that, according to the latest tax figures available, taking as a typical example a married person with two children and an income of $5,000, we confront the following comparisons:

In the United States the married person with two children and an income of $5,000 pays a Federal income tax of $75; in Australia the person similarly situated pays an income tax of $1,052; in Canada, $391; in the United Kingdom, $1,196.

Taking one other typical example—and I think it is of some importance, Mr. President, that the American people should begin to think in the terms of the burdens which they have got to carry—taking the typical married person with an income of $20,000, with two children, such a person in the United States pays a present income tax of $2,143; in Canada he pays $5,982; in the United Kingdom, $9,426; and in Australia, $8,548. These taxes, however, Mr. President, are only a part of the tax burden which is borne by these other English-speaking democracies now engaged in battle. In addition to the income tax, the United Kingdom has a special national-defense contribution, a special excise-profits tax, a purchase tax, the estate tax has been greatly increased, and customs and excise taxes have been substantially increased upon many commodities.

Australia not only has the individual income tax and the corporate tax but it has a special tax upon income derived from property; it has company taxes; it has supertaxes; it has wartime taxes on profits; it has a general sales tax.

Canada has not only the individual income tax but also a national-defense tax, a corporation income tax, an excess-profits tax, a sales tax, and excise duties and taxes which have been substantially increased upon practically all so-called luxuries.

Mr. President, I think this letter from Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Sullivan is a very important exhibit. I repeat, it shows the American people by way of a preview what they must expect to pay into the Treasury of the United States without much further delay if we are to maintain the national solvency, and it shows the Congress of the United States what its duty inevitably will be in terms of tax responsibility.

I ask that Mr. Sullivan's letter be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVILIAN SUPPLY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an Executive order issued by the President on April 11 establishing the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply in the Executive Office of the President and defining its functions and duties.

It seems to me that this Executive order is in fact an act of legislation made without any authority that I can find in the statutes. I desire to read to

the Senate for a moment part of the order, authorizing the Director to—

Determine and publish, after proper investigation, such maximum prices, commissions, margins, fees, charges, or other elements of cost or price of materials or commodities as the Administrator may from time to time deem fair and reasonable; and take all lawful and appropriate steps to facilitate their observance.

That purports at least to give the Administrator power to fix the price of any commodity, of any article, manufactured or otherwise, in the United States without any authority that I know of from Congress. We debated for many months the question whether we should permit someone to fix the price of coal, and gave that power. Certainly the authority to fix prices can be given only by legislation; and there is nothing in this order which indicates any authority to enforce the regulation of prices.

I may say that I think price-fixing measures are necessary. To prevent inflation I think it will be desirable to fix prices in order to hold prices down; but if that is done it should be done after proper legislation by Congress, considering all the things that should be taken into consideration, and it should not be done by Executive order. If, under the present status of affairs, the President of the United States may fix prices and margins and practices in every industry in the United States, then I say Congress may just as well go home. If the President has that power, he has every other power that he chooses to exercise through Executive order.

I ask that this order be incorporated in the RECORD in order that Congress may see legislation that is going on in this country, in a matter in which legislation is not authorized, by persons who are not authorized to enact laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The order is as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER

ESTABLISHING THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVILIAN SUPPLY IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND DEFINING ITS FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and in order to define further the functions and duties of the Office for Emergency Management with respect to the national emergency as declared by the President on September 8, 1939, for the purpose of avoiding profiteering and unwarranted price rises, and of facilitating an adequate supply and the equitable distribution of materials and commodities for civilian use, and finding that the stabilization of prices is in the interest of national defense and that this order is necessary to increase the efficiency of the defense program, it is hereby ordered:

1. There shall be in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President an Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, at the head of which shall be an Administrator appointed by the President. The Administrator shall receive compensation at such rate as the President shall determine and, in addition, shall be entitled to actual and necessary transportation, subsistence, and other expenses incidental to the performance of his duties.

2. Subject to such policies, regulations, and directions as the President may from time to time prescribe, and with such advice and assistance as may be necessary from the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and utilizing the services and facilities of such other departments and agencies to the fullest extent compatible with efficiency, the Administrator shall:

a. Take all lawful steps necessary or appropriate in order (1) to prevent price spiraling, rising costs of living, profiteering, and inflation resulting from market conditions caused by the diversion of large segments of the Nation's resources to the defense program, by interruptions to normal sources of supply, or by other influences growing out of the emergency; (2) to prevent speculative accumulation, withholding, and hoarding of materials and commodities; (3) to stimulate provision of the necessary supply of materials and commodities required for civilian use, in such manner as not to conflict with the requirements of the War, Navy, and other departments and agencies of the Government, and of foreign governments, for materials, articles, and equipment needed for defense (such requirements are hereinafter referred to as "military defense needs"); and (4) after the satisfaction of military defense needs, to provide, through the determination of policies and the formulation of plans and programs, for the equitable distribution of the residual supply of such materials and commodities among competing civilian demands.

b. Make studies of the Nation's civilian requirements for materials and commodities, the supply of goods and services, the status and trend of prices and factors thereof, and the impact of the defense program upon civilian living standards; exercise the powers of the President in requesting such studies pursuant to section 336 (a) of title III of the Tariff Act of 1930 (title 19, U. S. C., sec. 1336 (a)); and conduct such investigations, hold such hearings, and obtain such reports as may be necessary or desirable to carry out this order.

c. Determine and publish, after proper investigation, such maximum prices, commissions, margins, fees, charges, or other elements of cost or price of materials or commodities as the Administrator may from time to time deem fair and reasonable; and take all lawful and appropriate steps to facilitate their observance.

d. Advise and make recommendations to other departments and agencies, whenever the Administrator deems it appropriate, in respect to the purchase or acquisition of materials and commodities by the Government, the prices to be paid therefor, and in respect to such of their other activities as may affect the price of materials and commodities.

e. Inform the Office of Production Management of the amount, character, and relative importance of materials and commodities needed for civilian use; and advise and consult with the Office of Production Management with reference to its procurement, production planning, priority, and other actions the effect of which may be to diminish the supply of materials and commodities available for civilian use.

f. Establish and maintain liaison with such departments and agencies of the Government and with such other public or private agencies and persons as the Administrator may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this order.

g. Formulate programs designed to assure adequate standards for, and the most effective use of, consumer goods; stimulate the utilization of substitutes by civilians for consumer goods and commodities of limited supply; develop programs with the object of stabilizing rents; and promote civilian activities which will contribute to the purposes of this order.

h. Recommend to the President the exercise of the authority vested in him by the following-named acts, whenever, in the opinion of the Administrator, such action by the President will enable the Administrator to carry out and secure compliance with the provisions of sections 2a and 2c of this order:

(1) Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (Public, No. 783, 76th Cong.).

(2) Section 120 of the National Defense Act (title 50, U. S. C., sec. 80).

(3) Section I (15) of title 49, United States Code.

(4) The act of October 10, 1940 (Public, No. 829, 76th Cong.).

i. Perform the functions and exercise the authority vested in the President by the following-named acts, insofar as and only to the extent that the authority conferred by such acts will, in the opinion of the Administrator, enable him to carry out and secure compliance with the provisions of sections 2a and 2c of this order: Section 713 (a)-7 of title 15, United States Code, Supplement V; section 4 of the act approved June 7, 1939 (title 50, U. S. C., Supp. V, sec. 98c); and section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended by the act approved June 25, 1940 (Public, No. 664, 76th Cong.); subject to the disapproval by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy of each proposed action thereunder.

j. Advise upon proposed or existing legislation, and recommend such additional legislation as may be necessary or desirable, relating to prices, rents, or the increase in supply and the equitable distribution of materials and commodities for civilian use.

k. Keep the President informed in respect to progress made in carrying out this order; and perform such other related duties as the President may from time to time assign or delegate to him.

3. The Administrator may provide for the internal organization and management of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, and may appoint such advisory committees as he finds necessary to the performance of his duties and responsibilities. The Administrator shall obtain the President's approval for the establishment of the principal subdivisions of the Office and the appointment of the heads thereof.

4. There shall be in the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply a Price Administration Committee consisting of the Administrator as Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Loan Administrator, the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Director General and Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management, or such alternate as each may designate, and such other members as the President may subsequently appoint. The Committee shall from time to time, upon request by the Administrator, make findings and submit recommendations to the Administrator in respect to the establishment of maximum prices, commissions, margins, fees, charges, and other elements of cost or price of materials or commodities as provided under paragraph 2c above.

5. Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply or as may be allocated to it by the President through the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator may employ necessary personnel and make provision for necessary supplies, facilities, and services. However, the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply shall use such statistical, informational, fiscal, personnel, and other general business services and facilities as may be made available to it through the Office for Emergency Management or other agencies of the Government.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 11, 1941.*

[No. 8734]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I feel compelled to insist that the morning

hour be devoted to morning-hour business. I have complained numerous times against the making of speeches in the morning hour. The complaint does not seem to have done any good, and I do not want to make any point about it now; but Members of the Senate sit here waiting for the Chair to call through the morning program so that they may introduce bills or resolutions or insert matters in the RECORD.

The morning hour was not set aside for speeches, and I shall object to any more speeches being made in the morning hour, because it can be done only by unanimous consent. I wish the Chair would go through the morning-hour call so that Senators who have other business may leave the Chamber if they do not want to listen to speeches. After the morning-hour business is over, any Senator, of course, is at liberty to make as long a speech as he desires on any subject he pleases; but I hope Senators will observe the rule in regard to the business of the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following report of the Committee on the Judiciary was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1261. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen cattle having a value of $50 or more in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 181).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of Anthony Famiglietti; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1335. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts; and

S. 1336. A bill authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1337. A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles Adkins; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of James Roswell Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1339. A bill to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1340. A bill to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many of the cities of the Nation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1341. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $10 each to the members of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution authorizing the purchase of foreign merchant vessels for national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4057. An act to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the Freedmen's Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts;

H. R. 4083. An act to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to dispose of property coming into his possession;

H. R. 4131. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended;

H. R. 4221. An act for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter; and

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY—AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 26, line 3, to strike out "completion of."

INVESTIGATION OF FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLIC-LAND PATENTS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 94), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of instances of fraud in connection with the issuance of patents to public lands in the Pacific Coast States, and matters related thereto. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, by bill or otherwise.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $2,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN AT VALLEY FORGE, PA.

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator AIKEN at Valley Forge, Pa., on April 6, 1941, on the subject "Freedom and Unity," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN AT COLUMBUS, OHIO

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator AIKEN at Columbus, Ohio, on April 4, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR McFARLAND

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator McFARLAND at the Jackson Day dinner in Phoenix, Ariz., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THOMAS D. SAMFORD BEFORE THIRD ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Thomas D. Samford before the Third Annual Conference of United States Attorneys at Washington, D. C., March 13, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE DR. ANNIE J. CANNON

[Mr. HUGHES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the late Dr. Annie J. Cannon, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a document prepared by H. E. Ketner, Commerce Counsel of the State Corporation Commission of Virginia, in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN ON THE ENCIRCLEMENT OF AMERICA

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post, entitled "The Encirclement of America," which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are only two pages of the calendar, and it had been my purpose to ask that the calendar be called for consideration of unobjected-to bills. However, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, has in charge three or four bills which he desires to have considered before the calendar is called. They are on the calendar, but if the Senator from Massachusetts desires to have the bills taken up now, I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Before making an order in that matter, I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Kentucky what disposition he intends to make of the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill which we were to have had before us today.

Mr. BARKLEY. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who is in charge of that bill, and who is temporarily indisposed, has requested that the bill go over until he can return to the Senate. I think it is fair to say that that will not be this week, so that the bill will not be taken up this week, and I cannot fix the time when it will be taken up, because I do not know when the Senator from Tennessee will return. The bill is an annual appropriation bill, and there is nothing urgent in it. However,

there is one controversial matter connected with the bill, pertaining to an appropriation for a so-called subsidy to the American Export Air Lines for service across the Atlantic Ocean. That is a matter of some controversy, and the Senator from Tennessee, who is interested in it, and who is in charge of the bill, desires that the bill be delayed until he can return. I can guarantee that it will not be taken up this week.

Mr. McNARY. I see no urgency in the matter. I was merely curious to know when we were to consider the bill, and desired to be advised. I assume the Senator from Tennessee will be able to return within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will be back early next week, but I cannot be sure.

Mr. McNARY. I understand the bill will not be brought up for consideration this week.

Mr. BARKLEY. It will not be.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator desire to ask unanimous consent that the calendar be now considered?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; except that the Senator from Massachusetts, I understand, wants to have two bills considered. Would the Senator from Massachusetts be willing to have the bills taken up when they are reached on the calendar?

Mr. WALSH. That will be satisfactory.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The first order of business was the resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 935) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to commodity loans and marketing quotas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did Order of Business No. 150, Senate bill 935, go over?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection was heard, and the bill was passed over.

WITHHOLDING OF COTTON

The bill (S. 1250) to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce cotton of the 1940 and previous crops which is owned by the Government or which is pledged as security for Government loans, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent, and when he was present at the time of the last call he asked that this bill go over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I want to have this bill considered in connection with one introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I should want the order to apply to both bills, that they may go over today.

Mr. BARKLEY. The other bill has already gone over. I think this bill had better go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], who is interested in this bill, is temporarily detained. I think it should go over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be passed over.

COUNSEL IN SELECTIVE SERVICE CASES

The bill (S. 1254) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain matters was announced as next in order.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I propose to speak for about 30 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Senator may speak for only 5 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The call of the calendar will take but a few minutes. I suggest that the Senator wait.

Mr. TOBEY. I will wait.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill 1254?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person appointed under authority of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or the Selective Service Regulations made in pursuance thereof as a member of a local board, a board of appeal, an advisory board for registrants, as a Government appeal agent, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections as provided in section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

TERMS OF DISTRICT COURTS IN KENTUCKY

The bill (S. 208) relating to the terms of the District Courts of the United States for the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky was considered ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective on and after July 1, 1941, regular terms of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky shall be held at the following places and times in each year:

At Richmond: Beginning on the second Monday in February and the second Monday in September;

At Covington: Beginning on the fourth Monday in February and the fourth Monday in September;

At Catlettsburg: Beginning on the third Monday in March and the second Monday in October;

At Pikeville: Beginning on the first Monday in April and the fourth Monday in October;

At London: Beginning on the third Monday in April and the second Monday in November;

At Jackson: Beginning on the second Monday in May and the first Monday in December;

At Lexington: Beginning on the fourth Monday in May and the second Monday in January; and

At Frankfort: Beginning on the third Monday in June and the fourth Monday in January.

SEC. 2. Effective on and after July 1, 1941, regular terms of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky shall be held at the following places and times in each year:

At Louisville: Beginning on the second Monday in March and the first Monday in October;

At Paducah: Beginning on the third Monday in April and the second Monday in November;

At Owensboro: Beginning on the first Monday in May and the fourth Monday in November; and

At Bowling Green: Beginning on the third Monday in May and the second Monday in December.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) directing the Comptroller General to readjust the account between the United States and the State of Vermont, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] wishes to speak on this matter. He is not present, and I object to present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

COMPLETION OF BOCA DAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 15) to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam in the Little Truckee River in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to complete construction of the dam in the Little Truckee River, near Boca, Calif., which has been begun and substantially completed under a contract with the Washoe County Water Conservation District. The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures, from funds now available for the completion of the Boca Dam, as may be required therefor.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to deliver custody of

such dam to such district for operation and maintenance purposes in accordance with the contract between the United States and such district dated December 12, 1936, at the earliest practicable time.

SEC. 3. The amount which such district is required to pay the United States under articles 11 and 12 of such contract of December 12, 1936, shall not exceed $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PROPERTY LOST IN HURRICANE AT PARRIS ISLAND

The bill (H. R. 3097) to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel, and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees, for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PROPERTY LOST IN EARTHQUAKE AT MANAGUA

The bill (H. R. 2990) to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men, or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua March 31, 1931," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF ROLLAND H. DENNY

The bill (S. 993) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer without cost to the estate of Rolland H. Denny a triangular parcel of land containing one-half an acre situated at Seattle, Wash., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey, without cost, to the proper legal representatives of the estate of Rolland H. Denny, deceased, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a triangular parcel of land containing an area of one-half an acre, more or less, situated on Lake Washington, being part of the lands of the naval air station, Seattle, Wash., in accordance with a permit issued to Alice K. Denny by the Navy Department, dated September 27, 1940.

TRANSFER TO THE NAVY OF WARD'S BANK TRAINING WALL

The bill (S. 1109) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy certain land known as Ward's Bank Training Wall was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer to the Navy Department, for use in connection with naval activities, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the following property situated at the entrance to the St. Johns River, Fla.:

(a) All that parcel of land known as Ward's Bank Training Wall.

(b) The right-of-way adjacent to the South Jetty.

SEC. 2. That the transfers of property referred to in section 1 shall be made subject to such reservations as may be necessary for use in connection with river and harbor activities that may be made by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire, on behalf of the United States, through condemnation or otherwise, such right, title, or interest, if any there be, in and to such land not now owned by the United States, known as the lands at the entrance to the St. Johns River, Fla., described as Ward's Bank Training Wall and the South Jetty property.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY IN FIRE AT QUANTICO, VA.

The bill (H. R. 3160) to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps for loss of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OVERTIME RATES FOR NAVY AND COAST GUARD FIELD SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 342) establishing overtime rates for compensation for employees of the field service of the Navy Department and the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That compensation for employment in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek computed at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate is hereby authorized to be paid, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, to those per annum employees in the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard, whose overtime services are essential to and directly connected with the expeditious prosecution of the overtime work upon which the employees enumerated in section 5 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671, 76th Cong.), and section 1 of the act of October 21, 1940 (Public, No. 873, 76th Cong.), are engaged: *Provided*, That in determining the overtime compensation of the foregoing per annum employees the pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one three-hundred-and-sixtieth of their respective per annum salaries.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be effective during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, and shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless Congress shall otherwise provide.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing overtime rates for compensation of certain per annum employees in the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard."

INCREASE IN OFFICER AND ENLISTED STRENGTH OF THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3786) to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy is hereby increased to 232,000. The President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase this number to 300,000.

SEC. 2. The phrase "authorized enlisted strength," as applied to the personnel of the Navy, shall hereafter mean the total number of enlisted men of the Navy authorized by law, exclusive of the Hospital Corps.

SEC. 3. The total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be equal to 5½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the active list.

SEC. 4. Hereafter the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps shall be 20 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill is of considerable importance, and is also a matter of urgency. It provides for increasing the authorized officer and enlisted strength of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps approximately 75 percent. If Senators will consult the committee report, they will be fully informed as to the present strength of the Navy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate be in order. This is an important measure, and I should like to hear what the Senator from Massachusetts has to say about the bill. The Senate should know what is involved and there should be better order in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize an increase in the officer and enlisted strength of the Regular Navy and the Marine Corps by approximately 75 percent. It is necessary because of the expansion of the Navy, and particularly because of the law providing for a so-called two-ocean Navy. The increase in the personnel is to provide the number of additional officers and additional enlisted men that may be necessary to man the new naval craft as naval vessels are launched.

In the committee report definite and detailed information is given as to this necessary increase in the Navy. In brief, the bill provides for an increase from 191,000 enlisted men, which is the present strength of our Regular Navy, to 300,000 enlisted men in the year 1942, with a proportionate increase in officer strength. This authorization does not provide for the increase that will be necessary to man the two-ocean navy. It authorizes the increase that will be necessary during the next fiscal year.

The future requirements of officers and men on active duty for the two-ocean Navy, existing and under construction or

conversion, are approximately as follows for the fiscal years listed below:

Fiscal year	Line, including aviation personnel	Total line, staff, and warrant	Enlisted men
1941	14,700	21,000	232,000
1942	17,000	24,000	286,000
1943	21,000	28,000	408,000
1944	24,800	33,000	474,000
1945	25,500	34,000	504,000
1946	26,200	35,000	532,300
1947	26,300	35,500	532,500

Mr. President, it is gratifying to report that the Navy has had no difficulty whatever in obtaining volunteer enlistments. I think the applications have been from 5 to 10 times as many as the requirements of the Navy. The enlisted personnel is of an exceptionally high order. There has been no attempt to modify or reduce the physical or intellectual requirements. Practically every enlisted man now is at least a high-school graduate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Have any of the present enlistments in the Navy been made on a 1-year basis, or are they all on a 3-year basis?

Mr. WALSH. The enlistments in the Navy are of two kinds. Youths between 17 and 18 years of age can enlist with the permission of their parents, and be discharged when they reach 21 years of age. All other enlistments are for 6 years.

In my opinion, it is quite remarkable that the Navy has been able to receive so many enlistments, and all that it can foresee it needs, on the 6-year basis. The number enlisted on the basis of minority is considerably smaller. A year and a half or two years ago, at the time the regulation was made increasing the enlistment period from 4 years to 6 years, I myself was inclined to doubt the wisdom of it, but I am happy to say that it appears to have worked satisfactorily, and there has been no diminution or lessening of the number of the American youths who are seeking to enlist in the Navy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me ask the Senator another question. Are any of the present draftees who are inducted into the service for a year going into the Navy?

Mr. WALSH. There are no draftees whatever in the Navy. They go entirely into the Army.

Mr. BRIDGES. The voluntary enlistments which are taken on a 6-year basis are taking care of everything?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, indeed.

What I said about the regular enlisted men in the Navy also applies to the Marine Corps. The present law requires the strength of the Marine Corps to be 20 percent of the Navy. Therefore the bill provides for an increase in the Marine Corps of approximately 75 percent. The situation in regard to voluntary enlistments in the Marine Corps is in every way satisfactory. The enlistment period in the Marine Corps, however, is but 4 years, and not 6 years.

Mr. President, I do not know that there is anything else to say, except to note that the present authorized emergency strength of the Navy is 197,000 men. The Regular Navy, as of April 8, 1941, consisted of 195,793 regular enlisted men; Fleet Reserves, 7,929; retired list, 536; 4-year Reserves, 51; other classes of Reserves, 17,994; making a total of 222,303.

There were on active duty March 1, 1941, 11,300 regular officers—line, staff, and warrant; 1,201 retired officers; and 7,633 Reserve officers; or a grand total of 20,134.

It is to be noted that in this authorization there is no provision for increasing the number of admirals in time of peace. It remains the same, which is 70.

Other commissioned officers are increased on the percentage basis fixed by the present law in accordance with the number of enlisted men. In other words, the number of captains, commanders, lieutenant commanders, senior lieutenants, junior lieutenants, and ensigns varies as the enlisted personnel of the Navy increases or decreases.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I am pleased to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRNES. I am interested in the increase in the Marine Corps that would follow the increase in the enlisted personnel of the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. The strength of the Marine Corps is 20 percent of that of the Navy.

Mr. BYRNES. If we adhere to the 20-percent provision, which has been in existence for many years, it will mean that in 1947 we will have 135,000 enlisted men in the Marine Corps. Did the committee give consideration to the question of the necessity for increasing the Marine Corps to that extent? So long as the enlisted personnel of the Navy was at a comparatively low figure, 20 percent of that figure in the Marine Corps was essential; but I can see that we may reach such a situation that we will have a marine army as well as the Regular Army.

Mr. WALSH. The committee did not consider that matter, because the bill authorizes only the strength which is asked for and required this year. The table to which I have referred shows an approximation by the Navy of the increase in the authorizations that will be required from year to year. The bill would increase the authorized number of enlisted men in the Marine Corps from 27,497 to 46,400, which would be 20 percent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and would increase the number of officers from 1,512 to 2,552.

The Senator has raised a very important question. It is a matter which ought to be considered in future authorizations, because I can well see that a Marine Corps of the size proposed might be unnecessary. Of course, as the Senator knows, on certain types of vessels in the Navy, such as cruisers and battleships, there is a certain percentage of marines. More and more the marines are being used for the protection of property and for guard purposes at naval stations.

Incidentally let me say that at various times the Senator and I have discussed the question of civilian guards and marine guards. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having to do with naval affairs, the Senator knows that we have a very large and increasing number of civilian guards at our naval stations. I have not been particularly sympathetic toward that course. I have felt that any naval base ought to be guarded and protected by naval enlisted personnel and officers, in the same way that Army establishments are guarded by Army personnel. On the other hand, the contention is made that the men should be used for military purposes, and not to perform functions which civilians can perform.

Mr. BYRNES. Of course, in the final analysis Congress, through appropriations, can regulate the number of men in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. The bill affects only the maximum.

Mr. BYRNES. I was interested to know whether the question had been studied because it is very interesting. We have to provide a certain number of marines for the battleships and cruisers which will be commissioned as a part of the two-ocean Navy, but it seems to me it would not be necessary to adhere to the 20-percent ratio merely for that purpose.

When we reach the point of 135,000 enlisted men, if part of the increase is allotted to aviation, we shall then have the Air Corps of the Army, the Air Corps of the Navy, and the Marine Air Corps, which will assume considerable proportions at that time. That is true also of the ground troops of the marines. Without going into the question as carefully as I should like, it does not seem to me that as the enlisted personnel of the Navy goes up to 500,000 it will be necessary to adhere to the 20-percent ratio for the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. Only last year the Marine Corps sought to have the number of men allowed increased above the 20 percent now permitted by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair calls attention to the fact that under the 5-minute rule the time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 5-minute limitation be not applied in the consideration of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Only last year the Marine Corps sought to increase temporarily the number of enlisted men and officers beyond the 20-percent limitation. The law limits the number to 20 percent of the personnel of the Navy. The committee refused to grant the increase.

Mr. BYRNES. It is very natural that an officer in charge of any branch of the service should believe that the particular branch in his charge is the most important. He would not be a very capable

man if he did not believe that of his particular service. However, those of us who have to see the whole picture can weigh the desire of the Commandant of the Marine Corps in relation to the entire perspective. I cannot see that it would be wise to build up a separate army of marines. If the enlisted strength of the Navy is increased beyond 500,000, we must provide all the marines necessary for the ships and for such aviation service as is necessary, but we ought not to establish an independent army.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina, and I am sure the members of the committee appreciate it. I think it is very appropriate that a thorough study of the whole subject be made before we decide to continue the 20-percent ratio, especially as the Navy increases.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. Can the Senator say how many men were in the Marine Corps in the last war?

Mr. WALSH. I am unable to say.

Mr. GERRY. Does the Senator know whether or not the Marine Corps is to be used for the defense of the new bases? Has that question been gone into by the committee?

Mr. WALSH. We have not discussed that matter, and I have no knowledge about it. Of course, none of the new bases is yet occupied.

Mr. GERRY. I so understand; but I wondered whether the 20-percent ratio entered into that question?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The measure the Senator is now discussing is, in fact, emergency legislation. If I correctly understand the purpose of the bill, the proposed increase in personnel of the Navy is mandatory only for 1 year. In the future, if conditions should change and the emergency should subside, the Navy would not be prevented from reducing the personnel in accordance with whatever the situation might require.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, it does not mean that in 1947 we are to have 537,000 men in the Navy. The number will depend upon the conditions which may exist at that time.

Mr. WALSH. It also involves the assumption that we shall build the increasing Navy which we have authorized by law, and that the Congress will make the necessary appropriations from year to year.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I should like to make one further observation in line with the question asked by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] who is now leaving the Chamber. He asked about the enlistment of men in the Navy. I think it is only fair to observe that the testimony of one of the admirals who appeared before the committee showed that not only are the desired number of men for the Navy being obtained by voluntary enlistment, but for physical reasons four out of every five are being rejected. In other words, five times as many men are attempting to enlist in the Navy as are being accepted. The testimony further shows that no trouble is anticipated in obtaining the required number of enlistments for the great program looking to 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I assume that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] recognizes that the Senate cannot foresee what conditions may arise requiring the expansion of the Marine Corps. I certainly should not wish to have any implication, so far as the Committee on Naval Affairs is concerned, that we are committing ourselves for or against such expansion. I assume the record is clear that the Committee on Appropriations will have the final voice as to whatever provision is made for the Marine Corps. I know that the Senator from South Carolina is cognizant of the requirements with respect to appropriations. However, under the changing conditions of modern warfare, and under the entirely unforeseeable conditions which may prevail in this hemisphere, the Marine Corps is one of the chief instrumentalities of defense. It has been of constant and expanding use.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate to say that, though I have a very high estimate and opinion of the officer personnel of the Navy—and I think that opinion is shared by the members of my committee—the enlisted personnel is also of a very high order. They are exceptional types of American manhood. They are patriotic to the core, deeply interested in their work, and actuated by a desire for constant and steady self-improvement. The record of their taking of correspondence courses and private instruction under the officers, which is voluntarily done, is remarkable. The contributions from their pay which they send home to their families are most gratifying; and I am pleased to say that our country is most fortunate in the fine personnel of the Navy and of the Marine Corps, particularly the enlisted men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the interest in the strength of our Navy, I suggest that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs on increasing the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes, which is very informative, be included in the RECORD of today's proceedings.

There being no objection, the report (No. 180) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3786) to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the authorized officer and enlisted strength of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps approximately 75 percent. The bill—

(a) Increases the permanent peacetime enlisted strength of the Regular Navy from 131,485 (plus 6,000 apprentice seamen) to 232,000 men, and the emergency strength from 191,000 (plus 6,000 apprentice seamen) to 300,000 men;

(b) Increases the permanent peacetime enlisted strength of the Regular Marine Corps from 27,497 to 46,400 men, and the emergency strength from 39,400 to 60,000 men;

(c) Increases the authorized number of commissioned officers in the line of the Navy from 7,562 to 12,760;

(d) Increases the authorized number of commissioned officers in the Marine Corps from 1,512 to 2,552;

(e) Redefines the phrase "authorized enlisted strength" to conform to the present personnel situation in the Naval Establishment;

(f) Maintains the commissioned line officer strength of the Navy at the same ratio, 5½ percent of the total authorized enlisted strength as now provided by law; and

(g) Reestablishes the authorized enlisted strength of the Marine Corps at 20 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

As the bill does not repeal existing laws it also—

(a) Increases the authorized strength of the Supply Corps, the Medical Corps, the Civil Engineer Corps, the Chaplain Corps, and the Dental Corps.

(b) Increases the number of officers allowed in each grade. It does not increase the number of rear admirals in the line of the Navy, and the number of general officers in the Marine Corps in time of peace, as the maximum number of officers in these grades is fixed by the act of June 23, 1938, at 70 and 14, respectively, except during war.

The requirements of officers and men on active duty for the two-ocean Navy, existing and under construction or conversion, are approximately as follows for the fiscal years listed below:

Fiscal year	Line, including aviation personnel	Total line, staff and warrant	Enlisted men
1941	14,700	21,000	232,000
1942	17,000	24,000	286,000
1943	21,000	28,000	408,000
1944	24,800	33,000	474,000
1945	25,500	34,000	504,000
1946	26,200	35,000	532,500
1947	26,300	35,500	532,500

On March 1, 1941, there were on active duty 11,300 Regular officers—line, staff, and warrant—1,201 retired officers and 7,633 Reserve officers, or a grand total of 20,134. Of this total, approximately 900 are ensigns of the Naval Reserve who had graduated from Reserve midshipmen's schools.

The line of the Regular Navy is being gradually expanded by the graduation of midshipmen from the Naval Academy, the appointment of limited numbers of Aviation Reserve officers and graduates of Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps units who are on active duty. Reserve requirements for the line will be filled by continued employment of graduates of Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps units and graduates of the Reserve midshipmen's schools, and the continued call to active duty of retired and Reserve officers.

As of April 8, 1941, the following enlisted personnel of the Navy were on active duty:

Regular Navy	195,793
Fleet Reserve	7,929
Retired list	536
4-year Reserve	51
Other classes of Reserves	17,994
Total	222,303

The present authorized emergency strength of the Navy is 191,000 men. This figure, however, is exclusive of the 6,000 apprentice seamen, 7,933 Hospital Corps men, and 67 prisoners undergoing discharge, and therefore the total number of enlisted men in the Regular service permissible under existing law during an emergency is 205,000.

On September 8, 1939, the President declared the existence of a national emergency. By Executive order he then directed that the enlisted strength of the Navy be increased as rapidly as possible, by voluntary enlistments, to 145,000 men. Subsequent modifications of this Executive order have increased this figure to the 205,000 maximum allowed by law. The actual enlisted strength of the active list as of March 29, 1941, was 194,229, and at the present rate of recruiting it is estimated that the legal emergency strength will be reached early in May. If the authorized strength is not increased by that time, it will be necessary to curtail the procurement rate to approximately 1,400 men per month, which are the normal replacements which will be required to maintain a strength of 205,000 in the Regular Navy.

The situation in the Navy which requires the additional personnel contemplated by this bill is well known. The needs of the Marine Corps, while just as real, may not be so apparent. The committee therefore takes this opportunity to advise the Senate that, in general, two self-sustaining streamlined Marine divisions are in the making. The ground troops of each would consist of about 14,000 men, and each would have, in addition, amphibian-tractor battalions, balloon-barrage squadrons, and various other units. Additional defense battalions are needed, and aviation alone will require nearly 7,000 more men by June 30, 1942. The remaining details would be used at our newly acquired bases, for other foreign duty, for ships' detachments, and for miscellaneous naval and Marine Corps activities in the United States.

The following figures represent the estimated personnel requirements of the Marine Corps for the fiscal years 1941 to 1947, inclusive. These figures have not been approved by the Navy Department.

	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947
Officers	3,329	5,529	7,729	9,260	9,301	9,361	9,379
Enlisted	50,566	80,566	110,566	133,287	134,209	135,555	135,854

The figures given above include Regulars, Reserves, and retired personnel on active duty.

Officers and men (Regular, Reserve, retired) on active duty on March 25, 1941, were as follows:

	Commissioned officers	Chief warrant and warrant	Aviation cadets	Enlisted men	Total
Regulars	1,503	225	.....	38,551	40,279
Reserves	1,087	12	158	8,572	9,829
Retired	125	8	.....	2	135
Total	2,715	245	158	47,125	50,243

Recruiting of enlisted men in the regular Marine Corps was stopped on December 1, 1940, on which date the corps had reached the limit allowed at the present time. Since February 10, 1941, 2,146 men have enlisted in the Marine Corps Reserve.

The phrase "authorized enlisted strength" as applied to personnel of the Navy is defined by law (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 152) as the total number of enlisted men allowed by law, exclusive of—

(a) The Hospital Corps.
(b) Apprentice seamen.
(c) Men sentenced by court martial to discharge.
(d) Men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia.
(e) Men furloughed without pay.
(f) Enlisted men of the Flying Corps.
(g) Men under instruction in trade schools.

The following is the situation with respect to the seven excepted categories:

(a) The Hospital Corps of the Navy was established by the act of August 29, 1916, and its strength fixed at 3½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. Under existing law the maximum number of enlisted men allowed in the Hospital Corps is 7,933.

(b) The exclusion of apprentice seamen appears to be historical rather than logical; 6,000 apprentice seamen were permanently authorized by the act of August 29, 1916, and have since, in both personnel and appropriation acts, been considered as an independent item.

(c) The number of men sentenced by court martial to discharge is negligible. At present the average number is 67. This category might well, therefore, be eliminated as an exception.

(d) There are no men detailed to the Naval Militia.

(e) The number of men furloughed without pay is infinitesimal in comparison with the total strength.

(f) There is no Flying Corps.

(g) Although men in trade schools were by law excepted in computing the authorized enlisted strength, the Attorney General, in an opinion rendered June 9, 1931, held that the provision limiting the number to 14,000 was temporary legislation only. Actually this number is in excess of normal requirements, but the committee believe the restriction should be removed. In view of the Attorney General's opinion, the Navy Department has not regarded these men as excepted, and they have been counted in with other men in computations of actual strength.

While the "authorized enlisted strength" as defined by existing law is important in itself, it is also important as forming the basis for other computations. In this connection it should be noted that the figure of 131,485 men is not used for these computations, but, instead, the figure 137,485, the difference being occasioned by those laws which define the basis as the "total authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy, exclusive of the Hospital Corps, prisoners undergoing sentence of discharge, enlisted men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia, and the Flying Corps." Thus, for these computations, 4 categories of men are excepted instead of 7, but the only category which changes the figure is that of apprentice seamen, which, as previously explained, represents 6,000 men.

Because of the wording of these laws, the figure 137,485 has frequently been loosely referred to as the "total authorized enlisted strength."

The authorized emergency strength as previously stated is 191,000 men. This figure, however, is exclusive of the 6,000 apprentice seamen, 7,933 Hospital Corps men, and 67 prisoners undergoing discharge, and therefore the total number of men permissible under existing law during an emergency is 205,000.

From the foregoing it will be seen that simplification of the various laws on the subject is highly desirable and the committee concur in the recommendation of the Navy Department that the provisions of this bill designed to do so be enacted. This would be accomplished by redefining "authorized enlisted strength" to eliminate all but one excepted category, and by using the resultant figure as the basis for all computations.

Under existing law, as well as by the terms of the bill, the authorized commissioned strength of the line of the Regular Navy is 5½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength. Officers are distributed in the various grades in accordance with a percentage allowance. While the 5½ percent is used to determine the authorized strength, the actual strength is not necessarily the same figure. The distribution of officers in each grade is based on the actual strength and not the authorized strength. The following table is illustrative of the situation:

Line officers of the Navy

Grade	Percentage allowed	Number authorized	Actual number	Additional numbers authorized by law	Fitted officers authorized by law	Authorized by this bill
Rear admiral	1	[1] 70	82	15	0	[1] 70
Captain	4	302	357	58	25	510
Commander	8	605	768	114	111	1,021
Lieutenant commander	15	1,134	1,486	98	372	1,914
Lieutenant	30	2,269	1,928	62	0	3,828
Lieutenant (junior grade)	42	3,182	(1,203	19	0	[5] 5,417
Ensign			(1,233	4	0	
Total	100	[3] 7,562	7,058	370	508	[4] 12,760

[1] Maximum number, except during war, fixed by the act of June 23, 1938.
[2] 58 officers carried in these grades instead of rear admiral.
[3] 5½ percent of 137,485.
[4] 5½ percent of 232,000.

Under existing law and under the terms of the bill, the authorized enlisted strength of the Marine Corps is 20 percent of the so-called total authorized enlisted strength of the Navy. With 232,000 and 300,000 made the peacetime and emergency authorized enlisted strengths for the Navy, the Marine Corps strengths would then be 46,400 and 60,000, respectively.

The act of June 23, 1938, in amending the act of May 29, 1934, provides in part:

"SEC. 15. (b) * * * hereafter commissioned officers of the Marine Corps shall be authorized in number in the same proportion to authorized enlisted strength and shall be distributed in grades, promoted, retired, and discharged in like manner and with the same relative conditions in all respects as provided for commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, by existing law, or by laws hereafter enacted, except as may be necessary to adapt the said provisions to the Marine Corps * * *."

The following table is illustrative of how this law is applied and what the situation will be upon enactment of this bill:

Marine Corps officers

Grade	Percentage allowed in grade	Number authorized in grade	Number authorized in grade by this bill
General officers	1	[1] 14	[1] 14
Colonel	4	60	102
Lieutenant colonel	8	121	204
Major	15	227	383
Captain	30	454	766
First and second lieutenants	42	636	1,083
Total	100	[2] 1,512	[3] 2,552

[1] Maximum number, except during war, fixed by the act of June 23, 1938.
[2] 5.5 percent of 20 percent of 137,485.
[3] 5.5 percent of 20 percent of 232,000.

Other effects of the authorized increase provided by this bill will, by law, be to increase the authorized number of officers in the various staff corps. These authorized strengths, which are functions of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy, are set forth in United States Code, title 34, section 3, and are as follows:

Supply Corps: Twelve percent of the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy.

Civil Engineer Corps: Two percent of the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy.

Medical Corps: Sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total authorized number of officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps, including midshipmen, Hospital Corps, prisoners, and men in the Naval Militia and the Flying Corps.

Dental Corps: One dental officer for each thousand of the total authorized number of officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Chaplains: One chaplain to each 1,250 of the total personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps as fixed by law, including midshipmen, apprentice seamen, and naval prisoners.

The committee point out that the personnel increases authorized by the present bill are not adequate to cover anticipated needs of the Navy when it has reached the peak of its expansion, but are believed to be adequate to cover the Navy's needs for 1942 unless there is a decided change in the international situation.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 3, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith the draft of a proposed bill to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Navy from 131,485 men, as now provided by law (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 151), to 232,000 men; and to increase the emergency strength from 191,000 to 300,000. It would also maintain the commissioned strength of the Navy at the same ratio, 5½ of the total authorized strength, as now provided by law (U. S. C., title 34, Supp. V, sec. 2); redefine "authorized enlisted strength" to conform to the present personnel situation in the Naval Establishment; and reestablish the authorized enlisted strength of the Marine Corps.

The authorized emergency enlisted strength as previously stated is 191,000. This number is exclusive of 6,000 apprentice seamen, 7,933 Hospital Corps men and 67 prisoners undergoing discharge, making the total number of men permissible under existing law 205,000. At the present rate of recruiting, it is estimated that the legal emergency strength will be reached on or about April 18, 1941. If the authorized strength is not increased by that time, it will be necessary to curtail the procurement rate to approximately 1,400 men per month, the normal replacements which will be required to maintain a strength of 205,000 in the Regular Navy.

The enlisted personnel requirements for the current fiscal year will require a minimum of 232,000 men to man the ships of the operating forces to 100 percent of their complements. Funds are included in the supplemental estimates, 1941, title VI, now pending in the Congress, for 232,000 enlisted men for the fiscal year 1941. The requirements for the fiscal year 1942, as can now be foreseen, will be for 286,000 men, and it is highly probable that during the course of the year additional operating requirements will increase this number.

Existing law defines authorized enlisted strength as "the total number of enlisted men of the Navy authorized by law, exclusive of the Hospital Corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court martial to discharge, those detailed for duty with naval militia, those furloughed without pay, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, and those under instruction in trade schools," and limits the number in such trade schools to 14,000.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would reduce the above exceptions to the Hospital Corps only and greatly simplify the computations necessary. To summarize the situation with respect to existing exceptions:

(a) The exclusion of apprentice seamen appears to be historical rather than logical. Six thousand apprentice seamen were permanently authorized by the act of August 29, 1916, (39 Stat. 575) and have since been separately considered, as independent items, in both personnel and appropriation acts. As the number of apprentice seamen is determined by recruiting requirements, and is a variable quantity based upon the appropriated strength of the Navy from year to year, there seems to be no good reason for not considering them as a part of the authorized enlisted strength.

(b) The number of men sentenced by court martial to discharge is negligible.

(c) There are no enlisted men detailed for duty with naval militia.

(d) The number of men furloughed without pay is infinitesimal in comparison with the total strength.

(e) There is no flying corps.

(f) Existing law, as quoted above, allows as many as 14,000 men in trade schools, and men so detailed are in addition to the authorized strength. While the number is in excess of normal service requirements, it is believed that the restriction should be removed, in which event these men would be included in the authorized strength.

The language of section 2 will have the further simplifying effect of doing away with the distinction between "authorized enlisted strength" (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 152) which excludes seven categories of men and "total authorized enlisted strength" (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 2) which excludes four categories. This distinction serves no useful purpose.

Sections 3 and 4 of the proposed bill constitute a restatement of existing law to accord with the new definition of authorized enlisted strength in section 2, the authorized commissioned strength of the Navy and the authorized enlisted strength of the Marine Corps being based upon the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

The Navy Department recommends the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FORRESTAL, *Acting.*

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to report from the Committee on the Judiciary House Joint Resolution 86, which is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 56. I also ask that the House joint resolution be taken up for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the request that the joint resolution be immediately considered? I could not understand the Senator's request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Delaware desires unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 86 instead of Senate Joint Resolution 56. The joint resolutions are identical.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 86) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 56, No. 190 on the calendar, be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 56 will be indefinitely postponed.

That completes the calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at my request during the call of the calendar, House bill 3252, Calendar No. 178, was temporarily passed over until the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] could return to the Chamber. The Senator from Maryland is now present.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of House bill 3252, which was passed over a few moments ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McNARY. I ask to have the title of the bill stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 11, after the word "amended",

to insert "or section 4 of Public Law No. 5, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved February 6, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to strike out: "(2) upon its determination that such action is in the best interests of the national commerce and defense because of changes in conditions occurring after the execution of its contracts heretofore or hereafter entered into for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, reconditioning, repair, outfitting, or equipping of vessels, the Commission is hereby authorized to modify such contracts in conformity with provisions hereof relating to negotiated contracts, and to adjust the payments to be made thereunder, but the aggregate amount payable to the contractor under any contract modified pursuant hereto shall not exceed the amount which would have been payable if the contract as modified had been entered into under the authority of this section; (3)", and to insert, at the end of the words stricken out, the numeral "(2)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, before the words "per centum", to strike out "7" and insert "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 7, after the word "negotiated", to strike out "or modified."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 9, after the word "negotiated", to strike out "or modified."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 15, after the word "into", to strike out "or modified."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 24, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The provisions of sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 5, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved February 6, 1941, shall apply to all activities and functions which the Maritime Commission may be authorized to perform pursuant to an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, or any appropriations to carry out such act, but nothing herein shall be construed to affect the appropriation made by Public Law No. 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TOBEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to announce to the Members of the Senate that upon the conclusion of today's business I shall move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next; and, so far as I now know, I shall move on Friday that the Senate adjourn until Monday, or possibly Tuesday. The appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury Departments having gone over, and the conclusion of bills on the calendar having been completed, there is nothing else for the Senate to do this week. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has introduced today a joint resolution carrying out the recommendations of the President's message of last Thursday, authorizing the President to purchase certain ships that are now in the harbors of the United States. That joint resolution, of course, has gone to the Committee on Commerce, and I am hopeful that it may be possible for the committee to report it so that it may be considered next week. Of course, I cannot prophesy that that will be done, but I hope it may be done. Other than that, I see nothing in the way of important legislation to occupy the attention of the Senate during the remainder of this week; so Senators may govern themselves accordingly as they wish.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The legislation for the purpose of implementing the President's message regarding the St. Lawrence seaway has not put in an appearance. I wonder if the Senator has any information as to what is contemplated in that respect.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I have no such information. As the Senator knows, the message of the President was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has not been taken up by the committee, and I am not able to give the Senator any information as to when it will be considered.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF AMERICAN VESSELS FOR CONVOYS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on March 31 I took the floor of this body to address the Senate on the imminent danger of the United States being drawn into the war as a participant, and more specifically upon the peculiar policy which in my opinion, if embarked upon, would be certain to bring us into the war as a participant—namely, the use of our naval ships as convoys for goods to belligerents. At the conclusion of my remarks I introduced a joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles to belligerent countries.

On April 2, 2 days later, I again addressed the Senate on the same subject; and a debate ensued between myself, the majority leader, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and others.

Feeling very deeply on this subject, and believing as I do that the vast majority of citizens of this country are strongly opposed to this Nation's participation in the war, I have also taken the matter to the public by means of the radio, and in response have received thousands of letters from all parts of the country which but confirm this opinion of mine.

Mr. President, the time has come to call a spade a spade. The time has come to stop the plan of convoys in its tracks. If we withhold our protests until after convoys have been used and vessels with American seamen have been sunk, whether by mines or by torpedoes, it will be too late. American blood will have been spilled and we shall be in the war. Make no mistake about that. The President himself said, only a few weeks ago, that "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

Winston Churchill, in his book published by Charles Scribner's Sons, written after the last World War, said:

> Nothing will bring American sympathy along with us so much as American blood shed in the field.

When testifying recently before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary Knox was asked whether it would be advisable to convoy ships across the Atlantic and he answered:

> No, no. In my judgment, that would be an act of war.

Mr. President, it is undisputed that convoying ships with the American flag and American seamen on board means shooting and that shooting means war for the American people.

The administration's spokesmen in the Senate and House during the debate on the lend-lease bill urged its passage on the assurance to the people that it was the best means of keeping us out of the war, and yet, today, now that they have had their way on the lend-lease bill, including the $7,000,000,000 appropriation of the people's money, some of the very same gentlemen are beating the war drums in favor of convoys; this in the face of the President's admission that convoys mean war for this country.

Again I say, the time has come to stop this plan in its tracks. I therefore introduced in the Senate a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) to prohibit convoys, except in times when this country is actually at war.

According to the Gallup poll, 83 percent of our people are opposed to our getting into the war. The anticonvoy resolution now before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations provides a means for the people's representatives in the Senate and House to translate their public statements against war into specific legislation to keep us out of the war. This anticonvoy resolution presents the issue directly and without equivocation. It will give the people the opportunity to see whether the administration and the Members of the Senate and House mean business when they say that they are opposed to sending American sons to die on foreign soil.

The hour is at hand; delay may be fatal. Let it be remembered that war cannot be repealed, that the bankruptcy following war cannot be repealed, and that the dead cannot return to their homes.

Mr. President, there is a tragedy being played upon the American stage.

Last fall the American people were given the solemn assurance in the Republican and Democratic platforms that they would not be plunged into the war. Two days before the election the President appealed to the voters for support and said in a Nation-wide broadcast: "The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war." The millions of Americans had their hopes built up in their belief in that promise.

and to let them down now by sending convoys, which would result in immediate participation in the great struggle of warfare, would be nothing short of criminal deception.

Then, when the President was pressing for passage of his lend-lease-give bill, his Secretary of the Navy repeated the solemn assurance to the people that he was opposed to war, and therefore was opposed to American convoys, and the President indicated his opposition to convoys with his statement that "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

The people were asked to support the lend-lease bill on the assurance that it was the best possible means of keeping us out of the war. They believed the President and took assurance in the public testimony of the Secretary of the Navy.

With these assurances the lend-lease bill was passed and $7,000,000,000 of the people's money appropriated. Then suddenly the veil was lifted and an abrupt change in the attitude of the administration took place.

The New York Herald Tribune, the Chicago Tribune, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Chicago Daily News, Secretary Knox's own paper, all reported that there is a scheme on to launch into a program of convoys.

I introduced my anticonvoy resolution on March 31. The New York Herald Tribune of the next day carried a front-page feature report under the heading Knox Urges United States Escorts. The article states:

> Secretary Knox has opposed for some time any transfer of American naval vessels to the British beyond the 50 destroyers already transferred, but it has not been explained until recently that his objection was pitched upon a desire to see American ships, under the American flag and with American crews, do the convoying rather than upon any hesitation to put the vessels at the disposal of the British.

Secretary Knox was interviewed by the press that night and asked if the report was true that he had changed his mind on convoys, and he replied:

> I have no comment.

The Christian Science Monitor of April 2 reported that the President has revealed that the prospective use of convoys is now receiving official study, and last week the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee started beating the drums for convoys on the floor of the House.

Some time ago William Allen White resigned as chairman of the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies and in doing so issued the following statement:

> I tried to get out after the election because I felt the warmongering activities made this a full-time job for a younger man. In two of our chapters, New York and Washington, we have a bunch of warmongers, and under our organization we have no way to oust them, and I just can't remain at the head of an organization which is being used by those chapters to ghost-dance for war.

His successor, Mr. Gibson, on the radio last week ghost-danced for war with an unequivocal demand for immediate use of American convoys with American seamen.

That is why, Mr. President, I say that a great tragedy is being enacted on the American scene. The people believed the administration's preelection and prelend-lease pledges to keep the people out of the war, and yet, now that it has had its way in the election and in the lend-lease bill, the true scheme is unveiled before the people's eyes. The weather vane has flopped 180 degrees, and the war clouds are on the way.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is discussing a very important question. Will he tell the Senate just where he thinks the administration is going to use convoys, how far they are going with them, and when they are going?

Mr. TOBEY. I will answer the Senator from Illinois by telling him that if he will read the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire it will tell him how I want convoys used and what limitations should be placed on the use of convoys. It is a declamando statement, and if it should be passed by the Congress it would prevent convoys, the one thing President Roosevelt says means war.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has not answered my question at all. I do not know what is in his resolution, and it really makes little or no difference.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me suggest to the Senator that he read it; it will do him good.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be so, but what I am trying to find out from the Senator is where and under what terms convoys, which he dreads, might be used?

Mr. TOBEY. I will answer that; I will tell the Senator what is going to take place. It will be what I am about to bring out chronologically in my remarks in a few moments—creeping and creeping, edging and edging further and further along, all the traffic will bear, all the American people will bear, until we are forced to war. That is what is going to take place.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has not answered my question as yet. The Senator is trying to convey to the Senate and the country the idea that he is against convoys. There are many Senators against convoys. I should like to know what information the Senator has when he is discussing the question of convoys and where these American ships are going under the administration's policy at the present time.

Mr. TOBEY. I will read my resolution to the Senator for his edification.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator answer the question.

Mr. TOBEY. The resolution itself will answer it. It represents my theory, my thesis, and there is a great yearning in my heart to have it enacted into law by the Congress of the United States in order to keep us out of war. The resolution reads:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That, except in a time when the United States is engaged in war—

Please mark that—

> hereafter no part of the land or naval forces of the United States, and no vessel documented, or aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States, shall be used, directly or indirectly, beyond the limits of the territorial waters of the United States and its Territories and possessions, to transport or deliver, or in connection with the transportation or delivery of, or for convoy purposes in connection with the transportation or delivery of, any articles or materials to or for the use of any foreign country with respect to which the President has issued a proclamation under section 1 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, or which is engaged in actual hostilities with one or more foreign countries even though a state of war has not been declared or recognized in any such proclamation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUCAS. Obviously the resolution does not answer my question. Let me make this further inquiry, Does the Senator believe that the Neutrality Act is in force at the present time?

Mr. TOBEY. I like to believe that.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that certain combat zones have been laid down by the President of the United States and that American vessels are prohibited from going into those combat zones?

Mr. TOBEY. I have heard that that is so. I also know that a little while ago we passed a bill called the lend-lease bill which said, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law"—a wide-open, blanket authority to the governmental authorities to do just as they blankety-blank please with the American people and their resources. That is very much in my mind, sir.

Mr. LUCAS. In the discussion of the lend-lease bill, the Senator heard the best constitutional lawyers on the Senate floor, both on the Republican side and on the Democratic side, both majority and minority, advised the Senate and the country that the provision to which the Senator is now referring did not in anywise repeal the present Neutrality Act. The present Neutrality Act, as the Senator knows, provides for combat zones, and those combat zones have been laid down by the President of the United States. The Neutrality Act also provides that American vessels shall not enter belligerent ports. If that is the law, I cannot understand why the Senator is so disturbed about convoys.

Mr. TOBEY. Secretary Knox said he would favor convoys if the President favored them. In other words, he would "hear his master's voice" and act accordingly. Now if the Senator will let me continue with the statement of my views, when I get through he will be much more enlightened.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall never be enlightened until the Senator advises me from some concrete authority, from someone in the administration with real responsibility, as to what the administration expects to do with respect to the Neutrality Act, which as I understand it, is a complete barrier to convoys in combat zones or belligerent ports.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire will tell the Senator from Illinois that he sent a telegram of considerable length to the Honorable Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, and so far has not been enlightened with any answer. He has questioned the Secretary on this subject, but echo answers not. Now I will proceed, if the Senator please.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not surprised that the Senator does not get any answer from the Secretary of the Navy. I contact departments every day asking questions, and it is difficult to get answers from them. I would not blame the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of State or the President of the United States for not divulging certain confidential information that they may have, that the Senate cannot and should not have.

Just as the Senator from New Hampshire apparently has better information on the convoy question than the people down at the other end of the Avenue, I distinctly remember that the late Senator Borah said he had better information than the administration had as to what was going to happen in Europe with respect to war; but it turned out that President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull had better information than a number of us in the Senate had at that time. At that moment I thought Senator Borah was correct.

I say with sincerity to the Senator from New Hampshire that in this crisis he is taking, in my humble opinion, the wrong attitude upon the question of convoys. It is not before us, and the Senator is unnecessarily firing the imagination of the American people.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me ask the Senator a question, now.

Does the Senator from Illinois agree that his Chief Executive said that convoys mean shooting and that shooting means war? I ask the Senator the question. Will he answer it?

Mr. LUCAS. All right.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask the question. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment, and I shall answer.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator agree with the President?

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer by asking the Senator whether or not he has any personal and direct information that the President of the United States has ever repudiated that statement?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this is becoming opera bouffe. I will proceed. That is why I say that a grim tragedy is being enacted on the American scene.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield further.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator will retain his orchestra seat until I finish, then I will answer his question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Let us pray to the Divine Power lest we forget the experience of 1917, a war that we fought to end wars; a war that we fought "to make the world safe for democracy," but which ended in sowing the seeds of the present war after clutching the people in a world-wide depression.

Let us not forget the advice of Winston Churchill who said:

> America's entrance into the war was disastrous, not only for your country but for the Allies as well; because had you stayed home and minded your own business, we would have made peace with the Central Powers in the spring of 1917, then there would have been no collapse in Russia, followed by communism; no breakdown in Italy, followed by fascism; and nazi-ism would not, at present, be enthroned in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war and minded her own business, none of these "isms" would today be sweeping the continent of Europe and breaking down her parliamentary government.

Let us hold in our minds the futility of our costly venture of 1917, a venture to end wars, a venture to "save the world for democracy," a venture of disillusionment and regret, and then consider the issue of the hour.

Shall we convoy and, as the President said, thereby get into the war? Or shall we enact into law my anticonvoy resolution, which will prohibit, without qualification, the use of American convoys with American seamen on board?

The anticonvoy resolution rests in the Senate committee awaiting action. The decision is in our hands. We should act now.

Time is of the essence in this matter. What is being done? The press have suggested that the matter is being smothered in committee. I cannot believe this suggestion in view of the very sincere and definite assurance given to me by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in our colloquy on April 2. When on that day I asked him if he would not give me assurance that he, as chairman, would have the committee consider the resolution in the near future, he replied:

> This resolution * * * will undoubtedly have the careful consideration of the committee at a reasonably early time. I am not able to say that it can be taken up tomorrow, or one day this week, but certainly at a very early date. The committee will be back in regular session on Wednesday, and I can assure the Senator that the resolution will be given careful consideration, and, of course, the action taken by the committee will be controlling upon the disposition of the resolution. But there will be no disposition on the part of the chairman of the committee not to give a full, and fair, and frank hearing upon the resolution.

I further asked the chairman of the committee if he did not believe, in view of the seriousness of the situation that the matter should be debated frankly upon the floor, and that Senators should go on record either for or against this far-reaching measure. He replied:

> I say to the Senator again that I shall be pleased to bring the resolution before the committee and give it the consideration to which it is entitled; and I recognize the importance of the resolution.

Then I specifically asked the chairman of the committee if he would no doubt feel that the matter was so important that it should be debated on the floor of the Senate regardless of what the attitude of the Foreign Relations Committee might be, so that the American people might know the attitude of their representatives in this body in such a matter, and we might have an opportunity to go on record on it. He replied:

> I have no objection to debating it before the Senate and before the country, and I certainly think that all matters of importance—and I regard this as a matter of importance—should be subject to debate before the Senate.

It is a particular satisfaction to me to know the attitude of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on this matter of convoys, and they will bear repetition as we consider the question anew today.

On this floor he said a few weeks ago, when considering the lend-lease bill:

> I had from the beginning said I was opposed to convoying, and I thought that the President was well understood as having made that declaration even since the introduction of this bill. It has been published everywhere, and I did not think there could be any doubt about it.

He further said:

> As plainly as I can say it, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war.

Still further, he said:

> I said awhile ago, Mr. President—if this word "transfer" has any bearing upon the matter—that we will not take the extreme risk of convoying, or of attempting to deliver on the other side of the globe any of the arms or implements of war which we wish to furnish. We will not take the extreme risk of involving our people in war unless, of course, we should be attacked. If we should be attacked, we would do what all of us would, of course, favor. That is a wholly different question.

Further, he said:

> We are not going to convoy. We are not going to deliver arms and munitions on the other side of the ocean in areas of danger.

He further said:

> Mr. President, I do not subscribe now, and I hope I never shall, to the doctrine that we are headed into an inevitable war.

I commend him for that.

I am glad to have that assurance, but in a situation such as that which confronts the Nation and the world today, I again say that time is of the essence, and because of rapidly changing events abroad and the zeal that is manifested in high official circles in this Nation to initiate the policy of convoys, if the action of ths body is to be of any potency, it must take action now or in the near future.

Many times we have heard the statement made that when one's premises are wrong it inevitably follows that the conclusions are false. This was forceably brought to my attention in the last 2 days when I read in the morning paper a statement by the Honorable SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commit-

tee of the House of Representatives, and I wrote to Mr. BLOOM as follows:

APRIL 14, 1941.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, House Committee
on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: I was considerably surprised to read in this morning's papers your statement against submission of the convoy question to the Congress, and your declaration that this question of convoys is strictly a matter for the President's determination.

In your statement you say: "Only the President can determine how and where convoys are needed, if they are needed. That isn't in our department. * * *"

Isn't in our department? I recognize that the Congress, which is supposed to be a body representative of the people, has reduced itself to a sorrowful position by virtue of its "yes man" attitude, and I equally recognize that the Congress has turned over many of its powers to the President; but I cannot for a moment concede that we have reduced our status to that of a department, subservient to the whim and rule of the President. God forbid that the time will ever come when the people entirely lose the benefit of a Congress which has the determination in a crisis to exercise its constitutional prerogatives.

Your statement further says, with regard to convoys: "I couldn't imagine what such a resolution would say."

To relieve your imagination, I herewith enclose a copy of my anticonvoy resolution, which prohibits in the plainest of English language the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft from transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries.

Your statement further says: "We (the Congress) couldn't say we authorized convoys or we forbade them. The President has that power." In this position you are in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The argument is used that because the President, under the Constitution is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it follows that he can send convoys of the United States Navy anywhere in the world that he chooses, regardless of any prohibition by the Congress.

This argument overlooks the fact that section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution gives to the Congress the power to make rules for the regulation of the land and naval forces. Therefore, while the Constitution makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it further specifically provides that the Congress shall make rules to regulate the Army and Navy.

It seems clear from this that if the Congress makes a rule prohibiting the Navy from being used to convoy goods destined for belligerents, that this would be a rule within the meaning of the Constitution, and comes under the powers granted to the Congress by the Constitution.

Further, the same article and section of the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the power to declare war.

The President himself has said that "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." Can it logically be held, for example, that the President, because he is Commander in Chief of the Army, could send a large part of the Army over to German soil under orders to fight, without a declaration of war by the Congress? I have never heard that contended by even the most ardent interventionists.

It is equally true that the President cannot send United States warships to convoy goods for belligerent countries, if the Congress by law specifically prohibits such action.

In conclusion, I raise this question: Is it fair and honest to the American people for us to allow action to be taken now which will immediately launch the millions of American citizens in a long struggle of active warfare, in the face of the fact that the President raised their hopes in his assurances to them over the radio, 2 days before he was reelected, that the first foreign policy of our Government would be to keep this country out of war; in the face of the fact that both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms gave the same assurances to the American people; and in the face of the fact that the Members of the House and Senate, only a few months ago, were elected to office on their solemn pledge that they would do all in their power to keep this country from being involved in the war?

This question I put to you in all earnestness and sincerity, and in view of your responsible position as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I would appreciate from you a full answer.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

Mr. President, I said a few moments ago, and I repeat, time is of the essence in this matter. The greatest propaganda machine that has ever been built up in this country in a generation—namely, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, formerly known as the William Allen White Committee—is for convoys, hook, line, and sinker; and I am advised that under its leadership there is about to be undertaken a campaign to sell convoys to the American people through the medium of the radio, paid advertisements, and public addresses throughout the Nation. To apply the President's own words, that convoys mean shooting and shooting means war, in this offensive of theirs, which they are undertaking to bring about convoys, they are measuring up to William Allen White's indictment of being warmongers and ghost-dancing for war.

If the plain people of America could be articulate, there would be such an avalanche of anticonvoy sentiment displayed as would force the recognition of this public opinion throughout the Nation.

And, too, I remember the eloquent words of the President as he addressed the Congress in joint session a year ago, and said at the close of his address:

I will not let the people down. The Congress will not let the people down.

I want that to be true in this matter of convoys, which, if sanctioned and undertaken, will, to use the President's own words, mean war, and participation in the war, and all that implies in the cost of blood, money, and grief.

Let me here read a chronological record of significant utterances of the President to the people of the United States, bearing on our foreign policy and possible entrance into the war.

On September 11, 1940, not very long ago, the President said:

I hate war now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand with my party upon the platform adopted in Chicago.

And let us remember that party declaration in Chicago was that we never again would send our boys abroad to fight in foreign fields.

On October 23, 1940, less than 6 months ago, the President said:

To every man, woman, and child I say your President and your great Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves, not for any foreign war—it is for peace I have labored and it is for peace I shall labor all the days of my life.

On October 28 the President said:

In all these ways, we made it clear to every foreign nation that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

On October 30 the President said to the mothers and fathers of America:

And while I am talking to you, mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance; I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again—your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign war. They are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense.

On October 30, in another address, he said:

The United States today is at peace; it is going to remain at peace.

And on November 2 he said:

Your President says this country is not going to war.

And on November 3 he said:

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war.

But that was 2 days before election, and after election the tone changes—the tempo quickens. On December 29 he said, and I use his words:

We must be the great arsenal of democracy; we must apply ourselves to our task with the same resolution, with the same sense of urgency, with the same spirit of patriotism and sacrifice as we would show if we were at war.

On January 6 the President said:

We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers.

In the same address the President backs the establishment of the four essential human freedoms, everywhere in the world, pronouncing that phrase four times.

On March 15, less than a month ago, the theory of "aid Britain" was enlarged by the President to commitment to complete defeat of the Axis. In a radio address he said:

And from now on the aid will be increased and yet again increased until total victory has been won. Never in all history have Americans faced a job so well worth while.

And now, with these references as a prelude, the matter of convoys is being given serious consideration, even if not already embarked upon in some degree.

Mr. President, I am fearful—terribly fearful—that backstage, as it were, behind the scenes, this use of convoys is being approved and sanctioned; that plans are being made, if not already perfected, to use the armed naval forces of the United States to convoy goods to belligerents. Again I repeat the President's

words, said but a few weeks ago, when he expressed himself against convoys:

Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war.

This, reduced to its lowest terms, is the definite statement by the President that convoys mean war. How can we possibly sanction or approve convoys, which the President says mean war, in the light of his promises to the American people to keep us out of war? Is it fair and honest to the American people to present them with party platforms pledged to keep them out of war and then, after election is over, to plunge them into war? Is it fair and honest to the American people for the President to broadcast to the millions of voters 2 days before reelection the following words: "The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war," and then, after the people have acted upon his assurance and had their hopes built up on his assurance, to plunge them into war? Are we to break faith with the men and women of the country in this manner?

If the United States ever goes to war with Germany—when that decision has to be made—it ought to be faced in Congress directly and not by indirection. It should be declared by the Congress, whose constitutional power it is to declare war, and not precipitated upon the people by some policy or step sanctioned by the Executive.

Last Friday the world observed Good Friday, the day on which Christ was crucified on Calvary, but the preliminary to that crucifixion was the betrayal of Jesus. Mr. President, if the people of the United States are led into war after they have been assured by the President himself that we are not going to war, then I measure my words and say that they will have been betrayed by one whose word they believed and they will be crucified, not on Calvary, but here, throughout these United States, and there will be a Nation-wide Gethsemane for us all.

Mr. President, the time has come to speak plainly. Ours is the responsibility. Millions of our people desire us to keep them out of war. We stand on the threshold of war. Once we cross that threshold and become an active participant, we will have been guilty of breaking faith with the people. We will have joined in the game of European power politics. We will be left holding the bag for the political master minds of Europe. We will have forced on every citizen of these United States a burden of debt which staggers the imagination. In the train of that war will come the dead, the maimed, the insane, saddened homes, the heartaches of fathers and mothers and the probable loss of democracy on the home front and a depression which will make that of 1930 look like a summer sunset in comparison.

In this solemn hour, pregnant with such dire possibilities, nay, more, probabilities, for our Nation, I call on my colleagues in Congress to exercise their own divine power of thought, to ignore the flatteries and cajolings of any man, whatever his station, to cast out allegiance to any party to dare any threats or offers of reward and to measure up to the highest standards of statesmanship which have ever been exemplified by those who have preceded us in this body. Let us be freemen, Senators of a free country, which is to be kept free from participation in this European war.

God help us to keep faith with the people whom we serve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the close of the debate this afternoon on the matter of convoys, certain communications from some of the people of the United States, expressing their disapproval of the convoy system, and those that I insert will be a cross section of thousands received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The matter referred to appears at the conclusion of Mr. TOBEY's speech.)

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I could not be other than in most hearty agreement with the Senator from New Hampshire in his expressions of the last half hour. He has indicated reason to believe that there is organized effort on foot to prevail upon the President to undertake immediately the convoying of American production to Great Britain.

Under date of March 31 of this year, Grenville Clark, about whom we have heard a great deal in connection with the pushing of America further and further into the embroilment abroad, addressed this letter to a correspondent, whose name I have deleted from the letter, but the letter is over Mr. Clark's signature:

I enclose a petition to the President asking that American convoys to Britain be provided at once.

We may anticipate, Mr. President, that Mr. Clark will be gathering up these petitions and relaying them to the White House, if that has not already been done. How extensive the movement will be no one can know; but the great bulk of the American people who are unalterably opposed to the theory of convoying had better be making themselves heard at the same point where Mr. Clark and his associates are making themselves heard, namely, at the White House.

I continue to read from Mr. Clark's letter:

Because of the cumulative effect of the attacks on British shipping (by mine, submarine, air bomb, and surface raider) I have, like many others, become convinced that only one thing can give any reasonable assurance of keeping Britain's supply line open, viz, an effective system of American convoys. I have pieced together all the information I can get and have discussed the question with several men recently back from England. All the evidence points to the one conclusion—that convoys must be provided and provided without delay if we are to have any assurance that our declared policy will not be a futility.

The next great crucial decision to be made—and it must be made soon, I believe—is whether and when we will do this, i. e., use our own merchant vessels protected by our own warships and perhaps planes, and all with American crews.

The President primarily must make that decision, and I think it useful and appropriate for citizens to express their views to him. Therefore, I drew up this petition, and am sending it to about 200 people, most of whom I know personally.

Incidentally, one of those to whom he addressed his letter is not circulating the petition.

If you agree with it and want to authorize the use of your name, please wire or write me as soon as possible.

When a reasonable number of approvals have come in, I shall forward the petition to the President with a list of those who have approved it. Neither the list nor document will be made public before being sent to the President, but he will have authority to make them public at his discretion.

Let me add that since the step recommended means de facto war (with shell fire, bombs, and torpedoes), whether or not declared, I, like almost everyone, have arrived only with great reluctance at the conclusion that convoying is essential. When, however, the alternative is considered and the vast consequences for us that would follow the cutting off and forced surrender of Britain, there seems to me no escape from the conclusion.

I hope you will wire or write within a day or so after receiving this.

Sincerely yours,

GRENVILLE CLARK.

P. S.—I enclose an extra copy so that, if you wish, you can pass the petition on to one or two friends who would probably want to sign. They could notify me direct or through you.

G. C.

Enclosed with the letter were two copies of the petition, entitled, "A Petition to the President." I ask unanimous consent that the petition be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 31, 1941.

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT

To the President of the United States:

The undersigned citizens respectfully ask you to determine upon and direct prompt and decisive action to provide American convoys to the British Isles and other places where the British Commonwealth of Nations and its allies need food and materials of war to continue their struggle. We assign the following reasons:

First. The people of the United States, after full consideration and debate, have taken the position that in our own vital national interest, Hitler must be prevented from achieving victory in this war. This means that the British Isles must be protected from capitulation. This means, in turn, that the supply line to Britain must be kept open on a scale that will ensure a constant flow of food, raw materials, and munitions adequate to sustain the strength of the British people and their vast war effort. If this supply line is cut off the British people, no matter how brave and enduring, cannot keep up the battle and must succumb.

We do not believe the defeatist talk that Hitler is invincible. We believe that we have it in our power, if we will use it promptly, to maintain the bridge of ships to Britain, with every prospect of ultimate victory through the joint control of the seas by Britain and the United States and joint superiority in the air.

Second. The maintenance of the supply line to the British Isles requires American convoys as a minimum indispensable measure. By this we mean the use of American merchant ships, protected by American naval vessels, both manned by American crews; and we mean the use of American patrol planes and pilots. It is now apparent, we believe, that nothing less will assure the maintenance of the supply line to Britain. We believe this because, unless effectively checked, the cumulative effect of the continued sinkings will sooner or later cut off Britain and make our "lend-lease" program a futility. We do not believe that the mere

turning over of our merchant vessels or warships for use by the British with their crews, or other measures short of American convoys, will be enough to ensure successful resistance to Hitler's campaign against British shipping.

We are deceiving ourselves if we avoid this issue. The longer we delay, the more Britain will be weakened. At best, the greater will be the ultimate effort we will be required to make. At worst, if we longer delay, the position will become irretrievable and all our efforts to prevent the domination of the dictators will prove futile. It is time to face these facts.

Third. We recognize that the action for which we petition will involve a state of war, declared or undeclared. We think, however, that it is time to quit trying to have it both ways. We should no longer declare, on the one hand, our determination that Hitler must be defeated, and yet fail, on the other hand, to take the necessary practical steps to accomplish his defeat.

If we really mean to prevent a Hitler victory, and American convoys are, as we believe, essential to that end, let us go ahead without regard to the consequence. A British defeat, with all its implications, would involve such grave danger to our future as to be intolerable. Our own self-interest alone obliges us to spare no effort in safeguarding Britain from isolation and forced surrender. With so much at stake, we cannot be content with halfway measures of doubtful effectiveness.

Accordingly, we urge you to act and act now while there is still time, lest we invite a catastrophe for the future of our country because our measures are too little and too late.

Name	Address	Occupation
Name	Address	Occupation
Name	Address	Occupation

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I think we cannot impress too strongly upon the American people that however much some may want to discount the theory that there is danger in an undertaking to convoy American production to Britain, nevertheless the fact remains that tremendous pressure is now being exerted by forces which have been highly successful in breaking through the neutrality laws, to which reference has been made on the floor today, to break down this resolve and to push ahead with further aid and further involvement, if need be, in the name of aid to Britain and in the name of enlarging upon the defense of the United States

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from North Dakota and his reference to Mr. CLARK, who, as we all know, was the author of the Conscription Act and was very active in getting it through Congress. I understand that he has also been very active in the William Allen White Committee.

Coming back to the convoy matter, and addressing my remarks for a moment to the distinguished majority leader, a few minutes ago he took the floor and stated that the Senate would adjourn from today until Friday, and then from Friday until Monday, because there is nothing of importance to come before the body.

I submit that such a statement seems like an anomaly. We have before us the matter of convoys, which the President says mean war. A joint resolution relating to the subject is now pending in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and yet we are to fold our tents like the Arabs and steal away until Friday, and again until Monday, because there is nothing important before the Senate.

I do not think that is a correct statement; and I say so with all due respect to the majority leader. There is something before one of the leading and eminent committees of the Senate. I refer to the convoy resolution which makes the issue clear and unmistakable. The American people have a right to insist that that resolution be considered in committee, and that the Senate shall have an opportunity to debate it and vote upon it; and yet we are told that there is nothing important before the Senate.

I now wish to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. I regret that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has stepped out of the Chamber. I ask the distinguished majority leader what the situation is in the Foreign Relations Committee to his knowledge, he being a member of the committee, as to the likelihood of the resolution being taken up and considered at the meeting of the committee tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no information to impart to the Senator as to when it will be taken up or whether it will be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to ask a further question, if I may do so without being considered impertinent. I do not intend to be impertinent. Has the Senator conferred with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee with respect to the Tobey resolution since it was introduced?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have had conversations with him.

Mr. TOBEY. Have the minds of the two Senators met on any policy as to how to handle that resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator expect the resolution to be taken up in committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no expectation one way or the other about it.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator think that his statement was incorrect?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am only one member of the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no more influence with the committee than has any other member. I do not think it is quite fair for the Senator from New Hampshire to try to extract from me information as to what the committee will do, or when it will do it, when I have no information on the subject.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to my friend—and I do consider him as such—that I have no intention to be impertinent in the slightest degree, or to embarrass anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not embarrassed.

Mr. TOBEY. A few minutes ago the Senator made the statement on the floor that he intended to ask for an adjournment from today until Friday, and then from Friday until Monday, because there is nothing important before the Senate. I say that the resolution with respect to convoys is the most important thing that could come before the Senate. It is a matter of life and death, and war or peace.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the use of becoming so excited?

Mr. TOBEY. I am not excited. However, I am in dead earnest. I have what I call righteous indignation in my soul.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all right. The Senator may "indignate" all he wishes; but he knows that the resolution is not before the Senate. It is before the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator knows that the Senate is not in a position to take it up until the committee reports one way or the other on it, unless he wishes to make a motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution, which he has not done.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator heard me read today the fine testimony given by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE] in the colloquy on April 2, in which he stated that he would give the resolution consideration, that it would have a hearing, and that it would come before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not hear that part of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator heard it in person on April 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. I heard the Senator's remarks a few days ago.

Mr. TOBEY. Two weeks have elapsed, and nothing has been done about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Sometimes it may be unfortunate for a hen to have only one egg in her nest; but the Senator knows that before every committee of the Senate, and of every other legislative body, numerous resolutions and bills are pending which have not been considered. Other matters upon which no action has been taken are pending before the committee, some of which have been pending longer than has the Senator's resolution. If I had any information, if I were a mind reader, a clairvoyant, or a prophet, I might be able to tell the Senator what action will be taken by the committee, and when it will be taken; but being none of those things, I cannot inform the Senator when the resolution will be taken up, or how members of the committee will vote upon it.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course not. I understand that.

A moment ago the Senator used the illustration of an egg. Let me reply to that statement. If the resolution now before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is an egg, it is a fertile egg; and if it is incubated, hatched, and brought to the floor of the Senate it will produce something worth while. It will produce peace.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether or not an egg hatches depends upon whether it is fertile or infertile.

Mr. TOBEY. It also depends upon whether or not somebody sits on the egg and squashes it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that event, of course, we could never know whether it was fertile or infertile.

Mr. TOBEY. I want to stop the squashing. Frankly, this is the point: Is any effort being made, because of administration requests or pressure, to have the resolution remain quiescent in the archives of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations until it dies and mortification sets in? Or does the committee intend to make a bona fide effort to report the resolution and bring it to the floor of the Senate for debate and action? What does the Senator think?

Mr. BARKLEY. What do I think about what?

Mr. TOBEY. The question which I have propounded.

Mr. BARKLEY. As to whether I think the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will report the resolution?

Mr. TOBEY. No. Let me repeat the question. It will bear repetition.

Is the Senator of the opinion that the suggestion has been made by someone high in authority—possibly someone in the White House—that the resolution be not considered by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations? The power of suggestion is very potent. Will the resolution remain in the committee until it dies and mortification sets in, and the inscription "Requiescat in Pace" is placed above it? Does the Senator believe it ought not to be debated on the floor of the Senate and passed?

Mr. BARKLEY. I can speak only for myself. So far as I am concerned, I can say that the President has never mentioned the resolution to me. It has never been discussed in the presence of the President when I have been present. So the answer to the Senator's question is "no."

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to ask a further question, in all kindness. Does not the Senator believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations should consider and report back to the Senate for action things of the importance of this resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. In the language of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I would not attempt to speak for him—I think I can say that the Foreign Relations Committee will no doubt give consideration to the resolution of the Senator whenever it deems it advisable to do so. When that will be, I am not enough of a prophet to know.

As to whether the committee should vote it out and bring it back on the floor for consideration, I can only say that the committee will undoubtedly take such action as to it seems wise when it considers the subject; and I would not say that the Senator's resolution is entitled to be voted out of the committee and to be brought onto the floor of the Senate out of its order, or any more rapidly than its importance deserves, or ahead of any other resolution which might be presented on the same subject.

Of course, the Senate has control of its committees. If the Senator from New Hampshire becomes too impatient over what he conceives to be the inactivity of the committee on his resolution, he has the right any day to move that the committee be discharged from further consideration of his resolution. The Senator knows he can do that. It is an extraordinary remedy; probably the Senator would not desire to pursue that course. What the result would be if he followed that course, I do not know. I cannot speak for the committee.

There has been no more delay on this resolution than on hundreds of other resolutions which have been offered, the authors of which deem them as of great importance, as the Senator deems his resolution. It strikes me that the Senator from New Hampshire should leave to the judgment of the committee, which I think appreciates its responsibility, the question of taking up this matter and disposing of it when it deems advisable and wise, and in such way as it deems advisable and wise.

Mr. TOBEY. Just one more word, and I shall be through. Taking the Senator's premise, the question of convoys is very much before the administration at the present time, as we all know.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I see a good deal in the newspapers about it and I hear a good deal on the floor of the Senate about it, but outside of that, I am frank to say to the Senator, that it has not been discussed.

Mr. TOBEY. The danger of convoys, I am advised from very good sources, is imminent; and the point I make is that if we do not put this resolution through the committee and bring it back and debate it and act on it, then it may very well develop some morning that somewhere on the Atlantic convoys will have already been started, the Senate will not have considered the matter, the resolution will have been lying dormant in the committee, and no action will have been taken. Then what will happen? Some of our ships will be sunk, there will be righteous indignation throughout the country, and we may be in war.

When it is said there is nothing before the Senate, I take exception to that. I think that, in view of the issue before us and its importance, we should forget parties and everything else and give an honest hearing, and we should consider it and bring it back, and show the American people we are meeting our obligations and duties on this great question before the American people.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to say that, so far as the President of the United States is concerned, I think he has as acute a sense of his responsibility as I have of my responsibility, or as the Senator from New Hampshire has of his responsibility, or as the entire Senate has of its responsibility; and it is not quite fair to express the fear day by day that the President of the United States, in the exercise of his authority and of his judgment and of his discretion, and in the performance of his duties, and before the Senate can act in a negative way on some resolution, will order something done that may precipitate us into war before we have had an expression on the subject from the Senate or from the House of Representatives or from the Congress as a whole.

Mr. TOBEY. In view of all that has been said this morning, and in view of the importance of the matter, will the Senator use his good offices and the eminence of his position to see that the resolution is given consideration in the committee in the near future and is brought to the floor of the Senate at an early date?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I stated awhile ago that I am not making any commitments on the floor of the Senate as to what action I will take in the committee. I do not think it is any more to be expected that I shall in advance tell the Senator or the country what I will do in reference to that resolution than in reference to any other resolution or any bill. Whenever the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in the exercise of its own judgment and wisdom, shall decide to take up the matter and consider it and dispose of it one way or another I shall be ready to join in that consideration. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. TOBEY. And meanwhile war clouds gather.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we can speculate about war clouds. War clouds have been gathering for a long time. Despite all we have done in the United States to dispel those clouds, they are still gathering and still hovering.

Mr. TOBEY. And finally the storm comes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, all right; let it come.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As a very humble minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of course I am in no position to give the Senator any very authentic assurances, but to this extent I can assure him: That the first time the Committee on Foreign Relations meets, a motion will be made to consider the Senator's resolution, and it will have at least one vote. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the Senator's good wishes.

Oh, Mr. President, here is a body of 96 men, and here are 500 or 600 people in the galleries; and I look to those here, and I look beyond them to the people in the hinterlands of America, where 130,000,000 people live—plain people, the kind of people Abraham Lincoln loved—and I hold a brief for them; and they are asking us what we will do about war or peace, what we will do about convoys, which mean war, as the President said. They are asking us why the Senate is adjourning for 5 days, or for 3 days; they are asking us what we are doing. Let us get on the job, consider this burning issue, and send back word to the American people that, as far as in us lies, we will stop this mighty danger of war—the use of convoys. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BONE in the chair). It is the duty of the Chair on occasions of this kind to advise the occupants of the galleries that the galleries will be closed in the event the rules of the Senate are violated. Regardless of whether the occupants of the galleries like or dislike, approve or disapprove, statements made on the floor of the Senate, demonstrations by those in the galleries are a violation of our rules.

If they are repeated, we will have to clear the galleries.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the interest of orderly procedure and consideration of legislation of importance on a subject so vital to the American people, I regret that it seems necessary, every time we meet, for someone to catechize some member of a committee as to how he will vote or as to how much influence he will exert to get a particular resolution considered; and that the Senate of the United States is to be castigated, and that I, particularly, am to be taken to task because a little earlier in the day I announced the obvious fact that there is no business before the Senate for consideration during the remainder of this week. We called the calendar, and we disposed of all matters on the calendar. There is nothing on the calendar for consideration. The appropriation bill which has been pending here has gone over because of the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee having it in charge, who is absent on account of illness. Now we are to be condemned, and the newspapers of the country are to carry the headlines tomorrow that the Senator from New Hampshire has condemned and castigated the Senate of the United States, and me in particular, because I announced today that we would adjourn until Friday, and from Friday to Monday, because there is no business on the calendar.

The Senator from New Hampshire is not going to intimidate me or embarrass me, if he is undertaking to compel me to withdraw my suggestion or to pursue a different course. When we have finished our business today we will adjourn until Friday, unless my motion is voted down; and unless there is some business to transact on Friday and Saturday, we will then adjourn until Monday or Tuesday.

The Senator from New Hampshire can bring his proposition before the Senate at this very moment by a motion if he desires to do so, and if he thinks well of the chances of favorable action upon his proposition.

Mr. TOBEY. How much chance has a snowball in hell?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator desires to compare the Senate to hell, and himself to a snowball, then let him make the comparison.

The Senator knows there is no business on the calendar. The Senator knows it would be useless to meet tomorrow or Thursday; and, in fact, we might even adjourn until Monday, if it were not for the constitutional provision that the Senate cannot adjourn for more than 3 days without the consent of the other body.

If the Senator is so anxious to put the Senate on record with respect to his resolution, he can do so now by making a motion, and he will ascertain how many votes it will receive. It might be carried; I do not know. I have not made any canvass of the Senate, any more than I have made a canvass of the Committee on Foreign Relations as to how it will vote on the resolution. But the Senator has no right to criticize the Senate or to criticize me for going over until Friday, unless at this time he is willing to use every parliamentary remedy he possesses to bring the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. May I point out to the distinguished majority leader that it is possible for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to meet tomorrow or Thursday to consider the so-called Tobey resolution, and to vote upon it; and then it would be possible for the resolution to come up for consideration on the floor of the Senate on Friday, if that is desired. But when it is thumbs down and swords out to kill this thing, of course it is going to die.

Let me say further that I did not address the Senator from Kentucky in any disrespectful way. He is a peculiar and unusual Senator, occupying an important position. He is the distinguished majority leader, as well as one of the leaders on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am one of the newest members of the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. But, nevertheless, beyond peradventure, one of the most potent; and, therefore, because of his natural talents and great ability and his occupation of the majority leadership, I address him differently than I would an ordinary Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's compliment, but I cannot, notwithstanding my position, give the Senator any more information as to the attitude of other Senators in this body or of members of the committee on his resolution than any other Senator can give him, because I do not make it my business to go around and canvass Senators as to their attitude. I may have fallen down in the performance of my duties, but I have never regarded it as a part of my duties to canvass and poll in advance to find out how Senators intend to vote on matters which have not yet even been reported to the Senate from the committees to which they have been referred.

(The letters and telegrams referred to in Mr. TOBEY's speech are as follows:)

AUSTIN APPLIANCE CO.,
Denver, Colo., April 12, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your resolution. We believe that 80 percent of the Americans are back of your resolution and the other 20 percent should be.

Sincerely,

W. E. AUSTIN.
AUSTIN APPLIANCE CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 13, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Congratulations on your resolution to oppose the convoying of ships to Britain.

The warmongers have admitted the convoying of ships means war. Please use all of your influence to oppose and fight convoying.

Yours truly,

D. J. MCDANIEL.

NATIONAL LEGION OF MOTHERS OF AMERICA,
Hollywood, Calif., April 10, 1941.

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the National Legion of Mothers of America and citizens of Hollywood and Los Angeles, Calif., in a mass meeting held at the national headquarters of the National Legion of Mothers of America urge that no armed forces, ships, or airplanes of the United States be used as convoys or patrols for war materials to belligerent nations.

Convoys mean shooting—shooting means war. We mothers are looking to you to keep your campaign promises. We must maintain peace for America.

Yours for peace,

FRANCES SHERRILL,
Founder.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your wonderful speech. Convoys are war and war is what the people emphatically do not want.

Your amendment should be adopted. If 85 percent of the people are frustrated on this question it will produce a cancer in this democracy of ours.

Keep up the good work, the people are behind you.

Yours truly,

PEARSE A. MITCHELL.

GRAFTON, W. VA., *April 9, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Re: Convoys.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We listened with rapt attention and deserved admiration to your powerful broadcast last evening on the Tobey Anticonvoy Resolution. We are today writing our sole Senator KILGORE (West Virginia as yet has no other) calling on him to support this resolution in behalf of the people who elected him.

Please send me a copy of the resolution.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. JED W. ROBINSON.

PASADENA, CALIF., *April 8, 1941.*

Hon. CHAS. WM. TOBEY,
Senator, New Hampshire,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Want to commend you for introducing Senate bill against convoying or patroling of vessels to any belligerent nation. Have written our Senator and Congressman asking support of your bill.

1776 was a measure to keep us out of war, your bill should be voted on favorably by every Senator and Congressman as I believe this is or will be our next step toward war.

If I can be of any assistance to you, please advise.

Very truly yours,

E. A. GUMMIG, M. D.

GREENFIELD, MASS., *April 8, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just been listening to your talk on convoying of our ships, and I am trying, through my tears, to write you my blessing.

As a mother of two sons, my prayers will be for you and your bill and may God bless you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MATTIE MANN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 6, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Now that the lend-lease bill has passed, this country is facing one more step

in the chain of events that is leading this country toward war.

We feel that, had the issue of convoys been included in the lend-lease bill, the bill would have been defeated. The American people love liberty and hate war. Therefore they are unalterably opposed to anything that leads this country into a war not of our own making.

Won't you, as a representative of the people in the United States Senate, use every influence and power at your command to see that Resolution No. 62 becomes the law of the land and prohibits the use of our Navy for convoy duty.

Convoys mean war. Democracy cannot live in war.

Respectfully submitted.

JENNIE V. SCOTT.
MRS. CHAS. H. HOLCOMB.
DAVID F. SCOTT.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 8, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard your very good talk over radio tonight and also called several of my friends to listen in, and we agreed we should have more Senators like you who are fighting for the interest of the American people.

You mentioned about 85 percent of the American people are against America's entry into the war. I believe the sentiment against war is getting stronger daily and people are getting tired of being taxed for the European war. After all this is not our war.

If America would mind her own business instead of pledging aid to all the countries who fight the Axis powers the war would probably be over by this time. All we are doing is sticking out our necks and in the end we will be the ones who are fighting alone and paying for it too. What assurance have we that the very ones we are helping will not turn their wrath on us?

America for the Americans.

Yours truly,

MARY ANN LAST.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *April 10, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are absolutely right in your opposition to convoys. Convoys mean war and war means bringing to America the same conditions we deplore in Europe.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL A. CARLSON.

EDGERTON, WIS., *March 8, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES A. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: No, we won't or don't like war at any time or anywhere, and we don't want convoys, don't want union now, and we, the people, don't want war.

Thank you for the splendid talk.

MRS. R. A. PETT.
MARLETTE PETT.
ROY PETT.
JACK PETT.

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just listened to your very fine speech on the radio, and want to thank you for it. I am convinced that the Senators and Congressmen today have the greatest opportunity to serve their country that they have ever had, or perhaps will ever have. I also believe that those who fight against the use of convoys or other measures which will surely get us into this war, will be gloriously rewarded by the people. Almost to a man, the people are opposed to our going into this war, and have relied upon the leaders to keep us out. Many are confused and frightened, and hardly know what to say or do since promises made before the election by both parties have been so lightly cast aside. You may be sure, though, that the people are still opposed to war.

Thank you for the fight that you are making, and I pray that you may be successful.

Sincerely,

LUCY G. STUART.

WEBSTER GROVES, MO.

MEIGS, GA., *April 9, 1941.*

Senator C. W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have learned with deep appreciation of your effort to keep America out of war by introducing an anticonvoy resolution. I take this method of showing my anxiety for peace. You are doing a much-needed work.

If I knew the name of the House Representative who took a part in your joint resolution, it would give me great pleasure to thank him also.

Respectfully,

MILDRED HICKS.

(I vote in the white Democratic primary, and I wish there were more Democrats sharing your view of war.)

EXETER, N. H., *April 10, 1941.*

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have watched your efforts to keep the Government's plighted word to the people with the greatest admiration. Beyond a doubt convoys for contraband would be a most provocative step of aggression. There seems, however, to be little interest in safeguarding the welfare of our own country among the unthinking mass of legislators governed by war hysteria and orders from higher up. I want England to win and I should be willing to do and spend anything we may legitimately to accomplish that end. This in spite of the iniquities of the Versailles Treaty that brought on this irredentist war of vengeance and the wholly insincere and disingenious part played by the politicos of England and France during the past 20 years. They produced in Germany a type of behavior which cannot persist in human nature too long, but which must be repressed while it exists. But, having warned France and England of this, are we in any way responsible or directly concerned? I think not. I should hate to think of Nazi arrogance after a victory, but do I think Americans should die for Britain's tortuous continental policy? Emphatically not. We have our own politicos' mistakes to pay for.

The witch doctors of economics say that we could not survive a German victory as a democracy. Could we survive a war as a democracy? There was abundant economic prophecy about the last war, almost all wrong. Scientists say that we are only on the frontiers of our development. If we cannot survive and keep our souls in the 7,000,000 square miles of the United States and Canada perhaps we shouldn't. I believe we could, and it is something to retain our national integrity and not become the appanage of any bloc.

The Army is now apparently in the saddle and behaving with increasing arrogance toward those who believe in the value of mere education—a common step on the road to the totalitarian state. The drafted men will now set out at the President's good pleasure. Men "can't be taught to be good soldiers" in a year. It is apparently becoming plain that the average American, in spite of our lurid reputation, is not interested in killing, and that this absurd state of mind can't be quickly eradicated.

I am still convinced that the Swiss system of universal military training is the best for us. If every man knew that at a certain age he would be called for 3 months' intensive basic training and would be subject to 2 weeks' field work a year for 10 years thereafter, that, if he liked the life, he might go to successive noncom and officers' camps or enlist at good wages in the mechanized forces there'd be none of this horrible uncertainty which now fills the lives of all our young men. Canada, at war, calls for only 4 months, but this is for a defensive force only. Can it be, as President Conant told me last June, that a vote for the Burke-Wadsworth bill was a vote to bring us into war?

As I look out on the pleasant, everyday life of a New England country town, I know that it's towns like that the country over that we would unite to defend, but there can be nothing but hatred, dissension, bitterness, and ruin for us in an overseas war for an economic theory.

I wish you all success in your battle against convoys and I congratulate you on your stand against all propaganda and for genuine Americanism.

Very truly yours,

H. S. STUCKEY.

DOYLESTOWN, PA., *April 9, 1941.*

The Honorable Senator CHARLES TOBEY.

DEAR SIR: We have listened to you on the radio, and I want you to know that we are back of your bill to prohibit convoys 100 percent. I am sure that I speak also for 1,000,000 other mothers of America.

If this is a country for the people and by the people, and the majority are against us getting into this war, how is it we are headed that way?

In the name of peace and defense of our country being taken into a foreign war is despicable. If our neighbor's house was deliberately set on fire we would not make it worse by throwing all our furniture and ourselves into it but try to protect our own house and also help our neighbor save his.

Our grateful thanks to you for your brave stand in these critical days.

I am not a pacifist nor an appeaser but a 100-percent American mother whose ancestors settled in Newburyport, Mass., in the late 1600's.

Very sincerely yours,

MRS. EDWARD HISTAND.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY,
BETHLEHEM, PA., *April 9, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The deception of the people practiced by the President in his pre-election promises about war, in the 1776 bill, and under the William Allen White committee, now faces an 83-percent majority opposed to the final step.

I hereby pledge my efforts to prevent our entry into any foreign war.

Yours very truly,

GILBERT E. DOAN, *Head.*

(Money included if you need it.—D.)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
April 10, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Pursuant to my policy of commending those Members of the Congress who are still fighting to obey the will of 85 percent of the American people, and who have the courage to oppose the insidious and misleading public statements of the cohorts of this administration, I want to thank you for your effective work, both on the Senate floor and over the radio.

I have a son, who in a year and a half would be of age for the draft; and while he

had injuries in prep-school football that would never permit him to be a first-line soldier, there are other services he could adequately manage. There is not a real American boy nor a patriotic American mother who would not fight to the last farm ditch in our own defense; but neither these boys nor their parents are willing for them to die in the mountain fastnesses of the Balkans or the deserts of Africa to maintain the British Empire. If you could read many of the letters now beginning to appear in the local papers, it would be apparent that the people are becoming aware of the fact that we are again about to become dupes of "perfidious Albion." A letter in a recent issue of Life magazine even contained a suggestion of which I have often thought, that before the American people are asked to give mobile soup kitchens and ambulances, the Queen of England and others in the royal family throw their jewels into the war-effort pot. The question is, Can this overwhelming public opinion be crystallized or rather mobilized in time to stop Mr. Roosevelt's manifest determination? It certainly cannot, if the Congress is as gullible and weak-kneed as they seemed about the so-called lend-lease bill. Exactly what many of us feared has come to pass. We cannot right the wrongs of the world; we still have many to set in order at home; and we certainly cannot send expeditionary forces when there is not enough equipment even for adequate training in the camps.

I am particularly riled at the slogan that we are absolutely dependent for existence on the British Navy. If true, then we should remedy that condition with all possible speed, and not send our equipment to fall into German hands.

Just a little more British propaganda and high-handed remarks from their statesmen and I will be as neutral as Lindbergh. Churchill asked for "tools"—his last speech plainly demanded convoys. How can even the Members of Congress be so obtuse? And why does Britain not call on her own Empire? There are teeming millions in India; and the French Provinces of Canada—certainly in as much potential danger as the United States—have practically struck. I took especial note of the fact that the class inclusive of the 19–20-year-old English boys was just called up a few months ago.

It is little short of tragic that our own Government is not more chauvinistic. Unless the President now has a "world savior" complex, it is difficult to understand how an official, reportedly so astute politically, could have been so completely "sold."

Perhaps a benign fate is intervening to save the American people from chaos by a plunge into what Thomas Mann predicts will be a 30-years war. I refer to the accession of BOB REYNOLDS to the chairmanship of the Military Affairs Committee.

No smear campaign can touch the World War veterans. During that junket, the able-bodied Mr. Roosevelt was behind a desk, not a trench.

The people want the aid to stop at material. Apparently nothing changes that opinion; and those who understood the implications of the lend-lease bill and still voted for it, betrayed their constituents. One Alabama Senator publicly stated that he was opposed to convoys or expeditionary forces, emphatically. It will be interesting to see how he talks and votes when the question comes up—if it is permitted to be put as per your resolution—squarely up to the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

ELIZABETH T. WELLER.
(Mrs. Thompson Weller.)

OLIVE, CALIF., *April 9, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building:

Resolved, That the members of the Orange County Division of the National Legion of Mothers of America and citizens of Orange County, Calif., assembled in mass meeting in Olive Civic Auditorium, insist that the Congress of the United States, in keeping with the will of our people, immediately adopt the Tobey resolution, Joint Resolution 62, barring convoy by any part of our armed forces of war or other materials to countries at war.

NATIONAL LEGION OF MOTHERS OF AMERICA, COUNCIL No. 2,
IVA MCCLINTOCK, *Secretary.*

DENVER, COLO., *April 9, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I heard you speak over the radio last night and heartily agree with you. I feel that convoying of the supplies to Great Britain by our ships will be the last straw.

If we would expend the same amount of energy and money toward preparing our own United States for any emergency in the future that we are expending toward other so-called democracies we would be so well defended and so well organized that no nation on the globe would look in our direction for conquest.

We had best look to our own country's needs.

What will be the feeling of our people when one of our beautiful big battleships is blown to bits while convoying and taking with it many hundred fine American boys?

Mine is only one small voice, but I do so hope that the thinkers and the people we depend on to guide the course of our country in the best way will look out for this country's welfare first.

My vote is very much against our ships convoying.

Sincerely,

MRS. ZANA W. ROBERTS.

HANOVER, N. H., *April 12, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just been listening to the Columbia radio program, in which you participated. I wish to express my admiration for your courage in the advocacy of what are now unpopular views. I am glad to be a resident of a State which has one Senator who is not carried away by the prevailing hysteria and who is able to see the facts of the situation as they actually are.

Most sincerely yours,

RAYMOND W. JONES.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK
OF SOUTHAMPTON,
Southampton, N. Y., April 11, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Permit me to say that I was very much impressed with your recent radio address in connection with your anti-convoy bill.

I would therefore like to take this opportunity to advise you that I am very much against the United States using our ships manned by our American men to convoy any merchant ships to Great Britain.

I am absolutely in favor of helping England in supplying her with any and every article that will help her beat Hitler, but I am not in favor of any of our men being killed, nor our ships being destroyed by direct intervention.

Yours very truly,

E. R. MANNING.

ST. MARK'S LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Scranton, Pa., April 8, 1941.

The Honorable Senator TOBEY.

MY DEAR SIR: I had the pleasure of listening to your masterly and patriotic plea, on behalf of your amendment to prevent convoying of American ships, or any ships, for that matter, by American ships. You and your fellow patriots should make a nightly, daily appeal on behalf of your resolution, the sole aim of which is to keep America out of war.

It surely is a sad state of affairs, as you so clearly stated in your splendid appeal to the American people, that our administration seems bent on again plunging America in war, and as Senator WHEELER so well put it, "to plow under every fourth American boy." Surely, if this is, as Lincoln once said, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people" then the people should have a voice and vote in this all-important matter, and given a chance to be heard. The people had a chance to vote on prohibition, which is by far less important than war. I feel that the people of the United States are sold bag and baggage to a foreign policy, which they utterly abhor and detest, and it seems to me that it is up to the determined effort of men, like yourself, Senators WHEELER, NYE, WALSH, and other patriots, to keep us out of war, in spite of the efforts of Mr. Roosevelt and his associates. I therefore appeal to you, Mr. TOBEY, to keep up the fight, use the press, the radio, and every other lawful means to make null and void the efforts of those who, while unwilling to shoulder the gun, would nevertheless like to see our American boys again slaughtered on the battlefields of Europe.

Again, Mr. TOBEY, I wish to congratulate you on your fine patriotism, and hope and pray that you will continue to foil the warmongers in their wicked and sinful efforts to plunge America into another European war. Thank you, Senator, and may God bless you richly for your fine work.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. BENDER,
Native-born American pastor here at the same church 35 years.

MANCHESTER, N. H.

DEAR SENATOR: Being the mother of five good American boys, three of which would be taken in this terrible war. I will give my boys to defend the good United States of America. But, dear God, forbid to lose them.

Keep up your fighting spirit. No convoy for United States of America.

Sincerely,

MRS. W. J. NORTON.

SUGAR HILL, N. H., *April 9, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I don't suppose that anything I may say will make my views in regards the present situation any clearer nor that I need to restate my appreciation of your valiant work in behalf of our remaining out of the war. However, I do feel that your public statements have had weight in your own State. I have sensed a considerable cooling off in this part of New Hampshire. A few months ago there seemed to be a feeling that we could have our cake and eat it; now there is a feeling of fear that perhaps we have been blind fools led down the road to war by a man who, while he declares he hates it, is sending our boys directly into it.

Certainly the work that you have done and the work done by Senator WHEELER has not gone unnoticed and although I know you have been called everything from a "red" to "fifth columnist" the sane, sober people back home know that you are right.

In these days of stress a man has but one thing to guide him, his conscience. Regardless of how unpopular consciences may be today they are the only guideposts and signs an honest man has. I feel that although the propaganda machinery may not love you that you will have yourself to live with in the future and it will be a much more pleasant companionship because you have not let your better self down in this crisis.

Very truly yours,

MYLES D. BLANCHARD,
Minister, Community Church.

P. S.—I know that you are very busy. Don't bother to acknowledge this.

ST. ANSELM'S, *April 10, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: You have my support on your anticonvoy resolution. I hope that you will be able to reverse the trend toward war.

I shall be in Washington the beginning of next week to attend the annual meeting of the Catholic Association for International Peace at Trinity College. I am planning to stay at the Oblate Scholasticate at 391 Michigan Avenue NE. If I have a chance and if you are not too busy I shall try to call on you.

With best wishes for a happy Easter,

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD F. ANGLURI, O. S. B.

ROSLINDALE, MASS., *April 6, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Thank you for all your efforts to keep this country at peace.

I am writing you today to urge you to do all possible to defeat any idea of convoys. Never mind what the newspapers will say about you or about the way the people are supposed to feel. The common people of this country do not want war. Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war. Total war for this country means slavery for generations.

Keep up the fight and defeat this idea of convoys. I know you can be depended on to fight for the right.

Sincerely,

HELEN KELLEY.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
Good Friday, A. D., 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In memory of Him who said, "Blessed are the peacemakers," please do all you can to keep our country from taking any part in this grievous war.

Let us not forget that entry into this war would probably mean the death of our social order. Please make it possible to feed the hungry and the starving in Europe, and work for peace with justice to all.

May God guide you.

Sincerely,

GEO. H. HALL, JR.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., *April 7, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Please vote against convoying ships to England. We want to keep our sons from going over there. God give you strength to carry on.

Sincerely,

MRS. JOHN GARLAND.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Hon. Senator CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The President has always said "short of war"; please keep him to his promise.

Do not let the Navy convoy ships to Europe.

Keep us out of war.

Thank you.

I remain,

Yours truly,

(MRS.) LOUISE BANCROFT.

APRIL 7, 1941.

FIRST EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Norwich, Conn., April 12, 1941.

United States Senator Honorable TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Continue to oppose any or all convoying attempts. You will truly serve your country in her best interests.

May a blessed Easter season be yours.

Sincerely yours, in behalf of the millions who tremble at the reckless and provocative ventures of our present administration.

CARL STOREK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 15, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Bunker Hill Democratic Club, Forty-fourth Assembly District, unanimously went on record at meeting tonight against convoying ships by United States Navy.

D. A. SULLIVAN, *Chairman.*

LEBANON, N. H., *April 10, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Enjoyed your radio address on convoys. I think your resolution should be adopted and am advising Senator BRIDGES accordingly.

Sincerely,

MELVIN B. DUNBAR.

JACKSON, MISS., *April 1, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: For many months I've considered expressing to you my opinions relative to sending American boys to fight the wars of Europe. As a youth I now express my opinions.

Please do not doubt my loyalty to Americanism. No person, party, or organization of any kind has asked that I write to you. I never have been a member of any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States. And having been a citizen of the United States during all of my past life, of Irish and Dutch parentage, and being a loyal American in both thought and action, I trust that I write without doubt of my loyalty to my country.

Today Britain requests our aid "short of war." With the majority of the American people, I believe that our country should aid Britain "short of war." Undoubtedly aid "short of war" is difficult to define, but is it not possible to give aid without wrath or appeasement? I do not believe that true patriotism means that the American people are to become "yes" people to false propaganda or irrational emotions, often controlled by selfishness or sentiment.

We citizens know that some men of public trust, men who know more about international affairs than the average man, are telling America to wake up and follow us. Their right and duty is to inform America about international affairs. But these men of public trust must remember that true patriotism to democracy means loyalty to the people in their conduct of public trust. True patriotism to democracy means that our leaders are servants of a free people.

What are the American people asking today? They are asking, Do you think Roosevelt is goin' to send our boys to Europe? Many citizens feel and believe that our great President is not only for aid "short of war" but that he is attempting to arouse the people to war fever in order that youth may soon be thrown into foreign slaughter. These citizens are the same citizens who once heard the President promise that our boys would not fight on European soil unless attacked. The deduction of thousands of Americans is that our intervention in Europe's war with men is already planned and promised. God forbid it. The prayer of the majority is that intervention with men has not been promised.

War propaganda is already widespread. It has grown by leaps and bounds, promoted and perpetuated by the good and the bad, by the patriotic and unpatriotic. Men of public trust are forsaking reason for loss of temper.

Today Britain is fighting for the same principles which we have pledged ourselves to protect. I am not anti-British; I am pro-American. Britain is this country's friend, though she has not always been so. I hope and pray that Britain is the victor in her fight against Germany and Italy. My opinion of sending American boys to fight the wars of Europe has been described by an editor of a newspaper. The editor wrote: "We do not consider it our duty, now or ever, to back up Great Britain every time she gets herself into a dog fight over the decaying carcass of Europe. If Britain gets the impression—for the second time in the last 25 years—that we'll run to her aid every time she gets into a mess, then, to put it bluntly, we're in for a hell of a time ahead." Moreover, the fact still prevails, the majority of the American people believes that democracy is best served by keeping American boys out of World War II.

Are we a nation of appeasers? No. A thousand times no. No nation is being appeased by the United States.

Let America fight for her self-interest by building up such a powerful military machine that no nation or combination of nations dare attack. Let us serve America and the rest of the world by preserving sanity in America for the day of peace and reconstruction. Let's be cool-headed, but not softheaded. Today, let the will of the masses be told again and again to the President and to the Congress of the United States, "Keep American boys out of Europe."

Would the slaughter of thousands and thousands of American boys in Europe be a curse or a blessing to the safety and strength of Americanism? Surely, most of us believe that the safety and strength of Americanism transcends every consideration of life, property, or foreign interest.

I believe that you believe in the following great truths, which are printed in every issue of a daily newspaper of my State: "There are disloyalties and there are crimes which shock our sensibilities, which may bring suffering upon those who are touched by their immediate results, but there is no disloyalty and no crime in all the category of human weaknesses which compares with the failure of probity in the conduct of public trust. The breaking down of the faith of a people in the honesty of their government and in the integrity of their institutions, the lowering of the respect for standards of honor which prevail in high places, are crimes for which punishment can never atone."

V-ry truly yours,

ARNOLD LEE HINDMAN.

LAKEWOOD, OHIO, *April 12, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In listening to the Peoples Platform talk on the air Saturday evening, I thank God that we have men like you and Senator GEORGE, Senator WHEELER, that still believe that the people have and should have something to say as to whether our boys should be forced to fight on foreign soil, which will happen if we are to convoy shipments abroad.

This is not honest nor fair to we Americans and think we should have a referendum vote on this subject and not push our young men into this slaughter.

Please keep up this fight for us for there are so many who believe as you do on this subject and to me is the most vital thing in the world, as I am a mother of one of these boys.

God bless you.

A MOTHER FROM CLEVELAND, OHIO.

ALBANY, N. Y., *April 12, 1941.*

DEAR SIR: Your arguments on the Peoples Platform talk on April 12 were wonderful. They were so honest and sincere and real.

"We the people" are being fooled by English propaganda and lies. It's an awful thing for a leader to promise the people one thing and do another. We will lose faith in our

Government. Here's all success to you and a vote against convoys.

R. J. LEWIS.

BOSTON, MASS.

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

You sure are the true type of American and may you have success on your anti-convoy crusade. We, the American people, do not want our boys to convoy the goods across the sea. We want peace. That is what our President promised us.

M. M. BURKE.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 11, 1941.*
Senator CHARLES M. TOBEY,
New Hampshire.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We understand your recently introduced a resolution in the Senate which would forbid the use of United States naval or military forces to escort goods to foreign destinations.

We are in back of you all the way—we certainly do not want our boys or our ships to go over in any way at all. Keep up the good work and we are fighting hard here in Buffalo too. So please, Senator Tobey, do all you can in your power to help keep us out of war.

Sincerely,
RUTH and JOSEPH EISENRIED.

SAN MARINO, CALIF., *April 12, 1941.*
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We agree with all you stand for, and are delighted you do not want our ships to convoy to England. Please do your best to keep us out of war. We want the declaration of war to be the individual vote of the American people themselves. Please do your best.

Very sincerely,
E. C. and G. L. WILDER.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BONE in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claud N. Sapp to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the same request with respect to the Navy nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make a similar request with regard to the nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, April 18, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 15, 1941.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Claud N. Sapp, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Karah J. White, Ashland.

CONNECTICUT

Donald S. Burke, Unionville.

GEORGIA

Alvin B. Crews, Temple.

INDIANA

Ernestine A. Deutscher, St. Paul.
Mildred B. Canfield, Shoals.

IOWA

Dell C. Jacobsen, Walnut.

MICHIGAN

Glenn E. Wood, Lakeview.

MONTANA

Adolph L. Rachac, Conrad.
Sylvia E. Dickson, Corvallis.

NEBRASKA

Homer S. Yeakle, Fairbury.
Dale W. Karnopp, Union.
Richard W. Keckler, Weeping Water.

NEW YORK

Mary J. O'Connell, Ocean Beach.

OKLAHOMA

Eddie A. Blackmon, Crescent.
Wyatt N. Pierce, Davis.
Pearl Brazell, Lamont.
Woodrow Rhoton, Shidler.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ralph J. Allen, Du Bois.

PUERTO RICO

Blanca de la Rosa, Isabela.

VERMONT

Roscoe E. Olmstead, Saxtons River.

WISCONSIN

Ruth M. Graves, Cottage Grove.
Harold H. Peck, Lyons.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

NOTE.—For a list of the names of all persons whose nominations for promotion, in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, were confirmed today, see Senate proceedings of April 1 (legislative day, March 31), 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 2796.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, we rejoice that Thou hast made this day, the open sky, the sunlight, and all that is blossoming in the wide earth. Grant that as we look upon the bird, the flower, the heavens above, upon morning and evening, we may associate them reverently with the divine goodness and power; blessed be the Lord, our God, for all the hidden treasures which are in Thy name. We pray Thee to look with merciful favor upon the multitudes which are crowding our gates. Keep them in such goodness, such cheerfulness, such true faith, and trust in God, our Father, that all the overflow of their lives shall be heavenly and divine. Grant that they may have such wisdom given to them, patience, and self-sacrifice that they may seek the things that make for peace, gentleness, love, honor for all men, and fidelity to the country which crowns them with such opportunities. Arm and strengthen us for every emergency of life by Thy wise guidance. May sorrow become joy, weakness strength, walking firmly with Thee, neither falling nor stumbling. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

APRIL 15, 1941.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. WINDER R. HARRIS as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress, from the Second Congressional District of Virginia, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Colgate W. Darden, Jr., is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Hon. WINDER R. HARRIS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM BY THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 382) on House Resolution No. 178 providing for the payment of the expenses incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs authorized to conduct studies and investigations of the progress of the national-defense program; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such studies and investigations or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Accounts, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM BY THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, from the same committee, I submit another privileged report (Rept. No. 383) on House Resolution No. 179 providing for the payment of the expenses incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs authorized to conduct studies and investigations of the progress of the national-defense program; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such studies and investigations or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is likewise a unanimous report.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1942

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 384) a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24), authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 2788), "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for 1942"; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2, of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee on the bill (H. R. 2788) entitled "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for 1942."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON INVESTIGATION OF CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 385) a privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled "Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power"; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled "Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power," of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 5,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Gladly.

Mr. MICHENER. This resolution provides for the distribution through the document room, I take it?

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman that there should not be distribution through the folding room for this particular document. However, may we have the assurance of the gentleman that he will use his good offices to see that the document room does not give them all out before the Members who have need for them have an opportunity to secure copies?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman may certainly have that assurance. May I add that it is the attitude of the Committee on Printing that documents such as these, for which many of us have no need, for instance, should not be distributed to all Members and therefore be wasted. However, we shall use our best efforts to see that everyone is supplied.

Mr. MICHENER. I appreciate the gentleman's statement that he has no use for these documents. They are technical. I happen to have the University of Michigan in my district and I have calls for a large number of these documents for use in teaching in universities. I want to be assured that I can get copies.

Mr. JARMAN. In this way you will be able to get more than you otherwise would.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am rather curious to know the basis of the request for the additional thousand copies of the independent offices hearing. I have been a member of that subcommittee for a great many years and this is the first time I can recall when there has been such a request. I am not advised as to who made the request for the additional copies.

Mr. JARMAN. May I say to the gentleman that that resolution has already been passed. However, the chairman of the subcommittee, as I understand, made that request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no other information in the province of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. JARMAN. That is all the information I have; simply that they are necessary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], today, I may address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of the coal strike.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS of Texas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special order of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], today, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKES AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have always considered that the mail a Member receives from his constituents is indicative to a certain extent of the sentiments existing in his particular district. Recently I have been receiving scores upon scores of letters from various people back home calling upon me to use every ounce of energy at my command to see to it that something was done to curtail the myriad labor disorders throughout the country. To many I have

answered that I have felt it was the prerogative and authority through constituted legislation of the President of the United States to handle this situation and that responsibility for settling these disputes was certainly within his grasp, but that I was ready and willing to vote upon any reasonable legislation that came before Congress to curtail the vicious, dilatory, and damaging strikes going on in the country today. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Providence Visitor of Thursday, March 27 last, in regard to labor and the national defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and include an editorial from the Duluth (Minn.) Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two short excerpts on the St. Lawrence seaway; and I ask that they be inserted separately.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and include therein a clipping from the Baltimore Sun and several letters from the Baltimore Association of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein portions of an article from the Sons of Italy magazine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by me on April 2 before the Chicago Association of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by Mr. Rex Stout on the American Forum of the Air hour over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very informative address by William Ritchie, of Omaha, Nebr., on the subject William Jennings Bryan, given at a Bryan birthday banquet.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit two requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Donald C. Galehouse on the distribution of surplus commodities in north Louisiana; and, second, to insert in the RECORD an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IS WAR IMMINENT?

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, the President of the United States issued an Executive order establishing the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supplies in the Executive Office of the President, defining its functions and duties. In that order he states as his authority section 120 of the National Defense Act. I quote from that authority:

Section 120 of the National Defense Act, title L, United States Code, section 80:

> The President, in time of war or when war is imminent, is empowered—

And so forth. He also quotes section 1, title XLIX, United States Code, which starts off:

> In time of war or threatened war, the President may certify—

And so forth. Mr. Speaker, can it be Mr. Roosevelt is indicating to the public that a state of war exists or that war is imminent? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes at the conclusion of the special orders for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

ENFORCE THE HOLDING COMPANY ACT

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] offered some criticisms of the present operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and suggested certain changes.

No doubt some of his complaints are justified, but, in my opinion, he seeks the wrong remedy. The main trouble is that the Securities and Exchange Commission has not enforced section 11 of the Holding Company Act, which provides for the breaking up of the vast, useless holding companies that sprawl over the Nation, levy additional tribute upon the consumers of electric energy in every State in the Union, and rig the securities market.

I call upon the Securities and Exchange Commission to proceed with the enforcement of section 11 of the Holding Company Act now. When that is done, the people will be relieved of a great deal of these excessive overcharges, local commissions will be able to function, and the purchasers of securities will know what they are buying.

Then it will not be necessary for the Securities and Exchange Commission to assume the position or the functions of what has been termed a "glorified stock exchange."

Our former colleague, Mr. Eicher, of Iowa, has just been made Chairman of the Commission, which encourages us to hope that section 11 of the Holding Company Act will now be enforced.

DO WE HAVE ANY DUTIES TO PERFORM?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but call attention to the statement made yesterday by the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], as follows:

> There is no program at all. On Thursday I know of nothing that will be brought up and there is no intention of bringing up anything.

Mr. Speaker, after I hear a few Members on that side of the House and many on the Republican side pleading that we do something for national defense, that we prohibit communistic tendencies in this country, when we know that a lot of these strikes now going on are fomented by the "fifth columnists," by people who are not real red-blooded Americans; when good American citizens want to work and are prohibited from working unless they do something against their own will, it seems to me the majority leader ought to have a program here that will stop these subversive activities. He ought to have a program that will bring America back to the time of Abraham Lincoln. Is this to continue as a free country? If so, then we must have freedom for labor. They should not be coerced into doing something they do not want to do. We are losing our freedom fast. Who is responsible? I say it is the laws passed the past 8 years that need to be revised.

The President has the power now to stop the strikes against our national defense. Why does he not do it? Why does not the majority leader see that legislation to correct the present evils is introduced in the House? We have the time. I will vote for it. Will you?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts on Oregon banks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any other special orders for tomorrow I may be permitted to speak 10 minutes instead of 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and also to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD another extension which will include an article from a Detroit newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

CLEANING HOUSE 3,000 MILES AWAY WHILE PARASITES OVERRUN OUR OWN HOME

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, what a tragedy that millions of dollars should be wasted, perhaps a million lives sacrificed, in a futile effort to force other nations to adopt and follow those principles of government which prevailed here in America until the coming of the New Deal.

What a tragedy that we should spend our treasure, take the lives of our young men, to carry freedom of speech, equality of opportunity, to people across the sea, while here at home both are denied to our own citizens.

"Equal justice under law" is the legend chiseled deep into the marble over the entrance to the United States Supreme Court in Washington. But here in America—the cradle of liberty and the home of freedom—there no longer is equality under law for our own citizens.

In the great manufacturing plants of the Allis-Chalmers Co. at West Allis, near Milwaukee, in Wisconsin, a few hundred men under the leadership of a Communist, whose party preaches the overthrow of this Government by force and whose wife is a Communist holding a Federal job, defied the forces of law and order, stoned the car of the Governor of Wisconsin, kept thousands of men from the jobs which were rightfully theirs, and held up the national-defense program for 75 days. The administration forced the plant authorities to reemploy those disloyal, lawless men, and, so far as we have learned, none has yet been punished for his violation of the law.

At Dearborn, near Detroit, in the plants of the Ford Motor Co., again a few hundred men forced more than 125,000 men into idleness; compelled loyal workers to lose wages amounting to more than $900,000 a day. These few hundred, directed by greedy, ambitious leaders, damaged valuable machinery, which it will be difficult to replace, to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars. They beat peaceful, law-abiding citizens; and they, too, at the insistence of representatives of the Federal Government—at the request of the Governor of the State of Michigan, Murray Van Wagoner, who failed to give loyal employees protection—were taken back on their jobs. So far, although they defied all law, although they beat and misused peaceful citizens—yes; even kidnaped some—none has been punished. But the Federal Government is insisting upon prosecuting Ford under the Wagner Act.

"Equality of opportunity everywhere in the world," said the President not so long ago in his address to Congress. Hundreds of thousands of dollars and American lives to enforce equality of opportunity in France, in Belgium, in China, in Greece, but not in Milwaukee; not in Detroit; not in other industrial cities in these United States.

Why is it that the President cannot see and cast out the beam from his own eye before attempting to cast out the mote from the eyes of people more than 3,000 miles away? Why not equal justice under law, equality of opportunity, for the workers of Ford, of Allis-Chalmers, for other employees throughout this Nation of ours?

Why not equality of opportunity, an equal chance to work, for those who do not belong to the labor organizations which are supporting and which aid in continuing the President in office? Why not a little application of the golden rule here at home? Why not protection for our own workers who wish to earn a livelihood?

The President having failed to give us equal justice under law, equality of opportunity, how much longer will Congress refuse to act?

The United States Supreme Court has recently held that men who never were employed in store or factory might nevertheless throw a picket line around either and keep employees from the jobs which were rightfully theirs, customers from the places where they desired to do business, and, in the end, destroy the business of the manufacturer or the merchant by such picketing.

That is the doctrine recently enunciated by our Supreme Court, which pointed out that such a result was not only possible, but had actually occurred and was legalized by the National Labor Relations Act; protected by the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia, the Sherman, and the Clayton Acts.

Only yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] attacked me on the floor of the House because I condemned the methods used in the strike at the Ford motor plant. Among other things, the gentleman said:

> Mr. Speaker, I did not think we would be able to adjourn until we heard the gentleman from Michigan again assail and attack labor organizations. Of course, in his eyes any man who advocates the cause of labor is a Communist and a "red."

His statement that in my eyes "any man who advocates the cause of labor is a Communist and a 'red' " is so absurd as to merit only ridicule. It proves, however, how inaccurate the gentleman can be. With as great a degree of accuracy, might I charge that he advocates the head cracking, the kidnaping, the malicious destruction of property carried on by some strikers.

I have not any thought that anyone who advocates the cause of labor is a Communist or a "red."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I will yield. Just a minute.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if I may have the indulgence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I withdraw my request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes so I may yield to him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request to interrupt the Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether or not he is defending these men at the Ford plant who are cracking the heads of the men who want to work. I am asking him whether or not he is defending those men.

Mr. SABATH. I will answer that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SABATH. No; you are asking me a question. I will answer that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I will answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. All right. Now, I do not defend any Communist or any man who is a real advocate of subversive activities against the United States, but I maintain that many progressive labor leaders who are honest and sincere in the cause of labor and who want to aid the cause of labor are being attacked

and assailed by several gentlemen on the floor day in and day out as "reds" and as Communists, and there is no foundation for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not assailed any honest labor leader nor called any such leader a Communist or a "red." You are seeing things that are not there. The only thing we have been talking about on this side of the House, the only thing I have heard criticized here, is the unlawful activities of certain so-called labor leaders. We are not objecting to anybody who is a legitimate labor man.

Mr. SABATH. I am against the racketeers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you defending the activities of Walter Reuther, Harry Bridges, and men of that kind?

Mr. SABATH. No; I am not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is my purpose from time to time to call the attention of the House to specific instances showing that members of labor organizations, workingmen who do not belong to labor organizations, are being deprived of their civil liberties, denied equality of opportunity, of protection under the Constitution.

It seems now to be accepted doctrine that the property of employers may be destroyed with impunity. As just stated, the Supreme Court upholds the constitutionality of the N. L. R. A., under which it admits a man's business may be destroyed. The Supreme Court has stated, as have circuit courts of appeal in several instances, that the remedy lies with Congress.

It is my purpose to remind the Members of Congress as often as the opportunity offers, of the fact that the Federal Government and we, by our inactivity, are denying to our citizens equal justice under law, equality of opportunity; destroying their civil rights.

This afternoon let me give you excerpts from the testimony of a witness who testified on April 8, 1941, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, Judge Arthur J. Tuttle presiding, even though I have just quoted some of that testimony. This testimony shows how the great Ford motor plant, which in one plant employed 85,000 men, was closed. It shows the methods used by the strikers, by that organization which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Atlanta [Mr. RAMSPECK] so often defend.

William Burnette, superintendent of the pressed-steel building of the Ford Motor Co., in which there were working, on April 1, 8,500 men, testified as to the method used to close one branch of the plant.

He met some 15 men near his office. One had a wooden mall, 6 inches in diameter, 10 inches long, weighing approximately 10 pounds. He asked the man with the mall, "What are you doing with that mall?" He replied, "If anyone refuses to stop, we are going to use it." The man and his backers went down the lines of machines—there were some 3,000 of them in that building—and the machines were stopped. All these men were strangers to the superintendent.

But two employees, both colored men, working on the fender job, refused to shut down their machine, and the superintendent testified that in order to prevent bloodshed he told them to quit work.

That may be, in the estimation of some—it may be even in the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter—peaceful picketing. It may be an expression of free speech. But the workers in the factory understood that it meant serious bodily injury if they did not cease work and close the plant.

Conduct equally unlawful, unpunished, took place upon the highways of Michigan. C. I. O. pickets denied citizens the right to use the highways, to go about their lawful business. State police did not prevent such unlawful interference with the use of the highways, nor did they prevent employees who desired to work from being assaulted and beaten.

This all on the theory that if they interfered with the activities of the pickets there would be bloodshed. On the same theory, neither the thief, the robber, the footpad, nor the murderer would be opposed, for opposing him might incite violence—might result in the spilling of blood.

That the foregoing statement of lack of protection, of the denial of civil liberties, is true, let me call attention to the sworn testimony given by John Lasanen, in the same court, on the same day.

For 12 years Lasanen had been—and he was on the occasion to which reference was made—a member of the Detroit police department, assigned to the fourteenth precinct. On the 2d of April 1941 he was off duty, and, as he was a veteran who desired treatment at the veterans' hospital at Southfield and Outer Drive, attempted to use Miller Road to reach the hospital.

He was driving his own car, wearing his police badge and his police shirt. He was first stopped on Greenfield, south of Michigan Avenue, by C. I. O. pickets, and told to go back. He asked where he could go through to get to the veterans' hospital, and the reply was that he could get through if he could get permission from a strike leader on Miller Road.

Between 30 and 40 men were in the group which stopped him on Greenfield, which is a public highway. They wore C. I. O. buttons and some wore Ford U. A. W. caps.

Lasanen told the pickets that he was a veteran and a police officer and told them he wanted to go to the veterans' hospital for treatment. He showed the pickets his badge. He showed them his V. F. W. button, but they refused to let him through.

He then drove his car back to Michigan Avenue, up Shafer Avenue, until he came to a group of three or four hundred pickets, wearing buttons. Again he was stopped; again he told the pickets that he was a Detroit police officer, a veteran, and that his mission was to reach the veterans' hospital for treatment.

The pickets started gathering around the car. Then, said the witness:

A brick came through my windshield. They started getting hold of me. Some grabbed me by the collar, some by the necktie, some by the sleeve of my coat, and I pulled my gun. I said, "Get back; leave me out of here." I said, "Leave me out of here; that is all I want of you. I ain't got nothing to do with your outfit. All I want is to get to the veterans' hospital."

As I held the crowd back on one side, somebody grabbed me from the one side and pinned me, and when I turned around I don't know whether I released my gun or let it down, and my gun was gone then, and a man with a C. I. O. cap on took my badge off me. * * *

They went through my pockets and what change I had they took it. That was about 60 cents in change. * * *

I was struck above the right eye, on the arm here, and on the elbow, and mostly by flying brick and some by fists.

Just beyond where I was stopped was a barricade of cars, lengthwise, crosswise of the road.

When I showed them my V. F. W. button, told them who I was, they said, "It don't make no difference who you are. We are running this."

Question. Have you got your gun and badge back?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. Your 60 cents back?

Answer. No, sir.

The witness then testified that they told him to get out of his car and partly forced him; and—

I got out with them, and I asked them to bring my car for me, and they told me to get a wrecker and bring back some C. I. O. men with hats and they would let me have my car.

So I goes with these men, and I call for a wrecker, and they wouldn't permit that wrecker to go in there. They were going to tip it, and they ordered them out, and the city of Dearborn wrecker tried to get in, and they ordered them out. They wouldn't let the wrecker get that car. * * *

I got it that evening, I should judge, about 8 o'clock.

The COURT. What was broken on the car so that you couldn't drive it away?

Answer. They damaged the motor; they broke all the glass out of it. They dented the body on different parts of the body; they flattened all four tires but the front tubes, and I don't know—the back one they had let the air out. They probably run the car around, because the wheels were out of round. They were dented from being run on the rim. * * * They set fire to that back cushion.

The foregoing testimony shows an utter failure on the part of the State police of Michigan, who were under the jurisdiction of Michigan's Governor, to protect a citizen of the State.

Hundreds of other instances, differing only as to time and degree, can be cited. More will be given to the House from time to time, but the question which is today propounded to each individual Member of the House is this: Can it be said that we are regarding seriously and fulfilling either in letter or in spirit the oath which we took when we became Members of this body?

And the further inquiry is this: How long, the administration and local authorities having failed to protect American citizens in their efforts to earn a livelihood, in their desire to assist in our national defense, how long will we sit here and by our inaction permit this unlawful conduct to continue? The answer is one which no man can make for another. It is one which each must give and it should be one which will satisfy the conscience of each of us.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the strike in the bituminous-coal fields of the country is giving me grave concern. Not a pound of coal is produced in my district—the Seventh District of Virginia—which is largely agricultural, and we are not in the usual industrial sense a big consumer of coal. Therefore I can approach the subject without any local personal interest, and I hope I can discuss it briefly without any personal bitterness.

We all know that Mr. Hitler's program is one of divide and conquer, and it has been Mr. Hitler's boast that he will never have to make a military attack upon us because we are going to be divided so much among ourselves that we will fall because of internal war before we ever face an external war. The strike in the coal fields is vitally affecting our defense program, since about 75 percent of industry, as well as transportation, is dependent upon coal. We are losing a production now of approximately 2,000,000 tons a day, and we have already lost about 20,000,000 tons. We do not know whether we can make it up or not.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman tell us what branch of the Government has jurisdiction over this strike situation, and what it is doing about it?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In answer to my friend, I would say, as he of course knows, the Department of Labor has jurisdiction and has delegated its chief conciliator, Dr. Steelman, to try to settle this strike. He has been unable to do it. The southern operators have asked that the Secretary of Labor certify this strike to the Mediation Board, and apparently that will be the step next to be taken, if we get an adjustment of the strike.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COX. Has the Mediation Board any power other than Dr. Steelman has to enforce its findings? As a matter of fact I think Dr. Steelman is very much of a better influence and produces very much better results than we can hope to get from the Mediation Board.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The southern operators who have been under his jurisdiction for the past 2 weeks do not agree with my distinguished friend from Georgia. When the bill to continue the Bituminous Coal Act came up, the Virginia president of the Virginia Coal Miners Organization came to see me about it. Incidentally he is a very fine man. I told him that I did not believe in Government price fixing, that I voted against the bill in 1935 and again in 1937. He urged upon me the national emergency. He said that it is essential in the national defense that we continue this business on a stabilized basis, and that if the miners could enter into a contract with the operators at a fair wage so that they would know what they would pay and still stay in business, it would be the right thing. I said, "Are you going to use this price fixing to make exorbitant demands upon the operators for a new wage scale?" He said, "Absolutely not"—that those engaged in the mining of coal are just as patriotic as anyone else in the country, and he said that they also recognized that if they got the cost of coal too high, they would lose business to competitive fuels, such as oil and gas and electricity. As is known, Mr. Speaker, I voted to continue the Bituminous Coal Act, although I did not believe in the theory of Government price fixing. When the conference met, the head of the miners, Mr. Lewis, presented his demands, and for the first time, so far as I know in conferences of this kind, he not only refused to waive one red cent of his demands, but increased his demands after the conference started. He asked a dollar a day increase, and a minimum wage of a dollar an hour, and an increase for mechanical operators of a dollar and a half, an increase which would put some of them up to $9 a day. There is not another industry that I know of in the country that has a minimum wage of a dollar an hour, and that is what Mr. Lewis has demanded for a 7-hour day and a 35-hour week. After the conference started he said, in addition to that, "we propose to wipe out the differential that has always existed between the northern and the southern fields." Before the fields were unionized, the differential was greater than it is now, but when the N. R. A. code was prepared by Mr. Lewis and his collaborators and approved by the President several years ago, certain differentials were established. The northern fields were fixed 40 cents a day above the Virginia and West Virginia fields, $1 above the Kentucky fields, and $1.80 above the Alabama fields.

The Kentucky fields were a dollar lower; the Alabama fields $1.80 lower. Mr. Lewis proposed, after these strikes started, that that differential be eliminated and that the Virginia and West Virginia fields be increased $1.40 a day; that the Kentucky fields be increased $2 a day and the Alabama fields be increased $2.80 a day. That increase, on an expected production of 500,000,000 tons, will amount to about $200,000,000 a year. One Virginia company that has an annual output of about 250,000 tons applied that rate to its January work and found that it added 45 cents a ton to the cost of production of its coal. Under the Bituminous Coal Act, whenever the cost of production goes up as much as 2 cents a ton, the law requires the Bituminous Coal Division to revise the minimum-wage scale.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FLANNERY. I am not familiar with the bituminous-coal industry, but may I ask what the average yearly wage is?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Of course, that has been the fly in the ointment in the coal fields. We have about 400,000 men engaged in producing what 300,000 men could produce in normal times, and there has not been steady employment. In many of the mines those men did not get over 125 or 150 days' employment in 1 year. While the hourly rate was high and the weekly rate was high, the total yearly earnings, considering the cost of living in the coal fields, which is a little higher than in the average section, has been a poor return for the miners.

Mr. FLANNERY. About what was it; does the gentleman know?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not have those figures, I am sorry to say; but, of course, you know, because you are familiar with coal, that we opened up a great many coal mines when coal went to $20 a ton during the World War. We got 400,000 or more employees in there to do the work of 300,000, and the work had to spread among them, and there was not steady employment. But now we face a different situation. It was testified before the Ways and Means Committee that these mines will probably reach a maximum capacity on the 35-hour week sometime this fall, and the total production for this year will be about 500,000,000 tons; but by November it will be in excess of a 500,000,000-ton rate.

Now, see what is going to happen if this proposal is carried out. Incidentally, Dr. Steelman is doing all in his power to force the southern operators to accept this proposal, when they tell him they cannot possibly stay in business on that wage. Mr. Lewis provides in this wage scale that for over 35 hours in 1 week, time and one-half shall be paid, unless that day is Saturday or Sunday, when double time shall be paid. On any holiday that they have to work double time will be paid.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is going to force me to revise my opinion of Dr. Steelman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Now, that brings me to this point: It takes a ton and a half of coal to make 1 ton of coke. It takes 2 tons of coke to make 1 ton of steel. Already steel has increased its minimum wage 10 cents an hour, bringing them up to 72 cents an hour, I believe, which is still away below this proposal. This increase in the cost of coal that goes into coke, that goes into steel, will amount to about $1.25 a ton increase in the cost of steel. If the southern fields, which produce about half of the needs of the country, cannot operate you can see where we will be from the standpoint of national defense if the northern fields alone stay in business and attempt to supply the defense needs of the country.

The shut-down has already affected steel, because most of the coke ovens in Pennsylvania and especially the beehive ovens are already down. When you shut down a coke oven and draw it you cannot get it in operation again in less than a

week, and then if it cools off too rapidly it will crack and that has to be repaired before it goes into operation. It will take from 1 week to 3 weeks to get most of these mines in full operation again. We are losing tonnage at the rate of 2,000,000 tons a day, and, as I say, we are already behind some 20,000,000 tons.

I am sorry to say, and I hate to say this at the Easter time, the anniversary of the resurrection of One whose love commenced where men's hatred ended, at the Eastertide, I say, there is a definite movement on the part of certain northern interests to crush competition of the southern coal mines, and if the southern operators are crushed their 150,000 employees go down with them. They have endorsed this proposal to wipe out the differentials that will add $2 a day in Kentucky and $2.80 a day in Alabama. Much of our coal goes north. The Norfolk & Western Railway hauls 10,000,000 tons a year into the Ohio industrial area, and southern operators shipping to that area pay $1 a ton more in freight than is charged to the Pennsylvania and Ohio operators. Much of the coal in New England comes from the Virginia and West Virginia fields, goes to our Hampton Roads, a haul of 300 or 400 miles, is there loaded on boats, goes up the coast, is loaded in the freight trains, and then goes into the interior at a cost of $1 to $2 a ton in transportation more than coal from the Pennsylvania fields.

I say to you, my colleagues, and I hope I can say it without any bitterness, the essential program of our national defense is involved in this strike and in a demand that I personally feel is unreasonable and one that the southern operators cannot possibly meet and stay in business. When industry in France was put on a 40-hour week production fell 60 percent. When Germany went on a 60-hour week and increased the production of planes to 1,000 a month, the production of planes in France fell to 38 a month. According to one Frenchman, at that period every man from the one who wore the silk hat to the one who wore the overalls seemed to regard his Government as a grab bag, and the program was to see who could grab the most and grab it the quickest.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This strike which the gentleman has described so clearly and eloquently has been in effect, or, rather, the lockout, or walkout, since April the 1st.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is perfectly apparent they cannot get together because Mr. Lewis has said he will not yield anything whatsoever.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is it not primarily a case that ought to be immediately and without further delay referred to the Mediation Board in order that they could try to work out something that would be satisfactory to both sides?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I think so, and that is what the southern operators are asking. They say they are willing to give an 11-percent increase right now, go to work now, fill these defense needs, and then adjudicate by aid of the Board what the permanent contract shall be.

I was going to say that a great English statesman, Edmund Burke, once said, "Nations do not learn by experience." I hope we do not prove that is true in this emergency. France did not learn anything by experience. I hope we can learn something from the experience of France. We do not want to make of the expenditure of this $40,000,000,000 defense fund a grab bag for industry, for labor, or for capital. Senator CONNALLY said at the Jackson Day dinner in Richmond:

> There is but one Union to which we all owe allegiance, and that is the Union of the 48 States. The interests of that Union must always come first.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 7 minutes.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a problem confronts this Nation in connection with strikes in the defense industries which, unless it is met and solved courageously and promptly, may ruin the country.

If anyone were to propose a law permitting aliens—those who are not citizens—to vote in any of our civil elections, he would be regarded as a crackpot. Anyone who would propose to clothe aliens with authority in the military service in a time of peril or national emergency would likewise be regarded as a crackpot.

Yet it is a singular and sinister fact that aliens are permitted to hold office in unions and to vote in those organizations when it comes to selecting their bargaining agent and their officers, and when it comes to deciding whether or not a defense industry shall be tied up by a strike, jurisdictional or otherwise. The law does not permit aliens to vote in municipal, State, or national elections. It must be apparent that reasons why they should not be permitted to do so in unions exist in far greater measure. We are daily faced with the startling fact that the activities of union aliens, many of them officers of their organizations, are contributing much to the present unfortunate conditions in national-defense industries.

It is a fact recognized by every responsible military and naval official, by every Member of Congress, by every experienced observer in this country, that the most dangerous sabotage, the most dangerous undermining of our defense efforts can come and will come through strikes, slow-downs, sit-downs, and walkouts in our defense industries, if sabotage comes at all.

The great danger we face is not that "fifth columnists" will work as they did in France or Holland when the enemy started through those countries. Our great danger is that those "fifth columnists," using honest but deluded American workmen as their instruments, will do to us what they did to France—defeat our national-defense efforts by strikes and walk-outs before an enemy army appears.

Even the administration no longer attempts to conceal the sinister gravity of the strike menace in our defense industries. For a time it did, but it was impossible to fool the American people in the face of the veritable plague of strikes which has swept defense industries.

There is not the slightest reason, economic or otherwise, why aliens, such as Harry Bridges, should be permitted to come into this country and assume positions of power or dictation in our Government, in our military establishments, or in our labor unions. There is nothing in the Constitution which gives the alien the right to usurp a place of power and authority which he can use against the best interests of the Nation which harbors him. There is nothing in our American way which gives any alien such rights. There is nothing in logic or common sense which dictates that we should be so utterly foolish as to continue to permit the operation of this form of ready sabotage of our national defense.

This is not to say, of course, that all aliens are enemies of the United States of America by any means. But it is to say that honest, earnest, sincere aliens, whose love for and sympathies with, lie with this country do not themselves want to be exposed to the danger of blame for what unprincipled aliens, paid agents of the dictators or otherwise, might do. The right kind of aliens would much prefer that they have no voice in deciding these momentous questions, so the worthy one will not be blamed and perhaps suffer painful consequences for the acts of others.

It is a matter of amazement to officials of other countries, military and civil, that we in America permit this sort of thing as we do. Unlike us, those foreign officials do not regard these things as tolerance; they regard them as plain stupidity, and they are nothing short of that.

There are no grounds whatever upon which the right of aliens to hold office and vote in these strike ballots can be defended. There is no reason whatever why aliens should be allowed to have any voice in deciding such questions at all.

It is time for America to wake up and, through its Congress, put a stop to this practice.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to make this observation: I believe I can see this in operation now. That is, the effort that is going to be made to smother this public demand that is coming to us for legislation dealing with the strike situation. It is going to be contended that strikes are being adjusted, that if left alone they will soon pass out of the picture. I want to express the hope that the people will not be deceived by any such contention as that and that the Congress will not fail them, itself, and the country in meeting its responsibility so far as the enactment of legislation that will do the job is concerned.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I have just returned from 10 days in my district, and while the people everywhere are much concerned about our being taken step by step into the present World War, I think there is more complaint and more apprehension expressed regarding the growing strikes everywhere throughout this country and the things that are being done in that way to sabotage our defense program.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will permit another observation, may I say, whether intended or not, there has evolved out of the revolution that which I think it is fair for us to label as a labor government. It remains to be seen with what degree of justice it can rule.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I believe the people of this country are wide awake to the things now going on and will insist that the Congress do its full duty under the circumstances.

Mr. COX. Probably not quite as conservative as the MacDonald government of England, but certainly not as radical as the Bloom government of France.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. On that I am not so sure I agree with the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing the necessary legislation to put an end to the activities I have just discussed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the special orders for today I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, we must realize the seriousness of the present hour. Let us not deceive ourselves by imagining we are living in some fool's paradise that wise men overlook.

Since this Nation has embarked upon undertakings, which in substance mean that the taxpayers are underwriting much of the cost of the present world war for the democracies, the time has arrived when the Federal Government should exercise every precaution to prevent break-downs or stoppages in our own defense program.

From the delays which have already occurred, it is apparent that we must act quickly if we are to do anything effectively to safeguard our own interests. Every informed person now knows that by the steps, which, one by one, have led us to the brink of war, the Nation has been placed in a complicated situation under international law. Should the Axis Powers unfortunately win a decisive victory over the democracies, the United States will stand to lose not only that which we have leased, lent, and invested to help secure a democratic victory, but, in addition, our Nation would probably be held liable by the victors for damage, losses, or defeats suffered by reason of the assistance rendered against them by this Nation.

We need assurance that our own defense program costing billions of dollars will be executed with dispatch, with economy, and with honesty. The investigations heretofore authorized by this House will provide that assurance if they are carried forward with vigor. Both committees will need funds and both should be armed with full authority to inquire into every phase of the whole defense program. House Resolution 162 directs the committees to proceed and by means of studies and investigations, determine whether the program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically. This is a big assignment. To determine the objectives requires a study of men, methods, and materials. It requires a study of capital, management, and labor. It requires a study of motives. The national-defense program cannot be successfully executed if the management is loaded with dollar patriots.

It cannot be successfully executed unless capital cooperates with labor, labor with capital, and the Government must cooperate with both.

The whole program can be sabotaged by profiteers and political chiselers just as quickly and effectively as by professional saboteurs. We have got to get down to brass tacks and to work.

No patriotic American could avoid arriving at this conclusion after carefully reviewing the events of the past 12 months on our industrial front.

During that time, with millions unemployed and upon public relief, there has been strike after strike, fire after fire, and explosion after explosion in the industries of the Nation. While the strikes are too numerous to mention, I desire to call particular attention to the fact that there have been 11 disastrous explosions and 16 destructive fires that have directly affected national defense in the last year. There have been many lives lost and the property damage was enormous. It has been charged that some of the strikes can be traced to communistic and alien influences; there are also charges that some of the fires and explosions that have occurred are the work of professional saboteurs.

These charges have been made in public by men high in the administration. As early as last November 20, Inspector Louis B. Nichols, Administrative Assistant to F. B. I. Director J. Edgar Hoover, in an address delivered before 3,600 delegates to the National Interfraternity Conference meeting in New York City, declared—

that schools for saboteurs were operating throughout the United States under the tutelage of agents of belligerent foreign governments.

Only last Saturday night Vice President Henry L. Wallace, in an address at Winston-Salem, N. C., charged that—

foreign agents are sabotaging our labor organizations to the great disadvantage of labor itself.

If Mr. Nichols of the F. B. I. knows of schools for saboteurs and the Vice President knows that foreign agents are sabotaging our labor organizations, is it not strange that neither Madam Perkins, the Secretary of Labor, nor Sidney Hillman were able to throw any light on the subject when they appeared before the Military Affairs Committee last week? Is it not strange, too, that J. Edgar Hoover should be unwilling to appear before the Military Affairs Committee to give them the information his principle assistant was willing to hand out in public last November? There ought to be someone in the Government who knows something about Communists, Fascists, Nazis, and all the other subversive groups, foreign or domestic, that are charged with undercover, un-American activities.

I want to know who that someone in the Government is. I believe the public wants to know, too.

There are a great many things that give me concern about the management of the whole defense program.

I am concerned over the activities of one Walter Reuther in the defense program and the labor movement as well.

Mr. Speaker, Walter Reuther is one of the three Reuther brothers of Detroit, Mich. The three brothers, Roy, Victor, and Walter, have been active in the labor movement for several years. They have been mentioned many times in the Dies committee hearings, and Walter has been identified by witnesses as a radical Socialist, a revolutionary Socialist, an associate of Communists, and even a Communist by some.

Now I have no intimate knowledge of Walter Reuther, and am depending upon the Dies committee reports and various news releases for my information. Last summer Sidney Hillman appointed Walter Reuther as a member of the Advisory Commission on labor training in industry. Did Mr. Hillman know that the Dies committee was in possession of copies of a letter written by Walter Reuther while in Russia to a friend in this country admonishing him to "carry on the fight for a Soviet America"?

I for one would like to know what Mr. Hillman knew about Walter Reuther and his philosophies and why he received this appointment.

I would also like to know more about the motives that impelled Walter Reuther recently to ask the United Automobile Workers of America, employed in the various General Motors plants, for authority to call a strike of all employees excepting those engaged in defense work.

This Reuther fellow, and the things I have read about him, makes me wonder whether or not he should have a place in the defense program when there are plenty of capable men in America who hold no such views as "carry on the fight for a Soviet America."

Mr. Speaker, while I am somewhat disturbed about the activities of certain individuals on the labor front, I am also disturbed about the activities of other groups on the financial front.

I for one would like to have the investigating committees look into the background and history of the Brecon Loading Co., a Delaware corporation, wholly owned by the Coca-Cola Co. I want to know just why this corporation

was set up and how they could, with only a paper organization, secure a defense contract amounting to over $14,000,000 on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. I think the public will want to know all about this contract, too. I intend to do my best to find out what I can.

Mr. Speaker, there is yet another matter the two committees should investigate and that, sir, is the propaganda that is being sent out from Washington to deceive the American people.

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, the American people are resolved against our participation in Europe's war. I know the overwhelming sentiment of my district is against convoys, against the sending of American boys to the slaughter fields of Europe, Africa, or Asia.

We believed the President, and also Mr. Willkie, when they promised that no American soldier would fight on foreign soil unless we were first attacked.

But there are, sir, a group of propagandists who seek to create the public impression that there is a war fever in this country.

One of these propagandists is employed by the Wall Street Journal. I do not know his name, but I do know that he is poorly informed and extremely careless in his conclusions. I want the committee to search out and find the man who can find war fever in this country.

The Wall Street Journal for April 11, 1941, said on its front page:

Balkan blow-up inflamed public opinion and permitted new war-aid moves.

Roosevelt seized the chance to act forcefully, transferring cutters to England and bringing Greenland under United States guaranty.

Earlier he had been hanging back, had declined to ask for a new Defense Powers Act on prices, priorities, and commandeering. "Public isn't ready." But now war fever is up. Congress' mail shows it. Quasi-official Army and Navy Register demands "actual declaration of war."

What war fever? There is a fever against war but it would take a Houdini to conjure up evidence of a fever for war. This war fever that the Wall Street Journal talks about is the hope and creation of the warmongers only. The people do not want war. Why not investigate the active promoters of this so-called war fever? I want to know who they are. My people want to know who they are.

Mr. Speaker, there is one final group in the defense program that has me puzzled. I am unable to understand just why certain men were selected for membership on the super mediation board recently created by the President. I am puzzled particularly over the appointment of one man, who is to represent the public in the settlement of labor controversies.

Mr. Speaker, that man is Dr. Frank P. Graham. Understand, I make no charges whatsoever against him, but frankly I am puzzled and want to know the facts. I hold in my hand a booklet published this year and circulated under copyright by the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., of New Haven, Conn. In this booklet, entitled "The Fifth Column Versus the Dies Committee," on pages 20 and 21, I find the following comment:

Among the "prominent college presidents," the name of Dr. Frank P. Graham bobs up quite often. Dr. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, was once a board member of Soviet Russia's State University of Moscow summer school for training American students in communism. Most recently he was president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, identified by Earl Browder before the Dies committee as a "transmission belt" for Communist propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, I promptly referred to the Dies committee hearings after reading this about Dr. Graham, and in volume 7, page 4483, of the hearings, I find that as a matter of fact Earl Browder did testify the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was classed as a Communist "transmission belt." But, Mr. Speaker, I did not stop here—I began searching to find out what I could about the kind of teaching Americans received in Moscow, and in the hearings of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, set up to make an investigation and study of the Works Progress Administration, in volume I, page 1095, I find the following testimony by Charles H. White, New York Negro, and former member of the Communist Party. He had been in Russia. Here is what he was taught.

Mr. WHITE. Practically the whole time I was there, for about 18 months, I was with about 100 other Americans, who were there for the same purpose, and we were instructed in sharpshooting classes and taught the handling and manipulation of rapid-fire machine guns, how to construct the various barricades in street fighting, defending public squares, taking public buildings, and how to destroy the tank, that is the military tank, and horseback riding, and secret coding.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of training one group of Americans received in Moscow. I want to know more about these Moscow summer schools.

But to get back to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

I have, sir, in my hand, a bulletin issued by the Alabama Council of Democratic Clubs. In this bulletin the Southern Conference for Human Welfare comes in for some very unkind remarks. Let me quote just one or two passages from this bulletin:

This was not a conference of southern people representing the South, but of interlopers with ideas, purposes, and designs inimical to southern traditions and entirely foreign to the South's peace, happiness, well-being, and progress.—Alabama Women's Democratic Club.

And another:

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare has let the southern people, white and black, down, and so has committed an offense against common decency.—From the Montgomery Advertiser.

Mr. Speaker, I find from the bulletin issued by the Alabama Council of Democratic Clubs that Dr. Frank P. Graham is the chairman of a committee on civil rights within the welfare conference. I also find the following comment on the Southern Conference of Human Welfare:

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which condemned capitalism as opposed to communism, our voting laws, segregation of races, and our southern traditions, was led and sponsored by, and composed of 99 percent Federal office holders and rabble-rousing radicals, few of whom ever thought of serving their community or country without pay.

Mr. Speaker, if Dr. Graham was in fact such an important factor in this organization, if he in fact did serve as a board member of the University of Moscow's summer school for training American students in communism, then I say he is no man to represent the public on this super mediation board. The people ought to know all about Dr. Graham.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support this investigation. It must be thorough. There must be no soft pedaling, no whitewashing, no shielding of favorites. We at least must realize the seriousness of the present hour. Let us not deceive ourselves by imagining we are living in some fool's paradise that wise men overlook. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore made, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by the director of the southern division of the A. A. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have secured this time simply to read a letter from the president of the trade and labor council in Great Falls, Mont., a very well informed and high-class patriotic American, which I think is a very sane and at least a very temperate statement of the strike situation as he found it after he had traveled along the Pacific coast:

I have just returned from the coast, where I had a good first-hand glimpse of living conditions surrounding defense industries. It is my well-considered opinion that it is an insult to the intelligence and patriotism of the American worker to brand as communistic-inspired every move they make to better their conditions. Investigation shows that some of these men employed in industry contributing to defense make as low as $12 a week if they work full time. Now, couple this with the fact that some of these workers, because of a shortage of housing, have to live 20 miles from their work. The round trip of 20 miles a day by car would mean an expense in gas and oil of at least 50 cents a day. If anyone can explain how these workers can possibly contribute anything to the support of a family under conditions such as this, then I

shall gladly accept the charge that these workers are led by Communists; but my experience in dealing with Communists, "reds," and radicals is that if you give a man a job where he can raise his family in somewhere near decency and health he becomes poor material for a Communist, "red," or radical. It is my studied opinion that the Government could do more to stop strikes and lockouts by making it their business to see that the defense workers had a decent place to live and wages enough to raise their families in decency than by any other method. The Government assists industry by furnishing money for expansion. It is only reasonable, then, that they protect the human element in industry by eliminating the deplorable living conditions surrounding defense industries.

The Members will recall on the beginning of our defense program that the industries practically refused to proceed or went on a strike, so to speak, until they knew what kind of a tax bill Congress was going to pass, until they saw the lid sort of being taken off on the profits they were going to make, and saw that their expansion program was going to be pretty well taken care of by the United States Government. The newspapers, I notice, did not emphasize that situation very much, but let us watch the scare headlines of the newspapers all over the country saying the unions are holding up production and all that sort of thing.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am glad the gentleman has read this letter from his constituent. It gives us an angle on the situation that we ought to have. It is a very reasonable, temperate, and moderate statement of his case.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is a little more in the letter which I want to read. I thank the gentleman for his remarks on the letter and his contribution to what I am saying.

I am reliably informed that workers pay as much as $30 per month just for parking space for a trailer in many areas around defense-industry plants. The Government alone can stop this by building living quarters for these workers because certainly private interests could not be expected to provide housing for hundreds of thousands of temporary workers who are being drawn into defense-industry communities.

It makes nice sounding patriotism to proclaim that everyone should make sacrifices in the name of national defense but it is just too much to expect the worker to strip himself and family of all decency in order that landlords and industry can make a profit.

Most newly hired adult male common laborers receive a starting rate of pay ranging between 42½ and 67½ cents an hour, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey of entrance rates of common laborers prevailing in 20 large industries in July 1940. Nearly one-sixth of the workers started on the job for exactly 30 cents an hour—the minimum prescribed by the Fair Labor Standards Act for industries engaged in interstate commerce—and nearly a third were paid a starting rate of less than 42½ cents.

I think these figures should be made public knowledge in defense of strikes in defense industries. Certainly the American standard of living cannot be maintained on these wage levels and the American worker should not be expected to make all of the sacrifices.

Sincerely yours,

B. I. STEINMETZ, *President*.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about the fellows who are getting 72½ cents an hour?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no words of defense to offer for a strike where a good wage scale is paid and where a course of safety is pursued for the workingman. But where a mere pittance is paid under poor working conditions—then strike should not be denied to the workingman. It is his only weapon. I understand nearly all of the strikes are settled, and everything is going fine. I will say this: There should be no such thing as a jurisdictional strike. That should be out in times like these.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is not what I was trying to get at.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will let me continue.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That should be out; but on the other hand, I do not believe in denying the workman the right to strike when the Nation is at peace if he is underpaid. We are still at peace. We are not in the war, thank God.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, we are on the tax end of it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are not at war, we are still at peace. So far as I am concerned, we are going to keep out of that war as an active participant.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman will strike that from his speech.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did not get the gentleman's question?

Mr. COX. I asked the gentleman to yield that I might say that as I interpreted the letter as read from Mr. Steinmetz, he is not undertaking to say that anybody is a Communist at all, he is simply undertaking to say that the best cure for the radical is a job at living wages.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The point I was trying to make was, so many of the workers, farm workers, for example, get 20 or 25 cents an hour, and these other fellows are getting 75 cents and a dollar an hour. That is where the injustice comes in.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no doubt that there have been jurisdictional strikes that are unjustified, but I tell you their relative importance has been overemphasized by the press. I do not know what the purpose is, but we all know that when it comes down to brass tacks, according to the labor paper published here in Washington—and I think it is one of the most reliable publications I know——

Mr. COX. What paper is that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The paper called Labor, published here in Washington. Its editor is Mr. Keating. I believe he is one of the most reliable publishers in the city of Washington.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman mean to tell the House that that is the source from which he gets his information on the employer-employee relationship? They are special pleaders for labor alone. They want to exaggerate the claims of the group they represent. I am not disposed to criticize, but you let me control your source of information and I will control your thinking. If you get your information on the labor situation from the paper the gentleman has indicated, you will think just exactly as that paper does, and I do not believe it is always sound, nor is it quite fair.

Mr. O'CONNOR. When it makes a statement that I find has been approved by a great many people who are supposed to be informed on the subject, then I adopt it as pretty close to being true. For instance, the last issue of the Labor paper pointed out that only 1 out of every 250 laborers who were employed had been on a strike during the defense program; in other words, it was less than 1 percent of those engaged in industry who went on strike. I find that that statement in substance was made some place at a Jefferson Day banquet by Mrs. Roosevelt, where she pointed out that the number of workers on strike during the time from the beginning of our defense program amounted to less than 1 percent. That fits in with the statement in the paper called Labor.

Mr. COX. Quote somebody else on that score and let me call it an alibi.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have read a great many of the statements made by Mrs. Roosevelt, and, just as my good friend said about the letter I read, they have been mighty sane, sound, temperate, and fine American patriotic statements.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there to me?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about this one statement she made about the electrical union in New York, which is one of the most radical of the unions, so I was advised by the president of the international union, Mr. Cary. She told that group she was glad they had ceased to act as individuals and were acting as a group, and she hoped they would go on in order to follow that out. You have one group pulling against the other. She is advocating that these fellows in industrial plants get all they can. Suppose our farmers do the same thing and we have a sit-down strike, what are these city fellows going to eat? What are they going to use for food after a while?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let me say this to the gentleman. I do not know, of course, what Mrs. Roosevelt said on that occasion, if anything, but——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me tell you first, let them come out and plant some potatoes and dig them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Individual action amounts to nothing. If it were not for unions in this country, labor would today

be working for a starvation wage. The union has been the means to place the workingman in a position so he might live decently.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman advocates class against class, then, does he?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I advocate the unionization of labor, because it is through the unions that labor has been able to get some of its rights in this country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to make the observation that this country is in a very critical situation at the present time, and our allies are now on the run. We have got to cease this slobbering over so-called social gains and get down to business and prepare for war. We cannot wage a war on W. P. A. principles. Now, we might just as well get that in our minds now as later on, and the sooner we come to that realization the better for America.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I partly agree with the gentleman, we must prepare for war, but apply that rule to industry the same as you do to the workingman. Industry got their rights off the bat—before they would turn a wheel. Their profits were made secure before they would cooperate.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Does the gentleman recall that last summer in connection with the tax bill the defense industries held up for 6 months the whole defense program so they could get their hand in the sack clear up to the arm pit, in order that they could wipe out all limitations on contracts and in order that they could have the Vinson-Trammell Act repealed from the statute books, limiting the profit on Navy contracts, and in order that they could have amortization of taxes, and we gave them a gift of 75 percent of the taxes they were paying, in order that the sky would be the limit and there would be no competitive bidding and in order that there could be negotiated contracts on a fixed-fee basis. Why do we not ask these industries to make corresponding sacrifices when we demand that labor should make them?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is just 100 percent right and I want to comment on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me call your attention right there to the fact that Mr. Ford offered to turn over his factory without profit if the others would do the same thing.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; but Mr. Ford is one out of a million.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why should the administration try to destroy him?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not believe the administration wants to destroy him or anyone else and I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are three large concerns that have 20 percent of the contracts and they are the Duponts, General Motors, and Bethlehem, and neither one of them will farm a thing out to the small industries so that they may perform this work. Now, who is the more loyal American citizen, the man who strikes for a living wage so he can feed his family or the individual who refuses to turn over some of these contracts to some other concern that can produce the things which we have to have in connection with our defense program, so that they can add to their huge profits?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Michigan. With respect to the statement the gentleman has just made, I simply commend to him the fact that the Military Affairs Committee is now holding hearings on this very subject, and that is not the testimony that has been given by one of your O. P. M. heads who has been before the committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that these figures come from Chester Davis, who has recently been appointed president of the Federal Reserve bank in St. Louis, and who, as I understand, is a member of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. That is a statement Mr. Davis made.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. That is fine; but I would like to see that statement and know where he made it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It was quoted in Labor, I think, 2 or 3 weeks ago—March 25, 1941. [Laughter.] Now, do not be laughing at labor or the paper called Labor. What would you do without labor? I call attention of you gentlemen to something else. Some sit around here day after day and crack down on labor, but how in the name of God would you build a building, a ship, a plane—anything—how would you make even a monkey wrench without labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN. But plenty of them are going into machinery these days.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But who are throwing them? What would capital amount to if you did not have labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, show us the callouses on your hands.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to answer my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know where they are.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have had more callouses on my hands than the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman's knowledge of anatomy is somewhat limited.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. The gentleman did not point his finger at me, did he, when he said we came here every day to bait labor?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say first to my friend, Mr. HOFFMAN, I refuse to be diverted to any other part. No, to Mr. SHAEFER, I did not—no one in particular, but I have heard a lot of talk about labor, and I have often thought, what would capital do without labor. All the money in the world would not amount to a snap of your fingers if you did not have somebody to put it to work, and who puts it to work to build your buildings, your railroads, your battleships, your airplanes, and everything else you are to use—it is labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And what would labor do without capital?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Each needs the other but labor is the more essential in the final analysis.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I take it that the gentleman is not in favor of this technique that prohibits a man from going to work? The gentleman does not favor these unions who want to keep hundreds of thousands away from work.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I favor labor unions, but, of course, sometimes you have radical leaders, but the mine run of union men are the finest citizens that we have in America today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And let me tell you what I think is an ideal American Christian. The man who gets up every morning and gets his little lunch pail which his wife fills with food, goes down to his shop or wherever he goes, and works for 8 or 10 hours a day for a fair day's wages and keep his family, educates his children, goes to church, pays his bills, and lives a clean life. Works of honest toil are the highest evidence of Christianity. Yet some capitalists of this country have been trying to drive the workingmen down to the point where he can hardly keep body and soul together; and I say this to the gentleman: If the capitalistic system is going to survive in this country, then the capitalists had better commence to look beyond the end of their noses before it is too late. There may be trouble ahead. If you will go into the cause of the revolution in Russia, you will find it was caused by driving down to the last notch the laboring class of Russia.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And now that you have the fellow on his way to work, what do you say about the other fellow who will not let him get to his bench and go to work?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, as I said awhile ago, we have a few radical fellows. But there are union rules also. The run-of-mine union man is as good an American citizen as you will find anywhere in the world or in this House of Representatives, and we have just as good Americanism right in this House as any place and the gentleman is one of them. Every Member is doing his best as he sees it to serve his country in the very best way he knows how.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree to all that, especially the last part of it, but I am trying to get you to say something in opposition to this fellow who will not let the man to whom you referred go to work.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course unions have their rules. Once a strike is called pickets are used. Courts have held this is lawful.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I believe we are all in accord with the proposition that at least 95 percent of the union members are just what the gentleman says about them. They are God fearing, patriotic American citizens. They would die for their country, just as quickly as any of us would; but does not the gentleman believe that in these critical days that that 95 percent, that great majority, should be deaf for the time being to the pleas and teachings and preachings of these labor agitators and organizers, who are working simply for the money that they can get out of it, without regard to the welfare of the country or the welfare of the workingman?

Mr. O'CONNOR The gentleman has made a fine statement, and I appreciate it, but does not the gentleman feel this way, that if the paper called Labor had given the proper percentage of those engaged in labor and those on strike since the defense program first began, that the men that are running the works are pretty sensible, and have the situation under control when less than 1 percent of those employed have been on strikes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

STRIKES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a visit to South Carolina, and I was asked one question by practically every one of my constituents which I had the pleasure of talking with while on this visit through my district. I was asked, "What are you Congressmen going to do about strikes on the national-defense projects?" I spent practically all of my time trying to explain why some drastic legislation had not been enacted to curb strikes on these projects.

Gentlemen, the strike situation on national-defense projects and industries manufacturing war materials has become so serious that, in my opinion, it is our duty as American citizens to take some drastic action unless the President's newly appointed Mediation Board is successful in settling these strikes at once. We all know Hitler and Mussolini are having a hearty laugh at our expense. They have certainly noticed the pictures appearing in our newspapers of men who are being beaten up when they have committed no crime other than wished to work to support their wives and children. I believe that practically every red-blooded American in the House of Representatives will agree with me that this is a disgrace to America.

We are supposed to have liberty and freedom in this country, and our young men who have been drafted to serve their country for $30 per month must think that they are being imposed upon, and they are being imposed upon and they are willing to fight, and if necessary die for their freedom. I personally cannot see how we can call ourselves a free people when we cannot work to support our families without being beaten up. I personally think that some of the leaders of some of the labor unions are acting as Hitler's agents, and the President and the F. B. I. should take some action at once to place these labor agitators behind the bars, and I think that they should remain in jail until the war is over and then shipped back to Europe. I should think that the leaders of the labor unions should take advantage of the great opportunity at this time to prove to the American people that they have a just right to exist.

The American people, in my opinion, will not tolerate strikes in national-defense industries very much longer. The Congress and the President have been more than patient with the leaders of the labor unions during the past few months, and the time is drawing near when it will be considered nothing less than treason for the leaders of the labor unions to call strikes on national-defense projects. Personally I advocate the Federal Government taking full control over all industries and labor connected with the manufacturing of national-defense products, and war materials of any nature. We should place all of these projects and labor under the jurisdiction of the Army, as it will be too late for us to build up our national defense after Hitler has blown up a few of our national manufactures and airports.

It is beyond my exaggerated thoughts when American labor would strike on national-defense projects, when they are receiving an average salary of $2 per hour, when their brother soldier is only receiving $1 per day. Of course, I am well aware of the fact that patriotism cannot be bought and the patriotic young men of our Nation are serving in the Army and Navy for the love of their country, and not for the salary they expect to receive for their services. They are not complaining about the salary they are receiving, and, in my opinion, they are only trying to perform their patriotic duty in preserving the freedom of their country. I am terribly disappointed that the leaders of the C. I. O., and some of the other unions, have become infested with all kinds of "ism" and ideologic views. There is no jurisdiction, in my opinion, for any union to compel carpenters and other employees to join unions to work on Government cantonments; they do not guarantee the workers a position or any consideration after the project is completed. I have known several young men who have been employed for several months as carpenters' helpers with some of the Army camp cantonments and were compelled to pay a part of their small salary each week as union fees. The gentlemen that I refer to were discharged as soon as they completed paying their union fees, which amounted to about $50. I believe any person in the United States should be allowed to work for the Government, if they so desire, without having to pay a fee to any union.

I have always found it necessary to work in order to make a livelihood and perform manual labor in order to secure an education. I can readily sympathize with the problems confronting the workingmen, and especially the farmers, who are compelled to work from sunup until sundown without any guaranty that they will receive any compensation for their retiring labor. I cannot prescribe to the type of patriotism laid down by some of the C. I. O. leaders; and the time has arrived when we must take stock of ourselves here in this great country of ours. We all know that Great Britain is struggling for life against a mad tyrant who has no respect for human life and considers might as right. We must continue to speed up the national defense in every way possible. We now, more than ever, can see that it is necessary that the United States be prepared for any eventuality, since Great Britain seems to be weakening under the strong Hitler machine.

We expect to continue to send the democracies all the aid possible, and in order to do this we must not allow any un-American activities to keep us from presenting a united front. [Applause.]

I would like to take this opportunity to insert a resolution recently passed by the South Carolina State Legislature:

House resolution memorializing the President of the United States of America and the Congress to take such immediate action as is necessary to put an end to strikes

Whereas the dictators of the world are doing all in their power to overrun weak nations and to destroy the democracies; and

Whereas the United States of America has recently appropriated huge sums of moneys for the purpose of aiding these unfortunate countries being trampled upon by the dictators; and

Whereas, to carry on this humane undertaking to save the liberty of the peace-loving people of the United States and the democracies of the world, it is necessary that the entire people unite in one common purpose by laying aside every selfish motive and contributing their patriotic services to that general; and

Whereas the production of guns, tanks, airplanes, and war materials of various kinds is being delayed by strikes in various parts of the country, instigated in many instances by so-called "fifth columnists"; and

Whereas it is the sentiment of the people of South Carolina, expressed by this body, that these deplorable strikes be immediately taken in hand by the President of the United States and Congress, and that such legislation and means be promulgated as will wipe out these "fifth columnists," who are today endangering the peace and safety, not only of the democracies abroad, but of the United States itself: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby, memorialized to enact such legislation as may be necessary to immediately put an end to all existing strikes and to prevent the occurrence of strikes during the present emergency: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, and each Member of the Congress from South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasant to award others a part of my time; and I will yield a part of the 5 minutes.

I, like many others, have been in my district. I was away when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] made his remarkable speech, which I read very carefully. All rose and applauded him. He has marched up the hill. I do not want him to march down again until something is done. I am calling now upon the Judiciary Committee of the House to respond to the desire of the people and report legislation. This committee must not be lulled to sleep because a few strikes have been settled.

I realize and you must know now that the people all over this Nation are waiting for a voice to speak plainly again. I would like to intone if I could—"There is no right to strike against the public safety any time, anywhere." That man was afterwards elected President of the United States, largely upon that edict. I call upon some courageous man here now to make use of some such expression.

I talked with a soldier boy yesterday. I said to him, "You are a flying cadet of 8 months, now graduating. You have risked your life at parachute jumping, and faced many dangers. What have you to say about these strikers?" He said, "We would like to have a go at them." Indeed, they would like to have a go at them.

Let the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] proceed without flinching. Let the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] continue his insistent demands. Let other gentlemen show equal courage. We must have the men on the majority side to demand prompt action. But there is the man, sitting there, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who deserves the greatest credit for this movement. Let us not forget his great service. He has been courageous from the beginning. In the sit-down strikes he was almost the only man who raised his voice. The Republicans were just as cowardly as the Democrats. Why did we hesitate to speak out? During those terrible days of the sit-down strikes, few dared to express themselves. I take a little credit for having raised my own voice, to the best of my ability, in supporting the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] also expressed himself on various occasions. I take these few minutes to say to you that the country is ready and is demanding of the Congress that we do something. We can at least stop these racketeering union dues of $75 on defense projects. Treat that separately, if desired. That smells to high heaven. Everybody will approve that. Perhaps other more important phases can be handled in other legislation. I can never forget this man, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. He is a hero to me. I want to see him get his proper due. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein an article on war by our former colleague, Bruce Barton, of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a brief excerpt from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was on objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia) for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 165. An act to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment, those suffering from service-connected disease or injury, and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 166. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 167. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 178. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 198. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain land located within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation, Mont., for certain land owned by the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, of Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 218. An act to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 658. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 755. An act for the relief of W. W. Carlton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 768. An act to amend the Neutrality Act of 1939 to permit the transportation by American vessels of articles and materials to certain naval and air bases leased by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 850. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase refuge lands within the State of South Carolina for the perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey and to provide pure-blood brood stock for restocking within its native range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 991. An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1123. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1166. An act for the relief of Daniel Steele; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1190. An act for the relief of Julia Neville; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1200. An act to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 16, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Naval Affairs will hold hearings on Wednesday, April 16, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4139.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4088, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to charter and purchase available vessels of domestic and foreign registry and to provide necessary insurance and reinsurance for such vessels and their operations.

The committee will also consider at the same time House Joint Resolution 167, relating to the purchase of foreign ves-

sels as recommended by the President in his message to Congress of April 10, 1941.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 108, 1057, and 2763.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

419. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting secretary of the Interior, transmitting draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 178. Resolution providing expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the House Calendar.

M . COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 179. Resolution providing expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 24. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 2788), "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for 1942"; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. Senate Concurrent Resolution 8. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled "Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power"; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4262. A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain matters; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3998. A bill to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793); with amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII,

Mr. TALLE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. O. Danneberger; without amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3474) for the relief of Henry W. Meere; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4268) for the relief of Christopher C. Cole; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4363 (by request). A bill to create a Department of Recreation for the District of Columbia; to define its purposes and to fix the duties and responsibilities of the members thereof; to authorize the use of the public-school buildings, playgrounds, and athletic fields, together with other public buildings and lands within the District of Columbia, for certain recreational purposes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4364. A bill to provide for the retirement of any officer of the National Guard who has served as Chief of the Militia Bureau or Chief of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4365. A bill to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4366. A bill to amend section 601 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, to provide for an excise tax on eggs and egg products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 4367. A bill to amend title 29, section 160 (F), of the Code of Laws of the United States, relating to orders or decrees entered by any circuit court of appeals of the United States, or the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, pertaining to any finding of said courts, overruling or sustaining, in whole or in part, any finding or order of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4368. A bill authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution authorizing the purchase of foreign merchant vessels for national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolutions 13 and 14 concerning Senate bill 710 and surplus marketing; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, with reference to importation of livestock and agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 38, with reference to strikes and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Louis C. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEAVY:

H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Lair; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4371. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

701. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of the employees of the Nash Frint Motor Co., Milwaukee, Wis., favoring a law that would be fair to both sides of labor to put labor back to work and fully support the men who have enlisted and been drafted in our Army and Navy; to the Committee on Labor.

702. Also, resolution of the town meeting, Rochester, Wis., on April 1, 1941, opposing any deferment of such men who are not working because of strikes and that any men now deferred be subject to draft who are striking or who go on strikes in the future; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

703. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Monroe, Wis., opposing the convoying of ships to Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

704. Also, joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to stabilize the dairy industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

705. Also, joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to compensate school districts for taxes on lands taken over by the Federal Government for national forests and other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

706. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin to defeat House bills 6 and 19 as an unjust burden to place upon small users of fuel oil for heating their homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

707. Also, petition adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature and relating to the procurement of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

708. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Stevens-Ferry National Farm Loan Association, urging the enactment of legislation to

amend the existing Federal farm-loan law by providing (1) Government guaranty of Federal land-bank loans; (2) by changing the national farm-loan associations stock ownership basis to a membership basis; and (3) providing for adjustment of indebtedness of the Federal land bank, where such adjustment is to the best interest of the bank, the association, and the borrower; to the Committee on Agriculture.

709. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Mrs. Frank O. Garrison, president, and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the New Castle Methodist Church of Walhonding, Ohio, urging the passage of the Morris Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

710. Also, petition of Rev. E. C. Brooks, and other residents of Danville, Ohio, and vicinity, urging the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860) to control moral conditions surrounding military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

711. Also, petition of Mrs. C. R. Barnes, and other residents of Greenwich, Ohio, and vicinity, urging the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860) to control moral conditions surrounding military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

712. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Jersey Shore, Pa., opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway construction project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

713. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, providing a basis of recovery for claims of California Indians based on early treaty arrangement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

714. Also, petition of the State of California, favoring consideration of the resolution relative to construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

715. Also, memorial of the State of California, relative to allocating funds in surplus marketing budget for 1942 to California fruit growers because of loss of normal export markets due to the war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

716. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Beckley Chamber of Commerce, Beckley, W. Va., relating to the construction of an addition to the Federal post-office building in Beckley; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

717. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the Beckley Chamber of Commerce, Beckley, W. Va., opposing the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

718. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Middlesex County, N. J., opposing the lay-off of men employed on the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

719. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa to the Congress of the United States, urging that the Council of National Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administration of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation be respectfully requested to coordinate their programs to the end that the problems of the farmers of our country be properly recognized; to the Committee on Agriculture.

720. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Scotland Chamber of Commerce, Scotland, S. Dak., by Harlan J. Bushfield, Governor, petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to Senate bill 831 to improve and develop the Missouri River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

721. Also, petition of the county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a highway from Hilo through the saddle between Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa to the district of Kona, county of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

722. Also, petition of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, Oklahoma City, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 3796 and 3797, concerning the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

723. Also, petition of the city of Decatur, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

724. Also, petition of the Waco Junior Chamber of Commerce, Waco, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national conscription; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

725. Also, petition of Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, State of Alabama, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation concerning Federal cooperation in forestry work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

726. Also, petition of the Fall River Building and Construction Trade Council, Fall River, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

727. Also, petition of the Alliance of Tulsa Building Trades, Tulsa, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to strikes and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

728. Also, petition of the International Highway, Road, and Street Construction Union, New York City, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation concerning Work Projects Administration and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

729. Also, petition of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

730. Also, petition of the National Farm Loan Associations, Opelousas, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to strikes and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, grant that our souls may breathe in faith as we approach the altar of prayer. Bestow upon us something of the majesty of our Master's horizon that in treading the paths of service we may have the joy that deepens, the gratitude of the righteous, and the peace that flows softly down the robes of the redeemed. Heavenly Father, we are tossed on many currents; we are filled with weakness where we should be strong and with strength where we should be weak. Help us to discern Him whom the infinite God sent in His mercy to make manifest to us His government in its relation to our salvation. Make us to feel that there is in the divine Heart a place for every experience, for every want, and for every human soul seeking to aspire upward. O Lord, grant that there may be in us a higher understanding, a more charitable heart, and a conscience that is willing to be guided aright. May the blessed spirit of our Saviour rest upon us as rain upon a fruitful garden. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931", approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940;

H R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938", approved June 19, 1939;

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 15. An act to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County water conservation district;

S. 208. An act relating to the terms of the district courts of the United States for the eastern and western districts of Kentucky;

S. 342. An act authorizing overtime rates for compensation of certain per annum employees in the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard;

S. 993. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer, without cost, to the estate of Rolland H. Denny a triangular parcel of land containing one-half an acre situated at Seattle, Wash.;

S. 1109. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy certain land known as Ward's Bank Training Wall and the right-of-way adjacent to the south jetty at the entrance to the St. Johns River, Fla., and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a title in fee simple to the Ward's Bank Training Wall and the south jetty property, Florida; and

S. 1254. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3252. An act to make emergency provisions for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

"OUR SKY PILOT—G. S. M."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in this fateful hour, when our way of life is challenged, when horrid war is spreading over the earth like an ever-consuming flame and nearer and nearer our own shores, we are deeply impressed with the tragedy of it all. It is time for meditation and for prayer. Already many Americans and American homes have been grimly reminded that we must ever be ready to sacrifice, if need be, if our institutions of freedom are to survive.

Today I am thinking particularly of one fine American home that has made the supreme sacrifice.

February 24, 1941, Ensign Gordon S. Maxwell, age 23, of Roanoke, Va., aviation pilot, United States Naval Reserves, lost his life in line of duty when his plane crashed during hazardous dive-bombing practice near the naval base at San Diego, Calif.

Gordon Maxwell typified the very finest in American youth. For this there was a good reason—his fine Christian home. His father, Dr. George M. Maxwell, an eminent physician, a distinguished civic leader, and a poet of more than local renown. His mother, a typical true lady of the South. There were 10 Maxwell children—7 lovely girls and 3 fine boys. All 3 of the boys early enlisted in the service of their country in naval aviation. Now 1 is gone, the circle is broken, but 2 boys and 7 girls carry on.

There is sadness today in the Maxwell home, but they grieve not as ones without hope.

Gordon Maxwell was passionately fond of aviation. He loved to soar up into the heavens and wing his way amongst the snow-capped clouds. On one occasion, not long before his last flight, he wrote his mother, "If I ever crash in my plane, don't sorrow for me, for I'll still be flying up in the clouds, laughing down at you and waiting for you."

Of the many fine sentiments set in poetic verse by Dr. George M. Maxwell, the father, probably none ever came so deeply from his very soul as the verses, "Our Sky Pilot—G. S. M.," which he composed on the passing of his son. Here it is:

OUR SKY PILOT—G. S. M.

They say that he's gone;—
  But I know that he swings
On up to God's throne
  On His heavenly wings,
And I hear his clear call
  To the station up there,
To give him the beam
  That his landing be fair.

They say that he's dead;—
  But I know that he's not;
For the words that he said
  I have never forgot.
"If I crash in my plane,
  Do not sorrow for me,
For I'll f[illegible] on again
  Through the heavens," said he.

"When you're crying down here,
  (Maybe doubting God's love),
I'll be laughing up there
  In the heavens above;
And some day, when you come
  In your plane, soon or late,
I'll be waiting, close home
  At the Heavenly Gate."

So I feel, every night
  As I look at the stars,
That I see him in flight
  Around Venus and Mars,
And on out into space
  Through the Pleiades, (seven),
With a smile on his face,—
  A Sky Pilot of Heaven.

—*George Madison Maxwell.*

Written March 18, 1941.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, our Sky Pilot rides the airways today, and methinks he is looking down upon us weak mortals, bidding us have courage and faith and strength to meet the challenge to America—the blessed land for which he gave his life. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects: First, on the proposed Puget Sound, Gray's Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Columbia River Canal, by Rear Admiral Luther E. Gregory, C. E. C., United States Navy; and, second, a statement I made before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered at Pekin, S. C., on April 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by James Truslow Adams.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR UNIONS AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention of the House to a bill which I am introducing this morning.

The bill in question is intended to compel labor organizations to make annual statements of receipts and expenditures, to list all officers and their salaries, and to forbid such organizations from making contribution to candidates and political organizations.

This bill has been introduced in the interest of the men who pay the membership fees and dues, but who, as a rule, do not know what becomes of such funds.

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to remind the House that, taking advantage of the great defense program, labor officials have greatly increased membership in their organizations and collected vast sums of money. The time has come when members of labor organizations and the public must have some protection from the racketeers who now control some State and local groups.

I realize that it is difficult to secure passage of any legislation opposed by such racketeers. However, we should not forget that unorganized workers represent by far the largest percentage of labor in the United States and are at least as good citizens as the organized workers. It therefore is logical to conclude that all workers, regardless of affiliation or nonaffiliation with any labor organization, should be allowed to work on all jobs in which Federal, State, or city governments are interested. I submit that so long as taxpayers cannot secure work on public tax-supported projects without paying tribute and protection money to a private organization, this is not the land of the free, neither is it the home of the brave as long as some public officials, through fear of losing a few votes, fail to do their duty.

Mr. Speaker, I find that the public is very bitter because the administration permits strike sabotage in defense industries by men who are receiving high wages. Honest and patriotic members of labor unions—and most of them are honest and patriotic—are opposed to what is being done to hinder defense production. Our boys are being drafted at $21 to $30 per month. They cannot strike, and they should not be subjected to the risk of being called to battle inadequately armed because of delay in production of implements of defense through strikes brought about by Communists and racketeers who are unworthy of protection of the flag.

We are told that it is not uncommon for Communists and aliens to hold office in labor unions. While my bill does not go that far, I believe that membership in any organization that seeks to destroy our Government by force and lack of cititzenship should disqualify a person from holding a position of honor or trust in any organization claiming the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation are thoroughly aroused by the administration's coddling of labor racketeers and other subversive elements in order to gain votes. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order today, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend to my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution on the Great Lakes seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks made by my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON] with reference to veterans in the present national emergency may be extended in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a brief excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of the people who reside in my congressional district in Indiana, and many of those engaged in industrial activities therein, have recently made inquiry regarding the distribution of contracts for our national defense. They believe, as I believe, that these contracts should be equitably distributed throughout our country, with especial attention to those States which are far inland and which have the natural protection of distance from our coast lines. At the present, practically all of these contracts have been and are awarded to large firms and plants in large business centers, and the small industrialists in the smaller communities have not been awarded any great number of these contracts; in those instances in which defense contracts have been awarded to the smaller industries and which are located in the smaller communities they have been very insignificant in the amount involved. These defense contracts should be widely distributed among all communities, both large and small, to the end that every community may aid in developing our national-defense program. There should be no partiality shown with respect to communities when we prepare for the defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, every man, woman, and child in our country will be compelled to aid in the payment of the vast debt which is created by reason of this huge defense program. It is certainly unthinkable that our own Government would seek to aid and develop one community in our country by awarding large contracts for defense production therein, and at the same time retard and injure another community by withholding from it a fair share of these defense contracts. All of the people in those communities where large contracts are awarded are benefited thereby, either directly or indirectly. The workers in the plants are given good jobs, and the farmer, the businessmen, and those of every walk of life feel the impact of the bulging pay roll.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that especial attention should be given to the location of the development of our defense materials. Our east and west coasts are susceptible to great damage in case of an attack. Our defense production should be placed as far inland as possible, in order to avoid the possibility of the destruction of the plants in which such defense materials and supplies are under production in case of an attack. In my own State of Indiana, in which the center of our population is located, we have a location which is second to none; we have every facility available, with splendid plants and with workmen of every class, both skilled and unskilled. In my own congressional district there are fine industrial centers in the cities of Muncie, Winchester, Union City, New Castle, Richmond, Liberty, Connersville, Rushville, Greenfield, Greensburg, and Shelbyville, and many of the smaller centers have fine facilities for the production of the defense materials and supplies we now require. In each of these cities and communities the finest citizenship will be found; the men and women are loyal and patriotic Americans; they are for the United States of America first. It is my general understanding that the plan is to allocate these defense contracts so that there is a very wide distribution thereof, and so every community may have its part in this stupendous development.

The President has recognized the necessity of locating our defense program far inland. Under date line of October 1, 1940, the press carried the following article:

Gubernatorial spokesmen for nine Mid-Western States told President Roosevelt today that the defense program would collapse unless the Nation's central regions received their fair share of new defense industries. The Chief Executive gave assurances that such industries would be located inland as rapidly as possible.

Looking toward the safety of our defense industries and to the safe development of our defense, the location of those plants and the contracts awarded should be far inland and widely distributed.

However, Mr. Speaker, up to this very moment the larger communities and the larger cities have been receiving the lion's share of this defense work. I hope that policy will be changed. If we are to continue as a great nation—and we will—we must stimulate and develop the smaller communities in our country. We cannot hope to make great progress in the future if the work is centralized in the large cities and communities, and the very vitality of the smaller communities and cities is taken away by withholding from them a fair share of the work which is made available through the defense contracts. We must recognize that the very stability of our Nation rests in the small communities; the farm, the village, and the small cities have made a great contribution to our Nation. These have aided in making our country great. The people in the smaller communities do not fully understand why the smaller industry and the smaller community cannot secure a fair share of these Government contracts. The people in those communities want to work; they are highly patriotic; the unemployed want to secure employment; and all of these people want to aid their Government in this great development.

Our Government should be entirely free from engaging in any activity which would tend to make our people believe that partiality is involved, especially at the time we are seeking to develop our own national defense. Our Government should make a wide and equitable distribution of our national-defense contracts in order that all of our people may aid in this stupendous task. The motto should be: "Let every American help." I hope our Government will not forbid any American from aiding in this emergency, by preventing the award of contracts to our smaller communities. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the decentralization program and the building of a navy yard at Duluth, Minn., and to include a short bill I have introduced for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the ppendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by William Ritchie, of Omaha, Nebr., on the subject of William Jennings Bryan. This exceeds the 2-page limit and consists of approximately 3 pages of the RECORD. I have an estimate from the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, day after day I have listened to one Member of this House after another stand up and criticize labor because of the strikes in defense industries.

I, too, have visited my district during the past 2 weeks, and I am taking the floor today to praise labor. The district I represent is a virtual arsenal of defense. We have hundreds of millions of dollars in defense contracts, and our factories are going day and night. We have not had a single defense strike in this district.

This record is to the credit of labor. You cannot blame the rank and file of labor for these defense strikes. I attribute these strikes to the fact that people of un-American leanings have been allowed to creep into key positions in organized labor in some parts of this country. This is not the case in New England. Labor in New England does not invite people of un-American tendencies into their organizations. They drive them out.

The rank and file of labor is truly as American as the membership of this great body. These men stand ready to do their part in this crisis. They need the help of the Government in a definite and strong move to clean the Communists, Nazis, and others from their ranks. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may be allowed to extend his remarks twice in the RECORD and to insert accompanying documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial in the Oregonian on the Centennial of '43.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OREGON TRAIL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 20 of this year the Legislature of Oregon, which is my native State, passed a Senate joint memorial calling upon the Congress and the States formed out of the original Oregon country to provide for the commemoration of the establishment of the Oregon Trail and of the civil government in the Northwest which occurred in 1843, almost 100 years ago.

My own father and mother took part in the migrations which followed the opening of this trail and with thousands of sturdy American pioneers trekked their way across the plains and mountain ranges to reclaim and hold for the United States this great Pacific territory. Their only means of transportation were ox teams and covered wagons. This vast territory, an empire in its proportions, now consists of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, and Colorado. This old pioneer trail began in Independence, Mo., and ended in the Willamette Valley in Oregon. It has now become the famous Lincoln Highway with its hard-surfaced highway connecting the East and the West. The Union Pacific Railway follows pretty much the same course as does also the United Airways.

These pioneer settlers on May 2 and July 5, 1843, met at Champoeg on the Willamette River in Oregon and formed a provisional government, which was the first civil government established in this great western frontier. This historic spot is now dedicated and maintained as a shrine for the first civil government in the West.

There was a spirited contest between these American pioneers and the British subjects who inhabited this territory for control. Our pioneers won out and the controversy was ended in 1846 when the United States by treaty gained possession of the Oregon country north to the British Columbia boundary.

Mr. Speaker, by reason of the courage, fortitude, and farsightedness of these intrepid pioneers, the Pacific coast line is now the western boundary of the United States and we have the broad Pacific Ocean as a protecting barrier in our national defense. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to these pioneers for this accomplishment. The States from which this great Northwest Territory was carved will be deeply appreciative, I am sure, if the Congress of the United States will provide for the recognition and commemoration of this historic event culminating in the opening of the Oregon Trail and the preservation of the Oregon country for the United States, and the establishment of civil government in that vast territory. A special stamp commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of this historic event in the year 1943 would be indeed appropriate, and Mr. Speaker, I most respectfully urge that such a stamp be authorized by the United States. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech recently made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to protest against the criticism that is being heaped upon individual Members of Congress and upon Congress itself. Many letters are coming to Members of Congress in which it is charged that Congress as a whole and the individual Members of Congress are lazy, that they lack intelligence, that they lack patriotism, and that they will not do anything except meet and adjourn.

I am sure that the people who write these letters do not realize the heavy burdens that are put upon us. It is true that men are being denied the privilege of working in this country, that the Nation is bankrupt, that against the will of the great majority we are being dragged into war; but here we are in Washington, with all of its wonderful entertainments, with the ball games, with the wonderful golf links, with good fishing, and with the solitude of our offices, where we can meet and write speeches against present conditions and at the same time devise ways and means of avoiding any effective action. The people should not expect too much of us. We are getting, 435 of us, only $10,000 a year each, and it seems that if we meet each day and adjourn that is quite a task for a rubber-stamp Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and some data submitted to me by a Mr. Scattergood, of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DOMESTIC SUPPLY OF RUBBER

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the subject of the possibility of a domestic supply of rubber produced and refined in the United States, I want to make one thing very clear. I do not claim to be an expert on rubber, but I do know that rubber is one of the most critical materials now needed for national defense in this country. I know that we import about 90 percent of our rubber from two

sources, British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. I know from figures that have been furnished me by the Department of Commerce that last year the total imports of rubber into this country amounted to 1,832,000,000 pounds, and the total amount consumed in this country was 1,384,000,000 pounds.

This strange-looking shrub that you see here on the table in the well of the House is a guayule rubber shrub. It originated in Mexico and is now grown under cultivation successfully in this country. I might add that 8,000,000 pounds of rubber refined from this particular plant were imported from Mexico last year and used successfully in this country by various tire companies of national repute.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would prefer to finish my statement first, but I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman and would not interrupt except to approve his presentation of this very important subject of home-grown rubber at this time when it is so vital. I also wish to call attention to the fact that the wizard who has given America so many inventions, Thomas A. Edison, gave the best years of his life to a study of this very proposition of our own production of natural rubber from desert vegetation. I cannot anticipate my colleague's statement altogether in regard to this, but I endorse it generally, because I know our domestic production possibilities. I merely wished to say that, in addition to the practical work done in the Southwest, we have also had able pioneering done by one of the greatest scientists America ever produced, Thomas Edison.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

As I have stated before, this plant originated in Mexico and it is still produced there in its wild state, not cultivated at all. In 1909 a factory was opened at Marathon, Tex., which extracted guayule rubber from the plant. It remained open until the supply was exhausted in the neighborhood, and then necessarily had to close, as the plant did not respond to attempts at domestication.

Although indigenous to Mexico and the Big Bend country of Texas, where it grew seemingly under the most trying conditions, this shrub refused at first to grow in other regions in which, generally speaking, conditions should have been much more favorable. The Continental Rubber Co. began experiments, but the ultimate success in reconditioning and reacclimatizing the plant was due to the efforts of Dr. W. B. McCallum. He began to treat the seeds chemically, treated the soil, and developed disease-resisting qualities; additional difficulties developed, as the newly domesticated plant at first developed very little rubber content; gradually plants were selected which bore larger amounts of rubber, and gradually, too, growth cycles were controlled which brought about quicker maturity without loss of rubber production.

In Salinas, Calif., in 1931 approximately 6,000 acres of guayule were put under cultivation and the plant was grown highly successfully. A refinery was established in Salinas that would handle a production of approximately 10,000 pounds of refined rubber per day.

The price of rubber fell to about 3 cents per pound after the acreage was planted in Salinas, and the farmers who had interested themselves in planting this product were unable to harvest their crop at a profit because of the extremely low price of the refined rubber at that time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice the plant is about a foot and a half high. How long does it take to produce a plant sufficient for the manufacture of rubber, or a plant such as the gentleman is displaying in the well of the House?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I may say to the gentleman that this is a mature 4-year-old plant from the plantings in California. The plant that has been developed now as a result of cross-breeding and selection will approximate twice that size and will develop a great deal more rubber content per plant than is true in the case of this particular shrub. The one you see here contains between 15 and 18 percent rubber. New plants that have been developed recently will produce better than 20 percent rubber.

Furthermore, it has been developed that rubber can be extracted successfully from guayule plants that are less than 1 year old, although this naturally increases the cost. I understand, however, that this can be done for 40 or 45 cents per pound, which is less than the present cost of synthetics by quite a substantial margin.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman intend, in the course of his remarks, to refer to the climatic conditions under which this plant can be grown?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; indeed.

Mr. TREADWAY. I wanted to interrogate the gentleman along that line, but if he intends to cover that point, of course, I will not ask him to yield now.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I see no reason why that point should not be covered right now. So far as climatic conditions are concerned I will say that this shrub grows very successfully in northern Mexico and Texas. It has been cultivated successfully in the coastal valleys of California and can also be produced in other sections of the Southwest.

Mr. TREADWAY. It therefore would appear from what the gentleman has said that it can only be grown in warm climates or in a tropical climate.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. According to the testimony of the experts who have conducted extensive investigations in this country, including the experts employed by the American Rubber Producers, guayule may be grown in a great many other States, but they have not gone far enough with their investigations to know just what States. It requires a nominal amount of winter rainfall, approximately 8 to 12 inches, and rather warm, dry summer months. That is the ideal growing condition for the present development of this plant.

Now, with reference to the farmers who planted rubber in California some years ago, I received a most interesting letter just the other day from a man who lives in my district and who took part in the development of this plant, and with your permission I would like to read this into the RECORD at this time. This letter is sent to me by Mr. Harvey Smith, a farmer in the Salinas Valley, and he writes as follows:

When the rubber company began contracting with farmers to raise guayule, I made a contract and put in 98 acres. When it came time to harvest, the price of rubber was practically nothing, so the company came to the farmers and asked us to carry on. Some of the boys got mad and plowed out the rubber and burned it, but a few of us carried on and played ball, until 3 or 4 years later when the price of rubber was between 10 and 11 cents a pound. Then we harvested. The first check I got was for $4,000, which exactly paid off a mortgage on my ranch, and, frankly, saved the day for me. In spite of doing many things wrong in cultivating and harvesting, I still made more money than I could have made on any other crop and they can have my farm any time they want. I know this is the opinion of most any farmer in the Salinas Valley, although as I stated before, there were some who were disgruntled and didn't wait until the price of rubber got up to 10 cents per pound.

I may say in this regard that the rubber which was imported from British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies last year averaged approximately 20 cents a pound. To go on with the letter:

We learned a great deal. For instance, I spent too much money in many ways—in preparing and cultivation—I know I spent too much money on hoeing and could have just as well cross-cultivated. But in spite of all costs, I made excellent money. I figure I could cut the costs a great deal if I go into it again. When we planted before, we figured that the cost of preparing the land would be $8 to $10 per acre. Frankly, this could be done for as low as $3.50 per acre, and be done as well. Five or six cultivations at 50 cents per acre per year should be sufficient.

In harvesting they used a new rake which smashed off a large part of my plants, losing probably from 20 to 25 percent, which wouldn't happen again.

If I can be of any help to you in this matter, I will be glad to assist you.

HARVEY B. SMITH.

I would say that Mr. Smith's experience proves rather conclusively that guayule can be produced at a profit to the farmers in this country.

In other words, it is a feasible and practical method of producing rubber.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman object to a further interruption?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not at all.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman spoke about foreign countries producing rubber. Of course, that is an entirely different type of plant from which rubber is secured.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is right.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is there any difference in the final value of the rubber, or is it chemically or scientifically different from that produced by this plant? In other words, is this as marketable as the imported rubber?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. In that regard I may say I wrote to a rubber firm in this country, one with which I am sure many Members are familiar, manufacturing the famous Ball-Band rubber goods at Mishawaka, Ind. In reply to my inquiry as to how they used this rubber, I received a letter and will quote from it briefly:

We have made use of this product in our industry for many years. Our present consumption is approximately 4 percent of the dry plantation crude. Guayule, under certain conditions and in certain products, has some advantages when blended with plantation rubber. Its chief use is in connection with tacky surfaces and certain kinds of cements. It is possible to effect some improvement in processing, using rubber blend with small quantities of guayule.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman right there dwell on the further subject, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, as to the durability or toughness as compared with the rubber that is imported into this country?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The Goodrich Rubber Co. is manufacturing tires using Hevea rubber in combination with the rubber produced from this plant and they find they get a better, more resistant, and longer-wearing tire from that combination than from the straight tree rubber.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, as I gather from what the gentleman is telling us, there is a material difference between the imported rubber from the rubber plant or tree and the manufactured rubber from this plant the gentleman is showing us?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not a great deal of difference. After this plant is refined it contains some resin, more than the rubber from the hevea rubber tree, but when it has been deresinated it is approximately the same, according to the Bureau of Standards, as the rubber from the hevea rubber tree.

Mr. TREADWAY. But it seems preferable to mix the two together to get a good product?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct. As far as that is concerned, certain synthetic rubbers are better for certain uses than any of the natural rubbers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Has any attempt been made to manufacture automobile tires from this kind of rubber alone?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; I understand that tires have been successfully manufactured from guayule rubber, but the best finished product seems to come from a combination of guayule and Hevea rubber.

Mr. TREADWAY. This is very interesting and educational. The gentleman spoke a few moments ago about a man experimenting, and not carrying it out successfully, because he did not know the whole process. Has the Government aided in that sort of study?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The Government, through its various branches, has made several investigations in regard to this particular plant, and I shall quote here from a report made by the Bureau of Standards, which I think will be found very interesting.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think that is very valuable.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The following statement is taken from a Bureau of Standards report on vulcanization tests of guayule rubber in 1927:

Notwithstanding the limitations of necessity imposed on the results so far, the tensile and elongation properties of the products prepared from the guayule shrub by suitable treatment indicate that, when properly prepared, the rubber from guayule will compare favorably with that from hevea and can be used to a large extent as a direct equivalent therefor, without appreciable diminution of the tensile elongation product.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the Department of Agriculture, in its experimental stations and in its research, given any encouragement to the production of this type of plant in the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am sorry to say that the Department of Agriculture has given no encouragement, nor has any other department of the Government given any encouragement to the production of this plant in the United States. Why, I cannot understand.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman believe that due to the good-neighbor policy of the administration we are to give away what the farmers here can produce to foreign producers?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the good-neighbor policy enters into it to a great extent. You gentlemen will all recall that a year ago we appropriated $500,000 for investigating the possibility of producing rubber in the Western Hemisphere. That entire sum has been expended in Central and South America, and not in the United States itself. In that connection I should like to insert here certain correspondence between the Secretary of Agriculture and myself:

JUNE 24, 1940.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I note with interest the fact that the sum of $500,000 has been included in the second deficiency appropriation bill for use in conducting investigations into the possibility of producing rubber in the Western Hemisphere. This is extremely gratifying to me personally, as I took an active part in discussing this item when the deficiency bill was up for action on the floor of the House.

If you will refer to my remarks as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 86, on pages 8523 and 9082, I believe you will understand my interest in this subject. Furthermore, if you will refer to my statement before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, page 463 in the hearings on the second deficiency appropriation bill, you will note that my concern centers principally around the possibility of developing the guayule rubber plant.

Rubber, of course, is one of the important strategic materials so essential to our preparedness program. Approximately 90 percent of this country's present supply is now imported from the Dutch East Indies and British Malaya. Rapidly changing conditions throughout the world bring us to the realization that this supply may be seriously curtailed or cut off entirely in the not too distant future. It is imperative, therefore, that we overlook no opportunity to develop rubber production closer to home. I am sure that you concur in this point of view.

Guayule rubber is now being successfully produced in my district in the vicinity of Salinas, Calif. I understand that it can be grown commercially in other States where there is a nominal winter rainfall and a long, dry summer. I do not have exact figures available on cost of production or refining of the guayule product, but feel that the Department of Agriculture could ascertain these facts through a comprehensive investigation.

May I respectfully urge that you use your good offices to inquire into this matter at your earliest convenience and advise me of your findings.

Sincerely yours,

J. Z. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

JULY 10, 1940.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Your letter of June 24, requesting that the Department include an investigation of guayule as a source of rubber for supplying the needs of the United States as a part of the investigation to be undertaken under the $500,000 item in the second deficiency appropriation bill, has been received. We appreciate your interest in this general problem and your desire that all sources of supply of this important strategic material shall be investigated.

It is true that at present there exists an emergency with regard to rubber supplies in the United States. It is equally true, however, that it would not be possible with the money made available under the deficiency appropriation to develop sources of supply in this hemisphere to meet this immediate emergency. The intent of the appropriation is to develop a permanent rubber industry in the Western Hemisphere at as early a date as possible, which will in all respects be self-sustaining and able to compete in costs with rubber produced in any part of the world.

For years the Department has watched with sympathetic attention attempts to produce rubber from the guayule shrub. While it is true that rubber of a satisfactory quality can be produced from this source, the best information which we have been able to obtain has led us to the conclusion that a price of at least 20 to 30 cents a pound under present conditions of production would be required to produce guayule rubber. This compares with the much less than 10 cents for which rubber can be produced in the Orient. In view of these facts it is difficult at present to visualize a self-sustaining production of guayule rubber in competition with Hevea rubber from the tropics. New methods of production might reduce costs, but on the basis of present information we do not see any reasonable hope of developing a self-sustaining guayule rubber industry in competition with East Indian rubber.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct in the assumption that this enterprise has been

successful because of the efforts of individual citizens?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They have not needed any wet-nursing from Madam Perkins or anybody else?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not at all. The American Rubber Producers, which company I mentioned a moment ago, has expended approximately $5,000,000 in investigating this type of plant and its feasibility as a domestic rubber product. They deserve a great deal of credit, as do the farmers and the chamber of commerce in Salinas, Calif., for keeping this project alive.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the Federal Government should give more encouragement to the production of deficiency products in this country?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I do, indeed.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Department of Agriculture, which spends millions and millions of dollars of our taxpayers' money, has done absolutely nothing in connection with this proposition?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is exactly what I mean to say, and I intend to ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters which I have received from the Department of Agriculture in that regard.

Mr. PITTENGER. What excuse do they give for their inaction and lack of interest in this proposition?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. They claim that this is not a practical proposition, insofar as it will cost more to produce this rubber per pound in the United States than it costs at the present time to import rubber from the Dutch East Indies and British Malaya. However, the example of Mr. Smith, the farmer who paid off his mortgage with the returns from his guayule crop, would seem to nullify their excuses.

We are presently subsidizing almost every other type of agriculture in the United States. If it is necessary to subsidize, to a certain extent, the production of a plant that produces one of our most critical materials, why not do it? Why not use a little of that money in assisting American farmers to produce rubber within our own borders, instead of being entirely dependent for almost 100 percent of our supply on the world rubber market? It seems perfectly ridiculous to me.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think most Members will agree that it is ridiculous, just as a great many other things they are doing are ridiculous.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. It might be interesting for me to take you through the various steps necessary in the production of this shrub.

In the Speaker's lobby are several bottled samples showing how to produce guayule rubber from the seedbed right through to the refined product.

The seed is planted in nursery beds and grows for approximately 1 year, after which the top is cut off and then transplanted to the field. Approximately seven or eight thousand of these shrubs are planted per acre. Only a minimum amount of cultivation is required during the growing period. After a period of 4 years the entire shrub is harvested. It is then taken into the refinery and broken up and put through the mill, then through the dryers and refined into the completed product.

Four years may seem like a long time to wait for a rubber supply. It is if you have to depend on one planting, but in the production of this plant it would have to be a rotation process. For instance, if you had 10,000 acres devoted to the production of guayule rubber, you would harvest 2,500 acres every year.

An enormous acreage could be devoted to the production of guayule in the United States if the Government would see fit to get behind the movement and encourage the production of it in this country.

In that regard I would like to read a statement from another Government bulletin, prepared by the United States Tariff Commission in 1935:

> Production of guayule compared to East Indian plantation rubber is insignificant. If produced in sufficient quantities, it would act as a check to excessively high-priced rubber, but the cost at which it can be produced on a large scale to compete actively with india rubber has not yet been demonstrated. Prospect of large-scale production does not appear particularly promising. Up to the present time guayule has been used largely in compounding with india rubber rather than as an active competitor. The output of guayule is dependent largely upon the price of india rubber.

In other words, we might have to reach some sort of system of subsidizing guayule production in order to make it successful, but that seems to be justified by the Tariff Commission's statement that a certain amount of domestic production would check excessive prices on imported rubber. Here is a statement appearing in the Rubber News Letter issued by the Department of Commerce on June 15, 1940:

> The only rubber-yielding plant which has been a commercial source of rubber within the United States is the guayule shrub. This plant could be cultivated on a large scale, methods of rubber extraction are known, and the shrub is capable of yielding some rubber if harvested at an age of 2 years, although a 5-year or longer period is required for economic production.

I may say in that regard that it has been found that the most economical time to harvest this plant is at the end of a 4-year period. To go on with the statement:

> The producers specializing in guayule have experience in seed collection and planting, cultivating, harvesting, extracting the rubber, and deresination, all by mechanical means. Deresinated guayule has been tested in tires and found satisfactory. The price of the material, judged under national-emergency standards, would be reasonable. Perhaps large-scale cultivation would bring to light plant diseases or other retarding factors.

With reference to diseases, I can say that the investigations conducted by the American Rubber Producers, Inc., have practically eliminated plant disease in the guayule shrub. The news letter ends with this interesting observation:

> If a million acres of guayule shrub were planted at the rate of 100,000 acres a year, and harvested, and rubber extracted at this rate at the end of 10 years, this country would have a large domestic living reserve of rubber in the shrub, always accessible for emergency large-scale output, and a valuable insurance from the national standpoint.

I certainly agree with that statement. If we had taken steps along that line 10 years ago we should now have on hand a large supply of emergency rubber for our needs. I simply cannot understand why the Government fails to take cognizance of the fact that rubber can be and is being successfully produced in the United States at the present time. It is a practical matter. Since the first of the year in Salinas, Calif., 1,000,000 pounds of refined rubber have been extracted from guayule rubber plants.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. Has there been enough experience in the production of this rubber to know what is a reasonable average price per pound of the refined rubber made from the guayule plant?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes. I intended to take that up. According to a letter from the Department of Agriculture written some time ago in connection with this shrub, and which I intend to place in the RECORD, the estimated cost is from 25 to 30 cents per pound. Practical experience has shown, however, that the cost runs from 20 to 21 cents per pound. As I stated previously, hevea rubber was imported from abroad last year at an average price of 20 cents per pound. Under present conditions, guayule rubber can be grown in competition with imported rubber. If the price should drop, however, it would be necessary for the Government to guarantee some sort of price to the producers of the guayule plant. To me it is simply unthinkable that we continue to do nothing about it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. In connection with the cost of production I gather from the gentleman's remarks that this is practically in the experimental stage at the present time, that it has not been developed sufficiently to know all the factors involved.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Oh, no. I tried to make clear that it is not in the experimental stage. Further experiments are developing a better shrub, but it is way past the experimental stage at the present time.

Mr. TREADWAY. But no great quantity of guayule rubber is produced in comparison with the hevea rubber we import.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman is entirely correct. The amount of guayule rubber produced in this country is small in comparison with the total imports of hevea rubber.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then I am right in assuming that the price could be reduced with Government assistance in helping develop the processes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Unquestionably it could be reduced. The original wild shrub produced from 5 to 8 percent rubber. Careful experiments developed the shrub until it produced between 15 and 18 percent rubber; and they have now succeeded in developing shrubs that yield better than 20 percent rubber. At the present time they can produce approximately 1,800 pounds of refined rubber per acre of guayule plants. It is not unreasonable to believe that with further experiment we can not only increase the size of the plant but increase the rubber content of the plant and certainly the amount of rubber per acre.

Mr. TREADWAY. And therefore reduce the cost per pound.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. And because of that reduce the cost per pound. We could soon put ourselves in a position where we could at least have something in order to dicker with the international rubber monopoly that fixes an artificial price on the rubber that comes into this country.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman has been very considerate. May I ask him one more question?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. At one part of the gentleman's remarks he started to read a letter from the Bureau of Standards. Then the gentleman was interrupted and read a report from the Department of Commerce. So far as I know the gentleman did not include in his remarks the letter he personally received from the Bureau of Standards. I think he should do so.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. I received a letter from the Department of Agriculture, which will go in the RECORD, and I read from a Government pamphlet prepared by the Bureau of Standards in regard to guayule rubber.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It seems to me the subject the gentleman has been discussing is of such national importance in world conditions that should our supply of rubber from the Pacific be cut off this may become of vital importance to the national-defense needs of this country.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman is entirely correct in his statement. Frankly, I do not see how any of us can look into the future and feel confident of an uninterrupted supply of rubber from the Dutch East Indies or British Malaya, in view of present world conditions.

The Department of Agriculture has been conducting experiments in South and Central America. They claim they can produce in South and Central America practically all the rubber we need in this country. That however still leaves the production in the hands of a foreign monopoly.

In connection with the fact that it takes 4 years to grow the guayule plant to the stage of economical rubber content, I may say that it takes at least 5 years before the Hevea rubber tree begins to produce and probably 7 to 10 years before it reaches economical production.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Recently our Government has set up four regional laboratories under the Department of Agriculture to find new industrial uses for agricultural products.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. One such laboratory is located in California, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Are these laboratories doing anything in the matter of research along the line of the development of this guayule rubber? Are they giving material assistance?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I do not believe that the laboratory in California has anything to do with the production of guayule rubber in this country. As I said, up to the present time it has been developed entirely by private industry. It seems to me that if any development is undertaken by the Government the time and expenditure made by the American Rubber Producers Co. in developing the guayule plant and processes should be taken into account.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Should not this come under the scope of that laboratory, and should they not lend assistance?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think they could be very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Just the same as anything else. Is it possible, so far as the gentleman knows, to grow this all through the southern part of our country where we are growing cotton, where we have acres devoted to cotton? Could it not be grown down in that country, so far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Of course, if this is developed, and if it becomes a feasible product with a little Government help, we could not only plant it on acres now producing surplus cotton but on acres in many States of the Union that are producing surpluses of all types of agricultural commodities. It appears strange to me that the Government should not be interested in it from that standpoint. We appropriate money every year in the agricultural appropriation bill for the Surplus Marketing Administration to purchase surplus agricultural products. Here is something that will supplant acreage producing surpluses at the present time. Here is a place where funds supplied to the Department of Agriculture could be really worth while in developing something essential to our national needs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said that it appeared a little strange that the Government was not interested. Some of us are aware of the fact that the Government is more interested in the people of other lands than they are in our own folks. That is along the line of their general activity. Take our sugar in Michigan, the Government is more interested in sugar produced by offshore areas than in Michigan.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I call the gentleman's attention in that regard to the fact that in California we think we have the most economic area for sugar production in the United States and I think the figures of the Department of Agriculture will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman better tell that to the new dealers because they are cutting down our acreage in sugar beets in Michigan.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not with my vote.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but they did it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I know it, and I am "agin it."

Mr. TREADWAY. Do I gather from what the gentleman says that the officials of our Government have shown no interest in the development of this industry in our country?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. TREADWAY. But they have gone into South America and other countries and have aided in the development of the product there?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. TREADWAY. I agree with the gentleman when he says he can offer no explanation for that procedure. Nobody else can.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I cannot.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman would not expect that anybody could?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. No, it seems very peculiar, to say the least. May I refer to a bill that was considered on the floor of the House just before the congressional recess, the Department of State appropriation bill for 1942. On page 329 of the hearings you will find the following statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and the answer of Dr. Bressman, of the Department of Agriculture, with reference to guayule rubber:

> Mr. CARTER. Why are you overlooking the other plant?
>
> Dr. BRESSMAN. That, if we are, is due to the price situation. We feel that we are forced to look at the rubber project as a long-time one. It takes 6, 8, or 10 years to get established, and the price situation may be somewhere around 10 cents a pound at that time.

I read a letter from a farmer in my district who sold his rubber when the price was 10 cents a pound and he got more money for it than for any other agricultural product he had on his ranch at that time. When will we wake up? [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herewith a letter from Dr. Auchter, of the Department of Agriculture, which throws further light on the subject of guayule rubber production in this country. In spite of the fact that the Department claims that commercial production of guayule in this country would cost from 25 to 30 cents a pound, recent practical experience proves that this is not the

case. I feel that this is a subject of such vital importance that it is entitled to the most careful scrutiny by the Congress and the departments of the Government. The letter to which I refer is as follows:

APRIL 30, 1940.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: In accordance with your telephoned request we are glad to furnish the following information in regard to the historical background of guayule in the United States:

In the early part of the present century a world-wide search of possible rubber-bearing plants was made by many individuals and nations interested in finding new sources of rubber. In this search it was found that the guayule shrub of Mexico contained rubber in appreciable quantities which could be extracted mechanically. This shrub was found widely spread in the Sonora district of Mexico and in the southwestern part of Texas in the United States.

Processes for the mechanical extraction of the rubber were developed and factories for the extraction of the rubber were erected in Mexico and at Marathon, Tex. The supply of wild shrubs in Texas was soon exhausted, but there has been a regular industry in the production of this rubber from the wild shrubs in Mexico. At the present time there are five factories owned by the Intercontinental Rubber Co., in Mexico, but only two of these plants are being operated at present.

Soon after the extraction work was started in Mexico, experiments with the cultivation of the guayule shrub were initiated and in 1911 a report, Guayule: A Rubber Plant of the Chihuahuan Desert, by F. E. Lloyd, was issued through the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Later, experiments were initiated for growing the shrub in the United States. Experiments were conducted in Arizona and at several places in California, and Salinas, Calif., finally was selected for large-scale plantings. Planting experiments were conducted and selections obtained with higher rubber content, so that it was found possible to produce plants having a 15-percent rubber content in comparison with approximately 8 percent obtained from the wild plants.

Cooperative and independent investigations also were conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture in California and Arizona to check the results being obtained by the American Rubber Producers, Inc., which was the subsidiary of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. charged with determining the possibilities of producing guayule commercially in the United States.

The experiments at Salinas were sufficiently encouraging that several thousand acres were planted and a factory for the mechanical extraction of the rubber was constructed. This factory was of a type to handle the output from approximately 2,000 acres of rubber per year or, since a 5-year rotation plan was considered desirable with the guayule being grown for 4 years on each 2,000 acres of land and the land being allowed to lie fallow for 1 year before being replanted, the factory was able to handle the constant production from 10,000 acres of guayule.

Elaborate machinery for planting, cultivating, and harvesting the guayule shrub was developed and the mechanical phases of the work perfected in the attempt to make it possible for well-paid American labor to compete with the low-paid labor of the East on a competitive basis.

These experiments indicated that guayule could be raised commercially in the United States at a cost of from 25 to 30 cents a pound and contracts were prepared for having local farmers grow the guayule, the planting and harvesting being done by the American Rubber Producers, Inc. However, the price of crude rubber dropped below the level at which guayule could be grown and no assurance was possible that the price of rubber at the end of 4 years would be sufficient to repay the costs of cultivation, harvesting, and extracting the rubber. It is our understanding that no contracts were actually signed.

It was reported that extensive areas of guayule were planted on land belonging to the company itself, but that also several thousand acres were planted on land which the company leased from local landowners.

In view of the impossibility of assuring a sufficiently high price for crude rubber to repay the extension of the plantings or the continuation of the rental on land not owned by the company, the guayule on rented land was harvested and the rubber sold for commercial uses in the United States.

In the meantime, the company had interested the Italian Government in planting guayule in Italy and in the African possessions of Italy. Our understanding is that the guayule at Salinas is now being used for the production of seed for these cooperative plantings.

We do not have any information as to how much planted guayule there is at the present time in Salinas, but believe that a sufficient supply of seed could be made available for extensive plantings. Of course, before any large-scale planting could be recommended, the economic features of cost in relation to price of rubber from the East Indies would need to be considered.

Sincerely yours,
E. C. AUCHTER, *Chief of Bureau.*

It appears to me that the Government should be interested in encouraging the guayule industry in the United States in view of:

First. The opportunity to build up a domestic source of supply for rubber so that in a grave emergency we would not be wholly dependent on southeast Asia and the adjoining islands for this important raw material.

Second. The opportunity to build up a domestic source of supply of rubber so that American consumers would have some protection against possible commercial combines between the great rubber producing companies of the Far East. The United States at present uses about 60 percent of the annual rubber output of the world.

Third. The possibility of building up an industry in the United States that would give profitable employment to some thousands of American farmers, mechanics, and laborers. We send some two to three hundred million dollars annually to foreign countries to pay for the rubber we import.

Fourth. The opportunity of occasioning a measurable reduction in the acreage now devoted to many crops that are in surplus, and increasing the acreage devoted to a product for which we are almost completely dependent on overseas sources.

Fifth. The precarious position of the United States in depending entirely on the continued health of hevea trees in the Middle East now producing 96 percent of the world's supply of rubber.

Sixth. Adding even 10 percent to the total annual supply of rubber by means of cultivated guayule would mean much lower prices for the remaining 90 percent, with the United States, as a consumer country, greatly benefited.

Furthermore, I cannot understand why we should not proceed to build up a rubber reserve for use in any emergency. It is difficult to make an estimate of the extent to which the guayule rubber industry must expand before it would prove to be a material factor in our problem of providing an emergency supply of rubber. Studies have indicated that, considering stocks on hand and afloat at any one time; the proved practicability of using reclaimed rubber extensively; the estimated extent to which rubber could be saved by effective conservation methods; the possibility of synthetic rubber serving as an inferior substitute for some purposes; and the fact that even under the worst conditions unusually high prices would attract some rubber to the United States through neighboring neutrals; there would be no critical situation with respect to rubber shortage created in the United States during the first 12 to 18 months of an emergency. Thereafter, the situation might become very acute. The guayule plant is of relatively slow growth and, consequently, if we are to count on guayule rubber as an emergency supply, a considerable acreage of the growing shrub should exist before an emergency arises. The question of an emergency supply of guayule rubber is, therefore, almost solely a question of the acreage devoted to the industry in the United States.

At present no one believes that the United States will, in this or the next generation, produce annually the major part of the rubber we consume. But if the guayule industry could develop to the point where approximately 400,000 acres were devoted to the growth of guayule, we would produce annually almost 160,000,000 pounds of rubber and have in reserve at all times not less than 250,000,000 pounds. The existence of these conditions would, in the event of a war where our overseas communications were interrupted, be of inestimable value to the Nation. [Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain letters and documents from departments of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from Marine Progress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of any legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

"THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED"—LET THE CITIZEN SAVE HIMSELF IF HE CAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, years ago a financial genius, when criticized for conduct considered detrimental to the public, is reported to have said, "The public be damned."

The present New Deal administration, the Democratic Party, and Congress itself seem not only to have adopted this slogan but to have added to it the thought, "Let the citizen save himself if he can."

Our people have no desire to be dragged into war. Nevertheless the President, notwithstanding his many promises, is doing that very thing. Congress makes no effective effort to stop him. Both Senate and House adjourn from day to day without acting upon legislation which is essential if we are to avoid war; if our form of government is to be preserved.

In the Senate a bill which would prevent the convoying of ships is bottled up in committee. In the House, legislation which would aid in national defense, prevent industrial strife, is denied a hearing on the floor.

The leader of the majority party in the one House, the leader of the majority party in the other, backed by the administration, prevent this Congress from carrying out the will of the people, who send Senators and Representatives here.

This deplorable situation is possible only because we here in the House refuse to assert ourselves, because we weakly acquiesce in this program which is so destructive of our welfare.

The coal strike is tying up all of the southern operators. The difficulty seems to be this: There is not only a differential in freight rate giving the northern operators an advantage, but because of the way in which the wage scale is fixed or arrived at, the difference between the way the southern operators figure the wage and the northern operators fix their scale, there is an apparent but not a real discrimination. Put in other words, it means that as a matter of fact the southern operators are paying as high a wage as are the northern operators, but because of the discrimination in the freight rates the cost of coal from the southern operators is higher than that of the coal furnished by the northern operators, so the northern mine owners and the operators of the northern mines have agreed with John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers to this increase in wages. If the southern operators agree to it, it means that they are going to be unable to market their coal in competition with the northern operators.

I see a gentleman here from a coal-mining State, and I ask him, because I am not as familiar with this coal situation as some, whether or not that conclusion is correct.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There is an unholy alliance and collusion between the northern operators and Mr. John L. Lewis, trying to take advantage of the present situation as to emergency-defense needs. The freight-rate problem and the wage differential should not be made a part of the present controversy. The northern coal operators are trying to use this time of national danger as a means of forcing a selfish advantage in favor of the northern coal operators.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They are using this national emergency to force the southern operators into this agreement with the United Mine Workers?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is the reason I think it is an unholy alliance for a very evil purpose, and they are hazarding their country's safety in trying to put it over.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I doubt if it could be said that the purpose is to force the southern miners into the United Mine Workers, because the southern mines, as I understand, are practically all union mines, and the miners belong to the United Mine Workers or progressive miners' union.

May I make a statement that may help to clarify the situation somewhat. Take Kentucky, for instance. Kentucky consumes very little of the large tonnage of coal she produces. She must find her markets north and south. In order to get to her northern market she must send her coal through the bituminous coal producing States of Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. These States producing soft coal are near to the market. Kentucky coal must travel hundreds of miles farther to get to the market.

It is not a matter of choice about freight rates. It is a matter of fact. The Kentucky coal operator must pay around 40 or 45 cents more freight per ton to get his coal to the market than the northern operator. Most of the southern operators, and many of the southern miners, as I understand, take the position that they cannot pay this great differential on freight, pay same wage, and still operate their mines in competition with northern mines.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do they not also take the position that the southern miner is getting practically the same pay that the man who digs the coal in the northern mine gets?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Let me clear that up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes so that the gentleman from Kentucky can enlarge on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When the N. R. A. was established and they were fixing wages for the coal industry North and South, that differential in freight rates was recognized and they allowed a difference in pay of something like 40 cents a day in order to take up this differential so that the southern mine owners and miners could carry on their industry. This has gone on for several years. Every 2 years when a new contract was made between the coal operators and the United Mine Workers this differential was recognized, up until this time.

Some people say that it will not put the southern operators and miners out of business, but prior to 1933 when the coal miners in western Kentucky were members of the union and organized, and they got the same rate of pay and did not recognize this differential, it closed down practically every mine in western Kentucky, as I now recall, and they remained idle for months and months, for perhaps a year. It wrecked a lot of mines down there. The miners could not work. Finally the union mine officials appealed to the high officials of the United Mine Workers and said, "We have to have this differential or the mines cannot operate and we cannot work. The northern operators and the high officials of the United Mine Workers would not agree to it, so the miners themselves were forced to withdraw from the United Mine Workers and establish a union of their own in order to make a contract with the mine operators allowing this differential, and the miners were able to work again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean in the southern district?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In the southern district. Then they went back to work.

This freight differential applies largely to West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and some other States, perhaps Alabama. In my opinion, unless there is some differential there, the southern mines cannot operate. This will work to the detriment of the operators and the miners and of the people generally. It will put the railroads and railroad workers out of business. Some railroad workers called on me today and urged that this be settled. I want to conclude by saying that the only thing that is holding this up——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes more.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I will only take 1 minute of the gentleman's time. This is an important question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have nothing to do, anyway, from the administration standpoint, and our rent is paid, and there is no expense for lights, and we are here, there is no reason why the gentleman should not proceed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Let the Speaker put the request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to have his time extended 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, the matter has come down to this point: The southern operators and miners, many of them, have suggested that this matter go to the President's Mediation Board; but before the matter can get to the Mediation Board, it must be certified by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is Miss Perkins.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Madam Perkins; and on yesterday the Members of the House from the coal sections of the South, and I understand Senator BARKLEY and others, joined in the request to Miss Perkins to certify this dispute to the Mediation Board. It is agreed that there is a controversy here that cannot be settled by the parties and that it must be certified, and these Representatives from the House and from the Senate requested Miss Perkins yesterday to certify this dispute; but up until 11:30 today, when we had another meeting, she had not certified it. These southern operators are willing to give to the miners a straight increase of 11 percent on their wages and go to work now and submit all other questions to the Mediation Board.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am putting that in my remarks; the gentleman is anticipating my remarks.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And then to submit all other matters in dispute to the Mediation Board and then the miners and operators in the South submit to whatever the Mediation Board may find to be the right and just thing. So I think we ought to all join in this request and urge mediation, because not only the operators, and the miners, and the railroads, and the railroad workers, and the people in the sections of the country involved, but this stoppage of the mines is striking at the very heart of the national defense of this country. I do not wish any injustice done the miners. I am confident the Mediation Board set up by the President desires to and will do justice to all the parties. We must not destroy the coal industry of the South. It would hurt miners and all classes and the country as a whole.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The fact is, that from my district they are wiring me.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation right there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Amplifying what the gentleman from Kentucky has said so far as this meeting of Members of Congress on yesterday is concerned, may I ask him if it is not a fact that these Members, meeting in an effort to get this matter certified to the Mediation Board, were not only unsuccessful, but they were unable to get in touch, either by telephone or by conference, with Madam Perkins. This is a matter that cannot be settled on the floor. The responsibility is entirely with the administration and Madam Perkins' executive order, and if the establishing of the Mediation Board will not permit the dispute to get to the Board, should not Congress take action?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the gentleman will permit me to answer that briefly——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. At that meeting the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] presided as chairman, with all of us sitting in the meeting, and we made an effort to reach Madam Perkins, but were unable to do so, and we conveyed to her secretary the information that we were meeting there and told her what the matter at issue was and stated that we desired to meet Madam Perkins, and they said she was in conference and could not be disturbed. So we were not able to ask her in person, but we requested her secretary to inform her we wanted her to certify this dispute to the President's Mediation Board.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the several gentlemen, and I just call attention to the fact that, from the Appalachian district, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Vermont get 60 percent of their coal, and that the quantity of coal on hand is not sufficient to last them more than 2 or 3 weeks, and industries all over the country are going to be cut down, and there is no reason why the northern operators cannot go ahead and produce coal if they want to, but their purpose is, so the southern operators charge, to force the southerners into this same agreement with Lewis and so put the southerners out of business. Now, that is the proposition.

Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] said that the miners were forced some while ago or a few years ago to disrupt one organization and form another, and then he made the statement, as I understood him, that almost all of the miners down there were in some miners' union.

Now, here is today's issue of a Washington paper, and on the front page is this picture of an automobile with bullet holes through the windshield in front and through the doors and through the side of the car, and it is headed, "Where Three Died."

MIDDLESBORO, KY.—The bullet-riddled auto in which mine officials C. W. Rhodes, E. W. Silvers, and Bob Robinson were riding when shot and killed near here Tuesday during a series of gun battles resulting from strike disorders.

And, on the same page, is the picture of an overturned truck on which had been loaded a piano, with the caption, "Rough on the piano"—strikers standing around and, underneath, this legend:

ST. LOUIS.—Seven men were arrested shortly after this truck was overturned, and an A. F. of L. headquarters was closed by police, when violence flared in the movers' strike. A. F. of L. workers are protesting hiring of C. I. O.-affiliated unionists.

Here is another jurisdictional strike. No contest over wages and hours; the men involved all union men, but members of the A. F. of L. overturning the truck, undoubtedly damaging the piano, because members of the C. I. O.—union men—were given a job.

Again let me ask, Does the President want national defense? Does he insist upon aid to Britain? Or is it more important that the members of these unions fight out their jurisdictional quarrels and, on occasion, both turn to the racketeering, job-selling practice? A firm declaration from the President would stop the trouble, unless it be true, as some suggest, that the unions are more powerful than the administration.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That killing was in Tennessee, but they sent the dispatch from Middlesboro, Ky.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. What about those four men killed down in Harlan County? That is a different county. They are just as dead, however, as though they had been killed in Tennessee, and the gentleman should not forget that. The gentleman undertakes to lay the blame on Madam Perkins. I know that the lady is not very popular with the Members of this House, but I am not criticizing her today. Apparently, either she does not know any better, or she does not intend to change her course of conduct, and that has been apparent to the Members of the House for 2 years.

Here we sit, not 435 of us, but some of us are here almost every day. We have the power of the purse. Just why we let these things go on I am unable to understand. As was said earlier in the day, we have been charged with being indolent, with being lazy, with being unpatriotic, and we have been charged with lacking good sense and with having no courage. Of course, I cannot admit those charges, but how much truth is there in them, and why should not each one of us take to bed with him tonight the question of whether or not we are serving our people or are just drawing our pay?

How much longer will we let things go on like this killing down there in Kentucky? I have not been to Harlan County for 2 years, but the last time that I was there I took the trouble to talk not only with the miners and the operators, but with people who were doing a little farming, with merchants and with clerks, in fact, with everyone that I could get to tell me anything.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes. Some of us may want to do a little talking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 20 minutes up to now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the Chair has not counted out the time consumed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], and I do not want to be put in a false light in the RECORD.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan have his time extended an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members of the House.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Right on the comment the gentleman just made [laughter]—oh, I know that the gentleman could not use all of the time himself. Will he yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think we ought not to overlook the fact while blaming too much on the House of Representatives. Madam Perkins is in the official family of the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But we, too, are the servants of the people, drawing our money and doing nothing.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If Madam Perkins, under the Mediation Board set up by the President, does not act, I am satisfied she would act if the President asked her to act. And the gentleman knows that we could not get through any measure here with the administration against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We might try—and I am not ready to admit that we cannot accomplish anything. We have the power of making or withholding appropriations, and in the end we cannot shift our responsibility to the executive department or to any official of this Government as long as we pay their salaries for doing nothing or doing something detrimental to the interests of our country. Cut off the pay of some of those folks, deny some of these Federal employees compensation, or, more properly, an appropriation for doing things they are not doing, and they will be coming to Congress.

Almost every Member of the House is familiar with the attitude of the departments. We go down there on our knees asking for information. We do not get it. That situation should not be reversed; but when bureaus want something, when the departments want something, they should come to the people who are given the power under the Constitution of appropriating the taxpayers' money, and I am telling you that we cannot dodge our responsibility, Mr. Representative from Kentucky; and if we cut off or just reduce the appropriations, the department heads will come trailing in where they should.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And the gentleman from Kentucky has not been dodging his responsibility. I have insisted all the time that this House assert itself, and not be controlled by the Executive. I have insisted that the House legislate and not abdicate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. Suppose a few more Members do that. We can lay the delay, the inaction to the majority party all right enough, and perhaps for a time we can get away with it, but the Representatives who come from the Republican districts are being asked by their constituents—and I speak advisedly—to make a fight on the floor of the House.

Even though the President has betrayed the people by his inaction, by his friendship for communistic doctrine, by his harboring of the left-wingers, that is no reason why we, as an opposition party, should quit cold. I like the motto, "We never quit 'till the hearse comes 'round."

There is no reason why we cannot give this administration either a licking or hold it up to public contempt if we insist day after day upon some action on some of this legislation which has been offered.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. I rise for information. I am told that Madam Perkins has said that both sides to a contest must request that it be referred to the Mediation Board. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether there is any such rule or law requiring both sides to request it and whether or not she would be empowered to refer it unless both sides did request it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know about that, but I know it is a very simple matter for the House, regardless of what the Senate may do, to pass a resolution requiring her to certify this matter or any other.

This is the point I want to make: The fundamental issue at the bottom of all this is the right of a man to work; and until we get busy and make it possible for American citizens who want to earn a livelihood to do so, we are not going to solve this question in a permanent way. The attitude of this Congress, as I see it, is the same as I stated at the beginning, "The public be damned. Let the individual citizen, the man who wants to go to work at a job, get there if he can. Let the taxpaying citizen hustle to get the money to pay the taxes we impose. We will do nothing to help him."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman argue that in cleaning up this strike situation there is a possibility that there may be worked into the clean-up an adjustment of freight rates, making freight rates the same from southern coal areas to northern industries as from northern coal areas to northern industries?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I was not linking up the freight rates with the labor situation at all. My whole point is that it is the duty of Congress, not only collectively, but it is the duty of every single Member here to enact legislation, and to see that that legislation is enforced, which will give an American citizen the right to hold a job when he gets one.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield further? The reason I raised that question is because there was so much discussion brought into the argument with reference to freight rates. So what I want to do is to bring the issue down to this, as far as freight rates are concerned: Is it the intent of anybody who has entered the discussion to try to bring about an adjustment of freight rates through a labor agreement? I do not believe it can be done and I would not be sympathetic to such a proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not talking about that. Freight rates are not, in my opinion, a proper subject of labor legislation. I am asking that the gentleman and all other Members of this House insist upon legislation which will give a man the right to go to work without paying dues to some labor organization, or without having his head cracked when he gets to a picket line.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, my votes take care of that situation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I understand that Madam Perkins assured the southern operators that if there was any question of wage differentials, she would sign any paper they wanted any time, and she would equalize the freight rates for them. So she is bigger than the Interstate Commerce Commission right now. [Laughter.]

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. The gentleman from Kentucky asked if there was any law or any rule or regulation requiring both sides to a controversy to request, before the controversy could be certified to the board. The answer is that there is no law providing for or affecting this board. It is entirely a matter of Executive order and within Executive control. If there is such a condition today where either side cannot reach the board because of a certification, it is up to the President, who has the authority and who created the board and who should make it possible for labor and employer to go to the board.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman reply to this: Do you think for a moment that we should sit here and let the President, by refusing to act, ruin the country or tie up the defense program?

Mr. MICHENER. No; of course I do not.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have also been appealed to by my home people. I called the Mediation Board yesterday, and, of course, I received the answer that the matter had not been certified to them as yet. I suppose the important lady, like other important women, has "at home" days, does she not? She could not possibly talk with your delegation on yesterday until she talked with the President. She is not Secretary of Labor except in name. The President is really the Secretary of Labor. We all know that that is true. The gentleman from Michigan wants action.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts want action?

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to state that the plain people are getting tired of the "ex-plain" people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One difficulty is that we here in Congress have spent too much time explaining our inactivity and it may be somewhat difficult for some of us to explain successfully when the 1942 elections roll around. Some of these mothers whose boys have been called for training and for war at $21 per month, just will not understand why their Congressmen let strikers, getting in some cases almost that much a day, refuse to work to give the boys in training the things they need.

May I make this further observation: The same procedure is being used in connection with this coal strike that was used in the Allis-Chalmers strike and the strike at the Ford plant. In the Allis-Chalmers strike there is no doubt about it, the leader of the union is a Communist, and his wife, going under an assumed name, Ann Stewart, is on the pay roll of the Federal Government in Milwaukee. There is no dispute about that,

and she is a Communist; and there is no dispute about that. Now, that is the situation which confronts us there.

In the Ford strike at Detroit there were demands that 8 men be reemployed after being discharged because their acts had been destructive; because they had encouraged slow-down strikes. The Federal Conciliation Service and the Governor of Michigan forced the Ford Co. to take 5 of the 8 back when they were known to be men who prevented production. For example, in 1 department, the tire department, they would turn out 15 tires an hour. When this slow-down came along, they turned out 1 or 2 an hour. When the company officials remonstrated and discharged the man responsible for the slow-down, the strike was called and the department was shut down and, at the strike's end, the company was forced to take him back where he could continue his destructive tactics.

THE COAL STRIKE

The Southern Coal Operators' Wage Conference is an organization of coal operators of the South, who produce an average of 150,000,000 tons of coal, which is more than half of the commercial coal mined in the Appalachian fields. This coal is used in 40 of the States of the Union and is the principal supply of coal for household and industrial purposes in at least half of those States.

The distribution of Appalachian coals is shown by the following table:

States served:	*Percent of requirements*
Florida	33
Georgia	85
Illinois	[1] 15,000,000
Indiana	[1] 14,500,000
Iowa	28
Kentucky	90
Michigan	87
Minnesota	[1] 4,500,000
Missouri	5
North Carolina	99
Ohio	40
South Carolina	99
South Dakota	30
Tennessee	65
Virginia	100
West Virginia	40
Wisconsin	[1] 4,500,000
Maine	60
New Hampshire	60
Massachusetts	60
Rhode Island	60
Connecticut	60
Vermont	60

[1] Tons.

Statements have been given to the press that the Nation has on hand 28 days' supply of coal above ground. That statement is inaccurate, for the reason that much of this coal is in the hands of a few large users and that industrialists who use smaller quantities are without an adequate supply for continued operations.

Here is a telegram received late yesterday from a paper mill in my district:

Would appreciate your wiring collect opinion what can expect regarding settlement coal strike. Facing shut-down if shipments not resumed next few days. Urge Government action.

MAC SIM BAR PAPER CO.,
Otsego, Mich.

Unfortunately, I have no way of correctly, adequately answering that wire. No one can successfully predict what Madam Perkins and the unions will do when they get their heads together.

Not a few other telegrams to the effect that the coal supply of the sender is running low and insisting upon immediate action to end the strike have been received.

The strike, as we know, was called to obtain an increase of $1 a day in the wages of the coal miners. The northern operators and John L. Lewis have reached an agreement and, so far as I have been able to judge, there is no reason why those operators should not proceed to dig coal, unless it be that, combining with Lewis, the northern operators are attempting to create a situation which will force their southern rivals out of business.

My information is to the effect that, because of the differential in freight rates, which discriminates against the South, the southern operators cannot meet the wage scale paid by the northern operators.

They also contend—and there appears to be merit in their contention—that because of the different method used by them in arriving at the wage paid the men who actually dig the coal, they are, as a matter of fact, paying a wage scale which is equal to that paid by the northern operators. They insist, and with much reason, that they not only are paying a wage equal to that paid in the North, but that, keeping in mind the differential in the freight rate, if forced to sign the contract which was signed by the northern operators, they will actually be discriminated against to such an extent that they will be forced out of business.

Their claim is that the northern operators, greedy for profits, greedy for business, are insisting upon forcing them to agree to a per diem or per-ton wage, the same as that paid in the North, without making any allowance whatever for the method by which the per-ton rate of pay is arrived at and also without taking into consideration the discriminatory freight rate.

The southern operators, in a telegram to the President, dated April 13, and in a release to the press on April 14, stated their position and their statement is worthy of our serious consideration. The telegram and release are as follows:

APRIL 13, 1941.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

We have notified you of the formation of a new association representing coal producers in Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, formed with the desire and purpose of negotiating a contract and getting our mines back to work. We are again urging that you get Secretary Perkins to refer the matter of our negotiations immediately to your recently created Mediation Board.

Optimistic statements are being given out by some of the Government bureaus indicating there is a 28 day supply of coal on hand and no shortage is feared. The statement that there is a 28-day supply above ground is probably true but some consumers have a 6-month supply, others have none and many have only a few days. If the defense industries are to be operated and the ordinary industries of the Nation are to provide the public with the necessaries of life, and if the homes of the Nation are going to be furnished with fuel, it is important that the mines return to work immediately.

Our group is having a meeting at their headquarters, 320 Washington Building, tomorrow, Monday morning. We will be glad to have a committee meet you and discuss the matter with you or with the Mediation Board if you will advise us at the above address. We are proposing to our men that they go back to work and be given an 11-percent wage advance over that in effect on March 31 and that all other matters be subject to negotiations or mediation.

EBERSOLE GAINES,
President, Southern Coal Operators Wage Conference.

STATEMENT OF L. T. PUTMAN

In order that our position, and in fact the entire coal situation in the United States, may be fully and completely understood, we wish to give an exact, concise summary and inventory of the present situation as it is.

On Friday, April 11, we dissolved the Appalachian Joint Conference for many good and sufficient reasons, but principal among which was the reason that we felt that by doing so enormous quantities of badly needed coal might be started flowing into our national-defense program without any delay whatsoever. This was for the reason that we were told Pennsylvania and Ohio and other so-called northern districts were in accord with the United Mine Workers of America as to the terms and conditions of an agreement, and we were told that we were blocking the wheels of progress. If these representations were true we knew that as soon as we removed ourselves from the conference a contract would be made between the northern operators and the United Mine Workers and the tonnage would start moving from the northern districts.

Now we are told that neither the United Mine Workers of America, acting through their president, John L. Lewis, nor the so-called northern districts, acting through their representatives, will sign an agreement. They are refusing to start the movement of any coal in the United States unless and until the Southern Conference agrees not only to what they have written as to terms and conditions by which the northern districts are to be governed for a period of 2 years, but until we accede to the prejudicial and unfair conditions which they have written for us and which, if acceded to, would put the southern operators completely out of business. Many of the mines in the South would be unable to operate even under present wartime conditions and would have no chance to operate under normal conditions. The accusing finger of justice in this situation must be pointed exactly where it belongs.

John L. Lewis, representing the United Mine Workers of America, and Charles O'Neill, president of the Eastern United Coal Sales Corporation, and J. B. Morrow, president of the Pittsburgh Coal Co., representing the northern districts, have it within their power to start the production of coal tomorrow in the northern area. They say they are in agreement as to their own contracts but they are strangling the Nation in its defense program by steadfastly refusing to make the slightest move to remedy the situation until the southern operators accede to terms to which they simply cannot yield.

On April 3 we made a very definite, concise and clean-cut proposition without attaching any strings or restrictions whatsoever. This has been reiterated many times and was again offered on April 12 and was as definitely refused then as on previous occasions. The essence of our proposal was and is im-

mediate resumption of operations without the slightest further delay, but inasmuch as a wage increase of some proportions was indicated, we agreed to immediately establish an 11 percent increase. We agreed further to continue to carry on negotiations about any further increase and about the many details concerning working conditions. Our attitude on all these matters remains unchanged except that the results of our efforts have so thoroughly convinced us of the futility of ever effectuating an agreement with our employees in the presence of our enemies in the northern districts that we have finally and definitely refused to participate in further discussion of our own problems in the presence of our enemies of the North.

It seems to be apparent that the northern operators and John L. Lewis, aided by the Federal Government, are attempting to drive the southern operators out of business.

The administration may be following the same doctrine which it applied to Michigan sugar-beet growers. Knowing of the greater efficiency of labor in the North, of the advantage because of the installation of improved mechanical devices, and that the northern mines can produce coal cheaper and market it for less because of the advantage in freight rate, than can the southern operators, it desires to put the southern operators out of business.

Not so many years ago, representatives of the sugar-beet growers—and I happened to be present—were told by representatives of the Department of Agriculture, in the office of a distinguished former Member, Carl Mapes, that we in Michigan had no right to ask for an increased acreage for sugar-beet production, for the reason that Colorado could more cheaply produce sugar beets, with a greater sugar content. We were also advised that, inasmuch as Florida and Louisiana could produce sugar cheaper than any of the rest of us, those two States should have the business, but that, ultimately, the off-shore areas, with their cheap labor and climatic advantages, being able to produce sugar cheaper than anywhere in the continental United States, should be given a monopoly of the business. That argument found no response in the hearts of the sugar beet growers.

The present argument of the Government, of the northern operators, and of the United Mine Workers now meets with no greater warmth from the southern operators.

"THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED"

The press told us yesterday that steel workers had been granted an increase in wages, which would amount to more than $90,000,000 during the coming year. That is good news for the steel workers. The increase in the wages of the miners is good news to them.

Undoubtedly, we should all rejoice with them, but, while rejoicing, we should not forget that a balance must be struck and that the interests of all groups must be taken into consideration.

The increase in the wages of the steel workers will be followed by an increase in the price of steel, and the increase in the wages of the coal miners will be followed by an increase in the price of coal, and, in the end, with an ever-increasing spiral of prices, no one, as was pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] when we were meeting over in the Ways and Means Committee room last fall, will be benefited.

Just what action does the Government, does this Congress, intend to take to equalize those increases, which must be paid by everyone, and to insure to the clerk, the office worker, the merchant, the farmer, and the farm laborer a like increase in payment for his services?

Just how long will Congress meet here day after day, adjourn without action so that Members may attend ball games, play golf, go on fishing excursions, or sit in their offices writing speeches telling what should be done and, at the same time, devising some scheme or method by which effective action can be avoided?

I have not been to Harlan County since 1939. At that time, I learned from miners and from operators and from people who were not interested, except incidentally, in either, that, if outsiders would keep their collective noses out of the Harlan County situation, there would be little, if any, trouble. The same holds true in the cities of Michigan.

If meddling organizers and greedy racketeers, who do not live in the vicinity of these mines or factories, were barred from instigating and carrying on trouble, local people could in most instances protect themselves.

Several years ago, a bill was introduced by me to prohibit the interstate transportation of these subversive agitators, but the bill received no consideration.

There would be little, if any, trouble in the Ford Motor Co. plants throughout this country, if the solution of whatever trouble arises was left to the employees and the Ford Motor Co.

This administration, the Communists which it harbors; those who would remake our form of government and who hold high positions with the administration; its Sidney Hillman, who wants to deprive every workingman of the privilege of working when and where he may find employment; its Madam Perkins, who is a genius at harboring the "reds" and the front for the Communists; its Harry Hopkins, who as a waster of other people's money cannot be surpassed, is not only driving us into a war which our people do not want, but, through its trouble-making protégés, is rendering it impossible for us to either adequately prepare for war, for national defense, or to avoid bankruptcy and industrial strife.

This administration is giving encouragement and valuable aid to "goon" squads, to rioters, who enforce their will by violence, in defiance of all law.

Why not for the moment turn from the war abroad to the civil war, to the economic war, to the industrial strife, which is so widespread throughout our land?

We here in Congress have been free with our criticism of the administration. We here in Congress now know what the administration is doing. We know what the ultimate result will be.

What excuse have we to give to our constituents or to ourselves for our failure to remedy the situation?

Have we, too, adopted the slogan "The public be damned—let the citizen save himself if he can?"

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am very, very sorry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders for the day I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a house concurrent resolution from the Iowa Legislature memorializing Congress respecting income taxes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some letters from professors of medicine in the University of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times on February 28 an editorial and cartoon dealing with air-line tragedies.

The cartoon pictures a bloated politician sitting on the aviation control tower, and while plane after plane crashes in the field around him he says, "A few more crashes and maybe I'll master this." The editorial is even more explicit.

Five fatal air crashes in less than 6 months—

Says the editorial—

are the price the air lines and their passengers have paid for the colossal blunder of the administration in abolishing the independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and discontinuing its three-member air safety board. The Civil Aeronautics Authority was abolished and aviation regulation turned over to a newly created Civil Aeronautics Board, under the Department of Commerce, thus enfolding air transport in the arms of politics.

That is the end of the quotation.

It is my purpose today to discuss the charges made in this editorial and the inferences involved in the cartoon.

To begin, we might as well admit that the office has been moved, that June 30, 1940, was moving day, down the corridor and around the corner, on the same floor of the Commerce Building.

CAUSE OF THE DROUGHT

Let us hope that no one sees anything sinister in that slight move. Yet if a change in an organization chart can be blamed for accidents, why not a change

in office location? Have we not historic precedent?

What gave us the Dust Bowl? Investigate the records of the Weather Bureau. Out in Dodge City, Kans., the weather bureau was installed in a Weather Bureau Building in 1909. Here it remained until April 7, 1931, and during those years Kansas boomed. But then the Bureau was moved to the First National Bank Building; and a year later to the Federal Building.

You should read the record. The annual rainfall before was from 19 to 27 inches; the 10-year average was 23 inches. The first year the Bureau was moved—1931—rainfall dropped to 15.75 inches. By 1934 it had reached 11.5 inches. The 10-year average is 15 inches.

That tells the story. When the Weather Bureau was moved out of its own building, out of its independent status, into rented quarters or under another custody—then the good earth lay dry and parched, the dust blew, and Kansas faced economic ruin.

In that hour the Department of Agriculture made a film entitled "The Plow That Broke the Plains." It was not the plow at all. It was the removal of the Dodge City Weather Bureau.

You and I scoff at that superstition, and we should; but if we do, why not scoff at the equally untenable suggestion that to move the Civil Aeronautics Authority down one corridor and around a corner in the Department of Commerce Building would cause airplanes to fall.

HINCKLEY A BUSINESSMAN

But you will protest that it was not that simple. There was a change in personnel and the independent Air Safety Board was abolished. Let us look at that.

Gen. Donald H. Connolly became Civil Aeronautics Administrator on July 1, 1940. Robert H. Hinckley retired as chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board to become the Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Three men retired from the Air Safety Board and one man became responsible, but below him the investigating personnel remained the same. Save for customary transfers, retirements, and replacements, that was true of personnel at airways, airports, and all inspection services.

Then, just as we admitted a change in physical location, let us admit these personnel changes, and ask these pertinent questions:

Were these changes made to bring aviation under the domination of the Department of Commerce?

Were they made to enfold the air industry in the arms of politics?

The answer to these questions should come quickly on a factual basis. Robert H. Hinckley is not a newcomer to Government service. He was connected with relief administrations from April 1933 until August 1938 when he became a member of the first Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. Hinckley was not a professional welfare worker. He came to the Government as a substantial Utah businessman with the added background of having pioneered aviation in that State by the establishment of one of its first flying services.

CONNOLLY'S SPLENDID RECORD

There are 22 Senators and 43 Representatives from the States which Mr. Hinckley served while he was a regional administrator for F. E. R. A. and W. P. A. They can testify whether or not his administration of relief agencies was on a political basis. As one who worked across the desk from him, who traveled Western States under his guidance, who received suggestions and directions from him on every phase of public spending, I want to put my personal testimony into the record that his administration of relief was not political and that when the excellence of that record was recognized by his promotion to other governmental activities, it could hardly have been a political appointment for the purpose of "enfolding the air industry in the arms of politics."

Again: Donald H. Connolly became Civil Aeronautics Administrator. As resident engineer of the Chicago district of the Army Corps of Engineers, he was loaned to F. E. R. A. His record as an Army engineer can be read by the most critical. If anyone wants to know his ability as an engineer, let him review the story of the construction of the Indiana Harbor and Calumet Harbor breakwaters; or to know his record for a nonpolitical administration of public matters let him search the files of Los Angeles newspapers while Colonel Connolly was relief administrator in that center.

He was moved into Los Angeles County not to bring politics in, but to keep politics out. He built worth-while projects; he made an enviable record, and when he had completely clarified the Los Angeles situation he returned to his duties with the Army at Chicago, praised and appreciated by all classes of citizens whom he had served.

THEY KEPT POLITICS OUT

While we are on the subject of men from the Army Corps of Engineers, may I remind you that when our present defense program seemed to be bottlenecked there was brought into the picture here in Washington Brig. Gen. B. B. Somervell. A recent newspaper story commenting on the progress since January 3, cites the fact that General Somervell is known in Army circles as a "trouble shooter," that he was borrowed from the Army Corps of Engineers to take charge of the construction division of the Quartermaster Corps, that the present program was the largest undertaken since the World War, and will eventually exceed that wartime construction. That newspaper story gives credit to General Somervell for the spurt in emergency construction work. I just want to remind the membership of this House that General Somervell previously was pulled from his Army desk and dropped into New York City as a W. P. A. administrator, not for the cause of politics, but because the job got too hot for politicians to handle and the Government turned to its own Army Corps of Engineers.

These men from the Army Corps of Engineers—General Somervell, General Connolly, Major Clay, and a host of others—have never been brought forward to inject politics into an administration or an organization. There is not one of them whose record reveals anything of the kind.

BOARD STILL INDEPENDENT

But wherever we turn we are met with the assertion that the whole scheme of reorganization had a political bent. These people point to that part of the reorganization by which the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and the routine functions of the five-man Civil Aeronautics Board were placed under the Department of Commerce. Is this politics? Before we jump at such a conclusion, let us recall that a number of routine functions connected with the United States Supreme Court are handled by the Department of Justice. This does not subject the decisions of the Supreme Court to the political control of the Department of Justice. The independence of the Civil Aeronautics Board in carrying out all its regulative, investigative, and standard-setting functions was specifically guaranteed by the reorganization plan.

Furthermore, the membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board was in nowise changed from that of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, except that the chairman of the Authority, Mr. Hinckley, resigned to become Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Civil Aeronautics. Thus if the old Authority was to be regarded as a high-minded, independent group of individuals, the same character inheres in the new board. It has the same substantive powers, and four out of five of its members are identical, while the fifth watches over the administrative connections of civil aviation with the Department of Commerce.

I come now to the Air Safety Board, which has been canonized by some people as the sole cause of air safety in this country. What exactly were its functions, and how have these functions been exercised since the reorganization? The functions of the Air Safety Board were to investigate accidents and make recommendations to the general board or Authority, which might be promulgated or not as the latter saw fit. In other words, the Air Safety Board functioned more or less like an investigating committee of Congress. It made recommendations to the legislating body. But whereas a congressional investigating committee is appointed by the legislating body, the Air Safety Board was independently appointed.

THE AIR LINES' RECORD

Today the Civil Aeronautics Board, the legislating body, has an Air Safety Bureau, which makes the same type of investigations as the Air Safety Board with the same staff personnel and its findings, just as before, constitute recommendations for action by the same parent body.

Now, let us examine the record of aviation in this country. I can assure the membership of this House that what little study I have been able to devote to that subject convinces me that we should all be shouting the record of American air-line safety from the housetops. Instead of that we are witnessing an hysterical campaign which serves to alarm the

public with intemperate charges against the Government aviation agencies.

What was the actual record of airline safety? Was it 17 months or 15 months, or should we not worry about months at all but do as we have always done in the preparation of statistics and Government reports—use calendar years?

We start on March 27, 1939. We then go through an entire summer of good flying weather, an open winter, and another summer, clear up to August 31, 1940, before the crash at Lovettsville, Va. Very well, then, it is 17 months—but is it? On August 13, 1939, an American line had a crash at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The fact that the accident took place at Rio rather than at Miami was possibly pure happenstance. The accident was a fatal one to an American air line, but so anxious were the aviation people of this country to develop interest in the cause of air transport, to develop airplane factories as a line of defense, to encourage airplane design and construction that this accident was skimmed over as if it had no part in the American record. Where heretofore figures had included the miles flown by all American air lines they were now changed to include only the miles flown within the territorial limits of the United States. Perhaps we should use the crash at Rio, and, if so, the period is twelve and a half months. Again let us remember that President Roosevelt transferred the Aeronautics Authority into the Department of Commerce July 1, 1940. Therefore, the period of accident-free flying under the old C. A. A. and Air Safety Board was from August 13, 1939, to June 1940, a period of 10½ months, not 17.

THERE WERE "MIRACLES," TOO

But if we confine ourselves to a true statistical study, we are not going to be concerned only with accidents which develop fatalities. When insurance companies are making rates, they do not count only people killed or accidents which involve fatalities. Nonfatal accidents count, not to the same degree, perhaps, but they count.

Accident frequency is the underwriters' test—accident frequency, and that over a period of years. Full credibility is not given solely to one year or to one employer or to one operator, not alone to those mishaps which result in death, even though death is the only circumstance to which the carrying company is extending coverage.

So we must look at the record actuarily, giving credibility to all factors which bear on our problem. We must therefore add to our list the nonfatal accidents, the miracles. There were 11 of these in this safety era, not all serious, but worth counting. Let me illustrate: On January 12, 1940, at Moline, Ill., an engine failed during flight. In attempting to land the pilot overshot the airport, pulled up, struck a tree, and effected a landing on river ice, skidding into a concrete retaining wall. Six people were injured; the plane was smashed. You talk about miracles. Because of the season and the temperature the surface of that river was hard. And because the airplane skidded just so much and no more, the impact with that concrete retaining wall was borne by the wing tip, which collapsed to become a shock absorber. Yet it was stated on the floor of this House on the 6th of last March that "for 17 months not a single accident occurred, not a single life was lost, no one was hurt."

Let us edit that to make it 10 months, not 17. Let us admit a few were hurt. Let us say there were no lives lost in those 11 miracles, thanks to a kind Providence; but let us remember that statistically these accidents count. Let us think of that when people complain of the reorganization program. Good fortune was a passenger on those ships, but the record was not faultless.

SAFER EACH YEAR

However, let us use the basis heretofore employed—miles flown per year per fatal accident. Suppose we take it for all American air lines, domestic, foreign, and territorial. Miles flown increased from 7,000,000 miles per fatal accident in 1936 to 40,000,000 miles in 1940. If we chart it, the line moves steadily upward.

Then take it on a less favorable basis—miles flown per year per fatal accident by domestic air carriers. Here the figures, if charted, go up from 1936 to a peak in 1939 and slightly down in 1940, but still 1940 is four and one-half times as good as the 1936 record, three times better than 1937 and 1938, and only one-tenth below the 1939 peak. With all the accidents, it is not a bad record, is it?

Suppose we turn now for a few moments to other means of transportation. It has seemed to me that one of the surest ways to keep our perspective in this discussion was to find out if there was any similar controversy at an earlier date, to see, for example, if the development of the railroad, which we have come to regard as the very acme of transportation dependability and safety, was marked by the very same crises, by the very same pockets and periods of disaster and death—yes; even by the very same denunciation and abuse which we find in connection with these recent airplane crashes. I do not intend to take the time of the House this afternoon to review in any detail the 100 years of railroad transportation. I assure you that it is a fruitful and pleasant field for anyone who wants to understand what is going on in the development of air transportation today. The student and scholar will find the same circumstances, almost the same words, that characterize the present period.

BACK TO WOODEN BRIDGES

Let me give you a few of the high lights in the story as I have found them.

On December 29, 1876, there was a disastrous wreck at the Ashtabula bridge at Ashtabula, Ohio. This was an iron bridge which collapsed as a passenger train was crossing it. The death list ran to staggering totals, and the nature of the catastrophe made it a favorite with the headline writers. The New York Tribune, the newspaper founded by Horace Greeley, ran editorial after editorial whipping up public opinion and demanding that something be done. In its editorial of January 1, 1877, the newspaper gave its theory of the wreck and its remedy for the future. The bridge was made of iron. Hence the newspaper recalled with approval all the popular theories that iron and steel become unsafe at low temperatures. It also trotted out the theory that the vibrations caused by passing trains change the molecular structure of iron, rendering it more crystalline and brittle.

This theory—

Said the writer—

Seems to be supported by the practice of condemning and discarding cannon that have been fired a certain number of times, though there is no external evidence of their growing weakness. * * * Whatever the laboratory experiments on the effect of cold or vibration may teach to the contrary, this disaster ought to and will confirm the popular belief, unless some different and more complete explanation can be offered. The bridge, as now appears, could hardly have been safe for very heavy trains under any circumstances. In the weather of that bitter night it was no better than a trap.

And then comes the editorial writer's momentous conclusion:

If iron is never safe during our severe winters we must go back to wood.

THE TWO LOCOMOTIVES

Just think of what would have happened if we had taken the hysterical advice of this editorial writer and gone back to wooden railroad bridges. The history of railroad legislation during the nineteenth century shows that legislatures often did follow the hysterical suggestions produced by public panics—with results that did not improve railroad efficiency.

Take, for example, the Tariffville, Conn., disaster 1 year after Ashtabula, January 15, 1878. We had here a new type of accident. A train headed by two locomotives moved onto a bridge. The second locomotive was derailed in some unexplained fashion. As it fell it hit the stringers under the bridge, breaking them like wooden matches and the bridge collapsed.

Now, what do you suppose they proposed, the good people of that day? They did not seek to remedy the condition whereby derailment became possible and even probable; no; they proposed a law that when a train was being moved by two locomotives one should pull and the other should push. I need not remind you that that method, which eliminated one cause of danger, was the fruitful source of some of the worst railroad disasters on record.

From the very illuminating volume on Railroad Accidents written by Charles Francis Adams, I could cull many paragraphs which should be a warning to us in this parallel period of public excitement over the recent aviation accidents.

STRANGE LAWS ENACTED

It so happened—

Writes Adams—

that the Legislature of Connecticut was unfortunately in session at the time of the Norwalk disaster (1853), and consequently the public panic and indignation took shape in a law compelling every train on the railroads of that State to come to a dead standstill before entering upon any bridge in which there was a draw. This law is still in force (Adams wrote this in 1879), and from time

to time, as after the New Hamburg catastrophe, an unreasoning clamor is raised for it in other States. In point of fact, it imposes a most absurd, unnecessary, and annoying delay on travel. It is of a par with another law, which has for more than 25 years been in force in Connecticut's sister State of Massachusetts, compelling in all cases where the tracks of different companies cross each other at a level the trains of each company to stop before reaching the crossing, and then to pass over it slowly.

I understand that there are laws in some States today which require that when two trains reach an intersection, both shall come to a dead stop and neither shall start until the other shall have departed.

In times of public excitement we have to scrutinize carefully even the suggestions emanating from expert sources. Following the epidemic of wrecks in the 1870's, Adams himself wrote to President Garfield suggesting that the way out was for the Federal Government to set up a Railway Bureau in the Department of the Interior. I am sure that both the friends and foes of Mr. Ickes are eternally grateful that Adams' advice was not followed.

INTEMPERATE CHARGES

We have heard in recent weeks the charge of "legalized murder" leveled at the Government authorities in connection with the regrettable aviation fatalities. Everybody recalls how frequently that charge used to be made in the "yellow" press in connection with railroad accidents. Often even the most respectable people would indulge in such charges and would vie with one another to see who could more effectively whip up public hysteria. For example, following the Revere railroad wreck in 1871, a public indignation meeting was held in the sedate State of Massachusetts. At this meeting Wendell Phillips spoke as follows:

So I begin by saying that to my mind this terrible disaster, which has made the last 36 hours so sad to us all, is a deliberate murder. I think we should try to get rid in the public mind of any real distinction between the individual who, in a moment of passion or in a moment of heedlessness, takes the life of one fellowman and the corporation that in a moment of greed, of little trouble, of little expense, of little care, of little diligence, takes lives by wholesale. I think the first requisite of the public mind is to say that there is no accident in the case, properly speaking. It is a murder; the guilt of murder rests somewhere.

One of the odd things about the hysteria over railroad wrecks was the failure to recognize that even in the worst years the railroads were 50 or 60 times as safe as the stagecoaches of the old horse and buggy days. Adams, who was one of the railroad commissioners for the State of Massachusetts, made a careful investigation of the subject and came to this conclusion on the basis of the statistics that had been kept in France of stagecoach and railroad accidents.

SAFER THAN THE HORSE

And what is most interesting in this connection is that air-passenger safety today is substantially greater than railroad-passenger safety was at the time Adams was writing. In other words, it is far safer to fly by air today than it was in the old days to ride behind a horse on a stagecoach. Popular thought refuses to believe this, just as in Adams' day it refused to believe that the railroad was 50 or 60 times as safe as the stagecoach.

Adams gives a good explanation of public psychology in regard to railroad accidents in his day. It is worth quoting for the light it sheds on our attitude to aviation today.

The fact is—

Writes Adams—

that when a railroad accident comes, it is apt to come in such a way as to leave no doubt whatever in relation to it. It is heralded like a battle or an earthquake; it fills columns of the daily press with the largest capitals and the most harrowing details, and thus it makes a deep and lasting impression on the minds of many people. When a multitude of persons, traveling as almost every man now daily travels himself, meet death in such sudden and such awful shape, the event smites the imagination. People seeing it and thinking of it, and hearing and reading of it, and of it only, forget of how infrequent occurrence it is. It was not so in the olden time. Everyone rode behind horses—if not in public, then in private conveyances—and when disaster came, it involved but few persons and was rarely accompanied by circumstances which either struck the imagination or attracted any great public notice. In the first place, the modern newspaper, with its perfect machinery for sensational exaggeration, did not then exist—having itself only recently come in the train of the locomotive—and, in the next place, the circle of those included in the consequences of any disaster was necessarily small. It is far otherwise now. For weeks and months the vast machinery moves along, doing its work quickly, swiftly, safely; no one pays any attention to it, while millions daily make use of it. It is as much a necessity of their lives as the food they eat and the air they breathe. Suddenly, somehow, and somewhere * * * at some hitherto unfamiliar point upon an insignificant thread of the intricate iron web, an obstruction is encountered, a jar, as it were, is felt, and instantly, with time for hardly an ejaculation or a thought, a multitude of human beings are hurled into eternity. It is no cause for surprise that such an event makes the community in which it happens catch its breath; neither is it unnatural that people should think more of the few who are killed, of whom they hear so much, than of the myriads who are carried in safety and of whom they hear nothing.

A PERFECT PARALLEL

If we substitute the word "airplane" for "railroad train," the description fits present-day public reaction to aviation accidents to a "t." Aviation accidents are, in fact, far more spectacular and dramatic than railroad accidents ever were, and people's attention is fastened on the few accidents that occur, never on the millions of passengers that fly safely every year.

There is no need to try your patience with a long recital of the history of transportation. It is an open book for all who may wish to read it. I could construct a chart which would show that the Westinghouse air brake, the steel Pullman car, the block system of control, and a host of other things resulted in a gradual lowering of accident frequencies, resulted almost in the elimination of the threat of death to those who rode on a railroad train. You and I stepped into our Pullman with the full assurance that we would arrive at our destination safely, even though we traveled in our lifetime millions of miles.

But if you compared air and rail disasters, you could build another chart. It would illustrate the fatalities arising from air transportation and railroad transportation. You would note that air transportation, in spite of the tremendous increase in ships flying and miles flown, is gradually becoming safer.

But the rail section of this chart would interest you. It would show a long period of almost perfect safety as far as railroad transportation was concerned, and then suddenly in these last few years the lines have been jumping up, fatalities have mounted, wrecks have been taking place with surprising frequency, and in many of them we have had deaths to report.

Yet we need to remember that in this period America has been experimenting with speedier railroad transportation, with lighter streamlined trains, with terrific speeds for which perhaps our railroad beds were not in shape. The fact that these lines rise sharply does not indicate that we should lose faith in the Interstate Commerce Commission nor the railroad managements. The railroad workers are more interested in safe transportation than any member of this House could possibly be and they, with our regular governmental agencies, will solve the new problems.

NAMES MAKE NEWS

And so if, after reviewing this record in the air and the parallel experience and record of the railroads, you study again the recent wave of airplane disasters and ask "Why the outcry?" the correct answer might be that it is because of two factors: The first, airplane accidents are spectacular; and the second, prominent people ride the air lines—United States Senators and Representatives, captains of industry, actors and actresses, movie stars, people whose names make news.

Yet in terms of passenger fatalities per hundred million passenger-miles of travel, American aviation is today as safe as the railroads were around the year 1900 or 1905. In other words, the aviation industry has in a very few years progressed to the same point which it took the railroads three quarters of a century to reach. And the aviation industry has made this giant stride toward safety notwithstanding the vastly greater inherent difficulties that had to be overcome in air navigation as compared with surface travel.

What has made possible this phenomenal progress toward air safety? It has been made possible by the vast resources of modern technology and by the organization of the aviation industry under Government supervision so as to utilize these technological resources for the safe operation of air lines.

The quickened pace of present-day technological development is obvious. The complex problems connected with air navigation can be solved far more rapidly than were the relatively simple problems connected with rail transportation. But they can be solved only in the degree that our technological resources

are actually put to work to solve these problems. In delving into the history of railroad accidents, I was amazed to learn that until the time of the Civil War the worst and most disastrous type of accidents was caused by the faulty mechanical construction of the early railway cars, which caused them to telescope under the slightest disturbance. What is amazing about this is that the theoretical science of the time understood full well the correct mechanical principles, but it was nobody's business to see to it that the correct principles were applied in the practice of the railroad industry.

SCIENCE IS THE KEY

The aviation industry is fortunate in that from the very beginning it has developed under a wise policy of Government supervision and regulation. It is this Government supervision which insures both the development and the application of our technological resources for purposes of air safety.

Many people tend to look upon the program of Government supervision as a purely static matter of safety policing. They visualize it on the same basis as tenement-house inspection, or the inspection of public theaters to enforce fire-hazard regulations. In such fields we know all the answers, and we appoint a board or a commission to enforce our known safety rules and devices upon recalcitrant private interests. If anything goes wrong—well, we blame the board. If there is a disastrous tenement-house fire, for example, we say that the supervising agency was guilty of laxity, inefficiency, or graft.

That is not the way to approach the problem of air accidents. Most of our air accidents occur not because there has been any neglect of the known rules of air safety but because we just do not have all the scientific answers.

My point is that in a dynamic field like aviation we should not, whenever regrettable accidents occur, jump to the conclusion that the safety enforcement machinery has been at fault. We should rather ask ourselves whether we have been doing all that we could to further the progress of aviation research, and whether we have spent enough money to equip our airways with the best and latest air-navigation facilities and techniques.

A CONSTRUCTIVE ATTITUDE

This healthy and progressive attitude is now being displayed by the members of the committee which this House appointed to investigate the recent air accidents. All of these gentlemen have made it their business to acquaint themselves with the realities of modern air transportation, to learn if safety is a matter of blaming somebody or a matter of eternal scientific vigilance to assure human mastery over the air.

It is a privilege to refer to the very inspiring and courageous speech of our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is a member of the investigating committee. The gentleman, in speaking to this House on April 3, 1941, confessed his past errors in opposing various appropriation items connected with aviation. I think his words ought to be repeated as a guide for all of us:

Having learned something of aeronautics—

He said—

I look back at the temerity with which some years ago I opposed certain items in the independent offices appropriation bill; and along about that same time I took it on my own responsibility to take a little money out of the Weather Bureau appropriation. Heaven help me, I will never do it again as long as I live. I will say that to you.

When he had concluded, I walked across the Chamber to congratulate him on his frankness and on the good sense with which he had undertaken his duties as a member of the special investigating committee. May there be many more like him in this House to insure the future of aviation.

LET US HELP AVIATION

It will be a happy outcome of the present investigation if, in the words of the gentleman from Illinois, we all henceforth "assume our responsibility to provide for the growth of aviation and carefully study its problems."

The great function of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration is to regulate, supervise, and direct the flow of air commerce so that it is speedy, safe, economical, and of service to the Nation. No public outcry can hurt that program unless it moves into the field of superstition, thereby frightening people, delaying development, destroying confidence, and finally hampering the flowering of American genius in a new type of transportation. The war in Europe has taught us pretty plainly which particular implement of warfare contributes most to defense of this hemisphere. It is for that reason that the Members of this House can commend the investigation which its Members have made and can in turn congratulate the air transport industry upon its record of performance and steady progress. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Does the gentleman from New Mexico yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman's able address clearly indicates he has made an extensive study of aviation. It likewise shows that he is fully advised in reference to the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Authority before and after reorganization; but I feel that the RECORD should show—and I think I am in position to speak because I handled the Reorganization Act under which the President issued the order—that not one function of the old organization under that law could be abolished by the President, and, just as the gentleman said, it simply moved around the corner in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is absolutely right. The original legislation was carefully drawn, wisely considered, and very well put before this Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LABOR UNIONS AND THE RIGHTS OF LABOR

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I presume that as we are now in the midst of the national-defense program and even though hysteria is in the air we have not yet come to the point where it is treason to reason.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard much about collective bargaining, with relation to union organization, about the right to work, a slogan used by antiunion advocates on the floor of the House, but it might be well that we go back into a little of the history of collective bargaining. In order to be able to bargain there must be a commodity to bargain for; there must be one offering something for sale and somebody else ready and willing to buy that which is offered for sale. Under certain circumstances, however, a person finds himself in a position where he is not able to bargain. Years ago it was a death sentence to belong to a labor union, but as time passed it became only a prison sentence to belong to a labor union. As society developed they found it to be true, that on one side was the employer ready and willing to take the commodity of labor, but labor was not in a position to bargain individually. The only way they could go to the employer and really bargain was when they organized and offered for sale their collective strength. When they offered their collective strength for sale then they were on even terms with the employer on the question of bargaining. If an individual went in to sell his labor he could not bargain because of the fact that he did not have a sizable commodity to bargain with; therefore, we have the labor unions of today.

Let us consider the proposition of what has happened in the national-defense program. The present administration has been maligned because of the labor situation of late. I call your attention to the fact that the present administration has been very patient because of the fact that cooperation is needed in labor and in industry alike so that we may have national unity; therefore, when the national-defense program was first put into effect, even though the industrialists of this Nation had refused to cooperate, and this is a matter of record through the statements of the War and Navy Departments, and they refused to accept national-defense contracts for several months until the question of tax amortization and the question of profits had been adjusted, this administration did not reach out, slap them, and crack down on them. No. This administration arbitrated with industry at the time. When it arbitrated with industry, it was done in the American way. We did it in the interest of unity. And now that labor is asking its just due, this administration is doing the same thing it did with industry. It is being patient with them, cooperating with them in the interest of settling these strikes and these differences, and it is only by doing this in the American way that we will have national unity.

I view with disdain those who now criticize and condemn labor, and shriek at the top of their voices that the laboring man should be forced to go in and produce, even behind a phalanx of cold steel and bullets.

No, Mr. Speaker; that is not the way to meet this problem. These strikes are being adjusted satisfactorily through the agencies and legislative authority created by this Democratic administration. In the American way, if you please.

Any person who listened to the testimony of the gentlemen before the special investigating committee knows that the great leaders of this Nation, the great leaders of industry, if you please, have voiced themselves against any legislation to outlaw strikes or to outlaw unions, and it might be interesting to note that out of the hundreds of thousands of factories in this Nation there are now only 11 strikes. That was last week's report. I understand that most of them have now been settled.

Let us be reasonable. Let us meet this problem calmly and deliberately, as Americans should meet it. A great American, a man whom the Nation respects, the Governor of the State of Michigan, the Honorable Murry D. Van Wagoner—and I am proud to say he is a Democrat—settled the Ford strike with the help of the Conciliation Department of the Department of Labor of the Federal Government. He settled it. Ford accepted. The Governor and the people of the State of Michigan accepted it. The union organizations accepted it. Labor in general rejoiced over it. All the people of the Nation met it with open arms, excepting one individual that I know of, who has cried out and said that there is a tie-up with communism in this settlement. No; it is not a tie-up with communism. It was a real American act in the interest of national defense that has sent those men back to work. The union cooperated in doing that. The Governor of Michigan cooperated in the interest of our national unity.

Yes; it has been said that there were hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of machinery smashed in the Ford plant by the strikers. Nothing was ever more of a lie. Let me tell you what happened. In the Ford plant before that strike there were Negroes from the South imported into Detroit and put into the Ford plant. They were referred to as the loyal workers. Probably they would be referred to by the antiunionists as "the right to work" workers. After the strike started and after the workers left the plant those 600 Negroes were kept in there, supposed to be loyal workers. They were running around that plant with "blitz" buggies, the cars Ford is manufacturing for the Government in the defense program. They were shooting craps. There was dope peddled and there was liquor furnished them. Those loyal employees, not union men, were the ones who destroyed the machinery, and not one single union man was involved. Mr. Walter White, the head of the Association for the Advancement of Colored Workers, talked to them by radio with a loudspeaker device set up in the plant and pleaded with them to leave the factory so as to avoid a race riot. The unions did not want a race riot. I wonder who did?

These men got out of control of the company who brought them in. In the face of the fairness of the Governor, the unions, and representatives of the Department of Labor the company could not afford to allow these Negroes to be used for the purpose they were first intended to be used for.

Let us get at the facts. Captain Lyons of the State police of the State of Michigan, one of the finest bodies of its kind in the world, testified in the United States district court presided over by Judge Tuttle, and he stated that he received excellent cooperation from the strikers and the pickets and that without this cooperation from the union there would have been bloodshed.

The State police of the State of Michigan, the Governor of the State of Michigan, and right on down the line, cooperated in seeing that the strike was handled properly. It has been claimed on the floor of this House that this strike was called in order to reinstate eight Communists. No, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. There were eight men involved; none of them Communists, but all loyal Americans. Those eight men were bargaining stewards of the union, if you please, organizers for the union, who were legitimately operating within the law; but Henry Ford for many months openly defied the National Labor Relations Act, even though this Congress spoke, even though the President of the United States spoke, and even though the Supreme Court of this land declared it constitutional. Ford said, "It might be constitutional as to the rest but it is unconstitutional as to me."

Are we going to let either the managers of industry, labor, or anybody else defy the law? It was because there was a defiance of the law on the part of the Ford Co. that this strike was called. Five of these men were taken back by Ford without any question at all because he knew they were illegally dismissed because they were union stewards organizing his employees which they had a right to do within the law. Three of the cases were turned over to the Conciliation Department and the Ford organization for further consideration. I understand those three men will be returned to their jobs.

Yes; we have had and we always will have disputes between those who have a commodity to sell and those who want to buy that commodity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it not a fact that most of the major strikes are now settled?

Mr. HOOK. I understand that practically all the major strikes involving a dispute with labor are now settled.

Mr. GRANGER. The most important one at the moment is the coal strike?

Mr. HOOK. So I understand.

Mr. GRANGER. Is that strike not more a strike as between operators than a strike between labor and the operators?

Mr. HOOK. So I understand. I have not gone into that fully, but, as I understand it, there is a difference between the southern operators and the northern operators of the coal fields on the matter of differentials, which is the reason that the tie-up of this industry is not settled at this time. It is not a question of labor. It is not a question of unions, but a dispute between the operators themselves; and if there is a loss in the national-defense program, it can be laid to the operators, and not the unions. There is an old saying that "murder will out," and in this instance the truth is coming out. When the story is completely told, gentlemen, you will find that labor, both organized and unorganized, are loyal, 100-percent Americans, interested in their Nation and loyal to our country. They are doing their bit in national defense. Labor knows that on their shoulders rests a great burden. They will meet this task of saving democracy as they have in the past. Let us have national unity on the part of industry, government, and labor, and we will remain a free people.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the legislative program in order for the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain statements relating to the present bituminous-coal controversy on the part of the southern group of operators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCINTYRE, for 2 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 15. An act to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 208. An act relating to the terms of the district courts of the United States for the eastern and western districts of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 342. An act authorizing overtime rates for compensation of certain per annum employees in the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 993. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer, without cost, to the

estate of Rolland H. Denny a triangular parcel of land containing one-half an acre situated at Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1109. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy certain land known as Ward's Bank Training Wall and the right-of-way adjacent to the south jetty at the entrance to the St. Johns River, Fla., and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a title in fee simple to the Ward's Bank Training Wall and the south jetty property, Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4088, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to charter and purchase available vessels of domestic and foreign registry and to provide necessary insurance and reinsurance for such vessels and their operations.

The committee will also consider at the same time House Joint Resolution 167, relating to the purchase of foreign vessels as recommended by the President in his message to Congress of April 10, 1941.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 108, 1057, and 2763.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

420. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the exemption from military service of certain aliens residing in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

421. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, Glenn Dale, Md.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

422. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made under the authority of the act of March 5, 1940 (Public No. 426, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

423. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

424. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

425. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Public Works Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

426. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for dispcsition of lists of papers by the Department of State; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

427. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of State; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

428. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for the disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

429. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for the disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

430. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of War; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

431. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

432. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the United States attorney for the district of Idaho, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

433. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the United States attorney for the district of Idaho, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

434. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

435. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition by the United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island, with approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

436. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

437. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition by the United States attorney for the district of Utah, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

438. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the United States attorney for the western district of Washington, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

439. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition by the United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

440. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendations for disposition of a list of papers by the United States marshal for the western district of Michigan, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

441. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of a list of papers by the United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

442. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin, with the approval of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

443. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

444. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of lists of papers by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1123. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4372. A bill to amend the crop-loan law relating to the lien imposed thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4373. A bill to repeal obsolete and superseded statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 4374. A bill to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 4375. A bill to repeal obsolete and superseded statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 4376. A bill to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 4377. A bill to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 4378. A bill to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 4379. A bill to repeal an obsolete part of a statute and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 4380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 4381. A bill to amend an act of March 15, 1904, so as to permit the construction between certain points on the Minnesota River of bridges of lower heights than those authorized by such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 4382. A bill to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 4383. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4384. A bill to provide for the classification of cotton for producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 4385. A bill providing for the examination and survey of Moriches Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 4386. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Isle Royale; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4387. A bill authorizing the appointment of midshipmen to the United States Naval Academy from the Irish Free State; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4388. A bill authorizing the appointment of cadets to the United States Military Academy from the Irish Free State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4389. A bill to provide certain articles of apparel for certain employees of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4390 (by request). A bill to amend the provisions of acts of Congress which are now codified in title V of the Code of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4391. A bill to provide shorter hours of duty for members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. R. 4392. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, by prohibiting certain political contributions by labor organizations, to provide for the registration of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4393. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution for the preservation and restoration of the frigate *Constellation* as a national museum and making Newport, R. I., its home port; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution making the fourth Monday in November and the first Monday in June of each year legal holidays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution, authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of civil government in the far West, the blazing of the old Oregon Trail, and the epochal immigration of 1843; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 10, with reference to the Federal Motor Transportation Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolutions referring to House bill 3301, with reference to wages at navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to an adequate Federal antilynch law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4395. A bill for the relief of James Franklin Whitten; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4396. A bill granting an increase of pension to Louis Kimmel, Sr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

731. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Association of Chosen Freeholders of New Jersey, Jersey City, N. J., protesting against the curtailment of Work Projects Administration activities until proper provision is made to absorb in regular employment the majority of those now on Work Projects Administration rolls who will be forced to return to relief rolls if the present program is not amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

732. Also, petition of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, department of New Jersey, protesting against strikes in defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. Also, petition of 47 residents of Hudson County, N. J., relative to governmental policy during the present emergency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

734. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Harry C. Egbert Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Cincinnati, Ohio, urging the early passage of House bill 2669, to provide pension benefits for certain Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

735. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Senate of Massachusetts, urging enactment of House bill 3301; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

736. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of an adequate Federal antilynching law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

737. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of the Geyer antipoll tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

738. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Protestant Big Sister Council of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging legislation to protect workers in the Brooklyn cane sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

739. Also, petition of the New York Post Office Clerks' Association, Inc., New York City, urging the passage of the longevity bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

740. Also, petition of the Community Councils of the City of New York, Inc., opposing Senate bill 937 and House bill 3582; to the Committee on Agriculture.

741. Also, petition of the Junior National Chiropractic Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of House bill 1052; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

742. Also, petition of the United States Customs Inspectors' Association, Port of New York, urging the enactment of House bill 1073 to include United States customs inspectors; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

743. Also, petition of the New York State Economic Council, Inc., New York, concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

744. Also, petition of the Customs Guards Association, Port of New York, Inc., urging the enactment of House bill 1073, to amend the Classification Act of 1923; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

745. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the adoption of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, so-called; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

746. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the adoption of an

adequate Federal antilynch law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

747. Also, petition favoring the bill restoring percentage wage differential for a leading man and for a quarterman at any navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

748. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the Senate of Massachusetts, favoring the bill restoring percentage wage differential for a leading man and for a quarterman at any navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

749. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the adoption of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

750. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the adoption of an adequate Federal antilynch law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give ear, O Lord, unto our prayer and harken unto the voice of our supplication. We wait at Thy altar to claim Thy mercy in the forgiveness of our sins, beseeching Thee to continue Thy arm of sheltering care. Bless us with an uncomplaining faith, obedient to all Thy providential dispensations. Supply all hearts with an affection that strengthens and refines that we may be led by the guidance of Thy holy will and follow the ministries of our divine Master. We humbly pray Thee to be in all the affairs of our country, guiding all who make and execute our laws and to lead us to understand deeply that it is righteousness that exalteth a nation. In every great redemptive effort which glorifies our time, give us the heart of courage that defeats fear, clothing us for assertion and for loyalty that stands forth bravely for the right. We rejoice, our blessed Father in heaven, amid all in this universe of starry splendors, unfathomable and unthinkable immensities, we cannot fall out of the hands of the living God. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COAL-MINE INSPECTION

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SMITH of West Virginia, SOMERS of New York, and ENGLEBRIGHT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Buford C. Tynes to the Huntington Advertiser on national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include two brief addresses, the first by Chief Justice Hughes and the second by Mr. Paul Mellon, on the occasion of the dedication of the National Gallery of Art.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce to the House that the calendar will be called next Wednesday. I do this so the chairmen of the various committees may have notice that the calendar will be called.

NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement by the publicity director of the United Mine Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the last few days with reference to the wage conference of the United Mine Workers of America and the operators in New York City. There seems to be quite a controversy over the differential in wages. From my standpoint, I see no reason and no justification why the miners should be asked to accept a lower wage rate below the Mason and Dixon line. It costs just as much to live there as it does here. They expend just as much energy in producing coal as they do here, and they are entitled to an equitable wage. Much has also been said about the matter of freight rates. The Pennsylvania coal operators have contended for years that they have been discriminated against in the matter of freight rates as against the southern operators on coals moving to the Great Lakes and to the seaboard.

The mileage from southern West Virginia to the Lakes is approximately 373 miles, with a freight rate of $1.91 net ton. The mileage from the Pittsburgh district to the Lakes is 182 miles, with a freight rate of $1.56 net ton. Thus the coal is hauled 191 miles farther for an additional 35 cents. Figuratively, this coal is hauled past the very gates of western Pennsylvania's coal fields on its way to the Lakes.

In the case of northern West Virginia, the mileage is 262 miles, and the freight rate is $1.76 net ton, or a haul of 80 miles farther for an additional 20 cents. The southern fields have, therefore, an advantage over Pennsylvania in a much lower rate per mile haul.

Under the Guffey Coal Act the minimum prices are based upon the consuming points. Therefore the difference in freight rates is taken into account in the selling price of the coal, and the argument for differential in the wage rates to compensate for any so-called freight rate is irrelevant.

The combined rail-and-water rate to Boston from southern West Virginia is $3.28. To compete with this, western Pennsylvania has a freight rate of $4.09 to Boston. Certainly our southern friends are not attempting to justify a wage differential to cover this difference in freight rates.

The wage differentials between the northern and southern fields date far back to the time when they were not unionized. The southern operators were able to obtain employees at a lower scale than the northern operators. In 1933, when the Appalachian group was formed, there was an attempt made to wipe out these differentials in the conference with the United Mine Workers of America. Every succeeding 2 years since then, when it was necessary to negotiate a new wage contract between the operators and the miners of the Appalachian group, this question of wage differentials was a matter of controversy. The present conference in New York City has been attempting to wipe out this differential. In every case the United Mine Workers have recognized the injustice of the wage rates between the North and the South and have constantly attempted to equalize these wage rates in the contract. The northern operators have always felt that they were placed at a disadvantage by having to pay a higher rate than the southern operators. In conclusion, I might add that the Appalachian is the

largest collective-bargaining agency in the world, and it should be a great source of satisfaction to the people to know that this group has always continued to negotiate until a satisfactory contract has been consummated.

STATEMENT BY K. C. ADAMS, PUBLICITY DIRECTOR, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

The statement of Representative ROBERTSON of Virginia in the House of Representatives on April 15 asserting that $200,000,000 would be the annual cost of the southern Appalachian operators if the 40 cents differential wage rate is eliminated, suggests the degree of desperation of the southern operators and the boundless limits of misrepresentation they are attempting in order to deceive the general public in their home States.

In an analysis of the costs involved, with both the northern and southern representatives present, it was officially stated to the public press, and not disputed, that the cost per ton would not exceed 3.03 cents per ton, or approximately $5,000,000 per year on an average annual production of 150,000,000 tons.

The Department of the Interior has the production cost record of all mines. It possesses all information about coal efficiency, mine capacities, freight rates, and all other information essential in determining the economic relationship of the bituminous-coal industry. One thing the public should understand is the fact that coal is not sold merely on a tonnage basis because there is a sales unity in freight-rate calculation but on the B. t. u. ton basis, which overcomes most freight-rate differentials about which the southern operators complain.

With the Government in possession of complete statistical knowledge of the industry, with Government regulation of coal prices in effect, and with an established collective bargaining arrangement that has time and again proven the only basic stabilizing force within the industry, it does not require much imagination to discover that such an industrial set-up and consumer protection constitutes the ideal economic arrangement that the people and the Government have so long demanded in all industry.

The southern operators should accept the honest audit of production costs which the Government has at hand, and which shows the ability of the southern operators to eliminate the 40 cents differential that they have so long enjoyed without any economic justification. They can do this without impairing their normal profit returns in the least.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short table showing the difference between commodities of life under two Governments, the United States and Russia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement that I am today making before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times-Herald for this morning carries a story that indicates that at the present time the United States is in a practical sense convoying munition-laden British merchant ships as they leave the harbors at Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York.

If this be true, then it is being done in a secret, evasive manner, and the American people are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. Speaker, everyone, from the President on down, seems to be agreed that convoying means war. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate should at once summon all officials who might know about this alleged convoying and ascertain the truth. If we are convoying, it should be stopped immediately, at least until the people of America know what is going on and this Congress has had an opportunity to act.

As the author of House Joint Resolution 152, which is identical with the resolution introduced in the other body by Senator TOBEY, I hope that a hearing can be had on these resolutions at an early date. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to say, in response to what the gentleman from Nebraska has just said, that the newspapers today also carry a statement from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, that there is not one scintilla of truth, in any way, shape, or form, in the statements and the reports to which the gentleman from Nebraska alludes. [Applause.]

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I opposed the Tinkham amendment, introduced by the distinguished Congressman from Massachusetts, to bar Russia from any aid under the lease-lend bill, H. R. 1776, then under consideration, because it was my firm belief at that time that even though Russia was guilty of the charges as stated to the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman TINKHAM, we in America should not alienate her friendship, because in so doing, actually, we would force Russia into an alliance with the Axis Powers. At the time of deliberation in the House on H. R. 1776, Russia had already signed a treaty with Germany, and, in my opinion, she was then a silent partner in the Axis dictatorship. This alliance has now become a vital active force in the new treaty between Russia and Japan, and the menace to the United States in this new pact cannot be overemphasized. Japanese leaders have been working for a long time to eliminate the Soviet threat in the north so that their Army and Navy could concentrate on the program of southern expansion, and there is no doubt that Japan's objective in signing the documents a few days ago in Moscow, spurred on by Hitler, is aimed directly at the United States. It is quite clear that this treaty compels our Navy to be constantly on the alert and "on patrol" in the Pacific, and it makes the question of convoy an even more fateful one. The Nazi press states that the Japanese-Russian accord will have a salutary and sobering effect upon the "aid for Britain" advocates in the United States. Statistics indicate that prior to this pact materials of vital use in the present war had been exported to Russia in greater amounts than all her purchases in the past 5 years, and we know that these exported commodities have found their way into Germany to help Germany carry on her war against the same democracies we are pledged to help under the lease-lend bill in order to promote the defense of the United States of America. It would be highly inconsistent for us, the "arsenal of democracies," to continue to export to Russia any goods that might be used in warfare, who in turn would transfer them to Germany to fight the very democracies we are pledged to help, as we well know that Russian communism propagates and thrives on a fertile program of this nature.

Russia has been just as guilty in this present war as has Germany, in view of her ruthless tactics against helpless Finland and Poland. She has disqualified herself in the eyes of the world from any assistance or help from the United States. However, with the signing of the Russian-Japanese pact it is my firm belief that she has sealed her doom with us and has definitely alienated any further friendship with the United States.

I contemplate the introduction of legislation which will place Russia in the same category as her Axis partners and deny her any aid whatsoever under H. R. 1776. Further, I believe that we should declare null and void any other trade agreements between Russia and the United States. I feel certain that our President will act accordingly in pursuing his splendid foreign policy. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Sign on labor and national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by General Drum on the Plattsburg idea of training camps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include quotations of certain Philippine leaders with respect to their friendship with our country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on The Time Table of the European War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by a St. Louis labor organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today and I ask unanimous consent that the special order may be postponed until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement on gold by Mr. Harold Fleming, an economist.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the legislative program of the day and following any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I made today may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BLAND, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CULKIN, and Mr. OLIVER.

THE PRINCIPLE OF MAJORITY RULE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, 83 percent of all Americans want this country to stay out of war. That means that only 17 percent are undecided or favor our armed intervention in a shooting war. For over 150 years this country has been dedicated to the principle of majority rule.

If in spite of this vast majority against war, President Roosevelt plans or blunders his way into war through the use of convoys or some less obvious means, I suggest that he immediately resign the Presidency and turn it over to Wendell Willkie.

After all, if minority rule is to become the basis of Government in America, Willkie is entitled to the job. Willkie received 45.05 percent of the vote last November which is almost three times the size of the minority vote recorded for war by any poll taken in this country at any time since the war began in September 1939. I make this suggestion in good faith and in strict conformity with the ancient adage "What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, first by the insertion of an editorial from the New Ulm Journal, on the topic "What's Behind the Strikes," and, secondly, by the insertion of an editorial from the Mankato Free Press, on the topic "Forcing a Labor Crisis."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE TREASURY AND WAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we hear much talk about keeping our country out of war. I sometimes wonder whether the Congress is not trying to keep us out of war by bankrupting us, when I look at the Treasury financial statements, and find out how rapidly we are going into the red. I wonder, where are you going to get the money? Further, are you going to have a tax bill which you promised the people sometime that you would present at this session? You will have to have one, and I am asking the Ways and Means Committee to bring in a tax bill that will make the people of this country tax conscious of our spending. We want them to realize that you will ruin this Nation when you get a two-ocean navy and a million and a half men under arms unless you raise money to support them. Now, they say they are going to ask for two and a half million men under arms. What are we going to do? The people of this country never realized that we were going to be a militaristic nation, but that is what we are building up to now, and if we get into this war we will wreck this Nation because we will not have any money to carry it on. All you do is spend, spend, spend with no thought of where you get the money to pay the bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of an article from the Saturday Evening Post by Harry Scherman. This may slightly exceed the amount under the rule, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed, notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 4.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. HARRY L. HOPKINS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, day by day we get a report that the production schedules for airplanes, for guns, for munitions, for camps are all behind. Day by day we hear of strikes, but perhaps the worst blow that the President has struck at national defense has been the appointment of Harry L. Hopkins as coordinator of the defense program. Mr. Hopkins' record in the W. P. A. is the grossest record of incompetence of any of the notorious incompetents that the Roosevelt administration has produced. Why the President cannot put someone in the position who will do a job and see that we get our production up where it belongs and take care of national defense in this country is something that I cannot understand. It is time for the President to cooperate in the defense program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PARTIALITY AND PREFERMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONSCRIPTION ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the World War there were a great many ugly rumors of partiality, preferment, and favoritism in connection with the administration of the conscription act that was in vogue at that time. It is rather interesting that we should be regaled this week by press accounts of what may appear to be preferment or attempts to secure preferment. I do not pass on the merits of the case that is being ventilated in the papers at the present time. I do say that one of the best ways to destroy the morale of this country would be to let it appear that there is preferment and favoritism.

I would respectfully suggest to my good friend the majority leader that I think it would be an excellent idea if a resolution of inquiry were promoted in this House from the majority side to see whether there are cases of that kind, because it should be stopped now rather than have the thing develop to a point where cases will be brought to the attention of the country later, which will definitely impair the morale of the people, and especially that great host of young men who are the real backbone of our Army. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day is disposed of tomorrow and any other special order I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the legislative business today and any other special order I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HARRY L. HOPKINS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the charges made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] with reference to Harry Hopkins, I cannot let those statements go unchallenged.

I respect the views of the gentleman from New York. He is a very fine gentleman, with a very strong mind and a very fair gentleman, having in mind the very partisan considerations that he so vigorously entertains. But the making of reckless statements should be done only when the evidence is convincing.

As far as Harry Hopkins is concerned, he has always led the fight of the underdog, the underprivileged. History shows that any man who fights for the underdog during his lifetime is vigorously condemned by some. Anyone who fights for the unfortunate, no matter in what position he may be, during his lifetime must expect to be condemned, because they try to destroy his effectiveness by undermining the respect of the people for such men, by characterizing them in a manner which the evidence and the facts do not warrant.

Harry Hopkins is one of the outstanding Americans of the present generation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

CLARA HARKNESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 180) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 180

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Clara Harkness, widow of L. M. Harkness, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said L. M. Harkness.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Kansas Legislature and a table submitted by the Tariff Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

CONSTRUCTION OF ARMY CAMPS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the United States Army cantonment at Indiantown Gap is located approximately 10 miles from Harrisburg, Pa. It was a National Guard camp which was turned over to the Federal Government. The original cost of this camp upon which the first appropriation bill was based, was estimated at $7,665,600. It is now estimated by the contract engineer that it will cost $17,956,027 and that there will be a deficit of approximately $10,300,000. This project was commenced October 9, and the original date set for its completion was January 1, 1941. This was later extended. The original project provided for the housing of the Twenty-eighth Division only or for the housing of 918 officers and 17,883 men in 803 buildings. The present project provides for the housing of 1,101 officers and 20,401 men in 1,054 buildings. By housing I mean, of course, not only barracks but mess halls, warehouses, recreation centers, and so forth.

SITE

Indiantown Gap, like ancient Rome, is situated on seven hills. It was built at the foot of a mountain range on a series of hills, large and small. The total area covers 15,000 acres, all of which is being leased by the Federal Government from the State of Pennsylvania. I have no information as to the length of time for which the land is leased, nor its terms. The camp is approximately 18,000 feet or 3½ miles in length. The vast majority of the buildings are built upon rock, although some of the rock is covered with soil. The contour map shows a very uneven surface, and a personal inspection verifies the fact that the engineers found it difficult to find enough level ground to locate any group of buildings without tremendous expense in leveling off rock. Practically every telephone and telegraph post hole had to be drilled out of solid rock with electric drills. Every pillar upon which were built the numerous buildings had to be set in a base drilled out in the same manner. The difficulty and expense in leveling off rock or trying to do any grading in this area made it necessary, even in the selection of the most level piece of ground, to situate such buildings in such a way that while the front part of the building was level with the ground the back part of the building was setting on stilts anywhere up to 12 feet in height. This was particularly true in the construction of the hospital where enclosed walks from one building to the other made it necessary to have such walks on a grade which did not exceed 5 percent. This grade was made necessary by the fact that patients are taken from one building to another in wheel chairs. Owing to climatic conditions it was necessary to enclose that portion of the building between the first floor and the ground. Drop siding was used for this purpose, and in many instances it required more lumber to board up the portion of the building from the ground to the sills than it did from the sills to the eaves. This again was particularly true in building the hospital unit. I was informed that every water line and sewer line had to be laid in trenches drilled out of solid rock; such trenches, because of the unevenness of the ground, were in some instances 16 to 18 feet in depth. It is very difficult to estimate the additional expense incurred due to the laying of water mains, sewer lines, the drilling of post holes through shale rock, the extra length of building piers, and the fact that they had to be set in solid rock. The building area is approximately 18,000 feet or nearly 3½ miles in length. As stated hereinbefore, this is a one-division camp. A level area would have made it possible to build this camp in a rectangular form or from 1½ to 2 miles in length, saving the expense of building from one-third to one-half of the main sewer lines, electric lines, water and telephone lines, and other facilities. Here again, thousands of dollars could have been saved. There is no question in my mind that the selection of this site has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars.

TERMITE SHIELDS

Fifteen thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent for termite shields on this project. Termites, I am informed, like ants, nest in the soil and have to get below the freezing line. They cannot live in rocky country unless there is adequate soil above the rocks so they can get beneath the freezing line. Indiantown Gap is in the freezing zone where they actually have, I am informed, very cold weather. It is built on rock which defies the nest-making ability of the most determined termite. There is one building on this reservation which

has been there a good many years. Some people contend that the building was erected in the year 1640. I was informed it could actually be traced back to the year 1690. For 250 years this wooden structure has set there and no termite has ever dared to attack it and yet we spent $15,000 for termite shields. When I questioned the construction quartermaster about the matter he verified my statement. I asked him why he did not notify the construction quartermaster's office at Washington of the facts and he told me he had informed the construction quartermaster's office giving them all the facts in a personal interview at Washington; that the Washington office called him on the phone the next day and instructed him to put the termite shields on. It would have been difficult for me to believe this had I not had experience with some of the winding and unwinding of red tape during the World War. I recall a lieutenant colonel of the Quartermaster Corps in a debarkation port in France who refused to issue rations to some 8,000 hungry troops who had just arrived because he could not find the proper form to fill out. Apparently we still have some of the same conditions in the Army today. The Army apparently still wraps itself up in red tape to such an extent that it becomes as helpless as an Egyptian mummy to act quickly in an emergency. It was apparently easier in this instance to let the provisions for termite shields stand even though it cost the taxpayers $15,000, than it was to unwind the red tape and save this $15,000. I did not attempt to learn who it was that sold termite shields.

In my judgment what we need in the Army today is authority on the part of some one individual to crash through so-called red tape and get immediate action on matters of this kind without going through miles of red tape which the Army calls channels.

LUMBER

The total amount of lumber purchased was 39,470,680 feet up to March 31; 13,752,818 feet was purchased by the contractor for a total of $578,072.54 at an average price of $42.03 per thousand feet; 25,717,866 feet was purchased by the quartermaster general's office for $1,014,482 at an average price of $39.45 per thousand. The following gives the schedule of the largest number of purchases by the contractor and the quartermaster general's office:

CONTRACTOR

Date	Purchase order No.	Feet board measure	Amount
Oct. 7, 1940	35	1,017,589	$43,149.30
Jan. 13, 1941	1683	2,050,000	77,687.50

QUARTERMASTER GENERAL

Oct. 14, 1940	116	3,272,000	$126,901.05
Do	221	1,384,500	56,883.25
Do	224	1,717,500	69,164.00
Do	230	1,361,000	51,303.71
Do	246	1,960,300	79,745.81
Do	248	3,001,700	122,587.60
Do	258	3,934,800	153,357.00

The lumber was delivered either f. o. b. railroad car at the station or the building site by trucks. The lumber was all scaled or counted at the railroad car before unloaded or at the truck when unloaded by both the contractor and the construction quartermaster. The vendor was paid according to this scale.

I might say in passing that 75 percent of the lumber that is now in the buildings at these camps was in the tree, growing, when Congress passed the act.

INSPECTION OF LUMBER

The engineer architect inspected the lumber as to grade and moisture content. No moisture machine was used, but the engineer used three methods of testing the lumber as to moisture: First, weight; second, feel; and third, breakage. The lumber was rejected on two occasions, and the lumber industry sent an inspector. The engineer was sustained both times. The contractor engineer states the quality of the lumber was above the grade required and that the moisture content was about up to grade.

SALVAGE

Forms were hauled from one location or area to the next and reused as long as usable. All surplus lumber or odd pieces that were usable were hauled to the next location. The scrap lumber and ends were hauled to a salvage field, worked over, and used for skirting around the bottom of buildings. The balance of the lumber not usable was turned over to the camp quartermaster.

EQUIPMENT

The total appraised value of all equipment rented was $991,250. The total rental paid up to March 31 was $432,754. The estimated additional rental to be paid is $59,185, making the total rental $491,939. The contractor received the Associated General Contractors' rental rate on his own equipment, but the Army paid 20 percent over the A. G. C. rates on equipment rented from third parties. They also paid the freight charges in shipping equipment to the job.

CHECKING EQUIPMENT

Each piece of equipment was inspected by the contractor's representative and reinspected by the construction quartermaster to see whether or not such equipment was fit and in good condition. If accepted, it was numbered and checked several times a day, and the time was checked several times a day. The contractor's time was checked four times each day. The repair shop kept a record and report on all equipment in the shop for repairs, giving the time when such equipment came to the shop and when it left the shop.

LABOR

This was an open shop. There were 12,960 men employed on this job at its peak, of whom 4,407 were carpenters, 65 helpers, 5,854 laborers, 637 plumbers, 283 sheetmetal workers, 172 electricians, the remainder being miscellaneous employees. Approximately 20,000 different men were employed during the duration of the job up to March 18, the day that I was there. The contractor stated that 80 percent of those who were paid carpenters' wages were good carpenters. This was rather unusual. However, Indiantown Gap was some distance from the nearest large Government project and in the vicinity of Harrisburg, where there was a fair supply of labor. The frames of the buildings were fabricated at a mill where power saws were used. Inch lumber, such as siding, flooring, and so forth, was cut on the building site by both bench and power hand saws.

WAGE SCALE

The wage scale was fixed on October 11, 1940, under a decision of the Secretary of Labor made in accordance with the Bacon-Davis Act. I was informed that there was no increase in the wage scale after the original determination was made.

The following scale is a partial wage scale covering the principal crafts:

	Per hour
Asbestos workers	$1.37½
Bricklayers	1.37½
Carpenters	1.00
Electricians	1.12½
Laborers, building	.65
Laborers, unskilled	.50
Cement finishers	1.12½
Painters	.87½
Plumbers	1.25
Roofers, composition	1.00
Sheet-metal workers	1.25
Steamfitters	1.25
Steamfitters-welders	1.37½
Truck drivers, under 3 tons	.70
Truck drivers, 3 tons and over	.75

ORGANIZATION OF WORKERS

The men were organized in areas, each area having a superintendent with a general labor foreman. There was a general carpenter foreman for each group of buildings and a carpenter or labor pusher for each 15 or 25 men. They operated on what might be called the progressive plan; that is, one crew put in the piers or foundations; the next crew built the first floor, including the setting of joists; the next crew built the frame; the next did the siding, and so forth. The contractor states that the carpenter or foremen were actually carpenters who could tell the crew not only what to do but how to do it. Time was checked four times each day—when the men went to work in the morning and at noon, and during midforenoon and midafternoon.

OVERTIME

Premium paid for overtime or for services not performed up to February 18 was $775,000, or approximately 4.3 percent of the total cost of the job. There was no overtime paid after February 18.

RAILROADS

No railroad of any kind was built. The material was hauled from the railroad siding about 3 miles to the camp.

OVERHEAD

The total of contractor's overhead was $551,137, or 4 percent of the total expenditures. This includes the salaries of superintendent, assistant superintendent, pay roll and employment department. The engineer's overhead was 1¾ percent, including the amount of the fixed fee. The camp construction quartermaster's overhead was 1.6 percent. This included office, inspection force, and so forth.

RATIO OF LABOR TO MATERIAL

The total expenditures on this project to March 31 was $13,690,537 of which $8,468,907 was paid to labor and $5,221,630 was the amount paid for items other than labor. This latter included material, equipment, insurance, taxes, and so forth. The ratio of labor to material was 62 percent labor and 38 percent material. I call attention to the wage scale paid on this project. At its height there were 4,407 carpenters who received $1 an hour as against $1.25 an hour at Meade and $1.62½ at Belvoir. There were 5,854 unskilled workers who received 50 cents an hour as against 62½ cents at Meade and 80 cents at Belvoir. In other words, over 10,000 of the nearly 13,000 employees have on this project at its peak received less than $1 an hour. In view of this fact the ratio of labor to material seems high even after taking into consideration the fact that $775,000 was paid as premium to labor in overtime. The organization of the working crews was apparently excellent. There were fewer wood butchers and more carpenters on this job, according to the contractor's statement, than on any other job with which I came in contact, with possibly one or two exceptions.

In my judgment, the ratio of labor to material is due to these factors: First, that up to March 31 we paid $775,000, or 4.3 percent of the total cost of the job to that date, in premium for overtime; second, the labor required because of the rock formation of the site referred to herein in the construction of the piers, trenches for water and sewer lines, telephone and telegraph posts; third, the tremendous extra expense in the building of piers in some instances many times the length that would have been required on level soil; fourth, the fact that the camp had to be spread out because of the site in such a way as to require 3½ miles of main sewer lines, water lines, electric lines, roads, and other facilities, whereas a level site would have required perhaps one-third to one-half less; fifth, the fact that this camp was built in severe climate during the winter months when labor could naturally not produce as it could in mild climate or milder weather; and sixth, not only did the site require one-third to one-half more expense in labor because of the way it was spread out, but that also applies to material.

CONCLUSIONS

First. Cost: The estimated cost upon which the original appropriation bill was based for Indiantown Gap project was $7,765,600. The contract engineer in his weekly report now estimates it will cost $17,956,027.

Second. Capacity: The original project provided for 918 officers and 17,883 men to be housed in 803 buildings. The present project provides for 1,101 officers and 20,401 men to be housed in 1,054 buildings.

Third. Site: Indiantown Gap, like ancient Rome, is situated on seven hills and covers 15,000 acres. Due to the hilly and rocky formation of the land, it was necessary to spread the camp out until it was 3½ miles long. Every building pier had to be set in solid rock. Every telephone and telegraph post hole had to be drilled out of hard rock. Water and sewer lines had to be laid in trenches, drilled out of solid rock in some instances 18 feet deep. Climatic conditions were such that the unused portion underneath the buildings had to be boarded up, the building in some instances set on piers 10 to 12 feet high, and it required more lumber to build up the unused portion of the building from the first floor to the ground than from the first floor to the eaves. The fact that the camp was twice as long as it should have been because of the hills and rocks required the building of 3½ miles of main sewer lines, telephone, telegraph, and water lines, whereas had the camp been built on level land at a rectangular shape only one-half of such main lines would have been required.

Fourth. Termite shields: Fifteen thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent for termite shields on this project, despite the fact that a wooden structure stands near by which was erected in the year 1690, is 250 years old, and no termite has ever dared to attack it. When the construction quartermaster of the camp notified the Washington office of the facts, he was told to leave it as it is. Apparently it was easier to let the provision stand than it was to unwind the red tape and save the taxpayers $15,000. The Army apparently still wraps itself up in red tape until it becomes as helpless to act quickly in an emergency as an Egyptian mummy.

Fifth. Lumber: The average lumber prices were approximately the same when everything was taken into consideration as it was in other camps, which was from 20 to 25 percent too high.

Sixth. Equipment rental: The equipment rental amounts to approximately 50 percent of the appraised value of the equipment rented. While the total amount of rental is high, the rate paid was not over 20 percent in excess of the A. G. C. rate.

Seventh. Labor: 12,960 men were employed at the peak, of whom 4,407 were carpenters and 5,854 were day laborers. Eighty percent of the men who were paid carpenter wages were carpenters.

Eighth. Wage scale: The wage scale was the lowest paid in the northern area.

Ninth. Overtime: $775,000, or approximately 4.3 percent of the total cost of the job, was paid as premium for overtime.

Tenth. Ratio of labor to material: The total expenditures on this project to March 31 was $13,690,537, of which $8,468,907 was paid to labor and $5,221,630 was paid for items other than labor. The ratio of labor to material was 62 percent labor and 38 percent material. The ratio of labor to material was very high despite the comparatively low wage scale and the high percentage of carpenters doing carpenter work. This was due to, first, $775,000 premium paid for overtime; second, the excessive amount of labor required because of the rocky formation of the site; third, extra expense in building piers; fourth, the fact that 3½ miles of main sewer, water, and electric lines had to be built because of the rocky soil condition; and, fifth, the fact that much of the work was done in severe climate during the winter months.

Eleventh. Excess costs: It is my judgment that the excess cost on this project is at least $4,276,000. When I take into consideration the low wage scale paid as compared to other projects in the same area, it seems to me that the ratio of labor to material and other expenses should have been, labor, 40 percent, and material and other expenses, 60 percent, instead of labor, 62 percent, and material and other expenses, 38 percent. Certainly, with this low wage scale, labor should not have exceeded 50 percent of the total cost of the project, which would have given us a ratio of, labor, 50 percent, and material and other expenses, 50 percent. Apparently, 38 percent, or $6,840,000, of the total cost of this project was spent for material. If this represented 50 percent of the total cost and we added a similar amount, or the other 50 percent for labor, then the project would have cost $13,680,000 instead of $17,956,000. In other words, on a ratio of 50 percent labor and 50 percent material, there would have been a saving of $4,276,000.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. In connection with the hospital at this site, and in connection with the hospitals at camps in general, I think the gentleman will be greatly interested to know that I have visited hospitals in these camps. I want to put in the RECORD the fact that recently I found 775 soldiers in the hospital of a camp out of the 20,000 soldiers there. The next day there were 955 soldiers in the hospital. I think it is quite a surprise to most people to know that the hospital is about the most important feature of the camps.

Mr. ENGEL. Those of us who have had that experience and spent 6 or 8 weeks in an Army hospital in time of war have been impressed with the necessity of having adequate hospital facilities.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. If there were no other large cantonments nearby, why was it necessary to pay a premium to labor?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not recall exactly what reason they gave me in this particular instance, but the reasons usually given are, first, the completion date line. This camp was started last October and was supposed to be completed by January 1. The first thing you notice when you look at diagrams showing pay rolls and progress in all these camps is that the pay rolls jumped up very sharply at the beginning of the work but progress did not make a parallel rise. This indicates they were using more men on the job than could be economically used.

In the case of Camp Meade the second reason given was that they tried to make up the differential between the wage scale at that camp and the wage scale at Belvoir, a nearby camp, by paying overtime. They attempted to bring about this equalization through paying overtime.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to clear up this question of overtime. How much do the men receive for overtime; time and a half, or double time?

Mr. ENGEL. In some cases they receive time and a half, and in other cases double time. Each camp has a different rule. At some they pay time and a half for overtime during the week and double time for Saturday and Sunday. At other camps they pay time and a half during the week, including Saturday, and double time on Sunday.

Mr. COLE of New York. Has the War Department given the gentleman any justification for the selection of this site which resulted in such vastly increased cost?

Mr. ENGEL. I have not asked for any justification. I do not think there can be any justification. I do not know why this site was selected other than that it was a National Guard camp and had some buildings on it. They could have selected many other sites which would have been more economical to develop where they would not have had to blast trenches out of solid rock to lay their water pipes, where they would not have had to lay double the length of water mains, sewer mains, and electric lines.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. From the gentleman's observation in this investigation he has conducted who in the final analysis selects these sites?

Mr. ENGEL. I am informed that the selection is made through the General Staff here at Washington. I am informed that the Corps Area Commander makes the recommendation.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Did the gentleman say there was any very specific reason why they used a National Guard camp?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes; there were some savings there, but there could not have been very much of a saving when you have to spend over $18,000,000 for a one-division camp.

Mr. THOMASON. Is the gentleman a contractor?

Mr. ENGEL. I am not. I am a lawyer.

Mr. THOMASON. The reason I asked that was that I wondered if any responsible contractor on the outside has confirmed the gentleman's figures and estimates on this particular camp.

Mr. ENGEL. When I arrived at the camp construction quartermaster's office, I had the construction quartermaster and his assistants, the contractor and his cost accountant, or project manager, the contractor himself, the contract engineer and his force all in one room. When I took down a figure or statement I read it back for verification. Some of the figures I have here are in the form of statements issued by the quartermaster. Here is a photostatic copy of the weekly report which they make. Here is another statement on the ratio of labor to material which the construction quartermaster furnished me.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not mean to question the gentleman's figures. He knows as a lawyer, however, that certain evidence is necessary in order to be convincing proof of the statements he makes. So I just want to be sure, in fairness to th War Department and to the gentleman, that there is some evidence in the record to show that there has been negligence, or bad judgment or waste of public money, or whatever the gentleman wants to call it.

Mr. ENGEL. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that I have had information that the War Department has had engineers go over my Blanding and Meade speeches, made on April 1 and April 3. They have had 2 weeks but no answer has been made by them thus far. I welcome criticism. I want the War Department to take these figures, go over them, and if I am wrong I want them to say so. Every figure I have, I received from either the War Department, the camp construction quartermaster, the contract engineer, or the contractor himself, and I have the original records here if the gentleman would like to inspect them.

Mr. THOMASON. I think the gentleman has been rendering a very fine public service. But this House by resolution has instructed the Committee on Military Affairs to make an investigation of the entire matter. May I say, inasmuch as I have been made chairman of the Subcommittee on Real Estate, Housing, and Construction, that I welcome these facts and this data he is giving us. In that connection, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: I observe from the public press, if he did not say it here, he made the statement that there were certain acts of negligence, I do not know whether criminal negligence or not, that in his judgment justified the court martialing of certain officers. I would like to know, therefore, if the gentleman has any evidence of profiteering, racketeering, or criminal participation by anybody, and especially those connected with the War Department in any of these camps.

Mr. ENGEL. If the gentleman will read the RECORD he will find exactly what I said. When I made that statement I had in mind Meade and Blanding. Surely, when a construction quartermaster of the United States Army comes before your Military Affairs Committee and says that Camp Blanding cost $5,000,000 more than they figured it was going to cost, because of the site that was chosen, somebody is responsible for the waste of that $5,000,000. I repeat what I said in my Meade speech, that the officers in the United States Army who are responsible for the selection of these sites and the waste of these millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money ought to be court-martialed and kicked out of the Army. [Applause.] The gentleman from Texas is an able and distinguished Member of this body, and I am certain he will do everything in his power to clear some of these matters up.

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I am sure all of us want to see this job as well and thoroughly done as possible; at the same time we must have evidence upon which to base serious charges. No investigation in detail has been made as yet by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Does not the gentleman think it is a serious charge when the construction quartermaster of the United States Army comes before your Military Affairs Committee and admits an expenditure of $5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money has been needlessly made because of the selection of a site that is 44 percent below lake level?

Mr. THOMASON. I think that is a very serious charge.

Mr. ENGEL. Does not the gentleman think that men who are responsible for that waste of money ought to be punished?

Mr. THOMASON. I think that is a very serious charge.

Mr. ENGEL. It certainly is; and they confessed it.

Mr. THOMASON. I think it ought to be investigated. The gentleman has stated, however, that he has had no explanation or that he has received no facts from the War Department or the General Staff who selected this site; so I assume in all fairness he would want them to be given an opportunity to explain this.

Mr. ENGEL. I made the talk on Blanding on the 1st of April and on Meade on April 3. Today is the 17th, yet nobody has answered my charges.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The officials themselves ought to know all the gentleman has been telling us here, if this site caused a waste of $5,000,000. Possibly the Department of Justice should look up the evidence. A Member of Congress is not required to go around and look it up.

Mr. THOMASON. I did not even intimate any such thing. That is exactly what is going to be done, but I want to know where the evidence is.

Mr. ENGEL. May I say to the gentleman that the Secretary of War and the construction quartermaster left Washington on the morning of February 24. That is the information I had at Camp Blanding. They visited Camp Jackson, S. C., a tremendously big camp, went from there to Camp Blanding, Fla., another large camp. When they were through at Camp Blanding, I was told, they left there before 3 o'clock in the afternoon of the same day. If you can tell me how you can go out here and inspect two camps and travel some 850 miles, eat your lunch, and do it in about 7 or 8 hours, you can do better than I can.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am sure the entire House appreciates the value of the work the gentleman has done in spending his time and efforts to get this information. I just wonder if the gentleman is aware of the fact that certain officers of the War Department regard the gentleman from Michigan and have characterized him as a Communist, which seems to be the only answer they are able to give to his accusations.

Mr. ENGEL. I may say to the gentleman that this is the first time in all my years that I have ever been accused of being a Communist. Calling names does

not answer questions. I have been accused of being about everything else, so this fills the roster. I would be interested in knowing who the officer is that accused me of being a Communist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suggest that to prevent bloodshed the gentleman do not give him the name.

Mr. ENGEL. No; I assure the gentleman I am a man of peace even if I have to fight for it.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman has investigated a number of camp sites?

Mr. ENGEL. I have.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman found that the labor costs are fixed by operation of law?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. That is, they are fixed by the Bacon-Davis Act, which has been on the statute books a good many years, and provides that the prevailing rate of wages in the community in which the work is to be performed shall be the wage rate, and that applies to all these camp sites, does it not?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes. Here is a photostatic copy of the wage rate fixed by the Secretary of Labor under the Bacon-Davis Act for Indiantown Gap. I do not want to put this in the RECORD because it is rather long. Under the Bacon-Davis Act, before the Army or any public department can take bids on a contract, the Secretary of Labor or someone representing her is supposed to make a study and determine what the prevailing wage is for each craft in that community or area. Then she issues the order. This order was issued October 11, fixing the wage scale for each craft. The order, with the information as to the wage scale, is then submitted to the War Department, and every bid that is submitted is submitted with the understanding and agreement that the contractor pay that particular wage scale.

Mr. HEALEY. So that is not left at all to any risk. The contractor, before he begins the job, knows what his labor costs will be?

Mr. ENGEL. The contractor knows what his labor costs will be, except for the possible question of the amount of overtime on the job.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Before asking the gentleman the question I have in mind, I ask that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Are there any special orders to follow? I do not want to impose on other Members who have special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMANN] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] have special orders following the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. I do not like to impose upon the gentlemen who follow me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman may have my 10 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. All right.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say first that I believe the gentleman is rendering a great service not only to the Congress but to the country as a whole. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have started getting letters from several different States inquiring about the gentleman's research and his findings. I believe it would be very helpful if the gentleman would include as a part of his remarks today a chronological index to the various statements he has made on the floor of the House, so that we can have the whole story before us to send out to those requesting it.

Mr. ENGEL. Does the gentleman refer to my various statements made recently or over a period of years? Let me inform the gentleman that this is not anything new.

Mr. MUNDT. I refer to the gentleman's statements within the last month or 2 months in connection with the building of the new camps.

Mr. ENGEL. I shall be pleased to do that. The speeches referred to will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of April 1 and 3.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I correctly understood the gentleman's statement, the site at Indiantown Gap cost in construction $5,000,000 more than it ought to have cost, substantially.

Mr. ENGEL. I made the statement that Indiantown Gap should have been constructed for approximately $4,250,000 less than it was constructed for, and I gave my reasons for so stating.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What did the site cost?

Mr. ENGEL. The site was turned over to them by the State of Pennsylvania as a National Guard camp, if I remember correctly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Free?

Mr. ENGEL. Free; yes. As I understand, some of the land is not very valuable, but some is, I imagine.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I have listened with interest to the gentleman's remarks. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman can confirm or deny a certain report that has been sent to me with respect to the manner in which men are chosen to work on these jobs. I understand the only requisite is that the men have a permit to work, and that many times after a man has gone to work they find he is not qualified for the particular trade for which he has a permit. Then they have to fire him after a week or two and get another man, and probably go through the same procedure. I have been informed that the average efficiency of the men working is around 25 percent. Is that true? Has the gentleman found any information on that?

Mr. ENGEL. I have tried to confine my studies to costs as far as I could determine them. I hope to make a talk on labor later and I do not want to anticipate what I am going to say at that time. I will say, however, that I found a superintendent who had been a construction superintendent for one of the largest housing construction companies in the United States for 25 years. He informed me that he had 800 carpenters under him at one of these camps and not to exceed 10 percent of the men he had under him were actually carpenters.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for just 2 minutes, because I do not want to impose on the time of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKERSHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. May I first complete my answers to this question? This man who was the construction superintendent for a large company building frame houses told me he had 800 men under him at 1 of these construction projects and that not to exceed 10 percent of those men were carpenters. I speak of carpenters not because I am picking on any one group, but because there were more carpenters involved than all the rest of them combined. That figure ranges from 10 percent referred to above to Indiantown Gap project where the contractor stated that 80 percent of the men drawing carpenters wages were carpenters.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. I would like to ask if these contracts were on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis?

Mr. ENGEL. These contracts, with two exceptions, were on a fixed-fee basis.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does not that mean the higher the cost and the more expenses they can pile up, the larger fee they can collect?

Mr. ENGEL. Not necessarily.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, based upon his practical experience in appropriation work and other types of work, and his State legislative experience, and his appropriation work here, and the forecasts he has made from time to time since this defense program started, and the investigation the gentleman has just completed and is now summarizing in these statements, if he has any reason to believe that in any such program of expenditure on the part of the Government misapplication of funds, and, you might say, graft can be kept

out without the closest supervision by investigating committees.

Mr. ENGEL. I should hate to admit we cannot expend money without dishonesty or graft.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But I say without the strictest supervision on the part of investigating committees.

Mr. ENGEL. We have to have the strictest supervision to avoid extravagance and waste if not graft or fraud.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. In view of this reference to communism, I think the statement should be placed in the RECORD that the gentleman from Michigan was an officer overseas for 2 years during the World War.

Mr. ENGEL. I served 27 months in the United States Army during the World War, with 23 months of service in France and Germany, and was discharged as a captain.

Mr. THOMASON. I would like to ask the gentleman what evidence, if any, he found of racketeering or profiteering in the purchase of land.

Mr. ENGEL. I did not go into the land purchases for the reason I had no authority to compel anybody to come in and testify as to what they had done, nor did I have time to examine records and abstracts of projects which involved from 2,900 to 117,000 acres of land. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on a distinguished American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem entitled "I Am the Cherry," by Guy Bogart, of Beaumont, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter addressed to me by the Honorable Philip A. Benson, president of the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn, N. Y., a very distinguished and respected member of our community. The letter deals with the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to comment on the question of what the policy of this country is. I read a part of an editorial that appeared in the Washington Star night before last:

As a Nation we are committed to the policy of giving all necessary aid to Britain and her allies. That means all aid necessary to insure either victory, or at the least, to prevent their defeat.

When I read that statement I asked myself the question, When did this Government commit itself to the policy of guaranteeing a victory to England or guaranteeing such force and help as would prevent the defeat of England?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will yield later on. Let us keep the record straight. This House is deeply indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] who, I think, made one of the most conclusive arguments against the lend-lease bill that was made during the course of the debate upon that measure. His remarks appear on page A1708 of the Appendix in the RECORD of April 3, 1941, and I commend them for rereading by the Members of this House. In that connection the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] quoted the statements made in the campaign before election. Now, in the light of what this paper claims to be a commitment on the part of this Government, I think those remarks bear restating. I quote from the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]:

The Republican platform, written at the Philadelphia convention, said:

"The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war. * * * We favor the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, all such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of national defense."

The Democratic platform, written in convention at Chicago said:

"The American people are determined that war raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa shall not come to America. We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. * * * We pledge to extend to these peoples all the material aid at our command consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national defense."

Is there anything in that platform that commits the Democratic Party or the Republican Party to insure a victory for England or any other nation? Is there anything in those platforms excepting that we are proposing to defend ourselves? That is the commitment we made in behalf of the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their platforms to the American people, when we were confronted with an election. Now what did Mr. Willkie say in the campaign? I again quote from the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]:

Candidate Willkie, running on the Republican platform, on October 4, 1940, and many times thereafter by transcription over the radio, said:

"If I am elected President of the United States I shall never lead this country into any European war. As a matter of fact, I shall never lead the country into any kind of a war unless the people, through their representatives in Congress, insist upon it, and I shall also refrain from indulging in extravagant attacks upon other nations. The best way for us to keep out of this war is by rebuilding our domestic economy and by the building of a great national defense, and by bringing our people into one united, common purpose to develop our own country, and to keep out of other people's troubles."

Speaking in Boston on October 12, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

"We can have peace, but we must know how to preserve it. To begin with, we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's war. Our boys shall stay out of European wars. There is only one way. We must become strong. We must build ourselves an air force, a Navy, and an Army so strong that no dictator will dare to tamper with our commerce, our interests, or our rights. That is the defense program we must have."

Speaking from Baltimore, on October 30, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

"I have given you my pledge many times over. I will work for peace. We are against sending our boys into any war other than the defense of our own country."

Let us now see what Candidate Roosevelt said, and I again quote from the same speech by the gentleman from Michigan:

President Roosevelt, addressing the Teamsters' Union, on September 11, 1940, said:

"I hate war, now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, and outside of my party as President of all the people, on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than 2 months ago. It said: 'We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'"

Is not that a direct refutation of the statement made in this Washington newspaper, the Evening Star, the night before last? You cannot convoy ships without getting into this war, and as President Roosevelt has said, the moment you convoy ships "the shooting begins," and I say when the shooting begins, war begins.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If you will pardon me, I will yield later.

Again the President said:

We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign

disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party.

At Boston Garden in October, Candidate Roosevelt said:

Our boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense.

Did you notice this morning's paper? Here is the scare headline:

United States escorts armed ships, Senators charge.

What is the difference between escorting a ship and convoying a ship? It is simply a twist of words. It means the same thing. If we escort our ships across the ocean with a battleship we are prepared to shoot in order to defend those boats.

I am just wondering, my friends, after reading this article in the morning paper, and the editorial referred to, if these platforms that the Democratic Party and the Republican Party adopted and the pledges given to the American people by Mr. Willkie and Candidate Roosevelt were only campaign oratory? Of course, Mr. Willkie admitted before a committee here that it was just campaign oratory. Of course, Mr. Willkie talked a lot—for which the Democrats should be thankful. I saw where some doctor out in California sent a bill to the Republican National Committee for $13,000 for work that he did on Candidate Willkie's throat during the campaign. In other words, he fixed that man so he could talk. I just thought to myself that the doctor sent the bill to the wrong committee. It should have been sent to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Only it should have been thirteen billions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The point I make is this: If he had not fixed this gentleman's throat so he could talk, it is hard to tell what the voters would have done in the November election.

And I, of course, always want to protect, if I can, the exchequer of the Democratic National Committee. I do not want them to pay a dime that they should not pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you not hear the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] say there was not a word of truth in that article to which you just made reference?

Mr. O'CONNOR. A word of truth in what article?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The one you just showed us in the Times-Herald about the ships.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not know what he said. I did not hear him. There is the paper. It speaks for itself. I do not know where either got their information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He said there was not any truth in that article.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Very well. I do not know whether there is or whether there is not, but I do know that there is truth in that statement I made as to what appeared in the Washington Star the night before last. I refute that statement. I say the American people in the last campaign did not commit themselves to the proposition of all-out aid to Europe. They only went so far as to say, "We will help England short of war." That is what they voted on. There was no issue between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie. Mr. Willkie said he agreed with Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy, except that he could do the job better than Mr. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will ask the same thing, then. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I promised to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wonder if the gentleman has inquired as to what this policy of "all aid, despite any risks," means; if it includes, for instance, using the threat to bludgeon Ireland to permit violation of her territorial integrity and surrender all her bases to England; and also in that connection I wonder if the administration endorses what was said at the English Speaking Union dinner the other night in the city of New York. I wonder what the reaction of the American people is going to be when they see that photograph of those two outstanding defenders of democracy kow-towing to each other, getting into a huddle, the great defenders of the four freedoms, Lord Halifax and J. Pierpont Morgan, the defenders of labor, of the unemployed, and of American democracy.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the publication of this article in the Times-Herald this morning and the statement by the gentleman from Virgina [Mr. WOODRUM] that there was no truth in it, in view of the gentleman's experience with White House statements, which one are we going to rely on now?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would rely on the President of the United States above many of the newspapers in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the statements that he has made to us that we have found to be untrue?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Until I find out that he is, directly or indirectly, violating the pledge that he gave to the American people, I will still have faith in him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is certainly gullible.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman has correctly quoted the expressions of the two candidates for the Presidency last fall. I wonder if the gentleman would care to give us his views as to the feelings of the American people on this convoy situation, assuming that there is some reason for the expressions in the Times-Herald upon this matter of convoying, and as compared to the expressions of the candidates before the last election?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I certainly will. I am glad the gentleman asked this question. I have not received a letter from any place in the United States or from any place in my own State in which the people asked that we convoy ships, because they all take it to mean war; they all say we should not. I have not received a single letter from any place in the United States wanting this country to go to war, and I have received thousands of letters to keep out.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I heard the gentleman make the statement that he believed the word of the President of the United States explicitly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will believe it until I cannot. I would sooner believe it than what I see in most Washington newspapers.

Mr. RICH. I am not here defending the Washington newspapers, but I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Pardon me—and I am going to take the President's word until I see where convoys will be used.

Mr. RICH. Before the President of the United States was elected in 1932, during the campaign of that fall, he said: "If you elect me, I will reduce the expenses of government by 25 percent; I will eliminate bureaus; I will consolidate offices." When the gentleman now sees what he has done, does not the gentleman feel ashamed that he ever put any confidence in him?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No. I will say to the gentleman that Mr. Roosevelt found an empty Treasury. He found a country that for 12 long years had suffered all the sins of omission and commission against every rule of democracy that ever existed in this country; he found the people out of employment and the banks closed; he found starvation staring the people in the face; he saw us on the verge of civil war. He had to take the steps he took in order to prevent civil war in this country; and the gentleman knows it as well as I.

Mr. RICH. No such thing. If the gentleman will compare the current statement of the Treasury with the statement issued at that time he will find that today's statement looks like Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard. If this course is pursued, the Nation will be wrecked, and we shall all go down with the wreck.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The foundation for this course was laid during the 12 long years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

Mr. RICH. Yes; he cried out against 3 long years of the Hoover administration, but I am telling the gentleman that for 8 long years he has been doing 10 times more damage to this Nation than Hoover ever thought of doing.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I believe it will take 16 years to undo what the Republicans did in 12.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair must first recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be discharged from consideration of the bill (H. R. 3257) to increase and equalize the pensions of those persons disabled as the result of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Military Affairs; that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3159) to remove certain limitations on the amount of retired pay of Regular or emergency officers who are veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, the China Relief Expedition, or the World War, and it be re-referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from the mayor of New York City, Hon. Fiorella H. LaGuardia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. And I hope after the gentleman answers one question he will permit me to ask another.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman may have the floor.

Mr. GIFFORD. I got the floor for the gentleman. I hope he will yield a little.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Most assuredly.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is fully in accord with the taking over of these Western Hemisphere territories that have been taken. The gentleman is in favor of taking these bases and protecting them, is he not?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am in favor of carrying out the purpose of the Monroe Doctrine even to the extent of putting a little rubber into it if necessary.

Mr. GIFFORD. We ought to embrace and protect the entire Western Hemisphere, which we have said we would do. I find no isolationist who says differently. Does the gentleman want to tell the House today we can do that without doing any convoying in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. O'CONNOR. First, it is not necessary to use convoys in the Western Hemisphere. I am for protecting the Western Hemisphere, but I am not going to support any bill or any policy that will permit us to convoy any supply ship to Great Britain or any other nation, because I feel that that means war, and I feel that it would be in violation of the pledges given the American people by President Roosevelt and my pledge to my people. when I was running for Congress. I told them I would do my best to keep this country out of war, and I am going to do that. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Then let us narrow the question. Is the gentleman willing to convoy goods manufactured here as far as Greenland?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am willing to do anything that is necessary to protect the American people or this country's rights within the Western Hemisphere. Remember this: If we go to convoying ships and supplies that are destined for England, in English boats, convoying them even to Greenland, to be convoyed by the British Government or any other belligerent government at that point, then is when your trouble will begin, and we will be in it. Indirectly, we then are sliding into this war by the side door or the back door.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman agree with this statement, written by one of the most authoritative persons writing in books today:

> Anyone who approves the occupation of Greenland and does not redouble his willingness to give support to Britain is too innocent to have learned the elementary facts of life.

If the Western Hemisphere is ours, how far are we going to withdraw ourselves and hide?

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman what I think about it?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not want you to try to question me. I am questioning the gentleman. His is the responsible party. We are going to find out here, and you are not going to dodge it much longer, how you feel on the convoy matter.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I can tell you how I feel about it. I am against convoys.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That ought to answer it.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is against it in the Western Hemisphere? Are you against convoying in your own back yard?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Just a moment. I defy the gentleman or the author of that article to point to a single instance where it has been necessary to convoy anything in the Western Hemisphere. [Applause.] I defy the gentleman or anybody else to show where a single American right has been violated by any country in the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, there is absolutely no need for convoys in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is the gentleman willing to stand here today—and I am going to have some of you say so—and do you want to tell Hitler and the world that you would convoy?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am going to tell Hitler and the world, because I am not afraid of him; Hitler cannot hurt us. I am willing to tell the world that so far as I am concerned I will never support a policy that will get this country into this war. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Is the gentleman speaking for the Democratic Party?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am speaking for JIM O'CONNOR.

Mr. GIFFORD. Who trusts his President.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Who left his politics in Montana when I came down here. I pursue, you will observe, a rather independent course.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman quoted his President. Is he with him or against him?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am with him as long as I feel he is right.

Mr. GIFFORD. But he is not with you any more.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And I will be with him as long as he stands by the pledge that he made to the American people. [Applause.] When he gets away from that pledge I will get away from him.

Mr. GIFFORD. But he made a pledge in 1933 and he got away from that quickly, yet the gentleman stayed with him.

Mr. O'CONNOR. He had to get away from it for the reason I told the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It is stated that he took 8 years. Maybe it will take 16 years to fix up the country after your 12 years of misrule. That is what you did.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman. He has spoken freely. He tries to hark back to that historical antidote.

Mr. O'CONNOR. You want to forget it. You want to forget the 12 long years. I do not blame you for wanting to. I would too, were I you.

Mr. KNUTSON. What does the gentleman term these last 8 years?

Mr. O'CONNOR. They have been arduous years. You left an awful situation for the Democrats to fix up.

Mr. KNUTSON. And you have not helped it any.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is going to take a long time.

Mr. KNUTSON. You have to gather all the unemployed and put them in camps, and put uniforms on them, in order to relieve the unemployment situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We had to do what we did to keep civil war from resulting from the way you treated the working people and the farmers of this country for 12 long years.

Mr. KNUTSON. All we get out of the Democratic rule is war. We got it in 1917, and we are going to get it again in 1941.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As one Member of the House, I wish to commend the gentleman's courage and his position on what I regard as the most important issue before the American people

today. Now, this article to which the gentleman referred in the Times-Herald this morning does not speak of convoying American ships. It says that we are using the battle craft of the United States Navy and Coast Guard in giving armed escort to munition-laden British merchantmen. We are not guarding American merchant ships. We are guarding British ships.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was putting it mildly, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think there is ample evidence for the Washington Star editorial writer saying what he said about our going to war. Has not the President said time and again in recent weeks and in recent days that we do not propose in this country to see Great Britain defeated?

Mr. O'CONNOR. But the Congress has not said so; and the people have said "No."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The President expects to put behind her such power and force as will enable England to win a total victory. Then on top of that, did not the Secretary of War, a Republican——

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to that term.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Testify the other day that we must prepare our young men to fight on terrains everywhere in the world? Certainly you are going to convoy ships—not only American ships but British ships. We are technically in this war now, and as the days go along we are going to get in deeper and get into a shooting war unless the people rise up and prevent it. In the end, the gentleman is right, because war means ruin and bankruptcy for this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly. I want to tell you something while you are on that, and I want this to get to the ears of the laboring men and of the farmers of this country, and to the middle classes of this country, because they will have to pay the bill in the end and do the fighting. It means a lower standard of living for every human being. It means putting our laboring class upon a parity with foreigners in Europe and South America, who work for half of what our people receive. It means a bankrupt nation, unemployment, and wholesale mortgage foreclosures. It means an end to our present way of life. It will also mean death and destruction for our young men, and it will mean that our hospitals will be overflowed with wounded in both body and mind. It will mean no end of pensions. It will nearly destroy our country, and we will lose all that we cherish and hold dear.

We cannot get into this war. We must stay out. We do not want to be the sucker nation of the world again, if we are not already it. Every nation on earth is now trying to get its hands into the United States Treasury, and many of them are doing it. We must not be the world's greatest sucker again.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The biggest thing is we are going to lose a lot of our liberties in this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman will recall that within the past week the President, by proclamation, has taken out of the combat zone certain waters of the world, including the waters of the Red Sea. The obvious purpose of that was, of course, to permit American vessels with American cargoes to proceed in those areas. The Axis very promptly countered by stating that any vessels, regardless of the flag under which they sail, finding themselves in those seas will be sunk. The day following, the President of the United States announced to the world at large that he as President would be compelled by law to defend American vessels wherever they might be found outside "combat areas" and wherever defense of those vessels was necessary. What is the implication of all this? How much additional evidence does the gentleman need to convince him that we are on the verge of something that his people do not want and mine do not want?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I still am trying to have faith in the commitments made to the Members of this House and to the United States Senate when the sponsors of the bill said the lend-lease bill was a peace measure. I still am hopeful that is what it is, and if it is, necessarily the President must be given some latitude.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is it not perfectly obvious that the next inevitable thing to occur will be contact between American merchant ships convoyed by American naval vessels and Axis bombers or submarines? When that time comes, does not the gentleman believe we will then find ourselves actually in a shooting war?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Whenever we convoy a ship into those zones or send our ships into those zones they will be shot at, and when that is done the war is on. I agree with the gentleman that far.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Then, will not the gentleman agree further that in view of the combination of circumstances I have just related, the action taken by the President must have been taken with the full knowledge of what the consequences would be?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree with the gentleman that it looks bad, but I have tried a lot of cases of circumstantial evidence, and I have many times found there was a missing link. I hope there is a missing link here, and I still pray the President will not use convoys.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I hope the gentleman's faith will be justified by subsequent events.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I still have some faith, and I pray it will be justified.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I first want to compliment the gentleman from Montana on his real efforts to keep our Nation out of this war. Does not the gentleman feel that in this city at least two newspapers and all through the East the bulk of the press are trying to make a concerted push to shove us into this war, whether we want it or not? Does not the same thing apply to the movies of the Nation? I cannot take my 10-year-old boy to the movies nowadays without his being left with the impression that we are in the war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no question but that the gentleman has put his finger on it. The picture shows are the worst of all. The moving-picture shows are trying to get us into the war and the eastern press generally is trying to get us into the war. I believe we have warmongers all over the United States trying to get us into the war. We have old men, too old to fight, and women who like to make headlines, and the international bankers trying to get us into the war.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I make the observation, so it will go into the RECORD, that the gentleman's approval and his applause came entirely from the Republican side. There is one question that I wanted to ask the gentleman but he avoided it, and I should like to put it in a different way. Would the gentleman approve of Ireland being annexed to the United States?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman did not ask me anything about Ireland, but let me tell you something about Ireland. Ireland occupies this position. She has fought for 600 years for what little rights she now has. She does not have so much today, but those rights have been won at the end of a long, heroic, sad, and terrific struggle with the aid of the United States. If she turns over these bases that England wants then of course Germany will come over and bomb her as it did the north of Ireland the other night, and as it did London last night. In other words, why should we ask Ireland to stick out her neck and to get into this war, when we here do not want to do it? Am I going to put myself in the position where I am asking my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to bare his breast to the bullets, when I do not want to do that myself, and is not that the situation?

Mr. GIFFORD. When Germany takes over Ireland you would want us to feed her?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not so sure Germany is going to take over Ireland. If Ireland had had a fair chance in the world she could feed herself and she would not ask for charity. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am against war, I may say to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], and I am pleased to see him take that position, but as was stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] when the gentleman from Montana said he was against war and would do everything he could to prevent it, I want him to understand that I take the same position, but remember that all the applause the gentleman got came from the Republican side. The Republicans do not want war. We are the fellows who applauded him because he said he was against the things that this administration is trying to do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What further evidence can be expected than the statement the President made to the Jackson Day diners when he said we must win this war?

Mr. RICH. I think the President will get us in the war if he is not careful. The President was on his fishing trip then and did not want to come back here to Washington to that $100-per-plate dinner. He said he would rather spend his time fishing than to associate, possibly, with those Jackson Day diners. They had gone after the employees of the Government here for these $100 dinners until they were all about strapped or busted furnishing a few extra dollars to the New Deal party, and he wanted to save his $100, so they called the dinner off. [Laughter.]

There is a serious side to this question that is confronting us and I have been talking about it more or less for the last 8 or 9 years. I have presented this Treasury statement to the gentleman from Montana, and every time I bring it up the Members on the Democratic side of the House get up and run out—now watch them go—they do not want to hear about this great debt they create. I have asked them time after time where you are going to get this money that you are squandering, where you are going to get this money that you are spending so unethically, putting this country so deeply in the red that the children—the boys and girls of this country—will have to pay the debts we are creating unless you repudiate them. If we cannot pay them ourselves, if we are not big enough to stand up here today and say we are going to finance our own country as we go along, how do you expect your children to ever finance them? This is the greatest squandering administration the world ever has known.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am informed that Mr. Hoover, when he went out of office as President, left a deficit of around $6,000,000,000, and I am also informed by the Treasury Department that our interest burden today is lower than it was at the time Mr. Hoover retired as President of the United States.

Mr. RICH. Who gave you that information? Who told you that? Name the man who told you that. I want to see him. I want to see the man who made that statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I made two statements. Which statement does the gentleman refer to—the one about the $6,000,000,000?

Mr. RICH. The man who told you that Mr. Hoover was in the red $6,000,000,000 and that he squandered money did not know what he was talking about and he certainly never saw this administration at work. Mr. Hoover's deficit in 4 years was $3,491,800,000. Mr. Roosevelt's deficit in 8 years was over $24,000,000,000, or over 600 percent more than Mr. Hoover's.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The information about the $6,000,000,000 was given to me by the majority leader of the House just as I left the floor. He told me about it.

Mr. RICH. Then the majority leader of the House is wrong again. He does not know. It was $3,491,800,000, not $6,000,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Wait a moment.

Mr. RICH. No; I want to answer your question. Just let me show you. When this administration came into power we had a national debt of about twenty-one and one-half billion dollars. There was a $45,000,000,000 debt limit. Since then the New Deal has increased that up to $49,000,000,000, and this year you hiked it again from $49,000,000,000 to $65,000,000,000. The gentleman should remember that after the World War the greatest debt of this country was August 31, 1919, $26,596,000,000. Now, you have a ceiling of $65,000,000,000, and I venture this assertion, that before 1942 rolls around very far you will be asking Congress to raise the debt limit to $100,000,000,000, because you cannot stay under the $65,000,000,000 debt limit very long the way you are going. Who did that in 8 years? Why, the man down here in the White House, and you gentlemen who voted for everything that he wanted. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Thank God, they cannot accuse me of doing any such thing as supporting his squandering. I am not a party to it, and just let me show you this. You fellows voted the other day to give the President $7,000,000,000 to do with as he pleased, in giving battleships away, airplanes, TNT, powder, and things to go over to Europe and kill people instead of trying to stop this war by peaceful means.

What is $7,000,000,000? A gentleman from New England wrote me the other day after I put a statement in the RECORD showing what $7,000,000,000 amounted to, to the effect that 1941 years have elapsed since the birth of Christ. Christ was crucified when He was 33 years of age. That leaves 1908 years since His death, and counting each year at 365 days in a year, multiplying 365 by 1908, you have 696,420 days. That includes Sundays and holidays, and every day except the extra day in leap years. Multiply that by $10,000 a day, and that will not equal $7,000,000,000 the great sum that you gave the President of the United States to give away. Your taxpayers, the people of this country, are going to have to suffer under this tremendous burden. Did the gentleman say that he did not vote for that $7,000,000,000?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did not.

Mr. RICH. Then I congratulate the gentleman. He is one of the few, only 55 of us, to be exact. A few on our side voted for it, but I do not care whether they are Democrats or Republicans, it was wrong to permit the President of the United States to have any such power. He should not have so much power in this country with that much money. His father spoiled him before he died by giving him so much money, and now the people of this country and the Congress have just ruined him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us get back to specific figures. We know that the national debt stood approximately at $20,000,000,000 when this administration took over.

Mr. RICH. About $21,500,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. At 5-percent interest on $20,000,000,000, that is a billion dollars a year tax burden. Let us remember what the gentleman from Montana said. Five percent interest on $20,000,000,000 is $1,000,000,000 a year tax burden.

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But we know that there was not a 5-percent burden interest.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the interest burden in the Budget for this current year?

Mr. RICH. One billion two hundred and fifty million dollars. That is what the Treasury Department wanted with which to pay interest on the national debt. But it should be remembered that we are now paying an average of only 1½-percent interest for our money. Much of it we get for less than that—maybe a quarter of a percent—and some of it we have to pay 3 percent for. The average is less than 1½ percent. The banks of the country have nothing to do with the money. The Government has got into everything. The banks have nothing to do with it; they cannot do anything. They are sitting idly by, because this administration has put the Government into all kinds of business, and we are becoming a communistic nation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us show this fact up. The information of the gentleman from Montana was incorrect. We know that in the present Budget the tax burden, the interest charge on the Government, is far beyond what the average interest burden was in 1933.

Mr. RICH. That is right. Any schoolboy can figure that out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the fact. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. RICH. I did not think it was worth talking about. I thought everybody in the United States knew it, and I did not think it was worth while to

explain it. The new dealers have not figured it out, however.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Now I yield to the gentleman from Montana, providing he does not take the whole 5 minutes, because I want a chance to answer any statement he might make. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to put the facts to the gentleman. The interest rate today is about 1½ percent on Government indebtedness. Before we started on the defense program, when our indebtedness was approximately $50,000,000,000, our interest burden was less on the $50,000,000,000 than it was at the time Mr. Hoover retired, when our indebtedness was $21,000,000,000. In other words, our interest was so high at that time and our Government securities were so low that it was hard to sell the Government securities and the Government had to offer as an inducement a high rate of interest in order to get people to buy the bonds; whereas today Government securities are so good that they can be sold at a rate of interest as low as 1½ percent. Therefore, before we started on the defense program our interest burden was lower than it was at the end of Mr. Hoover's administration.

Mr. RICH. No; the gentleman is wrong, absolutely. I want to tell the gentleman how far wrong he is. If you can get any consolation from the fact that we increased our national debt from $21,500,000,000 to $65,000,000,000, then I do not think anything of your business judgment, because there cannot be any sense to any Member of Congress or anybody else wanting to increase the national debt, especially to the point of wrecking our Nation. When we paid 3½ percent for money at the time of Mr. Hoover's administration, business was good in this country and people were getting interest on their money. The banks were able to conduct their business on a profitable rate of interest. Today the banks cannot do it; the people are scared to death to invest in anything.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There were no banks open.

Mr. RICH. Oh; the new dealers closed them, and liquidated many that never should have been liquidated. Today the banks have all the money they want. They cannot do anything with it. They are afraid to do anything with it. They are compelled to buy Government bonds. You will find you are going to have a very hard time to get the people of this country interested in buying bonds which in 5 years from now will not be worth a tinker's hoot, if we keep on going in debt as we have been.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman know that at the conclusion of the Hoover administration no bank was open? They were all closed.

Mr. RICH. If this administration had given any cooperation to the Hoover administration the banks would never have closed. But you were doing everything you could to oppose him. You were in control of the House of Representatives, and you would not give Mr. Hoover any power; you strangled him; you were to blame. I was here at the time, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who closed the banks?

Mr. RICH. The New Deal Democratic House, Mr. Roosevelt, wrecked the country, and now you want to put the blame on poor Mr. Hoover. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Just to keep the record straight, assuming for the sake of argument that the figure given by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], upon the authority of the majority leader, that Mr. Hoover left the country saddled with a $6,000,000,000 deficit was true, is it not also true that that represented only a small portion of the national debt which existed at the time the Hoover administration took over in 1929, and that we had, in fact, whittled it down from the enormous sum of twenty-six and one-half billion to sixteen billion?

Mr. RICH. First let me say Mr. Hoover's deficit was less than four billions, not six billions, as the majority leader informed his colleague. We whittled it down to sixteen and one-half billion. Then it went back to twenty-one and one-half billions. That was the Republican administration. But have you ever seen a Democratic administration that ever tried to reduce the national debt? Did you ever see a Democratic administration that ever reduced our debt? No; you never did. Have you ever seen a Democratic administration that ever reduced taxation of the people? Have you ever seen a Democratic administration that ever tried to save this Nation of ours? I think they are national wreckers, or Treasury raiders.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. No; "it is not the nature of the beast."

Mr. RICH. Somebody said the other day it was a Democratic administration that got us into the World War, and they are going to get us into this one next if we do not look out.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. What was the national debt when the New Deal took over?

Mr. RICH. It was $21,500,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is it today?

Mr. RICH. Well, they have the limit up to $65,000,000,000. I have here Mr. Morgenthau's statement. He only records it as being $47,165,928,769.86. That is, on April 14. But there will be a loss of five or six billion dollars at least on all these corporations that they have set up, all of these obligations that the United States is responsible for, in the sum of about $15,000,000,000. Now, they take credit for that at 100 cents on the dollar. You know all of the things that this administration has got us into after they said, "We will eliminate bureaus; we will consolidate offices; we will keep the Government out of business."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. The formula seems to be: If you cannot shoot a government to death, bleed it to death.

Mr. RICH. Well, they have bled it, and I am afraid they soon will be shooting. This week we have met here day after day and done nothing but make a few speeches. There ought to be legislation brought in here to stop the strikes; there ought to be legislation to keep this country out of war. We ought to do everything we can, so that the White House cannot do the things they contemplate doing. Instead of that, we are meeting from day to day and then adjourning. The Congress is a tool of the White House. The country is in the most dangerous position it has ever been in all its history. If we twiddle our thumbs around here and let the President down in the White House run affairs, we might just as well go home, because you will not have a home very long, and you ought to see it before you have to go to war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what bill is this?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this action agreeable to the Republican members of the committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have consulted with the members of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the minority member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, TARVER, LEAVY, TERRY, COLLINS, LAMBERTSON, DIRKSEN, and PLUMLEY.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WELCH (at the request of Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT) until May 1 on account of important business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MARCANTONIO was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 18, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 108, 1057, and 2763.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

445. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the Budget for 1942 for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, amounting to $11,380 (H. Doc. No. 175); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

446. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the complete annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ended October 31, 1940; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

447. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of a suggested amendment to section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

448. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

449. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize employees of the United States to testify on behalf of the District of Columbia and the employees of the District of Columbia to testify on behalf of the United States and of the District of Columbia without loss of salary or annual leave; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

450. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1942, as amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year, involving a net increase of $3,307,110 (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

451. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel for the fiscal year 1942 amounting to $295,000 (H. Doc. No. 177); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

452. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to $328,000 (H. Doc. No. 178); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

453. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1941, in the amount of $60,000 (H. Doc. No. 179); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 180. Resolution granting a gratuity to Clara Harkness; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 137. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri; with amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2844. A bill to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation; with amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3394. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to grant easements to States over lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control; without amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 482. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11 as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; with amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4397. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 4398. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Sturgeon and Otter Rivers and their tributaries in the State of Michigan for flood control, allied purposes, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 4399. A bill to provide for the establishment of principal post offices in certain places having only branch post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4400. A bill relating to the importation, manufacture, sale, or possession in the Indian country within the State of Minnesota of certain nonintoxicating beverages; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4401. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, Glenn Dale, Md.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4402. A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4403. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4404. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4405. A bill appropriating to the State of Utah the sum of $49,860.76, being 37½ percent of moneys received by the United States from the Independent Coal & Coke Co. for the wrongful taking of coal from land located in the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 4406. A bill to prohibit aliens from voting in labor organizations or acting as their officers or agents; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of civil government in the far West, the blazing of the old Oregon Trail, and the epochal immigration of 1843; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing

the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 12 with reference to legislation for the settlement and development of Alaska; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4407. A bill for the relief of Jacob S. Silverman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4408. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert S. Swett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4409. A bill granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 4410. A bill for the relief of Albert K. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4411. A bill for the relief of the Canton Exchange Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4412. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4413. A bill for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wichmann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 4415. A bill for the relief of Macon County Oil Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

751. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of Rev. William Henry Day, of Oneida, Ill., urging consideration of House bill 4013; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

752. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of Thomas M. Palmer, Forest E. Good, H. V. Clark, George G. Griffin, and A. R. Bean, of Clearwater, Kans., urging the United States Government to use its influence to open the blockade to adequately protected food, to be distributed under Mr. Hoover's plan, or some other effective neutral supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

753. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Peter Steiner and other residents of Lucinda and Snydersburg, Pa., protesting against use of convoys; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

754. Also, petition of Victor Ver Milyea and other residents of Warren County, Pa., supporting the Hobbs bill (H. R. 3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

755. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Highland Park (Calif.) Progressive Club, emphatically protesting against any amendment to the Social Security Act that would reduce the financial aid of the senior citizens of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

756. By Mr. TALLE: House Concurrent Resolution 15 of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, whom not having seen we love: Bring us, we beseech Thee, home in thought to Thee, each one of us, from any height, or depth, or place, at any time, bring us to Thine own Presence, which is our home.

Our moments of duty faithfully fulfilled follow us and never perish; our wasted hours we cannot gather up, and are clean gone forever; fill us then with the spirit of alacrity, so characteristic of the Sinless One, who in fewest days finished the work Thou gavest Him to do.

Keep us steadfast in the loneliness of temptation; through faintness of soul may we stand in awe and sin not, rising up to bear with patience whatever ill betide. In these days of the world's anguish may we never know bewilderment or dismay; but help us to remember Thy word, that "the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise, they seemed to die: and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction: but they are in peace. For though they be punished in the sight of men, yet is their hope full of immortality." So do Thou comfort us, O Father, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 15, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations and a protocol were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SMITH of West Virginia, Mr. SOMERS of New York, and Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLAND, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CULKIN, and Mr. OLIVER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. TARVER, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, current session, entitled "Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power," of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 5,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 24, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2, of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee on the bill (H. R. 2788) entitled "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for 1942."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940;

H. R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939;

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's

Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

FORMER SENATOR SCHWELLENBACH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, a day or two ago it was my privilege to have lunch with a former colleague of ours, Senator Burke, of Nebraska. We were discussing the Senate, and some of those who had been Members of the Senate. He showed me a letter from our former colleague, Senator Schwellenbach, in which he stated that by the 1st day of April he would have brought up to date his court docket, which was more than a year behind when he assumed the office of judge on the 1st of January. Due to the fact that all of us were very fond of Senator Schwellenbach, I thought some notice should be taken of this matter on the floor of the Senate. That is the reason why I make these remarks.

INSPECTION AND INVESTIGATIONS IN COAL MINES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. DAVIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. VANDENBERG conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD LAND GRANTS (S. DOC. NO. 48)

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of judicial proceedings concerning title to certain Northern Pacific Railroad land grants, together with a proposed stipulation for the settlement of the controversy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed.

EVERETT A. ALDEN AND OTHERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of certain legislation enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to permit the Department of Agriculture to effect a substantial saving in the administration of the Federal crop-insurance program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LANDS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, DAYTON, OHIO

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration Facility at Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, Ohio, for highway-widening purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

LANDS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, ROANOKE, VA.

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of legislation to authorize the Administrator to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration Facility, Roanoke, Va. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of State (2), the Treasury (2), War, Justice (12), Interior (2), and Agriculture, the Public Works Administration (Federal Works Agency), and the Social Security Board (Federal Security Agency), not needed in the conduct of business and having no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution relating to the importation of livestock and agricultural products from foreign countries into this country

"Whereas livestock is the most important branch of our agricultural industry and a decisive factor in national defense, both with respect to adequate sustenance of our people and as a source of income to defray increasing Federal expenditures, and it is highly important that the country's livestock business enjoy whatever degree of prosperity may come from preserving the American market for American producers, a protection to which it is fairly and justly entitled; and

"Whereas recent press dispatches from Washington inform that the United States Government proposes to purchase greatly increased supplies of livestock products from countries other than our own; and

"Whereas American producers are abundantly able to meet American requirements: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein)*, That we are unalterably opposed to the purchase or admission to this country of any livestock or agricultural commodities from other lands that compete with the crops and livestock produced in the United States, until and unless it is clearly apparent that the American producer is incapable of supplying home needs; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to the Members of the Kansas congressional delegation in Congress."

Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 33

"Whereas our Federal Government has recognized the necessity of placing the control of the production, manufacture, and distribution of many of our products under the supervision of a Council of National Defense; and

"Whereas there has been established a division of this Council of National Defense known as the Consumers' Division; and

"Whereas in a recent report of this Consumers' Division a statement was made that recent increases in food costs were due mainly to a rise of 4 percent in meat prices, and advice was given in this same report that the consumers of this Nation would do well to look for cheaper cuts of meat and for meat substitutes and to secure available information on the preparation of well-balanced meatless meals; and

"Whereas the Honorable Mark G. Thornburg, secretary of agriculture for the State of Iowa, has already very properly recognized that such statements from a Federal office will result in decreased consumption of Iowa farm products, and has, in a letter to Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumers' Commissioner of the National Defense Council, voiced his objections to such statements on the grounds that—

"1. The total amount of meat in storage in the United States is 25 percent over the 5-year average and 9 percent greater than the amount in storage on February 1, 1940;

"2. Hogs are now selling for less than 79 percent of parity and more than 1,000,000,000 pounds of pork and pork products are in the various storage plants of the country;

"3. During the last days of 1940 an article concerning a Washington release was printed in newspapers throughout the Corn Belt

which in effect assured the farmers that the defense program now being inaugurated, with all its new employment, would more than make up for the foreign market which the Corn Belt farmers have lost (we have lost a foreign market for 140,000,000 pounds of lard annually);

"4. It is not with satisfaction that the Iowa farmer watches a Federal department in one year plow under crops and destroy livestock and in another advise increasing hog production at a time when stocks of pork and pork products in storage are abnormally high, and then hears of another Federal department suggesting meat substitutes and well-balanced meatless meals; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently enacted the lend-lease bill, which contains a provision whereby Great Britain could buy or borrow farm products as well as armaments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That for the reasons stated in the preamble of this resolution the membership of the Council of National Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Administrator of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation be respectfully requested to so coordinate their programs as they affect agriculture so that the farmers of the Nation will have adequate recognition of their problems and that surplus farm products will be more readily consumed by the consumers of this Nation and will be made available to the people of the democratic nations of Europe; be it further

"Resolved, That all sections of the Council of National Defense be respectfully requested to consider the advisability of starting from the premise that the farmer is one of the most vital factors in our national-defense program and that the important place of agriculture in national defense be recognized; be it also further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Vice President; the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable William G. Knudsen, Chairman of the Council of National Defense; the Honorable Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; and to the two United States Senators and the nine Congressmen who now represent Iowa in the National Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 15

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Iowa are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

"That application be and it is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Iowa Member thereof."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 30

"Concurrent resolution respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon proposed legislation providing for an examination and survey of a ship canal connecting Lakes Michigan and Superior

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States a bill (H. R. 2490) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make an examination and survey for a ship canal connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, from Au Train Lake in Lake Superior to Little Bay de Noquet in Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas a canal along this proposed route would shorten lake traffic between Lake Superior and ports on Lake Michigan by approximately 340 miles; and

"Whereas because of the strategic importance of iron, copper, and wheat which is shipped through the locks at the Soo to the manufacturing districts at Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and other points; and

"Whereas the locks at the Soo and St. Marys River district, despite the precautions taken, are liable to attack by foes, which would cause a bottleneck at that point in case of sabotage by enemies of this country; and

"Whereas a canal in this location would provide an all-American canal and locks, which is of utmost importance from the national-defense angle as it would provide two outlets from Lake Superior: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and approve the proposed legislation aforesaid; and be it further

"Resolved, That a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to Vice President Henry A. Wallace, Speaker Sam Rayburn, United States Senators Prentiss M. Brown, and Arthur H. Vandenberg and the chairman of the Michigan delegation in the United States Congress.

"Adopted by the senate on April 3, 1941.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on April 9, 1941."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas the changed conditions resulting from the development of the national-defense program and the construction or enlargement of Army camps and cantonments has created serious problems of adjusting local governmental services to the new needs in the areas affected; and

"Whereas the welfare of the State and of its local subdivisions requires that a long-range program for solution of these problems be developed; and

"Whereas this is a condition Nation-wide in its extent, and one in which the Federal Government is vitally concerned and has great responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concurs), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to establish a special commission to study, investigate, and analyze the problems arising from these circumstances, and that the State of New York, because of the paramount interest of certain sections thereof, in these questions of accommodating governmental services to changed conditions, be represented upon any such commission established by the Congress."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of the bill restoring percentage wage differential for a leadingman and for a quarterman at any navy yard

"Resolved, That the Senate of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass H. R. 3301, entitled 'A bill restoring percentage wage differential for a leadingman and for a quarterman at any navy yard': And be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted April 10, 1941.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
[SEAL] *"Clerk."*

A resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions in favor of the adoption of an adequate Federal antilynch law

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, an adequate antilynching law which would enlist the powers of the Federal Government in learning the identity of, and prosecuting, those participating in lynch mobs, those responsible for inciting such mobs, and those local law-enforcement officers who remain lax or passive while a lynching is committed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith transmit copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house or representatives, adopted, April 2, 1941.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"*Clerk*.

"In senate adopted, in concurrence, April 8, 1941.

ING N. HAYDEN,
"*Clerk*."

A resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

"Resolution in favor of the adoption of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, so-called

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, so-called, to the end that millions of citizens of the United States residing in several of our Southern States shall have restored to them their democratic right to vote; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith transmit copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, April 2, 1941.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 8, 1941.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the table:

"Senate Resolution 84

"Whereas the Democratic Party of Texas has just finished its most successful Jackson Day dinner fund raising campaign; and

"Whereas Lt. Col. Myron G. Blalock, Texas national Democratic committeeman, has rendered long and useful service to the Democratic Party of Texas; and

"Whereas Mrs. Clara Driscoll, national committeewoman, has been outstanding in her service to the Democratic Party; and

"Whereas Hon. E. B. Germany, chairman of the State Democratic executive committee, has served the Democratic Party faithfully and well; and

"Whereas it is the duty of said party leaders to raise funds and otherwise carry on business of the national Democratic committee in Texas; and

"Whereas in their wisdom they selected the Honorable George A. Butler, of Houston, as chairman of the Jackson Day committee of 1941; and

"Whereas Chairman Butler selected Dury Helm, as his assistant and the following as district chairmen of the several congressional districts:

"H. H. Russell, New Boston; J. E. Wheat, Woodville, G. P. Birdwell, Tyler; George H. Wilcox, Sherman; Dick Stout, Dallas; F. H. Harvey, Corsicana; A. (Neal) Tribble, Navasota; cochairman, Mrs. J. H. Hinds, Nacogdoches; William N. Bonner, Houston; Ben Inselman, Galveston; Mayor Tom Miller, Austin; Lee Lockwood, Waco; Raymond Buck, Fort Worth; Everett McCullough, Wichita Falls; Mrs. R. A. Thompson, Corpus Christi; J. C. Looney, Edinburg; W. L. Kerr, Pecos; J. T. Stimson, Abilene; W. L. Boyles, Panhandle; Tom Garrard, Tahoka; Gen. R. L. Bobbitt, San Antonio; Sam McCollum, Brady; and

"Whereas this group of Texas Democrats under the direction of said party leaders and Jackson Day Chairman Butler, ably assisted by county chairmen and other loyal Democrats throughout the State of Texas, raised more money for the 1941 Jackson Day fund than any previous campaign in the history of the Democratic Party and also held a most successful dinner in Houston on March 29, 1941, thereby welding party harmony and good fellowship throughout Texas democracy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Texas Forty-seventh Legislature now in regular session, go on record as approving the outstanding achievement made by the hereinabove-named leaders of Texas democracy, and particularly do we congratulate the party on its selection of George A. Butler as chairman of the Jackson Day committee, of Texas, for 1941; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the National Democratic Committee, the Honorable R. J. Reynolds, treasurer of the National Democratic Committee, and also that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Texas and members of the Texas Democratic Party herein named."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 66

"Whereas the Honorable James Leslie Coke has on many occasions proved a credit to his profession and to the high office of chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas this native son of Hawaii by adoption, the Honorable James Leslie Coke, has had his brilliant career as a senator from the third senatorial district surpassed only by his distinguished and enviable record as one of Hawaii's foremost jurists and chief justice; and

"Whereas the Honorable James Leslie Coke has expressed the desire to retire from public life and relinquish the honor conferred upon him by the President of the United States as chief justice of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas by the retirement of the Honorable James Leslie Coke the Territory of Hawaii suffers a loss in no small measure: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii duly assembled in this Twenty-first Legislature*, That we do by this means extend to the Honorable James Leslie Coke our heartiest and sincerest appreciation for his important role in making Hawaii a better and finer place in which to live; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we do hereby convey to the Honorable James Leslie Coke our heartfelt aloha and good wishes for a long, healthy, and happy life; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and to Hawaii's own son and foremost jurist, the Honorable Chief Justice James Leslie Coke."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide funds for schools, equipment, and teachers for the educational training of children of persons employed on national-defense projects in and about naval reservations and military posts

"Whereas there has been an unprecedented activity in and near the naval reservations and military posts in Hawaii in the building of housing facilities for the increased personnel necessary to the carrying on of the national-defense program; and

"Whereas accompanying said personnel of defense workers are their families, wives, and children, many of said children being of school age; and

"Whereas the public-schcol facilities of the Territory of Hawaii in the vicinity of naval and military projects are now entirely inadequate to cope with the responsibility of providing these children with proper educational training; and

"Whereas under the territorial school budget all available funds have been allotted and distributed to cover the educational needs of the Territory, so that there are no funds available for the emergency created as hereinabove referred to: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to include within its national-defense program for the Territory of Hawaii such necessary appropriations as will provide educational facilities, school rooms, equipment, and teachers, so that proper and adequate schooling may be afforded the children of those employed in the defense-work program in and about the naval reservations and military posts; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commissioner of Education, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution of the Commercial Club, of Scotland, S. Dak., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 831) to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irrigation, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from John C. Foley Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of Little Rock, Ark., Paul E. Melker, commander, praying for the suppression of strikes throughout the Nation in the present interest of national defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions of the building and construction trades, American Federation of Labor, of Grand Rapids, Mich., and the Building and Construction Trades Council, of Green Bay, Wis., pledging that there will be no stoppage of work because of jurisdictional disputes between any of the building and construction trades on any building or construction project essential to the speedy and successful completion of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions of the Building and Construction Trades Council, of Meadville, Pa., and the building and construction trades department, of Green Bay, Wis., both affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, stating that, under employers who are recognized as being fair to organized labor, when any or all of the building- and construction-trades organizations are unable to supply a full force of building-trades men to man defense projects, every organization affiliated with such labor organizations agrees that a union employer shall be privileged to employ others than members of the building and construction trades affiliated with such labor unions until such time as the labor organizations so affiliated can replace nonunion men with members of their organizations, or until such nonunion men are requested to become members of the respective unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Missouri Old Age Pension Society, adopted at St. Joseph, Mo., praying for the enactment of House bill 4013, to

provide for old-age assistance, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from Thomas J. Higgins, of Brooklyn, N. Y., demonstrating against the United States convoying vessels through belligerent zones; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from H. B. Roberts, M. D., of Highland Park, Ill., praying that the United States keep out of foreign war and have little to do with international bankers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of several ministers of the gospel of Clearwater, Kans., praying that the United States open the belligerent blockade to Europe so as to supply food to Europeans under Mr. Hoover's plan, or some other effective neutral supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, favoring an appropriation to construct a highway from Hilo through the saddle between Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa to the District of Kona, County of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Frederick and vicinity, in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the Brotherhood Class, Grace M. E. Church, of Winfield, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Monte Gants, D. D. S., secretary-treasurer, Kansas State Board of Dental Examiners, Downs, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 783) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, relative to dental surgeons, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 702. A bill to increase the number of cadets allowed at the United States Military Academy from the District of Columbia; without amendment.

AMENDMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has asked me to report for him, from the Committee on Commerce—of which, however, I am not a member—House Joint Resolution 129, which has passed the House and has been ordered favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce. It extends for a period of 2 years or thereabouts a joint resolution pertaining to the property of the United States in connection with the world's fair recently held in New York, and authorizes the transfer of certain of the property on hand to various departments of the Government. There is no opposition to the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as a member of the Commerce Committee, I will state that the joint resolution was given consideration and unanimously ordered reported. I have no objection to its consideration at this time if that is the desire of the able Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], from the Committee on Commerce, I report back without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the Commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes; and I submit a report (No. 182) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS. As in executive session, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably certain nominations, and I hope that I will be able to have them confirmed in executive session this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be received at this time, as in executive session; and the reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations above referred to, reported favorably, as in executive session, from the Committee on Military Affairs, are as follows:

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of War, under the provisions of law;

John J. McCloy, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of War;

Brig. Gen. Ebenezer Lattimore Compere, Adjutant General's Department, Arkansas National Guard, to be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States, under the provisions of law;

First Lt. Harry John Robertson, Veterinary Corps Reserve, to be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, Regular Army, under the provisions of law;

First Lt. S. Kingdon Avery, Dental Corps Reserve, to be first lieutenant, Dental Corps, Regular Army, under the provisions of law;

The nominations of sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers to be general officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1342. A bill to provide for a 15-percent increase in compensation of postmasters and other employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 1343, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1344. A bill to authorize employees of the United States to testify on behalf of the District of Columbia and employees of the District of Columbia to testify on behalf of the United States and of the District of Columbia without loss of salary or annual leave; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, for the War Department I introduce two bills for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1345. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Government-owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii to the Honolulu Plantation Co.; and

S. 1346. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain lands on the Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Banderet; and

S. 1348. A bill for the relief of J. M. Swinney; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1349. A bill to create and establish a Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers for the District of Columbia and to prescribe its powers and duties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Frederick L. Bagby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. HARRISON):

S. 1351. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank, of Canton, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1352. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1353. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Kernan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1354. A bill to amend section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, for the purpose of making its provisions applicable to prunes for canning produced in the States of Oregon and Washington west of the Cascade Mountains; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BYRNES:

S. 1355. A bill to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Santee, Congaree, and Cooper Rivers in the counties of Berkeley, Clarendon, Calhoun, Richland, and Orangeburg, S. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1356. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1357 (by request). A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska and Hawaii applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territories; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1358 (by request). A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1359. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Anders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUBSTITUTE POST OFFICE CLERKS, LETTER CARRIERS, AND LABORERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would fix the status of substitute post office clerks, substitute city letter carriers, and so forth, and fix their salary and compensation. As the bill will affect a great body of Federal employees in this country, I think it quite proper that it should be printed in the RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received, appropriately referred, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1343) relating to the classification of substitute post office clerks and substitute city letter carriers in first- and second-class post offices, and substitute laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective July 1, 1941—

(a) Substitute post-office clerks and substitute city letter carriers in first- and second-class post offices shall be designated junior post-office clerks and junior city letter carriers. Junior post-office clerks and junior city letter carriers shall be divided into three grades, as follows: First grade, salary, $1,600; second grade, salary, $1,700; third grade, salary, $1,800. Grade 1 shall include such employees who have rendered less than 1 year of service; grade 2 shall include such employees who have rendered more than 1 year and less than 2 years of service; and grade 3 shall include such employees who have rendered more than 2 years of service and less than 3 years of service. Such employees who have rendered service in excess of 3 years shall be appointed to the position of regular post-office clerk and regular city letter carrier, respectively. Junior post-office clerks and junior city letter carriers shall be promoted successively after 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the third grade; and after 1 year's satisfactory service in the third grade, shall be appointed regular post-office clerks or regular city letter carriers, as the case may be. Junior post-office clerks and junior city letter carriers shall not be required to work more than 8 hours a day; and the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours: *Provided*, That in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the service so require, junior post-office clerks and junior city letter carriers may be required to work in excess of 8 hours per day, and for such overtime they shall be paid at the rate of time and one-half on the basis of the annual pay received by such employees. Junior post-office clerks and junior city letter carriers shall be granted 15 days' leave of absence, with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, each fiscal year, and sick leave, with pay, at the rate of 10 days a year exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to be cumulative. Upon appointment to a regular position they shall be given credit for the time served as junior post-office clerk or junior city letter carrier. All vacancies occurring in positions of regular post-office clerks or regular city letter carriers shall be immediately filled by appointment of the junior clerks or junior city letter carriers next in line for regular appointment; and all additional appointments to the positions of regular post-office clerk or regular city letter carrier shall be made in the same manner.

(b) Substitute laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service shall be designated junior laborers and be classified into three grades with compensation as follows: First grade, salary, $1,400; second grade, salary, $1,500; third grade, salary, $1,600. Grade 1 shall include such employees who have rendered less than 1 year of service, grade 2 shall include such employees who have rendered more than 1 year and less than 2 years of service, and grade 3 shall include such employees who have rendered more than 2 years of service and less than 3 years of service. Such employees who have rendered service in excess of 3 years shall be appointed to the position of regular laborer in the Postal Service or Railway Mail Service, respectively. Junior laborers shall be promoted successively after 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the third grade; and after 1 year's satisfactory service in the third grade, shall be appointed regular laborers in the Postal Service or the Railway Mail Service, as the case may be. Junior laborers shall not be required to work more than 8 hours a day and the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours: *Provided*, That in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the Service so require, junior laborers may be required to work in excess of 8 hours per day, and for such overtime they shall be paid at the rate of time and one-half on the basis of the annual pay received by such employees. Junior laborers shall be granted 15 days' leave of absence, with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, each fiscal year, and sick leave, with pay, at the rate of 10 days a year exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to be cumulative. Upon appointment to a regular position they shall be given credit for the time served as junior laborer. All vacancies occurring in positions of regular laborer in the Postal Service or in the Railway Mail Service shall be immediately filled by appointment of the junior laborers next in line for regular appointment; and all additional appointments to positions as such regular laborers shall be made in the same manner.

(c) Junior post-office clerks and junior city letter carriers in first- and second-class post offices, and junior laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service, shall be granted compensatory time for all service performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays in the same manner that compensatory time for such service is granted to regular employees.

(d) Any law, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, referring to substitute clerks in first- and second-class post offices or to substitute city letter carriers or to substitute laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service, shall be held to refer to junior post-office clerk or junior city letter carrier or junior laborer, as the case may be.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. GEORGE, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1337) granting an increase of pension to Charles Adkins, and it was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR SHEPPARD

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Fort Worth Star Telegram of Thursday, April 10, 1941, in tribute to the memory of the late Senator Morris Sheppard, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FREDERIC WILLIAM WILE BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief tribute to the memory of the late Frederic William Wile, written by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES BEFORE JEWISH NATIONAL WORKERS' ALLIANCE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, before the Jewish National Workers' Alliance of America, at Chicago, Ill., on April 13, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

USE OF AMERICAN VESSELS FOR CONVOYS—ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR HOLT

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former Senator Rush D. Holt, on the use of American vessels for convoys, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY AT OPENING DINNER, 1941 CAMPAIGN, GREATER NEW YORK FUND

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on April 14, 1941, by Hon. James A. Farley at the opening dinner of the 1941 Campaign for the Greater New York Fund, held at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MINISTER OF NORWAY BEFORE MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Wilhelm Morgenstierne, Minister of Norway to the United States, before the Minnesota Legislature at St. Paul, Minn., April 10, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BERNARD H. RIDDER ON NAZI METHODS OF FINANCE

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an address delivered by Bernard H. Ridder, publisher of the St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press, before the member banks of the Ninth Federal Reserve District at Minneapolis, on March 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY PEARL S. BUCK BEFORE WRITERS' COMMITTEE DINNER OF UNITED CHINA RELIEF

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Pearl S. Buck before the Writers' Committee Dinner of United China Relief at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on March 26, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine morning business is closed.

LETTER FROM HERBERT HOOVER ON FOOD FOR OCCUPIED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, former President Herbert Hoover and the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies continue to do all within their power to find a formula through which helpless and innocent noncombatants in the small invaded democracies may be fed.

Unless some solution is found without much further delay for the tragic plight of nearly 40,000,000 people residing in Belgium, Poland, Norway, and The Netherlands, millions of these people are likely to die. The situation in Belgium particularly is now most acute.

These small nations are Great Britain's allies. They are her friends. They are our friends. Between 17,000,000 and 20,000,000 descendants of these peoples reside in this country, and are good American citizens.

There has been much misrepresentation regarding the Hoover plan for relieving these suffering peoples. Some of this misrepresentation has crept into the British press. It seems to me that Mr. Hoover very effectively met these misrepresentations in a letter he wrote to the editor of the London Times, which was printed in that publication on April 16. Only parts of the letter were cabled back to the United States. Because the complete text of the letter to the London Times so clearly reveals the motives of this program, I have secured a copy of it, together with the writer's consent to have it placed before the Senate of the United States. I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

APRIL 12, 1941.

The EDITOR THE TIMES,
London.

SIR: I have been informed of the content of a dispatch which appears in the Times of April 10. As it is a wholly inaccurate presentation of my views and purposes, I should like my old British friends who do not read the American press, and are therefore not aware of the facts, to have a word on the subject. They should know that these quotations are from a small but zealous group whose distortion of fact do the British cause daily harm.

I have differed from part of one policy among many British policies, and it is one that particularly affects many Americans. That difference is in the question of food for the starving women, children, and unemployed men in the occupied democracies. An Englishman is not a traitor when he constructively criticizes a policy of his Government, nor is it enmity to England for an American to express such a differing opinion.

I start with two assumptions: First, that no Englishman wishes, any more than I wish, to let their former allies starve; and second, that there must be no military advantage to either side or no project could be accepted. Therefore every proposal of mine has been founded upon the requirement of a prior agreement with the Germans covering—

(a) Cessation of all requisition of native food supplies;

(b) Contribution of foodstuffs from German-controlled breadstuffs in amounts equivalent to the food already taken;

(c) Imports through the blockade of soup kitchen supplies and special food for children;

(d) Efficient neutral control.

That such an agreement is not impossible is indicated by the fact that the Germans on February 26 last accepted these terms in respect to my proposal of an experiment in Belgium. They agreed to supply 25,000 tons of breadstuffs per month from their own sources. Such an arrangement decreases rather than increases their supplies. It does not support men working for Germany. Other parts of this proposal assured that neither food, ships, nor money now available to Britain were to be called upon. It is said in Britain that the Germans will not keep such an agreement. If that should prove so, the relief would stop instantly. The maximum violation would be the seizure of all the imported stock of food in Belgium. Those stocks at any one time would not feed Germany for one day. Therefore it has no military importance in prolonging the war or violating any real purpose of blockade.

I have no wish to enter here the many reasons which impel an extremely large and growing number of Americans to favor these proposals, except one. Such an action would advance the British cause in America.

I have no need, either, to discuss my personal attitude toward the British people, so incorrectly stated in the dispatch referred to; but my friends in England should know that quite to the contrary of those implications, I last year advocated aid to Britain with "tools of war" in six Nation-wide broadcasts and on innumerable other occasions, and that also included advocacy of the lend-lease bill so far as it was "short of war" (to use the President's assurance) and so far as it was not a vehicle for abandonment of constitutional responsibilities of the Congress. Those reservations were not based on unfriendliness, but on the conviction that if the expressed purposes of this war are to be sustained, then those purposes must be maintained in our American domestic life.

In America usually we do not take the trouble to reply to what we know as "smear" material. I would not do it now if I did not have so deep a feeling for the agonies of the British people, a feeling the roots of which lie deep in many years of personal contact and the memories of a joint association in winning the last war.

HERBERT HOOVER.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF AMERICAN VESSELS FOR CONVOYS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in 3 short weeks the convoy issue has grown until today it is the boiling issue of the hour. The voice of the people of America has been heard. No issue can become paramount without the interest or apprehension of the people.

I have authoritative information that today in the White House there are thousands upon thousands of letters from the rank and file of the American people demanding to know what the President's policy is on convoys and where the administration stands on this issue.

Because of the word-twisting phrases of avoidance and indirection employed by the Executive and his spokesmen in the Congress, and because it is only a matter of plain honesty for the White House to give the people a frank statement in the matter, I addressed last night to the President a telegram which I now read to the Senate:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

The people of America are aroused on the issue of convoys. The time has come for a frank, unequivocal, and complete statement from you on this vital matter.

For several weeks word-twisting phrases of avoidance and indirection have been used to conceal rather than reveal the policy of the Chief Executive on the matter of convoys.

Please review in your mind the events of the past several weeks. During the period when the administration was soliciting support of the people for the lease-lend bill the question of convoys came up, and you stated that convoys means shooting, and shooting means war, thereby implying to the people that you were opposed to convoys.

Your Secretary of the Navy expressed his opposition to convoys in public testimony before the House and Senate committees at their hearings on the lease-lend bill, but added that he would change his mind in favor of convoys if you gave the word.

During the first week of April reliable newspapers reported that Secretary Knox was in favor of convoys. When queried by the press as to whether he had, in fact, changed his mind, he replied, "I have no comment." Thus the American people were not enlightened.

Then the Associated Press reported your statement to legislative leaders that suggestions for convoys were "too absurd to talk about at this time."

The next step was a New York Times report of conferences between British and American naval representatives to determine how a joint convoy system could be operated. The Christian Science Monitor and other leading papers reported that detailed plans for the use of convoys had already been drawn up and submitted to you.

During this time you, Members of the Senate and House, and I were receiving thousands of letters from the American people seeking definite assurance that the Navy was not going to convoy.

Then the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee sounded the note for convoys.

Then you in a press conference admitted that the plan for convoys was under consideration.

Then your spokesman, Representative SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, issued a public statement denying the right of the Congress to prohibit convoys and asserting that you and you alone had the unrestricted authority in the matter.

Then your White House Secretary, Mr. Stephen Early, said that you were very much amused at newspaper reports that American ships would be convoying.

During this time the American people in increasing numbers were continuing to write to Washington for information as to your policy on convoys.

Then in your latest press conference you stated that on the convoy question more nonsense was being written and more statements made by people who did not know a hill of beans about it than you had ever seen before. You stated that you knew more about it than the writers and orators, but that you were not talking about it. Thus again the American people were left unenlightened because you did not care to discuss the subject.

Yesterday reports persisted that the Navy is already being used to escort merchant vessels carrying war materials to belligerents. This morning your Secretary of the Navy said that there was not a syllable of truth in the report. Later this morning your White House Secretary, Mr. Stephen Early, branded the report as a deliberate lie, and still, regardless of these conflicting reports, you are silent in the face of the people's justified desire for direct, complete information from you.

On different days of the past 3 weeks you have alternately advised the people that the suggestion of convoys was too absurd to talk about, that a plan for convoys was under consideration, and, finally, that you know more about the subject than anyone else but do not care to discuss it.

Is not this issue of vital concern to the millions of American people? Have you not stated that convoys mean shooting and shooting means war for this country? Are not the people entitled to frank and honest dealing on this vital issue? Is this the kind of maneuvering that builds up the faith of the people in their Government?

I recall to your memory your statement made to the American people over a Nation-wide radio broadcast in which you said to them, "You are, I believe, the most enlightened and the best informed people in all the world at this moment. You are subjected to no censorship of the news, and I want to add that your Government has no information which it has any thought of withholding from you."

In this hour when the men and women of the United States are asking for a statement from you, their national leader, in this hour

when it is imperative in the national interest that the people be enlightened, and informed on the vital issue of convoys, which holds in the balance the question of our involvement in the war, I respectfully urge that you give me at this time a frank, informative, and unequivocal statement of your position on the issue of convoys.

I further ask for direct replies to the following questions:

1. At any time during the past several weeks have United States aircraft or naval vessels or Coast Guard cutters been used to convoy, escort, or otherwise used in conjunction with merchant vessels carrying goods to belligerent countries?

2. Are any such aircraft or vessels now being so employed?

3. Is there contemplation of such use of such aircraft or vessels in the near future?

4. What instructions have been given to the officers of any such aircraft or vessels with regard to action in the event that any of these merchant vessels carrying goods to belligerents are attacked?

A few weeks ago on another matter of importance to the people you were asked for a statement of your position and you replied to me in a letter marked "personal and confidential." I emphasize at this time that this is an issue vital to the people of America on which they are entitled to information, and I therefore respectfully request that your reply be of such a nature that I may give the people the assurance which they are entitled to.

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator.

APRIL 17, 1941.

Mr. President, you will recall that more than 2 weeks ago I addressed a telegram to Secretary Knox, calling upon him to state frankly to the people his policy regarding convoys, in view of his reported change of heart. The day after I sent the telegram to him, he was interviewed by the press as to whether the reports were true, and he replied:

I have no comment.

I advise the Senate at this time that to date Mr. Knox has given no reply to that telegram, and the people are still in ignorance on a matter for which they have a justified thirst for knowledge.

On March 31 I introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) to prohibit convoys. Later on that day, a man who has close contacts with the Government came to my office and asked me if I would be surprised to learn that United States convoys were already being employed. I replied that I could not believe that the President would for a moment permit this practice, in view of his statement that:

Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war.

This man left my office, and from then on I receive a series of persistent reports that convoys were being employed.

A few days ago Admiral Land, Chief of the Maritime Commission, came out in favor of convoys. Only yesterday, a Government investigator, well known to me, advised that he had information from within the Maritime Commission that convoys are being secretly employed at this time.

Why is it that the President has been unusually uninformative, in the face of the public demand for information, in the face of reports of reliable and reputable members of the press that plans had been drawn up for a joint enterprise of convoys between the United States and Great Britain; in the face of the report in Secretary Knox's own newspaper, the Chicago Daily News, made several weeks ago, that a plan for convoys was in the offing, although nobody, least of all the President, is saying so openly, in the face of the President's statement that he knows more about convoys than most others in the country, but that he was not going to tell the people about it; in the face of persistent reports that the Navy is already being used to convoy merchant vessels carrying war goods to belligerents?

Mr. President, these persistent rumors have come to me repeatedly in the past few days from various sources, and yesterday I received a letter, the contents of which I feel forced, as a public duty, to bring to the American people, and to the Congress. It comes from the Atlantic Seaboard, and reads as follows:

APRIL 15.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I know you are against convoying by our Navy. Some information has come to me which has shocked me. I think I should pass it on to you.

A young relative is in the Navy. He has been at sea on service. He was taken ill and put ashore in order to go to a hospital. I cannot tell you the name of the port. In fact I should not write this at all, but I think you should know.

He tells me that the United States Navy has been convoying ships for about 1 month. His ship was one of the convoys. If I tell you the name of the ship or the lad's name I would perhaps get him in trouble. He has been worried and thinks someone should know.

He says that they in the service know that the President's delay on the subject of convoying—the "put off" as he expresses it, is because it is secretly going on.

I trust you to use this information as you see fit, and only wish I could have given more details.

There, Mr. President, is a sincere, fair, frank statement through this relative, the testimony of a United States naval man, who is now in the hospital, and has been for a month on a ship which was part of an American convoy. Yet the President of the United States calls the suggestion that convoys are being used absurd, and laughs it off; and the American public, asking for information, are turned down cold. What price democracy? What has become of it in this country?

Because this naval man has had the courage and honesty to report a situation which holds in the balance the lives of millions of Americans, and because a revelation of the name of his relative who wrote this letter would, in all likelihood, lead to a revelation of this young man's identity, with the possibility of prejudice to his position in the Navy, I am keeping faith with the woman who wrote the letter by eliminating her name and address from the letter. If a committee of the Senate desires to hold hearings to investigate this matter, and will give assurances that this man's identity will not become known to his superiors, I shall be very glad, under such an arrangement, to turn the letter over to the committee or to make it available to them.

Mr. President, this morning I received from a Pennsylvania businessman a letter marked "Confidential." It reads as follows:

APRIL 16, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Have read with much interest where Senator BARKLEY took you to task for intimating the President was going to have the Navy do convoy duty without the knowledge of the people and Congress of this country.

Your suspicion that Roosevelt would slyly order convoy of British vessels with our Navy is not a myth but a fact. A young lady from one of the smaller towns near Philadelphia was hurriedly called to New York City by her fiance so he could see her before the ship sailed. This man is an ensign in the United States Navy, and he told the young lady to come to New York at once as his ship left at a certain time this week, and that his ship was ordered out on convoy duty.

Mr. President, it is a serious thing when the responsible officials of our Government, including our national leader, remain uninformative on this matter, which is so pregnant with danger to millions of American people. It is a danger to the American people when the convoy plans are drawn up in secret and there are hidden maneuverings to conceal from the people actions which are of such grave importance to the people. It is an incredible attitude for the President to laugh in the face of the people's justified request for information—for him to say, in the first instance, that convoys mean shooting and shooting means war, and in the second instance that the subject is too ridiculous for him to talk about—and in the third instance that he knows more about the subject than the rest of the people but does not choose to enlighten them.

Mr. President, press conferences are held, I believe, on Tuesday and Friday of each week. I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Herald Tribune, the issue of Thursday, April 17, and therein appears an article by Mark Sullivan, than whom there is no newspaper correspondent or writer more esteemed or trusted in the United States of America. Mark Sullivan, writing under his own name, made the feature of his article yesterday morning the press conference of the President held last Tuesday, and I shall read a portion of it. A question was asked the President which had nothing to do with the subject I have been discussing. Mark Sullivan's article then proceeds:

That question was meant, by allegory, to bring up the subject of use of our naval power to protect British cargo ships carrying supplies from us, in short, the question of convoy. This is a subject which Mr. Roosevelt does not like. Whenever it was brought up in this press conference, as it was in several forms, Mr. Roosevelt bridled. On this subject he said there has been more nonsense, more printer's ink wasted, more oratory by people who don't know a hill of beans about it than on any other subject in modern times. Having thus designated comprehensive ignorance as the state of others who speak on the subject, Mr. Roosevelt reassured us by saying that he knows something about the subject. While we were reassured by this, we were not enlightened in detail, for Mr.

Roosevelt said he did not care to discuss the subject.

From this momentary interlude of irritation Mr. Roosevelt was brought back to his high enjoyment of the occasion by one who asked whether he was going to take a scheduled trip to Warm Springs, Ga.

I quote that testimony from Mark Sullivan, bringing us a word picture of the press conference held last Tuesday, at which Mr. Sullivan says when the question of convoys was brought up, the President bridled, and irritation was manifest in the President's voice and manner. Why? Is it remarkable that on a question of such supreme importance the people want to know what is going on today? Their lives, their property, the lifeblood of their children is at stake in this matter. The President has said that "convoys mean war." Then why should not the people ask about these things, and why should the leader of this country, chosen in the last election for a third term, bridle up and become irritable because people ask him what the administration has been doing about convoys? A classic statement which I have hidden in my heart is—

The truth will bear the test.

So I say to the Senate of the United States, and to the President, and to the people of this country, "Let us have the truth wherever it leads us. Keep faith with the people who put you there, Mr. President, and who put us here in the Senate." Let us measure up to their great trust in us, a trust that we shall keep faith with them and keep them out of war and in the paths of peace, if it is humanly possible, and that we will not resort secretly, if you please, to a policy of convoys, the use of which was confirmed by the eloquent testimony of this boy who is now in the hospital and who was on a warship which was engaged in convoy work a month, which the President says will mean war.

Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war.

Mr. President, I now read, because it is so good, from the first page of the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of April 17, printed in a box and signed by Eleanor Patterson, a summation, in my judgment, of this situation and of the justice of my request. She writes as follows:

1. We believe that escorting munition-laden belligerent merchant ships on the high seas, regardless of legal technicalities which might be used to define the act otherwise, is the same as operating a convoy.

2. We believe convoys mean war. For what purpose could our naval vessels convoy merchant ships except to repel attack?

3. We believe that acts so full of meaning as these alleged, therefore, ought not to be committed secretly by the United States Government, but ought to be known to the people who must bear the consequences.

4. If we believed otherwise we would have to say that this country is no longer a democracy in which the people are superior to the Government.

Would that those words could be blazoned across this country, north, south, east, and west, and graven in the hearts of every Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States and of the President and his Cabinet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks of today a few documents bearing on the subject of convoys.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTON J. HAUG,
Nashua, N. H., April 11, 1941.

CHARLES W. TOBEY, Esq.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: During my recent trip through Maine I was glad to learn from the dailies there of your encouraging stand against entry into the war by this country.

While I am strongly in favor of helping England, I am strongly opposed to weakening our own country and especially to sending our men to fight on foreign soil.

It seems plainly ridiculous for us to try to tell the rest of the world how to behave. Is it not in the very nature of this country, in which all nationalities live and work toward a common goal, to keep out of the quarrels between other countries? Was not this country born because the people wanted to get away from the ever-brewing dissentions of foreign leaders?

We have the means to build this country strong against all assaults and see to it that out own foundations remain sound. It is far better to show other nations that liberty, strength, and peace can go together than leave our own back yard, force our views on others, and come back home finding somebody else in the back yard like misery, bankruptcy, Joe Stalin, or the Japs.

Very truly yours,

ANTON J. HAUG.

TEMPLETON, IOWA, *April 13, 1941.*

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I listened to a rebroadcast of a discussion on convoying of ships to England, and I admire your courage for holding your own.

Sometime ago I heard HENRY A. WALLACE talk to a group of foreigners, I believe, by radio, and it seemed like he said we must do it. Now, it would be all right if we would go back into the record of 1917. I saw a copy of his questionnaire he made out at that time. He claimed for dependency of a wife and baby, and also for agriculture. I understand he was placed in third and fourth class for those reasons. It seems at that time he wasn't so hot to go to war.

I fear Mr. WALLACE is being misled by the warmongers and false foreigners. I am sorry this is happening from our Iowa man, because I don't like any bloodshed this time and not gaining anything. Some of our men are still suffering from the last war.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain,
Yours truly,

BERNARD HEITHOFF.

CHANNEL MINING CO.,
San Francisco, April 13, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to personally plead that you will continue to do all in your power to prevent the entry of the United States into the European conflict. Also that you will continue to extend every effort to prevent the use of the United States Navy to convoy British shipping, or the use of American ships in European or African waters.

As a member of the Officers' Reserve Corps for over 12 years I have been an ardent student of military science and tactics, including all that has been known about modern mechanized warfare, and I agree closely with the views of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh in his recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I firmly believe that the United States aid will not only prove to be futile but will also serve to weaken considerably our own national-defense effort instead of strengthening it as claimed. I also believe that no combination of allied nations can check the advance of the Axis forces in the Balkans, Asia Minor, or Africa.

I see no serious set-back for the German forces until after they have taken all of Africa, Asia Minor, and possibly European Russia. Any attempt on our part to check this advance beyond the bounds of the Western Hemisphere will not only end in a humiliating failure but the final result might easily end in disaster for us.

Why must we take this unnecessary hazardous step and contribute to our own insecurity?

Respectfully yours,

WAYNE FOX,
First Lieutenant, Ordnance Reserve.

NEWPORT, R. I., *April 16, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire,
Senate Office Building:

Heartily congratulate you upon your bill prohibiting convoying or escorting our ships. Opening the Red Sea to American shipping is a direct invitation to attack on our merchantmen and, in my opinion, was done deliberately to involve us in active participation of the war. The citizens realize this and are duly outraged.

MRS. PAUL FITZSIMONS.

MIDDLEFIELD, MASS., *April 15, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to say to you that I approve of your resolution against convoys. President Roosevelt was not reelected to put us into war; it was his promise to keep us out that got the votes.

Sincerely,

MRS. M. C. STERNAGLE.

UNION GROVE, WIS., *April 12, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your courageous stand on the people's platform. America has been duped enough. If we followed the advice of one of your opponents on tonight's program, we might just as well ask for restoration of colonial status under Britain.

Some day some true American will arise from the rank and file of Americans who will advocate a policy of all-out aid for America regardless of other nations. This America will fear no nation or combination of nations, for it will be spiritually, morally, and militarily unconquerable.

Very truly yours,

HERBER LEINBERGER.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N. Y.,
April 14, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up your good fight against using convoys. You are right: Our people want peace, and by using convoys there is no surer way to involve us in the foreign mess.

HELEN TREYBAL.

ELIZABETH, PA., *April 16, 1941.*

United States Senator TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations for your able and effective opposition to the warmongering Colonel Breckenridge on the Peoples' Platform of April 12, 1941.

You were 100-percent right in stating that the same type of men as now represented by Breckenridge made suckers of those who served in the war of 1917–18. I say this, as one who fought in that war and I know that the majority of us who did also think so.

You may feel certain that the great majority of the American people, even if it is difficult to get them to express their opposition in letters to their Representatives, support you and the others attempting to prevent this blundering deceitful administration from involving us in war. Many, and they are neither Communists nor Fascists, are convinced that Mr. Roosevelt has "sold the United States down the river."

Sincerely,

W. J. KELLY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 17, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to inform you that I am completely in accord with your resolution against the use of United States naval vessels for convoy purposes. It is manifest that the use of our naval vessels as convoys will be the last step on the road to war and will lead inevitably to war. As less than 20 percent of the American people are willing that this Nation should enter the European war, it is evident that those who love England or who hate Hitler more than they love the United States of America desire to bring about the sinking of American convoys so as to create a war sentiment in this country. You deserve the thanks of the American people for doing everything in your power to prevent convoys.

I am writing to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee asking that the committee act favorably upon your resolution.

Yours very truly,

JAY F. TIFFANY.

TILTON, N. H., *April 23.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I listened to you over the radio last night and it does seem that 90 percent of the American people are half asleep to allow the warmongers to push us into another European war, which means ruination to our country.

I am so disappointed in Franklin D. Roosevelt. I sincerely hope the people will awake before it is too late. The American people are very tolerant, but if the warmongers push us into this war, I tremble to think of what will happen here in the United States of America. I pray to God that you, Senators WHEELER, WALSH, NYE, and all others, who are fighting the warmongers will be successful.

ALBERT G. MAISS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 14, 1941.*

Hon. Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.

DEAR SENATOR: I am heartily in favor of your anticonvoy resolution. We were promised by both candidates that our beloved country was to be kept out of war. The various bills passed recently were supposed to keep us out of war. The people have had no chance to vote on war—if they did they would say "No war."

We accepted these bills and promises in good faith and convoys are just one more step nearer the brink. The mass meetings for nonintervention are overflowing and great crowds, with upraised hands, vow to let no day go by without doing something to keep us out of war. I wish our leaders in Washington were as desperately in earnest. We are not in favor of fighting other people's battles. Our sons have no stomach to go out killing for Great Britain or anyone else.

Push your anticonvoy bill and God bless you.

Very sincerely,

SADIE M. TURNER.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 10, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We are in full accord with your bill to prohibit use of United States naval and merchant vessels to convoy or transport materials to belligerent nations.

We think, too, this offers our representatives the chance to prove their sincerity in wanting to keep us out of war.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. H. G. BUSH.

RICHMOND HILL, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.,
April 16, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been listening to your radio broadcast, and as an American-born citizen I wish to endorse 100 percent the valiant fight you are making against our becoming involved in European entanglements by convoying British ships or ships of any nation by the United States Navy into the war zone.

I am not pro-British or German. I am 100 percent pro-American, and as such I am willing to give my life in defense of my country, these United States of America, against invasion of my home by any foreign power, but I will not put one foot on foreign soil to fight for the British or any other nation.

I do not believe that the British are fighting our battle or anyone's battle. This country has never had to call upon anyone for aid in time of war in the past, or do I believe they will ever have to call upon any foreign power for aid in the future.

In closing may I wish you all the success possible in keeping this country out of war?

Sincerely yours,

FRED J. HARA.

GLENMONT, N. Y., *April 16, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY, *Senator,*
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My family and I listened with great interest to Lyman Bryson's round table this past Saturday evening. We heartily applaud your arguments against the convoying of arms, food, etc., into danger zones by American ships.

We believe the American people, above all else, do not want to take part in this war and see American blood shed.

We do not believe Britain is fighting our war. Even a superficial survey of European history is sufficient to disillusion the most naive of idealists from believing in the unselfishness of any European nation.

We believe one of the blessings of America to be the absence here of a long history of wars, injustices, and petty jealousies, which keep Europe in a constant state of distrust and desire for revenge.

If we enter this present war openly or by deliberately putting our men and ships in a position where they are sure to draw the fire of Nazi submarines and planes, we are injecting ourselves into this vengeful circle of European hates and fears. We will have associated ourselves so obviously with one side that we will have earned for ourselves the eternal enmity and distrust of the other side, and, furthermore, we will have lost our independence of action, of thought, and of foreign policy. We will henceforth be forced to subject our foreign policy to the approval of our European allies.

We think our Government should suggest to Britain that she turn over to us for the duration of the war her overseas commercial trade and so release some 9,000,000 tons of British shipping, which could then transport war goods from the United States to Britain and her allies. The warmongers would then be given no opportunity to sieze upon unfriendly incidents with which to inflame American opinion to the point of war.

We know you will use all the influence at your command to fight any proposal to place American men and ships in a position conducive to war.

Very sincerely.

MARIE WIEDEMAN
(and family).

FARMINGTON, CONN., *April 13, 1941.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have to hope that you will see this letter and pause.

America must not become engaged in the war in Europe. Mr. President, on that subject you have made some solemn pledges. I must remind you of them. The world has seen enough broken pledges for one generation. You are President of the United States. I must remind you of that. Even to consider convoying supplies to England, I beg to suggest, is to forget both.

The war in Europe is not our war. It is undoubtedly true that we should take precautions to prevent its consequences overwhelming us. But those precautions, by all means let them be strengthening ourselves with arms, with fortitude, with faith in our own works, with a will to demonstrate our own ideals, with unity within.

Mr. President, at the moment we have no unity. There is abroad in America, as within me, despair at the indifference manifest toward sentiments like mine; despair at seeming disregard for American interests. Congress approved the lend-lease bill, but can we be sure that the vote truly reflected the will of the people? Even if it did, there is certainly no will for the kind of aid or acts that will cause our engagement in this European war. Convoying does promise to engage us. So long as the administration's policy continues to hold this prospect we never shall have any unity. It outrages Americans like myself, and I am the son of a family on American soil 300 years. Patriots all. It helped start America. It fought to make it free, and I, for one, will join to preserve it a sovereign America, free and devoted to American purposes.

It is unfortunate that developments in this country have come to such a condition that a letter such as this is sent to the President. I regret it. But that is because people like me have too long been weak in their protest or indifferent—have appeased too much those who talk aid to England but who want us in this war. Appeasement, however, can go just so far. At the present juncture I, at least, shall do all I reasonably can to see that this appeasement goes no further.

Believe me, I say all this respectfully. Emotion overwhelms me, and I beg your pardon if I have been offensive.

Sincerely,

HERBERT WHITTIER ROOT.

FARMINGTON, CONN., *April 13, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have to send you a copy of a letter I just addressed to the President. May I hope you will take account of the sentiments therein.

Hopefully yours,

HERBERT W. ROOT.

FORT MYERS, FLA.,
April 13, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY.

DEAR SIR: A Concord, N. H., Democrat, leaving tomorrow for a short stay at Daytona Beach before proceeding home, will you please accept my sincere congratulations on the stand you took against the lease-lend bill and similar measures.

It is heartening to know that we have one man from New Hampshire in official Washington who thinks more of America than he does of a foreign power and who believes, as millions of us do, that our first duty is to America—to spend the taxpayers' money to wall this country with an arm of steel before we start giving it away to a country that controls one-quarter of the world, obtained by fair means and foul, principally foul.

No, Senator, I am not a "red," Nazi, Fascist, or foreign dupe, notwithstanding President Roosevelt and others of his ilk, and I resent the

aspersions in his recent radio speech belittling Americans because they honestly disagree with him.

No sane man can object spending whatever sum necessary to fortify this country, but I do object to giving it to a country that already owes us $5,000,000,000 and after the last war called us shylocks.

No, Senator, Great Britain is not fighting our battles; that remark has a familiar sound from World War days. She is fighting to protect that vast empire of hers; and if there is any fighting to be done, I, for one, prefer to have our boys fight it here, and then we will at least all know what it is all about. I believe most American mothers will agree with me there. To believe otherwise is a sign of fear and cowardice—that we are not big or strong enough to fight our own battles. What a sickening thought; but that seems to be the propaganda flying about.

Yours very truly,

ALGERNON O. QUIMBY.

FISHER FORESTRY & REALTY CO.,
Lyons Falls, N. Y., April 14, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: In common with thousands of other Americans, I was much interested in your radio-broadcast address on "Convoy." You were right in quoting the President as saying that "convoy means shooting, and shooting means war." Every move that the present administration has made is in the direction of war. I would be pleased if you would send me a few copies of your excellent address.

Under the lease-lend bill the administration could loan some of our destroyers and cruisers to Britain and have them manned with British crews and sail the British flag to act as convoy for our shipments. And this should not involve us in war. But for us to convoy or ship goods and supplies around Africa to the Red Sea, as decided on by the President, is fraught with much danger.

With esteem, I am

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE LYON FISHER.

OMRO, WIS., *April 14, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Wars are most keenly felt by those who had no share in causing them. I, a disabled veteran, would like to express my viewpoint and would be pleased to hear from you regarding these uncertain times. It is evident that some members of the administration are anxious for active participation in the bloody conflict now devastating Europe and that powerful and vicious propaganda continues to circulate to force our entrance into this new war of other peoples.

We must face the issue with sound American thought. We were called Uncle Shylock the last time. Are we to be called "'old 'em Yanks while we evacuate?" An empire at war, shielding its manhood. Australia and the Union of South Africa have no conscription; Canada has conscription for only 30 days, and then must have the consent of the individual before he can be sent overseas; an empire saving its vast resources, with 15,000,000 square miles and a population over 500,000,000, draining the security and wealth of our Government, our homes, and our way of life. What has become of our Americanism or common sense? Wars are not won by the foreign refugees who desert their country in face of battle, seek safety here, and then have the crust to tell us to stop Hitler while they themselves lack the guts to offer their body for the same service for which they would send some American to his death.

We cannot forget the many sons and fathers now lying in foreign soil; their crosses dot the "horizon" of futility. Our Government hospitals are filled with the maimed, the shell-shocked, the gassed, and the mentally afflicted. These same men 24 years ago were the flower of American manhood, the same as our youth of today. The place for American manhood is on top of American soil, and not under foreign mud.

My country and my Government mean too much to me for a fatal conclusion. Voice against the convoying of material by our Navy, and keep for us the peace which we still enjoy.

Very truly yours,

A. F. PAULASKY.

MANCHESTER, N. H., *April 14, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; I have heard your radio speeches; and, of course, I have read your resolution. I also have read in the Manchester Union various letters relative to your activities.

Senator, we are going to war. In fact, I believe we are now in the war. Whatever you say or do won't change things much. The problem is too big for the men designated to handle the affairs of the world.

Whatever happens, remember that there are a lot of fellows who served in France in the last war, and some of us who went into the army of occupation in Germany have known for a long time that this day of reckoning would take place.

You are doing your duty, and it is a source of great pleasure for those who know you best to be assured that whatever position you have taken you have been guided by a conscience and an education that qualifies you to speak for the people of the State of New Hampshire. Your vote will be for a long time in the minority, but your character will be forever with those of ambitions to serve all the people.

You have my respect and the respect of a great majority of the people of this State; so please continue to tutor the people of this country with a view that you might awake a consciousness that is being shadowed by a promise of a life without work.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. G. MCCARTHY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 17, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senator From New Hampshire,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My heartiest congratulations for your courage and statesmanship in your resistance to the use of our Navy for convoys of munitions to be made an excuse for the President to attack nations with whom we are at peace and which have given us no cause for war.

You have 90 percent of the voters of this country with you in this, and also against a war on behalf of England, China, Greece, or the Eskimos. Yet how can we stop this madcap crusader, who throws insults daily at the warring nations, and is driving us into eventual bankruptcy and the dissolution of government under the Constitution.

Brave and sane Americans like you form a rallying place to which those can repair, who will fight to keep the flag still flying of the United States our fathers brought to greatness.

The America First Committee serves a like purpose, and before long the present inarticulate masses will seek both for aid against the horror of plunging them into another European war, which, if successful, gains them nothing and leaves them impoverished.

If I can be of any service at any time, do call upon me.

Yours admiringly,

THOMAS RIDGWAY.

P. S.—My great great grandfather fought in the Revolution, my father in the Civil War, I in the Spanish War, and I have two sons in camps. I am not a German.

THE DEFENSE PROGRAM SET-UP

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have been interested in the extraordinary situation which prevails here now, in which the Senate of the United States has nothing to do in probably one of the greatest emergencies that has ever occurred. I have always been interested in the fact that many of the things which we might be doing, the President of the United States seems to be doing on his own authority, or possibly under statutes we have passed. In some cases I think his action is entirely outside of any statutory authority.

The majority leader last Tuesday said there was nothing before the Senate, and it is quite true there is nothing before the Senate, but it is also true that there is very little before the committees of the Senate. I am a member of three committees, the Finance Committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Committee on Education and Labor, and I do not think the chairmen of those committees have called any meetings for the last 3 weeks. The Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Banking and Currency, both of which have important subjects before them dealing with the defense program, have scarcely met since the convening of Congress. Before we met on January 3, recommendations had been made with regard to the entire currency situation of the United States. Recommendations had been made by the Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Reserve Board, and by organizations all over the country for a change in the reserve requirements. I have introduced a bill dealing with that subject. I introduced another bill carrying out other recommendations of the Federal Reserve Board. The committee has not met to consider any of those bills, and there seems to be no prospect that it will do so.

I have tried to study exactly what the present defense set-up is under which the country today is operating. We were told that if the lease-lend bill should be passed, then we could concentrate the power, and we could go ahead with the defense program. It is very difficult to find out exactly what the present defense set-up is and, far from being concentrated, it is becoming daily more complicated and diffused.

Apparently the entire set-up now is a bureaucratic set-up within the Executive Office of the President of the United States. The President is daily creating additional bureaus within the Executive Office—a kind of a superbureaucracy, having no connection with the existing agencies set up by Congress, and there is no specific authority from Congress to create them. I suppose the President, when he is given certain powers, may have someone in the Executive Office carry out those powers. That is the general basis of the plan. But I think it has gone far beyond anything that Congress contemplated or anything that Congress should contemplate.

The present set-up is—

First. The President issued an Executive order creating six different branches

of the Executive Office of the President. They are, first, the White House Office, which is all that any other President has ever had.

Second. The Bureau of the Budget.

Third. The National Resources Planning Board.

Fourth. The Liaison Office for Personnel Management.

Fifth. The Office of Government Reports, which we are going to be asked to authorize here shortly.

Sixth. The Office for Emergency Management. The Office for Emergency Management is under the charge of Mr. W. H. McReynolds, one of the President's secretaries, and since the Office for Emergency Management was created, about a month ago, there have been created within the Office for Emergency Management four different bureaus, and a fifth is about to be authorized.

The first is the Office of Production Management. We were told when the Office of Production Management was created that that was the centralized office from which the defense program was to be run. As a matter of fact, today it has degenerated into a very small branch of this whole defense set-up.

Second. The Division for Defense Housing Coordination. Mr. Palmer has a separate bureau and a separate set-up supposed to be coordinating the six or seven other Government housing agencies of different kinds and in some way directing the housing program. He is entirely independent of the Office of Production Management, and of the Cabinet, or anybody else, except the President.

Third. The National Defense Mediation Board. That was created by the President in the Executive Office, and it is just a branch of the Executive Office.

Fourth. The Office of Price Administration and Civilian Control, Mr. Leon Henderson's office, which has just recently been created.

Fifth. It is apparently the intention to create another bureau to administer the lease-lend bill, under the control of Mr. Harry Hopkins.

So we will have five entirely separate bureaus within the Executive Office of the President, and within the Office for Emergency Management, each of which is independent. We are getting back to the same old condition we had in the Advisory Council for National Defense, in which we had seven different men, without a chairman, something that everyone agreed we should get away from.

Mr. President, there may be legal authority for the creation of such a superbureaucracy, but I doubt whether Congress intended that the President should have power to create new agencies. We certainly have never intended that without authority from Congress a special bureau shall be created in the Government. If the President can do it in this manner, then he can create any kind of bureau and apparently give it any kind of power.

In the second place, it is an exceedingly inefficient set-up. The idea that this whole thing should be controlled from a single centralized position, was urged upon the Senate during the debate on the lease-lend bill. That is what that bill was to accomplish. I think I remember the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], in his most effective speech, pointing out that in the World War it was only when we had more centralized responsibility that we were able to administer the defense program.

The Senator from Vermont said:

> Yet this country fell into such terrible confusion from the fact that there were 20 or more different agencies of procurement, giving orders and making contracts with the same sources of supply, without any regard to each other's priorities or equal rights, that the whole system was in danger of collapsing, when President Wilson, exercising his power as a war President, and not by virtue of any statute of the United States, gave to Bernard M. Baruch the authority of a dictator over industry, galvanized the War Industries Board into life, and enabled it to be the clearing house of all these snarls. What appeared like an industrial miracle followed.

Instead of following the plan that was then followed, the President is simply dividing his powers of national defense and creating conflicting boards. Let me read what Mr. Ernest K. Lindley said this morning in the Washington Post with regard to the recent appointment of Mr. Henderson:

> Henderson's appointment shifts the balance of power in the whole national defense administration. Officially he is on a parity with O. P. M. under Knudsen-Hillman. Actually his powers in many respects are broader than theirs. While they, with the Army and Navy, are responsible for defense production, he is responsible for over-all economic management and for production outside the defense field.

In other words, we are steadily chipping off such powers as Mr. Knudsen had, and dividing them up among a large number of bureaus. I say that the Senate should now be considering the question of the creation of a War Resources Administration with properly limited legal powers, and with all the authority that ought to be given to such a War Resources Administration.

In particular, I think Mr. Henderson's price-fixing orders are absolutely illegal, and represent a usurpation of the authority which only Congress may exercise. I do not know whether or not Senators have read those orders, but they read like laws. They purport to lay down rules of law for the violation of which persons are to be punished.

Mr. Henderson started by fixing the price of iron and steel scrap. I shall not read that order. He then proceeded to fix the price of coal, while he was still only a member of the Advisory Commission for the Council of National Defense. Although we have given the Bituminous Coal Commission power to fix the price of coal, Mr. Henderson, on his own authority, proceeded to issue an order which reads exactly like a law, saying that no person shall sell coal at more than a certain price. Since he has been appointed administrator he has reaffirmed the coal order as administrator. Only yesterday he issued an order fixing the price of iron and steel, although he has no legal authority whatever to fix the price of anything. That order reads in part as follows:

> On and after April 17, 1941, no person who produces iron or steel products shall sell or deliver or offer to sell or deliver any such product, and no purchaser shall buy or accept delivery or offer to buy or accept delivery from such person of any such product, at a price exceeding the maximum ("ceiling") price.

The "ceiling" price for iron or steel products is defined as being the sum of certain elements, including the basing point base price, extras, and transportation. He then proceeds to fix the price.

When he comes to the question of enforcement of the orders he makes it very clear that what will happen if anybody violates the order is that Mr. Henderson will use other powers, such as the power to confiscate plants or confiscate the product, or some other club to be held over the heads of businessmen because they are not following an illegal order which he himself has issued. That is the whole basis for the price-fixing idea.

Of course, that kind of price-fixing is most objectionable. There is no appeal to anybody. If there is anyone who has bought scrap at a higher price than the price fixed by the order, there would be no appeal.

Apparently such a person would be pilloried before public opinion, under Mr. Henderson's order. He may not go to any court to have a determination as to whether or not the price fixed is reasonable. He may not have a determination as to whether or not he is being deprived of his property without due process of law. Mr. Henderson says:

> I will tell the people about what you are doing, and we will pillory you before public opinion. We will get every department of the Government to hound you until you agree to comply with the price fixed.

I say that such procedure is not fair or just. It is not the way prices ought to be fixed. Frankly, I think the price-fixing power ought to be granted to a proper authority today, to prevent inflation; but Mr. Henderson's method is not the proper way to fix prices. Furthermore, it is not an effective way to fix prices, because there will be some who will not obey. There will be some who will not care about public opinion. There will be some with respect to whom the Government will not be able to do anything, or use the power of confiscation. These chiselers would escape while patriotic and responsible concerns suffer loss.

We have granted the President broad powers to fix reasonable prices for the things the Government is buying. We granted that kind of power, but we have not given a shadow of authority to fix prices for the sale of products between two individuals. I think the Congress ought to determine that question. I think the Congress ought to determine on what kind of products we are to fix prices, and under what conditions, because if Mr. Henderson can fix prices in times like these, he can fix them in any other time of peace. If he can fix the price of steel scrap, he can fix the price of watches, or of any other product manufactured in the United States.

I say that we have here a usurpation of authority following, as it inevitably

follows, the creation without authority of a large number of Government bureaus to carry out a supposed defense program.

I have not had the time to dig up everything that has been done under this program, but I say that for the Senate to sit idle and do nothing while the executive department is assuming to write what are in fact statutes, is exactly what the parliament of Germany did in the case of Mr. Hitler. The statutes written and issued by Mr. Henderson are exactly like the statutes which Adolf Hitler can write by the stroke of his pen. Unless we get back to democratic processes we shall have a totalitarian government here.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I intend to detain the Senate for only a moment; but I do not feel that I should permit the remarks of the Senator from Ohio to go unnoticed, with particular reference to the rather veiled criticism which I understood he had in his remarks with reference to the committees of the Senate.

We all know that for the most part this session has been devoted to the problem of national defense. That does not mean that committees of the Senate dealing with other subjects have not been diligent in the performance of their duties. I think the Senate has the right to assume, and I certainly assume, that every committee has as keen a sense of its own responsibility as any Senator could possibly have. The Appropriations Committee has been busy. The Finance Committee has been busy, and has promptly considered every measure with reference to taxes or amendment of taxes that has been committed to it, and stands ready, and will continue to stand ready, to consider any further legislation on that subject when it has come over from the only body which, under the Constitution, can initiate it. We all know that the Banking and Currency Committee is, and always has been, one of the hardest-working and promptest committees of the Senate in considering legislation pending before it. Unfortunately, the chairman of that committee, Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, of the State of New York, has been ill for several months. Since early in the session he has been unable to perform his duties in the Senate or in the committee. I am happy to report, as I believe, that he is considerably improved. When he will be able to return I cannot say.

So I do not think it is quite fair to leave the remarks of the Senator from Ohio in the RECORD without some comment, or at least without taking note of the fact that these committees have not deliberately avoided the performance of their duties; and I think we can rely upon them to exercise all the diligence, and promptness, and care that the legislation before them deserves.

With reference to the function of Mr. Leon Henderson in the matter of price-fixing, to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, I do not desire to enter into any debate as to the legal authority which he may have or which the President may confer upon him in regard to the regulation of prices; but in connection with that subject I think it may be enlightening to have the clerk read from the desk an editorial published in the Washington Post of today, entitled "The Importance of Steel," which, it seems to me, certainly expresses a conservative viewpoint as to the wisdom of the action so far taken by Mr. Leon Henderson in regard to steel.

I ask that the editorial be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

IMPORTANCE OF STEEL

Leon Henderson's order "freezing" steel prices at prevailing levels is a wise precautionary move designed to prevent a general advance of steel prices following wage increases that have added many millions of dollars to company pay rolls. It is not, however, definitive. Mr. Henderson has explained that the "freezing" order does not set a permanent limit to steel prices. It merely gives his office time to study the effect of the wage advances on production costs and to authorize such adjustments as seem justified.

Whether increases in prices of certain steel products are warranted, is, as Donald M. Nelson, director of O. P. M.'s purchasing division, well says, "a question of fact." But facts regarding the production costs of a great industry such as steel are hard to determine. They are far from easy to interpret in terms of prices of finished products. That is especially true under present conditions when rising rates of production cause per-unit overhead costs to decline while wage outlays are rising. Moreover, with the steel industry running full blast to meet the heavy needs of the defense program, and to satisfy civilian demands, too, high-cost marginal plants and less efficient equipment are being pressed into service. The question arises, therefore, as to whether the prices required to cover the high costs of these marginal concerns shall be permitted to determine the general level of prices for steel products. Concerns above the margin of profitable production might be able to absorb wage increases that would put less efficient establishments out of the running. Mr. Henderson, out of his great experience with costs and prices, knows all this. He will seek to keep steel prices at minima consistent with fair treatment of the industry.

But steel is too important to be left untouched till the studies have been completed. As Mr. Henderson says, "steel is an element of cost in practically every item of the defense program" and directly or indirectly "in virtually every item of civilian consumption." Consequently, a rise in steel prices would be followed by advances in other basic commodities and it would be reflected eventually in rising prices of manufactured goods. "Presently," Mr. Henderson warns, "the ultimate consumer would find that he must pay more for what he buys, and so the foundation would have been laid for a dangerous upward spiral of prices in general—which would mean, briefly, boosting the cost of living." This official warning would, of course, carry more weight if it had been uttered before, instead of after, the steel workers had secured their wage increases. But at least it emphasizes the importance of holding wage increases within moderate limits, so that industry will not be compelled to boost prices of finished goods in order to cover its production costs and prevent profits from being turned into losses.

Doubtless the Office of Price Administration is in a position to perform a useful public service in preventing the steel industry as well as other defense industries from making wage increases an excuse for unjustified price increases. At the same time its effectiveness as a price-control agency is inevitably severely limited. Official price-fixing decrees alone cannot protect us from spiraling prices that spell inflation unless control is also established over production costs. And of these costs wages are the most important element. It is likewise necessary for those who direct our monetary and taxation policies to do their part to prevent prices and living costs from getting out of control. These considerations should be borne in mind lest the public expect wizardry to flow from Mr. Henderson's wand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, now just a word on the subject discussed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I do not intend to enter into any polemics with him on the subject of convoys.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to comment very briefly on the matter of price fixing before the Senator discusses the convoy question, which may take some time.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it will not take any great length of time.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to make it perfectly clear that I am not objecting at all to any word contained in the editorial published in the Washington Post, or to the theory that steel prices should be practically fixed. I am objecting only to the method, without legal authority, by which it is done. I desire to read into the RECORD one other order which I should like to have printed as part of my remarks, by which Mr. Henderson attempted to fix the price of coal, although, as I say, we have given authority to others to do so—which reads as follows:

On or after April 3, 1941, no person selling bituminous coal, whether producer, distributor, retailer, or any other seller, shall sell or deliver bituminous coal, or offer to sell or deliver bituminous coal, at a price exceeding the ceiling price. The ceiling price shall be the price received by such seller for a similar sale or delivery made on March 28, 1941.

When he comes to the matter of enforcement, Mr. Henderson says:

In the event of refusal or failure to abide by the price limitations contained in this schedule, this Division will make every effort to assure (a) that Congress, the various Federal, State, and local agencies and committees, including defense organizations, and the public are fully informed of the instances of such profiteering or noncooperation. * * *

In other words he will enforce his rules by propaganda. He will pillory the people who do not follow the rules which he has no right to make. I am objecting only to the method, and not to the fact that coal prices are fixed or that steel prices are fixed. I say that Congress since the first of January should have been considering the very complicated question of a bill to authorize the fixing of prices. It should have been here if it was in contemplation at all. I did not know it was in contemplation until about 2 weeks ago; but if the Government contemplates that necessity, there should have been consideration by this body of the problem of fixing prices.

I ask to have the entire order of Mr. Henderson, of which I have read only a portion, printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The order is as follows:

[From the Federal Register of April 3, 1941]

PRICE SCHEDULE NO. 5—BITUMINOUS COAL

Whereas the Price Stabilization Division of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense is charged with functions related to the maintenance of price stability and the prevention of undue price rises and price dislocations; and

Whereas the Nation's production of bituminous coal has in large part ceased as a result of a failure of the mine operators and employees to negotiate a wage agreement, and unless production is promptly resumed, there will be a shortage in the supply of bituminous coal available to meet the demand therefore; and

Whereas on account of such shortage and fears of shortage a serious and perhaps excessive and disastrous rise in the prices of bituminous coal is clearly threatened, which price rise will have an injurious effect upon the Nation's economy, because of the importance of bituminous coal as the prime source of energy for industry and as the prime source of heat for domestic consumers; and

Whereas it is difficult and perhaps impossible to maintain price stability and prevent excessive and unwarranted price increases in the absence of specific maximum standards set with the utmost expedition and at all levels of sale; and

Whereas the prompt establishment of such standards is necessary to prevent the kind of price policy which leads to a weakening of the defense effort through disastrous inflation, undue burdens upon the Government, economic dislocations, price spiraling, and profiteering, and the establishment of such standards is otherwise necessary in the public interest and in the interest of national defense; and

Whereas on the basis of information made available through the cooperation of the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior, and on the basis of other information secured by the Price Stabilization Division, I find that the maximum prices set forth below in this price schedule constitute reasonable limitations, in the present emergency, for bituminous coal.

Now, therefore, in order to facilitate cooperation with the Government in maintaining price stability and in preventing excessive and speculative price increases injurious to the defense program and to the public interest and welfare, it is directed that:

1. Ceiling price. On or after April 3, 1941, no person selling bituminous coal, whether producer, distributor, retailer, or any other seller, shall sell or deliver bituminous coal, or offer to sell or deliver bituminous coal, at a price exceeding the ceiling price. The ceiling price shall be the price received by such seller for a similar sale or delivery made on March 28, 1941. A similar sale or delivery shall refer only to a sale or delivery involving the same size and quality of coal, the same intended use, the same or nearby delivery and transportation points, and the same method of transportation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the seller from continuing to receive such price differentials on the basis of quantity sold or delivered as have customarily been received by such seller. In the event that no similar sale or delivery was made by such seller on March 28, 1941, the ceiling price shall be the price received by such seller for the latest similar sale or delivery made prior to March 28, 1941. In the event that no similar sale or delivery was previously made by such seller, the ceiling price shall be determined by appropriate adjustment of the applicable prices on most similar sales.

A lower price than the ceiling price may be charged, demanded, or offered: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the receiving of a price lower than that prescribed pursuant to the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937. The price limitations set forth in this schedule shall not be evaded whether by direct or indirect methods, or by charges for service or other charges not previously made by the seller of the coal.

2. Modification: This price schedule is issued upon the basis of presently existing conditions. In the event of a substantial resumption of production of bituminous coal, this price schedule will be revoked as soon as practicable; and in the event of any other substantial change in conditions, this price schedule will be adjusted or revoked, as may be appropriate. Persons complaining of hardship or inequity in the operation of this schedule may apply to the Price Stabilization Division for approval of any modification thereof.

3. Supplements: In order to facilitate the application of this schedule, supplements further stating its scope will be issued from time to time as may be necessary or appropriate.

4. Enforcement: In the event of refusal or failure to abide by the price limitations contained in this schedule, this Division will make every effort to assure (a) that Congress, the various Federal, State, and local agencies and committees, including defense organizations, and the public are fully informed of the instances of such profiteering or noncooperation; and (b) that the powers of the Government are fully exerted in order to protect the public interest in the maintenance of fair prices. Persons who have evidence of the demand or receipt of prices above the limitations set forth, or of speculation, manipulation of prices, or hoarding, are urged to communicate with the Price Stabilization Division. (Sec. 2, 39 Stat. 649; order filed June 3, 1940, F. R. Doc. 40-2213 (5 F. R. 2114); (order filed June 24, 1940, F. R. Doc. 40-2583 (5 F. R. 2381).)

Issued this 2d day of April 1941.

LEON HENDERSON,
Commissioner.

[F. R. Doc. 41-2441; filed, April 2, 1941; 11:58 a. m.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield in a moment. The ceiling price referred to, I assume, is the ceiling price fixed by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. TAFT. No; it is fixed by Leon Henderson, who was a member of the Advisory Commission of the Advisory National Defense Council before he became price stabilizer, and had even less power then than he has now.

Mr. BARKLEY. That order was issued at a time when it was not known that the Bituminous Coal Act would be extended. The bill extending it had not passed the Congress and had not been signed by the President. It is my understanding that the ceiling price referred to by the Senator from Ohio—and if I am mistaken, I am subject to correction—was the ceiling price theretofore fixed by the Bituminous Coal Division under the Coal Act.

Mr. TAFT. The Bituminous Coal Division may or may not have had the power to fix prices that day, but Leon Henderson certainly did not have that power.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a question which is open to discussion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to inquire whether or not it is the position of the Senator from Kentucky as majority leader that Mr. Henderson did possess ample statutory authority for the issuance of the order referred to? We had the matter up with Mr. Knudsen yesterday, and he was somewhat in doubt about what might be back of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly I have not gone into a meticulous research as to the authority upon which Mr. Henderson acted; I have assumed that, in a general way, he had authority, and the whole Defense Council had authority to do what they have been doing under the authority of the President which he has exercised under the Defense Act. I have also assumed—and I now assume—that Mr. Henderson would not attempt to exercise this authority without legal advice to the effect that he did have the power to do it. But I, myself, have not gone into the legal phases of it so that I can give the Senator the page and date upon which any legal opinion has been rendered under which Mr. Henderson has acted.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator go so far as to say that the issuance of such orders when there is serious doubt as to the statutory authority is not a thing to be encouraged?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should say that, as a general practice, administrative officers ought to be fairly sure of their ground when they issue orders based upon authority conferred either by Congress or the Chief Executive.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that entrance into this field of price fixing does involve very serious problems?

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly.

CONVOYS

Mr. President, a few days ago when the matter of convoys was under discussion in the Senate, I was interrogated by the Senator from New Hampshire, although not on the floor but in my seat. I responded, and in that coloquy said that all I had ever heard about the convoy of American ships or British ships or any other ships carrying materials of war from any place to any other place was what I had read in the newspapers and what I had heard on the floor of the Senate. While I am not at liberty to reveal what takes place in private conferences between me and executive officers, including the President of the United States, I think I am at liberty to say that in no private conference in which I have participated has there been any discussion of convoys or any intimation that the problem of convoys was one that was being given consideration. What has happened in other conferences to which I was not a party I am not, of course, at liberty to say, for I do not know.

In view of the discussion and the publicity which have revolved around the subject during the last few days, I took the liberty this morning to confer with the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Stark, both of whom unequivocally and emphatically authorized me to say for them, if I thought it necessary to make any statement whatever about it on the floor of the Senate, that not a

single ship, American or foreign, carrying any war materials from any place to any other place, had been convoyed or was being convoyed from any place to any other place, and that no orders had been received from anybody in authority to give such orders for convoying any ship of any kind from any place to any other place anywhere in the world.

I take it for granted that the statement of the Secretary of the Navy and the statement of the Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Stark, in both of whom I believe the American people have implicit confidence, are entitled to credit by the American people and by Members of the Senate over the rumors and backstairs gossip of people whose names are not revealed, who, apparently, are willing to write letters, or of some unidentified officer somewhere in a department of the Government, whose name is not revealed, to the effect that they have a suspicion that the President of the United States, under his oath of office and in the exercise of his judgment in a great crisis in our history and in the world's history, is deliberately undertaking to deceive the American people and by connivance and under cover to bring about the convoying of ships, a suggestion which he publicly denounces as absolutely untrue.

I suppose there are persons in this country who do not give full faith and credit to the statement of any public officer, including the President of the United States; but I am confident that the American people, without regard to politics, Mr. President, believe that the President of the United States is earnestly seeking to preserve the interests of the United States, to carry out his obligation which he took on the 20th of last January to support the Constitution and to administer the Presidential office to the best of his ability, and I am firmly of the opinion that the American people do not believe, no matter from what source the insinuations may come, that Franklin D. Roosevelt is deliberately attempting to deceive them or that he is secretly carrying out some policy or purpose or course which he publicly and emphatically denies he is carrying out or that he issued any orders to anybody else to carry out.

In all frankness and with the utmost kindness, for I have for the Senator from New Hampshire the utmost personal affection and kindliest feelings and I know how earnest and intense he is in advocating anything in which he believes or which he discusses, I do not believe any man in a responsible position, here or elsewhere, renders the American people any service by trying to create widespread suspicion that the President of the United States is not acting in good faith in all that he does or says upon this delicate subject.

Mr. TOBEY rose.

(Manifestations of applause in the galleries.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BARKLEY. Before I yield I want to make an observation. The rules of the Senate prohibit any demonstration in the galleries, and I would condemn any demonstration if it were on my behalf as much as I would if it were on the side of anyone else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Occupants of the gallery know that that is the rule of the Senate. We are glad to have visitors present in the galleries; they are entitled to come here; but we are entitled to expect that they will observe the rules of the Senate. I hope the occupants of the galleries will not make it necessary to comment any further upon demonstrations. I do not know in whose behalf they were applauding a moment ago, and I do not care, but it is a violation of the rules, and ought not to be indulged in. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished majority leader—and I heartily reciprocate, as he knows, the feelings of good will he has expressed toward me—that it is about time those in authority in this country at the head of the Navy, either the bureaucratic head or the actual head, or the man in the White House spoke and enlightened the people on this burning issue of the hour.

I have not created suspicion or cast suspicion. The suspicion abroad in the land was generated from the inner circles of the administration of the United States Government when, if you please, the President called the suggestion of convoys absurd; when a few days later he said, "We are considering convoys"; when a youth from New England writes, "I am on a convoy ship, and have been on it for a month."

Suspicion! If anyone with any perspicacity or understanding is not suspicious under these circumstances, he ought to go to a school for feeble-minded, in my judgment. There is ground for suspicion and incredulity all the way down through; and let me ask the Senator a question on this matter of convoys.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I thought the Senator rose to do.

Mr. TOBEY. I will do it now. All of us indulge in preambles, as the Senator knows.

Mr. BARKLEY. Sometimes the Senator's preamble is longer than his constitution. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. I may say that generally the preambles are worth while, if I may say so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I concede the worthwhileness of everything the Senator says, or even thinks without saying.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me ask the Senator one other question. Does not the Senator from Kentucky believe that the American people should have first-hand information and reassurance from the Executive and from the Secretary of the Navy and from Admiral Stark that convoys are not either being used or being considered? Does he not believe that?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have stated to the Senator from New Hampshire, and, if my words get into the press, to the country, that the Secretary of the Navy and Admiral Stark, the Chief of Naval Operations, have stated unequivocally and emphatically that convoys are not being used and have not been used in a single instance. The President of the United States has stated in the press, and it has gone all over the country, that statements to the contrary are absolutely untrue. What further can any of these gentlemen do to enlighten the American people?

Mr. TOBEY. I will say to the majority leader that it is unfortunate that it takes a campaign over the radio and public addresses in the Senate to smoke out some of the persons in authority to tell the American people about these things.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was nothing to smoke out except the bugaboo the Senator himself has raised over the radio and elsewhere.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire did succeed in getting the Secretary of the Navy on record, and also Admiral Stark, the first time that was done.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Secretary of the Navy has stated repeatedly——

Mr. TOBEY. What has he stated?

Mr. BARKLEY. Practically what I have stated here today.

Mr. TOBEY. I will tell the Senator what he has repeatedly stated—that he is against convoys, because convoys mean war.

Mr. BARKLEY. All right. The Senator has quoted that statement time after time.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not the slightest doubt about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. Now, let me ask the Senator another question. Does he agree with me that, if American ships are sunk, it means war?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator and I discussed that question 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask the Senator the question again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will stand upon the statement I then made. Whether convoys mean war or do not mean war, nobody now can prophesy.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator believe they do?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether they do or not. I do not believe they necessarily do. Nobody can prophesy what the future will bring forth; and for that very reason I think it is unfair to the American people to conjure up imaginary situations which do not exist and never have existed.

Mr. TOBEY. May I enlighten the Senator by reading to him the words of three patriots of the Congress—and I use that word advisedly?

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator say "patriots" or "patriarchs"? [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. Patriots. They are synonymous in this case.

I now read the words of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]:

> There is only one realistic course for America to follow if it wants to avoid the causes of war and at the same time maintain its dignity and self-respect. This course is for the American Congress absolutely to prohibit American ships from carrying American passengers or American goods of any kind to any belligerent nation, or to proceed through any combat areas.

Those are the words of the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

What did Representative SOL BLOOM, of New York, say on the same subject?

Where a part of the world has gone mad, where laws and rights are trampled upon, it is folly for the United States to expect its ships and citizens to be safe in exercising their rights. They will not be safe. They will be slaughtered. The United States would go to war as a consequence, and in that war thousands of other lives would be sacrificed.

Now listen to what the Senator sitting behind the majority leader, the distinguished JAMES F. BYRNES, of North Carolina, said about the danger of convoys.

Mr. BARKLEY. South Carolina, if the Senator please.

Mr. TOBEY. South Carolina; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it is the State south of North Carolina.

Mr. TOBEY. I realize that. I also remember what the Governor of North Carolina said to the Governor of South Carolina. [Laughter.]

The Senator from South Carolina is speaking:

Under the administration proposal we sacrifice our right to sail the seas. By the cash requirement we sacrifice the right even to send American property on the ships of other nations into the zone of war. By this sacrifice we remove the cause of our entering the World War and the cause most likely to result in our entering another war.

And President Roosevelt gave us the following solemn assurance:

This Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict.

I ask the majority leader, How can we convoy without entering the war zones?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, nothing has been done by the American Government since the war was declared in 1939, or since the passage of the lend-lease bill which is inconsistent with what the Senator from New Hampshire has read from the speech of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. TOBEY. I now call the attention of the majority leader to his own words. I know he likes to hear them.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a good speech, too. If the Senator from New Hampshire would quote from me oftener, he would make better speeches than he does. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. In other words, in the opinion of the majority leader, the oracle has spoken, "thus saith the Lord," when he speaks. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. My opinion of myself is almost as good as the Senator's opinion of himself, although not quite. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. I shake hands with the Senator on that statement, sir. I now read his own words to him:

If we had intended to include the Navy in the Neutrality Act, we certainly would have said so, and would not have limited the interpretation of the words "American vessel" by the provision for American registry—

And so on.

Mr. BARKLEY. All right. I said that.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the subject of convoys. The Senator from New Hampshire has made this dissertation on numerous occasions here in the Senate and over the radio, and I presume he will do so again in the future; so it is not necessary to indulge in a running debate with him now on the subject; but I did feel that the American people and the Senate were entitled to the emphatic statements of the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations with respect to this entire situation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, just one question. I should like to ask the Senator whether he would be willing, for the sake of the RECORD, to preface his statement in which he made the report from Secretary Knox and Admiral Stark regarding convoys with the three words "at long last"?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; my remarks stand for themselves. The Senator may amend his remarks if he wishes to do so.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I desire very much to believe that the issue as to convoying is as represented; in other words, that the Government of the United States is not undertaking to provide convoys in any degree and in any sense, because we all realize what convoys must mean. I know of no will to undertake to answer the challenge that convoys mean war.

In order that the Senate may be reminded what the sinking of a ship or ships, the loss of a few American lives, and an insult to the flag may mean, I offer for the RECORD a table taken from the book entitled "Neutrality for the United States," by Borchard and Lage. The table appears at page 351 of the book, revealing the names of the American merchantmen which were sunk, up to the time of our active participation in the World War, the dates of their sinking, the number of lives involved, and the cause of the destruction which was inflicted.

From page 83 of the same book I quote the following:

Until the break in diplomatic relations with Germany on February 3, 1917, only three lives had been lost on American vessels. These were all on the *Gulflight*, which was torpedoed on May 1, 1915, the very day the *Lusitania* sailed from New York. The vessel did not sink, but was towed in.

I ask that the table to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American merchant shipping losses up to our entrance into World War

[From Neutrality for the United States, Borchard & Lage]

Date	Vessel	Lives			Remarks
		United States	Foreign	Total	
Jan. 27, 1915	*Wm. P. Frye*				Raider.
May 1, 1915	*Gulflight*	3		3	Torpedo.
May 25, 1915	*Nebraskan*				Do.
July 25, 1915	*Leelanaw*				Do.
Aug. 4, 1915	*Pass of Balhamas*				Surrendered.
Oct. 28, 1916	*Lanao* (Philippine Islands Steamship).				Bombs.
Nov. 7, 1916	*Columbian*				Do.
Nov. 26, 1916	*Chemung*				Torpedo (Austria).
Dec. 14, 1916	*Rebecca Palmer*				Shelled.
Jan. 4, 1917	*Norlina*				Torpedo.
Feb. 3, 1917	*Housatonic*				Bombs or torpedo.
Total to Feb. 3, 1917 (ruptures in diplomatic relation).		3		3	6 sunk. 1 surrendered. 4 damaged.
Feb. 12, 1917	*Lyman M. Law*				Captured.
Mar. 12, 1917	*Algonquin*				Shelled and bombs.
Mar. 16, 1917	*Vigilancia*	6	9	15	Torpedo.
Mar. 17, 1917	*City of Memphis*				Shelled.
Mar. 18, 1917	*Illinois*				Bombs.
Mar. 21, 1917	*Healdton*	7	14	21	Torpedo.
Apr. 1, 1917	*Aztec* (armed)	12	16	28	Do.
Apr. 4, 1917	*Marguerite*				Bombs.
Do	*Missourian*				Shelled.
Total to Apr. 16, 1917 (war declared).					15 sunk. 1 surrendered. 4 damaged.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, however much we may be assured that our Government is not undertaking convoying at this time, there can be no denying the fact that tremendous pressure is being engendered in the United States to accomplish an order by the President, or any other authority, which would bring about convoying.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, if the Senator will permit, it might also be said that tremendous pressure is being brought to bear on the President on the other side that our vessels be not permitted to engage in convoying. I have received numerous letters from persons over the country advising me that petitions were being circulated to be sent to the President on that subject. So that the two sides of the picture should be mentioned if either is to be mentioned.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am quite willing that that matter should be mentioned. I am sure it is proper to mention it. I am one of those convinced that there is an overwhelming sentiment in this country against the idea of convoying, and also against running the chance of our being involved in the war. Yet we find, as we take one step after another that leads us a little closer to the war, a new pressure being organized in the country to lead us a step farther.

I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed from the most recently formed society, known as the Fight for

Freedom Committee, with headquarters at 1270 Sixth Avenue, RKO Building, New York. The letter is a confidential communication, mailed to how many I do not know, but it reveals those who are sponsoring this organization. The letter is accompanied by a statement setting forth its purposes. In order to make known what this organization is standing for, I read the closing paragraph of the gentleman who, I presume, is the secretary of the organization, Ulric Bell:

In short, the Fight for Freedom is the result of a widespread desire to present to the country a hard-hitting and militant body of men and women who know what they believe in and are willing to stand by it.

There is another reference in the letter, as follows:

It will afford, without attempting to usurp the functions of any existing organization or parallel any such organization, an opportunity for the affiliation of militant individuals and groups now urging an end to all timidity.

Their program is one of support to an all-out-aid program.

Accompanying the letter and the statement is a list of the names of those who have signed as sponsors for this committee. I ask that all this may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., April 7, 1941.

DEAR ———: I am writing you at the direction of a group headed by the Right Reverend Henry Hobson, Episcopal bishop of southern Ohio, and otherwise including Wayne Johnson, Grenville Clark, Francis P. Miller, James P. Warburg, Lewis Mumford, Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach, Ward Cheney, George Watts Hill, Dr. Conyers Read, Allen Dulles, and others. I am enclosing a copy of a statement which has been evolved by this group for a new body to be known as the Fight for Freedom Committee.

The statement speaks for itself. Obviously it is intended for those who have fully made up their minds about the present emergency and its implications. You will probably not disagree that our side in the fight against nazi-ism at home and abroad has been woefully tardy in facing squarely the real issue and the whole issue. The Fight for Freedom Committee therefore is proposed to be a medium of expression for all those who take the all-out line, both from the standpoint of meeting the present acute threat and of help in the long pull for strong and enlightened democracy. It will afford, without attempting to usurp the functions of any existing organization or parallel any such organization, an opportunity for the affiliation of militant individuals and groups now urging an end to all timidity.

Bishop Hobson has agreed to serve as acting chairman of the new committee. Wayne Johnson, of New York, is acting as treasurer. Many members of this general group already have subscribed to the declaration of policy herein transmitted. A headquarters staff has been set up under the direction of Mr. F. H. Peter Cusick. As you know, many outstanding individuals throughout the country have been cooperating with this office and are potentially devoted and zealous workers for the new undertaking.

At the instance of Bishop Hobson and others, I am inquiring whether you would serve as a member of the national Fight for Freedom Committee. If you will, it would greatly facilitate matters by having you send your approval by collect telegram to this office.

It is proposed to raise money by voluntary subscription as far as possible, and your response will represent no obligation in this respect.

In short, the fight for freedom is the result of a widespread desire to present to the country a hard-hitting and militant body of men and women who know what they believe in and are willing to stand by it.

Sincerely yours,

ULRIC BELL.

P. S.—Signers of the Fight For Freedom Committee: Mrs. Learned Hand, civic leader, New York City; W. A. Seavey, professor of Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.; R. Sturgis Ingersoll, Philadelphia; Gen. John F. O'Ryan, lawyer, New York City; A. Philip Randolph, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, New York City; Harry H. Semmes, lawyer, Washington, D. C.; William F. Cochran, Baltimore; George W. Martin, lawyer, New York City; Rufus E. Clement, president of Atlanta University; Elston Belknap, M. D., Milwaukee, Wis.; John G. Jackson, president of New York State Bar Association; James A. McLaughlin, professor of Harvard Law School; Ernest Graham Guthrie, Chicago Congressional Union; Judge Dorothy Kenyon, New York City; Dr. Philip D. Wilson, Columbia University, New York City; Herbert Agar, editor of Louisville Courier-Journal; Henry B. Cabot, Dover, Mass.; Rupert Hughes, author, Los Angeles; Humphrey Cobb, author, Pasadena, Calif.; Dr. Edwin Hubble, Mount Wilson Observatory, Los Angeles; Dr. Edwin F. Gay, Huntington Library, Pasadena, Calif.; Walter Millis, author, New York City; Mrs. Frederick Lewis Allen, New York City; Tom Stix, New Haven; Alexander Sachs, economist, New York City; Philip D. Wilson, surgeon-in-chief, Hospital for Ruptured and Crippled, New York City; S. A. Everitt, publisher, Huntington, N. Y.; James F. Curtis, ex-Assistant Secretary of Treasury, New York; Dr. L. M. Birkhead, chairman of Friends of Democracy, Kansas City; Noah C. A. Walter, assistant manager, Laundry Workers Joint Board, New York City; Lynn Harold Hough, dean of Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.; Mrs. George Stephenson, New York City; Archibald G. Thacher, lawyer, New York City; Mary Jane McLaughlin, Weston, Mass.; Helen Hill Miller, writer, Fairfax, Va.; R. P. Brooks, professor of economics, University of Georgia; Ross Hoffman, professor, Fordham University, Bronx, N. Y.; Ian Baldwin, Mount Kisco, N. Y.; Horace Binney Hare, Berwyn, Pa.; Alfred E. Stearns, headmaster emritus, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.; James MacGregor Byrne, lawyer, New York City; W. T. Couch, publisher, Chapel Hill, N. C.; W. Bertrand Stevens, Bishop of Los Angeles; J. A. MacCallum, minister, Philadelphia; Theodore C. Hume, minister, Claremont Church, Claremont, Calif.; Dr. Beatrice Carrier Seegal, professor at College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York City; John L. Balderston, playwright, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Loyal Leale, lawyer, New York City; William J. Carr, lawyer, New York City; Frank Smothers, Chicago, Ill.; Pedro de Cordoba, actor, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mary Bingham, Louisville, Ky.; Dr. Katherine Merritt, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York City; Marjorie P. Goldrick, Tuxedo Park, N. Y.; H. C. F. Bell, professor, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Reginald Townsend, publisher, New York City; Rex Stout, author, Brewster, N. Y.

---

1. The Nazi danger to us is absolute; therefore our need for victory is absolute. We have too long left the main burden of winning that victory to other people.

Inch by inch we have sidled our way toward belligerence, to the accompaniment of such phrases as "cash and carry," and "short of war." Yet today we are still in the position of talking peace while lending or leasing to our neighbors the tools with which to fight.

2. The time has come to assume our full burden. We are already playing a part in the war. As the blockade tightens around Great Britain the importance of our part must grow.

Hitler cannot allow our goods to get to Britain; if he does—he will be beaten. We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Atlantic; if we do—we shall be beaten. The problem is simple and the answer is war.

Only through a state of war can we attain in time the full use of our economic and moral resources. A half war is discouraging to our allies and humiliating to ourselves, since it involves asking other men to face for us the risks which we evade.

3. For our safety we must admit the truth at once. And for our souls' sake we must prepare to use the victory which we shall win to build a fairer freedom.

When we accept the war and accept the burdens of the new world to follow, we shall at last find peace within ourselves. No longer assailed by doubts and fears, we shall be working for the day when men throughout the world can again live in freedom to build those foundations of righteousness and justice upon which a lasting peace must rest.

NAME	IDENTIFICATION	ADDRESS
----------	----------	----------
----------	----------	----------
----------	----------	----------

RACIAL PREJUDICES IN WAR

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have made the point in the Senate about the fear of this, that, and the other thing engendering a spirit in the United States that is carrying us ever nearer to war. I have made reference here and elsewhere to the part which organizations have played in working upon American sympathies because of the persecutions which were taking place elsewhere in the world. These persecutions do engender a deep resentment among American people. I know I join in that resentment. We resent, as well, the kind of talk that flows from those who are primarily responsible for the persecution. We resent, for example, the boasting of what kind of blood is the blood to rule the world. We resent the thought that one nation as against another is destined to dominate the world. We have heard much loud talk about Aryan blood, and about what one race was called upon to do. We resent it, we bitterly resent it, and we denounce it.

But Adolf Hitler is not the first one to resort to that kind of play upon prejudices and sympathies. It was done by many others before his time, and will be done, I presume, for all time to come. Even great Americans have in their day resorted to language not at all unlike that employed by Adolf Hitler in his present effort to dominate at least his part of the world. One American, at the time when we were accepting new responsibilities by reason of our victory over Spain, wrote this:

Riots against the police are occurring in Habana. They will keep occurring. No Latin country governs itself. Self-government is the most difficult thing in the world for a people to accomplish. It is not a matter that a nation acquires by adopting a set of laws. Only Anglo-Saxons can govern themselves. The Cubans will need a despotic government for many years to restrain anarchy until Cuba is filled with Yankees. Uncle Sam will

have to govern Cuba as Alfonso XIII governed it, if there is any peace in the island at all. The Cubans are not, and of right ought not to be, free. To say that they are, or that they should be, is folly. Riot will follow riot. Anarchy will rise to be crushed. And unrest will prevail until the Yankee takes possession of the land. Then the Cubans will be an inferior, if not a servile, race. Then there will be peace in the island. Then will Cuba be free. It is the Anglo-Saxon's manifest destiny to go forth in the world as a world conqueror. He will take possession of all the islands of the sea. He will exterminate the peoples he cannot subjugate. That is what fate holds for the chosen people. It is so written. Those who would protest will find their objections overruled. It is to be.

This same American, in a book entitled "The Old Order Changeth," published by Macmillan in 1910, had this to say:

The best blood of the earth is here—a variated blood of strong indomitable men and women brought here by visions of wider lives. But this blood will remain a clean, Aryan blood because there are no hordes of inferior races about us to sweep over us and debase our stock. We are segregated by two oceans from the inferior races, and by that instinctive race revulsion to cross-breeding that marks the American wherever he is found.

Mr. President, I submit that with a little change of name in those particular expressions we might well attribute the sentiments to Adolf Hitler himself. But they were not of Hitler's origin; they were from the mind and from the pen of one William Allen White, the head of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.

From the Pacific coast a few days ago a letter was written to Mr. White by one who heard me say precisely what I have said here today. He said:

Senator GERALD P. NYE in a speech in Pasadena on April 1 read a quotation * * * which he attributed to you. It had a strong effect on the audience, and sounded very damaging to you.

The tenor of the quotation was that it was the destiny of this Nation to protect and dominate the people of Cuba, who were an inferior race; and that we as Aryans had the best bloods of the world amalgamated in our veins and could expect to dominate the people to the south of us.

It sounded exactly like the Nazi philosophy, and was so used by Senator NYE that when he said it had been written by you the audience gasped.

This letter has occasioned a letter being written to me by William Allen White under date of April 8, 1941, which I offer for the RECORD as follows:

THE EMPORIA GAZETTE,
Emporia, Kans., April 8, 1941.

Senator GERALD NYE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NYE: Here is a letter that I do not understand. I have no recollection ever of saying anything like this, at least for 40 years. You may remember that I started out as a conservative reactionary. And in the Spanish-American War I was an imperialist right. But I do not believe that nonsense now, of course. Would you mind, when you read this quotation, dating it, and say that you have a letter from me saying I think it is nonsense, and I haven't believed it for a generation? Then go ahead and say what you please. I know you want to be fair.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Most cordially yours,

W. A. WHITE.

Mr. President, I am most happy to have received this letter, and to make it a matter of record. In closing, let me comment to the extent of hoping that some day, perhaps less than 40 years from now, Adolf Hitler will call his talk of the present day pure nonsense, as William Allen White today calls nonsense what was said by him 40 years ago.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a protocol, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] today reported sundry nominations from the Committee on Military Affairs. With two exceptions they are routine nominations, and I think that is the only executive business to be transacted. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nominations be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none. The clerk will read the first two nominations.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF WAR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of War as provided for in the act approved July 2, 1926.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. McCloy, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the routine nominations in the War Department reported today by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed, and that all previous resolutions of confirmation in the hands of the Secretary be forwarded to the President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18, 1941:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Frank J. Kuhl, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Dental Surgeon Eugene C. Stamm to be senior dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from April 2, 1941.

The following-named senior surgeons to be medical directors in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

David J. Prather, April 8, 1941.
Louis L. Williams, Jr., April 8, 1941.

UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. Lee Farnum Johnson, of Colorado, as Assistant Administrator in charge of Project Management of the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency, vice Mr. William P. Seaver, transferred.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Sion Boone Hawkins for assignment and detail as State Director of Selective Service for the State of Georgia, under the provisions of section 10 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The compensation to be paid General Hawkins will be in excess of $5,000 per annum in accordance with his rank as brigadier general in the National Guard of the United States.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. Sion Boone Hawkins, Georgia National Guard, to be brigadier general, Adjutant's General's Department, National Guard of the United States, from April 11, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 18, 1941:

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF WAR

Robert A. Lovett to be Assistant Secretary of War.

John J. McCloy to be Assistant Secretary of War.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Clement Augustus Trott
George Veazey Strong
Irving Joseph Phillipson
Daniel Isom Sultan
Charles Hartwell Bonesteel
Innis Palmer Swift
James Preston Marley
Richard Donovan
John Piper Smith
George Smith Patton, Jr.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Henry Church Pillsbury
Henry Clay Coburn, Jr.
William Richard Dear
George Harris Paine
Charles Peaslee George
John Ashley Warden
John Blackwell Maynard
John Mitchell Willis
Edwin Hall Marks
Wallace Copeland Philoon
Philip Stearns Gage
Francis Page Hardaway
George Lane Van Deusen
George Marshall Parker, Jr.
Harry Dwight Chamberlin
James Irvin Muir
Charles Hines
Emil Fred Reinhardt
Wilmot Alfred Danielson
George Luberoff
John Emmitt Sloan
Fred Livingood Walker
Rapp Brush
Gustav Henry Franke
Harold Floyd Nichols
Karl Slaughter Bradford

James Blanchard Crawford
Ira Thomas Wyche
John Louis Homer
Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian
William Clayton Rose
Claude Martin Theile
Kenneth Thompson Blood
Harry Lewis Twaddle
Lehman Welling Miller
Howard Calhoun Davidson
Ralph Royce
William Ord Ryan
Joseph Taggart McNarney.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

S. Kingdon Avery to be first lieutenant, Dental Corps, with rank from date of appointment.

Harry John Robertson to be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, with rank from date of appointment.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Merlin Louis DeGuire.
First Lt. Franklin Kemble, Jr.
First Lt. William Menoher.
First Lt. Ray Allen Pillivant.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Charles Junious Harrison.
Second Lt. Victor Charles Warren.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Alden George Strong to be colonel, with rank from April 1, 1941, Coast Artillery Corps.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Ebenezer Lattimore Compere to be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We draw near to Thee, our blessed Father in heaven, that we may learn more and more how to carry ourselves in the spirit of brotherhood and benefaction. We praise Thee for the unsearchable riches of the Christ; when human life moves into fierce emergency, His resources are ever present and become the treasure of the darkness. We beseech Thee to enable us as a people to pass thoughtfully into clearer outlook and larger service. With a deep feeling of the central law of love in all human lives, how much, blessed Lord, do we need a sense of Thy presence, for we are humanly weak in the things which are divinely strong. O may the day soon come when the power of God shall be discerned in virtue, in love, in culture, in mutual fidelities, in patience; then shall the fruit of the spirit of our Saviour be felt in all our daily lives; within all thought, within all endeavor, may there reign supreme the beneficent heart of God. Striving in the midst of temptations, turned hither and thither, we bring to Thee our frailties and ask strength and forgiveness, in the name of our holy Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FREEDOM OF THE AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America the press remains free and untrammeled and so, pray God, may it always remain, for as long as we have a free press just that long will the people retain the essential means of controlling and directing their Government.

Thomas Jefferson fixed the place of a free press in peoples' government when he said:

If it were left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without government I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

Always the first move of tyrants in their advance toward totalitarian power is to muffle the press. Here in the United States when we dissent from the policies of the President we say so in plain, unvarnished language. We are free to object and criticize to our heart's content, marshalling our strongest adjectives to express our opposing views, and that is as it should be in this greatest of world democracies. In our commonwealth of freedom the President is just another American.

Those of us whose lives have been interwoven with the press deeply appreciate President Roosevelt's reaffirmation of the cardinal democratic principle of freedom of the press as so well and impressively expressed in a letter to Tom Wallace, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and made public in today's newspapers. By unanimous consent of the House I present his statement for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. WALLACE: The assurance I would bring to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, if it were possible for me to greet them in person, would be that free speech and a free press are still in the possession of the people of the United States.

Free speech is in undisputed possession of publishers and editors, of reporters and Washington correspondents; still in the possession of magazines, of motion pictures, and of radio; still in possession of all the means of intelligence, comment, and criticism. So far as I am concerned, it will remain there, for that is where it belongs.

How that freedom should be used, what contributions it should make to national defense, national interest, and national morals are questions for publishers and editors themselves to decide.

It would be a shameful abuse of patriotism to suggest that opinion should be stifled in its service. Unified national sentiment, which all of us should desire, bears no resemblance to a totalitarian regimentation of opinion and treatment of news.

I cannot better close this message to the American Society of Newspaper Editors than with a final assurance that those who disagree with what is being done and with the manner in which it is being done are free to use their freedom of speech.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in connection with my statement this letter of the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include resolutions adopted by certain civic bodies on the question of strikes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PLAUCHÉ]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] under a special order for today, I ask unanimous consent to have 30 minutes in which to address the House, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article from a Boston paper with respect to the appointment of Mr. Hopkins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star on the subject of national unity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

UNEMPLOYMENT AND W. P. A.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, W. P. A. has given jobs to about 65 percent of the unemployed in need. With an appropriation of $975,000,000 in fiscal 1942, W. P. A. will be able to provide work for only about 40 percent of the unemployed in need. Total unemployment will average between five and seven million in fiscal 1942. It is estimated that two and

five-tenths million of these will be in need of public assistance.

The extent of the need for W. P. A. employment can best be seen by reviewing:

First. The present facts regarding employment, unemployment, and need.

Second. The most reasonable forecasts of employment, unemployment, and need in fiscal 1942.

It should be stated at the outset that the basic problem of unemployment and need has been obscured by numerous highly optimistic guesses on the amount of reemployment that can be expected from the defense program. Much statistical irresponsibility is plainly evident in these estimates. They have led many people to believe that the unemployment problem has been licked.

These are the pertinent facts:

First. Nonagricultural employment is still nearly 900,000 under the peak level of 1929. Despite the gains made under defense stimulation, we have not equaled the mark set over 11 years ago.

Second. Agricultural employment is nearly one million under the level of 1929.

Third. Factory employment has felt the effects of defense activity more than any other sector of the economy. Yet factory employment has only just reached the level attained in the post-World War boom of 1920. After 20 years we are only back up to the 1920 mark.

Fourth. Average nonagricultural employment in 1940 was nearly one million below 1929; the labor supply was nearly seven million above 1929. More people and fewer jobs to go around; these are the facts of the situation and no wishful thinking can get around them.

Fifth. Unemployment now ranges between seven and nine million. The lower figure is the N. I. C. B. estimate; the higher figure is the C. I. O. estimate.

Sixth. The unemployed in need number 3,000,000 at the present time. Of this total, one and six-tenths millions have W. P. A. jobs; one and four-tenths get local relief or nothing at all.

Seventh. W. P. A. employment will drop from its present level to 1,235,000 in June. Unmet need can be expected to increase when this reduction in W. P. A. employment occurs.

These facts must be taken into account in any realistic estimate of the reduction in unemployment during fiscal 1942. They provide little basis for the optimism that has been expressed in many quarters. Those who thought that war and defense would soon solve the unemployment problem were simply wrong. The war is a year and a half old and defense activity is booming—yet fewer people are at work now than at the 1929 peak, and nearly 7,000,000 more people are in the labor supply.

What are the prospects for fiscal 1942? In the first place, regular nonagricultural employment this fiscal year will average about thirty-six and six-tenths million—an increase of one and seven-tenths million over fiscal 1940. Agricultural employment will be no higher than last year.

According to present plans, in excess of $40,000,000,000 will eventually be spent for armaments. But there are definite limits to the rate at which these funds can be spent. Only a fractional part can be translated into increased output and employment during fiscal 1942.

Employment in fiscal 1942 might average as much as 2,000,000 above fiscal 1941. This is a reasonably liberal figure; the increase might actually be less. Sidney Hillman said—Friday, April 10—that one and five-tenths million new jobs might open up before next January—this includes both defense and nondefense jobs. The optimistic estimates of five and six million reemployed this year are utterly unrealistic.

This means that unemployment will remain at a high figure. The normal increase in the labor supply next year will be 600,000. Still others, not normally looking for work, will seek new jobs. In 1917–18 there was an abnormal increase in the labor supply of about 3,000,000. There will be a tendency for these new workers to be favored over the long-duration unemployed. This development has already begun.

Conservatively, between five and seven million will be unemployed in fiscal 1942. If more people keep on coming into the labor market, this figure will be larger.

As stated above, about two and five-tenths million of this group will be needy unemployed during fiscal 1942. On the present Budget basis—$975,000,000—W. P. A. will give jobs to about 1,000,000 persons in fiscal 1942. This means that W. P. A. will give jobs to only 40 percent of those in need. During the last 2 years about 65 percent of those in need had W. P. A. jobs.

To give jobs to all unemployed in need next year, the W. P. A. program would have to be about twice as large as now provided for in the Budget estimate. Projects are available for such a program. W. P. A. defense projects—airports, access roads, public facilities of all kinds—can be expanded. A full defense effort and an enlightened social policy requires that these people be put to work. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement on the St. Lawrence seaway entitled "New Frontier for America."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

FARM PARITY PAYMENTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, during a press conference, expressed opposition to farm parity payments. I share with him his concern over the fiscal policy of our Government, but I do not see how he can justify his opposition to parity payments for agriculture. Mr. Morgenthau is the same Secretary who last year recommended to Congress a repeal of the 12-percent profit limitation for the construction of ships, aircraft, and other defense articles. This is costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. He is the same Secretary who recommended to Congress a 5-year tax moratorium for industry in the national-defense works which will cost the taxpayers additional hundreds of millions of dollars. He is the same Secretary who recommended to Congress this year an easing of the excess-profits tax, which will further increase the profits of business and industry. Agriculture is not asking for cost of production plus a profit, but agriculture is asking that it be given a farm dollar that will buy its equivalent with labor and industry. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a certain letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

SUPERVISION AND DETENTION OF CERTAIN DEPORTABLE ALIENS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit the unanimous-consent request that the bill (H. R. 3) to invest the circuit courts of appeals of the United States with original and exclusive jurisdiction to review the order of detention of any alien ordered deported from the United States whose deportation or departure from the United States otherwise is not effectuated within 90 days after the date the warrant of deportation shall have become final; to authorize such detention orders in certain cases; to provide places for such detention; and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I have no objection to this request—I take advantage of the opportunity to make inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary as to when the Congress and the country might reasonably expect some sort of action on the part of his committee in connection with the proposal to enact legislation dealing with the strike situation.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I understand it is the purpose of the Committee on the Judiciary to rework this bill and to get it back here as soon as possible.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3 has been reported by the gentleman's committee and a hearing held before the Committee on Rules on a request for a rule. The Committee on Rules will meet Wednesday, and that business has been made the order of that day. Is the gentleman asking that the bill now be recommitted to his committee?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain to the House what the bill is, so we all may know?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. Its purpose is to invest in the circuit courts of appeals certain jurisdiction in regard to aliens, their detention, and so forth. The request being made is that the bill be sent back to the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in order that everyone may understand the situation, this bill was reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary. It went to the Committee on Rules. There was a long hearing before the Committee on Rules. There was much doubt as to whether or not a rule should be obtained.

This bill gives discretionary power to the Attorney General to permit to remain in this country certain aliens in this country temporarily on visitors' permits or illegally. If the Attorney General feels that their sins should be forgiven, he then has a discretion which amounts to rewriting the terms of the quota law. I do not believe there is a chance of the bill passing in its present form. I do not believe there is a chance of its getting a rule; I hope not. But I do think the thing to do is to send the bill back to the committee, because there are some good things in the bill.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would this bill permit Harry Bridges to remain in this country?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to take the time of the House unnecessarily. I say to my friend and to the other Members of the House, and I am very candid with them, that I am not myself personally familiar with the difficulties that have arisen with regard to putting this bill through. There have been difficulties encountered, questions and objections raised, and opposition developed, which make the Committee on the Judiciary, I understand, unanimously of the notion that the bill ought to be sent back to the committee so that it may be reworked, and so that we may take into consideration the objections which have been raised and see what can be done about bringing out probably a better legislative proposition than that which is now contained in H. R. 3. I think I could not make a better explanation.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman this further question: As I understand, we have in this country 400, 500, or perhaps 700 persons who have committed crimes against this country, and whom the Secretary of Labor is permitting to remain in this country. Will this bill do anything to get them out of this country, and send them where they belong? We do not want them here.

Mr. SABATH. That was the aim of the bill, I may say in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. RICH. The quicker we get them out of this country, the better for this country. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. This bill would have made possible the deportation of Harry Bridges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials that have appeared recently in that great Northwest farm paper, the Farmer, of St. Paul, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by John A. Heffernan, of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, including four articles by Mr. Heffernan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WALTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an analysis of the three measures to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief statement by the Minister of Norway, Hon. Wilhelm Morgenstierne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to invite the Members of Congress to a meeting to be held in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building on next Monday evening at 7:30, to discuss the farm problem, especially the parity payments on all farm products. I hope you will all be there at that time so that we may discuss the subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. I again wish to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and his committee as a whole how much longer the deliberations of the committee on the proposal to report legislation dealing with the strike situation are to continue, and if there is ever to be a report of the committee submitted on that subject.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see anybody who desires to make answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short articles from the local papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Hampton Chronicle, of Hampton, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] daily asks the question whether there is going to be some legislation presented here meeting the ques-

tion of whether or not we are going to permit outlawed strikes to continue. Many of us on our side of this aisle ask the same question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is an outlawed strike?

Mr. RICH. An outlawed strike is a strike that is against this Government today, at least they should be outlawed at a time when we want to go ahead with national defense. They are strikes that are against this country, and I may say there have been many of them that hinder defense.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. There are two or three Members on this side who are interested in the question that the gentleman from Georgia asked and I want to know why we cannot get an answer to it. It seems to me it is high time that the Members on the other side of the House act and act before we find ourselves in the same condition that France was in.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. The majority leader, who is now present, as well as the Speaker of the House are the men who are responsible for seeing to it that we get legislation that is going to be for the protection of America.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will make it short.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be given an additional minute so that I may ask a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Do I understand it is the gentleman's wish that we bring out legislation to curb strikes?

Mr. RICH. I say we want legislation that is going to prohibit the un-American activities that are going on against this Government so that we can prohibit these strikes against our national defense.

Mr. BOREN. When I asked for a roll call vote on keeping the Congress in session to pass strike legislation, did the gentleman stand up to help us secure such a roll call?

Mr. RICH. Gracious goodness, I have been for that and I have been here all the week and the gentleman has been here all the week. Why do you not do something?

Mr. BOREN. Did the gentleman give me any assistance in that matter?

Mr. RICH. I am against these outlawed strikes and I am against the "fifth column" we have in this country, and yet you sit here in your seats and warm them day after day and you do not do anything about it. We want action, not talk. We want to protect America from the "fifth column" before it is too late.

Mr. BOREN. Did the gentleman give me any assistance in the matter when I attempted to force the issue?

Mr. RICH. You cannot force any issue here unless Mr. Roosevelt says so. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and I have been trying to get recognition and every day he has kept the Congress in session here and yet you would not do anything about passing the bill he introduced. Why do you not get busy? The gentleman from Michigan has done more to get recognition along this line than anyone and yet we sit here idly day after day and do nothing about it. All week you have fooled away the time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, relative to the question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] I wish to remind the House that during the 10-day Easter recess the Committee on Military Affairs, on which I have the honor of serving, remained in session and held hearings in an investigation into the strike situation. Testimony obtained during those hearings from the heads of various Government departments will guide the committee in its efforts to assist in solving this serious threat to our national defense.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. In just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but that the Committee on Military Affairs will shortly make certain recommendations.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman indicate when that will be?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. As soon as the opportunity presents itself. I might add that one of the recommendations which I have been seeking would provide for the so-called "cooling off" period before defense strikes could be called. No doubt the gentleman from Georgia has read the morning newspapers, which stated that the Committee on Naval Affairs has already taken action and has reported out legislation providing for the "cooling off" period.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 1 minute in order that I might ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. My reference was to the Judiciary Committee, and I did not name the Military Affairs Committee or, if I did, I spoke by mistake. The gentleman refers to the action just taken by the Naval Affairs Committee, and I assume he has examined the bill reported by the committee. Is the gentleman for it?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I am for a "cooling off" period in defense industries and shall support that portion of the bill. I doubt the advisability, however, of that portion that freezes existing open and closed shops. I want to know more about that.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman find in the Military Affairs Committee a desire, purpose, and will to go ahead with a thorough investigation, including an investigation of these strikes which are sabotaging national defense?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman the faith in his committee to believe that it will report legislation dealing with the situation?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Absolutely.

Mr. RICH. And if you don't get some word from the White House to pass such legislation, does the gentleman think that it will ever pass this Congress?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Any legislation that passes this House or the other body must first be given the green light by the White House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said here this morning about the necessity for immediate legislation, the purpose of which is to remedy, if possible, the labor-trouble interference with our national-defense program. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has queried our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] as to whether or not the Judiciary Committee contemplates reporting out remedial legislation at an early date. That is a pertinent question. I happen to be a member of the Judiciary Committee. The fact is well known that that committee has held extensive hearings in its quest for information that might be helpful in determining the best course to pursue. The committee has explored the main avenues and has established beyond peradventure that strikes have and are interfering with the national-defense program.

If my conclusion is correct, then, there are two questions remaining. First, will legislation be effective in minimizing strike interference with the national-defense program? And second, if such legislation will be helpful, then will the committee favorably report a bill carrying such legislation?

When the Vinson resolution was before the House on April 2 I made some observations that still stand. The day of reconnoitering on the part of the investigators is past. The time is long since overdue to write legislation if legislation is going to be enacted along this line.

The Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and possibly other Senate and House Committees are at this time investigating this same problem. When these committee hearings are printed, if you will take the trouble to compare them with the printed hearings of the Judiciary Committee, you will find that the witnesses are practically the same and that the Judiciary Committee hearings are a preview of these hearings on the same subject coming later.

It is true that the Judiciary Committee has not taken any action. In my judgment, the real reason is the fact that

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain to the House what the bill is, so we all may know?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. Its purpose is to invest in the circuit courts of appeals certain jurisdiction in regard to aliens, their detention, and so forth. The request being made is that the bill be sent back to the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in order that everyone may understand the situation, this bill was reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary. It went to the Committee on Rules. There was a long hearing before the Committee on Rules. There was much doubt as to whether or not a rule should be obtained.

This bill gives discretionary power to the Attorney General to permit to remain in this country certain aliens in this country temporarily on visitors' permits or illegally. If the Attorney General feels that their sins should be forgiven, he then has a discretion which amounts to rewriting the terms of the quota law. I do not believe there is a chance of the bill passing in its present form. I do not believe there is a chance of its getting a rule; I hope not. But I do think the thing to do is to send the bill back to the committee, because there are some good things in the bill.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would this bill permit Harry Bridges to remain in this country?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to take the time of the House unnecessarily. I say to my friend and to the other Members of the House, and I am very candid with them, that I am not myself personally familiar with the difficulties that have arisen with regard to putting this bill through. There have been difficulties encountered, questions and objections raised, and opposition developed, which make the Committee on the Judiciary, I understand, unanimously of the notion that the bill ought to be sent back to the committee so that it may be reworked, and so that we may take into consideration the objections which have been raised and see what can be done about bringing out probably a better legislative proposition than that which is now contained in H. R. 3. I think I could not make a better explanation.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman this further question: As I understand, we have in this country 400, 500, or perhaps 700 persons who have committed crimes against this country, and whom the Secretary of Labor is permitting to remain in this country. Will this bill do anything to get them out of this country, and send them where they belong? We do not want them here.

Mr. SABATH. That was the aim of the bill, I may say in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. RICH. The quicker we get them out of this country, the better for this country. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. This bill would have made possible the deportation of Harry Bridges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials that have appeared recently in that great Northwest farm paper, the Farmer, of St. Paul, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by John A. Heffernan, of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, including four articles by Mr. Heffernan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WALTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an analysis of the three measures to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief statement by the Minister of Norway, Hon. Wilhelm Morgenstierne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to invite the Members of Congress to a meeting to be held in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building on next Monday evening at 7:30, to discuss the farm problem, especially the parity payments on all farm products. I hope you will all be there at that time so that we may discuss the subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. I again wish to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and his committee as a whole how much longer the deliberations of the committee on the proposal to report legislation dealing with the strike situation are to continue, and if there is ever to be a report of the committee submitted on that subject.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see anybody who desires to make answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short articles from the local papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Hampton Chronicle, of Hampton, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] daily asks the question whether there is going to be some legislation presented here meeting the ques-

tion of whether or not we are going to permit outlawed strikes to continue. Many of us on our side of this aisle ask the same question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is an outlawed strike?

Mr. RICH. An outlawed strike is a strike that is against this Government today, at least they should be outlawed at a time when we want to go ahead with national defense. They are strikes that are against this country, and I may say there have been many of them that hinder defense.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. There are two or three Members on this side who are interested in the question that the gentleman from Georgia asked and I want to know why we cannot get an answer to it. It seems to me it is high time that the Members on the other side of the House act and act before we find ourselves in the same condition that France was in.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. The majority leader, who is now present, as well as the Speaker of the House are the men who are responsible for seeing to it that we get legislation that is going to be for the protection of America.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will make it short.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be given an additional minute so that I may ask a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Do I understand it is the gentleman's wish that we bring out legislation to curb strikes?

Mr. RICH. I say we want legislation that is going to prohibit the un-American activities that are going on against this Government so that we can prohibit these strikes against our national defense.

Mr. BOREN. When I asked for a roll call vote on keeping the Congress in session to pass strike legislation, did the gentleman stand up to help us secure such a roll call?

Mr. RICH. Gracious goodness, I have been for that and I have been here all the week and the gentleman has been here all the week. Why do you not do something?

Mr. BOREN. Did the gentleman give me any assistance in that matter?

Mr. RICH. I am against these outlawed strikes and I am against the "fifth column" we have in this country, and yet you sit here in your seats and warm them day after day and you do not do anything about it. We want action, not talk. We want to protect America from the "fifth column" before it is too late.

Mr. BOREN. Did the gentleman give me any assistance in the matter when I attempted to force the issue?

Mr. RICH. You cannot force any issue here unless Mr. Roosevelt says so. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and I have been trying to get recognition and every day he has kept the Congress in session here and yet you would not do anything about passing the bill he introduced. Why do you not get busy? The gentleman from Michigan has done more to get recognition along this line than anyone and yet we sit here idly day after day and do nothing about it. All week you have fooled away the time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, relative to the question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] I wish to remind the House that during the 10-day Easter recess the Committee on Military Affairs, on which I have the honor of serving, remained in session and held hearings in an investigation into the strike situation. Testimony obtained during those hearings from the heads of various Government departments will guide the committee in its efforts to assist in solving this serious threat to our national defense.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. In just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but that the Committee on Military Affairs will shortly make certain recommendations.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman indicate when that will be?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. As soon as the opportunity presents itself. I might add that one of the recommendations which I have been seeking would provide for the so-called "cooling off" period before defense strikes could be called. No doubt the gentleman from Georgia has read the morning newspapers, which stated that the Committee on Naval Affairs has already taken action and has reported out legislation providing for the "cooling off" period.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 1 minute in order that I might ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. My reference was to the Judiciary Committee, and I did not name the Military Affairs Committee or, if I did, I spoke by mistake. The gentleman refers to the action just taken by the Naval Affairs Committee, and I assume he has examined the bill reported by the committee. Is the gentleman for it?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I am for a "cooling off" period in defense industries and shall support that portion of the bill. I doubt the advisability, however, of that portion that freezes existing open and closed shops. I want to know more about that.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman find in the Military Affairs Committee a desire, purpose, and will to go ahead with a thorough investigation, including an investigation of these strikes which are sabotaging national defense?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman the faith in his committee to believe that it will report legislation dealing with the situation?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Absolutely.

Mr. RICH. And if you don't get some word from the White House to pass such legislation, does the gentleman think that it will ever pass this Congress?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Any legislation that passes this House or the other body must first be given the green light by the White House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said here this morning about the necessity for immediate legislation, the purpose of which is to remedy, if possible, the labor-trouble interference with our national-defense program. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has queried our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] as to whether or not the Judiciary Committee contemplates reporting out remedial legislation at an early date. That is a pertinent question. I happen to be a member of the Judiciary Committee. The fact is well known that that committee has held extensive hearings in its quest for information that might be helpful in determining the best course to pursue. The committee has explored the main avenues and has established beyond peradventure that strikes have and are interfering with the national-defense program.

If my conclusion is correct, then, there are two questions remaining. First, will legislation be effective in minimizing strike interference with the national-defense program? And second, if such legislation will be helpful, then will the committee favorably report a bill carrying such legislation?

When the Vinson resolution was before the House on April 2 I made some observations that still stand. The day of reconnoitering on the part of the investigators is past. The time is long since overdue to write legislation if legislation is going to be enacted along this line.

The Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and possibly other Senate and House Committees are at this time investigating this same problem. When these committee hearings are printed, if you will take the trouble to compare them with the printed hearings of the Judiciary Committee, you will find that the witnesses are practically the same and that the Judiciary Committee hearings are a preview of these hearings on the same subject coming later.

It is true that the Judiciary Committee has not taken any action. In my judgment, the real reason is the fact that

Mr. Hillman, Mr. Knudsen, Under Secretary of War Patterson, and others charged by law and under Executive order with the carrying out of our national-defense program, appearing before the Judiciary Committee, protested against the committee recommending favorably any legislation attempting by law to control strikes and lock-outs in the defense program. These men are the direct representatives of the President, and, of course, they speak for the administration. They told the committee that an attempt by Congress to pass legislation affecting strikes and lock-outs at this time would impede rather than expedite the defense program. Had not this position been taken by these representatives of the administration, I do not doubt but that the Judiciary Committee would have suggested remedial legislation.

I have no knowledge as to what other members of the committee might have said as to what the future action of the committee would be. As a minority member, I can assure the House that there are those on the committee who are anxious to report legislation providing a cooling time before active strikes are indulged in. I cannot see why the administration should object to the Congress writing a formula at this time, the execution of which can help in the work of the hour; that is, the building of an impregnable national defense.

If the administration will use its good offices and demand that these strikes stop, then I believe much will be accomplished. I can see, however, that laws placed upon the statute books which are violated with impunity, which are not taken seriously by those whose duty it is to enforce them, will injure rather than help. As I have said on numerous occasions lately, Mr. President, we appeal to you to make a courageous statement as our President and as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Will you do it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute, so that I may ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to again recognize Members to proceed at the request of any other Members for more than a minute. The time could be extended in that way to an hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very evident from what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has said, he being on the Committee on the Judiciary, that we are not going to get much action out of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that should answer the question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. Yesterday I was told by a good southern Democrat that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Member from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] had told him that the Committee on the Judiciary was not going to report out any legislation covering the strike situation. If that is true, the House might just as well sign one of those petitions that I have on the desk to bring out some legislation, not to ban strikes, but to fix it so that an American citizen can go to work when he has a job in a defense project.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who quoted the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary as saying that there would be no legislation. That statement has not been made. I call the attention of the House and of the country to one or two things connected with this whole agitation for more and more laws. One is the exaggerated notion of some Members of the Congress and of the country as to what one can accomplish by the mandate of the legislative branch of the Government. There seems to be the notion that additional legislation will correct any condition. [Applause.] Law must be executed before it is effectual. The Committee on the Judiciary, and I say that for both sides, Democratic and Republican, because I think we are in agreement, has been undertaking to do several things. One is to discover the facts and to let the country know what we have discovered and we have been standing ready to report any new legislation which the executive agencies of the Government may request necessary to enable the executive to do its duty toward our preparedness as quickly and effective as possible. The agencies of the Government that have the responsibility of preparing for national defense say they do not want any additional legislation. In other words, they have all the law now that they say they want to do their job.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I agree that a whole lot can be done with the use of the law they have now, and they say they do not want any more.

Mr. COX. Why do not they do it?

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech recently made by Assistant Attorney General McGuire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, House Resolution 181, and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 181

Resolved, That Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on World War Veterans' Legislation, Irrigation and Reclamation, and Claims.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution, House Resolution 182, and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 182

Resolved, That Winder Harris, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Invalid Pensions.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, in making this first appearance in the well of the House of Representatives, I deem it a distinct privilege to be a Member of this body, and I hope I may be able to play some small part in upholding the traditions which have, through the years, made this assembly the most democratic legislative body anywhere. Few such remain in the world.

You little realize, Mr. Speaker, how impressed we freshmen have been by the cordial and manifestly sincere treatment we have received on every hand. From your own good self; from my delightful friend and party leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]; from the genial and gracious majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]; from every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle; from the Sergeant at Arms; from the clerks; from the pages—the reception has been the same—a genuine handshake, a wholehearted greeting, and a solicitous offer to help one get settled and accustomed to the House procedure. The founding fathers would surely get a thrill if they could come back to this Hall and see the high plane on which free government, as conceived by them, is working.

Before reaching Washington, each of us read and reread the excellent advice of the gentleman from Vermont, Representative CHARLES PLUMLEY, "The Making of a Congressman."

March 6 last, we heard the captivating address by the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. LUTHER PATRICK. His subject was, When is a New Congressman a Congressman?

Through it all, Mr. Speaker, I voice the unanimous sentiment of the freshman class when I say we feel the Members of the House of Representatives reflect the finest, the grandest, and the best in American life. You set an example to the country, and, if you please, to the world, as to how a really democratic lawmaking body should function. We congratulate you and are proud to be here. [Applause.]

It is proper, in making this maiden speech, to do so in honor of the colorful city I represent. San Francisco has 2 of the 20 congressional districts apportioned to California. The gentleman from California, Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, represents the Fifth District, which is roughly the southerly half of the city, and I represent the Fourth, which covers the northerly half.

The gentleman from California, DICK WELCH, was raised in that part of San Francisco which is known as the Potrero district, and I was born in the Mission

This latter district derives its name from the Mission Dolores, founded in 1775 by the Franciscan Fathers. Here in the Capitol, California has honored with one of its two statues, the memory of the member of the Franciscan Order who founded Mission Dolores—Father Junipero Serra.

San Francisco Bay is Uncle Sam's most prized possession on the west coast. Some authorities rate it among the three finest harbors in all the world. One pinches oneself to realize that less than a hundred years ago California was not even a part of the United States. It was a sleepy Mexican colony. There were a few scattered settlements, stretching from San Diego to Sonoma. The total white population in the entire territory was perhaps only 5,000 and the native Indian population was about 80,000. Of the whites, Americans were perhaps not over 500.

While the settlers knew something about the amazing fertility of the soil, still they had not the remotest idea about gold, about lumber, about oil. But they were partly aware of the importance of the harbor of San Francisco. The hardy seafaring men who sailed from New England around Cape Horn to gather hides and tallow, and the intrepid frontiersmen who on scouting trips reached the Pacific, all sent home such glowing accounts of the bay, that President Andrew Jackson tried to buy the territory from Mexico. Some of those reports were so enthusiastic they could almost have been written 2 days ago by Californians, Inc., of San Francisco, or the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

The negotiations were still under way when Andrew Jackson retired, but in the Van Buren administration financial conditions were so acute, caused by the panic of 1837, that the matter was dropped.

However, shortly after President James K. Polk came into office, the proposition was again brought up. The Mexican President, Santa Ana, was willing to sell, but he encountered opposition from the people at home, so the deal fell through.

Later on the Mexican War broke out, and all Mexican interest in California was ceded to the United States in the treaty of peace. Gold had not even then been discovered.

The sole reason all through the years was the urgency of having San Francisco Bay in friendly hands. The peril to the Nation, should our marvelous harbor be held by others, is so apparent it is elementary.

San Francisco is really one of the world's great crossroads. It is to the Pacific Coast what New York is to the Atlantic. Next to New York, it is the second most important seaport in the United States. From San Francisco go forth ships carrying the Stars and Stripes to every corner of the globe.

Wherever those men who go down to the seas in ships meet—let it be Boston to Bombay, Alaska to the Cape, Shanghai, or any of the others—you will hear them affectionately talk of Market Street, Fishermen's Wharf, Chinatown, Twin Peaks. Sitting here in Congress, I have heard several speeches in which members referred to the "Grand Old Man of the Sea"—Andrew Furuseth. He was one of the most devoted and most beloved labor leaders in all the history of trades unionism. Mr. Furuseth's home was in San Francisco, and his name will live there as long as ships trade in and out of the Golden Gate. He would never once accept any larger salary as secretary of the Seamen's Union than the sailors themselves were paid, which was in Furuseth's time about $40 per month. San Francisco's history is filled with the names of many colorful and many interesting characters, but none is more unique, more respected, or more admired than that of the simple, wistful Andy Furuseth.

In thanking you for this time today, Mr. Speaker, may I say, I asked for it for the very special reason that April 18 marks a day in the saga of San Francisco, filling every San Franciscan and every American, first with a feeling of despair, and secondly, a much greater feeling of exultation.

It was at a quarter after 5 o'clock in the early morning on the 18th day of April 1906 that I, together with some 416,000 fellow townsmen, was rudely awakened and tumbled out of bed by the most terrific earthquake which ever shook any city in this country. The night before the elite of the city had been attending the grand opera. The Metropolitan stars, Caruso, Scotty, Madame Melba, and Madame Schumann-Heink, were playing an annual engagement, and some of the after-theater parties had hardly gotten to sleep before the earthquake came, and then fire broke out.

San Francisco is served from a water supply having reservoirs about 25 miles down the peninsula. The mains coming in from the reservoirs burst, and for 3 days the fire department could get no water. In the meantime the fire had taken a frightful toll. An area covering over 500 city blocks, with a total of over 28,000 separate structures, was in ashes. The area ruined was about one-third of the city and embraced the downtown retail, wholesale, financial, jobbing, and manufacturing sections of San Francisco. Every leading first-class hotel was wiped out. Fortunately the residential districts, except one, were to a large extent saved. The financial loss was approximately $400,000,000, and to me it is amazing to think that the insurance companies of the world, within 60 days after the fire, paid about $250,000,000 in cash. The only companies to welch on their contracts were some small foreign concerns.

Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States at the time, and within 24 hours after the catastrophe he requested the Red Cross to collect funds and administer relief to the stricken people.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, if my city lives to be 10 times 10,000 years, we can never thank you and all the rest of our countrymen enough for what you did for us in 1906. If ever a people poured out its heart and its treasure to those in distress, the citizens of this Republic did exactly that for San Francisco.

The story I love to associate most closely with the fire is what happened to my friend, Tom Hickey. This is the same Thomas W. Hickey who in 1928, at the Democratic National Convention in Houston, after Franklin D. Roosevelt had placed Al Smith's name in nomination for the Presidency, was the one selected to make the first seconding speech.

At the time of the fire, Tom was exalted ruler of the Elks, San Francisco Lodge, No. 3. As you know, it is the annual custom of the Elks to hold a national convention in one of the large American cities.

In 1906 Denver was the place, and the convention was to be sometime about May or early June. In the San Francisco fire the list of all members and all records of Lodge No. 3 were lost, and, although Tom and the secretary had tried to get in touch with the members, it was practically impossible because they were scattered everywhere. Finally Tom, the secretary, and one or two others decided to go on to Denver so the lodge could have at least a few in attendance. When they arrived they found about half a dozen other members of San Francisco, who had been on East and decided to stop off in Denver to see if they could do anything or be of help.

Now, the most important part of the Elks' convention, so far as the public is concerned, is the street parade. San Francisco always had a real turnout for these parades and had always been most interested in developing some new and original idea.

In 1906 the lodge found itself with no money either for costumes, chanters, floats, or a band. Accordingly, the group held a caucus the night before the parade to determine whether place No. 3 should be surrendered to one of the other California lodges, whether they should do nothing, or whether they should parade without the trimmings. It was finally decided to parade and hold place No. 3 themselves.

At 11 o'clock that night Tom was able to get in touch with a sign painter, who guaranteed he would have the sign ready by 8 o'clock the next morning. No one in the delegation slept a wink, fearing the sign would not be finished. But, sure enough, the painter realized the importance and came through. The delegation went to the spot designated for them to fall in line, and the first lodge, New York No. 1, hove into sight. There they were all dressed up like Father Knickerbocker, and the band playing East Side, West Side, All Around the Town.

Next was Philadelphia No. 2, the members dressed like Quakers, with the exalted ruler out in front dressed like William Penn. The Philadelphia band was playing and the carollers singing, I Have Come to Say Goodbye, Dolly Gray.

Next swung into line a nondescript group of men—no uniforms, no band, no singing, but holding aloft a banner with these words, "Of course, San Francisco is here."

Mr. Speaker, pandemonium broke loose. From every housetop, from every street corner, from every vantage point along the line of march, the people cheered and cheered.

Forgotten were Father Knickerbocker and William Penn; forgotten were the

splendid groups who came after. That day Denver wanted to pay homage to the little group from San Francisco. No national hero in the entire history of the Republic ever received a more genuine reception than did those few Elks from the far West. As the news agencies telegraphed the story to the four corners of the country, our people were drawn just a little closer together with that priceless intangible something which we all cherish so much and which we affectionately term "the spirit of America."

Thirty-five years have passed. The city laid in ruins is rebuilt. From an airplane, looking down, one cannot imagine that a building had ever been destroyed, and I hope every one of my fellow Americans may find time to come out and see what an amazing change has taken place. Mayor Angelo Rossi will greet you in a typical San Francisco way.

Symbolic of the present scene is the beautiful civic center, with our Federal building, State building, civic auditorium, municipal opera house, war memorial, and the city hall. All of these structures are gems of modern architecture.

The city hall was finished in 1915. A few years later President Woodrow Wilson visited the city on his last tour around the circle.

Sunny Jim Rolph was mayor at the time, and when he walked up the steps of the city hall Jim proudly pointed out to the President that the dome of the city hall in San Francisco is 14 feet 2¾ inches higher than the dome of this Capitol here in Washington.

Through the years our citizens have devoted themselves to developing a community around those basic American ideals of love, laughter, and loyalty; and with our guiding light that word of words, "tolerance."

A few seasons ago the world was treated to a marvelous motion picture, entitled "San Francisco." Playing the leading part was an alluring American actress, Miss Jeannette MacDonald, and I would like to close this talk with some of the words from her lovely song:

San Francisco, open your Golden Gate;
You let no stranger wait outside your door.
San Francisco, here is your wandering one,
Saying, "I'll wander no more."

Other places only make me love you best;
Tell me, you're the heart of the Golden West.
San Francisco, welcome me home again;
I'm coming home, to go roaming no more.

[Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "Humanity Is Threatened With Universal Bondage," under the authorship of the Honorable PRENTISS M. BROWN, United States Senator from Michigan, published in the Jewish Chronicle, one of America's foremost periodicals, under date of Friday, April 11.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my own remarks concerning the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders which may have been heretofore granted, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order previously granted, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan [Mr. HOOK] made a statement on the floor, in substance that the damage in the Ford plant was caused by a group of Negroes going under the name of Loyal Workers.

Without in any way questioning the sincerity or integrity of the gentleman, I want to call attention to the complete inaccuracy of his information. So that we may judge where the truth really is, what is said here this morning on the subject will be taken from the official transcript of the testimony given in court before Judge Tuttle.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOOK. For the information of the gentleman, I want to say that the testimony you are going to read from is before the court of Judge Tuttle?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. And it was taken on the question of an injunction proceeding?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. It is all one-sided testimony; the other side was not heard, and the testimony of the other side did not go in because the case was settled before this was finished. So you are getting one-sided testimony; just one side of the case. We are presenting both sides of the case.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If this sworn testimony, taken under oath, in a Federal court, is not more accurate than your statement when you attacked the Dies committee and its activities, I would like to know it.

Mr. HOOK. My statements were absolutely correct, and I do not need any insinuations from the likes of you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not making any insinuations.

Mr. HOOK. You certainly are. I am getting sick and tired of your likes making those statements on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As long as you brought up the matter, I recall that you afterward withdrew those statements, with the permission of the House, instead of having them expunged.

Mr. HOOK. And I afterward put them back into the RECORD and showed some facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; you sneaked them back in there. If they are in there, I will look them up and see if we cannot have them expunged again. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOOK. You never denied the fact that the man who was supposed to have forged those letters, who was convicted of forgery and perjury and false pretenses, at the time it was done, was on the pay roll of the Dies committee. You never denied that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman was gullible enough to swallow that testimony.

Mr. HOOK. And the gentleman from the Fourth District was gullible enough to swallow this particular testimony.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I am gullible enough to take this testimony which was given in the Federal court before a United States district judge, taken down by a reporter, the witness cross-examined by William Gallagher, attorney for the C. I. O. and never of record disputed.

Mr. HOOK. Brought in there by Mr. Bennett.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes because of the interruption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman has not as yet informed the House as to the name of the witness whose testimony he has referred to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This testimony was taken on the 8th day of April 1941, before Judge Tuttle, United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, southern division; and the witness is Thomas E. Drysdale. The witness was cross-examined by Mr. Gallagher, attorney for the union. I will just read portions of the testimony. The first part is found on page 69.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I will let the gentleman get a little of this first. Then he may not want to interrupt.

Mr. HOOK. I notice the gentleman said he would read just portions of the testimony.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There were some 5,000 men in this rolling mill plant. The witness was asked about these particular furnaces in the rolling mills that are now idle:

Question. Did you observe any damage that was done to the machinery?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. What did you observe?

Answer. Well, in that portion of the hearth we had six—eight—heats, of the steel in process. They were being made—eight 200-ton heats of steel in the furnaces in the process of making, and up until about 2:30 or 3 o'clock those men refused to leave the plant.

These were the loyal workers the gentleman was talking about evidently. I continue quoting the testimony:

They wanted to take care of this steel. So they brought the men from the rolling mill and forced them—

That is the loyal workers—

away from the furnaces, and it was necessary for us more or less to beg these men to take these heats out, which we were not allowed to finish, because we didn't dare take time to try to finish them. They were rolled out of the furnace unfinished, which makes, so far as the Ford Motor Co. is concerned, a total loss.

Question. What is the capacity of those heats, what is their volume?

Answer. They average between 180 or 200 tons.

Question. Of steel?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. And how many of those were rendered unfit for use?

Answer. There were eight, and we worked six out and two were still in the furnaces.

Question. What is the condition of the furnaces where the two heats are not out?

Answer. One furnace in particular had what we call a bottom boil on the front, and they refused to touch that furnace after we described to them the condition of the furnace, and which they knew the seriousness of, they refused to touch it until it broke out. It boiled down through the bottom and out through the front of the furnace, and shot the steel out onto the floor, halfway across the room, but luckily, it being a tilting furnace, we were able to tilt it up over so that it didn't lose too much of the steel, but it had to be tipped immediately, and being an unfinished heat, as I said before, rendered it useless.

Question. What was the damage to the furnace itself?

Answer. Well, I would estimate around in the neighborhood of three or four thousand dollars.

Question. Does that include the damage to both furnaces?

Answer No; that includes the damage to that one particular furnace.

Now, there is $3,000 or $4,000 damage that was caused by the C. I. O. on that one furnace, and there is no doubt about it.

Then, as to the damage to the steel the answer was:

Answer. Well, the damage to the steel is that the steel is not finished. Our specifications call for a very close finish at the end of the heat, when the heat is being made, and if those specifications can't be met after the steel is poured and rolled it can't be used in the manufacture of automobiles.

Question. Now, what is this steel used for, Witness?

Answer. That steel is used for the manufacturing of Government trucks and automobiles.

Question. Was there any damage to the rolling mill property?

Answer. Well, we do not know that. We will have to wait now until we can get the other two heats out of the furnace, which will probably take in the neighborhood of 2 or 3 weeks to melt them down, due to the fact they are a solid mass in the furnace, and bringing those heats out may bring the bottom out with them. We don't know.

Now, talk about the damage, it will be 2 or 3 weeks before these steel furnaces can be put in operation, and this stuff was for use, some of it, in the airplane engines which the Ford people are making.

Going over to another incident:

Question. Now, will you describe what happened there on the afternoon of April 1, 1941?

Answer. Well, a little earlier in the afternoon we had a lot of small incidents that practically shut production down, like metal getting in the rubber—in the tube machines, and so on—and along about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, or 4, when the afternoon shift was there, there was a definite slow-down throughout the entire tire plant.

Question. Describe that.

Answer. Well, in the tire plant a builder will make about, roughly, 15 tires an hour; on the bead job will make several hundred beads an hour; and we found there was a definite slow-down, and they told me they had been instructed they were to get 5 beads an hour, roughly, instead of 180, and 1 or 2 tires an hour.

Question. Who told you this?

Answer. Union men in the shop.

There is the C. I. O. It was not the loyal workers. These were not Negroes who were brought in. They were regular C. I. O. employees in the Ford shop.

Question. Can you identify those men by name?

Answer. Well, I can, several of them. I talked to them.

Then he goes on to say that they were working there with their C. I. O. buttons on.

Question. They stated to you they were instructed to cut the production of beads down from what number?

Answer. Roughly, from 180 an hour to 5 an hour. That is all they were to get.

Question. And that was done?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Production was curtailed in that amount?

Answer. That is right.

Question. What union are you referring to?

Answer. The men I talked to had C. I. O. buttons on.

Now do you understand why they discharged these men? It was because of these slow-downs—on account of the fact the company could not get production on these Government orders. One of the causes of the strike was the discharge of these men, and one of the terms of settlement forced on the Ford Motor Co. by the Federal conciliator and by the Governor of the State of Michigan was that they take these men who were discharged, all of them except three, back; and the other day the gentleman from Michigan stated that these three, according to his information, were to be taken back.

I ask you, in all fairness, how can the Ford Motor Co. proceed to operate its plant with men in the plant obeying the orders of the C. I. O. union outside and downtown—telling them how many tires, for example, to make during a certain period of time?

Mr. HOOK. Do you want me to answer that? You asked me the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you the only one on that side? I thought there were several Democrats over there. If you are the only Democrat, why, go ahead.

Mr. HOOK. I am not the only Democrat.

Mr. DINGELL. Just what difference does that make?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You have not the floor.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOK. I am not the only Democrat over here.

Mr. DINGELL. Why do you not yield?

Mr. HOOK. I am not the only Democrat here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not address you by name. I happened to look over on that side. If you want to say something go ahead.

Mr. HOOK. We do not need the whole Democratic side to answer you. Have you ever checked as to whether or not Ford obeyed the National Labor Relations Act or whether or not it was a violation of the National Labor Relations Act that brought about this strike, and have you ever checked in as to whether or not any one of these eight men were connected with any Communist organization, other than just making statements?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, just sit down.

Mr. HOOK. I do not have to sit down, and I do not need those kind of remarks either. He does not have to tell me to sit down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman keep still or will he not?

Mr. HOOK. I will when I get ready.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman asked me three questions in one. The first was whether I had ever checked on whether Ford had violated the National Labor Relations Act. That does not need any check. As a matter of fact, he has been convicted, and the conviction has been affirmed by the Supreme Court, of violating the National Labor Relations Act. But that is no excuse for violation of other laws by others. The fact that Ford Motor Co. was convicted of some violation of the National Labor Relations Act is no excuse for the malicious destruction of property to the amount of $25 or more, which in Michigan is a felony. That is no excuse for the hundreds of violations of the law against assault and battery. It is no excuse for kidnaping or for the beating up of men who are attempting to go down the highway to get to their work, and it is no excuse for the beating of a trade-school boy by the C. I. O. that the gentleman defends so vigorously here on the floor.

There was another question he asked me, if I had ever checked in on whether or not those eight men were Communists. I never have. I never said those eight were Communists. I said they were men in the plant who were disrupting production in the plant and were interfering with production which was essential to our national defense.

He asked one more question in his three-barreled query, and that was whether or not it was a violation of the National Labor Relations Act that brought about this strike. That one I can answer from the record.

A violation of the National Labor Relations Act did not bring about this strike. The strike was brought about in an effort to compel Ford to recognize the C. I. O. Many unimportant demands were made on the Ford Co. officials by representatives of the union; production was, on several occasions, stopped by representatives of the union and, finally, using the noncompliance with their demands as an excuse and instead of submitting those demands to arbitration, the C. I. O. pulled first a slow-down and then a shut-down in the company's plants. About that there is no question.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, today the minority is asked, for patriotic reasons, to give unity to the defense program. Today the minority asks the President of the United States to cooperate with the defense program.

For practically a year and a half it has been my duty to work upon and to present to the House from the minority viewpoint the largest volume of peacetime appropriations that have ever been presented to and passed by Congress for the purpose of national defense, or for any other purpose. I have willingly and unbegrudgingly supported enormous sums for defense purposes, for both our own defense and for aid to Great Britain. I defy anyone to stand up here in the House and say that I have not done my full patriotic duty.

I have today a more difficult problem to face. Shall I meet my full patriotic duty in telling the Congress and the country just exactly what the state of our defense situation is and just wherein the President has so failed to cooperate with the defense program which he himself initiated that we are lagging in our production of airplanes, tanks, guns, ammunition, camps, motortrucks and transports, and industrial facilities?

It alarms one whose first interests and whose first feelings are that our defense must be strong enough to protect America. It worries and distresses one to see that situation and to see the way it has been treated by the President. Perhaps he owes no duty to the rest of the country. Perhaps he and his friends will try to laugh aside what those of us whose patriotic instincts force us to speak are saying, with the allegation that it is partisan. Let me say to you that that alibi will no longer suffice. Some day, some time, the American people are going to rise in their wrath and demand action and more action until we are able to have America producing, training, arming, and equipping her defense forces to the best of her ability.

So far, the President has failed to put an end to the labor racketeering, the interunion strikes, and to clean up the management of the National Labor Relations Board.

He has failed to place the procurement and management of defense production requirements in the hands of one man with responsibility. He places Mr. Knudsen in a position where Sidney Hillman can veto his every act. And what is Mr. Hillman's situation? He is at present drawing his salary from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, $12,500 a year. He is on the pay roll of the United States Government for $1 a year. Is it not time that that divided allegiance ceased and that if Mr. Hillman is to continue in the employ of the United States Government in a most trusted position that he be paid by the United States Government and the United States Government alone? Is it not time that he ceased at the same time that he is joint head of the Office of Production Management to be the head of a labor union with conflicting duties in each position? Is it not time that those who were called to the service of the United States made that job the first claim upon them?

One of the things that has disturbed those loyal patriotic Americans who believe first in protecting their own country has been the appointment of Harry Hopkins to a position of a sort of super-Cabinet Member, a sort of overlord of the entire defense-production program. This appointment is sought to be excused by the fact that he is a great friend of the President and by the fact that the President has been kind to him and his family. Mr. Hopkins' record of accomplishment is not such as to inspire the trust and the confidence of the American people. He has been a complete failure in every position he has been placed in. Through the C. W. A. and the W. P. A. he wasted tremendous sums of the people's money and demoralized countless thousands of our people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TABER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman referred to Harry Hopkins as being a complete failure. I thought the only complete and unchallenged failure was Herbert Hoover.

Mr. TABER. Harry Hopkins is perhaps not the greatest failure. Franklin Roosevelt is the greatest failure. Herbert Hoover would be a piker as a failure as compared with Franklin Roosevelt, any day, any time.

Mr. DINGELL. The people do not think so.

Mr. TABER. I do not yield any further. The gentleman can apologize for his great failure if he pleases.

Mr. DINGELL. The Gallup poll today indicates where Roosevelt stands.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman is able to fool the people for a while, it will not last.

Mr. DINGELL. You cannot fool 79 percent of the people, which is the figure the Gallup poll gives.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DINGELL. That is the regular order. The gentleman can defend himself without the gentleman's assistance.

Mr. TABER. I wonder why it is that the gentleman feels so bad because his leader is such a failure.

Mr. DINGELL. I am laughing about it, not crying, as the gentleman is.

Mr. TABER. He is laughing because his leader is a failure. My God!

Mr. DINGELL. I am laughing about the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. TABER. I decline to yield further.

Mr. Hopkins has made political considerations the main feature of the expenditure of relief appropriations rather than the giving of relief. He is the same man who said, "We will spend and spend and spend, and vote and vote and vote," with a sense of responsibility purely political and without a capacity to handle the serious situation with which our Nation is confronted. Mr. Hopkins has been placed over men who are better qualified than he to carry on. Is it not time for the President to take his responsibilities seriously? Is it not time for him, as Mr. Wilson was reluctantly compelled to do, to pass up his personal favorites and put someone in charge of our production with capacity and ability to see that America is protected?

I appeal to the majority side of the House and I appeal to the President to keep faith with the people of the United States. Let me say to you, that during the progress of the British appropriation bill, I was given assurances that something would be done that has not been done. Is it not time for the President to keep faith with the American people and in this serious hour of world affairs give us an opportunity for American liberties and the American people to survive and maintain their independence? It cannot be done by dilly-dallying around or by wishy-washy tactics. I hope that the patriotism of the majority will appeal to them stronger and more insistently than any personal or political duty or advantage. I hope that they will join with me in this effort that I am making to persuade the President to cooperate in the defense program. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLAUCHÉ). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STOPPING STRIKES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the other day in the House of Representatives I said with respect to strikes in defense industries that it was high time Congress should assert itself, as the representative of the people and as the legislative branch of the Government, and legislate to stop these strikes at once.

Some people found fault because I did not suggest that more time should be allowed for mediation. However, my position was affirmed by some very distinguished gentlemen, namely, JUDGE SUMNERS of Texas, and Senator NORRIS, and others. I am content.

MEDIATING WITH A MAD TIGER

I ask you, Can you safely mediate with a mad tiger or a Russian wolfhound with rabies?

Right between us sensible people, while I was talking they had been mediating the Allis-Chalmers strike for 90 days, while we as a people were bleeding to death. Our ship of state had, and has, been walloped by the criminal delay, inaction, and incompetence instigated by un-American protagonists.

A RATTLESNAKE RATTLES

When a rattlesnake rattles, it is long past the time for mediation. That is especially true when you have been hunting that rattlesnake for 90 days, have found him, have dodged him, and have tried both to palliate him, and to avoid him. You know he is going to strike just as sure as fate. He did. He ran true to form.

I do not take back a word I said. The rattlesnake struck and stuck his poisonous fangs into defense industry with paralyzing effect.

I said, and I repeat, that there should be no partisan politics in national defense. Yet, as Americans, it is high time for 22,000,000 people, called Republicans, to wake up and, as both Republicans and Americans, insist that action shall be had by the party in power at once with respect to our national defense and your safety and mine.

If those to whom we have delegated authority are incompetent or unwilling to attempt to cope with the situation or do not have the intestinal fortitude to defy the saboteurs, the racketeers, the "fifth columnists," laborers and employers, and all those who are determined insidiously to wreck the United States, then let Congress, without respect to partisan politics, in 36 hours take the matter into its own hands and outlaw these strikes.

Calvin Coolidge said:

> There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time.

Are we too dumb to learn anything from the experience of others?

The vital life spark of this country is involved and is being smothered and choked to death at the Allis-Chalmers plant by those who are inspired by foreign influence and paid to do it and know what they are doing and where and why. Let us wake up, America.

Are we here in Congress as helpless as we look? Let us show the world that democracy and a republican form of government can function.

The Republican Party should be known as something other than the party of oppositionists. It should have a constructive suggestion that it is ready to offer. It has one and is ready to help make it a reality. It is 100 percent, or approximately so—or should be so—for the outlawing of these strikes against its own safety, individual and national. Let us get going before it is everlastingly too late.

I did not have time in which to say much, but in the extension of remarks which I was forced to make by reason of the time limit, I went on to say:

> These strikes against national defense, which is the guaranty for public and private safety, must be outlawed. They must stop. Congress apparently will have to legislate to stop them.
>
> I am no labor baiter, nor do I fail to appreciate all that is involved. The best thing that could happen to organized labor and to employers engaged in national-defense contracts would be for the Government to take over the plants and operate them pending the determination of the rights of all parties involved.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We have heard it on the floor, and we have been besieged by those who insist that the laborer "must have his cut." We have been told about the huge profits that big business proposes to make out of war contracts. Well, let us look at it for a minute. If the employers think they are going to make a huge profit for themselves out of the war contracts or if the employees think this is so, they are wrong.

I cited authorities to prove the foregoing statements and quoted from Channing Pollock, who said:

> While all over the world one kind of men and women are dying or stand willing to die for their countries, another kind are ready to betray their countries and their fellow men for 30 pieces of silver.
>
> There have always been people like this; Judas was not the first, nor Benedict Arnold the last of their tribe. Through long and bitter experience, governments have learned to ferret out and fight the spies and saboteurs and salesmen of military secrets. But the World War produced, and this war has multiplied and made more effective, a new and even more dangerous type of traitors. They are ordinary, everyday citizens—employers and workers—who exploit national emergency for their own selfish ends. Most of them are unaware alike of their effectiveness and their danger; but, as an eminent statesman and labor leader said recently, "every bit of grit they can put in the wheels of industry helps Hitler." That help takes many forms. It includes graft like that at Fort Devens, where the press reports pay-roll padding and other large-scale chiseling; it includes jerry building of defense camps, scheming combinations to profiteer on defense contracts, and hasty strikes in vital industries—strikes that might have been prevented by arbitration. The majority of these sappers of our safety would be the first to resent and the last to admit selling their birthright for a mess of pottage.
>
> A GREATER MENACE
>
> The truth is that they are a greater menace than any foreign foe. In some measure the conquest of every democracy that has fallen before dictatorship may be attributed to a conscious or unconscious break-down of character among common, everyday citizens of the democracies themselves. Neither unconsciousness nor any other reason excuses them.
>
> No desire for gain, no struggle for personal or group advantage or rights, no justified or unjustified resentment or quarrel can be allowed to interfere with national security. To that once more an overwhelming majority of us have pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Lives and fortunes can be of small avail without ships, guns, tanks, and planes. These we must have, and quickly, and we cannot afford to let anyone, of whatever group or minority, check the flow.
>
> More than ever before, perhaps, we have reached the point where no one must do that which, if it were done by everyone, would be destructive of the common good. Every American has become a vital and essential part of the structure that is America. Greed, dishonesty, loafing, and quitting that wouldn't matter much in normal times can be our undoing now. And make no mistake, America's foes are not only quick to detect such weaknesses, but eager and ready to aggravate and profit by them. Methods and examples are to be found in scores of published confessions.
>
> But whether the interruption of our national defense be alien-contrived, or only the result of human desire for gain and personal rights, this is no moment for monkey wrenches in our machinery. The unthinking may ask, "Why such a fuss if two or three armament plants do close down for a few days?" The answer is that even 1 day's delay might send hundreds of men into action ill-trained and ill-equipped; secondarily, and not so very secondarily at that, it is that each grafter and racketeer and chiseler and shirker and deserter is spreading corruption, subtracting from the average of morale and efficiency, contributing his bit to what Hitler had in mind when he said he expected America to destroy itself. Each of them is giving truth and force and effect to Hitler's indictment of all democracy.
>
> The punishment will not be the firing squad. No one shot Benedict Arnold. It may not be the loss of ill-gotten gains. Arnold died a comparatively rich man. The penalty he paid was not death but the fact that he had to live with himself. His crime was his executioner. A broken man, Gen. Benedict Arnold died a victim of his own conscience and of public scorn and neglect.
>
> Whether or not they are sent to prison, I should not want to be among the malefactors at Fort Devens. I should not want to be one of those who put the brakes on defense. I should not want to listen to what something within me would be saying whenever I read of a child killed by a bombing plane against which there had been insufficient preparation. I should not care to take the chance, however remote, of seeing what I knew to be needlessly long casualty lists of my fellow citizens, or of standing alone with myself while the flags of my country's conquerors passed by. I should dread hearing spoken in America the requiem Marshal Petain pronounced over France: "Our spirit of enjoyment was stronger than our spirit of sacrifice. We wanted to have more than we wanted to give. We tried to spare effort and met disaster."
>
> HAVE 130,000,000 AMERICANS ANY RIGHTS?
>
> Now, I ask you, during this emergency, which of the two conflicts are we going to suspend, the right, which they never had, of unions to strike against the national safety, or the right of 130,000,000 Americans to national defense?
>
> Many people know that I am no alarmist, but I am seriously disturbed. I am not easily upset by new situations, which are only old ones in new clothes to one who reads and interprets history understandingly, but I see in this onward march of Huns many things which reproduce and reenact days of long ago, but that go on and on.
>
> I may be one in a million, but I give it to you as my best thought that we had better wake up. The Hun is at the gate. It is high time we did something. These strikes, superinduced and planned and controlled by influences outside our own boundaries, are intended to cut, and do cut, our vital arteries. They bleed us and practically deaden our attempts to save ourselves. That is the low-down. That is the truth.
>
> The proposition which confronts all of us is reduced to a question of whether this republican form of government can save itself. The crossroads toward which we have traveled and which we have reached will permit of no mistake.
>
> PALLIATION, PROCRASTINATION, PROPAGANDA
>
> We can no longer listen to palliation, procrastination, and propaganda except at our peril. The clock has struck the hour. We will either save ourselves or sink. The responsibility rests on us. Do not forget it.
>
> It is unfortunate that the Secretary of Labor has testified that she did not know that there had been any sabotage in the defense industries. Well, the people in Vermont know there was sabotage at the Danby plant. That is only one of hundreds of others to which I might allude. Vermont is not inoculated against sabotage.
>
> ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH
>
> Too many Americans go to bed at night and sleep in a security that is false and unreal. They are hypnotized by a sense

of security superinduced by a belief in possibilities which do not exist. The fact is they are in the same situation as those who live on the edge of an inferno, who go to sleep lulled by a heat that temporarily comforts but is generating their complete overwhelming.

I have been away from Washington for 2 weeks. I have come back to know and to appreciate, from what I have heard and from sources that are reliable, that it is time for us to wake up. It is time for us to protect ourselves against the possibilities that threaten us while we doze in an unrealizing stupor from which we shall have to awake. May God save us from waking up in as unprepared a state and as unready to protect ourselves as we were in 1917.

These strikes to which I have alluded are planned, directed, and controlled by influences entirely foreign to us and to our manner of living.

BLANKETED UNDER SELF-SUFFICIENCY

The truth is the American people are asleep under blankets of their own self-sufficiency, superimposed by propaganda, trying to protect themselves against a state of mental weather but not against the blitzkriegs of the most ruthless murderers the world has ever known.

We are fiddling while Rome burns. We are talking about convoys. We are talking about changes in the Neutrality Act. We are talking about a hundred other things than those which vitally affect the future of civilization and our own lives. The time has come—and it is now—for us to realize that we are next, or else.

You do not believe it? I hope you will not have to live to see the day when you must believe it.

All the oratory in the world gets us nowhere. Unless we prepare to defend ourselves to 110 percent or more of our capacity and ability we might as well be sunk with Atlantis. I do not mean maybe.

SELF-PRESERVATION

The fate of civilization is hanging in the balance today. No threat of World War in 1917 was ever so compelling or so overwhelming as that which confronts the United States of America this very minute. It is time for all haggling and dissension and disunion to cease. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and the situation has practically reduced itself to that today, whether you believe it or not.

THE FEAR OF GOD AND THE HUN

I am not trying to scare anybody, but I would like to put the fear of God and of the Hun into the hearts of everybody.

Are we going to save ourselves? If so, these strikes must stop. If Congress cannot stop them and the President cannot stop them, then the American people must stop them—and now—in order to save themselves. That is how bad the situation is, as I look at it. That is how bad it is as others see it, whether they tell you about it or not.

It is time for the American people to get the idea into their heads that unless they act in unison in their own interest they are sunk and everything for which they have stood throughout the years is gone.

RESPONSIBILITY LOCALIZED

It is not a pretty picture, but it is a truthful one. You cannot overdraw or overcolor it. Take a look at it honestly and decide what you are going to do about it. The responsibility is on the doorstep of every American citizen. It is on your doorstep.

THE VINSON BILL

The so-called Vinson bill to bar strikes in defense industries has been unanimously approved by the Naval Affairs Committee. It will come to the floor some time next week. All it does is to put teeth into the enforcement of the declaration of policy issued by the President in setting up the Mediation Board.

It provides for—

First. Compulsory mediation by the National Defense Mediation Board, with a minimum 25-day cooling-off period before workers can go out on strike.

Second. Freezing of the open shop in defense industries, with a specific provision to the effect that even if a majority of workers in any plant favor a closed shop, this shall not be considered a lawful grievance. Employers are specifically banned from signing new closed-shop contracts.

Third. A green light for employers to fire union leaders if they have "reasonable cause" to believe that these unionists were at any time members of the Communist Party or advocated overthrow of the Government.

That is good as far as it goes, but the question is how far will it go.

Opposition to the bill has been voiced by the A. F. of L. and by John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers. It is also understood that national officers of the C. I. O. are strongly opposed to the measure.

STOP THE STRIKES

How can we stop the strikes? I have thought that Congress should take the initiative, but I have another idea today, and believe it is a good one.

THE RESPONSIBILITY ON THE GOVERNORS

The solution of this strike business, by reason of the demonstrated inefficiency of the bureaucrats and Congress to cope speedily, if at all, with the situation, rests with the Governors of the States. They should assume the responsibility for restoring, reestablishing, and preserving the rights of the States, most of which have been surrendered to the Roosevelt monarchy.

The people of the several States have a right to demand that their respective Governors call on the Federal Government only after they have utilized and employed the power and rights reserved to the States by the Constitution.

TO MAINTAIN REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT

It is up to the chief executives of the several States to see that this republican form of government is maintained and that it functions as originally intended by its founders. The responsibility is theirs to see to it that the States do not completely lose their identity, surrender their prerogatives, or become pawns in the hands of the Washington bureaucrats, whose motivating idea seems to be to create a totalitarian form of government, in which States and individuals are bound to become serfs.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

In this free country—God save the mark!—the right to work should be guaranteed and enforced, so that those who do not wish to join a labor organization but who are ready to act and to work to help save the country and themselves may have a chance to do so.

This may be a labor-controlled Government, but if nobody is permitted to work until he or she contributes an exorbitant price for the privilege, things have come to a pretty pass, and such a situation spells the beginning of the end of organized labor and all of us. Such a program is despicable, and finds its un-American inspiration in Russia and gets its first-hand impulse from Hitler.

Let me say that for 8 years I have sat as a Member of a Congress in which a few farsighted individuals, who could see the gathering storm, endeavored time and time again to warn their colleagues and the Nation of the threatening disaster. They were as voices crying in a wilderness because their warnings and their pleadings fell upon the deaf ears of a Congress, the mind of which was geared only to labor, relief, and social reform.

DISASTROUS DISARMAMENT

The matériel disarmament which was forced upon us was weakening. The psychological disarmament was disastrous. Selfish idealism, communism, and theoretical Utopianists rotted the minds of the college students. They fallaciously taught that we were fooled into the World War and blamed the Treaty of Versailles for the evils of the world. They proceeded upon the principle that a lie told often enough finally becomes to be believed as the truth. They distorted historical facts to make a good story.

LABOR SOLD DOWN THE RIVER

Notwithstanding all of our attempts to free labor from the injustice of exploitation of the employer, we have only succeeded in placing the control in the hands of its own racketeering leaders, who are now rolling in wealth from the dues wrung as tribute from those who wanted a job. In the present crisis, these racketeers are holding up the defense of the Nation to further their own selfish aims. In their ignorance they are extending aid to the march of totalitarianism which will surely fasten the chains of serfdom and peonage once more upon them and upon all those who labor.

CONGRESS ALONE CANNOT SOLVE THE PROBLEM

You need not look to the Congress to solve this problem of strikes in industries working for national defense. The Federal Government is impotent to act except in the capacity of a mediator, and that not efficiently.

THE RESPONSIBILITY IS ON THE STATES

You can draft a man to work, but that would not produce efficiency or encourage production. The fact is, the solution of the problem and the remedy are in the hands of the Governors of the various

States. Let us decentralize. Let us assert the sovereignty of the States. Let the Governors, under the police powers vested in them by the Constitution, proclaim that everyone who wishes to strike and cease work can do so; that the right to work is more basic, more fundamental, and more sacred than the right to prevent a man from working. Let them insure to everyone who wishes to work the protection of the police power of the State from molestation by word or deed and from violent picketing.

Then there will be no strikes.

LET THE GOVERNORS ACT

Let the governors deputize the fathers of sons who have been drafted in the Army and men who saw combat service in the World War to see that no violence interferes with the rearmament of this Nation.

If, and only in the event that, the Governors of the States find that they cannot maintain order and suppress insurrection in their States, then, and only then, let them call upon the President of the United States for assistance.

In recent years the people of the United States have been educated to believe that this is a good country to live in so long as they can live on and off it.

They have been propagandized to expect the Government to support them and to furnish them the more-abundant life without any effort on their part to help themselves or to earn it.

STATES HAVE CEASED TO FUNCTION

The States, as such, have ceased to function as sovereignties. Gradually their affairs have been and are being taken over, run, and controlled by the bureaucrats at Washington.

The war in Europe is bad enough, but the situation that confronts liberty-loving Americans at home is worse.

Our greatest danger is found in our complacent submission to this benevolent, bureaucratic dictatorship in what is now no longer a republic, except in name, but a Roosevelt monarchy.

The governors, backed by the people of the States, have the tremendous burdren on their shoulders of saving what is left of and to the States. They have the power to do it. It is their responsibility to the people whom they represent to undertake to reestablish our form of government, to assert and regain the rights reserved to the States. The governors have no justifiable excuse or alibi for doing other than as I suggest.

CAN ENGLAND WIN?

In conclusion, I want to go on record as saying that I fear the worst for England. With many millions under his heel, there is no telling what a world-conquering, maniacal Hitler may try to do in this Western Hemisphere. We must be prepared. These strikes to prevent preparation are a part of the well-conceived, long-considered, deliberate plan to upset our program for adequate defense against whatever Hitler may eventually undertake to do in this hemisphere.

Frankly, I hope against hope, but I do not see how England can win even with our all-out aid short of men. I hope I am mistaken, but I do not see how England can much longer withstand the terrific onslaught of the ruthless tyrant.

The war may drag along overseas for a year or two. We should be no party to it on foreign soil. That would be the rankest folly. To think we could accomplish anything by sending men to spill their blood to make a holiday for Hitler is crazy. Save England, if we can, as we are trying to do.

Our business is to defend America. We must save ourselves here. To do this we must stop these strikes. We must proceed to manufacture powder, produce planes, and get our economic house in order, and tolerate no delay.

THE STATES MUST COOPERATE

The States must cooperate as such. The burden is on the several governors to see to it that they do.

If the States cannot stop these unnecessary, unjustified, and ruinous strikes in their midst, then we are lost before Hitler wins. That is a part of his wicked plan.

What we forget but ought to remember is that if a picket line can prevent a man from going into a certain mill or factory to earn a living for his family, a picket line can also prevent him from going to a certain church to worship God as he desires, and can bar his way to the enjoyment of blood-bought liberty. It is only a step from one to the other. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been just 12 years ago this spring that the stock exchange hit its all-time high. For 10 years before that Wall Street had been pretty much the darling of the Federal administration. The pickings were lush, and no one worried. Seats on the exchange were selling for $625,000. "Naw, they can't regulate Wall Street," you heard everywhere.

But excesses, abuses, and irregularities have a way of bringing the chickens home to roost. Wall Street had formerly just burned the fingers of the financial crowd. This time, in October 1929, it caught even the shirts of the American public. The crash took under millions of average citizens. "Naw, they can't regulate Wall Street," you still heard.

But Wall Street's abuse this time struck at the real America, and every citizen felt it directly or indirectly. The Rayburn Act was passed, and they did regulate Wall Street. Seats, instead of selling at $625,000, today sell for $22,000.

Labor for some 8 years has been the favorite child of a later administration. They have made many gains, most of which they were entitled to.

But lately there is something vaguely familiar to me in comparison between the labor leaders and the attitude of the Wall Street barons of 1929. We see the "public-be-damned attitude" now as we did then.

Jurisdictional strikes, strikes of section against section, strikes for organization, strikes because management has fired one, two, or three workers. Strikes that shut down the blast furnaces of steel for lack of coal, strikes that tie up dozens of distant plants because one small group wants something for its own personal gain. We see excessive fees charged freemen to work to build our defense plant to fatten union treasuries.

Those excesses are familiar to those Wall Street times of "the public-be-damned" days. This time the labor leaders are not just fighting the employer. This time the public is not cheering on the side lines. This time the safety of all America is jeopardized by the abuses of the labor barons. This time the American Legion, the mothers of boys in the service, the farmer, and the average worker resent these excesses and abuses that endanger all America.

When America speaks as it is doing today on strikes against our safety as freemen, these labor leaders who think—as Wall Street once thought—"they can't regulate" had better learn the lesson that abuse of power and excesses against the interest of all America can and will backfire.

"Naw, they can't regulate Wall Street," but they did. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein two editorials or statements from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed at this time for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that when one side of a case is presented and the other side is not heard, people cannot be blamed for not coming to a real and proper decision. That is the condition that has arisen with regard to the strike situation.

A certain group on the floor of this House have been continuously maligning the cause of labor. They grasp onto every straw to condemn those who have been trying to balance the scales of economic justice. We who have interested ourselves in seeing that justice be done did not see fit to stoop to the low level of dignifying their statements with an answer. The result is that the newspapers have printed just one side of the

story. A very blaring example of this is the fact that my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], just read from testimony before the United States District Court in the State of Michigan which court is presided over by the Honorable Judge Tuttle. The testimony was all on one side. The real facts are that the Ford Motor Co. presented their side of the case when an application for a temporary injunction was made before Judge Tuttle's court. The Ford Co. witnesses were heard. I presume most of the witnesses were a part of the Harry Bennett gestapo. Harry Bennett is at the head of the Ford police force. For years he has filled that police force with many ex-convicts who were paroled from the State's prisons of Michigan and probably other places. They were used to beat into subjection men who did not agree with methods that were used by the Ford Co. They were used to protect the Ford Co. in their violation and complete defiance of the law of the land. This type of witness can be obtained to speak in behalf of Harry Bennett's gestapo at that time. Not a single solitary opposition witness was heard in this case. Not a single solitary opposition witness was brought in to testify or to deny the testimony offered by the Ford Co. because of the fact that the Ford strike was settled and the application for injunction, I understand, was withdrawn and therefore there was no need of any contradictory evidence.

The very fact that the strike has been settled should be enough for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to satisfy him, but no; he seems to want to resurrect the trouble and start it all over again.

We who are really interested in seeing the national-defense program progress and seeing the wheels of industry move are happy indeed that the strike was settled. Does he want to start this strike all over again? He now comes on the floor of the House with testimony taken with regard to the application of that injunction and says it was uncontradicted. True it is, as far as the testimony in that court was concerned it might be uncontradicted, but that was because, as I have said, the other side of the case was not heard. The case was over before a contradiction was really needed.

Before I leave this subject, might I say a few words with regard to fees that were charged for the right to work. I have heard many statements on the floor of this House of exorbitant fees charged by so-called union leaders. I do not consider any man who charges exorbitant fees to enter a union a bona fide labor-union leader. They are not. They are nothing but racketeers. I do not condone it. The bona fide labor leaders do not condone it. However, might I say that these labor racketeers who charge exorbitant fees are not the only ones that are guilty of such practice. I have it from reliable information that Harry Bennett, the head of the Ford gestapo, has charged as high as $50 to men before they would be given a job in the Ford plant. I presume that because Harry Bennett made those charges that it is legitimate and it is not racketeering. The right to work should be a right that will not be violated by exorbitant fees on the part of labor racketeers nor should that right be violated by Harry Bennett, the head of the Ford gestapo. I fully realize that just because Harry Bennett carries on that practice is no sign that labor racketeers should be allowed to set up the same kind of a practice.

The C. I. O. has been maligned here on the floor of this House and people have been led to believe that that union has been charging exorbitant fees. I challenge the gentleman from Michigan, or any other person, to name one single, solitary instance where a bona fide labor leader of the C. I. O. has charged an exorbitant fee for initiation into any C. I. O. union.

I do not rise on the floor of this House to defend just union labor. I am here pleading in the cause of the great mass of laboring men who are loyal, real Americans, upon whom this Nation must depend if it is to exist.

It is not right that an open charge of communism or nazi-ism be made against the great cause of labor. It is not right that it should be charged that the laboring men of this Nation are led by Communists or communistic propaganda. The average laboring man in this Nation hates nazi-ism or communism and hates anything that is the antithesis of Americanism. They believe in democracy. They believe in liberty. I think that one great American made a statement one time that democracy was nothing more or less than liberty plus groceries.

I call attention to a statement that was made on the floor of this House on April 14. The reason I call attention to this is that in that statement there was an attempt made to charge the Democratic Party with combining with Communist wreckers of the Ford plant, leading the public to believe that the eight men over whom the strike was called were Communists. I quote from that statement:

> Let me congratulate the leadership of the Democratic Party on its success of its combination with Communists and wreckers at the Ford plant, its control of the highways by pickets, its success in beating up the employees of the Ford plant, and in forcing Ford to take back the men who destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of property in the plant. I want to congratulate the Democratic Party on that wonderful wrecking campaign. It equals, if it does not surpass, the frightfulness of a Hitler. If it is the end of liberty of government the party is seeking, it is well on the road to victory.

This is an illustration of intemperate statements that have been made here many times, and it is to challenge that statement that I take the floor of the House; and it is to challenge such statements that I shall continue to take the floor of the House from now on.

I stated on the floor of this House on Wednesday that not one single solitary union man was involved in the destruction of any property within the Ford plant. I stand by that statement.

The Honorable Murray D. Van Wagoner, Governor of the State of Michigan, with the cooperation of the union officials, the State police, and the Conciliation Board of the Department of Labor, settled the Ford strike.

The reason for the Ford strike was that the Ford Co. itself refused to live up to the law and discharged eight men who were fully within their rights because of union activity. I just asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] whether or not he had made an investigation into the fact of whether any of these eight men that were involved were Communists, and he said he did not. Still he would lead the people to believe that they were Communists.

If Henry Ford, through the Ford Co., had complied with the law of the land and did not defy it, there would not have been any strike. It is about time that we go before the American people with the facts before we charge our fellow men with communism, nazi-ism, or any other kind of ism.

I do not know of any worse smearing that can be done than to charge a man with communism or anti-Americanism without having investigated first and having definite, positive proof. There is too much of this going on. It is this kind of stuff that has kept the people in a jittery state of mind. We cannot have national unity, we cannot have a national defense program if the leaders of our Nation are to make such intemperate statements without foundation of fact.

I well remember on the floor of this House many gentlemen charged Mr. Saposs, who was a Government employee, with communism and were successful through such a charge to eliminate the appropriation for his office. However, just the other day on the floor of this House, a Republican Member made the statement that he had investigated Mr. Saposs and he found definite and positive proof that Mr. Saposs was not a Communist but a real, true, honest American interested in the betterment of the common man.

As I said on a previous occasion, I did not hear any voice raised when the industrialists of this Nation at the beginning of the defense program refused to take contracts and refused to go ahead with the defense program until their claims were met and until they were given an amortization on their taxes, until the ceilings on profits were raised, and until other conditions demanded by them were met. They refused to go ahead and so tied up the national-defense program for months. I did not hear any cry then about sabotage in the national-defense program, but now, because of the fact that there were 11 strikes out of over 200,000 factories in this Nation, they are ready to crucify labor on the cross of justice. Industry was properly treated at the time. The Government arbitrated with them. They did it in the American way.

The laboring men of this Nation will carry the burden of saving democracy, as they have in the past. You cannot force upon labor any persecution. You must not put laws upon the statute books that will create in the mind of the laboring man of this Nation the idea that he is being persecuted. If you bring about such a condition in the minds of the great mass of labor, you will break down the

morale of that great patriotic class, and when you break down the laboring class of this Nation you will no longer have national unity, and without national unity we cannot win in this great struggle for the preservation of democracy.

Truly it is we who love this Nation want to preserve the democratic way of life; but we must not give up the very thing that we want to defend. The laboring man is the backbone of this Nation.

The man who labors by the sweat of his brow is a loyal, 100-percent American. The great laboring class are 100 percent loyal and 100 percent for national defense, providing that that national defense is for the purpose of saving our democratic rights. He will do his duty. Oh, yes, we know that there are so-called leaders who are supposed to be leading labor. We know that many of them are racketeers. But any of them that are racketeers are not bona fide labor leaders. In such a great movement there are bound to be a few that feel that they are above the law; there are bound to be a few that will be prone to chisel. The same thing exists in industry. Ninety-five percent of industry are honest and clean and legitimate, but there are at least 5 percent of industry that are selfish and arrogant and stoop to low, browbeating tactics, but the whole cause of industry should not be maligned because of the mistakes of a few.

Why is it that we have in the past had some so-called labor leaders that were not of the best? Let me tell you why. Many years ago there were only two types that went out into the laboring field to fight for the cause of labor, because of the very vicious opposition of industry. The labor movement has been written in blood. Men who took part in organizing labor many years ago were beaten, many of them shot, thousands of them thrown in jail without any excuse. Many of those who went into the field were crackpots and there was also the "tough guy" who did not care whether he went to jail or not. The reason that they were in the front and were prominent was because there was no protection of labor at the time, and the ordinary individual interested in labor did not want to make the necessary sacrifice. Since the National Labor Relations Act has gone into effect, since labor has been given some protection, a better class of leadership has come into the field, a real class of leadership, a type of leadership that is ready and willing to sit down across the bargain table and bargain things out, think things through, the type of leadership that Mr. Knudsen spoke of the other day when he testified before the investigating committee, the type of leadership that industry has faith in, the type of leadership that we the American people have faith in and with whom we shall sit across the table and arbitrate. They are reasonable. They are honest. They are fair. Certainly, they are fighting for the rights that belong to them, the same as industry stands up for the rights that belong on their side. The real leaders of industry are ready to think this problem through, are ready to arbitrate. I know of no greater leader of industry than Mr. Knudsen. He said in his opinion that the proper thing was to think these problems through, talk it over across the table, and talk the thing out in the American way. Yes; the American way is to arbitrate and not to use force. We should not force things down the necks of the American people. It just cannot be done.

Statements were made on the floor of this House today that this administration has been derelict in its duty. The great leader of the Nation, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been maligned and insulted. It has been derelict in its duty. The great failure. The American people did not think so. The American people do not think so today. They have faith in Franklin D. Roosevelt. They have faith in his policies. He is the protector of liberty. He has shown patience on both sides and his patience will bear fruit and will blossom forth in a national unity that will be a bulwark against any aggression against democracy.

While we are on the subject of bottlenecks and what has caused the national-defense program to lag, I want to call your attention to the final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee, transmitted to the Congress of the United States pursuant to Public Resolution No. 113 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. I commend it for your thorough study. When you read that report you will find that the biggest thing that we have to face in this Nation is the concentration of economic power in our national-defense program. We must break down this great concentration of power and spread it throughout the Nation. We must spread it to every nook and corner of the Nation so that all the people may become a part of our national-defense program, so that certain communities and certain sections of the country will not be forgotten. I commend to you especially the statement of Hon. Chester C. Davis, a member of the National Defense Advisory Commission, made before the Southern Governors' Conference in New Orleans on March 15, 1941, at which time he said:

> I think there is another reason perhaps more important than the ones I have cited. I was interested and I was somewhat shocked a few days ago to see a tabulation of the distribution of defense orders to date not as between areas but between industrial concerns. Included in the tabulation were eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded between June 13 of last year and February 15 of this year. This tabulation includes all types of contracts. Of this vast total, between one-fifth and one-quarter had gone to 2 groups of companies of closely interconnected ownership. Between 40 and 45 percent had gone to 6 closely interconnected groups. And a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies or interrelated groups of companies. There is rich food for thought in these figures. I believe they are closely related to the mediocre success we have had in apportioning a part of this new defense industry to the States represented here today. Our defense contracts are being absorbed by a small handful of concerns. The very smallness of the number threatens to be a serious bottleneck on the full use of our industrial and human resources. It is a bottleneck which must be broken.

In closing, might I again plead with all those who are truly interested in the preservation of our democracy to be calm, cool, and collected. Might I especially ask those who have been intemperate in their statements to give labor the credit of at least being loyal, to give the laboring man the credit that he, too, loves his country, to help the great laboring mass of people to become a part of the great program of national defense, so that they may truly do their bit as they wish to do it. I do not believe that there is an un-American in a humble laboring man's home in this Nation. We must create in the minds of the great mass of people the fact that their Government is working in their behalf, that their Government will protect them in the right to live and rear their families in an environment that is comparable to what it should be in a real, true, democratic nation, so that they may go on and build civilization to the extent that we will remove from this world that monster we call war. With the laboring class treated fairly, you will find that the laboring class will treat industry fairly, and then government will be a regulatory body that will bring about the cooperation that is necessary to bring happiness to mankind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that during the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] he quoted someone as having told him that I had said there would be no legislation coming out of the Committee on the Judiciary on the subject of strikes.

I regret exceedingly the necessity of taking the time of the House. even for 1 minute, to assure you that someone evidently misunderstood or was misinformed. I would not, under any circumstances, even if I thought it, have said such a thing. But I never had such a thought. I never pretend to speak for that great committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I am profoundly in hope that our committee will see fit to report some remedial legislation which in its wisdom it may find necessary. Having had no such thought, and having uttered no such prediction, I am at a loss to understand how such a statement could be attributed to me. So I hasten to make this correction to keep the record straight.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I address the House for 1 minute?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was greatly surprised by the statement made to me yesterday morning, because I had always understood the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] was in favor of some legislation that would remedy this strike situation. I only reported to the House what had been given me, and it was not given in confidence either.

Mr. HOBBS. I regret that the source of the gentleman's information was incorrectly advised or misunderstood concerning something that may have been

said about a specific proposal. I do recall that there was a Member of this body who asked me if I thought the Judiciary Committee was in favor of drafting all labor in this land and would approve a bill of that kind. I said I had no right to speak for the committee, but that I did not think any such bill as that would be reported. Several Members have asked me if our committee was going to report a bill, and I have said that I did not know.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] anything about strikes before he spoke this afternoon?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. As I understood, the gentleman from Michigan did not say that I told him anything. He said someone told him that I had said those things. I talked with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] about some phases of the subject weeks ago, when he was a witness before our committee, but I do not recall his having spoken to me, nor I to him, on the subject since.

[Here the gavel fell.]

KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR—THE PRICE IS TOO HIGH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, this Nation was founded by the willing toil, sacrifice, and bloodshed of men and women who were devoted to the cause of liberty.

There are in this Nation today men and women who are now ready to toil, sacrifice, and shed their blood if necessary to preserve the institutions of free government upon this continent.

But, Mr. Speaker, the majority of our people, much as they love liberty and much as they abhor war, have nothing more than a sympathetic interest in the affairs of the continents of the Eastern Hemisphere. Our participation in the last World War cost this Nation more than $40,000,000,000 in cash and 350,000 casualties, of which 126,000 were either killed in action or died in the service.

In the last 24 hours we learn that the Serbian Army, numbering more than a million men, fighting in defense of their homes and firesides, have succumbed to the might of the German military machine. Their resistance was heroic and brief. The President of the United States had promised the Serbs cooperation and assistance in that tragic hour when the die was cast. All informed military experts knew that aid for Serbia could only be of the promissory, on-order kind, and all knew that the aid could not be delivered if it were actually in hand instead of "on order."

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out the realities of the situation as I see them. Others may view the picture through ruby lenses, but I can see only bloody red as step by step this Nation enters into the conflict. And for what? To save the world for democracy? To defend America? No; to save the tottering remnants of the British Empire. To protect Britain's monopoly of the world's trade routes and her strangle hold upon the undeveloped continent of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we have already appropriated more than $40,000,000,000 for national defense and in aid to Britain; but should we take the fatal step that some are willing to tread so lightly, this next war will cost our Nation, not 350,000 casualties and forty billion in treasure but possibly as many as 5,000,000 casualties and the entire wealth of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, as one who stands ready to make any sacrifice for America, I am unwilling to pay this price to save the British Empire. I am confident that a vast majority of the American people have this same feeling; but, notwithstanding this fact, the administration is taking us, step by step, into the bloody conflict.

Much was said on this floor yesterday about the use of convoys. We are reminded over and over that the President is opposed to the use of convoys. Yes; he is so much opposed that his spokesmen in this House killed an amendment to the lend-lease bill that would have prevented the use of convoys, and again this week the administration proved its opposition to the use of convoys by killing the Tobey bill, which would have prevented such use of our ships.

Mr. Speaker, "by their works ye shall know them." And, judging by their works, it is easy for me to believe the story current that convoys are now being used.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, would the majority leader inform the House as to the tentative program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is Consent Calendar day. Wednesday, of course, as I have previously announced, is Calendar Wednesday. Outside of that, I am unable to advise my friend or the House further at this time.

Mr. MICHENER. Which committee has the call on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The first on the list are the Committees on Elections. They have nothing. Then the Ways and Means Committee. I know of nothing from that committee. Then the Appropriations Committee, and then the Judiciary Committee. I would assume, without committing myself, that there are a few bills from the Committee on the Judiciary. Of course, one bill was recommitted to that committee today. A rule has been asked for one bill. I do not know what bills these committees have, but I think it is good policy to call the calendar, and to do it as frequently as conditions will permit.

Mr. MICHENER. I quite agree with the gentleman.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940;

H. R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939;

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940;

H. R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939;

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.),

pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 3, a bill relating to the detention of certain aliens, on Monday, April 21, 1941, at 10 a. m. in room 346, House Office Building, before subcommittee No. 2.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 3188, a bill relating to Members of Congress and certain other persons receiving compensation for addresses and speeches, on Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. in room 346, House Office Building, before subcommittee No. 1.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 108, 1057, and 2763.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, April 23, 1941, for the consideration of private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

454. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of contracts entered into for buildings, facilities, etc., in accordance with the provisions of section 8 (b) of Public Act No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended by section 9 of Public Act No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, for the quarter ended March 31, 1941; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

455. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a revised report of negotiated contracts entered into by the Navy Department during the quarter ended September 30, 1940, in accordance with provisions of section 2 (a) of Public Act No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

456. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 1091. A bill to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 1094. A bill to grant pension for disability or death resulting from service in the United States Coast Guard before July 2, 1930, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 1095. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2475. A bill to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 3388. A bill to permit the Smithsonian Gallery of Art Commission to purchase a model of the winning design for the proposed Smithsonian Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 35. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; without amendment (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 802. A bill for the relief of Michal Kaliszkiewicz; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4416. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4417. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 4418. A bill to amend the selective training and service act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4419. A bill to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4420. A bill to amend the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 4421 (by request). A bill to provide for payment of proceeds of certain processing taxes to Guam and American Samoa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4422. A bill to promote the national defense by providing for the performance of the necessary construction and reconstruction work to provide for a high-speed Midwestern North–South highway to be known as the Lakes to Gulf Highway; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4423. A bill to authorize uniform recognition of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in the computation of retirement and longevity pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 4424. A bill authorizing and adopting the improvement of the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, from Manasquan Inlet to Cape May Harbor, including the construction of a canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay via the New England Creek Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 31, with reference to educational facilities; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30, with reference to House bill 2490, concerning a survey for a ship canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4425. A bill to authorize the President to bestow the Navy Cross upon Edward Abrams, former sergeant, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4426. A bill for the relief of J. G. Power and L. D. Power; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4427. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 4428. A bill to authorize the payment of adjusted-compensation benefits to the estate of Lula Brimm Horne; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 4429. A bill for the relief of J. D. McGee; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clinton Ward and Ester Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4431. A bill for the relief of George Cravey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois:

H. R. 4432. A bill for the relief of Herbert H. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4433. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Jacob Graev; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Michael McGinn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 4436. A bill for the relief of Bertha M. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Albert DeMatteis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4438. A bill for the relief of the Burns Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

757. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Bronx Post, No. 95, Veterans of Foreign Wars, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to free postage franking privilege to the armed forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

758. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Hudson County Chiropractic Society, Union City, N. J., requesting that chiropractors be given due recognition as members of the Army Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

759. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of members of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Branch 450, Green Bay, Wis., urging favorable action on the so-called longevity bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

760. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of Bronx Post, No. 95, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, requesting franking privileges to men in service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

761. Also, resolutions of the Board of Managers of the New York Produce Exchange, opposing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

762. Also, resolution of the New York State Economic Council, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

763. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Bankers Grange, No. 1330, Hillsdale County, Mich., opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

764. Also, resolution of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, Local 68, Saginaw, Mich., favoring the program to correct housing shortage among defense workers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

765. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of Council No. 8 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

766. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

767. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a new Federal labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

768. Also, petition of the Lumbermen's Association of Texas, at its fifty-fifth annual meeting held in Galveston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

769. Also, petition of the Fall Cities Carpenters District Council of the United Brotherhood Carpenters and Joiners of America, Louisville, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to any stoppage of work in the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

770. Also, petition of the California State Council of Carpenters, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for these heartening words: "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." Let Thy hand rest upon us, realizing the conscious, all-powerful spirit of God. Thou who art the creator of heaven and earth, help us to patiently trust, though we cannot comprehend the deep gloom and shadow of this present day. Deceit, cruelty, treachery, slavery, and betrayal are making their ordered steps across the heart of this suffering world. Oh, Thy righteous arm make bare and cast out the prince of darkness. We beseech Thee to hear the prayer of His Holiness of the historic church: "The world has no need of pride and violence, but of charity and love, along with humility which is not cowardice, but of truth and self-knowledge. These virtues do not lessen valor, nor diminish the love of country, nor prevent the citizens who in a truly just war struggle for the defense and honor and the well-being of their country." Oh, grant that the souls of the wicked, whose hands are thick with their brothers' blood, may cry out for forgiveness and mercy. We pray that knowledge and brotherhood may go forth with justice, and may nations no longer look upon one another like beasts ready for the spring. O Spirit of the Most High, breathe upon this stricken world. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 18, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the Commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2082) entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. DAVIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3252) entitled "An act to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. VANDENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of State.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.
8. Federal Works Agency, Public Works Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests to submit: First, to extend my remarks on the St. Lawrence seaway, and include therein an article by J. Adam Bede.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the old-age-pension problem and to include therein an editorial from Range Facts, a weekly newspaper of Virginia, Minn., on April 17, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. And also, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the so-called decentralization of industry program and to include therein a communication from Mr. Robert W. Wharton, Director of Information of the Office of Emergency Management, together with a bulletin issued by that Office.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article entitled "Thrift and War."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may be permitted to sit the remainder of the week during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SAN JACINTO

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, April 21 is a significant date in the history of Texas, and, for that matter, in the history of America. One hundred and five years ago today was fought one of the decisive battles of world history.

It is well that we should pause on these days of remembering and look backward. Beware of that individual in whose heart there live no images of heroism. Beware of that nation which does not on occasion stand before some altar of national sacrifice. There must be some shrine before which both individuals and nations, on occasion, stand with uncovered heads, not in blind worship of a magnificent spectacle or achievement, not alone with reverence, but with resolution to uphold the ideals of which the object revered is the embodiment. Today, when democratic institutions seem to tremble under the impact of barbaric assault, we like to consider the origins and contemplate the foundations of our great Republic.

One hundred and five years ago today was fought the Battle of San Jacinto, a battle which might well serve as an object lesson for both men and nations, especially in these times of peril. This battle was decisive not alone because it secured for the American Republic a little over one-third of her present domain. The battle was more decisive because it represented a complete triumph of democratic deals over barbaric dictatorship, of honor over dishonor, of social order over social chaos. At San Jacinto was portrayed in bold relief, in rugged simplicity, principles of conduct which should be fundamental in the lives of men and of nations who would be great. Travis and his confederates in the Alamo had been put to the sword. Fannin's men had been massacred at Goliad.

The great Sam Houston, confidant and friend of Andrew Jackson, rallied a small army of brave and determined pioneers, and prepared for a last battle. In the late afternoon of April 21 the small Texas army charged the imperial forces of Mexico under Generals Santa Anna and Cos. In 20 minutes of actual fighting the Texans had 8 men killed and 17 wounded, while the Mexicans in the course of the battle lost 632 men killed, 208 wounded, and over 700 captured.

Without dwelling further upon the details of this battle, what useful lessons can we draw from it today? First, there was resolute courage; while opposed by an army more than twice its size, and with vastly better equipment, the Texans were eager for battle. There was determination; Deaf Smith was sent to destroy Vince's Bridge, and thus remove all possibilities of retreat. There was honor; a cool resolve to keep faith at any cost with those who earlier had laid their lives upon the altar of Texas liberty. There was democracy; there was no aristocracy in the army of San Jacinto. Houston, Hockley, Burleson, and Lamar led their small army into battle, the dauntless Houston himself being severely wounded in the attack. Finally there was integrity in dealing with others which no heat of passion, no inflammatory appeals, no degree of provocation could upset. The world's history contains no profounder example of that spirit than when Santa Anna, the self-styled Napoleon of the West, stood before the wounded Sam Houston. A man who had violated every canon of civilized warfare, who had committed unspeakable outrages upon an honorable foe, when standing helpless before those he had persecuted, was judged not in a spirit of revenge, not in accordance with his own code, but by a code of integrity that could not stoop to do an unworthy thing.

Sam Houston in his hour of triumph did not become intoxicated with success and power. He did not succumb to the temptation for plunder and revenge. Most conquerors in their hour of victory over a ruthless foe sow the seeds of future conflict. Out of war these Texans sought to lay the foundations of peace. In war and in peace the men of San Jacinto gave unsurpassed luster to the Lone Star, which we hope will shine forever in the bright constellation of the 48 States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject Old King Coal Taking Another Beating.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including a short article on the Japan-Russia Pact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address I made last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, at Nashville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief editorial appearing in the Richmond Item, of Richmond, Ind., on April 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts is not going to solve the unemployment problem so long as we get activities such as those disclosed in the press this morning,

which states that on yesterday, Sunday, the President made an agreement with the Canadian Prime Minister to send unfinished materials from this country to Canada and have the Canadian workmen complete the job up there. That is not the way to end unemployment "south of the border." That is not a method which should meet with the approval of the American factory worker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by ex-Gov. Paul McNutt, of Indiana, delivered at the Jefferson banquet at the National Democratic Club, New York City, on Saturday night, and I also ask permission to include in my remarks an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore made today I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

RUSSIAN ENGINEERING MISSION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago I wrote a letter to Secretary of State Cordell Hull calling his attention directly to the presence of a Russian engineering mission in the United States. I told Mr. Hull, on the unimpeachable authority of industrial officials, that someone at Washington had ordered American plant officials to throw open their doors to these representatives of the Soviet Union. Up to the present time neither Mr. Hull nor any member of the State Department has offered a reply to or a comment upon this information.

I regard this as no trivial routine matter. In my judgment, this is an issue of the utmost gravity. I believe that the American people do not favor this kind of diplomatic courtesy. What possible justification can there be for revealing the world's best equipment to the Soviet Union? Are we allied with Russia?

Only yesterday the press associations quoted the official newspaper of the Soviet Union in a report which must make us all sit up and take notice. Russia has just concluded a pact of mutual friendship with Japan. Russia is laughing at the efforts of Uncle Sam and Great Britain to swing the Soviet into hostility toward Germany. Pravda is thumbing its nose at America. And our Government is showing Pravda's masters our newest equipment.

Would our State Department welcome a Japanese engineering mission to our shores? What is the meaning of deportation proceedings against a man who is charged with the crime of communism, or the jailing of a Communist leader, when we are simultaneously revealing the last word in our industrial armament to the masters of these very men?

I believe the American people are entitled to an explanation of these incredible contradictions.

I now call upon the State Department publicly to explain to the American people precisely what these Russian engineers are doing in our country and why American plant managers are being ordered to show them what we are doing. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two places and include therein certain short excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION AND MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to notify the House that I am today filing a report of the Naval Affairs Committee on the bill (H. R. 4139) to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes, with the amended bill, which will be available at the document room tomorrow morning. I am also asking that a rule be granted, and this request will be heard by the Rules Committee on Wednesday.

NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMISSION ON INVENTIONS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 3153) to create a National Defense Commission on Inventions, and for other purposes, which has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, be rereferred to the Committee on Patents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION AND MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until Friday morning to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 4139, just referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution, and to also extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call attention to a meeting tonight at 7:30 in the caucus room of the old House Office Building on the subject of agriculture. I have been assured a few minutes ago that one of the vice presidents of the Commodity Credit Corporation will be there and also a member of the Economics Department of the Secretary of Agriculture; so I hope you will all be there for the discussion that will take place at that time.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], chairman of the Flood Control Committee, asking me to announce to the House that the Committee on Flood Control will begin hearings on Monday, April 21, today, at 10 o'clock a. m., these hearings to continue daily. It is hoped to conclude them on Wednesday, May 14, 1941. General Schley, Chief of Engineers, will appear on Monday, April 21, to make the first statement.

I make this brief announcement for the benefit of the Members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PROHIBITION OF PROSTITUTION IN AREAS ADJACENT TO MILITARY AND/OR NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit

prostitution within such reasonable distances of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy. This is a bill reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what the bill is?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, during the World War there was legislation in existence which authorized the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to establish zones or areas around Army posts and cantonments within which they might take steps to prohibit evil practices and prostitution. This statute has expired; in fact, it went out of effect at a fixed date following the World War.

Mr. MICHENER. So this would make prostitution in those regions illegal?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is correct. It would authorize the Army authorities to solicit the assistance of local and State police authorities and State officials in an effort to enforce the regulations they may make in pursuance to this law, but the Army officials are prohibited without the military area or in any adjacent area from making seizures or arrests or searches of civilians.

This is a bill that was given very careful consideration by the House Committee on Military Affairs, and the bill was reported with three or four amendments that have been suggested by the Army and Navy authorities. It is favored by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff, and by every church group, every State health authority, and every State health board that I know anything about. There were 15 or 20 witnesses examined by the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That until May 15, 1945, it shall be unlawful, within such reasonable distance of any military or naval camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy, and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to engage in prostitution or to aid or abet prostitution or to procure or solicit for the purposes of prostitution, or to keep or set up a house of ill fame, brothel, or bawdy house, or to receive any person for purposes of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution into any vehicle, conveyance, place, structure, or building, or to permit any person to remain for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution in any vehicle, conveyance, place, structure, or building; and any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the provisions of this chapter shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War or the Articles for the Government of the Navy, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, and any person subject to military or naval law violating this chapter shall be punished as provided by the Articles of War or the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the Secretaries of War and of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to take such steps as they deem necessary to suppress and prevent the violation thereof, and to accept the cooperation of the authorities of States and their counties, districts, and other political subdivisions in carrying out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, after "building", insert "or to lease, or rent, or contract to lease or rent any vehicle, conveyance, place, structure, or building, or part thereof, knowing or with good reason to know that it is intended to be used for any of the purposes herein prohibited."

Line 13, strike out "chapter" and insert "act."

Line 19, strike out "chapter" and insert "act."

Line 22, after "Navy", insert " and the Federal Security Administrator."

Line 22, after "are", insert "each."

On page 3, line 2, after "act", insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on the personnel of the War or Navy Department or the Federal Security Agency any authority to make criminal investigations, searches, seizures, or arrests of civilians charged with violations of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. P. A. EMPLOYMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I notice in a news article from Connecticut that Arthur P. Johnson, Director of Public Relations and Assistance, says that we are having a labor raid that is threatening W. P. A. It seems to me it is a pretty bad situation when the men in authority in W. P. A. are so entrenched that they do not want the persons who are working on W. P. A. to get a job in industry. It ought to be that every W. P. A. official in this country is mighty glad that we can take these men off the Government pay roll and put them in jobs in private industry. This ought to be the object of every Member of Congress, and it ought to be the object of the administration to try to do away with W. P. A. and get the workers off the Government pay roll and into private industry at the very earliest possible moment. Even though this private employment is concerned with national defense, it ought to be a good sign, and such employment in industry will reduce Government expense. I hope we do away with W. P. A. and all officials connected with it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short poem written by a constituent of mine in memory of Hon. Morris Sheppard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

DESIGNATION OF THE PERSON WHO SHALL ACT AS PRESIDENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2532) designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1618, to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. KEAN objected.

PULPWOOD INVESTIGATION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 15, to investigate the apparent monopolistic purchasing of pulpwood by pulp and paper mills under a contract-purchase system from farmers and other owners, price fixing of paper, and other pulp products under trade practice rules and regulations including cost of distribution.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COTTONSEED AND COTTONSEED PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 571, to establish and promote the use of standard methods of grading cottonseed, to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on prices and grades of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PLUMAS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1595, to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will reserve that for a moment, I may say that this bill was passed over last week. It only involves a small tract of 240 acres.

Mr. RICH. The trouble is we are adding to these national forests all the time. Whenever the Consent Calendar is called, somebody comes in and wants to increase the size of some of these parks. You have the parks now so big that you cannot support them properly, and yet we are adding 250 acres here and 1,000 acres there. I think it is time to hold these things down. The Government has no money and is almost bankrupt, and yet we are increasing all these costs. I think everything of this kind ought to be suspended during the national emergency, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISCHARGE OR RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE REGULAR ARMY AND OF THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2277, to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2278, to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended by the act of June 8, 1926, so as to decrease the restriction on the number of enlisted men of the Regular Army who may be detailed as students at educational institutions and other places.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it has been the policy to object to all bills which carried with them an authorization of more than $1,000,000. This, however, was purely arbitrary; and inasmuch as we will have certain emergency bills on the calendar, perhaps it is not fair to the committees to put any arbitrary figure on bills of a defense nature. This bill, according to the report, would authorize about $2,550,000. The bill, so far as I am concerned, seems to be meritorious, and I am going to waive any objection on my part to the bill because of the amount involved, but I think we should understand that this is an exception to the general rule and that we are not establishing a precedent by which bills carrying such amounts of money will henceforth be approved on this calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill did not have the unanimous approval of the Committee on Military Affairs, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO SPECIAL ASSISTANTS, ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2609) to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of the United States against Doheny Executors.

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. SPRINGER objected.

TRANSFER OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF OFFENSE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1831) to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Hereafter all persons convicted of an offense against the United States shall be committed, for such terms of imprisonment as the court may direct, to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States or his authorized representative, who shall designate the places of confinement where the sentences of all such persons shall be served: *Provided*, That any sentence of imprisonment for an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term of 1 year or less shall not be served in a penitentiary except with the defendant's consent. The Attorney General may designate any available, suitable, and appropriate institutions, whether maintained by the Federal Government or otherwise, or whether within or without the judicial district in which the person was convicted. The Attorney General is also authorized to order the transfer of any person held under authority of any United States statute from one institution to another if in his judgment it shall be for the well-being of the prisoner or relieve overcrowded or unhealthful conditions in the institution where such prisoner is confined or for other reasons."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3191) to amend the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING JOINT SERVICE PAY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2279) to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VALIDATING CERTAIN CONVEYANCES HERETOFORE MADE BY CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3193) validating certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way, in the city of Tracy, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in the town of Elk Grove, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by the Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the conveyances hereinafter particularly described and heretofore executed by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain lands or interests therein, in the city of Tracy, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in the town of Elk Grove, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, and forming a part of the right-of-way of said Central Pacific Railway Co., granted by the Government of the United States of America by an act of Congress approved July 1, 1862, entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes" (12 Stat. L. 489), and by said act as amended by act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes,' approved July 1, 1862" (13 Stat. L. 356), are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed with the same force and effect as if the land involved therein had been held at the time of such conveyances by the corporations making the same under absolute fee-simple title.

The conveyances, recorded in the office of county recorder of San Joaquin County, Calif., in book of official records, which are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed, are as follows:

1. February 13, 1940: Margaret Gieseke; volume 669, page 473.

2. February 13, 1940: John B. Coughlan; volume 676, page 277.

3. February 13, 1940: Frank Ward; volume 669, page 474.

4. February 13, 1940: Henry Melburg and Erna Melburg; volume 669, page 476.

5. February 13, 1940: Frank Penny; volume 676, page 275.

The conveyance, recorded in the office of the county recorder of Sacramento County, Calif., which is hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed, is as follows:

March 17, 1931: Nellie M. Kearns; volume 340, page 465: *Provided*, That such legalization, validation, and confirmation shall not in any instance diminish said right-of-way to a

width less than 50 feet on either side of the center of the main track or tracks of said Central Pacific Railway Co. as now established and maintained: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed to legalize, validate, or confirm any rights, titles, or interests based upon or arising out of adverse possession, prescription, or abandonment, and not confirmed by conveyance heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co. and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co.: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, or other minerals in the land, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2685) to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] to explain the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, to convey or lease to the States or political subdivisions thereof certain projects formerly under the Resettlement Administration that have been developed with the idea in view of ultimately turning them over to the people that they will best serve, and to the political division of the State that can best administer them. This will benefit the Government as well as the State.

Mr. RICH. Is it real estate that has been improved by the Federal Government and that the States are now trying to get hold of?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Some of it may be improved, but most of it is in an unimproved condition and cannot be handled economically.

Mr. RICH. Will that necessarily take the expenses off the Federal Government and place them on the States?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. The purpose of this is to save money for the Federal Government and impose obligations on the States where the States are involved in handling the area involved. This bill passed the House last year and also passed the Senate. The President vetoed it upon the ground that it did not sufficiently protect the Federal Government. The bill came back to the Public Lands Committee, and we made the corrections we thought were necessary to protect the Federal Government, and it now appears that there are no objections from any of the bureaus, and we see no reason why any State should object.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Federal Government will offer these recreational sites to the States?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It will be up to the States whether or not they wish to accept them?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. For the information of the gentlemen, may I state that the necessary moneys for the operation of the recreation areas for the fiscal year of 1942 were included in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill passed by this House some time ago.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. To keep them open this year?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes; to cover the cost of maintenance for the fiscal year of 1942.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman whether the amendment that I submitted will be satisfactory?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. I have no objection to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Is this the bill about which I talked to the gentleman some days ago, together with some people from Michigan?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think it covers the proposition that the gentleman is talking about. As I recall, it does.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, the report of the gentleman's committee on this bill does not disclose the amount of money that was expended by the Federal Government in improving these lands. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us approximately what has been spent?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The amount of money that was involved in improving them?

Mr. COLE of New York. In acquiring and improving these recreation sites. In other words, how much money are we turning over to the various States?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I dot not have the figures. However, we are only turning over to the States certain projects that the Government is willing for the States to have, in order to save the Government money, and projects that the State is willing is assume responsibility of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over w. ıout prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGING THE TIME OF APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 145, to change the time of the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLFUL INJURY OR DESTRUCTION OF WAR MATERIAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3752, to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes", approved April 20, 1918, as amended November 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved April 20, 1918, entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes" (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101–103), as amended by the act approved November 30, 1940 (54 Stat. 1220; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101–106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That the words 'national-defense material', as used herein, shall include arms, armament, ammunition, livestock, stores of clothing, food, foodstuffs, fuel, supplies, munitions, and all other articles of whatever description and any part or ingredient thereof, intended for the use of the United States in connection with the national defense or for use in or in connection with the producing, manufacturing, repairing, storing, mining, extracting, distributing, loading, unloading, or transporting of any of the materials or other articles hereinbefore mentioned or any part or ingredient thereof."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLICLY OWNED AND OPERATED TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS OHIO RIVER AT CANNELTON, IND.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1824, to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same

shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "improve", insert the word "the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Chair advise the House what happened to Calendar No. 53?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the bill has been disposed of in some fashion.

The Clerk will call the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS CUMBERLAND RIVER BELOW CLEES FERRY, TENN.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2684, granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "a" insert "free highway."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. LOUIS RIVER NEAR DULUTH, MINN.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2766, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the St. Louis River, at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., authorized to be constructed by the city of Duluth by an act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, is hereby extended 1 year from August 7, 1941, and 3 years from August 7, 1941, respectively.

SEC. 2. The said act approved August 7, 1939, is further amended as follows:

(a) The second sentence of section 3 of said act is amended to read: "All such bonds shall be in a form not inconsistent with this act and shall mature at such time or times as the city may determine, not exceeding 20 years from August 7, 1941."

(b) The third sentence of section 3 of said act is amended to read: "The city, when it deems it to be in the best interests of the city, may issue refunding bonds to repurchase and redeem any outstanding bonds before the maturity thereof: *Provided*, That the refunding bonds shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 30 years from August 7, 1941, as the city may determine."

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "bridge", strike out "or bridges."

Page 1, line 8, after "1939", insert "and heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved April 30, 1940."

Page 1, line 8, after "hereby", insert "further."

Page 2, line 3, after "1939", insert "as heretofore amended by an act of Congress approved April 30, 1940."

Page 2, line 5, after "act", insert "as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes."

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER NEAR DUBUQUE, IOWA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2811, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Dubuque, Iowa, and East Dubuque, Ill., under authority of the act approved July 18, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER NEAR MILLERSBURG, PA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2828, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, HARRISBURG, PA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2829, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa., authorized to be built by the Dauphin County (Pa.) Authority by an act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from May 1, 1941.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the figure "1939" insert "and heretofore extended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1940."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, MIDDLETOWN, PA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2830, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa., authorized to be built by the General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, by an act of Congress approved April 30, 1940, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from May 1, 1941.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MAHONING RIVER, LOWELLVILLE, OHIO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3682, granting the consent of Congress to the Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River in the village of Lowellville, Mahoning County, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River in the village of Lowellville, Mahoning County, Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the word "bridge", insert "and approaches thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, KEOKUK, IOWA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4055, authorizing the city of Keokuk, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Keokuk, Iowa, or to purchase the existing bridge at that locality.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FORT MARION NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3937, to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SANTA YSABEL INDIAN RESERVATION, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3514, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain tribal land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to effect an exchange of approximately 1.8 acres of tribal Indian land of the Santa Ysabel Reservation, Calif., for a tract of privately owned land of approximately 4.3 acres of equal value: *Provided*, That such exchange shall be effected only when the Indians enrolled on said reservation have expressed their consent thereto, either in general council or through action of their duly recognized tribal governing body.

SEC. 2. Title to the land received in the exchange shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Santa Ysabel Tribe of Indians; said land shall not be allotted to individual Indians, and it shall remain nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress. Title to the Indian land conveyed in the exchange shall be by patent in fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACKSON BARNETT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3186, to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell and convey any or all of the property hereinafter described, upon such terms and conditions as he shall prescribe, if after investigation he finds that such action would be to the advantage of the heirs of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian enrollee No. 4524: Lot 2 of tract No. 8553, as shown on map recorded in book 105, pages 22 and 23 of maps, and the southerly 40 feet of lot 20 and all of lot 21 of tract No. 3446, as shown on map recorded in book 37, page 84 of maps, in the office of the county recorder of Los Angeles County, Calif., together with all improvements thereon, and all furniture, fixtures, and personal property, belonging to the estate of Jackson Barnett, located in or on said real property.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WIND RIVER INDIAN LANDS, WYOMING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2672, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement fixing boundary lines on Wind River Indian lands, Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized in his discretion to enter into an agreement or agreements permanently fixing the boundaries of allotted, tribal, and ceded Indian lands along the Big Wind River in sections 21, 22, 27, and 28, township 3 north, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, in Wyoming.

SEC. 2. No agreement or agreements authorized by section 1 of this act shall be entered into by the Secretary of the Interior until all of the Indian owners, tribal or individual, shall have given their consent in writing to the permanent location of the boundaries so far as they affect their respective lands. The consent of the tribe as to tribal and ceded lands may be given by the council or other authorized spokesman for the Indians. The consent on behalf of minors, Indians non compos mentis, and Indians who cannot be located after reasonable search may be executed by the superintendent or other officer in charge of the Wind River Indian Agency.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASIS FOR COMPUTING OVERTIME PAY OF LABORERS IN RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2985, to prescribe the time basis for computing pay for overtime work performed by laborers in the Railway Mail Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7, as amended, of the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"After June 30, 1941, laborers in the Railway Mail Service shall be required to work not more than 8 hours a day: *Provided*, That the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours, and the schedules of duty of such employees shall be regulated accordingly: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the Service require, and it is not practicable to employ substitutes, such employees can be required to work in excess of 8 hours per day, and for such overtime service they shall be paid on the basis of the annual pay received by such employees: *And provided further*, That in computing the compensation for such overtime the annual salary or compensation for such employees shall be divided by 305, the number of working days in the year less all Sundays and legal holidays; the quotient thus obtained will be the daily compensation, which divided by 8 will give the hourly compensation for such overtime service."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 16, add the following section:

"SEC. 2. The fifth paragraph of such section 7, as amended, of such act of February 28, 1925, is amended to read as follows:

" 'Substitute laborers in the Railway Mail Service shall be paid for services actually performed at the rate of 55 cents per hour, and when appointed to the position of regular laborer the substitute service performed shall be included in eligibility for promotion to grade 2 on the basis of 305 days of 8 hours constituting a year's service.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL LABOR ON MINERAL CLAIMS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1591, relative to annual labor on mineral claims in the Territory of Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the Territory of Alaska a survey for patent purposes made by a United States mineral surveyor under

order of the United States cadastral engineer, may be credited upon annual labor required by law to be performed upon or for the benefit of the claim or claims for the year in which such survey is made, but in no case shall the credit for the cost of such survey and its attendant expense exceed the amount of the annual labor required for 1 year as to the claim or claims so surveyed: *Provided*, That the cost of such survey shall not be credited in determining the value of the labor or improvements required under section 2325, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 30, ch. 2, sec. 29).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERHANGING WALKS ON HIGHWAY BRIDGE, ROUTE 36, HIGHLANDS, N. J.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 478, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the construction and maintenance of overhanging walks on the highway bridge, Route No. 36, at Highlands, N. J., for public use.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to grant permission to the State of New Jersey to maintain public walks on the Shrewsbury River highway bridge, Route No. 36, to overhang over portions of parcels 86A and 86B, Borough of Highlands, Monmouth County, State of New Jersey, being property of the United States used for a servicing base of the Coast Guard.

The property affected by such permission shall be described by metes and bounds in the permit, which shall also contain an express condition that if the State of New Jersey shall at any time cease to use or maintain the public walks on the highway bridge that overhang the described property in question, the permit shall be considered null and void, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to include in such permit such other conditions as he may deem necessary in order to assure that the maintenance of the walks will not interfere with the use of the said property by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF MARITIME LABOR BOARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4107, to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Virginia with regard to the nature and purpose of this bill? I understand the purpose of it is to continue for 2 years more the life of the Maritime Labor Board which was created by Congress some 3 years ago. May I inquire of the gentleman from Virginia as to the success of this Board?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the committee, after considering the matter very carefully and after hearing witnesses, was of the opinion that the situation existing at the time the Maritime Labor Board was created has been improved and is a great deal better today than at that time. I do not claim that all of this work was done by the Maritime Labor Board, as a matter of fact I do not think so, but it has been one of the contributing factors. They have made a study of the conditions in the maritime industry. They have made one of the most comprehensive reports that has ever been filed for some time and a general review of those conditions. It is the only agency in the Government that today is charged by law with having copies of all contracts that are entered into regarding labor in the maritime industry.

Without undertaking to say that it should be continued as a permanent institution, I feel it is one of the factors that have contributed to better conditions in the industry and that it would be well to continue it for 2 years.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it correct to say that the function of this Board is to act as a governmental agency to which both the shipowner and the ship worker might go to settle their labor disputes?

Mr. BLAND. By voluntary action only. Nothing compulsory.

Mr. COLE of New York. The Board has the right to bring a dispute before it of its own initiative, does it not?

Mr. BLAND. It has the right to call in the parties and itself undertake to find out what the factors are, but it has no right to compel anyone to come before it.

Mr. COLE of New York. At the time this Board was created by Congress, is it correct to say there was very strenuous opposition to it by the maritime labor unions?

Mr. BLAND. My recollection is that at that time they were very much opposed to it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is there any opposition to it today by the maritime labor unions?

Mr. BLAND. That I am unable to say. Generally speaking, I think they have been in favor of it. Some of the American Federation of Labor are in favor of continuing it as an agency, and some opposed.

Mr. COLE of New York. At least the gentleman's committee did not hear any serious voice of protest against continuing the operations of the Maritime Labor Board for another 2 years, did it?

Mr. BLAND. There may have been some who said they did not think the Board had done any good. I do not recall now. I know in private conversation with me there were some shipowners who felt that way, perhaps, but I expect that of any organization that tries to settle labor disputes.

Mr. COLE of New York. My purpose in asking these questions is to bring out the fact that the Government has already established a Labor Mediation Board in one phase of industry, the shipbuilding industry, and we are soon to consider a measure to create a general National Defense Mediation Board covering all phases of the defense industry. When originally adopted, the Maritime Labor Board was bitterly opposed by the maritime union, but with 3 years of operation they have been impressed with its success. We find now no substantial protest against it. I am confident that objections now raised to the Vinson Mediation Board will have no more foundation than those voiced 3 years ago when the Maritime Labor Board was created. It simply provides for a governmental agency to which the parties to a labor dispute might go in an effort to mediate their differences but requires the very reasonable restriction that this be done before a strike is called.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What does it cost a year to operate this Board?

Mr. BLAND. About $150,000. Every year the appropriation has been more than that, and every year since the organization was established it has turned back money into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has this Board increased or lessened its personnel?

Mr. BLAND. Necessarily since its creation it has increased, because it had none to start with, but within the last few years I do not think it has increased its personnel. At any rate, there is no tendency to increase it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wonder if the gentleman could advise us how many disputes it has settled in the last 2 years?

Mr. BLAND. That is impossible to say. They have participated in the settlement of various disputes. Other agencies, including the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, have participated. They have been a means of bringing the parties together, and the testimony was to the effect that they contributed very materially in preventing a threatened strike on the Pacific coast last year. Some of the shipowners say they did not do very much. Some of the labor people may say that they did it. But this Board has been a means of bringing together the parties and trying to effect a settlement, and it has contributed to the settlement of these difficulties. The fact is that today there is not a strike in the marine industry that I know of.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is the point I was seeking information on. This Maritime Board has tended to bring about peace in this industry; is that right?

Mr. BLAND. That is true. They have prepared a report with a number of recommendations that I doubt should go through, but at the same time it has contributed very materially to peace.

The report which the committee has filed clearly presents the reasons why we believe that the life of the Board should be extended for 2 years. These may be summarized as follows:

First. Labor conditions in the maritime industry have greatly improved since the enactment of title X and the creation of the Maritime Labor Board.

Second The record shows that the Maritime Labor Board has been effective in mediating labor disputes in the maritime industry.

Third. This is the only Government agency with which copies of all labor agreements are required to be filed, and these have been studied by the Board with a view to promoting stable labor relations in the maritime industry.

Fourth. The mediatory work of the Maritime Labor Board has embraced all principal seafaring and shore organizations.

Fifth. The continuation of title X will afford needed time for the careful consideration of the report and recommendations of the Maritime Labor Board submitted in compliance with title X of the Merchant Marine Act, and an opportunity to the Board to continue its study of the maritime industry, and on the basis of its added experience and knowledge be better enabled to submit further recommendations from time to time.

Sixth. In these times of national emergency it would be unwise to discontinue the special agency charged with the duty of promoting stable labor relations in the maritime industry.

Seventh. The Board considers peculiar problems of a specialized industry.

From its inception in July 1938 through 1940 the Maritime Labor Board has handled approximately 150 labor disputes in the maritime industry. Some of these disputes were of minor importance, others were very serious. Among the serious cases might be mentioned the case of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast, which was mediated by the Board in September 1939. The work of the Board in that case averted a strike which would have paralyzed shipping in all ports on the Pacific coast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1012 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by striking out "3 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADE-IN OF CERTAIN NAVY AND COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4105, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury, insofar as Coast Guard property is concerned, be, and they are hereby, authorized to exchange motor-propelled vehicles, airplanes, engines, and parts thereof, and obsolete, unsuitable, and unserviceable machines and tools, and parts thereof, in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character as those proposed to be exchanged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "Navy", insert "insofar as Navy property is concerned."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "are", insert the word "respectively."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "be, and they", and, in line 6, strike out the word "hereby."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the language of the bill is cumbersome. The amendment which I have offered would amend the bill to read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Navy, insofar as Navy property is concerned, and the Secretary of the Treasury, insofar as Coast Guard property is concerned, are respectively authorized.

Mr. BLAND. I accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ALIEN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4167, providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a new section is hereby inserted between sections 323 and 324 of the act entitled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code," approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149):

"SEC. 323a. A person who was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918, or at any time after April 20, 1898, and before July 5, 1902, who is not an alien ineligible to citizenship, who was not at any time during such period or thereafter separated from such forces under other than honorable conditions, who was not a conscientious objector who performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, and who was not at any time during such period or thereafter discharged from the military or naval forces on account of his alienage, shall, if he has resided in the United States continuously for at least 2 years pursuant to a legal admission for permanent residence in lieu of the usual 5 years' residence within the United States and 6 months' residence within the State of his residence at the time of filing the petition for naturalization, during all of which 2-year period he has behaved as a person of good moral character, be entitled at any time within 2 years after the date of approval of this act to naturalization upon compliance with all of the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that—

"(1) no declaration of intention shall be required;

"(2) no certificate of arrival shall be required unless such person's admission to the United States was subsequent to March 3, 1924; and

"(3) no residence within the jurisdiction of the court shall be required.

"Such petitioner shall verify his petition for naturalization by the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses who are citizens of the United States, or shall furnish the depositions of two such witnesses made in accordance with the requirements of subsection (e) of section 327 of the Nationality Act of 1940, to prove the required residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and favorable disposition toward the good order and happiness of the United States. On applications filed for any benefits under this act, the requirement of fees for naturalization documents is hereby waived."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UINTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, UTAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3987, to provide relief for, and to promote the interests of, the landowners on the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the action of the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the authority contained in the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), in the cancelation, deferment, and adjustment of irrigation charges against lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, is hereby confirmed as follows:

(a) The cancelation of $283,170.73 of unpaid construction assessment obligations and $28,875.37 of unpaid operation and maintenance assessment obligations carried on the books of the project: *Provided*, That such cancelations applying to lands, the owners of which are indebted to the United States for operation and maintenance costs, shall become effective only upon the payment of the indebtedness dealt with in subsection (c) of this section.

(b) The deferment until December 1, 1943, of the collection of $61,983.16 expended in drainage operations on said project; and

(c) The requirement for contracts with landowners covering $19,230.72 accrued operation and maintenance assessments, such contracts to provide for the payment of these assessments over a period of years.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to transfer water rights, with the consent of the interested parties, to other lands under said project and to make necessary contracts to effectuate such transfers.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make contracts transferring the operation and maintenance of any canal system or systems under the said project to an irrigation district, or districts, formed pursuant to State law.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,682.59 for the following purposes:

(a) To pay, for a period of not to exceed 5 years following the passage of this act (not to exceed $1,000 in any one year), 34 percent of the regular annual operation and maintenance assessments for class 4 lands in non-Indian ownership under the Redcap, Leland, and Henry Jim Canals, and 90 percent of such charges for class 5 lands in non-Indian ownership under said canals, $5,000: *Provided*, That no part of any money appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be expended unless and until the owners of such lands shall have paid in full their respective shares of such assessments and shall have entered into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior for the execution of soil rehabilitation programs on such lands; and

(b) To reimburse certain individuals, or their heirs, for payments made covering lands erroneously assessed for irrigation purposes, $689.59, which amount shall be payable from collections made from water users on this project and covered into the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act of 1934.

SEC. 5. In order to prevent the accumulation of delinquent project assessments or

other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Uintah Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 16, strike out "$689.59" and insert "$682.59."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4262, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that this bill as presently written may give an opportunity to some clever lawyer, by getting himself appointed a member of a draft board, to avoid the provisions of section 190 and practice before the Treasury Department or some other department of the Government within 2 years. Therefore I intend to offer an amendment which will clarify this situation, and I believe the amendment will be accepted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar Senate bill, S. 1254, will be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person appointed under authority of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or the Selective Service Regulations made in pursuance thereof as a member of a local board, a board of appeal, an advisory board for registrants, as a Government appeal agent, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections as provided in section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: On page 1, line 6, strike out "appointed" and insert "because of his appointment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4262) was laid on the table.

PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS IN CONNECTION WITH SUPPLY CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3998, to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of either the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] or the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, may I say that, as I understand, the bill provides that the Secretary of War may waive the provisions of the Miller Act with regard to the requirement of a performance bond.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the effect of the provision at the end of the bill reading as follows:

Provided, That, as to contracts of a nature which, at the date of the passage of this act, would have been subject to the provisions of the act of August 24, 1935, the Secretary of War may require performance and payment bonds as provided by said act.

The act of August 24, 1935, is the Miller Act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that when the bill was introduced it was mandatory and provided that the bond should be waived. The provision to which the gentleman refers was in the bill at that time. In the Senate a similar bill was amended so as to change it from a mandatory bill to a bill which empowered or authorized the Secretary of War in his discretion to waive the bond. That being the case, the provision to which the gentleman refers, in the event the bill were passed in its original form, would have provided that it would not apply to the particular cases to which the provision refers. The effect of the provision is that it leaves the law exactly as it is except that it gives to the Secretary of War the power and discretion to waive bonds in the event he sees fit to do so.

Mr. COLE of New York. This provision is not necessary?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is not necessary, I may say to the gentleman, and it probably could be excluded. I would request the gentleman not to move its exclusion for this reason: The bill has passed the Senate in this identical form. It is a bill in which the Secretary of War is very much interested. The Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, appeared before our committee and urged its passage. If it is passed by the House today in the form in which it now appears as amended, with the amended title and all, it will have passed both bodies in identical form. I intend to ask to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill, so that if my request is agreed to, the bill will be passed in both bodies in identical form and can go to the White House immediately.

Mr. COLE of New York. It seems to me rather silly for a great deliberative body to pass an act in which it gives discretion to a certain officer to do a certain thing, and then include in the same bill a provision stating that he does not have to do it if he does not want to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I would hardly characterize it as silly. I would say, perhaps it is unnecessary. However, our committee discussed that question and felt that it was so inconsequential in effect as hardly to justify us in recommending an amendment, which would cause the bill to be passed in the House in a form different from that in which it was passed in the Senate.

Mr. COLE of New York. With the gentleman's explanation of the history of the bill, the authority being directive, originally, rather than discretionary, I can understand how this may have happened, but that is not the real reason I rose to interrogate the gentleman with regard to the bill. I notice that the authority is given just to the Secretary of War. Of course, if it is advisable for the Secretary of War to have this authority, it is equally necessary for the Secretary of the Navy to have it. I wonder if the gentleman would have any objection to an amendment extending this authority to the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say to the gentleman that his statement is not quite accurate, for the reason that Army Regulation 5140, paragraph 10, provides that where a contract of construction is entered into by the Army and payment is made from time to time as the contract is performed, title to the property—whatever it may be—upon which the work is being done, passes to the War Department upon the making of the first payment. This property thus becomes public property because it becomes the property of the Government. That is the reason this amendment is necessary. The Attorney General and the Comptroller General have ruled that because of the fact that this property upon which the work is being done passes to the Government and title is vested in the Government, the property becomes public property so as to make the Miller Act apply to it. This amendment would exempt from the provisions of the Miller Act the contracts which the War Department desires to have exempted.

In the case of the Navy that is not the situation. In Navy contracts a lien is granted to the Navy upon the payment of the first installment, and title does not pass to the Navy under the law. Therefore the property upon which the Navy contract is being performed does not become public property or public works, and therefore the Miller law does not become applicable.

Now, I will say to the gentleman that there is some merit, perhaps, in the suggestion he makes, for this reason: Since the facts I have outlined have come to our attention—and in the hearings these facts were presented by the Under Secretary of War and by Mr. Cleveland, the expert adviser of the War Department—we have received a carbon copy of a letter which was sent by the Navy Depart-

ment to the Military Affairs Committee. This letter states in substance that they would like to have this bill we are now discussing made applicable to the Navy, because the Secretary of the Navy or the representative writing the letter states that he believes it may be helpful to the Navy. The reason for that appears to be that the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, in interpreting the act to which I have referred, providing for a lien in Navy contracts, has held that the act applies only to contracts for small supplies and not to contracts for ships, machinery, and that sort of thing.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman would have no objection to an amendment, including the Navy?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am frank to say to the gentleman that I am not yet convinced that it is necessary to so amend the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I say that this letter was brought up at a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee this morning, and the chairman of the committee, knowing that I was to serve in this capacity, directed to me to seek to have the bill amended so that the same authority would go to the Secretary of the Navy, and this was all at the request of the Navy Department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think the gentleman is doing his duty in the proper manner in bringing this to the attention of the House, and certainly I have no objection to any amendment to the bill which will further national defense in contracts applicable either to the Army or the Navy; but, as I say, I do not feel that I have the authority to sponsor the amendment to which the gentleman refers. This bill was the subject of discussion in the Committee on the Judiciary. It was the subject of extended hearings. The Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, appeared before the Committee and discussed this bill at great length. Mr. Cleveland appeared before the committee and General Schulz appeared before the committee. The bill had previously passed the Senate. All of these things had transpired and the Navy Department had taken no move to seek to amend the law in the manner the gentleman suggests. This being the case, it does seem to me, in the light of the facts I have outlined and in view of the fact there exists at least some question of doubt as to whether this bill needs to be amended in order to safeguard the Navy, and in view of the fact there have been no factual representations of cases in which the Navy is involved or in which this bill must be passed to protect its interests, I would question whether I could——

Mr. COLE of New York. What possible objection could there be to amending the bill to include the Navy, except for perhaps a day's delay in requiring a conference, and if it is in the interest of national defense should we not start that delay now rather than wait a week or two weeks?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. So far as I am personally concerned, I may say to the gentleman that if he desires to suggest an amendment I shall not oppose it. That is the position I take, but I do not feel authorized to present the amendment for the reason I have outlined—namely, that this bill has been the subject of extended hearings and the Judiciary Committee is presenting the bill in the form in which it has worked it out with amendments. If it is amended in the form which the gentleman suggests, the Committee on the Judiciary will not have heard any witnesses with respect to it and we will be relying entirely upon a communication which we have received second-hand, you might say, from Mr. Ralph A. Baird, Acting Secretary of the Navy, which communication was addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I may say also that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs took no action on it because, as he explains, he thought this bill would come to him from the Senate, whereas instead of coming to him it came to the Judiciary Committee. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, allowed the communication from Mr. Baird to lie on his desk thinking that he would later receive a suggested bill from the War Department.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is apparent that the reason why the Department did not appear before the Committee on the Judiciary is because of the confusion as to where this bill would be referred, and a substantiation of that is the understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs himself, who thought that the bill would go to his committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is entirely possible. I may say to the gentleman that in the letter of April 10 from Mr. Bard to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House the following statement is made:

> The extension of the discretion proposed to be vested in the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy undoubtedly would in many instances expedite the naval shipbuilding program, and accordingly, in order that the Secretary of the Navy may have the necessary authority to waive bonds whenever such action, in his judgment, is in the best interest of national defense, it is recommended that the bill S. 1059 be amended as indicated in the enclosed redraft.

The gentleman will note that no specific instances are cited, and the statement is made in a very general way that this extension of discretion would expedite the naval shipbuilding program. It occurs to those of us on the Committee on the Judiciary, who have become familiar with this situation as a result of the reference of the letter to the Military Affairs Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary, that it presents a situation in which the Navy could properly perhaps feel that a discretion is being given to the Secretary of War and that the Secretary of the Navy would like to have a similar discretion extended to him, without any factual showing of the necessity for that extension. As the gentleman well states, if there is a possibility or reasonable probability at least that the extension of this bill to the Navy is necessary to expedite the naval-defense program, certainly there is no member of the Committee on the Judiciary and, I am sure, no Member of the House who would oppose it; and if that is the situation, I shall not object to the amendment. I may say that I am the chairman of the subcommittee which brought out this bill, which held the hearings and reported the bill to the full Committee on the Judiciary, and that the full committee accepted our report. This letter from the Secretary of the Navy came to my attention only within the past 24 or 48 hours. Today I discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, with respect to the question as to whether, in view of the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, I should take the responsibility at this time of presenting this proposed amendment to the House. It was concluded between the chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], and myself that it would hardly be in order for me, handling this bill on the floor, to present this amendment in view of all the circumstances. However, I repeat that, if the gentleman desires to present that amendment, I shall not oppose it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection, and the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), shall not apply to any contract for the manufacturing, producing, furnishing, construction, alteration, repair, processing, or assembling of aircraft, munitions, matériel, or supplies of any kind or nature of the Army, regardless of the terms of such contract as to payment or title: *Provided*, That as to contracts of a nature which, at the date of the passage of this act, would have been subject to the provisions of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), the Secretary of War may require performance and payment bonds as provided by said act.

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "shall not apply to any contract" and insert "may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be waived with respect to contracts."
>
> Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "contract" and insert the word "contracts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:
>
> "That the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, be waived with respect to contracts for the manufacturing, producing, furnishing, construction, alteration, repair, processing, or assembling of vessels, aircraft, munitions, matériel, or supplies of any kind or nature for the Army, or the Navy, regardless of the terms of such contracts as to payment or title: *Provided*, That as to contracts of a nature which at the date of the passage of this act, would have been subject to the provisions of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may require performance and payment bonds as provided by said act."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in order that the gentleman from Nebraska may have the opportunity and that the House also have the opportunity of understanding what the amendment is, I may state that it simply inserts the words "Secretary of the Navy" after the Secretary of War, and the other necessary changes. Otherwise the bill is the same.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been quite thoroughly discussed in the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and myself under his reservation of objection. However, it occurs to me that it might be well to make the record on this situation, notwithstanding the fact that, as I have already said, I shall not oppose the amendment.

The Miller Act, which we all know is an act requiring bonds for the protection of material men and laborers on public contracts, calls for bonds on contracts for public works. It was the intention of Congress, I think we will all agree, when that bill was enacted that "public works" should mean public buildings, bridges, and so forth; but a situation developed which apparently required the enactment of this law to protect the War Department. The situation was this: The Attorney General and the Comptroller General have ruled that where installment payments are made on War Department contracts the title passes to the Government on the making of the first installment. In view of the fact that the property becomes the property of the Government—that is, the subject matter of the contract becomes the property of the government—the subject matter of the contract is caused to be "public works," so as to cause the Miller Act to apply. That means the Miller Act applies not only to public buildings, bridges, and the like, but to all types of contracts for personal property, on which payments are made periodically, because of the fact that the title passes to the Government on the making of the first installment payment. It is necessary to amend the law as proposed in the measure under consideration in order to authorize the Secretary of War to waive Miller Act bonds in cases where the requirement of such bonds was slowing up national-defense contracts of the War Department.

In the case of the Navy, the law of 1911 (37 Stat. 32, ch. 42, act of Aug. 22, 1911) provides:

> The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to make partial payments from time to time during the progress of the work under existing contracts and all contracts hereafter made under the Navy Department for public purposes, but not in excess of the value of the work already done; and the contracts hereafter made shall provide a lien in favor of the Government, which lien is hereby made paramount to all other liens, upon the articles or thing contracted for on account of all payments so made: *Provided*, That partial payments shall not be made under such contracts except where stipulated for, and then only in accordance with contract provisions.

Lieutenant Commander Russell advises that the Judge Advocate General has interpreted this to apply to contracts for small supplies, but not to contracts for ships, machinery, and things of that sort. He states that in the case of contracts which provide for partial payments with respect to ships, machinery, and things like that the Navy Department takes title to the property upon the making of a payment, and the contract thus comes within the provisions of the Miller Act, which, according to Lieutenant Commander Russell, is oftentimes a great and unnecessary expense.

If the Navy Department does take title instead of merely having a lien upon the property upon which the installment payment is made, as the contract progresses, then it is true that this amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] would be necessary to protect the interests of the Navy Department to the same extent that the original act as amended would be necessary in order to safeguard the interests of the War Department.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am advised by the Navy Department that this is necessary, and that is the reason I have undertaken to offer it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I understand. I am personally glad to cooperate to that end, but I desire to make the record clear. The Judiciary Committee makes it a practice to act deliberately. It does not report matters to the floor until it has had an opportunity to hear all sides of the question. It has not had that opportunity in this case. But in order to be on the side of safety and in order that the national-defense program may be expedited, I am glad to accept the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute, in lieu of H. R. 3998, the bill S. 1059, and to strike out all after the enacting clause in the bill S. 1059 and insert all after the enacting clause in the bill H. R. 3998 as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, perhaps it is inconsequential, and I did not offer an amendment, because it did not seem to be so important, but I notice the committee uses the word "matériel," which is purely a French word, and is listed in the dictionary as a foreign word. Although we have come to know what it means pretty well, I wonder if it has been the practice heretofore to use that word or to use any other foreign word in legislation without at least defining it and having it understood; because I think the use of words by the Congress of the United States will be an indication at least that it is in general use and accepted as meaning a certain thing.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman is getting into a question of etymology with which I am not conversant; but I may say that as far back as nearly 25 years ago we field artillery men in the Army used the word "matériel," and all knew what it meant.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sure we all know what it means, but it has never been used before in legislation we have passed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not think its use would cause any confusion, for I believe all know what it means. It was used a great deal in the World War and has been in use ever since. Everyone is familiar with its usage. I believe the word "matériel" is entirely plain to everyone.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Another unimportant consideration is whether the Government Printing Office has the orthographic accent marks to indicate, in this case, the acute accent, or, as the French would say, "accent aigue."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I cannot speak for the Printing Office.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am just wondering whether we could not express ourselves in the English language and have it thoroughly understood.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the gentleman has any suggestion to make along that line I am sure we should be glad to entertain it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not believe it is important enough to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 3998, was laid on the table.

GRADING AND CLASSIFICATION OF CLERKS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1123, an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from New York tell us whether he believes it wise to establish a precedent of pensioning employees at the age of 50 years?

Mr. BLOOM. In this case I will say yes. It does not mean they are exactly pensioned. It merely provides for their retirement if they are 50 years or above and have been in the Service for 15 years or more. In other words if they had been in the Service 15 years or more, and it is found they cannot, for some reason, perform their work in accordance with

standards of the Foreign Service, it provides a way in which the Service can retire them. It is similar to legislation of this nature passed for the War Department; but this is the only way that the State Department can at the present time retire people who have been in the Foreign Service for 15 years or more and who may have reached the point where they are neglectful of their work.

Mr. KEAN. How much would they get upon such retirement?

Mr. BLOOM. He would get his proportionate share.

Mr. KEAN. Suppose he had been in the service for 30 years, for instance, having entered it at 20 years of age and stayed until he was 50, how much would he get upon such retirement?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know what it would be at the end of 30 years' service; but whatever the length of time the employee had served above 15 years, at age 50 or above, upon such retirement, the employee would get a retirement proportionate to what he had paid in. That is, no annuity is based on more than 30 years' service, and all are based on a percentage of the average salary for the last 10 years of an officer's service.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has said this is the only way the Department can get rid of a man who is neglectful of his work.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not believe I said that. At any rate, that is not what I meant. This is carefully explained in the report of the Secretary of State, which is published in the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The bill is to permit the retirement of officers who, on account of declining health or advancing years, can no longer be utilized effectively and measure up to the requisite and characteristic responsibilities of the service. Many of these officers have often rendered excellent and even outstanding service in the past, and they are neither disabled in the sense to permit retirement nor are they unsatisfactory in the sense that specific charges could be made against them to justify their separation from the service on the ground of their being unsatisfactory officers in a strictly legal sense.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood the gentleman to say that. Does the gentleman believe that a man who is neglectful of his work deserves a pension at the hands of the Government? I had always considered that a pension was a reward for service well done, a reward for the performance of fine service. I do not believe we should pension a man who has not done his work well. Such a man, regardless of the civil service or any rule in the State Department, does not have to be kept if he is not doing his work; he has not got to be pensioned. You do not have to put a premium on inefficiency in order to get rid of him.

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman that this is not a pension.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is a retirement annuity.

Mr. BLOOM. He would have paid into the fund 15 years and certainly would be entitled to something.

Mr. WOLCOTT. He would be entitled to his money back.

Mr. BLOOM. I wish the gentleman would permit me to complete my answer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What is he entitled to except what he has paid into the fund if he has to be got rid of because of neglect of duty?

Mr. MICHENER. This would be a reward for inefficiency.

Mr. BLOOM. Not at all; it is not a reward for inefficiency because the man may have been efficient for 10 years or 15 years. Something may have happened after that period to prevent his rendering the kind of service expected of him by his country and the State Department. This bill would give the State Department the right to retire such an employee if they find his services can no longer be effectively utilized. As I have explained, it is not a question of willful neglect, but he has slowed up, perhaps through no fault of his own. That is all there is to it. Otherwise the Secretary of State could not retire him.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee tell us how many people this will affect?

Mr. BLOOM. I am assured it would affect very few officers. It would, of course, affect only those over 50. There are not over 12 to 15 of these who might even be considered for retirement, and probably a number of them would be able by increased effort to reestablish themselves.

Mr. STEFAN. Will this affect both career and noncareer Foreign Service officers?

Mr. BLOOM. Any Foreign Service officer who has been in the Service for 15 years or more, aged 50 or above. The noncareer officers come under the civil-service retirement plan.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say it was impossible for the Secretary of State to get rid of certain persons in the Service?

Mr. BLOOM. I did not say that. I do not like to have anyone put those words into my mouth.

I say this is the only way the State Department can honorably retire any of the people in the Foreign Service who have been in the Service for 15 or 20 years and are over the age of 50.

Mr. STEFAN. There should be no impression left in the House that the Secretary of State is not getting rid of inefficient personnel in the Foreign Service except in those cases where they are political appointees, over which he has practically no control.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no question about it. I am trying to impress upon the gentleman——

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman does not have to impress me. I know we are getting rid of inefficiency in the Foreign Service. I do not want left the impression that the Secretary of State is not getting rid of inefficient personnel in the Foreign Service. The State Department has got rid of many people in the Foreign Service who were inefficient; but there are some inefficient political employees still in the Foreign Service who should be gotten rid of.

Mr. BLOOM. Then give us a chance to get rid of them. I think I understand now to what the gentleman has reference, and that is also covered in the report of the Secretary of State, printed in the committee's report. Under section 33 of the Foreign Service law it is possible to separate involuntarily from the Foreign Service those officers against whom definite charges of unsatisfactory service can be made and proved. The requirements of this section of the law are technical in the sense that they provide for a hearing and it is necessary to substantiate the findings of unsatisfactory service. It would be most unjust to eliminate the class of officers that it is contemplated would be retired under this bill by resorting to section 33; and, in fact, it would not be practicable. The officers who would be retired, while no longer capable of measuring up to the full responsibilities of the Foreign Service, could not be justly charged with unsatisfactory service; and, in fact, many of them have formerly been excellent officers. The lives they have led, involving great strain and service at unhealthful posts, frequently without adequate medical facilities available, living through foreign wars, and other hazards, have slowed them up to a point where they should be honorably retired for the good of the service and the Government, but they should not be put out of the service under charges, which is the only procedure provided in the present law.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert a statement from the T. V. A. and also to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert a speech by James P. Pope.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today after the expiration of the time allotted the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in

the RECORD two resolutions, one from the Polish Woman's Alliance of America and the other from the Council of Polish-American Professional Organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACIEJEWSKI]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE RELATION OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, before I start my principal address, may I call attention to a report of a speech made by a man whom I consider the worst polecat in the Government service, Mr. Edwin Smith of the National Labor Relations Board. This speech appears on the first page of the Baltimore Sun of this morning and I think most of the Members will be interested in seeing it.

Mr. Speaker, because of the ground I wish to cover, I shall adhere to my manuscript and request that I be not interrupted until after I shall have concluded.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Before the gentleman starts, will he yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the speech the gentleman just referred to, the man expresses his opinion of Congressmen; so they might be interested, otherwise they may not read it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, at the time the House adjourned for the brief holiday period about 2 weeks ago we had directed our Committees on Military and Naval Affairs to investigate the alarming situation existing in the defense industry of the Nation due to labor's inauguration of a series of strikes.

The vote of the House was an indication of the anxiety we felt not merely over the conditions then existing but over the threats of labor to carry the strike to all our industrial plants producing for defense. Since our adjournment labor continues to make good its threat, and strikes have been continued and extended.

Now, permit me to state at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that wherever in this statement I may have occasion to use the term "labor" I wish it to be understood that I do not refer to the thousands of faithful workers in the ranks of American labor, but rather to the radical element that I believe has promoted the excesses that we now witness.

I have a sympathetic appreciation of the efforts and the accomplishments of all loyal Americans in the ranks of labor, generally. They are numerous, and later in the course of my remarks I shall indicate my sympathy in greater detail.

But I would remind the House that this determination of the element to which I refer to strike against the Nation's industry of defense began as long ago as November 1940, at which time I, among others, directed the attention of the House to the seriousness of subversive activities of a certain element in organized labor and urged the enactment of legislation to prevent this menace to the security and safety of our people.

The strike of 1940 against the Vultee Aircraft Co. tied up $48,000,000 worth of national-defense contracts for more than 12 days. This strike, together with others which occurred in 1940, compelled the defense industries of the Nation to lose the services of 547,000 strikers, involving 6,500,000 man-days. During 1939, 1,170,962 striking workers caused the Nation's industries to lose 17,812,219 man-days. In 1937 the Nation witnessed the beginning of the sit-down strike, and, more recently, strikes have grown constantly worse as the national emergency grows more serious. The recent strike at the River Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co. affected 85,000 workers, with an additional 35,000 workers in Ford Co. plants throughout the Nation. Ford defense contracts aggregating $150,000,000 were tied up.

The Allis-Chalmers strike extending for more than 10 weeks involved $45,000,000 worth of defense orders, including turbines, generators, gun and engine mounts, gun and engine parts, and special aircraft equipment for the Army and the Navy. Like other defense strikes, that strike was marked by violence.

The bituminous-coal strike now in progress has stopped about 85 percent of the Nation's soft-coal production and threatens the national-defense program.

On April 5 the Honorable William S. Knudsen, Director General of the Office of Production Management, speaking before the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the occasion of the observance of Army Day, said, among other things:

THE QUESTION OF MATERIAL

The background for all this is that war is today a question of material. The technical progress of making war has advanced to such a stage that 1 man in the field requires the backing of 10 men at home—not only men but machines and raw material as well. Therefore, we are particularly fortunate in having an abundance of men, machines, and materials to put to work to back up our forces for home protection, but we also have a surplus potential with which to help others.

Over across the ocean a battle of life and death is being fought—in the field, in the air, and in the shop. Over here, thank God, we have only the battle of the shop; but it is just as serious, just as important, just as indispensable, that we may not be in the same position here. We must plan and work to help the men who are fighting for their liberty, and when we do that with all our might we are getting in shape to protect ourselves for what might come later if it becomes necessary.

BATTLE AGAINST TIME

I sometimes am afraid that we haven't quite realized the seriousness of the battle against time. The next 4 months might be crucial in the whole history of the world, and if we can only save part of a month in these 4 it might mean everything in our future and the future of our children.

The launching of our program was started last June. Previous to that time small quantities of British and French orders had been placed in the United States, but mostly for aircraft, machine tools, and base materials. With the American defense program instituted in June it was possible to place over $12,000,000,000 worth of contracts promptly, Congress giving final authority in early September, so that we have placed today practically all the equipment required for 1,200,000 men and heavy equipment—meaning guns, tanks, and planes—for 800,000 additional. This we hope to have finished by the end of 1942. The additional load caused by the lend-lease bill and the British orders still unfilled adds 60 percent to the total, so that we are faced with a production job, the approximate size of which is 28,000,000,000 man-hours, to do in 27 months.

This is the biggest job ever undertaken by any country in that length of time, and it will require the maximum cooperative effort of every man and woman in the United States to get it done on time.

We have done a lot of plant construction in the last 8 months, and will have to do a great deal more, particularly on explosives, but the main job of metal working in this added program will and must be to find existing factories where, by piecing out or farming out, so-called, we can use tools we now have to do machine and assembling work. We just haven't time to build all the new factories necessary and supply new tools. You might be interested to know that during the last 7 months we have actually started and more than 60 percent completed 784 new factories at a cost of over $2,000,000,000, of which a billion dollars and a half was furnished by the Government and the balance privately financed. All these plants will be in operation within the next 4 to 6 months.

They cover everything from gunpowder to airplanes and are only a percentage of what is in work today. Many private facilities employed by thousands of contractors are actually at work producing shells and guns and motors and small-arms ammunition. All the existing shipyards have been commandeered and seven new ones started. Ships and planes and guns—there is the story in a nutshell. We must have more and still more. Every machine shop and foundry in the United States which can make even a piece of something must be enlisted for the duration.

Everybody knows that America is the greatest mass producer in the world. Not everybody knows that mass production inevitably takes time to get started.

We are mass producers of peacetime products, and it is a big shift to defense materials. It requires many new plants, hundreds of millions of dollars of machine tools, and complete retooling in nearly every case.

JANUARY AIR PRODUCTION

On aircraft we got a pretty fair production in January and February quite close to schedule, but to meet our goal these monthly figures have to double by August and keep on doubling until the end of the year.

Thirty-caliber machine guns are close to schedule. Fifty-caliber are right up to the notch, but in the former case we are striving for a 500-percent increase in monthly production by the end of the year, and in the latter case nearly a thousand percent. These figures roll off one's tongue pretty easily, but just try to increase something tough a thousand times.

The medium-tank program, as you probably know, has been deliberately held up because of the necessity of giving machine-tool priority to other more critical items. Nevertheless, we will start making a few of the 26-ton tanks in April or May and are now turning out the 13-ton tanks, which is the so-called light tank, at a fair rate. Even so, our present schedule must be doubled by the end of the year.

I sometimes wonder who invented the name "medium" and "light" tanks. They are certainly not medium or light by any other standard. The transmission alone of the medium tank weighs 7,600 pounds—as much as the combined weight of two automobiles.

On March 19, by Executive order, the President created the National Defense Mediation Board, whose function it is to bring workers and management together about the conference table.

But, despite the seriousness of the situation that confronts us, despite the "battle against time," as it is described by Mr. Knudsen, despite the admonitions of our Secretary of War, we hear the declarations of a prominent leader of labor against the efforts of the National Defense Mediation Board to effect a resumption of work.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to refrain from again directing the attention of the House to the alarming and serious conditions that confront the Nation today and that threaten the security and the safey of our people.

LABOR'S COLLECTIVISM

Today America is threateened with the collectivism of labor. Labor has struck—not against industry, not against management, not against private ownership—but against national defense, against all America. Since we have declared all-out aid against the aggression of dictators, since the President has requested and Congress has granted the most far-reaching legislation in the history of the Republic to place the Nation in a state of effective defense and to keep the aggressor away from our shores by aiding those who resist him, labor has defied the wishes of the President, flouted the purpose of the Congress, frustrated the efforts of industry, and jeopardized the safety of the Republic.

Labor has demanded the right to organize. That has been granted. Labor has demanded the right to bargain collectively; that has been granted—far removed though that right be from the constitutional principles of freedom of contract and the right of private ownership. Labor has demanded a greater share in the profits of industry; that has been granted through new scales of wages. Labor has demanded the right to restrict its contributions to the national wealth; that has been granted in a system of a shorter day and a shorter week. Labor has demanded a voice in management, yet insisting at the same time that it be secure in its right to strike when dissatisfied with management; that, too, has been granted. Labor has demanded recognition for its collectivist activity; that, too, has been granted, despite the fact that unionized labor strikes against the national defense. Labor has demanded and secured legislative and bureaucratic regimentation of industry, while at the same time seeking freedom from restraint for itself. Labor demands relief from taxation, yet urges a shift of taxes to industry. Labor demands a closed shop for labor, while at the same time it demands competitive enterprise for industry. Labor demands collectivist rights, privileges, and benefits for itself, while denying the individual right of freedom of contract and private property to others. Today unionist collectivism hampers, retards, and hinders production for defense. It defiantly ignores the public interest in the maintenance of industrial operation by striking at a time of great national emergency. It constitutes a serious social and national menace, for the injury it seeks to inflict falls not upon industry alone but upon the safety and security of all the people.

The present tendency of unionist collectivism is to destroy individual private ownership, individual initiative, individual skill, individual creativeness, and individual independence. Unionist collectivism today places a premium upon inefficiency, incompetence, indolence, disaffection, and violence.

Modern unionism is the tool of the agitator determined upon widening the breach between employer and employee, between industry and management, between industry and its workers, between skilled craftsmen and millions of little investors.

The collectivist tendency of modern unionism militates against the efficiency of thousands of skilled and loyal craftsmen who find themselves reduced to the level of the least efficient in the group, for efficiency is not a requisite for union membership. Modern collectivist unionism affords the same protection to the efficient and the inefficient, to the competent and the incompetent. All alike are under compulsion to join in order that the coffers of unionism may be filled and agitators may fatten upon larger salaries and fees and still greater power and carry on their destructive activities from one branch of the Nation's defensive industry to another until all industry is stopped and the Nation becomes a prey to enemies from within as well as from without. There can be no condemnation severe enough for such activities. If modern collectivist unionism does not destroy itself, it will at least cause the American people to denounce it and turn away from it. It already has alienated the confidence and support of the American people. Certainly labor is worth its hire. But it is no less equitable that it share the burden of responsibility and liability created by its arbitrary and subversive destruction of the Nation's industry for defense in time of grave national emergency.

Labor has no right to demand that others protect it from potential foreign aggression. It is still less entitled to protection when, by its own subversiveness, it destroys the efficiency of national defense and itself prevents the production of defense matériel. Nor can labor share in goods or services until they are produced, and when it destroys the means of production it should be willing to share in the loss which it creates. Yet it never has been willing to do so. It becomes too insistently and too eagerly the ward of government. It demands relief from government. It demands that industry and management and millions of little investors—the thrifty, the responsible, and the taxpayers of the Nation—rescue it from the penury, want, impoverishment, and woe which it brings upon itself. But having effected its destructive purpose, it makes no contribution to others who likewise suffer.

I would remind American labor that it has enjoyed many advantages under the American way. It has had the advantage of an abundance of wholesome food. It is clad better than labor in any other land. It has the advantage, generally, of comfortable homes or housing. It has an abundant leisure for recreation and personal advancement. Its children have the advantages and benefits of an educational system superior to any other, and there is no limit either educationally or socially to the heights to which it may attain. In no other land has labor ever attained so high a level of real income. The living standard of labor has increased constantly. Conveniences, comforts, and even luxuries are commonplace in the daily lives of America's workers. Labor should understand that these advantages, these benefits, these opportunities have been possible only in America; only under the American system of individual initiative, individual enterprise, private ownership, and the untrammeled operation of modern industry. Is it the purpose of labor now, led on by collectivist agitators, to destroy all these advantages, all these benefits, all these opportunities for itself and the Nation?

Collectivist unionism needs to be reminded that, after all, in America it is still the security of all the people that is the supreme law of the land, and that it must act within reason under that law. It must be made to understand that the real cause of labor suffers most when it makes unfair and excessive demands and seeks to accomplish its ends through antisocial action. America cannot, and I believe it will not, tolerate a power that seeks to place itself above and beyond the law—the safety and the security of all the people.

PRIVATE PROPERTY

America was established upon the principle that private property lies at the base of individual happiness, prosperity, and contentment. It was through the opportunity to acquire, own, manage, and dispose of property as he saw fit that the individual in America had a chance to develop himself and his family; to make provision himself for his own security and for the security of those dependent upon him free from the deadly paternalism of government.

Private ownership made the individual in America free economically; free to pursue his own course of conduct; free to take risk if he chose; free to win or lose in accordance with that risk. And while he could dispose of his private property as he saw fit, he was protected by the constitutional guaranty of the fifth amendment, to wit, "nor shall any person * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law," a constitutional privilege which we have seen violated with impunity in a day when the exercise of an alleged right to strike has come to constitute a denial of this fundamental constitutional principle, or at best is in violent conflict with it.

The right of private property in America has meant, among other things, the right to own a home free from the dead hand of a Government mortgage, free from the fear of foreclosure by unsympathetic bureaucrats. It has meant homes for the rearing of famous American men and loyal American women.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

Our citizens have prospered in the past according to their own efforts, their abilities, and their capacity to produce. The amount of wealth which each citizen acquired represented a fair measure of his energy, his ability, his thrift, and his wisdom. It represented, too, in a measure, his faith in the Republic, in the stability of its institutions, economic and political; freedom from Government intervention, regulation, and regimentation and bureaucratic dictatorship. Our citizens were encouraged and stimulated in their efforts to produce to the fullest extent of their ability by the hope of a reward commensurate with the quality and the quantity of the goods they produced or the services they rendered. Private ownership of the means of production and the freedom of enterprise enabled each citizen to produce in accordance with his economic activity and his individual ability.

Freedom from governmental restraint, insistence upon individual initiative, and the assurance of a reward in the form of profit enabled our citizens to reach an economic status definitely proportionate to their individual ability.

We, unfortunately, have come to witness the day when private ownership is challenged by a collectivist philosophy, when private management is challenged by organized groups led by self-seeking agitators, when private operators, owners, and management have been made dependent upon the will of unionist agitators and the dictatorship of bureaucratic agents as to the manner in which they may conduct private industry, even for national defense. Private ownership stands at the mercy of both Government bureaucrats and unionist dictators. They who insist upon such fundamental changes in our economic structure as are now being urged or forced upon us should be made to bear the burden of justifying the changes they demand on the ground not of temporary emergency but of permanent influence. They must overcome the presumption that the long-continued existence of our institutions has not ministered to our economic welfare.

Neither communism nor fascism are concerned with the preservation of private property. The Communists would abolish capital, destroy private ownership, and place the control of industry in the hands of the proletariat. The Fascists would regiment industry, make all decisions from above and regiment management. Neither is the American way. America always has considered private ownership as fundamental in our economic life, as essential to the maintenance of our economic, political, and social system. We believe that such ownership may extend to stocks and bonds and securities as well as to lands, buildings, and livestock. We never have accepted the doctrine that ownership is dependent upon the collectivist will. We must realize now that private ownership is threatened by a collectivist philosophy, and that we can maintain it only at the price of constant vigil.

PROFITS

Under our system of private ownership, individual enterprise, and industrial independence we have encouraged inventive genius, we have produced more and better goods at prices within the range of all our citizens according to their needs, and we have enabled millions of small investors to make a profit.

These millions of investors in America's industry have shown their faith in America's free enterprise; they deserve a reward for the services they have rendered. That is all that the profit motive implies. Without the hope of profit there would be no private industry, no private business, no private enterprise. Inventors would receive no reward for their inventions or their discoveries; competition in skills would be abolished, the incentive for improvement would fail. Despite our abundance of land, labor, and capital, no goods will be produced if the incentive of reward be discouraged. No goods will be produced when industry is stricken with the fear of bureaucratic control, and little investors with the fear of strikes.

INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM

The history of America, the success of America, has been in part the freedom of industrial enterprise. Ours has been a system of individual effort, individual activity, independent industry, in which each citizen has been free to choose for himself, free to follow his own desires, free to do that for which he regarded himself as best qualified.

Within the lifetime of most of us we have witnessed the benefits and advantages of mass production as it has been demonstrated by our modern industrial enterprise. Modern industry has made large-scale use of labor-saving machinery, creating new jobs while doing so through increased demand for the products it has created. Our modern industry has developed large-scale production more fully than any other nation, and it has enabled our people to produce more abundantly than the people of any other nation. Our industrial enterprise has made the machine the servant of man and subordinated it to our happiness, our welfare, and our comfort.

America's free industrial enterprise has given us more and better things, it has contributed to our advance and to our happiness. It has fostered, championed, and encouraged the progress that has been reflected in the comforts and conveniences that surround us and are a part of our daily lives. It has made possible a substantial share of the world's goods even for our people in lower economic groups.

Modern industry has made available the automobile, the radio, and comforts and conveniences in our homes. It has given us cheap light and power, modern refrigeration, air conditioning. It has enabled our farmers to ship perishable products to distant markets. It has made possible a wider distribution of the products of the farm. Yet we are but little aware of the intricate processes of production, transportation, or distribution—all parts of this modern industrial effort.

Modern industry has developed a higher standard of living for all of us. It has removed the drudgery from labor and increased the individual's productive capacity. It has developed new methods of travel, transportation, and communication; it has enlarged our mental horizons; it has helped us to appreciate the world in which we live. It has enabled all our people to satisfy their wants in proportion to their ability. It will continue to do so until it is prevented from doing so.

American industry has installed costly equipment in order that it might produce at lower cost. It has effected great savings in our national economy. It has introduced and practiced great savings in transportation, through large-scale purchase of raw materials and the wholesale distribution of finished products.

It has discovered, developed, and utilized cheaper methods of production. It has annihilated the costly waste of ruinous competition. It has wrought miracles in converting the products of field and mine and forest and placing them at the disposal of millions who otherwise never could have converted them. It has enabled us to push back the frontier and to transform a vast wilderness into a modern civilization.

American industry maintains great experimental laboratories insuring constant improvement in its products through the use of discoveries and inventions that otherwise never would see the light of day. It has encouraged and aided farmers, scientists, and great inventors. It has created ideal conditions for the development of ability and talent. It has taken the impecunious inventor from the cellar and the attic and placed him in a "house of magic." It has called into service able leaders, brilliant thinkers, and capable managers and given them an opportunity to exercise their skill and their genius, and to employ their talents in the service of humanity. It has benefited from wise and economic management but it has benefited the Nation as well.

American industry has increased our wealth; its ownership is widely distributed among thousands of little men and little women, each a little capitalist in his own right—a private owner of private property, even if but a small share of the total, each individually and personally interested in the success or failure of the Nation's private enterprise. Under the American system even a little capitalist, with only a little wealth, can share in the ownership of a million-dollar enterprise. It is he who receives dividends when industry is permitted to operate unfettered by the restraint of Government bureaucrats and the assaults of self-seeking agitators.

American industry has put to wise and efficient use the savings of many millions of little men and little women citizens of the Republic. It has effected a division of labor by which individual skills have been brought to the highest stage of perfection and efficiency, and far-reaching economy of time and labor has been developed. It has multiplied opportunities and created new ones for skilled craftsmen. America's industry has developed the best, the most efficient, and the most economical practices, enriching us all in the process.

America's industry has kept pace with our rapidly growing population, our increasing economic necessities, and the

rapid change in the complexities of our civilization. It is of vast proportions; it has produced and developed enormous energy; it has taken American ships and American goods to all the world; it has created employment for millions of our citizens. It is not possible to think of America without it. America's industry has enabled us to find new ways of living; it has helped us to develop our great cities; it has created potential abundance for all.

I do not contend that the management of our private industry has been faultless. It is no more than human—susceptible of all the faults of humans; but I do contend that its contributions to our American way of life, to our wealth, to our higher standard of living, to our comfort, and to our happiness have far outweighed its faults.

But we have come to act toward our private American industry in these latter days as though it were some malignant personal devil that should be driven out of our national life or destroyed. We refuse to evaluate or admit its stimulating influence upon our daily lives.

They who would destroy our private industry either directly or indirectly through bureaucratic regimentation, class hatred, intolerance, or sinister or subversive economic weapons, fail to recognize that private industry as we know it in America provides us with food, clothing, and shelter; that it has made the machine a slave in the service of humanity; that it has multiplied our powers and created new opportunities; that it has placed the resources of the world at our command; that it has surrounded us with comforts and provided us with abundant leisure for our self-development.

They who would destroy America's industry fail to realize that when industry loses we all lose; that when industry is prevented from completing its contracts for national-defense industry alone does not lose but that all the Nation loses—labor included.

They who would destroy America's industry fail to realize that when industry is assailed it must lose the productive capacity of plant, the accumulated savings of millions of little men and little women investors, the capitalists of America, while thousands of the thoughtless and irresponsible may look forward with satisfaction to a period of idleness and rejoice that their incomes may be reduced below an income-tax level.

PLANNING

We have embarked upon a scheme of planned economy—a euphemism, if ever there were one—to conceal the most far-reaching scheme of regimentation ever conceived by bureaucrats. It is a wide departure from our former way of life. It is insidious revolution. Its openly avowed purpose is to bring farm and factory under the control of Government bureaucracy.

This scheme that is being urged upon us is not an economic but a social principle, whatever its designation and whatever the allegations of the bureaucrats who urge it. It has been evolved by bureaucratic dreamers operating in an economic vacuum far removed from the practicality and the necessities of the work-a-day world in which we live. They would destroy the profit motive of private industry, for they assert that the social utility of industry cannot be determined by its ability to yield private profits. They contemplate governmental intervention, control, and ultimate ownership of private property through regulation, regimentation, taxation, and bureaucratic control. They contemplate an economic revolution to be staged by the proletariat, and the abolition of individualism. Such a scheme as they urge upon us contemplates domination by governmental bureaucracy of our entire system of production and distribution. These planners consider themselves called upon to weigh and decide the ultimate problems of social theory and to impose them upon us as arbitrary rules.

I am opposed to this scheme of so-called planned economy, because I recognize in it the belief that ownership is not a private right even in America but merely a collectivist institution.

GOVERNMENT AND BUREAUCRACY

During recent years we have seen government constantly expanding until we have come almost to accept the expansion of the functions of government as a matter of course. In our recent excursions in the realm of paternalism we have gone far afield from the intent and purpose of the founders of our Government in our spuriously laudable and mistaken attempt to provide for the safety, security, progress, and stability of some of our people at the expense of others.

We have encouraged indolence and indifference. We have discouraged thrift, while we have encouraged spending both as a nation and among our citizens. We have removed the incentive of individual achievement, of individual competence, of individual provision for old age, ill health, and the future, and replaced it by dependence upon government, thus encouraging the spendthrift, the wastrel, the indolent, and the impecunious.

The activities and functions of our Government have become as a snowball increasing in size as it rolls down hill, rapidly descending from the pinnacle of our earlier individual independence. One new governmental service after another has so increased and so multiplied the functions of government that today we have a vast service organization built up by Government itself, expanding day by day, constantly adding thousands upon thousands to the Federal pay roll, constantly increasing governmental expenditures, constantly enlarging governmental debt, constantly increasing the staggering burden of tax under which the thrifty and the responsible among our citizens struggle. As a nation we have adopted paternalism in the prime of our existence—only 150 years after our ancestors created and established institutions designed to make us individually secure against the oppressiveness of government and the impotence of collectivism.

We have adopted the philosophy that government not only owes but must guarantee to every person security against all the ills of life. Were we to list all the functions that our Government has assumed we should discover that but little is left for the individual to do. We have freed him almost entirely from the burden of work and of responsibility. When we come to examine closer, however, we shall discover also that we have despoiled him of his rights. They have vanished with his powers. They have diminished as his dependence upon government has increased. They will disappear entirely as the impotence of impending collectivism fastens itself upon him.

We have ignored almost entirely our traditions of individualism. We guarantee security to the worker. We protect him from the distress due to his unemployment. We have made provision for his advancing years. We provide for him and his family during sickness and in death—but we deny these benefits to his employer, who must provide through the taxes we impose upon him the funds necessary to provide these benefits.

We have made provision for an increase of wages for our workers not out of Government revenues but by Government authority and control over employers, but we make no provision for the employers who must pay these increased wages.

We have made provision for a shorter working day and a shorter working week for our workers through the power of governmental authority and control over employers. But we have enacted no legislation whereby those employers might continue to exist under the burden we impose upon them. We have provided for labor the right to bargain collectively, thereby destroying that freedom of contract which lies at the very base of our system of individual liberty. We have provided cheaper food for some of our people through a system of surplus commodity control and disposal, while others must pay through taxation the bounties which government thus provides. We have provided cheap clothing for some of our people by the same system at the expense of those who must provide government through taxation with the means of lavishness. We have provided cheap housing for some of our people by invading the domain of the private housing industry and making Government credit available at low rates to some while others meet the difference in the cost of credit through taxation. We abolish slums through the power of eminent domain and taxation. We have created, established, and developed Greenbelts and shelterbelts and housing areas and housing projects and Tugwell towns in every community in the Nation where once independent citizens dwelt in private homes and apartments. Government bureaucrats now fix the rates, terms, and conditions of sale or rent of thousands of homes occupied by citizens of the Republic.

Even now we seek through government bureaucrats to convince our courts that the practice of medicine is a function of the state, that our physicians and surgeons must abandon the private practice of medicine and become the agents of an impending and threatening collectivist system sanctioned by groups or by government. They have adopted the doctrine that government owes every one

a bureaucratic birth; a bureaucratic life free from mental, physical, or financial ills; a bureaucratic burial, and a bureaucratic life hereafter. Bureaucrats have come to regulate our lives from birth to death. They provide our cradles, our caskets, and our graves. Bureaucrats have made government our fairy godmother, our midwife, and our mortician.

We have made provision for a liberal education for all whether they be qualified or not, and we have seen the results of that bureaucratic and collectivist experiment in demonstrations staged almost within the Capitol itself.

We have established a paternalistic government in a land where rugged individuals once conquered a frontier, created economic security for themselves and their children, built their own homes and schools, developed their own lands, established the foundations of the greatest system of individual and private ownership ever known to civilization, and won freedom and independence by their own efforts.

The idea has come to prevail that all that is needed to provide all the things that government provides today is an act of Congress or an Executive order. There is utter disregard of the fact that government can provide only through taxation; and that disregard exists because they who demand benefits can escape and have escaped the burden of taxation. We have provided for the economic and social security for some of our people by placing the burden upon others. The object and purpose of our Government was not to benefit some of our citizens at the expense of others, but to provide opportunity for all. We are attempting to regulate forces and influences too vast and too far-reaching for Government control.

In our determination to extend the control of government we have not hesitated to invade the domain of private industry and to extend the functions of government to the regulation, regimentation, and even to the ownership of private enterprise.

We have restricted the operations of industry through bureaucratic control and domination. The confusing mass of administrative regulations, rules, and practices that have been cast about every private industrial, commercial, and financial enterprise should make us pause and consider the possibilities that lie in the abuse of administrative or bureaucratic interference.

The dictates of the bureaucrat, not the acts of Congress, have become and are the law. The bureaucrat determines what we may or may not eat, what we shall wear, and how we shall be housed. It is he who decides what may or may not pass in interstate commerce and the rates that must be paid. He invades the records of private enterprise in order that he may gather more taxes to pay for his extravagance and costly errors or to find new sources of revenue for further expansion. He demands the right to invade our homes, to tap our private lines of communication, to determine what we shall hear over the radio and the time and conditions under which we shall hear it. He would set government apart from the people or he would reduce us all to a collectivist state. We are at his mercy, and he knows no mercy.

We have given bureaucrats a blank check of legislative power and they have filled it out themselves at the expense of the people and to the detriment of private and individual enterprise. It is they who control, regulate, and regiment the Nation's private industry, the Nation's private banks, the Nation's private farms, the Nation's private transportation and communication—in short, the Nation itself and all its citizens. Bureaucrats have dispossessed the people from their homes, taken their farms, and dispersed them throughout the land. Bureaucrats have helped to destroy the confidence of our people in our institutions of private property, private ownership, and individual enterprise. They have helped to intensify antagonism between management and labor. They have created apprehension and uncertainty on the part of industry. They are destroying the confidence of our people even in our form of government.

The operation of our Government by bureaucrats has been marked by inefficiency, incompetence, waste, extravagance, and constantly rising costs, which our people must meet through vastly increased taxes. They seek to defend their excesses upon the ground that modern society has become so complex that it must be controlled, regulated, and regimented centrally. Thus they seek to justify the bureaucratic or the Fascist state, while we oppose foreign dictators and prepare to resist them.

If we would preserve our ideals of government and maintain our individual independence, we must not permit bureaucrats to destroy the foundations of private enterprise through regimentation, regulation, or control, for our Government was established upon the principle that the rights of the individual are supreme. Nor may we permit an impending collectivism that now seeks to destroy private management, private enterprise, and private ownership to destroy our ancient landmarks.

We must not permit Fascist, Socialist, Collectivist, or Communist principles to be forced upon us. We must warn our people not to adopt them by acclamation.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

What kind of government was our Constitution intended to establish?

By our Constitution the founders created a Republic—a representative Government. They never intended that America should become a collectivist state; they never contemplated that it would. They were practical men intent upon building a government on the only foundation that could make for stability—the private ownership of property. They created a competent government without recourse to monarchy, without the dictatorship of kings or collectivists. They adopted a Constitution which they believed to be best adapted to their own needs and to the needs of their successors as well.

And our Constitution has endured for 150 years, responsive to all the changes that have taken place during that time without fundamental alteration. Our Constitution has served us well because the founders put into it little that they themselves had not tried out in actual practice. Under our Constitution we have enjoyed freedom—freedom from want, freedom from insecurity, freedom from dictatorship, freedom from collectivism.

CONCLUSION

We can no longer ignore the danger signs of bureaucracy, centralization, fascism, or collectivism that today threaten our individual liberty, our principles of local government, and our institution of private ownership. Our people need to be aroused to the propaganda of self-seeking and self-serving bureaucrats who cunningly and astutely conceal their real purpose.

We must arouse our people to the menace of bureaucratic dictatorship. We must expose those who hold and urge opinions and doctrines foreign to the American way of life. We must resist subversive doctrines and practices.

Our way of life is the way of individual independence. It always has been so. It is based upon the principle that every individual has the right to acquire and to own property, whether that property be a home, a farm, or a single share of stock in a million-dollar enterprise.

The American way of life assumes that every individual has the right to choose for himself, to make decisions for himself, to be free to manage his private affairs himself. And abundance has characterized our way of life.

Before we discard the principles and the practices of our constitutional way for those of bureaucratic dictatorship or unionist collectivism we should consider the benefits that have accrued to us under a system of government in which the individual has been supreme, under which he has had the right to make decisions for himself, to regulate his own affairs and to live his own life in his own way.

We must not violate the traditions of America by permitting collectivism to prevail against individualism, by encouraging collectivist enterprise to prevail against private enterprise, or Government ownership against private ownership. It is contrary to natural principles and natural law to promote the interest of the group at the expense of the individual.

Despite all our unwise acts of recent years, I believe that in the end the principles of our present constitutional government will prevail in America threatened though they are at present from within and without. I know that if we will but insist upon the principles of private property and individual ownership and resist the encroachment of bureaucrats and the assaults of unionist agitators, we shall preserve the heritage of the founders.

I think the results of recent weeks have begun to arouse us as to the menace that confronts us. The excesses of collectivism have made us aware of the threat to our national existence not only in time of emergency but of the destructive purpose of unionist agitators even in times of peace.

Unless we are all cowed by these excesses of collectivism as we have witnessed them throttle the Nation's defense, as we have felt their impact in the Halls of Congress, or as we have witnessed their toleration and support by bureaucrats we shall rise as the elected representatives of the people and strike down those who incite, foment, and encourage them. We have the power to do so if we have but the courage.

We must strike the shackles which have been forged upon the Nation's defensive industry and free it for the safety and security of all our people. We must insist upon the free and untrammeled operation of private management and private ownership, of the freedom of contract, the freedom of enterprise, and individual independence.

Our Government must not force individuals into the collectivism of unionist groups; nor must Government permit such coercion. Our Government must not permit individual citizens to be denied the constitutional right of freedom of contract. Our Government must protect those who would remain outside the ranks of unionist collectivism as well as those who would join.

Labor must realize that private industry must profit if it is to survive; that it cannot pay wages except it profit; that it cannot pay wages in excess of earnings; that it cannot absorb the waste of strikes and indolence and sabotage, and continue to increase wages and decrease hours. Labor must understand that when industry suffers, the entire Nation suffers—not industry alone.

Externally we are engaged in a contest with fascism. Internally we are threatened with both fascism and communism. We must engage dictatorship both abroad and at home. We must oppose communism in its determination to destroy American institutions through the destruction of private industry; we must refuse Communist demands and resist Communist violence and aggression.

This is one task from which we may not flinch. It is one duty from which we must not flee. It will require all our power, all our energy, and all our courage, but it will be worth it. We owe it to the fathers who have bequeathed us the institutions we now enjoy; we owe it to ourselves, and we owe it to our posterity.

Whether we shall be able to maintain our heritage and pass it on to our descendants will depend upon our intelligence, our vigilance, our courage, and our will. We shall be able to maintain it so long as we adhere to the American way of life, to the constitutional principles that lie at the base of our individual liberty. But we shall lose it when we become indifferent to our constitutional safeguards, oblivious of the dangers that threaten us from within as well as from without, tolerant of the tyranny of bureaucrats, or disdainful of the menace of communism.

We shall lose our liberty, and our rights will vanish if we continue to permit ourselves to be forced in the direction in which we now are moving. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman cares to delete this discussion from the RECORD, if it takes anything from his splendid address, I hope he will do so.

I should like to suggest that perhaps to the story the gentleman has given us he might add that this is not a case of democracy working, it is a case of democracy being worked; and may I ask the gentleman, while he is on the floor, how long has this been going on? Who was the original collectivist?

Mr. COX. I would suggest to the gentleman that it is not a development of just today or of yesterday; it is a movement that has been in progress for some considerable time. Unless it is challenged and unless it is stopped we shall come out of the condition in which we now find ourselves stripped of our whole constitutional government as well as a bankrupt and a destitute people.

Mr. GIFFORD. I believe the gentleman has done a splendid service in showing this situation. I should be willing to tell the gentleman who the first collectivist was, clothed with authority. I think it begins from that date; but this was such a splendid Republican speech that I ought not to hinder it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address given by my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND PARITY PRICES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in all lands and under all forms of government citizenship involves service to the state. Especially here in the United States, where preservation of the Government and its institutions means to a greater extent than in any other country the preservation of the rights of the individual, the obligation of the citizen to support the state is all the more imperative.

But, Mr. Speaker, that obligation is a general obligation. It is not an obligation devolving upon any one locality or any one State or any one class or industry. It is the prerogative and privilege of all the people, all localities, and all classes alike. No one State and no one industry can be singled out to discharge the duties and make the sacrifices required by the Government while all the rest go free. No one section or industry can be made the scapegoat while all the rest enjoy the blessings of liberty and free government and national prosperity at their expense.

On this account, it is a matter of concern that the farmers have been selected by the Price Administration as the only industry in the Nation to supply services and products for the defense program at less than parity prices. Labor is loyally contributing its service, and industry is patriotically cooperating in providing its commodities, but labor is being paid more than double the parity wage, and industry is receiving up to more than twice the parity price. The products of agriculture alone are being requisitioned at prices pegged below parity.

On April 3—a day studiously selected to avoid repercussion in the House of Representatives as the House adjourned for a recess on that date—the Department of Agriculture announced pegged prices for hogs, butter, eggs, and poultry. The significant feature of the announcement is that none of the four were pegged at parity prices. In view of the fact that the Government has long been committed to the principle of parity prices for farm products, not only by repeated assurances from departmental officials but by solemn enactments of law, as the A. A. A. Act of 1933, the Soil Conservation Act of 1938, and the Agricultural Appropriation Acts of 1939 and 1940, the announcement assumes an importance out of proportion to the amount of farm income involved. The price of hogs is fixed at $9—only 24 cents below parity. Butterfat is pegged at 31 cents—less than 3 cents below parity. Poultry is priced at 15 cents—just one-half cent above parity. The addition of 24 cents to the price of hogs, or a little over 2 cents to the price of butter, or the reduction of one-half cent from the price of poultry would have given parity prices for all three, and it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the premeditated variation from parity prices by such inconsequential margins is deliberately subversive of the principle of parity and designed to sabotage the objective toward which the administration, the Department, and organized agriculture have been moving for the last 8 years.

This conclusion is fortified by the further announcement of a reversal of the policy of production control universally recognized as indispensable in any plan to stabilize farm prices. In other words, all Government efforts to raise the price of hogs and corn to parity are now abandoned in favor of a program to prevent hogs and corn from reaching parity.

The effect of the order is to fix the price of hogs at $9 a hundred and the price of corn at 65 cents per bushel when the cost of every item entering into the production of hogs and corn is steadily rising and will continue to rise.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Minnesota, one of the most influential members of the great Committee on Agriculture now at work on legislation to remedy the situation under discussion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Just on that point, those prices are fixed at Chicago and parity price at Chicago is close to $10, while the $9 price does not apply in the country to the farmer. I hope the gentleman will take that into consideration, because that means the farmer has to pay cost of transportation to Chicago and is dependent upon the grading of the hogs before he will get the $9 at Chicago and, in fact, he may get a dollar less than that on the farm.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman's very pertinent comment. He anticipates what I had intended to say.

However, the significant thing is that, regardless of the amounts involved, the fixing of farm prices at any other than parity prices is destructive of the basic principle to which Congress and the Nation has been committed for many years. And the abandonment of production control—a fundamental practice which has given labor and industry control of their markets and their prices—marks the dismemberment of the plan for farm recovery, under which we have made slow but consistent progress. In the last 8 years the Government has spent millions of dollars to make it possible and profitable for the farmer to regulate acreage and production to needs of the consumer and the demands of the market. In furtherance of that policy the Government at one time bought and converted into fertilizer 6,000,000 pigs in order to establish a proper ratio between supply and demand. And now, in diametrical contravention of that policy, the Price Administration is releasing the brakes on production, although the Department of Agriculture reports for February that stocks of corn totaled 2,000,000,000 bushels, of which 473,000,000 bushels were under Government ownership, and that "the carry-over on October 1 next will probably be the largest on record," and the surplus of hogs was so great that when I attempted to sell fresh lard from the hogs processed for my own meat during the winter local merchants refused to take it at any price. In the face of this situation the Price Administration is urging the abandonment of the farm recovery plan and increased production, with the manifest intention of taking the farmer's corn and hogs at less than parity prices—and, of course, the program will be extended to other farm products as rapidly as opportunity affords—while every item entering into the farmer's cost of production is more than double parity and steadily rising.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman care to yield there?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman in just a minute.

The principle of parity which the Price Administration seeks to disrupt is also vital to any plan of stabilization based on Government loans. Unless protected by the assurance of parity prices, agriculture abandons all discretion as to prices when it accepts a Government loan. For the Government with the huge surpluses which it controls under loans without guaranty of parity can depress the price at will by releasing its holdings on the market. The Government controls enough cotton today to force the price of cotton down to any level by the simple expediency of glutting the market—and it requires only a small amount of cotton to do it. If the Government should release even a small part of the corn it controls, it could in 48 hours force the price of corn down to 12 cents a bushel. A guaranteed parity price or a mandatory loan rate is the only effectual safeguard against such control of farm prices by the Price Administration.

The benefits of the widely advertised stamp plan to agriculture is dependent wholly on the farmer receiving a parity price for the food distributed under the plan. If bought from the farmer and distributed to the consumer at less than parity, it injures instead of benefits the farmer by freezing the price at the lowest rate the chain distributors can force the farmer to accept.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When we ask the Price Administration why the price of hogs was fixed at $9 instead of at parity we are told that $9 is all the traffic will bear—that if the price is placed above $9 the consumer will refuse to buy. It is a remarkable fact that you only hear the consumer mentioned when you are discussing farm commodities. When we passed the coal bill here the other day no one mentioned the consumer. When that admirable piece of legislation, the Wage and Hour Act, was before the House—raising the price of practically everything the farmer buys—the consumer was not considered. When we had up the "hot oil" bill, increasing the price of gas for the farmer's tractor, no one thought about the consumer. In none of the long series of laws enacted by Congress for labor and industry—for every one of which the farmer must foot a large part of the bill—the consumer did not enter the picture. It is only when the farmer asks half as much as labor and industry have been given that they make the welkin ring with protestations in behalf of the consumer.

Let us look into the consumer's ability to pay for what he eats at the farmer's expense. For the sake of brevity we will take the automobile worker, because he has been much in the public eye in recent weeks.

In 1920 hogs sold for $21.50 a hundred. To be accurate, they sold as high as $28, but I use $21.50, because I sold hogs myself that year and got $21.50 for them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the gentleman speaks of hogs selling for $21.50, he should not forget that the wage scale paid to labor at that time—in 1920—was less than it is today.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is remarkably accurate in his forecast. I was just coming to that. In 1920, when hogs sold at $21.50, automobile labor, according to the report of the Bureau of Labor and Economics, was being paid 59.8 cents per hour. In 1935, 15 years later, hogs had dropped to $12.40, while the pay of the automobile worker had risen from 59.8 cents to 70.9 cents per hour. Hogs went down and wages went up. As the income to the farmer went down, the income of labor and industry advanced, and the larger their income the less they paid for bacon and eggs.

Today the Food Administration fixes the price of hogs at $9. Automobile labor, according to the report received day before yesterday, has gone up to 97½ cents per hour. Hogs went from $21.50 down to $9, the price fixed by the Department last week, and labor has gone from 59.8 cents up to 97½ cents. Still they would have us believe the consumer is unwilling to pay more than 9 cents. That is an unwarranted reflection upon both labor and industry. Labor, above all others, believes that the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow is entitled to a fair and honest remuneration, and no one can make me believe that labor wants to mooch its food from the half-paid farmer when it is being well paid itself. Labor justly contends it is entitled to advanced wages because there has been a great advance in the profits of industry, and labor is entitled to its share of the profits. I have supported that principle on this floor at every opportunity, and I know labor will agree with us that when labor's wages are raised to a fair income, the farmer who feeds him is likewise entitled to an honest wage and a fair price for his product.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The distinguished gentleman has stated some of the problems of the farmer compared with what has happened to labor. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to the farm problem today—for instance, the dairy farmer, who is having his experienced help drafted; who has to hire inexperienced help at a great increase of cost. I am informed there is a great shortage of experienced farm help at this time. I wonder if the gentleman could help us out with any observations on that point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman touches upon a very important phase of the problem. As the farmer's income is fixed, as the price of his hogs and his butterfat is fixed at $9 and 31 cents, respectively, when the price of everything is constantly, steadily, and rapidly rising to him, his standard of living declines to the vanishing point—then International Harvester Co., from whom the farmer must purchase his machinery, the other day increased wages 5 cents an hour. In the steel industry, from which the farmer must indirectly buy most of his equipment, they have raised wages 10 percent. Another firm manufacturing farm supplies this last week raised their labor to a dollar an hour. All those increases naturally add to the farmer's cost of production. Then, as the gentleman has well stated, the draft takes the boys from the farm; the munitions plants and other war industries drain labor from the farm, and the farmer is caught between the upper and the nether millstone; on one hand his cost of production is rising, and on the other the Price Administration is locking the price of his products below parity.

That is the situation as it exists today. It is all the more serious because it is a growing disparity. Every day the situation becomes more acute. Every day the disparity between the farmer's cost of production and his income is accentuated. It is gratifying to know that the Committee on Agriculture is preparing legislation to remedy the situation, because this—above parity, of course—is just the beginning. The pegging of these few commodities is in the nature of a trial balloon.

The Price Administration has essayed to fix prices on a few metals, but according to the Kiplinger letters received this week has relaxed its restriction on some, and on others, notably steel, the payment of bonuses has vitiated the order. The real objective of the Price Administration is to freeze the price of food below parity. No attempt has been made to fix the wages of labor. Labor is in a position to defend itself. But the farmer, disorganized and without adequate representation in Congress, is easy prey.

As an indication of the effect of the action of Congress upon this situation, let me read from today's New York Times. The financial section carries articles dealing with practically all farm commodities, including cotton, corn, hogs, wheat, etc., but I will only take the time of the House to read one. Here it is:

> The bullish enthusiasm of the wheat market was shocked severely by the failure of Congress to take up farm legislation after the Easter recess.
>
> The understanding was that when the House came back after the Easter recess it would immediately take up this pressing question.
>
> The failure of Congress to take up legislation after the Easter recess depressed the wheat market materially, and all other farm markets, as you will note from today's papers. Speaking of wheat the Times says:
>
> Prices declined to the lowest level in more than 10 days, showing a drop of more than 4 cents a bushel from the recent high.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for an additional 5 minutes if he so desires. He is one of the ablest fighters for agriculture in the House, and we all respect his opinions in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman believe that if we could get legislation through Congress that would prevent the Government's disposing of any of this corn it holds at less than parity prices, it would be good for the best interests of the farmer?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There can be but one logical conclusion: That the Government and this House which repeatedly have been committed by enactments of the Congress, to the principle of parity, should now refuse to put upon the market one bale of cotton, one bushel of corn, or one pound of pork at less than the parity price.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I add, in line with what the gentleman said previously, that in the case of my own operations the men we have now engaged upon our farm in Minnesota for the coming year cost us at least 30 per cent more in wages than we had to pay last year. This statement simply to bolster the gentleman's statement that everything the farmer is using this year is costing him more money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And a year from now wages will be still higher, cost of production will be still larger; but if the Food Administration is permitted to control, the prices of farm products can go no higher.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Supporting the gentleman's contention, I have a letter in my mail this morning from a farmer who says he has lost a half dozen wage hands in the last 2 weeks because at present farm prices he was not able to pay them what they were able to obtain in industry and consequently they left him. Unless the price of farm products should be increased the chances are he will lose still others.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And in the meantime the price of cotton which this man produces——

Mr. HARE. Remains the same.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Fell on the market this morning.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes longer because, with his permission, I want to make a brief observation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I, with the permission of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, make this observation? We are now approaching a danger which we approached once before during the Hoover administration. The gentleman from Missouri was in the House then, and we should now be warned by that experience. By raising the price of things that are sold, whether labor or commodities, above the relative price of farm commodities we tend to break the trading contacts between the farmers and other people. That is a thing of vital importance to people who do not farm. When we paralyze the buying power of the farmers so they are no longer able to buy the products of the people who live in the cities, we of the cities cannot sell to them or to those who are dependent upon purchases by these farmers. Exactly that result took place at the time I mentioned. Our products accumulated in the warehouses of the cities.

We were getting big prices, relatively, in the cities, but we were giving to the farmers for what they sold money to move only a very small percentage of what their normal purchases were theretofore. Our production backed up on us. That paralysis of the buying power of the farmers, like the paralysis of a part of the body, extended up through the whole economic structure. We saw it as with our own eyes begin with these 30,000,000 people lying right down next to the soil. First the farmers, next the smaller villages and towns, then the great cities. We were taking their stuff but we were not giving them—I live in the city—we were not giving them enough in return for them to move our stuff from us to them. We called it a panic. It was a paralysis of the economic circulatory system. That same thing will happen again just as often as that cause gets into operation. The gentleman is stating the absolute fact that if we permit by high prices in the city and low prices in the country, if we permit the buying power of these 30,000,000 farmers to become paralyzed there is no genius of statesmanship can

prevent that paralysis from extending to the whole economic body, including the big cities of this country. I was here, the gentleman was here when that occurred, and he is speaking words of wisdom. I do not presume to comment on what he said in detail, but upon his conclusions. They are words of wisdom and of warning to this Nation, and to every man who lives in a big city, because I do not care how high you put these city prices, if the people who are operating these factories cannot dispose of the products of the factories, something has got to happen to prices, something has got to happen to employment, and we will again have the situation that obtained when we permitted the buying power of the man who works in the field to become paralyzed by the spread between city income and city price and farm income and farm price. If the gentleman desires to cut this out of his speech, he may take full liberty to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is the most important part of the speech and I am deeply grateful to the gentleman for calling attention to the fact that this problem is not merely a farm problem. It is a national problem.

Another thing may be said in connection with the very pertinent comment which the gentleman has made. We should prepare not only for the duration of the war but for the aftermath which will follow the close of the war, and if we do not by legislation stabilize farm prices there will be even a greater catastrophe that the gentleman himself recalls as a result of the situation following the last war.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I hope I made myself clear. I am not commenting on what ought to be done at either end, but I am commenting on the fact we cannot permit the farm prices and the prices in the cities to pull so far apart that the trade contact is broken between the farm and the city. I thank the gentleman for letting me interrupt.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I call the gentleman's attention to another thing he and I both saw?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The spread between industrial commodities and raw materials and farm prices is out of line now, far out of line. If and when this war closes, no matter how it terminates, the condition will grow worse because they will burn no factories in Europe or Asia. After the war closes those factories will be turned from manufacturing munitions and implements of war to the manufacture of peacetime commodities. This condition will grow worse. We must remedy it here, and in order to do so we will have to do something to bring farm prices up to a level with industrial prices in America.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement. We expect to have his cooperation in securing early action on the floor of the House.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman knows he will get it.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Missouri has delivered a very serious and a very just indictment of the fixing of certain farm prices below parity by the Food Administration. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has called attention to facts which once existed and which might exist again. Both gentlemen are, of course, correct in what they have stated. But what is the gentleman's solution so far as the fixing by the Food Administration of these prices? What will he do about it? We all know the facts exist. We do not get anywhere by standing up here and saying that a certain individual who has been appointed by the President to see that the consumer is protected should not be permitted to do certain things, or criticize him because he takes action that ruins the farmer. We certainly should appeal to the President to prevent his agent from doing that which the gentleman from Missouri says is destroying the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is one of the best-informed men on agriculture in this Congress.

Mr. MICHENER. I think we all yield to the gentleman from Missouri on matters affecting the farmers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I know his question is merely a rhetorical question. He merely wants me to say what he knows I am going to say, because he himself understands what the remedy is as well as any of us, and I trust that when that remedy is presented on the floor in the farm bill we will have his active, earnest, and energetic cooperation in enacting it into law.

Of course, the action of the Food Administration is not the action of any one man, it is in response to the request of Army officers, who have no concern about farm needs but who only desire to secure essential supplies at as low a price as possible, and is still further influenced by industrial leaders who desire cheap food in order to insure cheaper labor for their factories.

The remedy is obvious. The gentleman asked a very simple question. It is a simple question, because Congress has already shown how to do it. We put a floor under the wages. We insured a return upon the capital invested in railroads, coal mines, the oil industry, and we established a fair-price schedule. We have enacted this legislation for everybody else. All that is necessary, in answer to the gentleman's question, is for us to do for agriculture what we have already done for every other class and every other industry of the country—bring in legislation to stabilize agricultural prices at least at a minimum of parity. The farmer asks no more. It is a modest request, and I am certain this Congress will grant it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the speech I made this morning may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address delivered at Dayton, Ohio, by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CULLEN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The hearings on flood control announced to begin on Tuesday, April 1, were postponed to begin on Monday, April 21. As announced, the hearings will be on reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since H. R. 9640 was reported on May 2, 1940, but not considered by Congress on account of national defense, and the hearings will also be on amendments to existing law. The committee plans to keep the authorizations within a limit of $250,000,000, and the bill planned will cover the principal regions of the country and will include the preliminary examinations and surveys on which favorable reports have been submitted.

1. Monday, April 21: Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, opened the hearings with statements and recommendations covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing emergency to provide flood control and desirable public works. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, assistant to the Chief of Engineers, who advised the committee during the hearings on H. R. 9640 in 1940, also appeared before the committee and submitted his views and discussed generally the projects that have been favorably reported since H. R. 9640. General Schley and General Robins will be available subsequently for additional information as to additional projects as they are considered by regions and as desired by the committee.

Information by division engineers and by district engineers has been furnished to the Chief of Engineers and will be available to the committee as reports in the several regions are reached during the progress of the hearings.

When the lower Mississippi Valley and the region under the supervision of the Mississippi River Commission are reached Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, will appear before the committee to report upon the status and progress, with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit, and will be available to the committee during the progress of the hearings on the lower Mississippi Valley.

2. Tuesday, April 22: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in Los Angeles and the Los Angeles area.

3. Wednesday, April 23: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Los Angeles and southern California region.

4. Thursday, April 24: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers and representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Kings and Kern Rivers projects.

5. Friday, April 25: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the Willamette Valley, the Columbia River Basin, and the Pacific Northwest.

6. Monday, April 28: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the western and southwestern Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado and west Gulf rivers.

7. Tuesday, April 29: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Missouri River and tributaries.

8. Wednesday, April 30: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Mississippi and Great Lakes region.

9. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

10. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

11. Monday, May 5. Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

12. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

13. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

14. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

15. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

16. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

17. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

18. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 3188, a bill relating to Members of Congress and certain other persons receiving compensation for addresses and speeches, on Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previous scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 108, 1057, and 2763.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income-certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, April 23, 1941, for the consideration of private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

457. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend section 142 of title 2 and section 829 of title 5 of the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

458. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a bill to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

459. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 7, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Port Allen Harbor, T. H., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 17, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 180); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

460. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1942, as amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year, involving an increase of $425,000 (H. Doc. No. 181); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

461. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of insane persons belonging to the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report pursuant to the last clause of section 1 of the act of June 28, 1940, Public, No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

463. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting statement of loan and other authorizations of the corporation made during the month of February 1941 (H. Doc. No. 182); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4139. A bill to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 148. A bill to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3974. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to adopt an official seal, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 179. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Nichols; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 250. A bill for the relief of Otto Meyer; with amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 684. A bill for the relief of Harold Byrne; with amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 713. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman; with amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 816. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain members or former members of the United States Coast Guard (formerly the Bureau of Lighthouses) for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at several light stations on the coast of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York; with amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; with amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1356. A bill for the relief of John I. Twehues; with amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Allison; with amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of Herman E. Schorr; without amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GATHINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1732. A bill for the relief of Floyd Wilday and Vera Wilday; with amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse; with amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1976. A bill for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie; with amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2739. A bill for the relief of Jack Y. Upham; with amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3200. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson; with amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3243. A bill for the relief of John Klasek; with amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3356. A bill for the relief of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4068. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of D. X. Sanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4144. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter L. Shearman; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4270. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Committee on Claims. S. 392. An act for the relief of Joseph Dolak and Anna Dolak, father and mother of Gene Dolak, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Committee on Claims. S. 897. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, and Bernard Paulson, special disbursing officer of the State Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 941. An act for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, J. T. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1104. An act for the relief of William A. Wheeler; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2933) for the relief of John C. Gibbs; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3729) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4439. A bill to permit production of additional food for national defense; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI:

H. R. 4440 (by request): A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4441. A bill to adjust the pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in keeping with the increased cost of living and responsibilities in a national emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4442. A bill to remove certain restrictions upon the employment of retired personnel of the Regular Army on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4443. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4444. A bill to promote the national defense by providing for the performance of the necessary construction and reconstruction work to provide for a high-speed midwestern north-south highway, to be known as the Lakes-to-Gulf Highway; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4445. A bill relating to the classification of substitute post-office clerks and substitute city letter carriers in first- and second-class post offices, and substitute laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4446. A bill relating to the manning of vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4447. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works in the Fresno County stream group, California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4448. A bill to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Benjamin Harrison; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4449. A bill to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 4450. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the State of Vermont to the Union; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. R. 4451. A bill authorizing the transfer to the State of Michigan for public-park purposes of certain surplus Federal property; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4452. A bill to provide for flood control by stream clearance; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4453. A bill to amend United States Code, supplement 111, title 16, section 851–856; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4454. A bill to aid in measures for national defense by the development and testing of new devices and materials and by directing natural resources to that end, and at all times to increase industrial employment and to enhance national prosperity by aiding and promoting research and the training of research workers in the engineering experiment stations connected with colleges and schools of engineering in the several State and Territorial universities and colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 183. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4139; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. Res. 184. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the causes of industrial unrest, disputes, and strikes which are interfering with the defense program; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to accept the message from the Congress of Costa Rica with reference to House bill 1776; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs..

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 23, 32, and 39, with reference to legislation concerning domestic products and other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 70, relating to the assistance of the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of the Luedtke Engineering Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 4456. A bill granting a pension to Idella M. Luce; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Fairchild, Ruth Fairchild, and Evelyn Fairchild; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of the Southern Asphalt & Petroleum Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4459. A bill to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Arthur Loren Fletcher; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daniel A. Brinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4462. A bill for the relief of the indigent and dependent heirs of Ted Vaughan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4463. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

771. By Mr. BELL: Petition of residents of Kansas City, Mo., endorsing recommendations of R. Swinburne Clymer, supreme commander of the Sentinels of America; to the Committee on Rules.

772. By Mr. BOLLES: Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact uniform laws relating to the assistance of the blind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

773. Also, joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the United States Congress not to reduce the tariff on dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

774. Also, joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the United States Congress to have investigated the possible existence of a monopoly in the distribution of cheese and other dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

775. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution of the Hayward Chamber of Commerce, Hayward, Calif., urging immediate legislation by Congress to put an end to strikes during the present emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

776. By Mr. FISH: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Orange County, N. Y., opposing the appropriation of funds by the Congress of the United States for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

777. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, concurred in without amendment by the Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to oppose any change in the existing law for the preservation of the cane sugar refining industry in the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

778. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the adoption of an adequate Federal antilynch law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

779. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the adoption of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

780. Also, petition of the Senate of Massachusetts, urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 3301; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

781. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the President of the United States of America to aid the Government and people of Eire by releasing foodstuffs, clothing, merchandise, and/or military equipment, to help the people of Eire to sustain themselves, resist aggression, and defend their democratic institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

782. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, requesting the Congress of the United States to use its efforts to modify the barracks type of architectural construction in the housing project at Cocumcussoc, R. I.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

783. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Maude Wolfe and other residents of Tionesta and Newmansville, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

784. By Mr. JOHNS: Memorial in the nature of a joint resolution of the Wisconsin State Legislature memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact uniform laws relating to the assistance of the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

785. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, concerning the cane-sugar-refining industry in the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

786. By Mr. KEOGH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the preservation of the cane-sugar-refining industry in the State of New York, opposing any change in existing law that would add additional burden on the American consumer, and cause further unemployment in the State of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

787. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the United Rubber Workers of America, Local No. 100, of Los Angeles, Calif., requesting Congress to make an investigation, open to the public, in order to discover the causes of the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Rules.

788. Also, petition of the Del Monte Properties, Inc., of the State of California, requesting Congress to take necessary steps to secure immediate additional and adequate appropriations to provide for the development of said strategic highways in the State of California, and particularly to that section most affected by national-defense projects, and that said defense-highway development be made a definite part of the national-defense program and financed in its entirety by national-defense funds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

789. By Mr. LEWIS: House Joint Memorial 7 of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact a law for the assistance of the blind which would be both uniform in its operation and uniform in the monthly sums to be granted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

790. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the Congress to oppose any change in the existing law for the preservation of the cane-sugar refining industry in the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

791. Also, resolutions of the Building Trades Employers' Association of the city of New York, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

792. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Wilhelm Peters and 14 other residents of the State of New Jersey, urging the enactment of House bill 4000, a bill to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors on military or naval reservations or within a reasonable distance therefrom, and also prohibiting taverns and vice districts within a reasonable distance from such reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

793. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Central Business Men's Association, Kingston, N. Y., opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

794. Also, petition of the Building Trades Employers Association of the City of New York, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

795. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, Albany, opposing any change in the existing law for the preservation of the cane-sugar-refining industry in the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

796. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of sundry residents of Bradford County, Pa., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

797. Also, petition of sundry residents of Bradford County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

798. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Petition of the Lakeview Board of Education and

10 other community committees and associations of Battle Creek, Mich., asking early action on House bill 3570 providing for community facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

799. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, assembled at Waco, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for the cotton industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

800. Also, petition of the Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers, I. U. of A., Port Chester, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

801. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council of Sacramento-Yolo Counties, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

802. Also, petition of the Middletown Post, No. 218, the American Legion, Middletown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

803. Also, petition of the Walczak Laboratory, Springfield, Mass., petitioning consideration of relief particular to proceedings before the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

804. Also, petition of the Alabama Federation of Music Clubs, held at Florence, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a national school of music for the development of American talent; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1941

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, whose Blessed Son, our Saviour, stretched forth His hand in righteous indignation to cast out from Thy Temple all those who defiled its courts: So purify our hearts, by the indwelling of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may regard the whole world as Thy Sacred Temple because our Saviour walked therein; and so enflame our hearts that we may seek no rest until this Temple is cleansed of all evil and consecrated again to Thee. Grant that all wars shall cease so that righteousness may prevail and the nations of the world may become the Kingdom of the Prince of Peace.

Again, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that, in the midst of many voices, Thy Voice may yet be heard; in the face of many wills, Thy Will may yet be done. Give us the vision to realize Thy purpose, strength sufficient for our task, and such utter consecration that, having put our hand to the plow, we shall never look back until the field is harvested for Thee. And this we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 18, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I announced that the 25th of this month, which will be next Friday, had been fixed for holding memorial services for Members of the Senate who have died since the last memorial service was held; but no formal action was taken by the Senate fixing that day. Therefore, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 95), as follows:

Resolved, That on Friday, April 25, 1941, at the conclusion of the morning business, the legislative business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of permitting memorial addresses to be delivered on the life, character, and public service of the Honorable M. M. Logan, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky; the Honorable William E. Borah, late a Senator from the State of Idaho; the Honorable Ernest W. Gibson, late a Senator from the State of Vermont; the Honorable Ernest Lundeen, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota; the Honorable Key Pittman, late a Senator from the State of Nevada; and the Honorable Morris Sheppard, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, referring to the memorial service, I hope that Senators who desire to deliver addresses on the life, character, and public services of the deceased Senators will advise the Secretary of the Senate, so that a tentative program may be made up between now and Friday.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. on Friday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order will be entered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 478) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the construction and maintenance of overhanging walks on the highway bridge, route No. 36, at Highlands, N. J., for public use.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts; and

S. 1254. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1591. An act relative to annual labor on mineral claims in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 1724. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind.;

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States;

H. R. 2475. An act to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy;

H. R. 2672. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement fixing boundary lines on Wind River Indian lands, Wyoming;

H. R. 2684. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard;

H. R. 2766. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2829. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.;

H. R. 2830. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa.;

H. R. 2985. An act to prescribe the time basis for computing pay for overtime work performed by laborers in the Railway Mail Service;

H. R. 3186. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian;

H. R. 3193. An act validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way, in the city of Tracy, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in the town of Elk Grove, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356);

H. R. 3514. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain tribal land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value;

H. R. 3682. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River in the village of Lowellville, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 3752. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended November 30, 1940;

H. R. 3987. An act to provide relief for, and to promote the interests of, the land owners on the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4105. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character;

H. R. 4107. An act to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. R. 4167. An act providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the Commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

MANDATORY PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1059) to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, be waived with respect to contracts for the manufacturing, producing, furnishing, construction, alteration, repair, processing, or assembling of vessels, aircraft, munitions, matériel, or supplies of any kind or nature for the Army or the Navy, regardless of the terms of such contracts as to payment or title: *Provided*, That as to contracts of a nature which, at the date of the passage of this act, would have been subject to the provisions of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may require performance and payment bonds as provided by said act."

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

FELICITATIONS FROM THE CONGRESS OF COSTA RICA ON ENACTMENT OF LEASE-LEND BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram from the Congress of Costa Rica, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA.

Messrs. Secretaries of the Senate and House of Representatives:

The Congress of Costa Rica sends its message of felicitations to both Houses of the Congress of the United States of North America on account of the passage of House bill No. 1776 inspired in the defense of the continent and of the democracies.

J. ALBERTAZZI AVENDANO,
CARLOS JINESTA,
Secretarios, Congress of Costa Rica.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters and report, which were referred as indicated:

ADMISSION TO ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL OF PERSONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of insane persons belonging to the Foreign Service of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXEMPTION FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the exemption from military service of certain aliens residing in the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONTRACTS WITHOUT ADVERTISING OR COMPETITIVE BIDDING, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the heads of the various departments and agencies of the United States to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when in the interest of the national defense, to authorize the President to give priority to deliveries under such contracts, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADVANCE OF PAYMENTS ON NATIONAL-DEFENSE CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to advance payments to contractors in connection with national-defense work in amounts not exceeding 30 percent of the contract price, etc., under the provisions of law; to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The report of the American War Mothers for the period October 1939 to October 1940 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by a Senator, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 31

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for educational facilities in the communities where Federal funds are to be expended for housing of defense workers

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 to be expended through the Office of Production Management on housing of defense workers, which in Michigan would result in an acute lack in educational facilities in such communities, and the inability of the taxpayers in those communities to provide sufficient revenue to build the needed school buildings, supply the needed equipment, and furnish the required number of teachers to take care of the additional school enrollment; and

"Whereas, in keeping with the defense program, the education of the youth of today, the citizens of tomorrow, in the true principles of democracy is imperative: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for educational facilities in the communities where Federal funds are to be expended for housing of defense workers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 13, 1941.

"Adopted by the senate April 3, 1941."

A resolution of the Building and Construction Trades Council, of Fall River, Mass. (affiliated with the A. F. of L.), pledging that there will not be any stoppage of work on account of jurisdictional disputes between any building and construction trade on any building or construction project essential to the speedy and successful completion of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Building and Construction Trade Council of Scranton, Pa. (affiliated with the American Federation of Labor), stating that, under employees who are recognized as being fair to organized labor, when any or all of the building- and construction-trades organizations are unable to supply a full force of building-trades men to man defense projects, every organization affiliated with such labor organizations agrees that a union employer shall be privileged to employ others than members of the building and construction trades affiliated with such labor unions until such time as the labor organizations so affiliated can replace nonunion men with members of their organizations, or until such nonunion men are requested to become members of the respective unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The petition of the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Salem Methodist Church, Arcadia, Ind., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., requesting that the War Department defer the sending of a battalion of troops to the Territory of Hawaii for the purpose of having such troops engage in and perform occupations carried on by civilian labor in Hawaii until such time as it has been determined that the civilian labor supply in Hawaii is inadequate to carry on properly in civilian enterprises and functions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Marion and Hillsboro, both in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—RESOLUTIONS OF SENATE OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions

adopted by the Senate of the State of Kansas favoring the enactment of a law which would provide for national old-age pensions. I am in sympathy with the program for adequate old-age pensions on a national basis.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Senate Resolution 26

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a law which will provide for national old-age pensions

Whereas no provision is made for the retirement income for those who have reached retirement age, or who will attain that age, who have, as farmers, business or professional men, or in other capacities, created jobs for themselves and others, nor for those who have been employed on farms, in homes, churches, public offices, or in other employment excluded by the Federal Social Security Act, except by submitting to poverty registration of themselves and all of the members of their family, while retirement income and widows' pensions are made available to all employed in business and industrial establishments without question as to their economic status; and

Whereas there is an adequate need for old-age pensions for aged persons in this country; and

Whereas it would be more practicable for persons to be paid on a national basis rather than on a State basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact some legislation which will provide adequate old-age pensions on a national basis; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be made a permanent record in the proceedings of the senate, and the secretary of the senate be directed to have copies of this resolution sent to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Adopted April 2, 1941.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VERMONT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have here certified copies of three joint resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, which I wish to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks. One of them is No. 292, a joint resolution opposing the St. Lawrence waterway project. Following the preamble, the resolution reads:

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the people of the State of Vermont, represented in the general assembly, therefore affirm their opposition to the use of the St. Lawrence River for establishment of a deeper seaway and hereby record their opposition to the construction of a St. Lawrence River seaway as highly unwarranted in the present national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Another one is No. 294, a joint resolution relating to Vermont forest lands, and following the preamble occurs this resolution:

That the people of the State of Vermont, represented in the general assembly, therefore affirm their belief that the United States should compensate the townships for reductions in grand lists occasioned by the purchase of lands for the national forests.

The third joint resolution is No. 304, expressing opposition to proposed Federal legislation to regulate the cutting of timber on private lands.

I ask consent that these three resolutions of the General Assembly of Vermont be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

No. 292—Joint resolution opposing St. Lawrence waterway project

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that he will propose to the Congress of the United States that it take the necessary action to authorize completion of the St. Lawrence River seaway development as an international project; and

Whereas the claim that the United States needs the St. Lawrence seaway for defense is not supported by the facts but has inspired the charge that the military, naval, and air hazards involved in the seaway project are out of all proportion to any industrial or commercial benefits that might accrue from the project; and

Whereas competent authorities have pointed out that the waterway would be icebound 5 months of the year, that no provision for tolls is contemplated; that free use of the waterway for foreign shipping would injure New York State and New England economy, ruin our railroads and our seaports on the Atlantic coast; and that the Great Lakes area would be deluged with cheap products of foreign countries to the injury of American industry, labor, and agriculture; and

Whereas during the navigation season the comparatively narrow ship channel of the St. Lawrence would make vessels easy targets of bombers and afford abundant opportunity through sabotage or bombing to destroy the locks and dams in the St. Lawrence, thus gravely interrupting traffic; and

Whereas in view of the existing urgent national-defense production needs it would appear most unwise to divert men, money, materials, and machinery to construct a waterway which would be in disastrous competition with New York State's canal system and New England railroads; and

Whereas, the United States should concentrate now upon the construction of airplanes, ships, guns, tanks, and other munitions, and not waste public funds, material resources, and effort on a waterway project against which so many seriously important and valid economic objections have been raised; and

Whereas the President's assertion that the United States "needs this great landlocked sea as a haven in which it will always be able to build ships and more ships in order to protect our trade and our shores" has been sharply challenged; and

Whereas it would seem an act of national folly to dissipate labor and resources on a project not vitally necessary and which could not be placed in operation before 1948: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the people of the State of Vermont, represented in the general assembly, therefore affirm their opposition to use of the St. Lawrence River for establishment of a deeper seaway and hereby record their opposition to the construction of a St. Lawrence River seaway as highly unwarranted in the present national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Approved April 9, 1941.

WM. H. WILLS,
Governor.

To the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

No. 294—Joint resolution relating to Vermont forest lands

Whereas the forests of the State of Vermont occupy a major portion of the State's land area; and

Whereas the proper management and utilization of these forests are essential to the welfare of the State; and

Whereas the United States has established in Vermont a national forest in accordance with the enabling act adopted by the general assembly in 1925 and subsequently amended; and

Whereas this national forest is an important factor in the continued productivity and management of a portion of the forest lands in Vermont; and

Whereas the purchase of these lands has brought about a reduction of some consequence in the grand lists of those towns in which the national forest is located; and

Whereas this reduction in the grand list has an important bearing on the performance of township functions: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the people of the State of Vermont, represented in the general assembly, therefore affirm their belief that the United States should compensate the townships for reductions in grand lists occasioned by the purchase of land for the national forest; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and hereby is, directed to transmit a copy of this resolution forthwith to each of Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Approved April 9, 1941.

WM. H. WILLS,
Governor.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

No. 304—Joint resolution expressing opposition to proposed Federal legislation to regulate the cutting of timber on private lands

Whereas there are two bills before the United States Congress which have for their object Federal regulation of the cutting of timber on private timberlands, and

Whereas under these bills any State which does not adopt cutting regulations suitable to the Secretary of Agriculture, will not receive Federal funds appropriated for forest-fire protection and other work: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the secretary of state be instructed to notify our Representatives in Congress that the members of the legislature are opposed to this proposed legislation.

Approved April 10, 1941.

WM. H. WILLS, *Governor.*

RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF IOWA—TAXATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, under the rule, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 15

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes,

gifts, and inheritances, and providing limitations on taxes so levied, and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

Whereas the people of the State of Iowa are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

That application be, and it is hereby, made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect"; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Iowa Member thereof.

I hereby certify this to be a true copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 15 as passed by the forty-ninth general assembly.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a joint resolution (A. J. Res. No. 70) adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact uniform laws relating to the assistance of the blind.

Mr. President, I also ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committees Assembly Joint Resolution 41, memorializing Congress not to reduce the tariff on dairy products; and Assembly Joint Resolution 33, memorializing the Congress of the United States to have investigated the possible existence of a monopoly in the distribution of cheese and other dairy products.

These joint resolutions have been adopted by the 1941 Wisconsin Legislature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Education and Labor:

Assembly Joint Resolution 70

A joint resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact uniform laws relating to the assistance of the blind

Whereas the national administration for a number of years has granted financial assistance to the blind, conditioned upon the States contributing their share for the same human purpose; and

Whereas this condition has been generously complied with by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin while many of the States contribute little or nothing for the assistance of the most unfortunate of our brethren; and

Whereas the daily needs and requirements of the blind are the same everywhere in this prosperous land and because of the refusal, neglect, or failure of some of the States to properly provide for them such action must lead to the blind migrating to the more favored States, one of which is the State of Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a law for the assistance of the blind which is both uniform in its operation and uniform in the monthly sums to be granted, and that the law shall be administered by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.)

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.)

To the Committee on Finance:

Assembly Joint Resolution 41

Joint resolution memorializing Congress not to reduce the tariff on dairy products

Whereas it has been called to the attention of this legislature that proposals are being made by Members of our National Congress to lower the present tariff on dairy products in order to permit imports of dairy products from South American nations; and

Whereas the lowering of such tariff would reduce the income of our Wisconsin dairy farmers and adversely affect the dairy market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature is unalterably opposed to any and all proposed reductions in the existing tariff on dairy products and respectfully requests that all reductions in tariffs on dairy products already made be restored; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Assembly Joint Resolution 33

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to have investigated the possible existence of a monopoly in the distribution of cheese and other dairy products

Whereas concentration and centralization in the marketing and distribution of cheese indicate the existence of a monopoly in the distribution of this product; and

Whereas Wisconsin is the greatest dairy State in the Union and produces 50 percent of the cheese of the Nation; and

Whereas the welfare of the dairy industry of Wisconsin depends upon the accessibility of the markets of the country to Wisconsin producers; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture has been investigating conditions in the cheese industry with relation to alleged monopolistic control of said industry; and

Whereas the investigations of said department have shown that the markets for the cheese produced in Wisconsin as well as in the Nation are under the control of a limited number of concerns; and

Whereas as a result of said condition the Wisconsin cheese producers do not at present have access to marketing outlets; and

Whereas Wisconsin sells 90 percent of the cheese produced in this State to markets located in other States of the Union; and

Whereas the concerns which buy and sell Wisconsin cheese operate on a Nation-wide basis; and

Whereas the investigations of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture show that such investigations can be brought to a successful conclusion only in cooperation with Government agencies which have jurisdiction over the entire Nation; and

Whereas the jurisdiction of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture is confined to State limits; and

Whereas cheese and other dairy products being the products of milk, their marketing is subjected to similar economic factors and influences: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to have the United States Department of Justice and also the Federal Trade Commission investigate the possibility of a monopoly in the distribution of cheese and other dairy products; and be it further

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture continue its investigation and cooperation with these Federal agencies; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Members thereof.

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF CITY OF RACINE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Racine at a meeting held April 4, 1941, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation enabling completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as outlined by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Midwest is vitally concerned in a deep-water outlet to the high seas, the State of Wisconsin, having 22 lake harbors entering the inland oceans, known as the Great Lakes, has championed such a project for many years; the city of Racine, having a harbor in point of water-borne commerce on Lake Michigan, has never ceased its efforts to secure the improvement of the St. Lawrence River as an efficient connecting link between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean;

Whereas the people of the Midwest are conscious of the fact that a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives them of an economical, expeditious, and free outlet for their factory and farm products to the markets of the world, the deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel, as advocated by successive Presidents of the United States, will prove an economic advantage to the Nation as a whole; it will bring the Midwest a thousand miles nearer the high seas and that much nearer to the markets of the world;

Whereas while the project must be regarded as one of the highest importance under normal conditions, it assumes a special significance at a time when the Nation is deeply concerned in the same as a defense measure; while the eastern section of the country is seeking more power service, the Midwest must have greater navigation freedom;

Whereas there can be no doubt that the great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region forms a vital part of an entire nation, and therefore should not be hampered or hindered in rendering a maximum service, the shipbuilding industry in the Great Lakes region deserves encouragement; such industries not only have their advantage in being centrally located but at a time when the Nation is dealing with the matter of defense they are more secure if located in the midcountry; and

Whereas thus the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project does not only possess power potentialities, navigation advantage, but also forms an important factor as a defense measure: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Racine herewith formally and respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as outlined by the President of the United States and thus remove the economic barriers which now afflict the Midwest country and the Nation as a whole; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives of the National Congress, and to the mayors and common councils of the important sister cities throughout the United States.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Racine, ss:

I, Frank J. Becker, city clerk of the city of Racine, Racine County, Wis., do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Racine at a meeting held April 4, 1941.

Dated this 12th day of April 1941.

[SEAL] FRANK J. BECKER,
City Clerk.

UTILIZATION OF McKEESPORT TIN PLATE CORPORATION PLANT

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the plight of workingmen who are thrown out of work because factories close down is a serious one. This is especially true of workingmen who have worked in steel mills. Technological improvements are especially responsible for workingmen losing their jobs, and we as a nation must think seriously about the problem of taking care of men who are so displaced. In the meantime the national-defense program should utilize all the Nation's facilities in meeting defense needs. Facilities for making more steel do exist in this country and they should be utilized. I am in receipt of a resolution from the Borough of Liberty in Allegheny County, Pa., which urges the use of the McKeesport tin plate mill in their locality. This mill is now idle, and the unemployed steel workers in that locality could be put to work immediately in manning that plant. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the Borough of Liberty printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOROUGH OF LIBERTY,
ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA.,
March 19, 1941.

To the Honorable:
JOSEPH M. GUFFEY,
United States Senator;
JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senator; and
SAMUEL A. WEISS, *Representative,*
Washington, D. C.

Whereas the McKeesport Tin Plate Corporation has recently sold its manufacturing plant, located in the Borough of Liberty and in the Borough of Port Vue, Allegheny County, Pa., to the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation; and

Whereas said manufacturing plant (or mill) has not been operated by the purchasing corporation since said sale, and a very large majority of the former employees (many of whom are either property owners and/or residents of the Borough of Liberty) of the McKeesport Tin Plate Corporation have been unable to secure or find other employment by reason of the purchasing corporation's inability or failure to resume operations in said plant, either by continuing the manufacture of tin plate or by providing for the manufacture of steel and/or steel products therein; and

Whereas many of said former employees, residents of this borough, have requested the Council of the Borough of Liberty to petition the United States Senators from this State and the Representative from this congressional district in their behalf; and

Whereas the Council of the Borough of Liberty at its regular monthly meeting, held on March 4, 1941, by appropriate councilmanic action, directed the preparation of this petition to you: Now therefore

The Borough of Liberty, and the undersigned, who are all of the duly elected (or appointed) and qualified members of the council of said borough, do hereby respectfully petition you and each of you to use and exercise all lawful means and influence at your disposal to secure for the said Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation such contracts, under the present program of national defense, for steel and/or steel products, as the manufacture of which could and would be carried on in the former manufacturing plant of the McKeesport Tin Plate Corporation located in the Borough of Liberty and in the Borough of Port Vue, as aforesaid.

Respectfully submitted.

BOROUGH OF LIBERTY,
By GLENN M. KIER,
President of Council.
WILLIAM H. DAUGHERTY,
Burgess.

Attest:

JNO. WEISSERT,
Secretary of Council.

Members of Council of the Borough of Liberty: Ernest Kemp, Charles W. Snyder, Harry R. Douglass, John M. Wunderley, David Dannenhaues, Jr., Thomas A. Lawson.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3869. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 183).

From the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 255. A bill for the relief of August R. Lundstrom; without amendment (Rept. No. 184); and

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to amend Public Law No. 861, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 17, 1940, an act to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval Establishments, including the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 185).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4083. A bill to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to dispose of property coming into his possession; without amendment (Rept. No. 186).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 187).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4057. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the Freedmen's Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts; without amendment (Rept. No. 188); and

H. R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 189).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 972. A bill for the relief of John H. Balmat, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 190).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1060. A bill to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army and Navy of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 191).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

A report (No. 192) to accompany the bill (S. 702) to increase the number of cadets al-

lowed at the United States Military Academy from the District of Columbia heretofore reported by him from that committee without amendment.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 916. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a revocable license to Guy A. Thompson, trustee, Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., and successors in interest, to maintain certain railroad trackage and station facilities on Jefferson Barracks Military Reservation; with amendments (Rept. No. 193).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1290. A bill to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 30), as amended June 2, 1939 (Public, No. 109, 76th Cong.), so as to provide compensation for donors of blood for persons entitled to treatment at Government expense whether or not the donors are in the Government service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 194).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1246. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 195).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1360. A bill to create a War Resources Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

S. 1361. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact to be entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1362. A bill to provide for cooperation between the Federal Government and States and political subdivisions thereof in providing for the toll-free operation of certain interstate bridges; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of Sioux Skyways, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Dwight Tuttle; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1365, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1366. A bill relating to the filing in the Court of Claims of the amended petition in the case pending in such court entitled "The Indians of California against The United States"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1367. A bill for the relief of certain Indians; and

S. 1368. A bill relating to lands of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1369. A bill to amend an act of March 15, 1904, so as to permit the construction between certain points on the Minnesota River of bridges of lower heights than those authorized by such act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1370. A bill to authorize additional compensation to persons in the land or naval forces while performing combat services or service in foreign countries which are engaged in war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1371. A bill to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students; and

S. 1372. A bill to amend article IV of the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1373. A bill for the relief of Dr. M. Kellogg Mookerjee; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. VAN NUYS (for himself and Mr. WILLIS):

S. 1374. A bill to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Benjamin Harrison; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution for the relief of the heirs of Fannie Ellis White; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

TRAINING OF C. C. C. ENROLLEES IN VOCATIONAL SUBJECTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act creating and establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps. I ask that an explanatory statement in connection with the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1365) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended, for the purpose of providing vocational training in Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the interest of the national defense, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

With the attention of the whole Nation directed toward making the Nation's defense impregnable, I have introduced for the consideration of the Congress an amendment to the act establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps which provides for the setting aside of 300 Civilian Conservation Corps camps to be devoted exclusively for training Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees in vocational subjects vital to national defense.

For 8 years the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps have caused the rest of the world to open its eyes in recognition. The Civilian Conservation Corps' full potential value to the country, however, has not generally been realized until recent months, when the Nation has been thinking in terms of solid defense.

By the very nature of its organization and operation, the Civilian Conservation Corps is qualified and experienced in preparing youths to step into the necessary ranks behind the line of our military forces.

More than 2,500,000 young men have gone through the Civilian Conservation Corps camps since 1933. Each of them has received valuable training, which now is saving the Nation untold millions of dollars when it has suddenly to prepare thousands to be cooks, bakers, construction workers, radio operators, truck drivers, automotive mechanics, tractor operators, and photographers, to mention a few vocations.

My amendment provides for the setting aside of 300 camps to be used exclusively for training purposes, and provides part-time training in the remainder of the Civilian Conservation Corps' 1,500 camps. It makes available $20,000,000, which will enable the Civilian Conservation Corps to start immediately to train additional thousands in skills in which there is today a serious shortage of workers. It is specifically drawn so that this Nation may have an ever-increasing supply of skilled road builders, bridge builders, pontoon men, truck drivers, tractor operators, shovel operators, caterpillar "skinners," welders, machinists, electricians, mechanics, powder men, maintenance men, and others.

I do not advocate military training for the Civilian Conservation Corps, nor would my amendment provide military training; but I do urge that Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees be trained for the important work which must be done to support men in the trenches or on the sea if the necessity should ever arise.

It is already a recognized fact that men who have had Civilian Conservation Corps training and are called for selective service fit the needs of the Army better than those who have not. They have learned to live together and to work together, two things which must be learned by every soldier at the outset, particularly the value of teamwork.

I realize, as do many others who have considered the question, that we not only need an adequate military force for national defense, but we must also have a sufficient number of behind-the-line workers to make and keep in operation the machinery of national defense. No other agency in the Federal Government is so well equipped to train this so-called army of supply as is the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I believe that now, while there is still time, the vast Civilian Conservation Corps youth program should be utilized in providing the training which makes for good citizens, useful in peacetime activity or in defense work.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1591. An act relative to annual labor on mineral claims in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 2475. An act to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2985. An act to prescribe the time basis for computing pay for overtime work performed by laborers in the Railway Mail Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 3193. An act validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way, in the city of Tracy, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in the town of Elk Grove, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 4105. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4167. An act providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States; and

H. R. 3752. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended November 30, 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2672. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement fixing boundary lines on Wind River Indian lands, Wyoming;

H. R. 3186. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian;

H. R. 3514. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain tribal land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value; and

H. R. 3987. An act to provide relief for, and to promote the interests of, the landowners on the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1824. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind.;

H. R. 2684. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard;

H. R. 2766. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2829. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.;

H. R. 2830. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa.;

H. R. 3682. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River in the village of Lowellville, Mahoning County, Ohio; and

H. R. 4107. An act to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, pending before the Committee on Indian Affairs is the bill (S. 1320) to add certain lands to the St. Joe National Forest, Idaho, in order to protect the watershed of the town of St. Maries. The bill was obviously referred to that committee through error. It is a matter that should be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I therefore move that the Committee on Indians Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BALL submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 683) to expedite the national-defense program by providing a method for the settlement of labor disputes in defense industries without resort to hasty strikes and lock-outs, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 60, line 4, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Postmaster General may transfer to the National Museum not to exceed 3 percent of the gross receipts of the Philatelic Agency, for the maintenance and increase of the national collection of postage stamps, including purchase of specimens not already represented, purchase of books and periodicals necessary for reference, and binding: *Provided further*, That hereafter all remainders of migratory-bird hunting stamps shall remain on sale at the Philatelic Agency until disposed of or until the Congress otherwise provides."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3205, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1942, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XVI TO COVER AMENDMENTS TO RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Resolved, That Senate Rule XVI be amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"7. That the provisions of this rule as to amendments to general appropriation bills shall apply to all bills making appropriations for relief and work relief."

INVESTIGATION OF ADVISABILITY OF AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. TRUMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 97), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Whereas various proposals relating to the prevention of unauthorized or unlicensed communications and the protection of the privacy of communications have been advanced as useful for the public interest and national defense; and

Whereas the problem should be considered in its entirety, rather than piecemeal; and

Whereas the proposals vary in their approach to the problem and in the underlying assumptions on which they are based; and

Whereas it is desirable that those proposals which would in fact serve the public interest and the national defense should be enacted into law and those proposals which would not serve the public interest and the national defense should be eliminated.

Resolved, That the appropriate standing committee of the Senate or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the advisability or inadvisability of amending the Federal Communications Act of 1934 as proposed in the following proposals:

1. That section 301 of the said act be amended to read:

"SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this act, among other things, to maintain the control of the United States over all the channels of radio transmission; and to provide for the use of such channels, but not the ownership thereof, by persons for limited periods of time, under licenses granted by Federal authority, and no such license shall be construed to create any right, beyond the terms, conditions, and periods of the license. No person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall use or operate any apparatus for the transmission of energy or communications or signals by radio except under and in accordance with this act and with a license in that behalf granted under the provisions of this act."

2. That section 303 (m) (1) of the said act be amended by adding the words "or revoke" immediately following the word "suspend."

3. That section 303 (m) (1) of the said act be amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(G) Has willfully and maliciously transmitted radio communications or signals revealing the position of any vessel of the United States Navy."

4. That section 605 of the said act be amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following words:

"*And provided further*, That whenever the Attorney General of the United States has reasonable ground for believing that a felony cognizable under any law of the United States relating to espionage (U. S. C., title 50, secs. 31–42), sabotage (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 381; title 50, secs. 101–103, and the act of November 30, 1940, Public, No. 886, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), the transportation of kidnaped persons in interstate or foreign commerce (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 408a–408c), or the transmission of threatening or extortion communications through the mails or in interstate commerce (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 338a, 338b, and 408d), may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, and he so certifies, and in so certifying states specifically the facts forming the basis of his belief that such felony may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice may, in connection with investigation, detection, or prevention of such felony or the apprehension of the perpetrators thereof, intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications; and if in such event such interception, listening in, or recording is to be carried on in an area within the jurisdiction of the Department of War or Department of the Navy, then it may be carried on by the Division of Military Intelligence or the Office of Naval Intelligence.

"Any such certificate or a duly authenticated copy thereof shall be admissible in evidence in any court having jurisdiction of any such case only as proof of its execu-

tion and filing. Upon and after the admission of such certificate in evidence in any case, any evidence obtained by the interception, hearing, or recording of any telephone, telegraph, or radio message or communication, as well as testimony concerning the same, shall be admissible and admitted in evidence, in any prosecution for any offense hereinbefore enumerated, if such evidence is otherwise admissible.

"Certificates made by the Attorney General under the provisions of this section shall be deposited in the files of the Department of Justice and form a part thereof.

"No person shall divulge, publish, or use the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this proviso otherwise than in connection with the investigation, detection, or prevention of any offense hereinbefore enumerated, or the apprehension or prosecution of the perpetrators thereof."

5. That section 606 (b) of the said act be amended by deleting therefrom the words "interstate or foreign" before the word "communication" in the first sentence thereof.

6. That the said act be amended by adding at the end thereof the following provision:

"SEC. 610. The Commission shall investigate methods, devices, contracts, and arrangements whereby aliens or representatives of aliens, or foreign governments or representatives thereof, have, directly or indirectly, (1) obtained ownership or control over persons, organizations, or corporations engaged in the production, manufacture, or distribution of equipment, supplies, and apparatus used in communication by wire or radio or (2) entered into restrictive arrangements with respect to the utilization of such equipment, supplies, and materials; and it shall further investigate the extent to which the manufacture and distribution of communications equipment, supplies, and apparatus are open to inspection and examination by aliens or representatives of aliens or foreign governments or representatives thereof. The Commission shall report its findings to Congress, together with its recommendations as to whether additional legislation on these subjects is desirable."

The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to obtain such facts as other Government agencies may have, and to secure the assistance and personnel of other Government agencies in the investigation hereby authorized.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, either in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR SHEPPARD

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send forward a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 98), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Morris Sheppard, late a Senator from the State of Texas, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to waiving the rule requiring that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and proceeding to its immediate consideration? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, after consultation with the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution relating to the expenses in connection with the funeral of the late Senator Sheppard was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand the rule of the Senate requires that such a resolution go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and, as I have no disposition to have this resolution take any other course than that ordinarily followed, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION TO A COMMITTEE

On motion by Mr. SMATHERS, the resolution (S. Res. 94) appointing a special committee to investigate instances of fraud in connection with the issuance of patents to public lands in the Pacific Coast States (submitted by Mr. SMATHERS on the 15th instant) was taken from the table and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

COMPILATION OF LEGISLATION, DECISIONS, ETC. (S. DOC. NO. 49)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress Senate Document 187 was ordered printed. It contained a category of legislation and amendments to existing law, with significant court decisions, from the Seventy-third Congress, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The Legislative Reference Service has brought down to date that documentation of important legislation beginning with the Seventy-third Congress and through the Seventy-sixth Congress. I ask unanimous consent that this revised publication be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE CITIZENS' PART IN NATIONAL DEFENSE AND AID TO BRITAIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Philadelphia Board of Trade on April 18, 1941, on the subject The Citizens' Part in National Defense and Aid to Britain, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE JONES AT ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATED PRESS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the occasion of the forty-first annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York City on April 21, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE—REMARKS BY PROF. ALEXANDER HAMILTON FREY

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum of remarks made by Prof. Alexander Hamilton Frey at a symposium on labor relations and national defense conducted by George Washington University Law School on March 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Tennessee Valley Authority on national defense, which appears in the Appendix.]

USE OF CONVOYS

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of convoys from W. R. Cunningham, of Newark, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY REV. E. STANLEY JONES ON AMERICA'S ROLE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by E. Stanley Jones on the subject What's America's Role in This Crisis? which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY ROBERT GERARD ON BLITZKRIEG: A WARNING TO AMERICANS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Robert Gerard, formerly lieutenant in the French Army, on the subject Blitzkrieg: A Warning to Americans, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM ARGUS-LEADER ON FEDERAL TAXATION

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., of April 18, 1941, on the subject of Federal taxation, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EASTER MESSAGE OF POPE PIUS XII

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Easter message of Pope Pius XII, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT—EDITORIAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY FARMER-GLOBE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Want That Waterway," published in the issue of April 8, 1941, of the Richland County Farmer-Globe, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS OF A. A. A.—EDITORIAL FROM WILLISTON DAILY HERALD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A. A. A. Hurts Some," published in the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald of April 7, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE FIXING

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to have incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, entitled "Henderson to Use Authority to Force Plant Expansion." I will read a portion of it:

The newly created Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply will use its authority "to stimulate provision of the necessary supply materials and commodities required for civilian use" to force a large-scale program of plant expansion, it was learned yesterday.

O. P. A. C. S. officials admitted that they would use several powers granted them in the Executive order creating the agency to provide extensive new production facilities, the construction of which, they believe, has not been sufficiently speedy or large enough for emergency demands.

Leon Henderson, O. P. A. C. S. Administrator, is known to have insisted in defense councils that production facilities, particularly those for raw materials and metals already on the Army-Navy Munitions Board critical list, be enormously enlarged.

* * * * *

In his new position of authority, observers believe that Henderson can use his price-fixing and supply "stimulation" powers as levers to obtain new plants.

For example, it was explained, Henderson might grant a price increase requested by a certain industry contingent on that industry's adoption of an expansion program to increase supply to a point where there will be no continued scarcity to force further price rises.

I pointed out the other day that Mr. Henderson has not the slightest shadow of legal authority to fix prices; but now he is going to use the authority he does not possess to fix prices in order to force various industries to build a great many new plants for civilian supply.

Of course, so far as the supply for defense is concerned, that authority is entirely given to the War and Navy Departments. It seems to me that this bureau is claiming powers which it has not the shadow of authority to claim, and that we are really proceeding along the same line that has been followed in every totalitarian state by which gradually every day the executive claims new powers; claims the power to govern the country by decree; claims the power to issue orders in which the legislature has from time to time tamely acquiesced until such powers are conceded.

Whether we ought to increase our plants in order to provide for increased domestic consumption is a serious question of policy. It certainly is not one that ought to be left to Mr. Henderson's individual discretion; but, whether or not the plants ought to be increased, it is certain that we have not granted him any power to increase them. We have not granted him any power to fix prices. We have not authorized him to use any power he has to force people to do things they otherwise would not do; and what he is proposing in this article is simply, in substance, government by blackmail.

I hope sooner or later to submit a resolution to create a committee to investigate the arbitrary powers which are now claimed, and to some extent being exercised, by Government bureaus that do not have such powers.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, of which I have read a part, printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

HENDERSON TO USE AUTHORITY TO FORCE PLANT EXPANSION

(By Alfred Friendly)

The newly created Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply will use its authority "to stimulate provision of the necessary supply materials and commodities required for civilian use" to force a large-scale program of plant expansion, it was learned yesterday.

O. P. A. C. S. officials admitted that they would use several powers granted them in the Executive order creating the agency to provide extensive new production facilities, the construction of which, they believe, has not been sufficiently speedy or large enough for emergency demands.

Leon Henderson, O. P. A. C. S. Administrator, is known to have insisted in defense councils that production facilities, particularly those for raw materials and metals already on the Army-Navy Munitions Board critical list, be enormously enlarged. His immediate staff have publicly demanded a larger plant and equipment expansion program, holding that modern mechanized warfare requires defense production from machine shops and steel mills greatly in excess of that presently scheduled.

RESISTANCE MET

An expansion program of the scope Henderson advocated, however, has met with some resistance, partly from business groups concerned with the financial risk involved and partly from other defense officials uncertain as to future requirements.

In his new position of authority observers believe that Henderson can use his price fixing and supply stimulation powers as levers to obtain new plants.

For example, it was explained, Henderson might grant a price increase requested by a certain industry contingent on that industry's adoption of an expansion program to increase supply to a point where there will be no continued scarcity to force further price rises.

In addition, the new agency has authority to recommend steps to assure adequate supplies. These recommendations, made under a Presidential delegation of power, will carry added weight, it is believed, with other Government agencies having the funds to spend on new plants and equipment.

POINTS TO STEEL ACTION

Henderson, who is fond of quoting an estimate of Bernard M. Baruch, Chairman of the War Industries Board, that scarcity in supply cost the Government an added $15,000,000 in its World War I effort, may also use his duty to hold down defense and civilian costs as an argument for insisting on new production facilities, it was said.

Meantime Henderson acted yesterday to hold down prices of farm machinery by writing manufacturers for their voluntary cooperation.

Although he admitted that wage increases have taken place in the industry and other costs have advanced, Henderson justified his request with an allusion to his recent order freezing the price of steel. He noted that there were "assured prices of the major raw material and a favorable demand in the industry generally."

Henderson asked that farm-equipment manufacturers maintain the price schedules now in effect and asked for voluntary cooperation "in the hope, which I am sure we both share, that other steps may be avoided."

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky when we may expect action on the post office appropriation bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot tell the Senator at this time; it will not be taken up this week, certainly. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who has asked that the bill go over until he can return, is ill, as the Senator knows. I am told by members of the Committee on Appropriations that there is nothing urgent in the bill. It will take effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year, on July 1. Probably the only matter of controversy in the bill, certainly the major controversy, grows out of a proposed subsidy for the American Export Air Lines, as I recall, for service over the Atlantic Ocean. Even that would not take effect, I understand, until the beginning of the fiscal year. Therefore, with the hope that the Senator from Tennessee may be able to return within a reasonable time, I think it is the understanding, at least of the members of the Committee on Appropriations who have spoken to me, that the bill will go over until the Senator from Tennessee can return, unless that would bring about undue delay.

Mr. McCARRAN. Unless it would mean a delay of some considerable extent, I suppose that would be the order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. In accordance with the order previously entered by unanimous consent, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Friday, April 25, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1941:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

James C. Capt, of Texas, as Director of the Census, vice William L. Austin, retired.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Harrison Parkman, of Kansas, to be Purchasing Agent for the Post Office Department. (A reappointment, his term expiring June 15, 1941.)

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Joseph O. Donovan to be State director of selective service for the State of California, under provisions of section 10 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Compensation for the office of State director

of California will be at the rate of $7,200 per annum.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY MARINE CORPS

The following-named lieutenant colonels to be colonels in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Karl I. Buse
Louis W. Whaley
Roswell Winans

The following-named majors to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

William J. Whaling	Paul A. Lesser
Daniel R. Fox	William D. Bassett
Vernon M. Guymon	James D. Waller
Edward G. Hagen	Cyril W. Martyr

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Archie V. Gerard	John H. Griebel
Chester B. Graham	Marion L. Dawson, Jr.
Thomas D. Marks	Harold G. Newhart
Wallace O. Thompson	George H. Potter

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1940:

Albert F. Metze
Harry A. Schmitz

First Lieutenant Clayton O. Totman to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we bless Thy holy name for the widespread sympathy going forth from countless hearts to those who are suffering untold agony, sleepless suspense, and appalled by the shocking inhumanity of war. Oh, grant that in the light of Thy travail and with the spirit of the good Samaritan, the American Red Cross may be greatly blessed of God. With that love which has but one tongue and of all languages, may these legions of mercy unite the earth by one common service in the common fields of human suffering by the inspiration of a common Saviour and led by the vision of a common destiny. We pray Thee that the teachings that fell from the sacred lips of the Master may stream forth into every dark place and carry hither the ray of eternal hope. Vouchsafe this day Thy presence to every heart. We pray for those for whom parents long ago prayed and have left the covenant of promise, for those who have forsaken their early faith, and for any who may be enthralled. O Thou High Priest of the Ages, appointed to succor all human flesh, may we be chastened, softened, subdued, and ennobled by that divine compassion which longs to heal and sanctify the grief of this world. In the name of the Great Samaritan. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

APRIL 21, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation from the following committees: Elections No. 1; Patents; and the Civil Service.

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

FLOOD RELIEF FOR LOUISIANA

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate a sympathetic attention of every Member of the House. My story is an old, old story, you have heard so often. Down in northeast Louisiana, the district which I represent, was subjected to heavy rains last year to such an extent that the Federal Surplus Marketing Administration had to feed approximately 48,204 families for approximately 5 months. I hope my friends the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] are here, for I should like to call this to their particular attention.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am listening.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. I also notice the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] on the floor. I appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee today and asked for $50,000 for certain drainage projects in northeast Louisiana. This amount, of course, is subject to a point of order, but I certainly hope no point of order will be made against this appropriation. I thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

THE RECENT MEXICAN EARTHQUAKE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, April 17, His Excellency the Honorable Josephus Daniels, United States Ambassador to Mexico, cabled the Department of State advising of a very severe earthquake in the territory surrounding the city of Colima, Mexico, on Tuesday, April 15.

Mr. Daniels advised that 21 persons had perished, 104 persons were injured, and about 20,000 persons were homeless.

He stated a need existed for food and medicines, both of which were scarce, and suggested $10,000 be sent for relief purposes.

The State Department requested the American Red Cross to cooperate, and the money was sent forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my city are ever mindful of those who are in trouble. We passed through an earthquake ourselves, and I have received a telegram from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin expressing great concern and suggesting an appropriation from this House. Everyone in San Francisco will join the Members of Congress in commending the American Ambassador to Mexico, the Department of State, and the Red Cross for the prompt and efficient way in which they handled the situation.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the stricken people in our sister Republic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therein a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain writings of George Washington of particular moment in our own time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

"FIFTH COLUMN" ACTIVITIES IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and insert two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to express my thanks and appreciation to a former Member of this House, who did not always support my activities here, but whose patriotism and Americanism are above reproach.

It is the former Member from Texas, the Honorable Maury Maverick, now mayor of San Antonio, who on April 4, 1941, saw fit to send this letter to me:

DEAR SAM: I read your address of March 26, 1941, on Un-American Activities in the Western Hemisphere with great pleasure. I want you to know that I got an inspiration for a very good speech on Western Hemisphere solidarity, also that you are in every way right.

This is not exactly an apology, because, of course, you always knew that I thought that you were a first-class man and were doing a good job. In the old days I used to kid around a little bit on your fight on un-American activities, and maybe you were a little strong on it, but, after all, you were a hundred percent right, and so I want to compliment you on your good work.

We must do something about "fifth column" activities in Latin American countries. They go almost unchecked. In one famous restaurant in Mexico City they have to have girls who know German because so many Nazis congregate in the place. In the old days they had to speak only Spanish and English.

Yes; we must wake up, or else we are going to lose all our liberties.

Keep up your good work; and if I can ever be of any help to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

MAURY MAVERICK.

My reply, dated April 19, 1941, was as follows:

DEAR MAURY: It was indeed a pleasure to receive your letter of April 4, particularly in view of the fact that we did not always see eye to eye while we were colleagues in the House.

There is no question that your outstanding Americanism and keen democracy have endeared themselves to every one of us, and I am sure that in your present position you are more than able to give vent to that indomitable spirit which is described so aptly in your book, A Maverick American.

Thanking you for your offer of help; and if I can reciprocate, you may equally count upon my cooperation.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN.

I cannot let this opportunity pass by without commending our former colleague for his courtesy and fairness and the fact that he had the courage of his own convictions in complimenting me at this time, although, as I stated before, he did not always support my activities in this House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by me before the United States Customs employees in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKE DEATHS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the legislative business for the day and other special orders already entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California called attention to the unfortunate bereaved following the earthquake in Colima, Mexico, and wants an appropriation to relieve their suffering. This is all right, but how about an appropriation for the widows and orphans of those mine officials and others who were shot down by Lewis' C. I. O. on the Tennessee-Kentucky line the other day?

And also how about this question of who the big boss may be? Lewis said the northern miners are not going to dig coal. The President asked last night or this morning that they dig coal.

The miners of Kentucky, at least of one mine in Harlan County that I happen to know of, want to dig coal. They are ready to dig the coal to keep the steel plants going. That is, 500 of them are. There are less than 50 C. I. O. members employed in that mine. But, when mine operators in Harlan County and their employees agree and attempt to open the mines, from other places—some within the State and some without—Lewis' armed goon squads come in and shoot them. How much longer will Congress permit this lawlessness, this civil strife?

If the President will let us have a part of the Army or a little police force down there to protect those miners, he will get coal. Who is going to tell us what we shall do? Is it the President of the United States, backed by the Army and the Navy, or is it John L. Lewis, backed by his goon squads?

With the patriotic sons being called away from their homes, the President having stripped local communities of the protection of law-enforcing officers, he owes a duty, under the Federal statutes, to protect the citizens of the United States from violence.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. The Governor of Kentucky still possesses all the police power he needs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is another Democrat who takes his orders from the New Deal headquarters. That does not help any. And the Constitution and the statutes clearly make it the duty of the Chief Executive, when State officials fail to protect their citizens, to use the Army and the Navy for that purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the balance of the week the Committee on Agriculture may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House as that committee is conducting some very important hearings. I have conferred with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and he is agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement which I made before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and to include a letter by Mr. Lical Park, legislative chairman, Washington State Federation of Post Office Clerks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper story relating to the large property holdings that the President's family has in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Minneapolis Star on the 19th of April.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by an outstanding American, Hans Schmidt, appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the Americanism legislative program of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, together with a letter from Frank Haley, of that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON]?

There was no objection.

THE COAL SITUATION SERIOUS IN MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to a telegram which I received yesterday having to do with a very, very serious situation. The telegram is from Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., from Mr. Thomas Folkner, manager of the large Pittsburgh Coal Co. dock, and reads as follows:

Your help in settling coal strike is urgently desired. Coal stocks on hand very low. We expect to be without vessel bunker fuel, Lime Island dock, this week, which, as you know, is extremely important to ore carriers in the defense program.

Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of the basic iron ore in this country goes down the St. Marys River past this dock. Many of these huge ore carriers stop there for

fuel. An exhausted supply of bunker coal is a very, very serious situation. It is up to the President to get this coalmine strike settled promptly before he shuts down every vital defense industry in this Nation.

I understand that today the huge steel plants in the Pittsburgh area are cutting their production down to 68 percent from a high of over 100 percent attained in recent weeks. The situation is very serious and demands immediate attention. Let us not fiddle while Rome burns. [Applause.]

The country demands and is entitled to action—prompt action—drastic if necessary.

Madam Perkins, our infamous Secretary of Labor, has proven herself utterly incapable of coping with this serious strike situation. Last week she testified before the Military Affairs Committee that the coal strike was not a serious matter and was not affecting the defense industry. How could she make such an idiotic, asinine statement in the face of the fact that she was well aware of this drastic reduction in the rate of production of steel this week unless coal was forthcoming? How could she make such an asinine statement when she knows that the stocks of bunker fuel on the Great Lakes are at the lowest ebb in years, and you cannot transport this vital iron ore from the great mines at the head of the Lakes to the steel producing districts without these carriers being supplied with fuel? How can she make such an absurd remark when, for instance, she knows that a large textile manufacturer in Georgia, working on $7,000,000 worth of Army uniforms, stated early last week that he would have to shut down completely within 10 days if coal was not forthcoming? How could she make such a silly remark when she knows that every defense plant in this country, almost without exception, is vitally affected by coal shortage? I'll tell you why she could make such an absurd statement, and why she continues making them: because she is subsidized or hypnotized by John L. Lewis and has been since the day she took her oath of office.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, last week Thursday at a meeting held in the office of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I heard a spokesman for the southern coal operators state that Mr. John L. Lewis offered to bet him $1,000 that they would be forced by the Government to accept his contract just as it was written, and that they would be forced to meet the northern wage scale, despite the fact that there is a considerable freight differential operative against them. I heard that same gentleman make the statement that Mrs. Perkins' chief conciliator, Dr. John R. Steelman, had told these operators that they would have to accept John L. Lewis' demands or the strike would not be settled. Mr. Speaker, if that be true, then that is a devil of a way for a conciliator to talk. I suppose conciliation means that you accept labor's every demand under orders from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this southern coal is particularly well adapted for these Lake vessels, especially during this year when they are working under forced draft, because of the fact that this coal is not only very high in British thermal unit content but also low in ash and the ash has a high fusion point. When these boats are operating under forced draft, as they have been requested to do by our Defense Commission, their furnaces under the boilers are operating at higher temperatures; and if a low fusion point coal is used, it produces considerable clinkers, which clog and burn out the grates, with consequent resultant reduced efficiency in operation. Hence it is particularly important that these southern mines be reopened immediately if we are to continue to move this huge ore demand from the mines to the furnaces.

Why has not Madam Perkins certified this coal dispute to the President's own Defense Mediation Board? You know why she has not. Because, to use her own statement, both sides must agree to mediate before mediation is possible, and in this case she told the operators that Mr. John L. Lewis refused to mediate, and therefore she would not certify the case. And what is Mr. Lewis' attitude, Mr. Speaker? I understand that he has made the statement publicly that "the President will crawl to me on his belly before I'll permit these mines to reopen." What is Lewis trying to do—make a grandstand political show to reestablish himself as the most powerful labor leader in America, and do that at the expense of the vital defense program of this Nation? Mr. Speaker, if that be his attitude, Mr. John L. Lewis, not Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, is the "No. 1 Hitler dupe in this country." And why does not his stooge, Harold Ickes, so charge instead of jumping through the hoop every time John L. cracks the whip?

Mr. Speaker, it looks to me as if the chickens have come home to roost, and it is time for the President to put his foot down and put his foot down a lot more firmly than he did in his statement last night. Who are we to be threatening to knock Hitler's ears off while we permit John L. Lewis to tie up every coal mine in America? Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, time to stop fiddling and get some action. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article which appeared in today's Daily News, by Damon Runyan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN AMERICA

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the problem of unemployment is not peculiar to America. It has attracted the attention of governments throughout the world. Before the present Nazi Government there was a democratic form of government in Germany which failed to provide employment for its citizens there. It failed to feed and clothe them; it failed to give them security; and because of that failure there came into power the National Socialist Party.

The Communist Government of Russia has solved its unemployment problem. The Fascist Government of Italy has solved its unemployment problem. The Nazi Government of Germany has solved its unemployment problem. It is not our solution, thank God, but totalitarianism has given an answer to unemployment. The challenge that we meet is this: Has democracy an answer to the problem of unemployment? I believe it has, and I invite your attention to it, because it is our No. 1 problem, and until we solve it we have not made democracy work. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

USE OF PORT NEWARK AS A SHIPBUILDING YARD

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, this year I presented House Resolution 87, requesting the Navy to negotiate with the city of Newark for the use of the port of Newark for the construction of naval vessels as they did during the World War. The Navy has seen fit to reject this proposal on the following ground:

> Navy contracts for all large vessels authorized have already been let, and there apparently exists within the country sufficient organized, going, small shipyards having the necessary personnel and financial responsibility to undertake the construction of the small ship auxiliary program now pending. A new yard would require engineers, draftsmen, foremen, and other leading men who must be skilled in the art of shipbuilding and have had recent experience therein. The manning of a new yard at the expense of organizations already established would have a serious effect on the latter.

On March 27, 1941, the Division of Business Review of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, a division of the Federal Government, issued the following statement:

> The $629,000,000 earmarked in the new lease-lend bill for construction of ships, similar to those planned under the 200-vessel emergency program, will have no effect upon the situation until this time next year if, as in the present emergency programs, nearly a year elapses between the appropriation of funds and completion of the first

ships. Expenditure of these funds will be impossible until a very large expansion in shipbuilding facilities has been made. Available facilities are now being fully utilized, largely on the naval construction program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on behalf of proposed legislation to grant free postage to soldiers, sailors, and marines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter addressed to me by Frank R. McGrath, president of the United Shoe Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Chapel Hill Weekly, of Chapel Hill, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain extracts from telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to a situation that is very grave and acute in my section of the country. In my congressional district the coal situation is in a very aggravated condition. Many of our industries are about to close because of the lack of coal. This will cause thousands of workmen to be thrown out of employment.

I call your attention to several telegrams I have received, one of which is from the mayor of the city of Richmond, Ind., which reads as follows:

RICHMOND, IND., *April 21, 1941.*

Lack of coal Richmond industry becoming acute. Manufacturers on defense contracts have from 2 to 4 weeks' supply. All local manufacturers rely for power Richmond light plant, who have only 4 weeks' supply left. Can you intercede for preferred shipments? Unless supply is replenished plants will be forced to close.

(Signed) Mayor JOHN R. BRITTEN.

Another telegram from the Starr Piano Co., of Richmond, Ind., reads:

Coal supply exhausted. Laying off 500 men unless conditions change.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind the Members of the House of the danger to our defense program if coal, the main source of power generation in the greater industrial sections of the country, cannot be secured to enable the many industries now engaged in production of defense material to continue to operate. Plants will be forced to shut down, many thousands of workers will become idle; workers who not only desire to be employed for the personal reward of their own labors, but patriotic men and women with full realization of the importance to the country of their individual efforts contributed to the important task of building the Nation's defenses. Those people are as concerned over the growing acuteness of the situation as anyone, and they want to know why the stalemate in coal-strike negotiations should be permitted to continue as it has for over 3 weeks. They want to know why the Secretary of Labor has not seen fit to submit the matter to the National Defense Mediation Board, which was created for the purpose of forestalling dangerous delays in defense production. And they have a right to know.

For several days I have been receiving letters, telegrams, and even telephone calls from my district telling of the growing danger and urging that something be done to avert a serious condition becoming more and more acute. Many Members of the House have received the same sort of pleas and have appealed to the Labor Department daily for information as to the progress of negotiations. The reply has been the same, day after day, while the situation becomes more and more acute. The reply is that further proposals are being considered that day; that negotiations are continuing; that the Secretary of Labor has not yet certified the matter to the National Defense Mediation Board. And the appeals of the public for renewed coal production and delivery continue to mount. When the mayor of Richmond, Ind., sent the telegram which I just read I immediately called the Labor Department and was told by the Labor Conciliation Service that they could give no further statement other than that the President had expressed his personal interest in the matter and that negotiations continue.

I was advised that no preparations were made for preferred shipments of coal even into localities where vital defense industries were threatened with shut-down from lack of coal. Gentlemen of the House, what kind of assurance can you give to mayors of cities in your districts who are appealing for some assurance that their cities will not be forced into an unscheduled black-out and the many local industries forced to shut down, when you get that sort of reply? How can you explain to the working men and women that they will have to be layed off from jobs which they sorely need and discontinue the work upon which national safety depends in these perilous days?

Mr. Speaker, the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor tells me that if—if, mind you—the situation becomes dangerously acute some arrangement may be made for the preferred shipment of coal into affected areas. I hold that the situation is acute now. I have here in my hand a sheaf of telegrams which I will not take the time to read here because they all tell the same story. Among them are messages from the mayor of each of the following cities in my district of Indiana: Richmond, Muncie, Connersville, New Castle, Winchester, Greensburg, Union City, Shelbyville, and Rushville. Each advises that a survey of the coal supply in each city has been made, and the startling result is that the average supply will only last from 2 to 3 weeks. The present shut-down in the coal industry has gone on now for over 3 weeks. From all it is possible to learn, a renewal of operation in the mines is no nearer than it was, and if the condition is permitted to continue only a few more days the matter of coal shortage will be more than acute. If a settlement is arrived at today and coal deliveries start rolling again over our railroads, there is no denying that our defense production will have suffered a serious delay, and the working people of our country will have lost much time valuable to them personally and to the Nation at large based on the value of the result of their labors. Return to normal coal supply and normal operation of industry will incur a great loss in production and to labor by natural process. I hope, sincerely, that even now a settlement has been reached and that the press wires and radio are soon carrying to the Nation the news that coal to generate power for national-defense production will start to move today.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honest conviction that those in charge of this Nation's industries going full blast in the production of sorely needed defense materials are rightfully alarmed over a delay which has now lasted 3 weeks, and that the workers in those industries are justly concerned over the prospects of a pending lay-off which they realize will be dangerous even if it lasts only 3 minutes—not 3 days nor 3 weeks. Labor, industry, and every other class of Americans have a right to demand that those charged with the responsibility of keeping the national-defense program moving should immediately and effectively discharge those duties. Let us get going and keep going and iron out our difficulties while we work. [Applause.]

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] about unemployment. I believe that is a serious situation. Today, however, there is a group of communistic racketeers in this country who create unemployment, and who say to those who want to work, "You shall not work until you pay through the nose and in self-respect your tribute to us, the leaders, in the C. I. O., for our racket."

Those are the people who are saying today in this country, "You cannot work."

I do not see that it is consistent to talk about unemployment, particularly when neither Mr. Hillman, Madam Perkins, nor the administration, nor any of the mem-

bers of the N. L. R. B., have ever said to those people, "Who are you to tell the people of this country whether they shall or shall not work?" There has never been one word said to the C. I. O. to stop their racket, either by Mr. Hillman, Madam Perkins, or by the administration itself. I am waiting; I am waiting every day for it. I do not believe employment will be helped or secured until such time as they give him that kind of word. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD; and, second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein short newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITY IN C. I. O. MARINE UNION

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post there appeared an Associated Press story from Camden, N. J. I quote:

The C. I. O. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America announced today the expulsion for communistic activities of two officers of the shipyard workers' union at the Maryland Drydock Co., of Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Speaker, I have condemned the communistic labor leaders in some of these C. I. O. unions who have been sabotaging our defense program. At this time I want to congratulate this organization for purging its membership of these communistic labor leaders. I commend this action and hope it will be emulated by other unions. I hope the rank and file of labor, which is patriotic, will take similar action and expel all such communistic racketeers from their organizations. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by my brother, J. Vincent Keogh, on the subject of the Brooklyn Public Library and its role in national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Country Gentleman magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Members of Congress how the members of the steel unions who have been granted a 10-cent increase in wages are going to get that increase if the miners refuse to mine coal so they can operate the steel plants of the country. It seems to me if labor in this country is interested in national defense and interested in getting good wages for those who belong to their unions, they will get out and dig this coal, and we will start to dig here in Congress, and we will dig ourselves in and try to cut down on unnecessary expenses in the operation of the regular functions of Government. You promised the country you would. You are not doing that now. Why? We are increasing the regular functions of Government and their costs at a time when we should preserve our Treasury so that we will have the money with which to pay as we go along for national defense. Where are you going to get the money? To do this you have got to get a new tax bill, one that will make the people think as they pay. That alone will save us from bankruptcy. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] that we may accept the announced fact—and apparently it is a fact and I am sure it is authentic—that at last some of the labor unions have commenced to get rid of those who are communistic.

Unfortunately, some name calling has been done on the other side of the picture here. No less a character than our good friend, MARTIN DIES, got into the name-calling business and called people Communists who evidently were not. Think of having one's name unjustly handed down to his grandchildren as having such charge placed against it in the records of Congress.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Just as soon as I finish this sentence I will yield to the gentleman.

We have a man, a worthy and outstanding citizen of Alabama, who is a thirty-second-degree Mason, a steward in the Methodist Church for many years, a devout Christian man, Mr. William Mitch, of my home town, and MARTIN DIES denominated him as a Communist. Many men who are in sympathy with the activities and work of the Dies committee have cooled off because there has been too much of this sort of thing. Mr. Mitch is certainly no Communist nor a Communist sympathizer. If we can get the confidence and support of those who are trying to do something for labor, much more good will come out of it than can be accomplished by a lot of hot-headed name calling. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include brief excerpts from letters and editorials on the labor situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a telegram I have received explaining the serious effects of the coal strike insofar as New England is concerned, and also to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short excerpt from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House I may say that, after the consideration of Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow, there is no further business for the remainder of the week. On Monday next, if a rule comes out of the Rules Committee on the Vinson bill, that bill will be taken up. Of course, Monday is District Day and District business will be in order at that time, but if a rule on the

Vinson bill comes out, that measure will be taken up.

If the bill now before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in connection with the requisitioning of seized vessels or vessels that are held because of sabotage efforts, comes out of the committee, that will be in order next week. I am hopeful that an appropriation bill will be in order for next week. I make this brief statement so that Members may govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the Committee on the Judiciary will have the call tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us what bills that committee will bring up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know. I am sorry that I cannot advise the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I suggest that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] might inform us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts would rather get his information from this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then we can conclude that, as far as Thursday and Friday are concerned, there will be no legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the intensity of the conflict in Europe makes activities of subversive agents sent to this country by Germany, Italy, Russia, Japan, and other nations allied or associated with them more dangerous day by day. These nations have always considered propaganda as part of the legitimate weapons with which they have been waging war. Ours is the one and only country in the world which does not maintain an espionage system in other lands. But that does not prevent other nations from doing their fertile work of espionage and the like on our soil. Propaganda has been raised to the level of a science and the successes which the aggressor nations have been scoring against the democracies make them bolder day by day or almost hour by hour. The ability to cope with such a situation apparently does not reside with our Committee on Un-American Activities.

By reason of the fact that the Nazi regime has been able to extend its sway over a large number of countries in Europe makes the situation even more dangerous. In each of these small countries, while the bulk of the population is thoroughly democratic and hates dictators, yet large numbers of people in all walks of life have succumbed to the lure of power and military regimentation, and have as a result become traitors to their own countries and subservient to the interests of nazi-ism. These men, like the Hachas and Quislings, are tools of the Nazi regime and the leaders of the Gestapo in their own lands. These same men have their counterparts in the United States. The Nazi regime is able to select from the conquered nations of Europe, men who will do its work in America.

Our committee has never seen fit to look into the situation or examine any of these subversive agents of Germany who are not German-born and who are technically members of conquered nations. I am sure that not even the surface has been scratched in ferreting out the activities of these aliens, and no member of the committee or its investigating personnel has the ability, the knowledge, background, or interest to examine into this phase of subversive activities which is so detrimental to the welfare of the United States and the future of our democracy.

At this time it is also important to observe that Italy is no longer an independent country, and that there is no such thing as an Italian "Ovra," although it may still call itself such. The "Ovra" is purely a branch of the Gestapo and operates under its management and control. Germany has taken over the entire work of Fascist penetration which heretofore was the work of the "Ovra." The very fact that sabotage on Italian ships in our harbors became a definite program, as testified to by the men who were taken into custody by our Government a few weeks ago, proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the very method of approach is the work of the Gestapo, and I am sure that if a further investigation is made of acts of sabotage in munitions factories and other undertakings for our national defense, the hand of the Gestapo will undoubtedly be discovered. It is also the Gestapo which is responsible for a renewed activity of the Nazi bunds throughout the country, and particularly on the western coast. This western coast becomes so much more important because of recent events in Japan and the Russian-Japanese nonaggression treaty. You see the Axis Powers act as a unit and their common enemy, our democracy, is treated by direction and under the control of the German Gestapo.

In spite of all the criticism that was leveled against it, the German-American Bund has not ceased to function but on the contrary has increased its activities year by year and almost day by day, and is a greater menace to our people today than it was in 1934 when I first called attention of the committee to this deplorable circumstance. The only thing that we accomplished thus far, if we can call it an accomplishment, is that the bund, apparently ashamed of its own name, is masquerading under the names of singing societies, athletic clubs, sport organizations, and the like.

You may recall that in the many years that I have been occupying the floor of this House and have been studying this problem I particularly felt that camps for the young would become the greatest menace to the survival of our democracy. In 1934 the danger was great, in 1935 the danger was greater, and now in 1941 the danger is overwhelming. Many more youth organizations today swear allegiance to Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, Joseph Stalin, and other tyrants. Many more of these youth organizations forsake the principles of Americanism and band themselves together to pay homage to a foreign dictator. Not only this, but these same youth camps and organizations come back to our public institutions of learning and infect the student bodies of our schools with their pernicious poison. Furthermore, as this activity increases, Americans are being called to foreign countries to confer with officials who teach them the doctrines of fascism and communism at first hand.

German spies are being stationed all over the United States and parades under all kinds of fictitious names are being conducted in the interest of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism.

Our committee, in its study of the question, has evidently overlooked some of the very definite leads which were brought out in the public press or on the platform about some individuals, who, if properly questioned, could shed light on the real facts. Our committee, for instance, has failed to investigate the character of the witnesses who have appeared before it, and who seemingly gave the committee information which in its very nature was misleading. I refer, for instance, to a man named Geoffredo Pantaleoni, who admittedly was a Fascist and who now claims to have a change of heart, and makes accusations against prominent citizens, charging them with fascism. A witness of this type gets himself publicity in the newspapers, has a statement broadcast throughout the country, degrades character, and accomplishes by his appearance before the committee the very things which it would take a great deal of propaganda to bring before the public. As a result, reputations are ruined, Americans are besmirched, and the irresponsible witness before the committee laughs up his sleeve, glorying in the fact that by the skillful use of our own agencies of government he was able to cause disruption and antagonism, the very thing which his master would consider as a clever stroke of propaganda.

This Geoffredo Pantaleoni whom I spoke about on the House floor recently, and which information is a matter of congressional record, made a statement in the New York press on April 18, 1941, in which he says he was a close friend of John F. Arena, the Chicago Italian-language newspaper editor who was recently killed. According to Lt. William Drury, of the Chicago police, it is found that Arena, the Italian editor, was an associate of Al Capone and his gangsters. The letter found by the Chicago police in his office desk proves conclusively that he had offered his services to Dr. Goebbels, the German Minister of Propaganda in Berlin, stating that he was willing and able to act in this country as a secret agent and spy for them, in which he would aid in establishing a dictatorship in the United States.

There are other individuals of this ilk who may be mentioned at this time. There is, for instance, a gentleman named Girolamo Valenti, the editor of a 2 by 4 newspaper, a publication which boasts on its front page that it stands for liberty and democracy and against fascism, dictators, and the "fifth column." This gentleman has made some broad statements without substantiation. In fact, he went to the trouble of writing me a letter about it, to which letter I replied and suggested that he be good enough to furnish me with details of his charges. Instead of receiving a reply to my letter, I received his newspaper, in which there is an alleged answer offering to prove the charges before any investigating committee or tribunal. Thereafter, in the issue of his newspaper of April 19, he attempts to give some facts, but the alleged facts as therein given are purely a babbling collection of generalities. This is the very same gentleman whom I subpenaed in 1934 and whose testimony is now a matter of official record. The testimony then given was, of course, barren of all facts, purely hearsay, and of no value.

If we were to go a little further into the examination of Mr. Valenti's background, we will discover that this gentleman himself is a Communist and has furthered the cause of communism in this country.

This is the record of Girolamo Valenti, the Communist provocator: Valenti was born April 16, 1892, at Valguarnera, Italy. His father was the owner of a sulfur mine. He attended elementary school at Valguarnera and high school and college at Catania, Italy. Valenti came to the United States in 1911. He wasted no time in his activities of organizing a left-wing Italian Socialist Federation in New York City—1913 he assisted in organizing left-wing labor unions; 1917–19 he was editor of the left-wing Socialist publication Avanti; 1919 he edited the La Folla; 1921 he edited La Parola del Popolo; 1923–30 Valenti participated in a number of left-wing strikes in New York City.

He was the author of the book Debs, a Political Prisoner, 1920; also a book of Third International, in 1920, and the Italian Socialist Labor Book in the years 1923–24.

In 1924 after the death of Giacomo Mattiotti, a Socialist deputy in Italy, Mr. Valenti started a public subscription in 1925 in his paper Il Nuovo Mondo in the United States. The collection totaled about $40,000 for the erection of a monument to Mattiotti's memory. Up to this date no monument has been erected, and no one knows what has become of the money that was given by the working men and women, including many humble families in this country. This is the type and character of the man who has been criticizing me. For his information, as well as for the information of the readers of his newspaper whom he has been feeding with the attacks on me, I want to make my stand very clear. I am against any individual, newspaper, or organization that seeks to spread fascism, nazi-ism, or communism in the United States. I have always opposed such movements, as my record in denouncing them again and again on the floor of the House will clearly show, and will continue to do so.

I cannot control the governments of other countries that may choose to establish Fascist governments in their own countries, but I will fight any groups or individuals who will try to import this type of government into our country.

In 1930, at the Communist International Anti-Fascist Congress in Berlin of 250 representatives of left-wing groups of some 20 countries, Valenti was present at this Congress. Henri Barbusse, French Communist writer, was elected president.

In 1930, Valenti was a member of the committee for the support of Il Nuovo Mondo, the campaign publication issued in behalf of Sacco-Vanzetti. This publication was financed by the Communist Garland Fund (American Fund for Public Service). On this committee was Louis F. Budenz, noted editor of Midwest Communist daily.

Valenti has been a member of the International Committe for Political Prisoners, a Communist group. Valenti in 1937 was a registered Communist member of the American League for Peace and Democracy and acted as official at its convention.

So we find that these gentlemen, Pantaleoni and Valenti, were close associates of Italian editor Arena, of Chicago, recently murdered. I am using them as examples only; they do not stand alone. They have given false and untrue statements to Government agencies so as to further their own respective interests, the one fascism and the other communism. Our committee, on the other hand, is so gullible that it accepts testimony of Fascists and Communists at face value without examining into the background of individuals who are giving such testimony.

Let us, as Members of this House, resolve that it is our duty to establish facts, and in order to obtain a true picture of real conditions, let us not accept the testimony of any witness unless we have first satisfied ourselves that the witness is trustworthy. Every witness before our committee should be investigated and checked up as to his background and credibility before he is allowed to take the witness stand and poison the air by accusations which he cannot substantiate.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to continue to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the serious problem of subversive activities within these United States. In the last World War I do not think we were prepared to cope with the situation, because we had not given the matter much attention. We blindly went into many conflicts without knowing who were the enemies within. Thank God, in this era and for a number of years we have watched our way by going into this situation and by checking on certain individuals in the country who are trying to undermine our Government in one form or another. Much has been said on the floor by many of my distinguished colleagues about the question of un-American activities. Much has been preached on the radio, and in the newspapers, and from a general summary of all of the speeches and preachings made, we have confined ourselves to the question of communism. Believe me, my friends, when I say that I join everyone in that condemnation of communism, but with all our condemnation of communism, we have not before this Congress a solitary plan or program to eradicate the so-called evils of communism. We have heard much talk about it, both by the committees investigating communism and by other groups in the country, but gentlemen, we should remember that while we are condemning communism, and rightfully so, yet we have done very little investigating, rather none, of fascism in this country. I think there are just as many saboteurs and spies who seek to destroy our democracy through fascism as there are those who try to do it through communism. As I have said on this floor many times, they are too closely related, and while we are doing a fairly good job in condemning one group of "isms," it is my best judgment that the committees of this Congress have not thoroughly gone into the matter of fascism.

In my investigation of un-American activities, I can safely say that we ought to watch fascism on the part of those who are seeking to advocate fascism in this country just as much as we should watch communism, because it is just as dangerous. While distinguished Members of Congress are charging communism, on the part of certain unions, there are silent groups in this country who may be labeled fascistic, who are just using this method of attacking trade unions to destroy our democracy and to serve the dictators of the other side. There is no question about that. In 3 years now we have not received one single piece of legislation, either on communism or fascism, by which we could do something to destroy the evils that we all claim do exist, and I admit they exist. There are just as many spies and saboteurs who represent Fascist governments in this country, in our labor defense, in our Army and in our Navy and in all walks of life as there are "reds" who are seeking to retard the program of national defense. We are blaming too much on the "reds" and at the same time overlooking a very serious situation that now exists. It has been called to my attention, that a group of sympathizers with the Axis Powers are now in the employ of certain branches of the defense program, where they are trying to sabotage the work of our Government in one way or another.

I think it is the duty of every Member of this House to call upon such investigating committees as we have to bring in some legislation, so that we can consider it and amend the law to such a point that we may be safe in this country from all of these "isms."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Gladly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have you introduced a bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Have I introduced a bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not think it was my function to do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You have been talking about too many speeches and not enough action. Suppose you write a bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to say to my good friend from Michigan——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not saying that in a critical way.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I hope not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When I kick about something I draw a bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I introduced a bill, but I venture to tell you that I will have a hard time with any bill that I introduce in this Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That may be true.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have demonstrated that by a number of pieces of legislation I have presented which I believed were for the benefit of this country and which are still being held up in the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have a dozen of them, but that does not stop me putting them in.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What is the use of my doing it? I call upon the Congress now to call upon the responsible committee that has received authority to do it to bring out some legislation to this Congress. I am sure that if they will submit any sound program we will be glad to support it as national defense.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But do you think we can excuse ourselves if some committee refuses to act?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, my dear colleague, for 2 years I have been seeking in vain to get power for the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to go into the question of dual nationality of people who hold certificates of citizenship to which they are not entitled. That has been tied up in the Rules Committee for almost 2 long years. My plan was very simple. There are men parading around this country as citizens that have no right to hold that certificate. The committee was in a position to expose that condition and then would probably have made recommendation for the cancelation of hundreds of thousands of those certificates. However, we could not get our resolution—that might have called for a small appropriation to the committee—to enable them to examine certain witnesses under oath and properly lay the foundation for the necessary remedies. Now, who was responsible for that? We have had other similar requests that we could not get anywhere with. So you ask me now to present a program as an individual Member of this House, with one vote, where a committee which was empowered with almost a half a million dollars and which has made a study for almost 3 years, has not made any recommendations. You want me to submit a program. The gentleman knows that is not a fair request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, the gentleman has great influence with the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins. Can she not help you?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, the gentleman is trying to be a little bit funny.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, no; not at all.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have nothing to do with Madam Perkins. I have not seen Madam Perkins in years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But I have heard you speak of her several times on the floor.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I spoke in her behalf, because there were some abuses, perhaps by yourself and others, on this floor, and unjustly so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suppose she would reciprocate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not need Madam Perkins. I want you and all of you Members of this Congress to support my plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not said that I would not support it. I have not seen it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

However, I am thankful to this Congress for having appropriated at least a little more money than you have in years past to the Department of Justice. I think that is where the solution of this problem will have to come from.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman says he is thankful for Congress having appropriated a little more money than in the past for the Department of Justice. Does the gentleman realize how much money has been appropriated? Does he know that we have more than doubled the appropriation for the Bureau of Investigation and gave them every dollar they have asked for—which I say was a wise move, but it was a lot more money; not a little more money?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that. I think it was the right thing to do.

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly it was the right thing to do, but the gentleman said we had given them "a little more money." That is a misleading statement, because the regular appropriation for the F. B. I. for this fiscal year was $7,600,000, and the Congress increased this $8,750,000, or a total of $16,350,000.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, I think there is no finer administrator than J. Edgar Hoover, and there is no finer class of men than those under his jurisdiction. I think they are the last word in investigation, and they are the last word in trying to save this country from subversive groups to whom I have referred a number of times.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with the gentleman, but I want the RECORD to show Congress has been very liberal and there was not one vote against this large increase.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has no power of subpena and, most unfortunately, the committees of this Congress which are charged with the investigation of un-American activities have not cooperated a hundred percent.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman should draw a comparison, however, showing one is an investigating committee of the Congress of the United States, and the other is an enforcement organization set up by the Congress of the United States in an executive department. I agree with what the gentleman said about the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its efficient work. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am glad you agree with me. As I said before, if you have increased the appropriation you have done a good thing for this country.

Mr. COCHRAN. We have not only increased it; we have more than doubled the appropriation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am just trying to advise the Congress and was hoping to advise the Dies committee and call its attention to certain matters they have failed to recognize, that the "reds" are not all to blame for un-American activities; that there are other groups—Fascist groups—in this country, domestic as well as foreign, that ought to be investigated, and that have not been investigated. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. KRAMER].

THE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Patents may sit today and tomorrow during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert a speech I made the other day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], who is now entitled to recognition, would yield me just 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS AND THE STRIKES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, concerning all this effort to cover up and to stifle legislation dealing with gangsters in labor, I want to say just this: That men should falter when it comes to dealing with the saboteur and the traitor is enough to awaken the dead. It almost provokes me to call upon the great Washington to step from the gilded frame that hangs to the Speaker's back and behold what is happening to this land of the free and home of the brave which he and his soldiers fought to establish. I am tempted to call upon the Speaker to furl that flag that hangs above his head and keep it furled until there is made manifest here a determination to defend it.

My God, my countrymen. What has become of the spirit that animated the great who have gone before? Have we been reduced to the level of the cattle of the field? Have we become numb, dumb, and done? If in this hour of the Na-

tion's peril we fail the young soldier of the Republic, if we fail the mothers and fathers who have given flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone to fight for their country, then an aroused public sentiment should lash every one of us out of public office.

Mr. Speaker, if we in this time of the Nation's distress lie down like a house of timid curs, then may God have mercy upon our cowardly souls, for we shall have betrayed our country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE GOVERNMENT'S FISCAL PROBLEM

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution, but I thank him more than I can tell for his contribution of yesterday. Writers of history in days to come will refer to that discourse. I noticed the pain on the faces of his colleagues on my right when he was delivering that message and realized that it might possibly do some good.

Blessed are those who expect nothing, for verily they will not be disappointed. I expect nothing particular will come of the remarks I make, being on the minority side, and having been called so many times one of the Jeremiahs of the House. My comfort is that Jeremiah was right. I have taken 30 minutes, and, as usual, after some 5 minutes I shall gladly yield all the time to the House that the Members who may see fit to do so may challenge my statements.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman starts, will he yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not believe the gentleman need be discouraged over the result of his efforts. As the gentleman stated, on yesterday the gentleman from Georgia and also the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] both made very, very good Republican speeches. But nothing will come of it. They took the New Deal down the stretch and back again, but they will not do anything about it. No one is going to follow the advice of the gentlemen.

Mr. GIFFORD. My topic will be somewhat along the line that more and more people are beginning to doubt that the more the country owes the more prosperous it will be. Congress seems to have been successfully etherized and we will apparently not have regained consciousness until some more blanket authority shall be demanded by the President. He has succeeded in gathering in the Executive Department so much of legislative power that I expect that he will not need more money or additional authority for some time to come.

I interrupted the gentleman from Georgia yesterday to remark, "We do not see democracy working; we see democracy being worked." The Democratic Party has drifted far from its ancient moorings. It still celebrates birthdays of its old heroes—but to what end? Jackson Day dinners at $100 apiece, simply to get all the "jack" possible out of Jackson. Nothing else. Jefferson is seldom quoted in these latter days. Defense measures and foreign affairs seemingly occupy the full attention of the administration, which has administered an anesthetic to Congress lest we meddle even with our domestic affairs.

However, this is the critical moment to do those things necessary to restore and strengthen the public faith in the Nation's credit. It is a little heartening—is it not?—to know that there will soon be a tax bill which will restore a little confidence to those investors who fear that the Nation is already lost in a vortex of debt. Never before has the Congress found the public more ready to accept higher taxes cheerfully. They know it is now necessary. However, some suggestions from those high in authority are rather frightening to me.

Secretary Morgenthau says that the simplest and easiest way would be to raise all present taxes by one-third. How comforting to that citizen in the 76-percent bracket to learn he will pay 102 percent. Wonderful reasoning, is it not? When that word goes out I think many will say, "I will keep my money in the bank as long as such a large percent is to go in the kitty." However, these taxpayers in the 76-percent bracket will probably not be touched by the new tax bill. Their present tax is highway robbery already. We heard the appeal from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, in the movies lately. He said that the United States credit is now as always the best in the world.

May I leave my argument for a moment?

Mr. Speaker, may I say to my colleagues that I know how restless they are. They do not wish to listen to comments. Certainly, I have as much attention as other speakers and I should not complain. The anesthetic has done its work.

I was speaking of what Secretary Morgenthau said to the people of this country through the medium of the movies. "Buy a share of the United States." But when you buy a share of the United States you know full well that you are buying a share of the United States debt, not a share of United States assets. We saw the picture of the enormous sheet of stamps and the bonds of small denominations being printed to be offered to the general public. Slogans of doubtful value will soon be on the air. I read one the other day—did you read it?—"buy baby bonds for baby." Little tootsie should grow up in the national debt.

Will those making an appeal for the purchase of these bonds now spend less for nondefense purposes? I saw an editorial in the Washington Post this morning assuring us that these former methods of appeal would not be adopted. Only a very polite invitation to buy will be given, without any special ballyhoo. They do not wish to stir up the public, lest it start to ask questions.

Are we to give up anything? No, says the handsome, bronzed McNutt. In that manner did the newspapers describe and quote him very recently. Speaking undoubtedly for the administration, he stated, in effect: "No; it is not necessary for us to give up any of our social gains. Labor will not be hampered in the slightest," and he proceeded to ridicule these strikes as important or dangerous.

Again the handsome, bronzed McNutt, whom I suppose the ladies, because of his attractive personality, will be more easily persuaded than will the men to believe and to follow. Let us beware of these personalities who so take possession of one's reason. Indeed, let us beware of the Pied Piper who already has captivated by his spending sprees and led us to the very brink of national bankruptcy.

Will the appointment of Harry Hopkins bring confidence to these people who are asked to invest in United States securities? He scattered billions like chaff to the winds, with little reference to need. All wealthy communities have had their full and complete share, and even more, since they could meet the bond conditions, while poor communities could not make the required contributions. But he said, "Spend and spend, and we will elect and elect." He also said, "Tax and tax." But to him "elect and elect" was more important. There were W. P. A. votes, even if only a few, in every wealthy community, and those votes had to be garnered. Will the appointment of Hopkins lend confidence to our people when it comes at a moment when the national credit hangs in the balance? Such an appointment as this is no ray of sunshine to me.

And how careless the President is in his statements. Would not you Democrats give anything if he could withdraw this statement: "What of our national debt? Do we not owe it to ourselves?" Then there is his later reference to the "silly dollar sign." Does that not send the shivers up and down your backs when you contemplate the national debt? Suppose you have eight brothers. One has money and he lends to the other seven and loses it all. That is all right. You see it is all in the family. Will you accept even this as comforting? But this large family of 130,000,000 people of the United States may look at this as something quite different. We all know that this administration has 4 long years to go, and we look to the future with confidence far from unshaken.

Am I trying to sell America short? Oh, no. It is a marvelous country. All its tangible assets will be left. I am only suggesting that those who have must part with what they have, but other people will have the tangible assets, of course. The country will recover.

Will the President reassure his people that he has changed? He easily changes. Can we now believe Dorothy Thompson may be right? What a change she sees in him. After harassing him for 7 or 8 years, now she declares that she sees a new President. There is a little hope in my own heart that he may indeed turn and go the other way. He has done it before. We need only hark back 6 months after he took office, when he turned and went in absolutely the opposite direction. He did so many things which he promised he would not do.

If it were not for the words of Abraham Lincoln ringing in my memory I could never forgive him, and I suppose this must apply to all of us. It is stated that Abraham Lincoln said—I quote from

the historian's book called The Age of Hate—that—

> If I found a solemn promise that I had made to the people that had finally proven itself to me that it was harmful to the people, I would break that promise.

I think a promise would be broken by Abraham Lincoln only under great stress of circumstance. His promises would not have been constantly broken, and he would not "have been blown around by every wind of doctrine."

I hope Dorothy Thompson is right. I had been getting rather tired of reading her articles. But I will have to follow her more closely to see if she can continue to maintain this viewpoint.

This President of ours has fed fat his grudges against business. Now, these business and industrial leaders are the men on whom he has to depend to meet the national emergency.

In order to induce the public to buy this huge amount of bonds we must cheerfully endure greatly increased taxation to maintain the Nation's credit. Confidence is the first thing to be restored. Up to this moment there has been no indication whatever that there is to be any cessation of spending. The gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]—and he placed his speech in the RECORD on yesterday—says that W. P. A. must not be curbed. Your Committee on Appropriations during the entire session to date has seen "gunpowder," even in all nondefense appropriations. Everything is tied to defense, and except for W. P. A. no nondefense appropriations have been curtailed, and now we know that in the end these will not be curtailed.

The last 7 years we have had sledgehammer blows of taxation. Sledgehammer blows have been inflicted upon business by bureaucratic control. All this is in contrast with a willingness to grant to labor all its demands in full. Certainly, these things do not make for confidence, rather do they inspire doubt and fear.

We granted the President enormous powers in the emergency crisis. He has not consented to give them up; and, because of the large, though dwindling, majorities he has received in election, we have not dared to take away from him a single one of those powers. It is very evident that once clothed with power he will not give it up. It must be taken from him.

But confidence will not be restored as long as the sword of Damocles hangs over the head of the monetary situation. On December 30, 1940, to my utter amazement and perhaps to yours, the Federal Reserve Board—whose members this President appointed and who were political appointments, always within his control—this Board, buttressed by the entire Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, united unanimously in recommending to this Congress the taking away of those powers. Up to this moment not a sign of activity by the banking committees of either branch of Congress has been shown. Why? They are awaiting a nod from that dictator President of ours. How did he get such control over this Congress? Should we not now move and move quickly to put into effect such persuasive recommendations?

Are we still under the impression that public opinion and that the populace trusts only the President? How foolish we are if we think that. Twenty-two million people and the solid South do not blindly follow him. Most southerners voted for him merely because they are Democrats, but they are not with him. No, most of them agree with the speech made yesterday by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. Most of them like to have us speak for them. They are not with Roosevelt and the New Deal policies, but they are not with the Republican Party either. They never will be, probably. They saw nothing to be gained by joining the Republican Party so they simply voted Democratic, that is all.

What are those recommendations of the Federal Reserve Board, to which we have paid not the slightest attention? The power to devalue gold expires this June. They say, "Do not renew it." They recommend that no more paper money should be issued against silver, bought from foreigners. That there should be no more money issued against the seigniorage of silver, which is the difference between the bullion and the minted coin value. Bullion valued at thirty-odd cents an ounce and coined at $1.29. Black magic.

They also suggested the repeal of the power to print $3,000,000,000, which, if taken advantage of, would send the shivers down the spine of any monetary authority and those who are watchful of the beginnings of that operation.

They recommend an increase in the legal reserves to any required or necessary amount to prevent possible inflation, and, lastly, that a stop be put to selling bonds to commercial banks. How often I have taken the floor on that subject. We are now told that the baby bonds cannot be transferred. They will have to be canceled over by the Treasury if sold or redeemed. The Treasury is beginning to see the light, because if these bonds could be transferred they would get into the banks, and then the banks could issue money against them. Sale to commercial banks is a highly dangerous proceeding, but it has been allowed to go along so long that now more than $47,000,000,000 of money is available for inflationary spending unless it is curbed.

Why do we sit here dumb? Because Secretary Morgenthau, supported, I am sorry to say, by Administrator Jesse Jones, has replied to those recommendations, "phooey." Morgenthau must sell bonds. He scents the danger of inflation. He wants plenty of money available for his purposes. He wants the banks to have plenty of money to buy the bonds if he cannot sell them to his public.

The President does not want to give up these powers. Is he clothed with greater monetary authority and knowledge than the Federal Reserve Board of experts selected by himself? When it comes to a point that he will not take the unanimous advice of a board like that, he is assuming to himself an omniscience which I hesitate to think any man would dare assume.

I am talking a little today about the Nation's credit, and I want to say to you that we should restore confidence to that public which is asked to invest its savings. Public opinion is only what you think other people are thinking. Public opinion will be moved by what we do and by our statement of intentions. You are the leader of public opinion in your district and you are not to sit idly by until your President or any other pied piper makes your public believe something they ought not believe. We cannot assure ourselves by saying, "My public wants it, and therefore I will vote for it."

The truth about these financial matters is greatly stretched. The truth hurts, and so would you if you were stretched so much.

I am sorry that my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] are not here this afternoon. One of them said he certainly would be here. Beware of these money doctors, these sincere but misguided colleagues, who are advocating printed money. More "black magic."

We are all very much appreciative of our friend the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. He is greatly overworked. He is very thoughtful and conscientious. As no other man, he wants to find a way out; but let him beware that he does not fall a victim to highly dangerous theories.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like the gentleman to yield for just one question now, although I have a lot of questions in my mind. Before the gentleman leaves the point which he has been discussing, I wonder if he would give me his explanation, also for the benefit of the House, of this brief phrase from the Constitution of the United States, in article I, section 8, clause 5, I believe:

> Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

If the gentleman would elaborate on that for our benefit, I would appreciate it.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman can read his Constitution. He was a schoolmaster once himself, and he understands it perfectly. I do not need to assist him, I am sure. The Congress does have that power under the Constitution, and I wish the Congress would take it back again. We gave it away. I think that answer is plain. Of course, it has the power under the Constitution.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I may add a word, I wish the gentleman had expounded that constitutional provision. I agree with the gentleman perfectly in his last statement that the Congress has the power and the Congress ought to exercise it. That power is now largely in private hands.

Mr. GIFFORD. But shall we print money without interest and distribute it? How dangerous. Should we follow the Voorhis plan? Listen. His bill provides that when peace returns there would obviously remain a great unexpended balance of this new money which has been printed, and look what he would do with it: His bill provides "that this be paid

pro rata to all citizens 21 years of age or over."

Now, my friend once advocated the Townsend plan and I presume he still advocates liberal pension schemes, willing to pledge his Nation's credit, and willing to print money without stint to accomplish all this. He wants to get control of the Federal Reserve Bank, which is even now fully politically controlled.

I read his arguments. I save them. The gentleman from California, JERRY VOORHIS, is the most dangerous man and the most lovable man in this Congress. I hope he has not won you over, sir. If he has, I will throw up my hands almost in horror, because I cannot believe that you would dare embark your Nation upon a road like that.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think well of him.

Mr. GIFFORD. So do I.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I always yield to the gentleman. I have been waiting and I have been inviting interruptions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has been pointing at me a lot.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I must point to somebody. So few will interrupt me. I do not know why.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There are many of us on this side of the aisle who feel like following the gentleman from Massachusetts at times.

Mr. GIFFORD. Following me to a banquet, only. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. And I am one of them, but sometimes the gentleman goes into fields where we cannot find him. The gentleman is talking about the constitutional provision giving the Congress the right to coin money and fix its value.

Mr. GIFFORD. What is the Constitution between friends like the gentleman from Arizona and himself?

Mr. MURDOCK. The Constitution means much to me and between me and any friend.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It may not mean much between some gentlemen, I assume, but what I am getting at is this. I would like to have the gentleman go on record here as to whether or not he would favor the Congress taking back that power and the Congress, through the proper agency, issuing money and regulating its value. Would the gentleman favor that?

Mr. GIFFORD. I want Congress to take back the power. I would not have the President appoint the Board. He would not be even satisfied with his own Eccles, who went along with him for 8 or 10 years, and who said that we could safely extend the debt to $40,000,000,000 but that we should balance the Budget once in every 10 years. But now when Mr. Eccles, that servant who yielded to him on every point, says that we have reached the danger point and that we should take back these powers, the President turns his back on him.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then, as I understand the gentleman, he is in favor of the Constitution at times, and at other times he is not; depending upon who is President.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want the powers taken back to the Congress. I think I can trust the Congress, but am not too sure of its ability to withstand pressure from the present Executive.

Mr. O'CONNOR. You only want to take it back when you have the right kind of President in power. The gentleman and I cannot fix the value.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are only 2 of its 435 who can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman represents a part of the industrial section of the country, and I would like to get his views on this thought that has been running through my mind. We are having considerable increases in hourly wages in our industrial centers particularly those places that are blessed or cursed with defense work, whichever way you want to apply it. I gather from what I picked up here on the Hill that very heavy tax burdens are first to be assessed against those wages which are being received by the industrial workers, something like 49,000,000 of them at the present time, and that following that they will be coerced or subjected to very heavy subscriptions for the purchase of Government securities in order to help advance the defense program. Has the gentleman's survey carried him far enough into this particular field so that he could give us an idea of what percentage or what total wages of the industrial workers in the gentleman's district are likely to be lifted out of their pockets through the application of additional taxes and the enforced purchases of Government securities?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; but it is said that 4 percent is to be raised to 8 percent, and people with an income of from $4,000 up to $25,000 will be much more heavily taxed than at present. I don't know that the President would sign such a bill, because he says only those that have ability to pay should pay. My time is exhausted, but before I yield I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] for placing in the RECORD an historical outline of the happenings of the last 8 years and the probabilities of taxation. It is a remarkable statement and it must have taken much research and time. I had expected to refer to it at length, and expected to put into the RECORD and I may at some future time give a summarization of some of its statements.

I want also to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] for putting into the RECORD the statement of James Truslow Adams. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has stated on the floor more than once, the word "thrift" has not been in the vocabulary of the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ARBOR DAY

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that it falls to the lot of a new Member to address the House on a subject that can bring only pleasant thoughts and memories to all who may be listening, and today it is my very pleasant duty to bring to you a memorial—a message in memory of a man who will live always in our histories and in our hearts—J. Sterling Morton, founder of Arbor Day.

It was on the 4th of January, 1872, at a meeting in Lincoln of the State Board of Agriculture that he introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That Wednesday, the 10th day of April, 1872, be and the same is hereby especially set apart and consecrated for tree planting in the State of Nebraska and the State board of agriculture hereby name it Arbor Day; and to urge upon the people of the State the vital importance of tree planting, hereby offer a special premium of $100 to the county agricultural society of that county in Nebraska which shall upon that day plant properly the largest number of trees; and a farm library of $25 worth of books to that person who on that day shall plant properly in Nebraska the greatest number of trees.

At the close of the debate, it was unanimously determined to call the new-born anniversary Arbor Day. On the day named by the resolution over 1,000,000 trees were planted in Nebraska and, without doubt, an equal number the following year. Governor Furnas issued the first proclamation March 1, 1874, calling for the observance of Arbor Day and, in 1884, the legislature made the 22d day of April, Mr. Morton's birthday, a legal holiday to be known as Arbor Day. His name is known in connection with Arbor Day the civilized world over. It has led up to the study of tree planting as a practical, economical necessity and the higher work of educating the people in the love of the beautiful in nature on a scale and to an extent that could never have been achieved without it. The observance of Arbor Day has broadened the scope with increasing interest of the wise use of our national resources. Conservation groups, women's clubs, sportsmen's organizations, farmers, and civic groups, as well as schools, now take part in its observance.

Instead of being limited to a short program in a day's activity, the Arbor Day festival may, as in California, usher in a whole week of programs devoted to conservation of forests, soils, fish, wildlife, parks, and recreation areas, fire-prevention activities, and other phases of resource use and management. In some places, as in one Wisconsin county, the Arbor Day celebration may be planned to mark the beginning of a forest-planting program that lasts through the entire season. It may be devoted, as was recently the case in an Iowa county, to local demonstrations of tree planting for soil-conservation purposes. In other communities, as in some New England towns, the day may be devoted to forest plantings on town or community forests. In still other localities, the tree-planting activities of the C. C. C. have in recent years served as the central theme around which the Arbor Day celebration has centered.

Of necessity, the time of observance of Arbor Day varies in different States

and countries, being determined by climatic conditions. In general, the date is early in the year in the South and is set further along toward summer in the more northern States.

Thirty-eight of the States and Puerto Rico have also enacted laws for the observance of Arbor Day. In other States such a day is observed by proclamation of the Governor, authorization of the superintendent of education, or by other action.

Arbor Day, having been celebrated for 70 years, is now firmly entrenched in the traditions of our country. It has its place in our history and the spirit of the day is unique in that it is always looking forward. It is directing us to a goal that will be reached in the future. It is celebrating not what we have done, but what we hope and determine to do now, and in the days to come. It appeals to the spirit of youth and to all that is generous and forward-looking in men of every age. It carries with it the inspiration to work toward the betterment of the community, the State, and the Nation. J. Sterling Morton knew not how well he was building for direct aid to our present defense program when he inaugurated Arbor Day.

I shall not attempt to give you a complete biography of this famous Nebraskan, for it is written in history and has been published in many issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over a period of years, but I shall rather attempt to give you a brief resumé of his life and activities.

J. Sterling Morton was born in Adams, Jefferson County, N. Y., on April 22, 1832, being the eldest son of Julius D. and Emeline Sterling Morton. He was educated in the schools of Monroe, Mich., University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, but graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. He was married to Miss Caroline Joy in the city of Detroit, October 30, 1854, and started with his bride on the same morning on which the ceremony took place for his future home in Nebraska. Mr. Morton's first public service in Nebraska, then a territory, was as a member of the lower house of the second legislative assembly, having been elected in 1855. He was reelected to the legislature again in 1857. It was this session of our legislature which undertook to remove the seat of government from Omaha to Florence by the power of resolutions of the two legislative bodies.

Mr. Morton, during his life, was a candidate for national office a number of times, generally against his will, losing in the elections because of the party majorities within the State. He was nominated for Congress in 1860, nominated for Governor in 1867, and again nominated for Governor in 1882. In 1888, at a convention which he did not attend and in which he had very little interest, he was again nominated for Congress. His final political effort was made in 1892, when he was again candidate for Governor.

Upon the election of President Grover Cleveland for his second term, he was tendered the position of Secretary of Agriculture. In this capacity, he distinguished himself immediately for his administrative ability. He antagonized political practices of both parties during his term of office and opposed all policies that, in his judgment, were not useful and would dissipate the taxpayers' money. He believed in conservation, rather than waste; he believed in the principle of abundance, rather than that of forced scarcity. He never sought a battle, but never refused one. At the close of the Cleveland administration, Mr. Morton resumed his life work of building the State of Nebraska and especially that portion of the State in which he made his home, for all these years he was essentially a farmer, but devoted much of his time to civic activities.

Mr. Speaker, Arbor Day in the United States has become a symbol of our faith in the future. Its observance in the planting of trees is indicative of our continuous effort to help nature help us and of determination to use better our national resources. The rare foresight of men like J. Sterling Morton is not common. We have reviewed briefly the life of a man who asked no more of life than he himself was willing to put into it. He labored long and earnestly and unselfishly to better the living conditions of not only Nebraskans, but of all other States, having in mind the happiness of all Americans. He labored unceasingly without benefit to himself and without pay, and history confirms his record of achievement. One of the founders of our great State of Nebraska, we are proud to claim him as our own while sharing the memory of his unselfish life and accomplishments with the Nation. In this critical hour which faces us in our national life today, we could well pray that some other leader with the vision and farsightedness of J. Sterling Morton might be sent to us for our guidance. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCGRANERY (at the request of Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania), for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The hearings on flood control announced to begin on Tuesday, April 1, were postponed to begin on Monday, April 21. As announced, the hearings will be on reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since H. R. 9640 was reported on May 2, 1940, but not considered by Congress on account of national defense, and the hearings will also be on amendments to existing law. The committee plans to keep the authorizations within a limit of $250,000,000, and the bill planned will cover the principal regions of the country and will include the preliminary examinations and surveys on which favorable reports have been submitted.

1. Monday, April 21: Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, opened the hearings with statements and recommendations covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing emergency to provide flood control and desirable public works. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, assistant to the Chief of Engineers, who advised the committee during the hearings on H. R. 9640 in 1940, also appeared before the committee and submitted his views and discussed generally the projects that have been favorably reported since H. R. 9640. General Schley and General Robins will be available subsequently for additional information as to additional projects as they are considered by regions and as desired by the committee.

Information by division engineers and by district engineers has been furnished to the Chief of Engineers and will be available to the committee as reports in the several regions are reached during the progress of the hearings.

When the lower Mississippi Valley and the region under the supervision of the Mississippi River Commission are reached Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, will appear before the committee to report upon the status and progress, with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit, and will be available to the committee during the progress of the hearings on the lower Mississippi Valley.

2. Tuesday, April 22: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in Los Angeles and the Los Angeles area.

3. Wednesday, April 23: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Los Angeles and southern California region.

4. Thursday, April 24: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers and representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Kings and Kern Rivers projects.

5. Friday, April 25: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the Willamette Valley, the Columbia River Basin, and the Pacific Northwest.

6. Monday, April 28: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the western and southwestern Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado and west Gulf rivers.

7. Tuesday, April 29: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Missouri River and tributaries.

8. Wednesday, April 30: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Mississippi and Great Lakes region.

9. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

10. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

11. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

12. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

13. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

14. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

15. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

16. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

17. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

18. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 3188, a bill relating to Members of Congress and certain other persons receiving compensation for addresses and speeches, on Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Continuation of hearings on H. R. 3359 (preventing publication of inventions) and H. R. 3360 (prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents), previously scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1941, have been postponed until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, and Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, April 23, 1941, for the consideration of private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, the purposes of which are to extend to all Government agencies the authority to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when it is in the interest of national defense, and to broaden correspondingly the authority to assign priorities to such contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

465. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

466. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a bill proposing several amendments to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

467. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1936 amounting to $52.46, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 amounting to $7,788,000, in all $7,788,052.46, together with a draft of proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 183); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

468. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

469. A letter from the president, the American War Mothers, transmitting the report of the American War Mothers from October 1939 to October 1940; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 148. Joint resolution relating to the Temporary National Economic Committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4465. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4466. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 4467. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish additional statistical information and marketing service for the benefit of the poultry industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 4468. A bill to limit the expenditure of Federal funds in order to assist in the control of subversive activities and to promote efficiency among employees of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4469. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works on the White River between Augusta and Clarendon, and at De Valls Bluff, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 4470. A bill to exempt from liability for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 men who have been honorably discharged from the Regular Army for the convenience of the Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4471. A bill to prohibit the use of the mails or other channels of interstate or foreign commerce for the delivery or transmission of any advertisement, solicitation, statement, or other communication wherein the word "Olympic" or any of its derivatives is used in such a manner as is likely to deceive the public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4472. A bill to prohibit the use of the mails or other channels of interstate or foreign commerce for the delivery, transportation, or transmission of any tickets, advertisements, solicitations, statements, or other communications containing false statements or representations as to the amateur character of any event, competition, or spectacle for the purpose of selling tickets of admission to, or raising funds for the support of, such event, competition, or spectacle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4473. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4474. A bill to provide for the further improvement of the Snake River between its mouth and Lewiston, Idaho; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 4475 (by request). A bill to extend gratuitous benefits to beneficiaries of reserve officers and temporary commissioned officers who shall have served in the regular armed forces for a certain period prior to being ordered to active duty or being commissioned temporary officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4476. A bill providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4477. A bill to provide domiciliary, medical, and hospital treatment to certain former members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to appropriate the sum of $200,000 for the victims of the earthquake at Colima, Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 41 A, concerning tariff and dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 33 A, concerning monopoly with dairy products; to to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4478. A bill granting an increase of pension to Katherine Sparks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4479. A bill granting an increase of pension to Edith M. Link; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4480. A bill for the relief of certain Hindu aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4481. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Riddle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4482. A bill to correct the naval record of Earl Emmett Carson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4483. A bill granting a pension to Lulu May Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

805. By Mr. BELL: Petition of several citizens of Kansas City, Mo., endorsing the prepared statement of the Sentinels of America regarding subversive activities; to the Committee on Rules.

806. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 22, relative to construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

807. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 14, relative to memorializing Congress to allocate funds in surplus marketing budget for 1942 to California fruit growers because of loss of normal export markets due to the war; to the Committee on Appropriations.

808. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 13, memorializing the President and Congress to enact legislation proposed by United States Senate bill 710, providing a basis of recovery for claims of California Indians based on early treaty arrangement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

809. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 34, relative to memorializing the President and the Congress in connection with legislation to provide marine hospitalization for fishermen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

810. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Mae Copeland, of Rockford, Ohio, and 112 other voters of Mercer County, Ohio, supporting legislation to make it impossible for young men in military training camps to have access to alcoholic beverages and that vice conditions in or near the camps be not tolerated by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

811. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petitions of Indiana members of the Christian Endeavor Union, approving the Ludlow peace amendment to the Constitution (H. J. Res. 1), proposing a referendum on war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

812. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, petitioning consideration of its resolution in regard to reciprocal border rights of American citizens and Mexican citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

813. Also, memorial of the State of California, petitioning consideration of its resolution to increase the import excise on foreign eggs and egg products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

814. Also, memorial of the State of California, petitioning consideration of its resolution relative to Kings River flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

815. By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of the Woman's Club of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

816. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mothers of the United States of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

817. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, Missoula, Mont., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

818. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, Bremerton, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thy holy name, O Lord Most High. We pray Thee to give us the secret of that life which will lift us above temptation and confusion and make us more than conquerors. There are many feverish crises which would dwindle into harmless proportions if only we could see them in Thy light. How gracious is Thy word. "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength." We rejoice that there is a divine Spirit stirring within us, making out of the dull realities of life an inspiration for things nobler, beholding the hand of love, of wisdom, and of power. Heavenly Father, in this hour of the solemn ministry of the clouds, oh, reveal unto us with awakened thought and elevated vision, that they are the dwelling places of God. In our national clouds of unrest and uncertainty, enable us to find the true forces of union and cooperation. Gather in our country's hush those forces that shall create mutual bonds of brotherhood, augmenting the treasures and the riches of a Christian democracy. Oh, minister to our people a sense of the nearness of the things invisible, of their magnitude, glory, and beauty. May we strive to be first in wisdom, thus becoming the servants and ministers of all. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution and move its adoption:

House Resolution 185

Resolved, That OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on World War Veterans' Legislation and the Census.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a few brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Hon. Alexander I. Rorke on April 19 before the National Democratic Club of New York City.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the speech I was just given permission to extend in the RECORD may possibly exceed the 2-page limit by a small amount. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding this, I may still be permitted to extend it in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Voice of the People column in the Morris (Ill.) Daily Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I made in North Carolina on March 12.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GERRYMANDERING MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to lend me their ears but to hold their respective noses because I am about to make a disclosure that is somewhat odoriferous.

Mr. Speaker, a committee of the Republican Legislature of Massachusetts is now attempting to gerrymander the Democratic State of Massachusetts so it will be virtually without representation in the National House. Unmindful of the workings of democracy—of the serious situation with which our Nation is confronted—they have so cut up Massachusetts as to put three sitting Democrats into one district. They will make it impossible to elect any Democrat except two from the heart of Boston, which will leave Democratic Massachusetts with a ratio of 6 to 1 Republicans in the House. This is a disenfranchisement of the progressive, liberal, and Democratic voters of Massachusetts. It is not gerrymandering; it is a massacre of the rights of the people of Massachusetts in order to serve a few scheming politicians. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, for 3 long years—for 3 long years—the President of the United States when he ran for office in 1932, speaking of Mr. Hoover said that for 3 long years Hoover had run the country in debt to the tune of $3,491,000,000. But for 8 long years—for 8 long years—for 8 long years this administration has made Mr. Hoover look like a piker when it comes to running the country into debt.

The Treasury statement of April 19 shows you are over $4,000,000,000 in debt for this year, and you have not started yet. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will soon bring in a bill to raise $3,500,000,000 more taxes that the public must find some place, some way, somehow; and I am glad he is bringing in a bill of that size. It is time this Congress began cutting down governmental expenses. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

WHO IS THE BIG BOSS—ROOSEVELT OR JOHN LEWIS?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a well-defined rumor going around the Capitol, and I will not give the exact words, to the effect that John Lewis told the President in substance that before we dig coal in this country the President will have to come crawling to him, Lewis, on his vest buttons, or words to that effect: The President acts as though he might do it. It is quite evident that Lewis has the President over a barrel. Many are watching to see what will happen.

Some of us are wondering whether or not we are going to get coal to operate the steel mills so that those employees can get the increase in wages which was given them the other day. Are we to have the coal that we must have in order that the Nation may proceed with its defense program. Or are we to permit Lewis to hold up the digging of coal which in turn will close the steel mills, and later other industries? We are wondering why it is that the President does not give protection to the southern miners and the southern mine owners who have agreed among themselves on a program, who want to dig coal, who have told us they will dig coal, but who cannot do so because John L. Lewis now is getting back to the same position he was in 1922 when, following his telegram of that time, 25 miners, union men, were killed at Herrin, Ill., by members of Lewis' United Mine Workers. Just when will we here in America have that "equality of opportunity" which the President said must prevail everywhere in the world?

Who is the big boss, Roosevelt or John Lewis?

Shall we have national defense or must we yield to Lewis? When the boys are drafted to train and fight shall we permit Lewis to prevent the production of coal which will prevent the operation of factories upon which those draftees are dependent for the things which will enable them to train and, if need be, fight?

[Here the gavel fell.]

PRINTING OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 369

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably (Rept. No. 32) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 28), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 28

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 9,000 additional copies of House Report No. 369, current session, entitled "Report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens," which shall be for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of moral rearmament and to include therein two short articles by Mr. Gould Lincoln and Mr. David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

BAD LUCK FOR THE SICK POOR OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the editorial which appears in this morning's issue of the New York Times. It is entitled "Bad Luck for the Sick Poor." As a Representative from a district in the city of New York, I regret that I must plead for help from the Surgeon General of the United States.

The present New York City administration has abandoned the sick poor. It has failed to build sufficient hospitals; it has refused to provide money to pay for city patients in private institutions. It is my intention to make a direct appeal to Dr. Parran to do something about the serious matter. Our mayor is so busy that he cannot find time to listen to the appeals of our leading citizens on behalf of the sick poor and the needs of our city-run hospitals. At a recent meeting in our city hall the representatives of the various private hospitals—Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic—were grossly insulted for asking the board of estimate to appropriate the funds to pay for the actual cost of hospital care for the city cases furnished by the private hospitals.

Common sense and world conditions dictate that we should be extending our hospital facilities and not crippling them by failure to vote the needed funds, personnel, and medical supplies.

The following is the New York Times editorial and a copy of my letter to Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States:

[From the New York Times]

BAD LUCK FOR THE SICK POOR

The board of estimate on Monday defeated a motion of Borough President Lyons of the Bronx to add $460,000 to the sum allowed voluntary hospitals for handling city cases. Even if this money had been allowed it would not entirely have relieved what is really a scandalous situation. The municipally operated hospitals are badly overcrowded. The private hospitals are about three-fourths full. The city now pays $3 a day for city patients received in the private hospitals, which is not only a lower rate than that paid in up-State hospitals doing a similar service, but

is between one and two dollars less than it costs the hospitals to care for the patients.

This ratio of services paid for to services rendered cannot be kept up indefinitely. Hospitals which already find it hard to balance their budgets cannot afford to fill their empty beds at a collective cost of $5,000 or more a day. Nor can the city save money in the long run by pinchpenny dealings with them. It might save money by filling the empty private beds at a fair price and thus avoiding the necessity for more municipal hospitals.

There is no argument as to the facts. More than 2 years ago Mayor LaGuardia made an appeal "to strengthen the position" of the private hospitals. Nearly a year ago the situation was clearly presented in the report of the Thacher committee, working under the auspices of the Hospital Council of Greater New York. Nothing was done about it. An increased appropriation is again refused. This is short-term and misleading economy. It is long-term waste. The board of estimate ought to reconsider.. It has time to do so before the final passage of the budget tomorrow.

APRIL 23, 1941.

THOMAS PARRAN, M. D.,
Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. PARRAN: Today on the floor of the House of Representatives I read an editorial which appeared in the New York Times entitled "Bad Luck for the Sick Poor." The editorial and my remarks may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As you probably know, at a recent public hearing in the City Hall of the city of New York, representatives of the various hospitals—Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant—were grossly insulted when they pleaded with the city authorities for the actual cost of the medical care furnished to city cases. The daily cost to the private hospitals to handle the city cases is over $5,000 in excess of the amount which they receive from the city of New York. Thus hospitals which are nonprofit organizations are contributing to the city this substantial sum when it should be the exact reverse.

The action of the board of estimate in refusing to appropriate sufficient money to meet the cost of medical care for our sick poor has been properly described as a "scandalous situation."

At that same public hearing, presided over by Mr. Newbold Morris, as the representative of Mayor LaGuardia, testimony was offered which indicated a woeful lack of doctors, trained nurses, and medical supplies in our city-run hospitals. In my opinion, these conditions are shocking to common decency and reflect on the part of Mayor LaGuardia and his hospital department an utter lack of interest in the welfare of the sick poor.

During the administration of President Roosevelt the city of New York has been given every dollar it needed to build adequate hospital facilities. Therefore I find no possible excuse for the frightful conditions existing in our hospitals.

Mindful of the fact that we are in the midst of a world situation which could throw added burdens upon our hospital resources at a moment's notice, I dread to think of the sad plight of the citizens of my city under the present administration with its do-nothing and don't-care attitude.

As the Surgeon General of the United States, I beg of you to do something about the awful plight of the hospitals of New York City. Because Mayor LaGuardia, Comptroller McGoldrick, and President of the Council Newbold Morris obstinately refuse to do their plain duty to the sick poor, I respectfully request you to take such action as may be proper under the circumstances.

The conduct of the officials who are directly responsible for what is happening to our city hospitals is a stench in the nostrils of every citizen.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain tables in reference to agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after the disposition of special orders heretofore made, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject The St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts, as well as an address delivered by Judge T. W. Davidson before the Texas Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, according to the estimate of the National Industrial Conference Board, there will still remain in the fiscal year 1942 somewhere between five and seven million unemployed people in the United States. Most of these people will be older men. The average age of men employed on W. P. A. today is 5 years older than the national average of all people employed.

I mention these facts to call to the attention of the House that we have come to a time when we cannot afford unemployment in America, when it is absolutely necessary that we use to the fullest extent all of our manpower in connection with the national-defense program and the production of necessary goods and services. It is something that is going to have to be considered by the House of Representatives and the Congress before long. I merely want the Members to be thinking about it in the meantime. If there ever was a time to abolish unemployment that time is now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my own article giving 18 reasons why the St. Lawrence seaway proposal should be defeated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

LET THIS NATION STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN BEFORE PLUNGING INTO THE WORLD WAR BY THE CONVOY ROUTE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objecton to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, the leaders of the Yugoslavian Army, assured and encouraged by the British Government that they would be given every assistance, overthrew the pro-Hitler government and enthroned the boy King, Peter. Within 48 hours their country was invaded by Hitler's armies, and the British aid and assistance failed to materialize. Twelve days later the boy King who had been encouraged by our President, as well as by England, was forced to flee to Athens as his armies succumbed to the weight of overwhelming numbers and modern mechanized equipment. Today the cables and radio carry the news of the imminent collapse of Greek resistance. Already Athens is under siege, and the King has fled to Crete. During the past 4 weeks I have watched the newspapers with more than passing interest. In that time I find the reports emanating from German sources on the trend of the war have invariably proved far more accurate than the reports originating from London.

Why, Mr. Speaker, should the American people be deceived by the newspapers? Why are we not given the whole unvarnished truth about the European war?

The time has come, I believe, for our Government, particularly the Members of Congress, to stop, look, and listen before plunging this Nation into the World War by the convoy route.

If England can convoy or otherwise deliver her merchandise to the United States, she surely ought to be able to take back supplies and munitions. I say this because every liquor store in America claims to be generously supplied with Scotch, English, and Irish liquors. Many of our leading dry-goods stores are featuring British fabrics and suitings; shoes and luggage of the finest quality, "made in England," are available to those who will pay the price. The British, until recently, had a traveling trade display moving up and down the Atlantic seaboard informing the public that the Empire motto was trade as usual, and asking them to buy British.

From newspaper accounts I also understand that the British Government, in order to protect its South American trade routes, still has in the intercoastal trade a large number of fine vessels that might well be put to the uses of war in case of necessity.

Yet we are asked to build ships and more ships—a bridge of ships, as it were—to aid Britain.

Then I learn, too, from the newspapers that Great Britain, sorely pressed as she is, has been able to spare a few commercial planes for the South American trade. Of course, if she did spare them it undoubtedly was for cash, and not on a lend-lease basis.

Personally, I think the people of America are being taken for a one-way ride that will end in disaster, unless we definitely halt the administration's ill-advised announcements and moves which daily bring the Nation closer to the actual shooting. The people are yet sovereign in this Republic. They have not surrendered their sovereignty to the Executive, but unless they assert themselves they will soon find no sovereignty left to surrender. Let us save our sovereignty, save our Nation, save our boys' lives, by keeping out of England's present war. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a release from the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and that my statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials taken from the press, showing the attitude of the press toward the Vinson bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the war news on all of the front pages, it occurs to me that probably a very important event yesterday may have slipped the attention and the notice of both the Speaker and the House. After a lapse of 25 years, Buffalo has again completely come into its own by the election of a Republican Member of the House in the special election yesterday. I am very happy to advise my brethren on the majority side that the minority will have one additional man to carry on its program of good government and the scheme of representative democracy for which we have contended through the years. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In other words, sorrows come not singly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE FUTURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln said, "This country cannot survive one-half slave and one-half free." Paraphrasing that remark of the immortal Lincoln, I would say the Republican Party cannot exist one half Republican and the other half New Deal. It must veer to the right or fold up. The purge is in order. No other course is honorable. Most Republicans know this. Few have the courage to publicly admit it. But now is the time. Tomorrow may be too late. The Republican Party must become the American Party and the people's party. It must become the national-defense party and the peace party. It must become the personal party of the man on the street, in the shop, at the factory, and down on the farm. It cannot claim to be American and for our people, yet at one and the same time be directed by men who are economic internationalists, free traders, or warmongers. There is no middle way. Straddling is out. The Republican minority must be a constructive opposition group. There is no room in the Government for two administration parties. This unity and coalition stuff is the "bunk." It spells disaster. So farewell to the Knoxes, the Stimsons, and the Willkies of yesterday. Bring forth the Jones and Smith boys, the good, old American team who can save the Republican Party. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the State Regent of the Daughters of the American Revolution of South Dakota at the time of the presentation of the South Dakota State flag at Valley Forge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas (when the Committee on the Judiciary was called). Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to call up a number of bills. Many of these bills have been reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is believed that probably many of these bills could be passed by unanimous consent. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bills which, at the direction of the committee and with the permission of the House, I shall call up may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Duncan	McGranery
Baldwin	Eberharter	Mitchell
Bolles	Folger	Mott
Buck	Fulmer	Norton
Buckley, N. Y.	Gale	O'Day
Burgin	Harrington	Reece, Tenn.
Byrne	Hill, Colo.	Robsion, Ky.
Cartwright	Hill, Wash.	Schaefer, Ill.
Celler	Izac	Scrugham
Chapman	Jackson	Secrest
Chenoweth	Jenks, N. H.	Shannon
Cluett	Johnson, Ind.	Stearns, N. H.
Collins	Johnson, Luther A.	Sweeney
Costello	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Taylor
Crawford	Kelly, Ill.	Tinkham
Creal	Kerr	Vorys, Ohio
Crosser	Kilburn	Ward
Culkin	Kleberg	Welch
Cullen	Kopplemann	Wene
Curtis	Lea	West
Dies	Lesinski	White
Domengeaux	McArdle	Wright
Dondero		Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have permission to sit during sessions of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to

include therein two excerpts from a recent publication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

INSPECTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS OF COAL MINES

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short letter to the speaker of the House of Representatives from the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until Monday midnight to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 4139.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of hunting in Kings Mountain National Military Park area and to include correspondence with the Director of National Parks in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief explanatory statement which may facilitate the disposition of a good deal of business today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary has directed me to call up a number of bills. Practically all of them are reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. I believe they are not in any sense controversial, and it has been suggested, and it seems to me a good suggestion, that we test the disposition of the House to dispose of these bills by unanimous consent; and I shall ask permission to proceed in that way, with the understanding that if opposition develops to any of these bills as they are called up I will ask the privilege of proceeding to the next bill and then return to those bills in their order and ask that they be taken up in the regular way under the call.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman is going to call these bills up in the order in which they are on the desk here?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And if there is any objection to any one bill, the gentleman will proceed with another bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will ask that the bill objected to be put aside and then go on with those unobjected to, with the privilege of returning and proceeding in the ordinary way on Calendar Wednesday with the bills objected to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For the information of some Members who may be opposed to some of these bills, I would point out if they permit this procedure to be followed they will have less chance of defeating any bill to which they are opposed. If any Member is interested in defeating a bill, he should object to the procedure the gentleman has suggested; otherwise he will have less chance in his opposition.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; he would have the same opportunity to oppose the bill when we return to the consideration of that measure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the Member insists upon the bills being considered in their regular order, each bill could take 2 hours, and if this were done the bill he is interested in opposing might not be reached.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right; but no one is going to do that with reference to the business of the House that has to be attended to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The business of the House will be attended to; but there are several bills that are controversial, and the men who are fighting those bills should know their rights under the rules of the House.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I assure the distinguished minority leader that there will be no disposition at all to take advantage of any gentleman who wants to offer any opposition to the bills which he can offer under the rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman could not take advantage of them if he wanted to, because the rules of the House would protect the individual Member.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not want to take up the time of the House in this discussion, but if any gentleman is opposed to any bill, if he objects it cannot be proceeded with except as we would proceed under the call.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What I want to point out is if I were opposed to a bill like this Missouri judgeship grab, I would object to this procedure now, so that time would be consumed on these individual bills and that one measure would not come up.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. There is no desire upon the part of the majority to interfere with the disposition of the business of the Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sure the business of the House will be disposed of properly, and of course I do not blame the gentleman for wanting to put his program through en bloc, if he can.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Oh, we are willing to sit here as long as we can, if there is any objection to the procedure. I am merely trying to expedite the business of the House, and to make it possible for Members of the House to get away from here as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Why would it not be better to find out the bills that are going to be objected to first, and thresh them out?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is what I want to do. In other words, I want to call up a bill, and if anybody objects to it, then to lay that bill aside temporarily.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman expecting to bring up the wire-tapping bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up House Joint Resolution 148, relating to the Temporary National Economic Committee, and ask unanimous consent that this resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 148

Resolved, etc., That not to exceed $2,500 of the funds appropriated for the Temporary National Economic Committee which remain unexpended and unobligated on April 3, 1941, shall be available after such date for expenditure by the Committee, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman, for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the Committee, including the employment of necessary clerical and other assistants in connection therewith.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS, ETC., TO RESIDE WITHIN 20 MILES OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up H. R. 148, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLARK). The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

To amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on account of the confusion that may have developed because of the extremely long title of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of this bill be postponed for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws the bill for the present?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

GRANTING EASEMENTS OVER CERTAIN UNITED STATES LANDS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up the bill (H. R. 3394) to authorize the Attorney General to grant easements to States over lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General, whenever he deems it advantageous to the Government and upon such terms and conditions as he deems advisable, is hereby authorized on behalf of the United States to grant to any State, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, easements in and rights-of-way over lands belonging to the United States which are under his supervision and control. Such grant may include the use of such easements or rights-of-way by public utilities to the extent authorized and under the conditions imposed by the laws of such State relating to use of public highways. Such partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction over the areas covered by such easements or rights-of-way, as the Attorney General deems necessary or desirable, is hereby ceded to such State. The Attorney General is hereby authorized to accept or secure on behalf of the United States from the State in which is situated any land conveyed in exchange for any such easement or right-of-way, such jurisdiction as he may deem necessary or desirable over the land so acquired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is suggested by the Department of Justice and it grows out of a situation in my own community. The Government has acquired a considerable bit of land for a Federal institution. There is a public road that runs through the property. What the Government wants to do is to close that public road running through the property and move the public road to the edge of the property. That is all there is in this bill. It applies to some other situations in different States. The bill has been reported with a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up the bill (H. R. 3191) to amend the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for this bill grows out of what at least some members of the committee feel is a misapprehension of the effect of legislation which the committee reported out last session and is now the law. The government of the District of Columbia is apprehensive that it might not be privileged to bring certain goods from Lorton, Va., where it has an institution which manufactures those goods in a prison, to the District of Columbia, where those goods may be used. This is for the purpose of making it clear that the goods produced by prison labor may be transported from the District of Columbia's prison, located at Lorton, to the District of Columbia, where it is desired to use it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is simply transportation within the District?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is not within the District. There is physical territory intervening between Lorton, in Virginia, and the District of Columbia, but it is transportation from an institution of the District to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all this bill does?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is all this bill does.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this bill does anything more than what the gentleman has stated. Does it change the present substantive law in any way?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Not in any way at all. I may say that personally I have never agreed that the District of Columbia had to have this sort of legislation, but they insist on it, and the Committee on the Judiciary reports this bill in order to remove any doubt.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is not the effect of this proposed amendment, that that institution will be permitted to sell prison-made goods to the United States Government in competition with free goods?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would like some member of the committee to state if he has a different impression about it. I understand it is for the purpose of bringing these goods to the District of Columbia, where they may be used in the District of Columbia. If I am in error, will some gentleman on the committee correct me? I think that is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I should like to have very definite assurance on that point before anything is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am told by my colleagues on the committee that that is correct. I do not think they have to have this bill, as a matter of fact. The reason for the proposed legislation has grown out of the misapprehension which I have stated. I am sure that is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to withdraw the bill from consideration at this time?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the next bill which I shall call up is S. 482, to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, and if I may have permission I would like to make a brief explanation so that Members will understand it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that he may make a brief statement?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been recommended by the council and approved, as I understand, by the Department of Justice, and unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. Does anybody know how many judges there are now in the State of Ohio?

Mr. THOM. Six, I think.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This judgeship has been deemed necessary by the Council of Judges and the Department of Justice; and the Committee on the Judiciary, after investigating the facts, has unanimously agreed that this judge ought to be added.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I respectfully make that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice

and consent of the Senate, one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Ohio", insert "*Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 137) to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on this bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Then the gentleman does not want to take it up by unanimous consent?

Mr. MICHENER. No. This bill cannot be considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Then, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that the bill be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL SEAL FOR FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3974) to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to adopt an official seal, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the Whole House as in the Committee of the Whole. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely makes certain the right of the Federal Security Agency to use a seal. It now uses a seal to authenticate its business, but there is some question as to whether or not it has authority to do so. They therefore wish to make certain of their authority.

The committee has reported the bill unanimously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency is authorized to adopt an official seal to be used as directed by the said Administrator on appropriate occasions in connection with the functions of such Agency or of any office, bureau, board, or establishment which is or shall hereafter become a part of such Agency, and such seal shall be judicially noticed. Copies of any books, records, papers, or other documents in the Federal Security Agency shall be admitted in evidence equally with the originals thereof when authenticated under such seal.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF PRISON-MADE GOODS BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 3191) dealing with the transportation of prison-made goods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman that he need not ask unanimous consent but may call up the bill if he so desires.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Then, Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3191) to amend the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, be amended by inserting after the words "Federal Government", occurring in the first proviso, the words "or the District of Columbia Government."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, the bill is now open to amendment, and any amendment offered may be discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and reported favorably. While I was opposed to the original bill which this bill amends, in my judgment, there is no reason why the District of Columbia should not have the legislation asked for in this bill. I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has an amendment which he desires to offer and I now yield the floor to him for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Page 1, line 8, change the period to a comma and add the following: "and strike out 'or to agricultural commodities'."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I realize we are not so rushed but what I may take a little of the time of our good colleague from Texas.

A short time ago I introduced this amendment in the form of a bill.

When we passed the original bill last year prohibiting the interstate transportation of prison-produced goods, for some reason or other we left out agricultural commodities. I am not demagoging in connection with this matter, but this is the third year I have been sitting here seeing tears shed—crocodile tears I sometimes think—over the plight of agriculture. I wish somebody would tell me why, if we raise barriers against the interstate transportation of prison-produced goods, we should not protect agricultural products as well as other products?

There is no reason why any penal institution or any public institution should be allowed with their cheap labor to produce one, two, or three hundred acres of onions, or any other farm product, and dump it on the market, regardless of what the product may happen to bring. It is my belief that that is not fair to the agricultural people of this country, and I hope you will not do anything to prevent farm products from being excluded from this bill. I believe that is no more than fair to the agricultural people.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. When the original bill was up for consideration the gentleman now speaking made a very hard fight for the point he is now insisting upon. He has always contended agriculture should have this consideration, and I agree with him that he is right. If this amendment goes out on a point of order, of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has not slept on his rights. He has done his best to get that which he feels should be done.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. I understand the gentleman has introduced a bill which is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary covering this same feature?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. GWYNNE. I trust the gentleman will urge hearings on that bill and try to get some action if his amendment is not agreed to here.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. Does the gentleman understand that this bill merely permits the transportation of goods made in the District of Columbia prison located in Virginia into the District and has no reference to agricultural commodities whatever?

Mr. MURRAY. It is an amendment to the original bill. I read the hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] insist upon his point of order?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, much as I regret to, I must insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman state the ground of his point of order?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is not germane to the bill now being considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have stated all I care to state at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, having considered the language of the bill and the amendment, is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane to the bill and therefore sustains the point of order.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION HOME OF CERTAIN PERSONS ARRESTED AND RELEASED WITHOUT CONVICTION OR CONVICTED AND PLACED ON PROBATION

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2844) to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in regard to the bill at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to make provision with respect to the transportation home of persons arrested and released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation. The law now provides for the transportation of prisoners from the place of incarceration to their respective homes.

This bill has been recommended by the Department of Justice. It has been thoroughly considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and unanimously reported favorably by that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 3, 1926 (ch. 795, 44 Stat. 901 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 746)), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following sections:

"SEC. 2. On the release from custody of any person who has been arrested on a charge of violating any law of the United States or of the Territory of Alaska, and who has not been convicted of such charge, other than a person admitted to bail, the United States marshal for the district wherein he is released shall, pursuant to regulations that may be promulgated by the Attorney General, furnish the person so released with transportation and subsistence to the place of his arrest or, at his election, to the place of his bona fide residence if the cost of transportation and subsistence to such place of residence is not greater than to the place of arrest.

"SEC. 3. When a court of the United States places a defendant on probation, the court may direct the United States marshal to furnish the defendant with transportation to the place to which the defendant is required to proceed under the terms of his probation and, in addition, may also direct the marshal to furnish the defendant with an amount of money not to exceed $20, for subsistence expense to his destination. In such event, such expenses shall be paid by the marshal."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "the", insert "court may direct the."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "shall."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "General" and the comma, insert "to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING PERSON WHO SHALL ACT AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2532) designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I say for the information of the House that this is not a simple bill. I shall conform to the wishes of the Members, and probably we can arrange sufficient time for explanation.

Mr. MICHENER. How much time does the gentleman want to agree upon?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would suggest 15 minutes on this side, which will give the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] time to explain the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] may ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and then may yield to any gentleman to proceed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and that 30 minutes may be allowed for its consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall act as President until a President or a Vice President shall have qualified: *Provided*, That if the House of Representatives shall not have elected a Speaker, the President of the Senate pro tempore shall then act as President until a President or a Vice President shall have qualified: *Provided further*, That no vacancy shall ensue in the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives nor in the office of the President of the Senate pro tempore by reason of this act.

SEC. 2. The person who shall act as President shall take the oath of office prescribed in the Constitution before entering upon the discharge of his duties, and he shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for the President and none other during his incumbency as acting President, and he shall exercise the powers, functions, and prerogatives of the Chief Executive while so acting; and when a President or a Vice President shall have qualified such person shall thereupon relinquish the office as acting President and automatically resume the duties of the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives or President of the Senate pro tempore, as the case may be.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, even during these hectic days, when our thoughts pertain mainly to our national defense, I think it is well to consider and examine our laws, or rather some omissions in our laws, which might result in great confusion and uncertainty as to the office of the President, or even in our failure to have a President.

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

These two lines in the Constitution establish all executive powers in one person. It places the President beyond the reach of any other department, except impeachment and conviction by Congress.

It is not necessary that I discuss the confusion, uncertainties, and havoc that would result from our failure to have a President, even for a very short time. The difficulties that would arise are obvious to everyone. There would be no head of the executive department. The members of the Cabinet and the chiefs of departments could not be appointed; no vacancies in the executive department could be filled; the Army and the Navy would be without a Commander in Chief. All laws would have to be passed by a two-thirds majority in both Houses or Congress; and it is doubtful if any valid law could be enacted even by a two-thirds majority, as under the Constitution a law must be presented to the President before it can be passed by a two-thirds majority.

The idea of a vacancy in the office of President was abhorrent to the Constitution makers. Such a thing was unthinkable. But while they studiously avoided the use of the word "vacancy," they failed to provide against such a contingency, and no provision has as yet been made by constitutional amendment or by congressional enactment to insure that we have a President under all circumstances and at all times.

The contingencies, remote but nevertheless real and possible, under which we might on Inauguration Day, January 20,

find this Nation without a Chief Executive are:

First, should the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect die, or become disqualified before the inauguration, or should the President-elect die or become disqualified before the inauguration, and the Senate fail to elect a Vice President.

The second contingency may arise through failure (1) of the electoral college to elect a President, and (2) through failure of the House of Representatives to choose a President before the beginning of his term.

Suppose there should be no majority over all for any Presidential candidate in some Presidential election. A third party has, and might again bring about this situation. Two hundred and sixty-six votes are necessary to elect. The election of a President would then be thrown into the House of Representatives. It would be a new House—one elected at the previous election. It would meet on January 3. It would have to organize. It could not organize until it elected a Speaker. This may not be possible for days, or weeks, or even months. Deadlocks have occurred in the past over the election of the Speaker, one lasting several months. The electoral vote is required by law to be counted on January 6, only 3 days after the first meeting of a new Congress. Obviously, if a deadlock over the Speakership should ensue and not be broken by January 6, the two Houses of Congress could not even meet in joint session on that date to count the electoral vote, much less proceed to the election of a President or Vice President. Assuming, however, that a Speaker of the House were to be elected promptly, and the count of the electoral vote disclosed a stalemate, the House would proceed to ballot for President. No other business would be in order from day to day. The date for the inauguration of the President is January 20, as fixed by the Constitution, allowing but 12 weekdays in which to make a choice, and if no one is chosen by that time, the Vice President, if the Senate meanwhile has elected one, would become acting President, otherwise, under this bill, the Speaker of the House would become acting President, and the House and Senate would continue to ballot for President and Vice President, respectively. In the election of a Vice President by the Senate two-thirds of the Senators shall constitute a quorum, and a majority of the whole number is necessary to elect. It might be an easy matter to prevent an election by the absence of a constitutional quorum.

In the extremely remote possibility of the death or disqualification of both the President-elect and the Vice President-elect, there is no provision now in our Constitution or statutes for the selection of an acting President.

To meet these contingencies this bill designates the Speaker of the House of Representatives as acting President until a President shall have been qualified. If the House of Representatives has not chosen a Speaker, then, and then only, the bill designates the President of the Senate pro tempore to act as President.

The Constitution makes no provision for succession in the event of the death or disqualification of both the President and of the Vice-President-elect, or in the event the House has failed to elect a President and the Senate a Vice President when that duty devolves upon them.

Three years after the ratification of the Constitution the Congress, in which sat many members of the Constitutional Convention, passed a law to take care of a vacancy in the office of President, providing for the succession, first, to the Speaker pro tempore of the Senate, and then to the Speaker of the House, who should act as President until a special election could be had.

This law remained on the statute books until 1886, when it was repealed. The reason for its repeal was that Vice President Hendricks had just died. The President pro tempore of the Senate was a Republican. He would have succeeded to the Presidency in the event of the death of President Cleveland. The Succession Act of 1886 made the succession fall first to the Secretary of State and then on down through the Cabinet.

This is the law today, but it takes care of a vacancy arising only after a President has qualified. Constitutional authorities do not interpret the law to provide for succession in the contingencies contemplated in the bill under discussion, to wit, where a President has not been chosen before inauguration or where a President-elect and a Vice-President-elect should not have qualified.

Before the passage of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution—the so-called Norris amendment—the new President qualified on March 4, so that the House had 3 months in which to elect a President in the event the election of one devolved upon it. But by the Norris amendment the term of the retiring President expires on January 20. The House meets on January 3; thus the House has only 12 working days in which to elect a President if it should be required to do so. This amendment increases the necessity for the passage of this bill.

The twentieth amendment contemplated that Congress would pass a law to take care of the contingencies we have been discussing.

Section 3 of the twentieth amendment is as follows:

> If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Vice President-elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President-elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Thus it will be seen that this amendment authorizes this legislation. The bill is in pursuance to provisions of section 3 of the amendment.

Under this provision it will be seen that Congress derives authority to designate any person whomsoever it desires to act as President under the circumstances indicated. An analogy is furnished in the temporary function exercised by the Chief Justice of the United States when presiding over the Senate in a trial of an impeached President. His authority so to act is in the Constitution. Likewise the authority of Congress to designate a person—any person—to act as President is derived from the same source—the Constitution.

Two Presidential elections have been thrown into the House of Representatives.

In 1800 Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr received the same number of electoral votes—73. The Jefferson-Burr controversy threatened a dissolution of the Government. It was said that the country escaped civil war only by the prevalence of that kind temper in the Congress which prevailed in the Constitutional Convention itself. This was the first time a Presidential election had been thrown into the House of Representatives and it nearly wrecked the young Republic.

The second and last time an election was thrown into the House of Representatives was in 1824. In the Electoral College Jackson had 99 votes, Adams 84, Crawford 41, and Clay 37. Jackson had a plurality of 50,000 in the popular vote. There was no question as to the election of John C. Calhoun as Vice President. Henry Clay was Speaker of the House at that time. Before the day for counting the votes a great scandal arose. Charges of corruption were made against Clay which were investigated without result. The situation was one which invited intrigue, and no doubt there was much bargaining and attempted trading of votes.

Excitement ran high. A coalition between the followers of Clay and those of Adams resulted in the election of John Quincy Adams on the first ballot. Clay, on account of being fourth in the electoral college, was eliminated in the House. If the old provision of voting for the five highest on the list had not been changed to the three highest, Clay, instead of Adams, probably would have been the choice. Adams, when a Senator, had opposed the change from five to three, and had his argument prevailed it is unlikely he would have become President.

Another election was almost thrown into the House in 1876 during the Hayes-Tilden controversy. Congress, by setting up a joint committee, whose decision as to the election was final, avoided an election by the House. Hayes was found to be elected by a majority of one.

A logical question is why in this bill I have designated the Speaker of the House of Representatives as first choice and President pro tempore of the Senate as second choice for acting President.

The reason is that the Speaker of the House has been recently elected by a majority of the Members of the House. The House represents the latest expression of the people. In other words, it might be said that he derives his power direct from the people as a result of the recent election. In a lesser degree the same could be said of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

There is a great deal of logic in succession to the Cabinet members, beginning with the Secretary of State, if a vacancy occurs after the beginning of a term. The Secretary of State and the Cabinet members are the choice of the President and are familiar with and sympathetic with the policy of the administration and would be best fitted to carry it forward. But this logic does not apply where a President does not qualify, as a Cabinet member of the old administration might be entirely out of harmony with the recently expressed will of the people and with the intended purposes of the new administration.

By designating the Speaker of the House and, if no Speaker has been elected, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Congress, by the enactment of this bill, would be designating a compatible officer, just as it did recently when an Assistant Secretary of the Navy was designated as Acting Secretary.

Upon the election of a President or of a Vice President, the Acting President would automatically resume the duties of his office of Speaker of the House or President pro tempore of the Senate, as the case may be. The bill provides that no vacancy in these positions would have ensued, and the Acting President would receive the emoluments of the President only so long as he should act as such. [Applause.]

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. I believe the gentleman has a good bill, which probably covers most of the contingencies. Might we not have a situation, however, where we did not have a Speaker chosen, and we might not have a President pro tempore of the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I have been aware that this question might be raised. However, the gentleman will find under article II of the Constitution, and also the twelfth amendment, which provides for the election of the Vice President by the Senate, that the Constitution contemplates that there shall always be a President pro tempore of the Senate or a President of the Senate, because it states that the President of the Senate shall receive and open the electoral votes; so there must be a President of the Senate. A case might likely arise where a Speaker would not have been chosen, but there must be a President of the Senate, under the Constitution. Therefore, I do not believe there is any real contingency that is not covered by the terms of this bill. I thank the gentleman for his question. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise largely for the purpose of calling to our minds the necessity of the passage of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution.

When the twentieth amendment passed the House it was not called the Norris amendment. The House refused to recognize the Norris amendment as it came from the Senate. It was known here as the Gifford amendment. I am rather proud of my part in its passage. At the last moment I offered a motion that the so-called Norris amendment be substituted, giving full credit to Senator NORRIS. However, as to the last half of the amendment, to which our discussion today relates, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was not the author. That second part was wholly the House or the so-called Gifford amendment. Its provisions were not even suggested by the Senator from Nebraska. His part was known as the "lame duck" amendment. Mr. Tyler Page, the Clerk of the House, with his more than 50 years' experience, collaborated with us in providing against events that might possibly happen. We provided in the twentieth amendment that Congress could do that which you are doing today. I shall not make objection to this bill. We would honor our Speaker, whoever he might be, and he probably would represent the majority party elected to power at the moment. The House by this legislation would make its own Speaker President of the United States.

However, I do say that it is a little farfetched to believe that the President pro tempore of the Senate at any moment might be in sympathy or harmony with the political party which may have just been elected. You are certainly taking a violent risk at a moment when violent public opinion would be prevailing. But some provision must be made. We could not contemplate a vacancy in the office of the President of the United States; there would be utter chaos of government.

If the President and the Vice President were in an airplane accident and both lives were lost before they were qualified, we would not want to name the past Secretary of State as President, who might be of the wrong political faith. We would do it after the President and Vice President are qualified.

I had always thought that when the twentieth amendment was passed we could withhold such action as we are taking today and act as the time demanded, selecting a man for the office who would be satisfactory to the majority of the people who had but recently elected their candidates. We are taking a little risk now in this matter lest we may not meet actual conditions and the demand appropriate at the moment this designation must be made. I will go along with you in that the Speaker, whoever he may be, shall be President for a while, but the question as to the President pro tempore of the Senate is not so clear.

I would ask for a minute more that the gentleman from Tennessee may make reply. His countenance betrays a little anxiety to do so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

May I ask the gentleman if he does not believe it would be well to have some kind of machinery set up before the contingency arises, because if you had to wait until the contingency did arise you might not have the House or the Congress organized so that you could take care of the situation.

Mr. GIFFORD. We might let the Supreme Court make the selection. There are plenty of ways to set up the machinery. Make your Speaker President if you desire, but I do not know how this bill will appeal to the Members of the Senate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDISON DAY

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) requesting the President to proclaim February 11 as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on said date and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, after "11", strike out "of each year" and insert ", 1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1942, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison."

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 137) to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to agree on time for debate if there is going to be any opposition to the bill.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. There has been some opposition expressed to this bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 137, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] is entitled to recognition for 1 hour.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the bill that the Committee is considering at this time is a bill that provides for the creation of a temporary judgeship in the eastern district of Missouri.

In 1937 the recommendation for the creation of this judgeship was first made by the judicial conference. Apparently, a very strong case has been made out at the annual meetings of the conference ever since, because for the last 4 years the same recommendation has been made. Despite the recommendations thus made the Judiciary Committee did not report favorably this bill until this session, and it was done very largely because of the convincing figures prepared by the administrative officer of the United States courts. I call your attention particularly to the total civil cases tried in the eastern district of Missouri. There were pending on July 1, 1939, 378 cases. There were pending on June 30, 1940, 424 cases.

Now, there is a reason for this and because of this reason we have provided for the creation of a judgeship that will expire upon the death, resignation or removal of one of the present judges, and that reason is just this. There are in the course of reorganization in the State of Missouri four railroads. The plans that are being submitted to the judges almost continuously require the time, and the undivided time and attention, of at least one of the two present judges. In addition to this, there are a large number of condemnation suits instituted on behalf of the United States. We hope that these railroads will all be satisfactorily reorganized soon, and we hope that these condemnation suits will be settled promptly, but until they are I feel it is entirely unfair to the people in the State of Missouri to be required to wait for months and months and months until their civil litigation is reached for trial. This bill has been carefully considered. It was unanimously reported by the committee and I earnestly recommend that it be favorably acted upon by the Committee at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I had not heard until late yesterday of House Resolution 137, providing an additional Federal judge for the eastern district of Missouri. Inasmuch as no lawyer living in the eastern district of Missouri had mentioned this bill to me, I was surprised when told by a colleague that such a bill would be up for consideration today. I at once secured a copy of this bill and a copy of the committee report accompanying it. I read the statement supposedly made by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the United States at the October session, 1940. In view of that statement, I can easily understand why our Committee on the Judiciary reported the bill favorably.

But, Mr. Chairman, knowing something about conditions in the eastern judicial district of Missouri, I was not convinced of the need of an additional judge by reading the committee report. I very much fear that the judges who recommended such legislation did not have sufficient information on which to base a decision. Late yesterday I sent a telegram, which I will now read, to Hon. Charles B. Davis, senior United States district judge at St. Louis. I quote:

Bill providing additional United States district judge St. Louis for consideration tomorrow. Have leaders of bar advise me if needed.

PHIL A. BENNETT.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that I requested Judge Davis to have leaders of the bar advise me if the bill was needed. Instead Judge Davis answered my telegram as follows, and again I quote:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 22, 1941.*

Hon. PHIL A. BENNETT,
Member of Congress:

Members of the bar have made no study of the condition of the docket. Lawyers have displayed no interest in the bill providing for an additional district judge. No lawyer has had difficulty in getting his case tried. The courts have not been burdened with work for the past year.

CHARLES B. DAVIS.

Mr. Chairman, no district judge stands higher in the estimation of the bar and of the people in general than Judge Davis, of St. Louis. His telegram convinces me that there is absolutely no need of an additional judge in that district. I fear that the only reason for this bill is the desire upon the part of somebody, somewhere, to take care of a political friend by creating another fat political judgeship.

The President of the United States a few weeks ago requested that the Congress practice the strictest economy in all things not directly connected with national defense. During the campaign of last year I promised my people that, if elected to Congress, I would back the President whenever I felt that his recommendations were to the best interests of this Republic. The President is absolutely right when he requests us to practice economy and reduce expenditures in all things not connected with national defense. I am backing him up in that request. An additional judge is not needed at St. Louis, and this bill ought to be defeated in the interest of the taxpayers of this Nation. We must begin to economize, and I know of no better way to begin than by defeating H. R. 137.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. The report shows that the number of cases pending July 1, 1940, although slightly in excess of the number in 1939, are far less than in 1936, 1937, and 1938.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The docket is being cleaned up. We have two splendid judges there who give all of their time to the work and one who divides his time between the eastern and western districts of Missouri. Judge Davis says that things are in good order, and we ought to listen to him.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and have always given much attention to these judgeship bills. I have been controlled to a large extent by recommendations of the judicial conference. I voted to report out this bill with the understanding that the judges where the new judge is to be assigned needed help.

The gentleman has presented to the Congress the very best proof and the last word as to whether or not additional judicial help is required in that district.

As far as cases are concerned, so far as numbers are concerned, that amounts to but very little in determining whether or not an additional judge is required. The question is, When may a litigant have his case heard? If a litigant may have his case heard, even though there are a thousand cases on the calendar, then no new judgeship should be created.

In that connection, let me say we had one instance in the State of Massachusetts, where they were asking for an additional judge. There were over a thousand unheard cases carried on the calendar, and when we investigated the matter we found those cases were draft-evader cases from the last war. They never would be tried. It was never intended they should be tried, but they were carried on the calendar to make a showing, in order that they might eventually get an additional judge.

In view of the telegram from the presiding judge in the territory to be affected by this bill, I shall vote against the bill, and I hope other Members of the House will vote against the bill until the matter can be further investigated.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no question but what a few years ago the docket was congested, but it is in fine condition today.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the report of the administrative officer of the United States, in which he points out that one of the condemnation projects in St. Louis will result in enough litigation to take the entire time of one judge for a year. Does the gentleman think that if one judge is sitting continuously, the other judge, particularly the 68-year-old judge, from whom the gentleman received the telegram, can take care of all the business when today it takes 23 months to get a jury action tried and 22 months to get a nonjury action tried?

Mr. BENNETT. My impression is that the matter of condemnation to which

the gentleman refers has to do with the well known Jefferson Memorial; but the Government is not spending money that way and you are not going to have those condemnation cases. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, at no time since I have been a Member of this House have I failed to support the recommendation of the conference of senior circuit judges in respect to the necessity of additional judges in any State of this Union, including the circuit judges.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just 1 minute. We are not talking about Michigan now. I refuse to yield at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COCHRAN. I decline to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twelve Members are present, a quorum. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Now, if this additional judge was recommended for the western district of Missouri, wherein my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] resides, I think we would have some right to pay a little attention to what he says; but he lives several hundred miles away from the city of St. Louis, where the judges sit most of the time in the eastern district of Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a minute. Let me go along for a second, and then I will yield. I think I have known Judge Davis just as long, if not longer than, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]. I have a very high regard for him. I also know the other judges serving in the eastern district of Missouri, and I know something about the work they have to perform and the hours they spend at work. I am very sorry the gentleman makes this a political question by saying that somebody wants to take care of a political friend. I yield now if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] will tell who that "somebody" is. No. He cannot tell who he is. He is only dreaming. The gentleman knows that no Member of this House will have anything to say about who is going to be appointed to this vacancy if it is created. He knows that judges are appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States if the President accepts their endorsement and not by Members of the House. I say the attorneys in the city of St. Louis where I live—and I know a great majority of them—have taken an interest in this bill. Why should they go and talk to the Federal judge as to the necessity for an additional judge in the eastern district of Missouri? Judge Davis is handling some railroad reorganization cases. He is doing a good job. He is an excellent judge. They are not small railroads. They are railroads like the Missouri Pacific, the Frisco, and other railroads of that character—some of the largest railroads in the western part of the country—and they take up a great deal of time.

Now, this report only brings the situation up to December 31. Since that time very unfortunately the War Department sent a man into the eastern district of Missouri from the western district of Missouri to get an option on some land. When the War Department discovered rather late the price that man recommended be paid for the land the Department notified the Department of Justice that they did not propose to go through with the agreements that had been made and instructed the Department of Justice to institute condemnation proceedings. This is going to take the time of one judge for a full year, if all cases are tried. All this has occurred within the last 6 weeks. I do not say that the War Department is right. The War Department admits it is subject to criticism in this instance, and officials of the War Department have told me so. They seek to break agreements made with property owners. It is not in my congressional district, but it happens that two persons in my district wrote me that owned property there. The War Department had contracted with these individuals agreeing to buy the land, now break the agreement, and have thrown the whole matter into the Federal courts. The district attorney of St. Louis was here 3 weeks ago. I had a conference with him. He went back with the papers to institute the condemnation proceedings. The area consists of thousands of acres. There is also another area in Missouri where a monster camp is to be constructed and where there will be a lot of condemnation proceedings.

The third judge referred to in Missouri handles only one-fifth of the cases in the eastern district of Missouri. He also sits in Kansas City, which is the western district, where he handles one-fifth of the cases, and he sits in Jefferson City the remainder of the time. This judge told me 3 weeks ago that he was working until midnight every night. There is the situation as it comes from the mouth of Judge Collett. He told me that himself. He certainly should know the situation and the conditions in the court.

Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] that when he stands here and says that Judge Kimbrough Stone, senior judge of the eighth United States circuit would make a recommendation to the conference of circuit judges solely for the purpose of letting some individual take care of a political friend, he does not know what he is talking about and his implication in saying that this bill is brought in here to take care of a political friend is a reflection upon the senior judge of the eighth circuit of the United States, a man who has the respect of every lawyer in the eighth circuit, as well as every member of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield as I mentioned the gentleman's name.

Mr. BENNETT. Why does the gentleman say I cast a reflection upon the circuit judge?

Mr. COCHRAN. I say the gentleman cast a reflection upon Judge Stone because this recommendation does not come from a Member of the House, does not come from a Member of the Senate, but does come from Judge Stone, the senior judge of the eighth circuit and his associates.

Mr. BENNETT. I said he had been misled by careless statements such as the gentleman is making at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I did not hear him.

Mr. BENNETT. Statements without foundation, absolutely without foundation.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am making a statement to the effect that the gentleman is attacking the recommendation of the judges of the eighth circuit, of which the gentleman's district is a part. The recommendation comes from them after a thorough investigation and they were not misled as the gentleman states.

Mr. BENNETT. The gentleman is demagoguing, that is what he is doing.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am stating facts. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee that reported the bill.

Mr. WALTER. Can the gentleman imagine the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, over whose signature this recommendation comes, endeavoring to create a judgeship for a worthy Democrat?

Mr. BENNETT. No, I cannot.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as I think he addressed me and not my colleague, that I do not believe there is a man in this House or a man in this country who does not honor and respect the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The gentleman knows as well as I know that no member of that Court or any member of the conference of circuit judges would stoop so low as to make a recommendation solely to take care of a political friend of some Democrat. That is, saying they would mislead the Congress, but you know, we all know, they would not.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman made the statement awhile ago that there was another camp in the district in which there would be condemnation proceedings. To what camp does the gentleman refer?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman will find out where it is in a few days when the Department commences the proceeding.

Mr. PLOESER. That is what I thought.

Mr. COCHRAN. The one I am talking about and the one the gentleman knows about adjoins his district, is separated from his district by the Missouri River. The gentleman knows how many condemnation proceedings are going to be held as a result of the action of the War

Department in calling upon the Department of Justice to institute such proceedings in connection with the site at Weldon Springs.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not true that this judgeship has not only been recommended twice by the judicial conference but has also been recommended by the administrative office of the United States courts?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is correct, although I think it has been recommended three times.

Mr. Chairman, let me say also that I am amazed that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], a man who has been on the Judiciary Committee all these years, should rise in his seat now, after voting to report this bill out of committee, and say he is going to vote against it, oppose it, because a Member reads a telegram here from one judge and makes a statement to the effect that the purpose of the bill is to take care of someone's political friend.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe my record in this House for economy will equal that of any other Member. If I thought for one minute this judge was not needed in the eastern district of Missouri I would vote against the bill myself. I say he is needed, and I am going to stand by the report of the conference of circuit judges the same as I have stood by them in the past, no matter where a judgeship was recommended, whether in a Republican State or a Democratic State, whether he was to be appointed by a Republican President or a Democratic President.

I have always taken the position that we should keep politics out of our judiciary—Federal, State, and local. Break down our courts and you will destroy our form of government. I want the best men available appointed as Federal judges. I accept recommendations from the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court speaking for the conference of circuit judges. I voted for these bills when we had a Republican President. That shows I did not let politics enter into the question.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope the gentleman is not accusing me of politics in connection with judgeships. I have voted for these bills regardless of political consideration, and, as my committee knows, I voted to report this bill out. But when the presiding judge in a district from the bench tells the Congress that there is not a client who cannot have his case heard within a reasonable time, I am not going to rely upon what we may pick up by hearsay or by what any politician says or by what anyone else says, except the man who is presiding and who knows.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say that the senior judge in the western district of Missouri made the same recommendation when we had a bill up to create a judge to serve part time in the eastern district and part time in the western district. What has been the result? Even with the extra judge that we voted about 5 or 6 years ago over his objection, the judges are overworked, as this report shows. I know Judge Davis better than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] knows him. He is about 67 years of age. He is a fine gentleman. But I say that an additional judge is needed in the eastern district of Missouri. I know that because the attorneys in my own city, where the bulk of the business originates, have told me he is needed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I happen to live in the same city in which my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] resides, and I imagine I know pretty much the same group of lawyers he does, with probably some exceptions.

No one has even intimated that we need an extra judge in this district. I have received no messages that this judge is needed. I was rather sorry that at the conclusion of the statement of my colleague he stated he knew of this great need. But he did not produce any message from the bar association or from any of the lawyers' associations. The reason probably that he did not is the simple fact related by Judge Davis in his telegram; that is, none of the lawyer groups have made an investigation of the docket and they are not concerned with the weight of the docket.

I regret exceedingly that we should have two distinguished gentlemen from Missouri indulge in this bit of repartee on the question of whether or not this is politics. The gentleman from St. Louis undoubtedly has lived in that city much longer than I have; however, I hope both he and I are as mentally and physically able at 68 as is Judge Davis. He mentioned that there will be two camps in the Eastern District of Missouri concerning which there will be condemnation proceedings shortly, but he could not name the second one. I find little weight in these blanket arguments that "I know of so-and-so, therefore it must be so," contradictory to statements made by a man who serves on the bench. If any living man should know the condition of the docket in that district, Judge Davis should know it. My colleague admits Judge Davis has unimpeachable integrity and great reputation. I would like to ask him to produce some evidence, other than the word of one man or another to the Members who are not thoroughly familiar with the situation as to the need for this extra judge.

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, and I assure this House, that if there is a need for such additional judge my colleague from the western portion of Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] and I will certainly vote for the creation of another judgeship.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. No doubt the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] will put into the RECORD as a part of his remarks letters or telegrams showing the need for an additional judge from reputable lawyers and judges.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that our lawyers are all reputable. When they get to be disreputable we get rid of them.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not know but what the gentleman said some of them were disreputable.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will yield I shall answer the question.

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that I meet these lawyers in St. Louis personally. I live in a big city. I do not live in a district where we have a whole lot of counties. I live in a city where people congregate together. I see these lawyers together, I see them at lunch, I see them at other places, and I say to the gentleman that I know the situation that exists there. I stated what one of the judges told me in reference to the hours he was engaged to keep up with his work.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is customary for the bar associations to make these recommendations.

Mr. COCHRAN. I never said anything about the bar association. I did not go to the trouble to get telegrams and letters. I could get them. Why did not the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] send a telegram to more than one judge? He sent a telegram to the Republican judge. Why did he not send them to all three judges?

Mr. KNUTSON. He knew he could depend on the Republican judge?

Mr. BENNETT. I did not think of his politics at all.

Mr. PLOESER. For the benefit of the gentleman from Minnesota, and for the benefit of the Members of the House, I hope the gentleman from St. Louis will be kind enough to put into the RECORD at some point the names of those lawyers in the city of St. Louis who feel the need for this extra judge. May I say to the Members of the House that St. Louis is a big city, and it happens to have more than one Congressman. Another member of the delegation from the city of St. Louis is telling you, on the word of the senior judge from the eastern district of Missouri, that you do not need another judge on that bench. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we all love the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], and, if I may be permitted to violate the rules of the House, I will go further and say that we not only love JACK because of his corn-beef-and-cabbage dinners and because of his invitations to go fishing with him but we also love him because of his consistency.

Since I have been here there has never been a time, there has never been a bill that would give St. Louis money that JACK was not right on the spot asking for it. There has never been an occasion when our beloved colleague JACK has not always dragged that red herring "political question" through the House well, always without exception.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. There has never been a time when I asked the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to yield to me that he has ever yielded to me, while he was making those fanciful, exaggerated statements that must have been inspired by something that comes out of St. Louis and is neither corn beef nor cabbage.

I will yield, JACK.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from the Western District of Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] brought in the political question, not I.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know that is your version, but the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] can smell that political question even if a Member on our side never mentions it, never even dreams of it. The gentleman can always drag it in some way and accuse us of raising the political issue. It is very fine of the gentleman to do that, it is very skillful procedure, because on the Democratic side, the majority side, you boys go through the treadmill here with more ease and with greater regularity than any flock of sheep ever followed the old ram through a gap in the fence. You do it always.

The question I wanted to ask the gentleman is this, Whether this judge has criminal jurisdiction? I would assume he has. So I can see why there might be some necessity for another judge down in St. Louis, in view of the reports that come out of there, according to the press. But I am thinking, too, of the benign and reforming influence of my beloved colleague, and I thought perhaps he could teach those St. Louis fellows to avoid criminal acts or, at least, to avoid getting caught at them in the future. I am sure the fact that St. Louis changed from a 40,000 Democratic majority to a 40,000 Republican majority this last election indicates that reformation is at work down there, and perhaps someone is going to save the city.

I think it was the day before yesterday that I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement on the floor by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], a good Democrat. It was a wonderful Republican speech. A few moments later the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], another outstanding Democrat, took the administration over the hurdles on its agricultural program. They both damned the administration as no dirty, black Republican would ever think of doing. When they had finished we knew that there was not a single man on the majority side who would follow the program which those gentlemen outlined commend by vote the reforms they advocated. They dig up all the iniquity that they dare bring forth on the floor of the House, they condemn the administration, and then they turn around and swallow it all again. It makes me think of that passage in the Scriptures about the dog, but I am not quoting what the dog did.

In a few days we are going to have another tax bill, and you are going to soak the people—the businessmen and wage earners. You recall that the President told you that taxes were paid in the sweat of the man who works. You are going to soak all the people of the United States to pay for this little excursion the President is contemplating across the sea, an adventure which will bring us only grief and sorrow.

The gentleman from Missouri is always preaching economy. He is one of the greatest exhorters for economy. He makes me think of the old camp meeting days, when the preacher would get up and tell us all about hell fire and eternal damnation and where we would go if we did not repent.

You boys over there on the majority side, through your spokesmen the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who preaches ecenomy every once in a while, have a habit of frightening us as to what is going to happen to this country of ours if your administration continues on its wayward course, but you backslide the morning after every camp-meeting sermon, and you never will adopt any of your own sound, common-sense suggestions and give us that constructive legislation and that economy which you talk so much about and which you know we should have. The shadow of Mr. Big hangs over you and frightens you into inaction.

Now you are asking for all this money down there for your big—what is it; a monument or something?—the memorial to Jefferson, whose teachings you ignore. You are going to spend some money in St. Louis, and then you tell us that this tax bill is coming in, and the President tells us how much we must sacrifice; and you come along and you want another judge, when the presiding judge tells you that you do not need him.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Our good friend from Missouri is like a guidepost. He shows the road that he does not take himself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not just understand that. I think JACK always takes the road toward national bankruptcy if the appropriation is for his district.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would be very happy to give the gentleman a diagram.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He takes the same road, but he always takes it in the opposite direction to that pointed by the economy sign, if his district is interested. That is what the gentleman means, I guess.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman referring to the Jefferson Memorial in St. Louis?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean where the land cost so much?

Mr. KNUTSON. Where it cost $27,000,000. That was put through by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the money been spent?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me advise the gentleman from St. Louis, if I may be so presumptuous, that if he is going to spend that amount of money again just to get political support for the New Deal down there, he should spend it more wisely with some other folks, because it is quite evident from the result of the last election that those people who got some of that money, those people who were the beneficiaries of our generosity, did not appreciate the source from which it came. I say this advisedly because of the returns in the last election.

Let me repeat once more, I do love my friend JACK. I like to visit with him out here in the lobby. As I said before, he is consistent; but how he does go after it when there is a chance to get something for St. Louis or his native State, and how utterly regardless he is of this principle of economy when the money is going to be spent in his home city or his home State. Oh, JACK, I love you.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to talk on this subject. I did not think it would be necessary, but my name, apparently, has been called as a witness. I am the other Congressman from St. Louis. I am a lawyer, a practicing lawyer, in the city of St. Louis. I know that the dockets of the eastern division are crowded. I know that the third judge that was given to us, who takes every fifth case, was a big help to that docket. I know Judge Davis and Judge Collett and Judge Moore very well. I know they are overworked and I know that they use all their available time to bring justice to the litigants by giving them an opportunity to have their day in court.

I know further from my long acquaintanceship with the man whom we affectionately call RED JACK, although the weight of years and the burdens of statesmanship are now turning his locks white—I know that if he did not believe this extra judge were needed, he would be the first one to get up here and say so. I think the records of this House will show that he has opposed things of that sort even though it might accrue to the benefit of the area of St. Louis. So I will say the lawyers out there think it is needed. It is generally admitted, except by the gentleman from the Sixth District, who denies that it is admitted, that the lawyers say we need this extra judge. The gentleman from Missouri, JACK COCHRAN, says we need it. I say we need it. I am the other Congressman from St. Louis and all of my district lies within the boundaries of the city of St. Louis. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I rather hesitate to intrude in this merry battle, but I was a member of the subcommittee that considered this bill and

reported it favorably, and I want you to know the facts that were disclosed to the subcommittee upon which we made a favorable report.

In this eastern district of Missouri there are two district judges. There is another judge who divides his time between the eastern and western districts. To start off with, I should say the judgeship was recommended by the Judicial Conference. In fact, it has been recommended twice. I have never taken the view that because a judgeship was recommended by the conference I would therefore vote for that judgeship. I do think, however, in view of the facts and in view of the way that conference is made up, that it is a circumstance which should be given great weight by the Congress.

In the next place, it was recommended by the Administrative Office of United States Courts. A few years ago we created this office, and I wish every Member would avail himself of the opportunity which has been presented to him to read carefully the report that was furnished by this administrative office. In times past, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] suggests, the cold record showing the number of cases on the docket meant nothing, but the reports made by the administrative office do mean something. They check the records very carefully, and that office joins in recommending this judgeship.

Now, here are some of the facts: There are four railroad reorganizations pending in the eastern district. There are also a number of condemnation cases. There is one project in the city of St. Louis which alone, we were told, takes the time of one judge.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. In just a moment.

It was first thought by the subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is chairman, that some of this difficulty out there was due to a temporary situation and might be solved if some outside judge were assigned to that district. I have always regretted that we do not change the law so that we can assign judges temporarily, but under present circumstances and under present law that cannot easily be done. So we did what seemed to the subcommittee the next best thing. We propose to create a judgeship which will be temporary, and in view of all the circumstances it will not be long until there is another vacancy there. In the meantime, this temporary situation should be taken care of.

Just to show you what the work has been for the last year, the total civil cases pending June 1, 1939, in that district were 378; civil cases filed during the year, 457; civil cases terminated during the year, 411; civil cases pending June 30, 1940, 424. In other words, the court in respect to its civil docket is not holding its own.

In 1940 the number of civil cases filed per judge in that district was 182. The average for the United States is 152.

I was a bit surprised to hear this telegram read here today. I regret that if some showing, contrary to the showing heretofore made by the judicial conference and by the administrative officer of the courts, could have been made before the subcommittee that such showing was not made. I have not the slightest desire to create one judgeship that is unnecessary in this country. All I want to tell you is that we gave this bill the same consideration that we have given every bill in our subcommittee, and we unanimously concluded that a judgeship was needed at this place. My mind is not changed because some person now sends a telegram to somebody claiming the contrary.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman mentioned some condemnation proceedings. The gentleman would not contend that we should put on a permanent judge to take care of a temporary matter?

Mr. GWYNNE. That is one of the circumstances that creates the temporary situation. Just how long that will last we do not know, except that we are told that it will not be disposed of in any one year.

Mr. KNUTSON. In the docket of the eastern district of Missouri, how many bootleg cases are there?

Mr. GWYNNE. I do not know.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand it is a considerable number. Why do they not transfer those to the police courts?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, there is no further request for time on this side.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. We have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 137, to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill, which motion I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BENNETT. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BENNETT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENNETT) there were—ayes 64, noes 55.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. This is an automatic call. The Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 179, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—127

Andersen, H. Carl	Grant, Ind.	Pittenger
Anderson, Calif.	Guyer, Kans.	Ploeser
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, Ill.
Andrews	Halleck	Reed, N. Y
Angell	Hancock	Rees, Kans.
Arends	Harness	Rizley
Baumhart	Heidinger	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bender	Hess	Robsion, Ky.
Bennett	Hoffman	Rockefeller
Bishop	Holmes	Rodgers, Pa.
Bolton	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Bradley, Mich.	Howell	Rolph
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Rutherford
Burdick	Jarrett	Sauthoff
Canfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Scott
Carlson	Jennings	Shafer, Mich.
Case, S. Dak.	Johns	Short
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Jonkman	Springer
Copeland	Kean	Stearns, N. H.
Crowther	Keefe	Stefan
Culkin	Kinzer	Stevenson
Cunningham	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Kunkel	Taber
Douglas	Lambertson	Talle
Dworshak	Landis	Thill
Elston	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Engel	McGregor	Tibbott
Englebright	McIntyre	Treadway
Fellows	McLean	Van Zandt
Fenton	Maas	Vorys, Ohio
Fish	Martin, Iowa	Wheat
Ford, Leland M.	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Fulmer	Michener	Wilson
Gale	Mundt	Winter
Gearhart	Murray	Wolcott
Gehrmann	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	O'Hara	Wolverton, N. J.
Gifford	Oliver	Woodruff, Mich.
Gilchrist	Osmers	Youngdahl
Gillie	Paddock	
Graham	Pheiffer, William T.	

NAYS—179

Allen, La.	Hare	Pierce
Arnold	Harris, Ark.	Poage
Barden	Harris, Va.	Priest
Barnes	Hart	Ramsay
Beam	Healey	Ramspeck
Beckworth	Hébert	Randolph
Bland	Hendricks	Rankin, Miss.
Bloom	Hobbs	Richards
Boehne	Holbrock	Rivers
Boggs	Hook	Robertson, Va.
Boland	Hunter	Robinson, Utah
Boren	Jackson	Rogers, Okla.
Brooks	Jacobsen	Romjue
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Russell
Bryson	Johnson, Okla.	Sacks
Buckler, Minn.	Kee	Sanders
Burch	Kefauver	Sasscer
Camp	Kelley, Pa.	Satterfield
Cannon, Fla.	Kennedy,	Scanlon
Casey, Mass.	Martin J.	Schuetz
Claypool	Keogh	Schulte
Cochran	Kerr	Scrugham
Coffee, Nebr.	Kilday	Shanley
Colmer	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cooley	Kocialkowski	Sikes
Cooper	Lanham	Smith, Pa.
Courtney	Larrabee	Smith, Wash.
Cravens	Lea	Smith, W. Va.
D'Alesandro	Leavy	Snyder
Davis, Ohio	Lewis	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Ludlow	South
Dingell	McCormack	Sparkman
Doughton	McGehee	Spence
Downs	McKeough	Steagall
Doxey	McLaughlin	Sullivan
Drewry	McMillan	Sumners, Tex.
Duncan	Maciora	Sweeney
Durham	Magnuson	Tarver
Edelstein	Mahon	Tenerowicz
Eliot, Mass.	Merritt	Terry
Elliott, Calif.	Meyer, Md.	Thom
Ellis	Mills, Ark.	Thomas, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	Mills, La.	Tolan
Flaherty	Monroney	Traynor
Flannagan	Moser	Vincent, Ky.
Flannery	Murdock	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	Myers, Pa.	Vreeland
Forand	Nelson	Walter
Ford, Miss.	Nichols	Ward
Ford, Thomas F.	Norrell	Wasielewski
Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.	Weaver
Gibson	O'Connor	Weiss
Gore	O'Neal	Whelchel
Gossett	O'Toole	White
Granger	Pace	Whittington
Grant, Ala.	Patman	Wickersham
Green	Patrick	Williams
Gregory	Pearson	Worley
Gwynne	Peterson, Fla.	Young
Haines	Peterson, Ga.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—125

Allen, Ill.	Dirksen	McArdle
Anderson,	Disney	McGranery
N. Mex.	Ditter	Maciejewski
Baldwin	Domengeaux	Mansfield
Barry	Dondero	Marcantonio
Bates, Ky.	Eaton	Mason
Bates, Mass.	Eberharter	May
Beiter	Edmiston	Mitchell
Bell	Faddis	Mott
Blackney	Fitzgerald	Norton
Bolles	Folger	O'Day
Bonner	Gamble	O'Leary
Boykin	Gavagan	Patton
Bradley, Pa.	Geyer, Calif.	Pfeifer,
Buck	Hall,	Joseph L.
Buckley, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Plauché
Bulwinkle	Harrington	Plumley
Burgin	Harter	Powers
Byrne	Hartley	Rabaut
Cannon, Mo.	Heffernan	Rankin, Mont.
Capozzoli	Hill, Colo.	Reece, Tenn.
Carter	Hill, Wash.	Rich
Cartwright	Hinshaw	Sabath
Celler	Houston	Schaefer, Ill.
Chapman	Imhoff	Secrest
Chenoweth	Izac	Shannon
Clark	Jenks, N. H.	Sheridan
Clason	Jensen	Simpson
Cluett	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Conn.
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson,	Smith, Va.
Cole, Md.	Luther A.	Starnes, Ala.
Collins	Johnson,	Stratton
Connery	Lyndon B.	Sutphin
Costello	Johnson, W. Va.	Taylor
Cox	Jones	Thomason
Crawford	Kelly, Ill.	Tinkham
Creal	Kennedy,	Vinson, Ga.
Crosser	Michael J.	Wadsworth
Cullen	Kilburn	Welch
Curtis	Kleberg	Wene
Davis, Tenn.	Kopplemann	West
Dewey	Kramer	Woodrum, Va.
Dickstein	Lesinski	Wright
Dies	Lynch	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Indiana for, with Mr. Bell against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Gavagan against.
Mr. Ditter for, with Mr. Harter against.
Mr. Boles for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Kelly of Illinois against.
Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Lesinski against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Cullen against.
Mr. Mott for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Cluett for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Patton against.
Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Simpson for, with Mr. Smith of Virginia against.
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Cole of Maryland against.
Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Byrne against.
Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Woodrum of Virginia against.
Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Lynch against.
Mr. Baldwin for, with Mr. Kramer against.
Mr. Clason for, with Mr. Boykin against.
Mr. Dirksen for, with Mr. Cannon of Missouri against.
Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.
Mr. Dewey for, with Mr. Dickstein against.
Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Beiter against.
Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Barry against.
Mr. Hill of Colorado for, with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy against.
Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Heffernan against.
Mr. Tinkham for, with Mr. O'Leary against.
Miss Rankin of Montana for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.
Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Buckley of New York against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. May with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. West with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Wene.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Smith of Connecticut.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Burgin.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Izac.
Mr. Taylor with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Geyer of California.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Kopplemann.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIDENCE OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND ASSISTANTS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to call up the bill (H. R. 148) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874 (18 Stat. 109), be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That every clerk of the circuit or district court of the United States, the United States marshal, or United States district attorney shall reside permanently in the district where his official duties are to be performed and shall give his personal attention thereto; and in case any such officer shall remove from his district, or shall fail to give personal attention to the duties of his office, except in case of sickness, such office shall be deemed vacant: *Provided*, That in the southern district of New York and in the District of Columbia said officers may reside within 20 miles of their districts."

The second paragraph of section 8 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 181), be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"The Attorney General is authorized to fix and declare the place of the official residence of the district attorney and of each of his assistants: *Provided*, That the said assistants must be residents of the district for which they are appointed, except that in the District of Columbia said assistants may reside within 20 miles of their district."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 1 hour. The gentleman may move the previous question at any time within the hour.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. Under the present law all district attorneys, United States marshals, clerks of the courts, and other assistants must be residents of the districts for which they are appointed, with the exception of the southern district of New York. Under the present law the district attorney and other assistants in the southern district of New York may live within 20 miles of New York City. That is, in New Jersey, or in any other State within 20 miles. That is the only exception.

This bill seeks to extend it so that the district attorney and assistant district attorneys may live within 20 miles of the District of Columbia—in Virginia, or Maryland, for instance.

This bill has been approved by the Attorney General for the reason that the area in the District of Columbia is one of the most congested districts—more so than it is in the southern district of New York. The committee has approved this bill, as well as the Attorney General, and I recommend its passage.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if we want to open the doors for carpetbagging, we are certainly going to do it if we pass this legislation. There is a perfectly valid reason why an exception should be made in the case of the southern district of New York for members of the staff of the district attorney to live within 20 miles of the southern district of New York. Bear in mind that in that case, and in that case alone, is the assistant United States attorney permitted to live outside of the district that he serves. The reason is perfectly obvious. The southern district of New York is entirely commercial. There is no residential community in that district. But the District of Columbia is just the opposite. There is nothing commercial here. It is entirely a residential city. I see no reason why lawyers in the District of Columbia should be discriminated against in favor of residents of the States of Maryland and Virginia. That is exactly what this bill is intended to do.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Does not the gentleman realize that the New Deal has so many employees that it is impossible for all of them to live within the District of Columbia?

Mr. WALTER. I have heard something along those lines.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the gentleman also realize that Chevy Chase, for instance, is, to all intents and purposes, a part of the District of Columbia, and that without this bill an assistant United States district attorney who lives in Chevy Chase could not be appointed unless he moves three or four blocks to come within the District of Columbia?

Mr. WALTER. Well, if that were the case, why was the limit placed at 20 miles? Why was it not made 10 miles, or why was it not made 5 miles? Could it be that it is intended to appoint a resident of the State of Virginia to the United States attorney's office who lives 20 miles from the District of Columbia, and unless this law is passed that young man cannot take the position if he does not see fit to move into the District of Columbia?

Just recently an indictment was attacked in the District of Columbia because the United States district attorney, so it was alleged, is a resident of the State of Maine. Of course, that got nowhere. An attack of that sort certainly had no bearing on the indictment. But it aroused every member of the bar of the District of Columbia to an appreciation of the fact that in a short time these splendid, well-qualified lawyers could not and would not be considered for the only few jobs that are available for members of the bar in the District of Columbia.

I repeat what I said at the beginning, that if we want to start carpetbagging, we will start it with this measure, which should be defeated.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. THOM. Is it not true that if this bill is passed, those men will have an opportunity for political appointment in three jurisdictions, or in possibly two? In the case of an individual who might be appointed from the State of Maryland, he could be appointed in the District of Columbia; so that he has two fields in which he may receive political appointment?

Mr. WALTER. Or the State of Virginia.

Mr. THOM. Yes; precisely.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this measure. It is unfair to the people of the District of Columbia, and I am a little astonished that my friend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary should favor the bill. I have followed his leadership in trying to help the District of Columbia secure some representation, some voice in their own government, but this measure would take from them what little they have. I am reminded of the scriptural narration:

> For he that hath, to him shall be given; and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath.

Undoubtedly this bill establishes a policy of carpetbag government for the District of Columbia. It cannot be said there are not sufficient able, experienced, and distinguished lawyers living within the District who could fill the offices of United States district attorney and assistants to the district attorney.

The sole purpose of this bill is to aid appointees from outside the District of Columbia. There are some fellows who have sufficient political pull in Virginia or Maryland who desire this bill passed in order to qualify them to hold these important offices in the District. It is presented to you and me here as a general bill, but in fact it is a private special bill for certain favored individuals. Is it fair, Mr. Speaker, for us to pass this special bill in order that some man or men living in another Federal district in the State of Virginia or in Maryland, in each case living in another Federal court district, having the right to vote, being eligible for election to office, being eligible to appointment as district attorney or assistant to the district attorney of their districts—is it right to appoint them to such offices in the District of Columbia? Yet here we come along with a special bill for some special man or men giving them just such rights. Not only would they have all the franchises and political rights in their own Federal districts but this bill would turn over to them this Federal court district. It is not right, and if my distinguished chairman does not lessen his activity here to take away from the District of Columbia what little the District has, I will question his sincerity in trying to secure larger opportunities and rights for the people of the District of Columbia.

For the 20 or more years of my service in this body I have felt that the people of the District of Columbia, some 600,000 or more, who pay more taxes than many other districts of its size and population, people of intelligence, patriotism, standing all the time loyal and helpful to the Government of the United States, having neither the right to vote nor to be elected to office—their rights in my opinion are already too much curtailed and I simply am not going to join today in a move to adopt a carpetbag policy. I was not in sympathy with the treatment of the South after the Civil War. Men went from the North to the South to hold offices. To make that possible required the passage of special laws, and such laws were passed, but it was an act of great injustice in my opinion to the South. Do not forget, you friends of the South here, by this measure you are trying to do identically the same thing to the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. TOLAN. Under the present law the President can appoint a United States district attorney for any city in the Union from any State; can he not?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He might do so.

Mr. TOLAN. That is what I understand.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That the President can do what?

Mr. TOLAN. For instance, an attorney in San Francisco can be appointed United States district attorney for the District of Columbia, but after his appointment he must reside in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is not the purpose of this bill.

Mr. TOLAN. I understand that, but is not that true?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; it is true.

Mr. TOLAN. It ought not to be true.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You have a law on the books that the President cannot appoint somebody United States district attorney from California in the State of Kentucky, or somebody from the State of Kentucky in the State of Virginia. That is the law, and there is only one exception to it: Somebody some years ago succeeded in writing into the law a provision permitting in the case of the southern district of New York somebody living outside of the district to serve as United States district attorney.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. In the bill under consideration could the assistant district attorney continue to maintain his residence

in Virginia or Maryland if appointed from there to this position?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No; not unless we pass this bill.

Mr. SOUTH. I say if this bill is passed, not only can a resident of Virginia be appointed to this office, but after appointment he could continue to maintain his residence within 20 miles of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under this bill.

Mr. SOUTH. That is what I say.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. SOUTH. Might it not work a hardship on the people of the District who have business with this man to have to drive out to Ellicott City, for instance? My position is just this: I do not care where the officials live when they are appointed, but I do believe it will be to the best interest of the people whom they serve to require them to live among such people during their tenure of office.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, why did we put it in the law that in the Federal court district of Virginia the district attorney must live in that district? Why do we have such a law for Kentucky and for every other State in the Union, with the one exception, southern district of New York? You have a Federal court district here in the District of Columbia and some of the folks living perhaps today in Virginia and Maryland, looking with greedy eyes, as a gentleman over here suggests, to these two or three places left in the District of Columbia want this bill passed so that they may be brought in here and be appointed, while still living over in Virginia, still voting over there, and still able to run for office and hold office if they are elected in Virginia or appointed over there, at the same time they serve the District of Columbia.

I say it is wrong. It is carpetbagging government.

Mr. SOUTH. The case that the gentleman from California mentioned is not analogous, in my opinion, because, for instance, a very distinguished Texan, Marvin Jones, was named judge of the Court of Claims, but he will henceforth live in or adjacent to the District. No one would think of naming him judge and letting him live in Amarillo, Tex., his former home.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The law that we are talking about applies to the Federal district court, which says the judge, the district attorney, and his assistants must live in their Federal districts. We have a Federal district court in the District of Columbia. I am sure the people of the District of Columbia want the law to remain as it is to permit and to require Federal district attorneys and their assistants to be residents of the District of Columbia. That is the district in which they are appointed to serve, and this bill here, in my opinion, should not be passed permitting them to reside in other States while serving here.

Mr. SOUTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Marvin Jones is not of the district court.

Mr. SOUTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He is of another court that belongs to the entire United States.

Mr. SOUTH. Yes; but if the jurisdiction of his court were confined to the District of Columbia he would be required to live in the District.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that in the District there are more lawyers per capita than anywhere else in the world?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. They have plenty of very able, very honorable lawyers here. They have plenty of people to hold these jobs, willing to live in the District, and it is unfair to take these few jobs away from them. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I should state to the House that I am not familiar with the details of this matter. This bill was introduced at the request of the Department of Justice and referred to a subcommittee, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] is chairman. I assume that the subcommittee was actuated by the fact that the District of Columbia is so restricted in territory that thousands of people who are connected with the Government must live in one of the two neighboring States, Virginia and Maryland, that 20 miles residence of the District of Columbia line would be within the suburban residential district of Washington. As stated I have not personally examined the matter and I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] who is better prepared to advise the House on these points than I am.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable confusion about this bill, which was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, as our distinguished chairman has stated, on the recommendation of the Attorney General with the request for a change in existing law to affect the District of Columbia only.

The situation is that until 1919 the United States attorney for the District of Columbia was permitted to reside outside the District. At that time the law was changed to require the District attorney to reside in the District of Columbia because of an accounting problem that arose, and it was solved in that manner. The very thing we are attempting to accomplish, namely, permission of the district attorney and his assistants to reside outside of the District of Columbia, existed for many years prior to the time the law was amended as I have outlined.

Under the existing law, as has been pointed out by those who have preceded me, a resident of any State in the Union may now be appointed district attorney or assistant district attorney for the District of Columbia. The suggestion that this bill has as its basis a desire on the part of someone to create a situation that will allow a nonresident of the District to be appointed district attorney simply does not apply. The fact is that that can be done at the present time. A resident of Virginia may be appointed district attorney for the District of Columbia or assistant district attorney of the District. The requirement in the existing law, as it has existed since 1919, is that if a nonresident is appointed he must move into the District and live in the District from the time of his appointment. The bill under consideration provides that a person appointed district attorney or assistant district attorney for the District of Columbia is not required to live within the small confines of the District of Columbia. For purposes of convenience he is allowed to make his residence in what we may call the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. In other words, he is permitted to reside within 20 miles of the limits of the District of Columbia.

My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH], for whom I entertain a very high regard, cited the instance of a former colleague, Marvin Jones. He said that Marvin Jones will now have to live in the District of Columbia, and that it would not be proper for Marvin Jones to be appointed from Amarillo, Tex., to the position he now enjoys here and be allowed to live in Amarillo, Tex. We will all agree that that is true. That is not the situation to which this bill applies, however. I do not believe it would be anything extraordinary or unreasonable if Marvin Jones, a resident of Amarillo, Tex., were appointed to the position he now occupies and should come into the District of Columbia to perform his duties and should see fit to live within 20 miles of the District of Columbia. That is the thing which this law would permit.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Yes; gladly.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to my colleague that under existing law, and, as I understand, that is what you are trying to get away from, the man who has this position could not live just across the line.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. He could go out toward Chevy Chase as far as the circle, which, I believe, is the boundary, but he could not live across the line. I understand that to be the purpose of the bill.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Exactly.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I said, I am not familiar with this bill.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. That is the purpose of the bill. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has put his finger on the very heart of this bill. The purpose of this bill is to permit the district attorney and his assistants who are now required rigidly to live within the small confines of the District of Columbia to do the very thing that our distinguished chairman has suggested; namely, to reside across the line outside of the District if they see fit to

do so. The limit of 20 miles is placed in the bill, because it is felt that that is a reasonable distance in these days of hard-surfaced roads, ease of transportation, and all that sort of thing. That is all there is to the bill, frankly.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not true that every mayor in the United States has to live within the confines of the city which he serves?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I could not say that; I am not familiar with all the municipal laws on the subject of residence requirements of mayors. I do not believe that is quite analogous. I believe this situation dealt with in the bill under discussion is an unusual one. Let me quote this paragraph from the letter of the Attorney General appearing on the second page of the report:

> The District of Columbia occupies an unusual position. Because of its small area, many persons whose business and professional life is conducted within the confines of the District frequently reside in the suburban metropolitan territory. Persons who are technically residents either of Virginia or Maryland are frequently closely identified with the District of Columbia.

This points to the very heart of this measure. The District of Columbia, as we all known, is an unusual district. It is a district in which the business of the National Capital is confined within a small area. In recent years particularly the people of this area, and, in fact, many Members of Congress, have seen fit to establish their residence—in the case of Members of Congress, their temporary abode—across the line in either Virginia or Maryland, outside of the confines of the District of Columbia. There is no criticism of that. The area to which I refer outside of the District of Columbia is the residential area of the District of Columbia. It is contiguous to it; it is used by the people who do their business in the District of Columbia as their place of abode, their home, and all that this bill would do would be to extend the same privilege to the district attorney and the assistant district attorneys of the District of Columbia.

A great many bugaboos have been raised, it seems to me, about this perfectly innocent bill, and all as a result of a perfectly legitimate request on the part of the Attorney General that a situation be created which will allow the district attorney and the assistant district attorneys to reside, as many other people who do their business in the District of Columbia are permitted to reside, outside of the District and across the line in Virginia or Maryland.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The city of Chicago has a Federal court district there, as do the cities of Boston and Philadelphia, and the district attorneys and their assistants must live within the boundaries of those cities, yet there is no effort to amend the law with regard to them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say to my distinguished colleague that we not only have a precedent, to which I have referred, in this particular instance which existed until 1919, but we have the additional precedent of the city of New York, where, because of the peculiar situation that exists there, somewhat analogous and somewhat similar to the situation which exists here, the district attorney and his assistants are permitted to reside at any point within 20 miles outside of the city of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill pass. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas) there were—ayes 43, noes 33.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 134, not voting 150, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—147

Allen, La.	Forand	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews	Ford, Leland M.	O'Connor
Arnold	Ford, Thomas F.	O'Hara
Barden	Gathings	Patman
Barnes	Gearhart	Patrick
Bates, Ky.	Gibson	Patton
Beam	Gore	Pearson
Beckworth	Gossett	Peterson, Fla.
Bland	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Boggs	Green	Pheiffer, William T.
Boland	Gregory	Plauché
Brooks	Hancock	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Hare	Ramsay
Bryson	Harris, Ark.	Ramspeck
Buckler, Minn.	Harris, Va.	Randolph
Burch	Heffernan	Rankin, Miss.
Burdick	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Camp	Hobbs	Richards
Cannon, Fla.	Holbrock	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Hunter	Romjue
Cartwright	Jackson	Sanders
Clark	Jarman	Satterfield
Claypool	Jonkman	Schuetz
Cochran	Kee	Scott
Coffee, Wash.	Kefauver	Scrugham
Colmer	Kerr	Sheppard
Cooley	Kilday	Sikes
Cooper	Kirwan	Smith, Maine
Courtney	Kocialkowski	Smith, Va.
Cox	Lanham	Smith, Wash.
D'Alesandro	Larrabee	Smith, W. Va.
Delaney	Leavy	Snyder
Dingell	Lewis	Somers, N. Y.
Doughton	Ludlow	Sparkman
Downs	McCormack	Spence
Doxey	McGehee	Steagall
Drewry	McLaughlin	Sullivan
Duncan	McMillan	Sumners, Tex.
Durham	Maciora	Sweeney
Eliot, Mass.	Magnuson	Tarver
Elliott, Calif.	Michener	Tenerowicz
Fitzgerald	Mills, Ark.	Tolan
Fitzpatrick	Mills, La.	Vinson, Ga.
Flaherty	Monroney	Voorhis, Calif.
Flannagan	Murdock	Vorys, Ohio
Fogarty	Nelson	Vreeland
Folger	Nichols	Wasielewski
Weaver	Wickersham	Zimmerman
Whelchel	Williams	
	Worley	

NAYS—134

Allen, Ill.	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Andersen, H. Carl	Harness	Robsion, Ky.
Anderson, Calif.	Hart	Rockefeller
Andresen, August H.	Healey	Rodgers, Pa.
Angell	Hébert	Rogers, Mass.
Arends	Heidinger	Rolph
Baumhart	Hess	Russell
Bender	Hoffman	Rutherford
Bennett	Holmes	Sabath
Bishop	Hook	Sacks
Bolton	Hope	Sauthoff
Bradley, Mich.	Howell	Scanlon
Bradley, Pa.	Hull	Shafer, Mich.
Brown, Ohio	Jarrett	Smith, Ohio
Canfield	Jennings	Smith, Pa.
Carlson	Johns	South
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Springer
Clason	Kean	Stearns, N. H.
Copeland	Keefe	Stefan
Crowther	Kelley, Pa.	Stevenson
Culkin	Kinzer	Stratton
Cunningham	Kunkel	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Lambertson	Taber
Dirksen	Landis	Talle
Ditter	LeCompte	Terry
Dworshak	McGregor	Thill
Ellis	McIntyre	Thom
Elston	McKeough	Thomason
Engel	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Englebright	Martin, Mass.	Tinkham
Fellows	Mason	Treadway
Fenton	Meyer, Md.	Van Zandt
Flannery	Moser	Walter
Gehrmann	Mundt	Ward
Gerlach	Murray	Weiss
Gilchrist	Myers, Pa.	Whittington
Gillie	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Graham	Oliver	Wilson
Granger	Osmers	Wolcott
Grant, Ind	Paddock	Wolfenden, Pa.
Guyer, Kans.	Pittenger	Wolverton, N. J.
Gwynne	Poage	Woodruff, Mich.
Haines	Rankin, Mont.	Young
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, N. Y.	Youngdahl
	Rees, Kans.	
	Robertson, N. Dak.	

NOT VOTING—150

Anderson, N. Mex.	Faddis	Mansfield
Baldwin	Fish	Marcantonio
Barry	Ford, Miss.	May
Bates, Mass.	Fulmer	Merritt
Beiter	Gale	Mitchell
Bell	Gamble	Mott
Blackney	Gavagan	Norton
Bloom	Geyer, Calif.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boehne	Gifford	O'Day
Bolles	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Leary
Bonner	Harrington	O'Neal
Boren	Harter	O'Toole
Boykin	Hartley	Pace
Buck	Hill, Colo.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hill, Wash.	Pierce
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Ploeser
Burgin	Houston	Plumley
Byrne	Imhoff	Powers
Capozzoli	Izac	Rabaut
Carter	Jacobsen	Reece, Tenn.
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Ohio	Rich
Casey, Mass.	Jenks, N. H.	Rivers
Celler	Jensen	Rizley
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Okla.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Sasscer
Clevenger	Johnson, Luther A.	Schaefer, Ill.
Cluett	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schulte
Coffee, Nebr.	Johnson, Okla.	Secrest
Cole, Md.	Johnson, W. Va.	Shanley
Cole, N. Y.	Jones	Shannon
Collins	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Connery	Kennedy, Martin J.	Short
Costello	Kennedy, Michael J.	Simpson
Cravens	Keogh	Smith, Conn.
Crawford	Kilburn	Starnes, Ala.
Creal	Kleberg	Sutphin
Crosser	Knutson	Taylor
Cullen	Kopplemann	Thomas, N. J.
Curtis	Kramer	Thomas, Tex.
Davis, Ohio	Lea	Traynor
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Vincent, Ky.
Dewey	Lynch	Wadsworth
Dickstein	McArdle	Welch
Dies	McGranery	Wene
Disney	McLean	West
Domengeaux	Maas	Wheat
Dondero	Maciejewski	White
Douglas	Mahon	Winter
Eaton		Woodrum, Va.
Eberharter		Wright
Edelstein		
Edmiston		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kilburn.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Beiter with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Short.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. West with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Rich.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Buck.
Mr. Shanley with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Davis of Ohio with Mr. Izac.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. May with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Wene.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Houston.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Geyer of California.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Smith of Connecticut with Mr. Lesinski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION TO SPECIAL ASSISTANTS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST DOHENY EXECUTORS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I call up the bill (H. R. 2609) to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of United States against Doheny Executors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes——

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and the House must go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Allen, Ill.	Fish	Mansfield
Anderson, N. Mex.	Flannery	Marcantonio
Bates, Mass.	Gale	May
Blackney	Gamble	Mitchell
Bolles	Gavagan	Mott
Buck	Gearhart	Nelson
Buckler, Minn.	Geyer, Calif.	Norton
Buckley, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Day
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Burdick	Gilchrist	Ploeser
Burgin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Byrne	Hartley	Powers
Carter	Hill, Colo.	Rabaut
Celler	Hill, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.
Chapman	Hinshaw	Rich
Chenoweth	Imhoff	Schaefer, Ill.
Cluett	Izac	Secrest
Cole, Md.	Jacobsen	Shannon
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkins, Ohio	Sheridan
Collins	Jenks, N. H.	Simpson
Connery	Jensen	Smith, Conn.
Costello	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Wash.
Crawford	Johnson, Ind.	Spence
Creal	Johnson, Luther A.	Starnes, Ala.
Crosser	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sweeney
Culkin	Johnson, W. Va.	Taylor
Cullen	Kelly, Ill.	Tinkham
Curtis	Kennedy, Michael J.	Traynor
Davis, Ohio	Kilburn	Vincent, Ky.
Dewey	Kleberg	Weaver
Dies	Kopplemann	Welch
Domengeaux	Lea	West
Dondero	Leavy	Wheat
Douglas	Lesinski	White
Eaton	McArdle	Wigglesworth
Eberharter	McGranery	Williams
Eliot, Mass.	Maas	Winter
Elliott, Calif.	Mansfield	Wolfenden, Pa.
Englebright	Marcantonio	Woodrum, Va.
Faddis	May	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 314 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 3252

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Utah Valley News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters from constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include letters from my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper clipping against communism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item in connection with the proposed plan of the Government to have Great Britain manufacture warships for the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the 30 minutes I have been granted today, tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Was any provision made for the Committee on Agriculture to sit this afternoon during the session of the House?

The SPEAKER. If the memory of the Chair is correct, the committee was granted leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the remainder of this week.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Several Members were attending those committee meetings and could not answer the roll calls.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Sugar Bulletin of April 1.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOLLES, for 1 week, on account of important business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will not use the time granted me today, in deference to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has transferred his permission to address to tomorrow.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the construction and maintenance of overhanging walks on the highway bridge, route No. 36, at Highlands, N. J., for public use; and

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793) as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the Commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will continue hearings on the following days:

1. Thursday, April 24: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers and representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Kings and Kern Rivers projects.

2. Friday, April 25: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the Willamette Valley, the Columbia River Basin, and the Pacific Northwest.

3. Monday, April 28: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the western and southwestern Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado and west Gulf rivers.

4. Tuesday, April 29: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Missouri River and tributaries.

5. Wednesday, April 30: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Mississippi and Great Lakes region.

6. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

7. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

8. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

9. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

10. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

11. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

12. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

13. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

14. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

15. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, April 24, for consideration of H. R. 3961 and H. R. 2381.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund.

(The hearing scheduled on H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y., has been indefinitely postponed at the request of the author.)

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 28. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the select committee appointed to investigate interstate migration; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 2082. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4401. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, Glenn Dale, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4342. A bill to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R.

8252. A bill to make emergency provisions for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 4250. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to Roland Boucher in recognition of his bravery and heroism in rescuing five children from drowning in Lake Champlain; with amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 4484 (by request). A bill to provide a minimum disability rating for enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, discharged for physical disabilities or on medical survey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 4485. A bill providing that the Federal contribution to States for aid to crippled children under the Social Security Act shall be determined according to financial need for assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4486. A bill to create five regional national libraries and to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 4487. A bill to provide for a preliminary flood-control examination and survey of the Pearl River, Miss.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4488. A bill to provide for adjustment of active duty pay and allowances of commissioned officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 4489. A bill to permit the courts of the United States, and State courts, to issue copies of naturalization certificates to all persons over 21 years of age who can show they are entitled to citizenship in the United States of America by the naturalization of their parent or husband, that was issued out of the court; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 4490. A bill to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County water conservation district; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4491. A bill to authorize clothing allowances for the United States Navy or Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R 4492. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pan-American center at Tacoma, Wash., for the coordination of commercial and cultural relations between the American republics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4493. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept certain land for park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of California:

H. R. 4494. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Santa Maria River and tributaries, Calif.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code: to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4496. A bill repealing section 611 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4497. A bill repealing section 611 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4498. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of insane persons belong to the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4499. A bill to authorize the heads of the various departments and agencies of the United States to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when it is in the interest of the national defense, to authorize the President to give priority to deliveries under such contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4500. A bill to provide longevity pay for certain officers and enlisted men of the civilian components of the national-defense forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution for the relief of the distressed and suffering people in the earthquake zone of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 3570, providing for assistance in meeting the housing problem in areas with defense workers; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, concerning homestead leases and patents; to the Committee on the Territorities.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Marie Oster; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Irene Dial; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Hattie Dillon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 4504. A bill granting a pension to Shirley Posey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4505. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Fannie Ellis White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Jeremiah Aldersley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Lawler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Howard Anthony Berry; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 4509. A bill for the relief of the L. & W. Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNS:

H. R. 4510. A bill for the relief of Ebenezer L. Haley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 4511. A bill for the relief of Giacoma Cicilia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 4512. A bill for the relief of Dr. M. Kellogg Mookerjee; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4513. A bill for the relief of Gladys Nelson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4514. A bill for the relief of Samuel J D. Marshall; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4515. A bill for the relief of Elmer Leibfried; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 4516. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

819. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, urging that all necessary steps be taken to prevent any change in the home port of the frigate *Constellation* and preserve to the people of Rhode Island and New England this cherished shrine; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

820. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, expressing opposition to the wire-tapping bill (H. R. 4228); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

821. Also, petition of the New York State Federation of Labor, opposing House bill 4139, introduced by Representative VINSON of Georgia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

822. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, requesting that the selective-service system grant deferment to farmers when the individuals can show that they have ownership or control of the land which they are operating and that such farming is their major enterprise, pointing out that farming is essential to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

823. Also, resolution of the Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, Riverside, Wash., urging that Congress use its influence to have industry and labor join with agriculture in forming a solid, united nation against Hitlerism; to the Committee on Labor.

824. Also, resolution of the Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, Riverside, Wash., recommending that the Government conscript all profits derived from munitions factories and other industrial corporations drawing profits from the production of war

materials during our preparedness and defense program, and further recommending that the Government issue interest-free money to finance wars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

825. Also, resolution of the Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, of Riverside, Wash., opposing the importation of Canadian-grown apples and recommending that restrictions in quotas be placed on importations, pointing out that apple growers of the Pacific Northwest are fighting for their economic lives and cannot long endure the uncontrolled marketing and importation of Canadian apples on the American market; to the Committee on Agriculture.

826. Also, resolution of the Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, Riverside, Wash., recommending that legislation be enacted amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act to permit the establishment of a program involving the graduated allotment, with little or no reduction in acreage or production or in marketing quotas on family-type farms below that normally produced or marketed, and providing for an increasing restriction on acreage or production or marketing quotas for farms of larger acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

827. Also, resolution of the Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, Riverside, Wash., recommending that Congress immediately enact a two-price agricultural program, which will assure American farmers an American price for that portion of their products consumed in domestic markets, pointing out that the spending for the national-defense program results in rising prices for labor and material, and at the same time increases the farmers' tax burden without corresponding increases in his own income; to the Committee on Agriculture.

828. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Women's Club of Forest Hills, N. Y., requesting that when Congress considers sugar legislation this year it should include provisions to prevent the expansion of the subsidized beet-sugar industry or the subsidized tropical cane sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

829. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Resolutions adopted by Maj. David McKelvy Peterson Post of the American Legion, Honesdale, Pa., relative to labor strikes in national-defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

830. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the St. Louis Guild, opposing the so-called Vinson compulsory mediation bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

831. Also, petition of the International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, Washington, D. C., opposing the passage of the so-called Vinson bill (H. R. 4139); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

832. Also, petition of the Michigan State Industrial Union Council, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor bargaining power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

833. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

834. Also, petition of the Harrisburg Newspaper Guild, Harrisburg, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4139, known as the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

835. Also, petition of the United Mine Workers of America, Madisonville, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4139 and antistrike legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

836. Also, petition of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America, Cincinnati, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

837. Also, petition of the United Mine Workers of America, Ellsworth, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antistrike legislation; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, wilt Thou be pleased to accept our endeavors to follow Thee in all our ways. Grant that the declarations of truth that shall be sent forth may be accompanied by the spirit of our great Teacher. Beneath the surface of material things enable us to seek the things unseen and eternal, holding us to the realization that sorrow, pain, and weakness have their mighty compensations, while the hands that hold the crown, ache with many a cross. We pray Thee to teach us that wisdom which shall inspire us as servants of our democracy to be humbly devoted to honor, fidelity, and manliness. O Thou Shepherd divine, have compassion upon Thy helpless children everywhere; those who are weary and long for the end; those who are innocently entangled in the cruel chains of unprovoked war; those who are in the midst of the draining seductions of man's inhumanity to man and are dying in mind, soul, and body. Almighty One, bid the compelling lamp of faith to shine in the goodness of an eternal God. We pray that all the injunctions of the sanctuaries of Catholic, Protestant, and Jew may go forth in the fullest measure, calling our people away from their idols, ease, follies, and indifference, making us a God-fearing Nation, worthy of our national existence. To the glory of our Redeemer and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3486) to authorize an appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert: "That section 1 (b) of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, is hereby amended (1) by striking out '$3,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,500' and (2) by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding a colon and the following: *'Provided further*, That all items of cost with respect to each such family dwelling unit shall be separately estimated with a view toward economy, and no movable equipment shall be installed in such units, unless the Administrator shall, in any particular case, deem such installation to be in the public interest.'

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of October 14, 1940, is hereby amended by striking out '$150,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$300,000,000'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, relating to defense housing, by authorizing an additional appropriation of $150,000,000, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to ask a question, is the gentleman familiar with the report attributed to one of the defense agencies to the effect that the President has made allocations under this bill of several defense projects; one, for instance, at Dumas, Tex.? Am I correct in understanding it related to this bill or did it relate to another bill?

Mr. LANHAM. I am not advised as to the particular matters about which the gentleman inquires, but I am advised that this bill having been delayed quite a bit by the recess, allocations under it have very largely been assigned and it is urgent that the work be proceeded with at once.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That answers the question.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In reading the amendment the Clerk read the statement, "with a view toward economy." Why do we not put language in the bill compelling as much economy as is humanly possible?

Mr. LANHAM. I believe if the gentleman listened to the amendment very closely he saw that was the very purpose of the amendment to which he referred.

Mr. RICH. The only trouble is that while we hear much talk of cutting down expenses in the regular routine operations of the Government, yet every appropriation bill comes to us carrying increases. Unless we put something in this bill compelling economy they are not going to economize.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is no increase in the amount appropriated in this bill as it comes from the Senate. The appropriation it carries now is exactly what it carried when it left the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it not true that economy is taken into consideration, and also is taken into consideration our desire not to get the Government into the position of jeopardizing local real-estate values? We are willing to increase the cost of the individual unit in order not to adversely affect the real-estate values in the districts in which we may build these houses.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman from Ohio is quite correct; and I may say that the amendments have the unanimous concurrence of the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I understand this is the bill to provide housing for defense workers.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. PITTENGER. At the time the bill was under consideration in the House there was considerable criticism of the plan to put electric ice boxes and other equipment into these houses. Is there any safeguard against that as the bill comes to us from the Senate?

Mr. LANHAM. As the bill passed the House, an amendment of somewhat similar import was included, and it was retained by the Senate.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it not true that the same amendment adopted by the House relative to movable equipment is still in the bill? It is not a controversial question at this time.

Mr. LANHAM. It is still in the bill as the House passed it.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Does this bill deal with needed additional educational facilities?

Mr. LANHAM. No. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has now before it the measure to which he refers and is giving very diligent attention to it. It had been hoped the bill would be reported out this week. The present prospect and hope is that we may be able to report that bill from the committee early next week. We have been working very diligently on it, and, but for the fact there was some delay by reason of the recess, the bill would have been reported by this time.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for answering the question. I asked it to place his answer in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee. I have been looking over the District, just touring around, to acquaint myself with the space that might be available in the District for buildings that the Federal Government may need. I see some of the worst ramshackle buildings in the District of Columbia that I have ever seen in my life. Homes that are not fit to live in. It seems to me instead of constructing buildings outside of the District, we ought to raze a lot of these ramshackle properties and make the District one of the finest places in the world for office buildings and for homes. The only way you are going to do that is for the gentleman's committee to take a tour, go down here in the Southeast, and look over the space down there. That is a grand place to put Government buildings. They will not interfere with the buildings in the Northwest or in close proximity to the Mall and the traffic down there in the Southeast of the District is not so heavy.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion, but this particular measure has to do with a specific kind of building in congested areas of national defense in order that the program for defense may be carried on. I think the statement of the gentleman is quite pertinent, but not perhaps to the pending bill.

Mr. RICH. It may not be to the pending bill, but I make the suggestion to the gentleman as chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee. I wish he would take the whole committee. If he does not have an automobile to take them around, let me take them on a tour of the city. I will show them many blocks of ramshackle buildings.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman and I shall also be glad to confer with him as to where we shall get the money.

Mr. BENDER. Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. RICH. We are going to get the money from the same place he is going to get the money to build these buildings. Of course, you cannot get it out of an empty Treasury. If a Government can do a lot of this work on the outside of the District, certainly it can do it in the District.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that, but we certainly cannot centralize all of our national-defense activities in the District of Columbia at this time.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I am wondering if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will support the Overton formula, which has been reported by the District of Columbia Committee, and which provides for just what the gentleman is asking.

Mr. RICH. May I say that the District of Columbia ought to be operated on an economical scale like we expect to operate our own business or our own homes in our respective districts. I do not propose to give the District of Columbia a lot of money and let our people back home pay the bill. That day is gone forever. What we ought to do is economize in the District of Columbia, and economize back home, or we will wreck the Nation and you will wreck the Government, and I do not want that.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. The District of Columbia Committee, I may say, has had quite a bit of difficulty obtaining affirmative votes from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am sure the entire membership of the House appreciates the splendid work that is being done and has been done by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I would like to prolong this inquiry slightly to ask a question. I understood the gentleman to say that the allocation of these funds had been made. I would like to know whether allocation has been made to specific projects or whether allocation has been made to areas in which work will be required to be done?

Mr. LANHAM. I am unable to give the gentleman definite information in that regard, but if he will get in touch with Mr. C. F. Palmer, the Housing Coordinator, who determines the needs and then apprises the Federal Works Agency of those needs in order that the construction may be done, he can get that information. I have been advised that it is very urgent that the work be undertaken at once.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I was interested in inquiring whether or not applications for this type of assistance could be made in areas in which defense projects are being erected, or whether the money has actually been allocated to specific projects so as to eliminate the possibility of securing any funds in that way?

Mr. LANHAM. I feel sure the money has not all been allocated. If the gentlemen who have such areas will bring their situations to the attention of the Housing Coordinator I think I can assure them he will give a very thorough investigation to the matter and be as helpful as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The action taken by the distinguished gentleman from Texas has the unanimous approval of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; it has.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEADERSHIP IN ENGLAND AND AUSTRALIA

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, press and radio reports indicate that because of recent British reverses there is a demand in England and Australia for a change in the leadership of those nations. Of course, we all know that there are many people who are so limited in their intelligence and so devoid of good judgment that they can judge a man only by his few failures rather than by his many successes, or by his few faults rather than by his many virtues. As one who has been consistently active in support of every assistance to Great Britain, I wish to say that if the British people permit that proportion of their citizens who are devoid of good judgment to dictate the leadership of the British Empire in this crisis, I am ready to withdraw our assistance, because I believe anything we might do to assist them would be futile. If any elements in the British Empire take advantage of this national crisis to jockey themselves into political control, most certainly an unfavorable reaction will result in the United States. I feel sure that Churchill and Menzie enjoy the

fullest confidence of those officials of the Government of the United States who are keeping up to date on the situation. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day, and after the special orders heretofore entered, I may have 20 minutes to address the House to answer an attack on the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who has requested me to make this request, may have permission to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning on the new tax proposal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COST OF LIVING

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to read a paragraph from a letter I have recently received from S. E. Moss, of Miles City, Mont., one of the leading citizens and railroad men of Montana, with respect to the cost of living as it is mounting now in that section of the country. This short paragraph graphically tells the story of what is likely to happen to the wage earner with reference to taxes to meet our aid-to-Britain program. It also shows how wages are going to be eaten up by the increased cost of living that is taking place. It is very interesting. I, therefore, feel that the Members of Congress should hear it and read it in the RECORD, as it comes from one of Montana's foremost citizens:

I am wondering again if the burden of this $7,000,000,000 is going to be thrown in the laps of the small wage earner, to read some of our local papers now; a bill is as good as enacted into law that will make us pay the major part of the increased tax by lowering the brackets of our incomes without exemptions; it is an outrage to see the way the cost of living is increasing. Bacon and ham was selling for 16 cents a pound 2 months ago, and now it is 28 and 30, and some as high as 38 cents per pound, and most any cuts of steak are out of the reach of the wage earner; some cuts as high as 40 cents a pound, and most everything else is going sky-high in the line of living costs, and we have got to eat to work, and we also have got to work to eat, so if it costs us all our earnings to live, where is our additional income tax going to come from?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by a young constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of strikes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram from constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article from the Worcester Telegram with reference to a statement issued by our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR LONG

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon, about 2 o'clock, we will have the unveiling of the statue of the late Senator Long of Louisiana. I desire to extend an invitation to all Members of the House to be present.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Christian Advocate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a concurrent resolution of the Minnesota Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, preceding the gentleman from Michigan, who I understand has the first special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I have already discussed the matter with the gentleman from Michigan, and it is satisfactory to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], and by the authority of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain brief speeches made by three citizens of El Paso, Tex., at a recent Jackson Day dinner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration is continuing its persecution of the southern coal operators. In this morning's Washington Post appears a statement issued by the Secretary of Labor. This is part of it:

It is now clear that the southern operators have withdrawn from negotiations—

That much is true—

and declined to agree to the President's proposal to reopen the mines.

That part of it—"declined to agree to the President's proposal to reopen the mines"—is absolutely false; there is no question about it. Why the Secretary of Labor wants to make that kind of a statement in view of the fact, which is known to all who wish to ascertain the truth, I cannot understand. There are mine owners down at Harlan, Ky., who are ready to operate, and there are miners there who are ready to go to work. The only thing that prevents the opening of those mines is that John Lewis sends an armed force in there and prevents those men who are ready to work from digging coal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RESTAURANT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 186

Resolved, That under the provisions of House Resolution 590, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to September 5, 1940, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to establish a branch of the House of Representatives Restaurant in the new House Office Building.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman make a brief statement as to just what is intended by the resolution and also a statement about the approximate cost?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to do that. We all know the practical situation that confronts us with respect to the House restaurant. We all know the difficulty the Members and their guests have in getting the attention which the exigencies of our work in the House reasonably require with respect to quick service. Of course, this is due to a number of causes, and we want to see that the public receives consideration, which is a practical matter, and then also our own office force, and the forces of the various committees are involved. The fact we have an increased secretarial staff has tended to make the situation perhaps more acute or difficult. Our office force must have some place to eat. Under present circumstances they naturally eat in the House restaurant. We have got to approach this condition in a practical manner by providing a place in the House Office Building which will tend to prevent their gravitating to the restaurants downstairs. I doubt if we want to go to the extent of saying that this shall or shall not be done, and it would not be wise for us to say that our secretarial staff may not eat down there under present conditions. Certainly we do not want to say that the public cannot be served there, because most of the public who patronize the restaurant are guests of Members of the House, either directly or indirectly. Occasionally we have our friends served down there because we may not be able to entertain them at lunch ourselves, but they are guests of ours just the same.

It is believed that if this restaurant is established a good part of our own office force would eat there and in this way relieve the situation that exists at the present time in the restaurant downstairs.

It is estimated this will cost $15,000. The matter has been taken up by a committee representing the House, composed of the Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]. It is my understanding, based upon reliable information which I have received, that their opinion is unanimous and they, in turn, have taken this matter up with the Architect and their action is the result of an inquiry made by the Architect and is in line with his recommendations. This, in substance, outlines the situation.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman has suggested that the people eating in the restaurant are usually guests of Members of the House. I want it understood, of course, that they are guests and the checks are paid by the individual Members of the House. There are no free meals for Members or guests.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. We ofttimes receive letters, as well as see newspaper comments, to the effect that the Members of the House enjoy this restaurant and that the Government or the taxpayers pay for the food. Of course, we all know this is not true, and in this new restaurant there is to be no food furnished anyone for nothing.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad that my friend has made that contribution, because there is an awful lot of honest misunderstanding in all of our districts, not only in this respect but in other respects. Some people honestly think we all live at the White House, for example, and some people think that our hotel expenses are paid, including barbers and everything else. Of course, they honestly think so, and it is up to us, insofar as we can, to correct that opinion.

Furthermore, while there are some other restaurants around here, yet this is the one that about everyone connected with the Members of the House, including their office force, eat in, and otherwise they would have to go downtown, which, of course, would mean a trip of a mile and a half or 2 miles away from the Capitol.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A good many people also have the idea that Members of Congress do not pay any income taxes or other taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I pay mine and I am glad to pay it. I am glad to have enough income to pay an income tax, and, of course, everybody whose income is subject to tax pays that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And there will be no congressional exemptions, I assume, under the tax bill that will be reported from the gentleman's Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not on the committee now.

I may say also that there are no reduced prices to Members and the restaurant pays for itself.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that the charges to the Members are the same as the charges to the public?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no difference in any charge made for the food between a Member of Congress and the general public.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would also like to have the gentleman explain for the RECORD that the Members of Congress do not enjoy any free use of telephones. In other words, there is a sort of opinion prevalent among the public that they can call up Members of Congress collect and the Government pays the charges. I wish the gentleman would point out what the fact is and what the law is in relation to that matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only telephone service we are afforded is for telephone calls in the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With no long-distance calls.

Mr. McCORMACK. Every long-distance call or every call that involves an extra charge, even if we make the call in connection with official business, we have to pay ourselves. I know I have a telephone in my political office in Boston and my average telephone bill is from $50 to $55 a month. I am glad to pay it, but I get no reimbursement from the Government. I pay that out of my own pocket.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder whether the gentleman, as a result of his long experience on the Committee on Ways and Means, and his usual versatility on all questions, can inform us whether we can deduct that $55 telephone call bill as an exemption on our income tax?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do. I consider that an expense, and I deduct it in my income tax, but I am not reimbursed otherwise on that account by the Federal Government. It is a deductible item, just the same as any extra travel that we undergo, just the same as any extra expense we pay for our travel over and above what we are allowed. A lot of people think that we get pay for our travel every time we go back home.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield further, although I think we have gone far afield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think this is a very interesting colloquy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And very valuable.

Mr. DITTER. And in no way critical of the extent to which the gentleman has gone. Where is this new restaurant to be located; on which floor of the House Office Building? I am thinking of one thing, and that is that we want to be protected against any approach of vermin. Is it to be on the first floor?

Mr. McCORMACK. I could not tell the gentleman that. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to establish a branch restaurant, and I think that we can rely upon his good judgment. And I am confident that he values the opinion of no Member more than he does that of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Oh, I am very humble in view of the approach the gentleman from Massachusetts has made.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. With reference to the deductions on account of income tax. The distinguished majority leader referred to traveling expenses. May I call his attention to the Lindsey decision, made by the Board of Tax Appeals, which is in force, a decision which is not in line with the statement made by the gentleman concerning exemption for income tax. May I suggest that anyone interested in the matter get the Lindsey decision and read it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was that decision based on official business—Members traveling on official business?

Mr. MICHENER. The gist of that decision is that the place of employment of a Member of Congress is in Washington, and that he is entitled to deduct from his income tax the actual traveling expenses coming from his home to Washington at the beginning of the session, and a like amount when he returns at the end of the session, but that he is not entitled to deduct actual traveling expenses coming from and going to his district in the interim, even though he says it is on official business. I speak by the card. The decision is in print, and in some districts, including my own, it is in force. For instance, some time ago I followed the usual method and deducted all traveling expenses of trips going back on official business—what I considered official business.

Later the representative of the internal-revenue collector called at my office, armed with the decision, and told me how much additional I had to pay. I took the matter up with Mr. Arnold, who formerly served with us, and Mr. Leech, who formerly served with us, members of the Board of Tax Appeals, and they tell me that is the law, and if Congress does not like it Congress must change the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to get that information. I never have had much bother with that.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has a different collector of internal revenue, perhaps.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no; not that. I stay down here pretty much during the course of the year. I realize that Members have to go back frequently, but I am so situated that I manage to stay here the greater part of the year, so I have not that problem concerning myself.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RICH. In speaking of this restaurant, the gentleman speaks of restaurants being a mile and a half or 2 miles downtown. Has the gentleman never visited the restaurant over in the Public Library; has he never visited the restaurant over in the Supreme Court Building, or in the Methodist Building next to it, where there is a restaurant? Has the gentleman never gone down near the Old House Office Building, on that street which is full of restaurants? The only time, my observation tells me, in this restaurant downstairs when it is full is about from 12:45 to 1:45, and it is then difficult to get a seat.

Let me ask the gentleman this: If you put a restaurant in the New House Office Building, is it because you passed a law last year granting one additional secretary to each Member of Congress? Is that the reason we have more people here, or is it because we have more business? I know a lot of the Members do not like it, but I am talking now.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. This is not now a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RICH. Well, it ought to be. I object to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to read excerpts from two letters. Here is one from a C. I. O. man at Gary, Ind. He is kicking about the tax bill and about the curtailment of his right to work. He says:

> I don't like the idea of paying taxes on all over $2,000 while the C. I. O., with a claimed 4,000,000 membership, with $12 per year dues, which I figure is $48,000,000—and this money pays no taxes—besides, any money paid in as union dues is deducted from our tax, so the Government gets nothing at either end, and gives them the right to manhandle and stop me from working if I do not pay them the dues they ask.

Evidently the gentleman calls to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee the fact that the unions are collecting—at least, the C. I. O. is collecting an income of $48,000,000 on which it pays no tax. Apparently there is no reason why that organization should not pay an income tax as well as others. Why does the Ways and Means Committee neglect this source of revenue?

He says further:

> I can't help but think that the Constitution is about broken up; at least, it is badly bent. As far as Government protection is concerned, the C. I. O. can come to my house and take my furniture. There is nothing here to stop them. John Dillinger and Jesse James should have joined the C. I. O., then all their hold-ups would have been legal.

That shows what that man thinks of the Government's failure to protect him.

Now, here is the other letter, from a boy in camp at Sault Ste. Marie, in the northern peninsula of Michigan. The young man writes about the deductions which must be made from his $21 a month to pay for necessary supplies. He writes:

> The laundry is worse than the hiking supplies. The laundry is $2.20 per month. The hiking stuff was extra shaving equipment, soaps, comb, etc. * * * I'll get about $13 this month after my expenses are taken care of. * * * This company is sometimes so regulated by the supply sergeant that we don't even have toilet paper. * * * The lighting situation is even worse. Tonight we have three 45- or 65-watt bulbs in a room that has 32 bunks in it. Will all need glasses before the year is out. * * * Not enough clothes for us. * * * It is this sort of thing that destroys the morale of any unit. And this unit is composed of men who aren't and weren't desirous of being in the Army.

Now you get the picture, the statement on the one side of a soldier getting $21 a month and the statement on the other side of a C. I. O. man at Gary, Ind., who tells us what the C. I. O. is doing down there to him and others. As long as we are in session there is no reason why we should not pass legislation protecting the man who really wants to go to work, equalizing the burden as between the man in camp and the industrial employee who gets between $60 and $80 a week, while the enlisted man gets what is left of $21 a month. Let me read you something about this strike at Detroit where the gentleman from the northern peninsula of Michigan said the damage at the Ford plant was caused by Ford workers. I read again from the transcript of testimony taken before Judge Tuttle.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I also come from the Upper Peninsula of

Michigan. I hope the gentleman is not referring to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I could not possibly be referring to the gentleman from the Eleventh District of Michigan for one moment, or that he ever intimated that the loyal workers in the Ford plant caused this damage at the Ford plant. It was caused by the C. I. O. The position of the gentleman from the Eleventh District is so definitely known here and throughout the country, and has been so often stated on the floor of the House as being opposed to the Communists that I am sure no one would think he was ever defending the C. I. O. or the Communists. There is only one man from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan in this House who is defending the C. I. O. I hope the gentleman accepts that as my apology.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me read excerpts from the testimony of Roosevelt B. Burrell, employed by the Veterans' Administration to carry mail from the Maple Street post office to the administration and deputized by the Federal Government, on the 2d day of April 1941, was traveling south on Maple Street with a load of mail.

Passing the intersection of Maple and Shafer, he was stopped by two men, one of whom asked him:

Where are you going?

The witness testified:

"I am en route to the Veterans' Administration with a load of mail," and they said, "Well, you can't get through there, I don't think."

After these two men boarded the truck—

And the witness says there were approximately a thousand men on top of the viaduct—

they said, "I don't think you can go there, but go ahead, if you can." I said, "I just came through here, and I suppose I will get back," and then I drove 5 to 10 feet, and then I heard a yell, but I didn't know what they said, and then a brick came through the left door window, breaking it completely, and it scattered the glass, the powdered glass, into my eyes and cut the top part of my lip and the peak of my nose, and by that time the bricks were constantly hitting the truck. * * * I have those here, and after that I did not proceed. I turned right back around and went right straight back through the crowd of men that were there, and the whole mob of men, to left and to right, when they saw me coming back, came into the middle of the street, throwing their hands up as if to stop the truck.

I didn't take any chance with people of that type, and I stepped on the gas and picked up my speed and blew my horn and went on through the crowd and went to the Dearborn police station and made a report of the same.

The COURT—

Now, this is the judge.

The COURT. What I was trying to figure out was whether this was a violation of the postal law or of some other law, because any interference with the United States mail until it is delivered is a violation of the postal law, and I was wondering whether, within that statute and that definition, this mail had been delivered or had not been delivered as yet.

Answer. Your Honor, the mail had not been delivered to the source to which it was going. It was en route.

The COURT. It is addressed to this place?

Answer. To the Veterans' Administration Facility.

* * * * *

The COURT. Do you have a box here and go to that box to get it, or does some post-office clerk here turn it over to you?

Answer. No, sir; we go to the rear door, the same as the regular Federal trucks, and the inspector of the post office has someone to bring the mail to us, and we go to the main window and sign for the registered mail ourselves and we are responsible for that mail until all registered mail is delivered to the Veterans' Administration.

The COURT. All right.

Mr. DOELLE. He is deputized by the United States Post Office to carry the mail to the facility.

The COURT. It was a violation of the law, what was done there, and he has described it, anyway, so I do not suppose that it matters in this case; it was wrong morally and legally and every other way, what he has described; if that happened, it was wrong, but I was wondering if he referred it to the Post Office Department or some other department.

What about equal protection under the law, what about enforcement of the law, what about the right of a man to travel the public highway?

The other day I read from a transcript of the testimony about a veteran of the World War, a member of the Detroit police force, who was going down to this same hospital, the veterans' hospital, for treatment. He was stopped and beaten by this same group of pickets. Here you have another illustration of the lawlessness and violence of these striking C. I. O. pickets carried on there in the Ford plant.

The thing that has prevented and the thing that now prevents the coal miners in the South, and the Ford Motor Co. from going into production at full capacity is the violence that is brought about and carried on by these pickets; and the authorities of the State of Michigan, as I will point out from the records in days to come, the authorities of the State of Michigan, the State police force, give absolutely no protection to the men who want to work, but they did protect those pickets who are driving out of the factories the men who had jobs.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. This morning the gentleman said that John L. Lewis was responsible for the coal strike being continued because Lewis said he would not give up the bargaining power of a strike. He claims he wants to hold onto the strike because of its bargaining power. It is a splendid illustration of the bargaining power of strikes, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a taking by force. In a few days I will bring in photographs taken on the scene of the Ford strike which will show that those fellows bargained with clubs and bars of steel. They insist upon the terms of their agreement, and they insist through the exercise of force on compelling the men to sign.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is that not a splendid illustration of real bargaining power?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and we sit here day after day doing nothing. This Congress is drawing down better than $4,000,000 a year, yet we absolutely neglect, or we refuse—I will put it that way—we refuse to pass a simple law which will give protection to the men who want to work, and we refuse to insist that the President and the law-enforcement officers of the State and Nation protect these men and women who want to work in order to earn a livelihood. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WALTER LIPPMANN'S ATTACK ON PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there was inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 22 an attack on President Roosevelt written by Walter Lippmann.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell us who Walter Lippmann is?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Walter Lippmann is a newspaper columnist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Elected to anything?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I have heard him referred to many times as an "international Jew." I do not know whether he is or not. He has never been elected to any office that I know of. I am told that he was at one time secretary to a socialist mayor in Schenectady, N. Y. He now seems to be trying to browbeat the President of the United States into plunging this country into the European war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the President accused of warmongering by Members on the Republican side of this House, and of trying to plunge this country into war; now we have these international columnists attacking the President because he is not plunging us into war.

When I use the word "Jew," I want it understood that I do so in the most friendly spirit. I draw a distinction between the international Jew, whether he is an international banker or an international Communist, and the American Jew who makes this his home, who is a part of his community, who is trying to build up and defend his country, and who must now suffer for the misconduct of

these international Jews who are always stirring up trouble for them. In my opinion they are today making the greatest blunder since the Crucifixion.

In this article Mr. Lippmann states:

> In this tremendous time the American people must look to their President for leadership. They are not getting leadership from the President.

If there ever has been a President of the United States who furnished leadership it certainly is Franklin D. Roosevelt—whether you agree with him or not.

Further on Mr. Lippmann says:

> They (the American people) are not being dealt with seriously, truthfully, responsibly, and nobly. They are being dealt with cleverly, indirectly, even condescendingly, and nervously.

In a similar tone, he proceeds then to criticize the President. For what? For carrying out his pledge to the American people. President Roosevelt has done exactly what he said he would do. He told us in the beginning that he was in favor of keeping America out of a foreign war, and that he would not send our boys to fight on foreign soil. He has kept that pledge.

Some of these columnists, and their backers, are trying to nag the President into intervening in a foreign war and into sending an American army to Europe.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. For a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is making a fine speech and I am pleased that he is doing it, but the gentleman does not mean to infer, does he, that the effort to get us into war is limited to a few columnists?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, no, but they are the spokesmen for the crowd putting up the money.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Who are they?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The international financiers, largely international Jews, with a few international gentiles, such as the House of Morgan, who own or control the gold supply of the world. They have controlled the world through the gold standard ever since Rothchilds got financial control of England during the Napoleonic war. They are now crucifying civilization on a cross of gold.

They first crucified the German Republic, and in doing so they created Hitler. He is their baby. Hitler never would have been heard of if it had not been for these elements swarming into Germany and undermining the German Republic. When it went down, Hitler arose from its ruins. The world is now reaping what they sowed—a whirlwind of destruction.

They are now crucifying England and abusing the President because he refuses to permit them to crucify the United States—upon this cross of gold.

They are dissatisfied because the President has not sent our Army and our Navy to Europe. This is the beginning of a drive to try to force him to convoy vessels into the war zone and to send an American expeditionary force to fight on European soil.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. Does the gentleman believe that with our all-out aid efforts, and after our having voted $7,000,000,000 at one pop, if we are not able to deliver the goods, if they go to the bottom of the ocean, we should not belt ourselves and deliver the goods? Does the gentleman mean that we should throw our hands up and not convoy, if necessary?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman could not deliver them after they "go to the bottom of the ocean," as he expresses it.

Mr. PATRICK. That is the point. Certainly we cannot deliver it after it is sunk.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am answering this attack on the President of the United States. I am not for sending an expeditionary force to Europe. That is what we told the American people in the campaign last year, and that is what the President told them. The President is carrying out that promise, and I am defending him for standing by that promise.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman fully appreciate the fact, and likewise the gentleman from Alabama, that if we convoy those ships and attempt to deliver war material to England it means war, it means our active participation in war, which would be a repudiation of the pledge that nearly every person who ran for office in the last campaign made to the American people, to do his best to keep us out of war? We know the American people do not want to get into this war. The President has said when convoys are used the shooting will start.

Mr. PATRICK. I am getting tired of folks saying that convoying means war. They are just taking it for granted; they say that convoying means war.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I do not want to get into any controversy between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], but I know that the American people said by their votes last year that they did not want us to send an expeditionary force to Europe.

With reference to the question of convoys, President Roosevelt has been quoted as saying that "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." He is undoubtedly correct. If we should attempt to convoy vessels into the war zone, I hardly see how we could escape being drawn into the war. If we were going into the war, we should have done so when you lifted the embargo, when we would have had the assistance of France, Belgium, Holland, and Norway, with all their armies, tanks, airplanes, navies, submarines, bases, and coast defenses, and before Italy entered the conflict on the other side.

We have done everything that we could, it seems to me, to aid Great Britain, short of war. We have done more for her than any other country ever did, or probably ever would, do for us. But we cannot perform miracles; we cannot accomplish the impossible.

These propagandists who are now criticising the President and trying to intimidate him into sending these convoys into the war zone would then demand that we send an expeditionary force to Europe. That would be the next step. If we got into the war, there could be only three possible outcomes: A complete victory over Germany, a negotiated peace, or defeat and humiliation. We cannot afford to think of accepting defeat and humiliation. If we are going to have a negotiated peace, we might as well have it now, while we stand a better chance to save the British Empire intact.

But if we are going to enter the war and fight it to a complete victory, we will have to land an American Army on European soil and fight our way to Berlin, against one of the most powerful military machines the world has ever seen.

Where could we land such an expeditionary force? The last foothold in Europe seems to be gone. Even if we landed such a force we know, and the President knows, that we would be going up against the most powerful military force in the world. We would probably lose 5,000,000 men in the course of the conflict, and we have no assurance as to the outcome.

The President is familiar with these things, and for that reason he has refused to plunge this country into war, the very thing these columnists are now trying to browbeat him into doing. On this the American people are with the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To go back, does the gentleman know of any one of these columnists who has ever been elected or who now represents any group of people except those who pay him?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I never heard of one of them being elected. I am not sure as to whom they represent.

The American people are in sympathy with Great Britain. We passed the lend-lease bill to provide for every assistance we could give. We appropriated $7,000,000,000 in order to speed up our own industries, not only to supply them with what aid we could but to build facilities for protecting our own country, now and for all time to come. Yet now, when the President is carrying out his very promises in the campaign, now when he represents the will of the American people, now when he represents the will of Congress, it comes with poor grace from these columnists to be criticizing him and accusing him of dishonesty and a lack of leadership. They do not suggest that he confer with Congress. What do they want? Just such criticism as that is doing the cause infinitely more harm than good.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. The gentleman from Mississippi is making a very fine statement.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I merely would like to have the gentleman name those who are making these attacks. Aside from Walter Lippmann, let us name Dorothy Thompson, who on the same day made a similar attack on the President of the United States. This is the same Dorothy Thompson who so magnanimously recently offered her 11-year-old boy in the service of the country.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I quit reading Dorothy Thompson back when she was extolling the virtues of communism in Russia. I do not know what she is saying. [Applause.]

I represent old-line Americans, Anglo-Saxons, people whose folks have been here for 200 years. They are in sympathy with Great Britain and with the English people. They are not interested in any international group who are merely looking after their own financial interests. Congress gets as much information on this subject as these columnists do. But if you will notice, none of them is suggesting that this matter be taken up with Congress and that Congress be called upon to render this assistance. If I had known what was in this article when it was offered for the RECORD, I should have objected to it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman did not bring out the point about Dorothy Thompson. She stated to us that she was willing for her own son to fight, and he is 11 years old.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I do not question that, and I do not doubt that if he were 20 years old she would be willing for him to fight. The American people are not shirking responsibility. I am not accusing any Americans of refusing to meet their obligations in this crisis. But we must realize the facts of the situation, we must realize what we would be up against if we undertook to send an Army to Europe at the present time; and I am not sure that it will grow better at any time in the future, so far as we can see now.

But I am criticizing these columnists who are beginning to turn their attacks on the President of the United States and attempting to browbeat or intimidate him into hasty action in this critical hour, into doing something that would probably involve the destiny of the Nation. If I had known what was in this Lippmann article, it would never have gone into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I seriously contemplated rising to a question of the privileges of the House and asking that it be deleted.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. The subject of convoys was brought up a moment ago—does the gentleman know that in last night's newspapers it was stated that the British shipping interests are abandoning that idea in favor of using smaller boats?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I saw something to that effect.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman a number of times has challenged me when I have undertaken to keep down the RECORD, and now the gentleman says that an article went into the RECORD which, if he had known about, he would not have permitted to go into the RECORD, and yet the gentleman has said that the RECORD is the only press that is not prohibited from saying just what it wants to say and how are you going to answer me on that?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I have stated this before, that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the one free press left in America. That is the one that my speech is going to appear in. It is the one free press that the Representatives of the American people can be heard through. The mere fact that one short article creeps in that ought not to have gone in, because it is abusive of the President, is not a condemnation of the policy of keeping the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD open.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I must decline to yield further.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is inconsistent.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is the wrong time for him to speak. He has been abusing the President and calling him a "warmonger," accusing him of trying to get us into war, and here is a man who is abusing him because he does not get us into war. So of all times, now is the one when the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to keep quiet.

Mr. RICH. I am going to speak in about 10 minutes and I will tell the gentleman what the President is doing.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I know how the President of the United States feels. The President is not trying to get us into any European war. The President does not contemplate sending American boys to Europe to fight. The President is carrying out his campaign pledges of last year. This is the time for Members of Congress and the American people to back him up, especially when the very ones who owe him the most from the standpoint of gratitude are turning their guns on him and criticizing him and abusing him for doing the very thing the American people want done—keeping this country out of war. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday of next week, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the legislative program of the day, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of a report on public-welfare institutions in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

"CONVOYS MEAN SHOOTING AND SHOOTING MEANS WAR"

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." This statement was not made by United States Senator BURTON K. WHEELER. It was not made by any lesser member of the America First Committee. It was made by no less a spokesman of the national administration than President Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself.

But this month news has come out of London that British shipping losses are mounting steadily. Germany's estimated 180 submarines and her few surface raiders are taking an ever-increasing toll of British merchantmen. Raids by bombing squadrons dropping out of the clouds to send British vessels to the bottom are jeopardizing the precious life lines of the British Isles. And in the face of all these facts it is rapidly becoming apparent that both Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt are doing their utmost to prepare American public opinion for the next move on the board—American convoys for British shipping. [Applause.]

Tuesday morning at breakfast I sat alongside three gentlemen, two of them members of this administration, the other gentleman a man recently come to this country from one of the foreign countries. The man from the foreign country asked these two friends of his how soon we would have convoys. They replied, as soon as public opinion would catch up with the President, and that they thought that by August 1 we would have convoys.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman would not mind mentioning the names of these gentlemen? He is putting their conversation into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, I was not "eavesdropping," as the young lady in the moving picture Virginia put it. I could not help hearing them.

Mr. PATRICK. But the gentleman heard them well enough to convey it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the delectation of the people in the country.

Mr. BENDER. I could not help hearing it, because they were talking loud enough for all to hear.

Mr. PATRICK. I am only asking the gentleman to give us their names.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know their names.

Mr. PATRICK. Because we do not know whether they were fooling or not.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes; gladly.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. The war will be all over by August the way things are going now, will it not?

Mr. BENDER. I hope it will be over in the right way. I am deeply concerned about the way things are moving in Europe today.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am afraid my friend from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] did not mean to be facetious, because this is not a time for facetiousness; but, assuming that Britain completely collapses, surrenders completely, so far as the British Isles proper are concerned, but that her Navy remains intact for the use of the other members of the British Empire, will the United States at that time confederate itself with the remaining members of the British Empire and proceed with some type of warfare, or will the United States recede from its position with the remaining units of the British Empire and affiliate ourselves with Canada and Latin America only and the United States then proceed on a Western Hemisphere defense? In other words, should we indicate to our people at all that this war will end so far as we are concerned this month, or next month, or next year, or any time within 5 years? It seems to me that we have taken on quite a job that will run indefinitely.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman is quite right in his last statement. I do not know in which direction we are moving. Frankly, we have no statement of war aims on the part of Britain. There has been no statement beyond that of beating Hitler. It seems to me that is not enough.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Their war aims have been stated; they have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Three weeks ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a brochure that was written by Gen. Sir Arthur Salter in 1937, in which he outlined this entire program as far as the British are concerned and as far as their plans for America were concerned. That was placed in the RECORD approximately 3 weeks ago. In that he showed, under a discussion of the Anglo-American trade agreement, just what England would expect from the United States and why. I commend that article, that speech, which I made under the title that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty, about 3 weeks ago, and I commend it to the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman very much. We were not in the war at that time.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. PATRICK. Are not the war aims pretty clear?

Mr. BENDER. They are not to me.

Mr. PATRICK. Is not everybody pretty clearly of the opinion that it is an effort upon the part of Germany to break down England as the mistress of the seas, so that she herself can take control of the seas and of commerce as announced over and over? Is there any doubt as to that, and that England is fighting to hold the strength that she has?

Mr. BENDER. In the last war, we at least had the Fourteen Points, and even they were not carried out, but they were something.

It is now over 22 years since the treaty of peace ending the First World War was signed at Versailles. When the parties gathered around the conference table to impose their peace terms upon Germany and the Central Powers, they fancied that the Allies had won the war. Today the decision as to the victors and losers is in grave doubt.

A few days ago President Roosevelt, speaking at a press conference, was questioned concerning the war aims of Great Britain. Mr. Roosevelt replied that the principal war aim was to win the war.

The President's answer is a clear reflection of a state of mind which refuses to recognize the basic problem. Those who urge a statement of war aims do so with two objectives in mind:

First. We wish to reveal, insofar as it is humanly possible, precisely how "diplomatic" understandings and agreements may affect a possible world war.

Second. We believe that any clear statement of objectives involved in the present conflict would tend to bring it to a speedier conclusion than seems likely at the present time.

There is no intention on the part of those who seek a declaration of war aims by Great Britain to sabotage the British battle for victory. The insistence upon a declaration of aims for the peace conference table is based upon an almost intuitive suspicion that without such a statement the successful belligerent may simply build up a new set of conditions at the close of this war which will lead to a repetition of what is now occurring.

Germany has been told by Adolf Hitler and his Nazi cohorts that the future of Germany is tied up inescapably with a successful prosecution of this war. Germans believe that should they lose in this struggle, Europe would be reconstituted in such a way as to leave no place for a German nation. They are fearful of a revenge psychology which would make the Versailles Treaty seem like a pleasant interlude.

Yet simultaneously, every intelligent student of world affairs recognizes that the only way of creating an intelligent form of peace in Europe in the event of a British victory rests upon an effort to permit the German people to work out their national destiny in keeping with the role that any great nation should have. Bitter as may be the feelings of the British and their Allies, we recognize today that out of such hatred there can never arise anything approximating a lasting peace.

Any real effort to state the aims of peace must necessarily offer an honorable and intelligible basis for the development of a post-war economy in Europe which will not lead to another conflict. The establishment of a system of cooperation by the European nations should be the number one requirement for an honorable peace. This would necessarily entail the destruction of the present spirit of hostility to all things German which characterizes the thinking of so many people in Europe today. A second aim should be the development of a new approach toward European problems similar to the Federal system in our own country, with economic barriers removed and a guarantee of equality before the law for all citizens of each European nation irrespective of their race, religion, or nationality.

We in the United States have had good reason to believe in the past that British imperial policy was not directed primarily toward the accomplishment of these aims. On the contrary, we have long felt, with strong historical justification, that Britain is intent upon only one thing—the enhancement of its own prestige and the development of its own internal economy at the expense of all other nations.

All this cumulative evidence of history warns us that Uncle Sam must beware lest his assistance contributes materially to winning a war only to find us once more losing the peace. We must make certain by our efforts before we begin active participation in the effort to achieve victory for Great Britain that the peace which is contemplated will prove more lasting than any that Europe has ever achieved before. The world has grown sick at heart over the repeated failures of the rulers of nations to realize the true objective of all people—security and tranquillity. If we insist now upon a clear-cut understanding of the foundations for an enduring peace, we shall be better able to undertake the all-out aid which our national policy dictates. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If President Wilson's 14 points had been carried out in the Versailles Treaty and in the enforcement of that treaty, this present war would have been averted. There would not have been any Hitler.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman.

It is already certain that if the President changes his mind and decides to propose a convoy system, the most violent debate in the history of our Nation will be precipitated. Battle lines are already forming, with a regular tour of the Nation being undertaken by representatives of the America First Committee and equally militant preparations by the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. Town halls, forums, discussion groups are furiously debating the proposition in advance of its consideration by Congress. The assertion by Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, that he would propose a ban on convoys has stirred bitter feelings in the upper Chamber of our Congress.

Throughout Washington, speculation is already running high. Rumor has it that Government officials are already planning a system of convoying British ships to Iceland with the protection of warships and planes. From there on across to Scotland and England, the British would be expected to take over the task of vigilance. What this means is easy enough to compute. Uncle Sam would be extending his chin over approximately 2,600 miles of air and water. Britain would undertake to guard the most dangerous 900 additional miles.

Perhaps the American people would vote their approval of such a scheme. We suspect that they would disapprove it overwhelmingly. Washington leaders know that the word "convoy" is packed with dynamite. They are not planning to use that term. Instead, they are going to proclaim that the waters of the Western Hemisphere must be free from all interference with commerce. Patrols will be established to see that the waters remain free. Should a submarine or hostile surface ship be sighted, the air patrol will simply inform warships along the surface and they will exert every effort to destroy the possible disturber of our hemisphere's neutrality.

The words are themselves ludicrous. Translated into simple terms, they mean precisely what President Roosevelt said some time ago. Patrols are convoys. And convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. I am frank to state that I think the only thing we can do to safely guarantee the delivery of our goods is by convoy. I do not disguise it. I announced to the world, as a Representative of a district in Congress, that I think the quicker we can belt up and send what we have over there where it is supposed to go, and do the job that we have already undertaken, the better it will be. Does the gentleman think that Uncle Sam should vote all-out aid to England, that he should take billions of dollars—of course, if we can by any means get it over there without convoy, O. K.; but since we have undertaken this job, we should do what we said we would do—deliver munitions and so on into the hands of those who are fighting our battle, whether we want them to or not. We are not trying to help England or anybody else, except to defend this Nation. Those who say that convoys are dangerous, that convoys will bring us into war, it is my opinion that if there is anything in the world that will save us from war it is to get aid over there in time for them to strike while the striking will do good, and not stand like the nations of Europe have.

Mr. BENDER. I understand the gentleman is in favor of a declaration of war immediately?

Mr. PATRICK. No; I am not in favor of a declaration of war immediately; and the gentleman knows that no such thing is said. I am in favor of convoys. I want the gentleman to understand that, for one, I am not trying to disguise it. Nobody is trying to disguise anything; but we do want to deliver what we have undertaken to deliver. Is Davy Jones' locker any place for the wealth that Uncle Sam is turning the tax system inside out to provide?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman from Alabama has been a warm advocate of the President's policies.

Mr. PATRICK. I do not even know how the President stands any more than the gentleman does.

Mr. BENDER. The President said a few months back, "Convoys mean shooting. Shooting means war." Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. PATRICK. I am not interested in what anybody says about that. I am interested in what every Congressman must find in his own heart after studying this thing through. I do not know whether convoys mean shooting or not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my industrious colleague.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That brings up the question when the lease-lend bill was before the House and Senate it was urged by the administration that there was no purpose or intention to get these materials across the seas by use of convoys. If anybody had it in mind in the administration they kept it concealed and they deceived the American people. Now we are beginning to hear that it is necessary and they had it in mind all the time.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is absolutely right. You will recall that the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], stated that the lease-lend bill was a peace measure. Many, many advocates of the lease-lend proposal said that no convoys were intended. That statement was made time and again by those who voted for that bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Secretary Knox, in testifying before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on the lease-lend bill, stated that he was against convoys because to convoy meant war.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Many of the gentlemen who supported the lease-lend bill stated that it was a measure short of war. I read in one of the newspapers the other day where those same men who advocated the lease-lend bill as a measure short of war were very poor judges of distance.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Gladly.

Mr. RICH. When the President said convoys meant shooting and shooting meant war, suppose we would start in to convoy some of the vessels across the Atlantic, half-way or all the way over, and suppose they were sunk, what would be the attitude of the American people? Would that statement of the President mean that because those vessels went down we would go to war? Does not the gentleman think that the American people would then say, "They are sinking our ships"? Does not the gentleman think there would be enough propaganda to say "They are sinking our ships," and they would want us to get into the war?

Mr. BENDER. It reminds me of yesterday's Gallup poll. It is amazing how these polls, instead of reflecting public opinion, endeavor to mold public opinion. It is the most vicious kind of propaganda we have in America today.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my neighbor.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman is entirely right. Does not he remember how the Literary Digest tried to elect Mr. Hoover in 1932? [Laughter.]

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman never thought of that, did he?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Gladly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think that the supplies and troops that the United States is sending to the base in Newfoundland and Greenland should be protected by convoy if necessary?

Mr. BENDER. Geographers have had some little trouble defining the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere. They have engaged in a goodly number of disputes as to how much goes in and how much goes out. We have agreed, roughly, however, that our Nation is to become the patron of the western world. We are making it our business to defend North and South America, and then some.

Today's boundary line has extended up north to include the Danish colony of Greenland. We are preparing to send an American army unit to occupy this ice-covered island as a new step in the direction of American defense.

In Washington there is much talk of another purpose in view. Convoys are decidedly unpopular with a goodly section of the American people. By establishing a military outpost at Greenland it is rumored that our Federal Government is seeking a means of outmaneuvering the opposition to convoy. We shall be obliged to protect the sea lanes to any American outpost. This means covering all traffic from the Atlantic seacoast to Greenland. It means American responsibility for goods shipped to Britain via Greenland, with the British Government taking over the job from there on.

It means one step more beyond the limits of all aid short of war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman has not yet answered the question.

Mr. BENDER. I cannot answer his question and, frankly, I have said that.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman's inability to answer specifically is due to the lack of consistency on the part of the administration, is it not?

Mr. BENDER. The distinguished gentleman is right.

Mr. DITTER. The vacillation with which we have been confronted on all sides by the administration's policy.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I asked the gentleman that question because I think we have got to recognize the needs of the situation and face the situation realistically. I was out on the ocean last week and saw what were presumably some United States transports being convoyed by United States destroyers proceeding in a zigzag fashion. To the best of my information, those ships carried troops and were being convoyed from the Canal Zone, possibly to Newfoundland or some other northern base. I asked myself the frank question: Well, if we move troops from the Canal Zone to Newfoundland or to Greenland, and if it is through a danger zone, could I honestly say I did not want them given protection? Or could I say I would refuse protection to supplies being transported to our forces in Newfoundland or Greenland?

Do you want them sent up there without proper protection? Answer that question for yourself and then ask yourself what difference there is between protecting or convoying such material to those places and convoying transports or cargo ships at least an equal distance? How will you prevent hostilities entering the picture? How could anyone differentiate between cargo supplies destined for our own troops and cargoes of lease-lend articles destined to go farther? I believe these are practical questions and questions we have got to face.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. RICH. May I have the privilege of trying to answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. BENDER. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. As long as we are trying to protect our own shores and our own country I think every man in America will support our efforts even to the extent of taking over the new bases the President says are necessary to protect our shores. We will convoy or we will take anything there for our own protection.

But it is an entirely different thing when we start to convoy material, even though it is material the Congress voted the President should give away and make the American taxpayer pay for; if he is going to start convoying such cargoes to Europe, it is a different question. I say we have no business going across the ocean, whether it be the Atlantic or the Pacific. We ought to stay home and attend to our own business. [Applause.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason I threw out that question was because it seems to me the answer most Americans would make is that if we are to send supplies or troops to bases, whether they be in Newfoundland, Jamaica, or even in Greenland, we should protect the delivery of supplies to our own troops. All right. Now, the reason I brought up that question was because the gentleman is raising the issue of the policy of convoying ships for a thousand miles. I do not know what the exact mileage is to Newfoundland or Greenland, but I do realize we are going to find it a difficult line to draw if we say we will permit the convoying of shipping within the zone of the bases we are setting up.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman referred to a thousand miles. I used the figure 2,600 miles.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will correct it to that figure, then.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the question the gentleman is discussing and that has been raised deals directly with section 3, subsection (b), of the National Defense Act, or so-called Conscription Act, which provides that these young men shall be inducted into the service for 1 year, and if the Congress declares an emergency the President may extend that period of service. I simply offer this little question: If convoying is to be resorted to, either to Newfoundland, Greenland, or Iceland, and trouble is incurred, will not Congress be compelled to declare the emergency referred to in section 3 (b) and thereby automatically extend the period of service of these new inductees?

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the American people, and possibly the Congress itself, are not aware of what is happening in this whole situation as it involves this country. We have been led through the back door to take steps that no one wanted to take or that no one had in mind taking. You will recall that during the last campaign the two leading candidates for President made the statement, as the chief plank in their platforms, keeping this country out of war. In every major speech Roosevelt made and in practically every important speech that Willkie made they wound up the speech with the statement that they are against this country going to war and our boys participating in the war.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman will recall that about 2 weeks ago the President by proclamation took out of the combat zone so-called areas on the seas, including the Red Sea.

Mr. BENDER. I recall that.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. He undoubtedly realizes, as does everyone else, that the purpose of that proclamation was to enable American shipping to transport war supplies to the British and its allies in that part of the world. The Nazis countered by stating that they would sink any ship regardless of the flag it flew that appeared in those waters. A day or two later the President of the United States at a press conference announced that the law compelled the President of the United States to protect American shipping wherever protection was necessary. Does the gentleman think that that particular line of activity was in keeping with the spirit or the letter of the Presidential claims during the recent campaign?

Mr. BENDER. Not at all.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The gentleman referred to statements made by Candidate Willkie in the last campaign. You will recall that before the Senate committee when Senator NYE asked Mr. Willkie whether he still stood by the statements he made with respect to neutrality, he answered that he regarded them as merely talk and not to be seriously considered. So I suggest to the gentleman to not seriously consider anything Mr. Willkie said.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman will also recall what Roosevelt said in 1932 about cutting down the cost of Government 25 percent.

Mr. HOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOWELL. In making that statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we can at least say that Mr. Willkie was candid.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When the gentleman speaks of Willkie, may I say that when Willkie was nominated by the Republicans in Philadelphia we thought he would go along the lines of the Republican Party so that we could keep this country out of war; but he took over Mr. Roosevelt's policy; therefore we were in a pretty bad spot, because we could not go along with him on that policy. We are against the foreign policy of Roosevelt and Willkie, and we want you to know it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is wrong as usual. Mr. Willkie did not take over our policies. They hired a doctor and paid him $13,000 to keep his throat rifled out so he could continue to make speeches against us. They did not pay it. He did the Democrats more good than he did the Republicans, but we cannot pay for every nuisance that comes along.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He certainly did. He sure helped you fellows; but why should you dodge your honest, moral obligation? Why you will not pay that is more than I can understand. You talk about boondoggling. You certainly got the best boondoggler.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am afraid the gentleman's ability to distinguish between the moral and the immoral has broken down, if he thinks there is any moral obligation on our part to pay Wendell Willkie's doctor bill or his campaign expenses.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is not the proposition at all. Wilkie admits he

was humbugging, but you go along and pretend you are not.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I told you he was humbugging you before he was nominated. Do you not remember my speech?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He did, and he did it in your interest, and your man is still keeping at it. There is not a day goes by but what he attempts to deceive the American people, and usually he gets away with it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And Wall Street has got him on cold storage, to be forced on you next time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not wonder at that. You have given us a lot of rotten, old stuff in days gone by, and we had to take it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is what goes with rotten Democrats; they become Republicans. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIFFORD. I have been rather anxiously waiting for the last many days for someone to have the courage to take up the subject the gentleman has taken up. Will the gentleman restate as simply as possible his feeling with regard to convoys?

Mr. BENDER. I am against the use of convoys.

Mr. GIFFORD. In the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. BENDER. I am against convoying because I agree with the President that convoying means shooting and shooting means war.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wanted that simply stated. Then will the gentleman reply to me, and to others who have made the inquiry, What is the use of manufacturing things and lending them or giving them away to help Great Britain if we do not protect them? Is there any use in doing it?

Mr. BENDER. Britain ordered materials here before the lend-lease bill was passed and they got over there somehow, just as Britain is sending things over here to sell in American stores, things that are advertised as "Bundles from Britain," by American stores.

Mr. GIFFORD. Perhaps I ought to make one remark. You see, I come from a section of the country, Cape Cod, if the gentleman did not know, where they have insisted on sailing the seven seas in spite of Jefferson's embargo in 1812. I do not believe you can tell my people that you would not protect the Western Hemisphere, if we adopt that which we have taken to ourselves, the Western Hemisphere. I am inclined to think my people would say, "If that is ours, we will do as we darn please in it." [Applause.]

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts see any difference between goods and blood and lives?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I see just as much difference as the gentleman, or anybody else, but I have a conscience that I have to go to bed with every night, and I have to fight with it.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. In view of the sentence which the gentleman ascribes to the President and the President's solemn promise to keep us out of war, why cannot we safely assume that the President foresaw this controversy and had it in mind, and that he will differ with the gentleman from Alabama and will prevent convoys?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts, whom I love so dearly, and who contributes so much to the discussions in the House, just asked if the gentleman from Ohio did not believe that we should protect our own, and he said that his people would fight for the right to sail the seven seas unmolested.

Mr. GIFFORD. In our own back yard.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman forget that a couple of days ago one of Great Britain's warships shot across the bow of one of our ships, within 50 feet, and stopped and searched the ship? What are you going to do about that?

Mr. GIFFORD. That was a mistake.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; that was a mistake, but there may be many of them.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am not going to try to make bright remarks, but the gentleman has been talking about convoying, as to whether we should convoy goods to Britain, as I understand.

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I want to make this observation for the RECORD—that I have just returned from my district, where I talked with a number of people, and I have had letters from many of them. My people seem to be in favor of convoying if it is necessary to get those goods across to Britain.

Mr. BENDER. Apparently the gentleman's district is not a good barometer for the rest of the country, for even Dr. Gallup, who is endeavoring to mold public opinion for convoys, says that only 41 percent of the people favor convoys. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLMER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there are two matters on which I wish to touch very briefly.

Yesterday it was my privilege to spend some 12 hours in conference with large users of steel products and steel manufactures. I got some direct information with reference to what is taking place in the steel manufacturing plants in the way of delaying delivery of steel products. I got some detailed information with reference to what is taking place as a result of the coal strike, which in turn is leading to the banking of coke ovens and the cutting down of working hours in the steel mills and the setting up of a procedure for tremendous delays in the delivery of new orders being placed and orders which have heretofore been placed.

For instance, the sales manager for one of the steel-products manufacturing concerns told me yesterday afternoon that an order placed now for 12-gage steel, even in small quantities, could not be filled within a shorter period than 6 months from now.

A steel worker last night in Youngstown as late as 10 o'clock told me that while he benefited from the 10-cents-per-hour or $4-per-week wage advance, he felt it was a grave mistake for the wage increase to take place and that, as far as he and his family were concerned, they knew that their increased cost of living would materially override that increased wage rate. This man is one of the steel workers himself. He said he felt that it was only a matter of a short time until public opinion in this country would revolt against the strikes that are in operation to the point where organized labor would lose the tremendous progress it has made in recent years. So I simply throw in those thoughts.

The other question I want to discuss for just a moment is something that came up this morning in connection with the new tax bill. One of our Members, the gentleman from Virginia, in interrogating the Secretary of the Treasury developed the thought that in 1932 we had a national income of approximately $40,000,000,000; and that this year it will probably run as high as $80,000,000,000; that after taking about 22 to 25 percent of that $80,000,000,000 out for the payment of taxes, State, local, and Federal, there would remain about $58,000,000,000 to $60,000,000,000 of national income for the use of the people, which would be roughly, say, $18,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 greater than that which they enjoyed during 1932.

As I view the situation, the fallacy in that argument is this: In 1932 the national income which flowed at that time was the result almost entirely of private enterprise. The $80,000,000,000 of national income this year, according to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, will be made up of and contain, let us say, from $15,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 of Government expenditures. That is Government check money, if you please, or Government pump priming in the name of national defense, and when you take that $20,000,000,000 out of the $80,000,000,000, you have, roughly, $60,000,000,000; and when you take your $20,000,000,000 or $22,000,000,000 of Federal taxes out of the $60,000,000,000, you drop back to around $38,000,000,000, or, say, $2,000,000,000 less today of net national income for the use of the people of the country than they had in 1932.

So I do not think it will help us to get our thoughts confused on these matters, and I will say it in this way, because if it is sounder to have national income as a result of Government spending, then why should we be concerned at all about Government spending? Why should we worry about deficits? Why should we

worry about $20,000,000,000 being spent during the coming fiscal year? Why not pump it up to $100,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000 for the Government to spend and let all of us have a good time? But if it is sound to run on the basis of private enterprise, if it is sound for us to have national income flowing from the free and voluntary action of our people through adventuring in enterprise, then we had better watch carefully what that national income is as a result of private enterprise and at no time get it confused with the national income which flows as a result of Government spending.

So I hope when the hearings come through on the tax bill now under consideration that not too much capital will be made out of what took place this morning, because, in my opinion, it was an illogical and unsound and fallacious approach to the question which we will be talking about a great deal during the coming months, namely, that of national income and the total tax burden which will be applied against that income, whatever it may be. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the last special order for today, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANDERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with newspaper dispatches last night which indicated that the British shipping interests have already planned to have ships built in Canada and paid for by American taxpayers and then have this country give them to Great Britain under the lease-lend program, and to include therein certain newspaper items. This is one of the most startling news accounts I ever read, and before we are through with it it will concern every Member of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have so many subjects that I would like to speak on today that I am somewhat at a loss to know just exactly what to do, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] hit on one which is very dear to my heart, and that is to save this Nation from going into bankruptcy. Where will we get the money to pay the bills? Since he brought out so intelligently the way this country is going and this administration is taking it, I shall have to confine my remarks principally to his statement.

PROMISES AND PERFORMANCES OF THIS SPENDING ADMINISTRATION

The first thing is to call attention to the Democratic platform and the policies they pursued in 1932, and I quote from that platform and hope that the Democrats will not all run away. I see many of them leaving now:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people, to be faithfully kept by the party when instructed with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this to be the platform of the Democratic Party:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction in governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government, and we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a valid effort to achieve a proportionate result.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are still 14 Democrats here on the floor.

Mr. RICH. There will not be any by the time I get through, because they do not like to hear the truth about their administration. Let us just look at the results as stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]—and I am going back to the Hoover administration, about which Mr. Roosevelt said that for 3 long years we had been running this country into debt. The gross national debt on March 4, 1929, when Mr. Hoover took office, was $17,378,514,363. The gross national debt on March 1, 1933, was $20,859,055,366. That showed a net increase in the national debt during Mr. Hoover's administration of $3,479,541,003 for 4 years.

But as against the national debt on March 1, 1933, the Hoover administration had made $2,397,267,288 in recoverable loans through the R. F. C. and other Government bureaus. The New Deal collected a large part of these loans, probably near $2,000,000,000. Therefore the real increase in the debt burden to the taxpayers for Mr. Hoover's 4 years was under $1,500,000,000. Moreover, this is only one-half of the story. The tax collections of the Hoover administration were: In 1929, $4,033,250,225; in 1930, $4,177,941,702; in 1931, $3,317,233,394; and in 1932, $2,121,228,006, making a total of $13,649,655,327. Mr. Hoover had a low income and his expenses were low.

If Hoover had imposed the taxes being collected by the New Deal, even before the new armament program, he would have collected over $24,000,000,000, instead of under $14,000,000,000, and would have had a surplus of seven or eight billion dollars. That is what would have happened in the Hoover administration, had we not had a Democratic House which obstructed everything that Hoover wanted to do. He would have had no deficit, and the reason that Hoover was in debt was because of the folly of the House then, which was Democratic, in failing to pass laws Mr. Hoover wanted to help and aid the administration. One by one I see my Democratic friends leaving the Chamber. They do not like to hear this because they are afraid of the comparison I expect to make with the spending Roosevelt rule.

Let us now look up the Roosevelt administration. When Mr. Roosevelt came into power in March 1933 the debt was $20,858,055,366. Today it is over $55,000,000,000, and we have increased the debt limit to $65,000,000,000, and before next year you will have to increase the debt limit again. This is the most extravagant administration of all the world for all time. Nothing ever approached it. The greatest taxes, the greatest receipts, and the greatest spending. If Mr. Roosevelt can get any satisfaction out of the promises made in the Democratic platform in 1933, which he approved 100 percent, and his record, he is welcome to it. But it is tough on the United States and its people. It is no wonder that I am opposed to Mr. Roosevelt, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] said. He has camouflaged the American people as no other President has ever camouflaged them in the history of this Nation and he has put the Nation in the most serious position that any President has who has ever occupied 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, or, in other words, the White House. Would I be for a President of that kind? Certainly not. I want a man who practices what he preaches.

Now, where do we find ourselves this year? He said he was going to have a balanced budget. He has made promise after promise on that. During the last 3 years he has not said anything about it. He has talked about spend, spend, spend. That is all he thinks about. But if you will digest the figures that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] gave you, you will see the reason why. They labor under a false apprehension because they do not know any better. That is the whole reason. Mr. Roosevelt never was trained in business. He does not know anything about business, and that is the reason why he is taking the advice of a lot of these Communists that they have brought over from Russia. He has associated himself with more radicals than I thought ever existed in this Nation under the Hoover administration.

Now, where are we this year? You are $4,000,000,000 in the red this year, and you will be $6,000,000,000 in the red before the 1st of July. Then the next year, when we get all these appropriations that we are using for national defense, when you voted $7,000,000,000 for the President to do with as he chose, in war, I say to you and to the American people that never have I been pleased more with my vote than when I voted against both the

lease-lend bill and the $7,000,000,000 bill. Why? Just because when the President tried to get rid of the Supreme Court the country would not stand for it. So he waited until a great number of them died, and the rest of them resigned, and he has got control of the Supreme Court now, and they render the decisions he would like to have. When the President of the United States started the lease-lend bill, any other man in America that would have proposed such a radical law as that would have been deemed crazy and fit for St. Elizabeths. But because Mr. Roosevelt said it was all right, the Congress went along with him.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I notice the gentleman has often quoted speeches made by candidates for the Presidency, which were afterward repudiated. I wonder if it would not be a good law, perhaps, to make candidates for the Presidency write their own speeches and make them take oath that they had read them before they delivered them?

Mr. RICH. I think that would be a fine thing, but I question very much, with all the speeches he makes and the number of times he is before the general public and the press in this country, whether it would be possible for him, even if he were a good man at writing speeches, to do so. I do not think any good American could write as many speeches as he has given to the American public, certainly not so many unfulfilled promises.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think the gentleman will agree that we are reaching a very low state of morale when we cannot rely on the statements of candidates for public office—any office.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree; and I think the time should come when men should stop politics and go straight down the line and dare to do what they think is right and honorable and just and hew to that line. I have stuck to that as far as I could ever since I have been here, and I do not care whether it be Republican or Democrat, I propose to do that very thing. [Applause.] God save America and keep us from bankruptcy; help Congress and the President to keep us out of foreign entanglements and, above all, keep us out of war. It will be suicide for us to get into any foreign wars, and I hope the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives vote "No" when the time to fire the gun across the seas comes; may we never send a man to Europe or Asia to fight. If they want to fight and must fight, let them come over here. Let us stay at home and attend to our own business and they will stay over there.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PEGGING OF FARM PRICES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak this afternoon for a few minutes in regard to another New Deal chicken that has come home to roost.

ANOTHER NEW DEAL CHICKEN COMES HOME TO ROOST

The recent price pegging of butter, hogs, eggs, and chickens by the administration was a bitter pill for a great number of people that have really felt the New Deal was a friend of the American farmer. It is more so when one realizes that the price of 92-score butter at Chicago is pegged at 31 cents per pound, when, in 1929–32, during the Hoover administration, this same butter averaged over 31½ cents a pound, and this period has been held up as the period of poor farm prices. In fact, this same 92-score butter at Chicago averaged 38 cents the 8 Republican years before the New Deal, and has averaged only 27 cents the 8 years of the New Deal. In other words, butter averaged 40 percent more the last 8 Republican years than it has the first 8 New Deal years.

I have letters from the United States Department of Agriculture that show what parity prices should be at Chicago. They show that the butter price would have to be increased by 20 percent; pork, 14 percent; and eggs, 7 percent. The farmer has not any cost-plus contracts, and evidently can look forward to a cost-minus price level as fixed by Leon Henderson. This has been done in face of present increased agricultural production costs. Where he gets his power is a question to many Members of Congress.

The power given away by Congress to the President and by him to Mr. Henderson shows that this New Deal delegation of power is most assuredly one more example of another New Deal chicken that comes home to roost. [Applause.]

The letters and table are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1941.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: In response to your telephone request there is shown below the average price received by farmers in the United States for butterfat, per pound, on or about the 15th of March. There is also shown the parity price of butterfat as of that date, together with the percentage that prices received were of parity prices in mid-March.

United States:

Price received by farmers per pound, Mar. 15, 1941 (cents)	30.7
Parity price, Mar. 15, 1941 do	35.0
Prices received as percentage of parity, Mar. 15, 1941	88.0

These are the estimates as published in the midmonth local market price report issued March 28. A copy of this report is enclosed for your information with particular reference to pages 3, 23, and 24. Our next report, showing parity prices as of April 15, will be issued April 29. There is also enclosed a mimeographed statement explaining in detail the method used in computing parity prices of agricultural commodities.

Ordinarily, the only parity prices published are based on the series of "average prices received by farmers," estimates of which are published each month by the Agricultural Marketing Service. However, for purposes of comparison we have computed similar data as of March 15 and April 15, using the price of 92 score butter at Chicago in place of the average price received by farmers, as follows:

	Chicago		
	92-score butter, per pound	Parity price, 92-score butter	Price as percentage of parity
	Cents	*Cents*	*Percent*
Mar. 15	30.3	37.3	81
Apr. 15 [1]	31.8	37.1	86

[1] Preliminary.

While the same method was used to compute parity prices in both cases, the data are comparable only to the extent that changes in the price of 92-score butter at Chicago are reflected in average prices received by farmers throughout the country. Although there is usually a close relationship between the two price series, the latter represents the average price for sales of all grades of butterfat (usually sold as cream) at local farm markets in the United States, and refers neither to a specific grade nor market.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH A. BECKER,
Principal Agricultural Statistician,
Division of Agricultural Statistics.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1941.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: In response to your request for additional information regarding parity prices of certain agricultural commodities, there is shown below data for hogs and eggs similar to those furnished in our letter of April 16 concerning butter and butterfat:

	Prices received by farmers [1]	Parity prices [1]	Prices received as percentage of parity [1]
UNITED STATES			*Percent*
Hogs, per 100 pounds	$7.08	$9.24	77
Eggs, per dozen	.164	.218	75

[1] Mar. 15, 1941

As in the case of butterfat, the above estimates were published in the Midmonth Local Market Price Report issued March 28. A copy of this report was enclosed with our previous letter.

Similar estimates for hogs and eggs at Chicago on March 15 and April 15, 1941, are as follows:

	Chicago		Market price as percentage of parity
	Market price	Market parity price	
CHICAGO			*Percent*
Hogs (packer and shipper) per 100 pounds:			
Mar. 15	$7.57	$10.20	74
Apr. 15	8.47	10.28	82
Eggs (fresh firsts) per dozen:			
Mar. 15	.171	[1].236	72
Apr. 15	.215	[1].236	91

[1] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

The base-period price used in computing the parity price of eggs at Chicago is an average of the 12 months in 1914 as shown in the Dairy Produce Yearbook, 1923, published by

Chicago Dairy Produce, 136 West Lake Street, Chicago. Although no information on egg prices at Chicago was readily available for the years 1910–13, there was practically no change in the level of egg prices during the 1910–14 period. Accordingly, an average for the year 1914 would seem to be reasonably representative of the entire 5-year base period. The estimated parity prices for April 15 at Chicago are preliminary, of course, and subject to revision when complete information is available concerning the index of prices paid by farmers, interest, and taxes for that date.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH A. BECKER,
Principal Agricultural Statistician,
Agricultural Statistics Division.

Averages of Chicago 92-score butter, by years only [1]

1915	28.00
1916	32.00
1917	41.00
1918	49.75
1919	58.49
1920	58.45
1921	41.67
1922	39.21
1923	46.03
1924	41.19
1925	44.07
1926	42.80
1927	45.78
1928	46.00
1929	43.75
1930	35.28
1931	27.05
1932	20.07
1933	20.79
1934	24.77
1935	28.81
1936	32.05
1937	33.23
1938	27.13
1939	25.40
1940	28.74

[1] Source: Land O' Lakes, Minneapolis, world's greatest farmer's dairy cooperative, through the courtesy of the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota.

Last 8 Republican years, 38 cents.

Last 8 New Deal years, 27 cents.

Last 11 years (1930–40) since the Democrats gained control of the House of Representatives, 27 cents.

Last 11 Republican years (1919–29) before Democrats controlled the House of Representatives, 46 cents per pound.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This morning, when the Secretary made his presentation on this tax bill he pointed out that he was not recommending that any defense expenditures be reduced in certain instances: For instance, old-age assistance and actual relief cases; and then he put in general language that provides what I would call a catch-all for everybody that can show substantial need. Does the gentleman believe that that type of language which carries the impression I have just indicated should also cover farmers who are selling their goods considerably below parity and who can show that they are entitled to additional assistance, for instance, through parity payments and the farm-benefit appropriations that are coming through, I understand, from the other body? Does the gentleman believe the Secretary's language is broad enough to take care of cases, for instance, like he has just presented here?

Mr. MURRAY. The trouble with the whole New Deal legislation, as far as agriculture is concerned, is that it is subsidy for the few at the expense of the many. It was said here a few days ago there was only a $595,000,000 cotton-fiber crop this year. It is easy to figure it out. Over $300,000,000 will be paid in subsidies to the cotton farmers, or over 50 percent of the value of the fiber. That is not saying that some individuals have not been helped. The same thing applies to social security. If a man says the average man does not get social security, he brings down the house on his head; but in the great rural areas of this country what little of this social security they get is not worth talking about.

The minority is never going to get anywhere, and it is easy enough without any politics in it to show how that is. We can bring it right down to what we are discussing here. The average price of milk in Massachusetts, in 1939, was $3.29 a hundred. Out in South Dakota, in 1939, it was less than a dollar; in fact, it was 96 cents. In North Dakota it was 94 cents. In Minnesota it was $1.08, and in Iowa it was $1.08. In Wisconsin it was $1.23, and even in the great State of Missouri, home of the chairman of our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, they got only $1.30 a hundred.

I do not know where Mr. Henderson gets all his power, but Mr. Henderson has been given power to put the price of butter, for instance, below what it was during Mr. Hoover's administration, when we were under the Smoot-Hawley tariff. They have got agriculture absolutely bogged down, for they have pegged agricultural prices below even what it was during Mr. Hoover's 4 years in office.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That just bears out my previous remarks wherein I discussed private enterprise versus Government planning, for it shows where Government planning actually places the price of butter below what it was during the period that was condemned in the colloquy this morning between the Secretary of the Treasury and the gentleman from Virginia. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I did not get up a prepared speech on this, of course; I just got up under the inspiration of the discussion on convoys.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama heard the gentleman from Virginia talk about the Communists who surrounded the President. Does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. PATRICK. No; I did not hear that, and I am glad I did not. Let us not pursue that any further, please.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I just wanted to say that the President has two-hundred-dollar-a-year men who are Republicans who are now giving advice to him. I do not believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania wanted us to characterize them as Communists.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Let me proceed, please.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is going to be so good when the gentleman does proceed.

Mr. PATRICK. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan later. I am not going to yield to him now. The gentleman from Michigan has often interrupted me, but I have always been somewhat disappointed when he got through, and I do not want to be again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has referred to me; he has mentioned my name. Will he not yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama refuses to yield.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the Speaker for coming to my aid.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to me, and I have asked him to yield.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman from Alabama declines to yield. The gentleman from Michigan does not seem to understand that.

I can see, Mr. Speaker, how those who voted against the lease-lend bill would not be particularly enthusiastic in carrying it out, but I voted for it, and the bill carried. I am serious about this thing, and I want to ask the House, What are we going to do if and when—and this is more than probable—if and when the systems open other than convoys will not deliver the goods? Is it possible that America has bitten off more than it can chew? Is it possible that you folks on the minority were right, and that we on the majority side were wrong? Of course, I am not willing to admit that we were. It seems to me that those who had conscientious convictions, as I did, are charged with the responsibility, if they are as sincere as I feel in my heart I am, of delivering the goods and in standing behind what we undertook when we said that we would deliver to England and to the Allies—and England is about the only ally left—the wherewithal to fight a battle that we feel sure is also America's fight. There is nothing partisan about this.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Did not a lot of you Members on that side stand up on the floor of the House during the debate on the lend-lease bill, who were for the bill, and state, "Why, of course, we will not convoy"?

Mr. PATRICK. I did not say that.

Mr. JENSEN. There were plenty who did.

Mr. PATRICK. Do not bind me to what anybody else says; not even the Chief Executive.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman have voted for the lend-lease bill if he had thought at the time he voted for it that we were going to convoy?

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, yes; I would if found necessary. Maybe some of the others would not.

Mr. JENSEN. You would?

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, yes. I voted for that bill with the idea of getting the goods over there. We voted $7,000,000,000 at one time.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Let me finish this sentence first, please. We voted $7,000,000,000 at one time. This is an expensive proposition. We are cutting to the bone in taxation. We are trying to deliver something. If we are going to do it, we have got to deliver it to the Allies while they still have strength enough to strike with force. The Axis forces struck over there the other day at a crucial moment and sank the very supplies the Allies needed most, which contributed tremendously, no doubt, to the early defeat that the Allies have recently suffered in Greece. If it comes to the point that we cannot by present means deliver—and this looks more than likely—shall we take all of this material—shall we take all of this vast money that we are raising through taxation, and everything we have scraped together, when we have turned our factories into a new kind of business, and shall we say that it must all go for naught at the bottom of the sea? Davy Jones's locker is no place for the sweat, the products, and the sacrifices of the American people. Since I voted for it, and I do not see how anybody who voted as I did on the lend-lease bill can think otherwise, and this may exempt you gentlemen who voted against it—I repeat, I do not see how anybody can do that and be consistent and go on to say that if necessary, if it can be delivered only by that means, that we should not convoy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think the gentleman has posed a question that our country must be thinking about, and that is, if we find that "something short of war" means that the war will be lost, what will we do then? The advocates of the lease-lend bill said it was not only short of war but that it was the best possible measure to keep us out of war. It was in that hope and in that faith, which some of us did not share who voted against the lease-lend bill, that we voted for the $7,000,000,000. I spent practically the whole of the last war in antisubmarine activities in connection with the Naval Air Service. Convoys are a most inefficient way of getting rid of submarines. As soon as you take up convoying, you then immediately realize that the way to get rid of submarines is to destroy them not when they are out looking for you but before they start.

Mr. PATRICK. At the bases?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. At the bases. Take the bombing planes that are out sinking ships. You soon realize that the way to destroy them is not when they are out over a convoy but where they are built. When you start to attack them there, the next thing you realize is that the way to do the destruction work on the submarine bases and factories most efficiently is to get there on their particular ground and destroy them. So that no matter where we stop, we are at a place where something more we may do would be more efficient.

Does the gentleman feel that the question of convoys is to be the limit of our participation, or does the gentleman feel on this question that this country is facing, that we should say: "We will go all the way, if necessary, to prevent defeat or achieve victory." Or should we debate it, discuss it, then tell those abroad that there is some limit, even to achieve victory or prevent defeat, beyond which we will not go?

I think the gentleman has raised a question that cannot be dodged, and one about which we have a duty to make a decision on and to let those abroad know of our decision. I feel that we have said and we have pledged that we will not go into the fighting phase of the war. We mean that even if it should have a very drastic effect on the outcome of the war over there. But we should let those abroad know of our decision, how far we are going to go. If, on the other hand, we intend to do whatever is necessary to achieve final victory, we ought to tell them. I would be glad to have the gentleman state just how far he thinks we ought to go.

Mr. PATRICK. I think the gentleman knew the answer to his question even as he asked it.

Mr. Speaker, may I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have more time, since I took so much of his time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object—would the gentleman yield to me to reserve the right to object?

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, you are breaking me. You are going to insist on that if I do not yield to you. I hate to do the House this way, but if the gentleman insists on it, why, I will do it under protest.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not think of depriving the House of the benefit of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. PATRICK. Nor of your own.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have always noticed you asked permission to strike most of yours when you got in a hole.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; the gentleman has interrupted me a lot, and I have had to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from Ohio renew his request?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed an additional 5 minutes to make up for the time so courteously yielded to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. The question was rather long, but I think I can get the germ of it. My answer, of course, would be that since we have only cargo, or whatever makes up the cargo represented in a convoy, that that would be only an effort to carry that to the point of destination chosen by the United States as shipper. That, of course, would not give us the right, even though it might be good military strategy if we were at war, to go out and burst into a submarine base and destroy the submarines, because after all, a nation at peace goes into convoying knowing that it is a peacetime nation making an effort to deliver war materials to a belligerent. We know that the belligerent, in opposition, does not want to sit supinely and see the weapons of death put into the hands of his mortal enemy, so naturally we know that if it can break in and get it, it is going to do it, and that would not inspire us to jump up, pop our heels together, and declare war, even if one of our convoys was sunk.

I am just trying to analyze this and get it through. I think these are matters about which instead of dodging and running around we ought to come out on the floor and thresh them out and have all the facts brought out, because the folks in the United States want to know. This is vital to them. It is vital to all of us. This idea of men elected to public office dodging the most vital issues does not help to shed the light of intelligence along the pathway a nation has got to stroll. For one, I do not care if I have to go before the people every 2 years. I want to open the book and let everybody read.

So I believe as firmly as I believe anything that we must listen wherever the English language can interpret the German language, wherever the German language can be heard, and be interpreted. We have heard the voice of the spirit behind this new order state that democracy is outmoded and unworkable and must be discarded. We know that there is a strong force at work, and that the war clouds hang low, and we can see many things written across the dark clouds. A blind man who is not willfully blind can see it. So we must consider what will happen. It has been amazing to us how the countries of Europe could stand one at a time and let Hitler arrange a program by which he could bowl them over in order, and it seems to me that if we are going to do anything for delivering matériel into the hands of the Allies while they can still strike we had better do so now or we shall be doing the same thing——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I will ask the gentleman not to break in the middle of a sentence. When I get through the sentence I will yield, but the gentleman just sits there and scratches his head and sleeps, and all at once busts right in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman has made an absolutely false statement. He said I sat here and slept. He cannot prove that.

Mr. PATRICK. That is right, I cannot tell when this man is asleep. I withdraw that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The point of order is that the gentleman said I was sitting here sleeping. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. PATRICK. He says he was awake. Well, if he says he was awake, I will withdraw it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a moment; a point of order.

Mr. PATRICK. Please let me withdraw it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is out of order when he refers to a Member on the floor in that way. I insist he be called to order and proceed in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. PATRICK. It seems to me that offers a great danger of us doing the same thing. Now, what has happened? If the powers that have fought Hitler one by one had banded themselves together, it is my honest belief that dictatorship would not have been running like a wild beast rampant in the world today; yet Hitler has engendered enough fanaticism and enough strength and has enough loot that he has accumulated from the nations that he has overrun until he is actually a threat and menace to all organized society. He has unsheathed his sword against democracy, and it is a mighty sword.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; to the esteemed gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Alabama that if Wilson's Fourteen Points had been carried out by the Versailles Conference there would not have been any Hitler.

Mr. PATRICK. I entirely agree, and thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman has been discussing the question of convoys. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that in the newspapers yesterday and last night it was stated that the British shipping interests are quoted as having said they are going to do away with convoys, because that does not work?

Mr. PATRICK. I would like to study that, because it is more or less an experimental thing; but if it is true and if they have some other means of convoying that is safer and will do the job better than the present system of convoying, of course, that takes that thorn out of our side, and we hope most heartily that is the case; but even so, we still realize that the problem of convoys is before us, and that must obtain and we should confront it. As Congressmen we should think it through and be willing to do that which we see will be the quickest and the most thorough means of making these deliveries.

Hitler's idea is absolutely obtaining in Europe, and he would not have to send——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Has not the gentleman learned that there is a thing called a sentence and one attempts to go through syllogism to a conclusion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am addressing the Chair and I did not address the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. Address the Chair, then—I do not yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. The statesman from Alabama refuses to yield to the politician from Michigan. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a moment. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I object to that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLMER). The gentleman from Alabama will proceed in order.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So the facts are that Hitler would not have to send an array of soldiers over here with Stuka bombers and panzer divisions if he breaks the back of the English Navy. That is the greatest issue, and that is the greatest war aim right now, I think, unquestionably, in the world.

England is now mistress of the seas, but England believes in free commerce. Hitler advocates a controlled commerce. Any little nation, no matter how modest, no matter how obscure, may now run its flag up and trade in any port or in any sea so far as that is concerned, but if Hitler gets in command, with his idea of controlled commerce, of course, he would put his ideas into effect immediately. He would not have to send divisions overseas. He would commence to regulate our trade and control our commerce, choke us down at every port. We are a "have" nation and we need to ship. Germany and Japan and Italy are "have not" nations, so far as variety of national resources go. They exploit other nations, and these "have not" nations have got together under a new order to get anything they can seize in the way of riches or strength from other nations.

The new order, as they have concocted it, furnishes them a method, a call, and a cry with which they could go to their folks, and if they do break the back of the English Navy, no man can talk any longer about building a Chinese wall around the United States. This is the reason we have to take this kind of a position. This is why we voted the lease-lend bill. This is the reason that we said our method of defending our country has to be different. We cannot say that America can live unto itself. It is a physical impossibility, and when one talks about staying at home and minding our own business, he is talking vain things, things that cannot be done in this world, and we know cannot be done. We cannot live by that sort of system. That is all over and gone, and so when we see that situation, for us to sit idly by as the European nations have done and let them come to us and knock us down, and it looks as though we promise to be one of those in the line-up, because after crushing the powers that oppose the new order in Europe today, he will turn his machines against us. He then will have the hordes, he then will have the other nations he has reduced and will have the strength and the power he has been accumulating behind him, and what will be our chance then?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the gentleman's position, it is this. This country should see to it that England is not defeated.

Mr. PATRICK. Well, the gentleman should put a little more to the end of that statement.

Mr. MICHENER. I think that is a fair conclusion from what the gentleman said—first, that the gentleman's position is, one, that the United States should see to it that England is not defeated; two, that the United States has already progressed to the stage where she furnishes matériel.

Mr. PATRICK. Well, we have not put much over there yet. We holler loud, but we have not yet delivered much stuff.

Mr. MICHENER. Let me finish. Three, that if that matériel is not there and cannot be gotten there without our aid, that we should use sufficient force to get it there. Four——

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, well——

Mr. MICHENER. But that is the gentleman's position. It seems to me that no other conclusion can be drawn. Therefore, it necessarily follows that if the convoying will not do the business, then we must send an expeditionary force and men must go. Will the gentleman go that far?

Mr. PATRICK. No; certainly not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have an additional minute to answer that question.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman from Alabama does not desire any additional time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the very absurdity of what has just been said by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is well demonstrated by the refusal of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] to answer the question put by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. The gentleman from Alabama also made the statement that Ger-

many is one of the "have-not" nations. I shall make no comment on that. Gentlemen know how much accuracy there is in that kind of a statement. The only thing I wanted to call attention to at this time is this. Is it not true that every single nation, every single people that has gone to war where England has requested it, has been defeated?

Mr. PATRICK. So what?

Mr. HOFFMAN. So what! Are we to welcome a like course? I think of America first, and I do not want any part of a war which is going to destroy our country, nor do I want any part of a program that sends an expeditionary force across the sea when there is no place even to land such a force, and when there is no hope of success, without the loss of millions of lives. Even the gentleman with his imagination and ability, great as it is, cannot tell us how we can hope to win such a war. Let us prepare for defense and do it now. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that everybody knows that neither I nor any one else who has appeared on this floor has today hinted, suggested, or intimated that anybody should contribute to an expeditionary force across the Atlantic.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 25, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will continue hearings on the following days:

1. Friday, April 25: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the Willamette Valley, the Columbia River Basin, and the Pacific Northwest.

2. Monday, April 28: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the western and southwestern Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado and west Gulf rivers.

3. Tuesday, April 29: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Missouri River and tributaries.

4. Wednesday, April 30: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Mississippi and Great Lakes region.

5. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

6. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

7. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

8. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

9. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

10. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

11. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

12. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

13. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

14. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, May 7, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4215 (Mr. ALLEN), to exclude certain aliens.

Consideration of House Resolution 94 (L. M. FORD) and private bills Thursday, May 8, 1941.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILBURN: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 2381. A bill authorizing the transfer of land owned by the United States back to the Spring Park Club, of Richfield Springs, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3490. A bill to fix the amount of the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCHULTE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4181. A bill for the relief of Marcel Stark; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4456) granting a pension to Idella M. Luce, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN OF Massachusetts:

H. R. 4517. A bill to provide a rate of 1 cent per mile for the transportation by railroad of members of the military forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS of Louisiana:

H. R. 4518. A bill authorizing additional allotments for channel clearance in navigable streams and tributaries thereof; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 4519. A bill to increase the grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr KING:

H. R. 4520. A bill to ratify and confirm certain right-of-purchase leases, special homestead agreements, cash freehold agreements, certificates of occupation, homestead leases, and patents issued under, or in purported compliance with, section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act and the laws of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 4521. A bill to amend section 64 of the copyright law (title 17, U. S. C.), so as to make copies or reproductions of prints and labels available upon payment of the required fee; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4522. A bill to provide daylight saving between the last Sunday in March and the last Sunday in October in each year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 6, with reference to highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 4523. A bill to recognize the high public service rendered by soldiers who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4524. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4525. A bill for the relief of John Cardillo and Philip Cardillo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 4527. A bill granting a pension to Maud Brown Engle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 4528. A bill for the relief of Charles Hay Hubbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4529. A bill for the relief of John Henry Hester; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

838. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 32, relative to Kings River flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

839. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to increase the import excise on foreign eggs and egg products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

840. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 39, relative to memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States in regard to reciprocal border rights of American citizens and Mexican citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

841. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Council, Greater New York and vicinity, expressing opposition to the Vinson bill (H. R. 4139); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

842. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Carpinteria Valley Chamber of Commerce, urgently requesting Congress to take the necessary steps to secure immediate additional and adequate appropriations to provide for the development of strategic highways in the State of California and particularly to that section most affected by the national-defense projects, and that said highway development be made a definite part of the national-defense program and financed in its entirety by national-defense funds; to the Committee on Roads.

843. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, respectfully memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the import excise on foreign eggs and egg products to the point that will encourage the domestic production of eggs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

844. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging that the President and the Congress of the United States include the construction of dams on the Kings River as one of the Federal construction projects and that Federal moneys be appropriated in sums sufficient to complete the construction of the dams and other public works; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

845. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to immediately enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico to have the order contained in circular No. 5, by Fernando Casas A. Leman, dated January 6, 1941, rescinded, and to reestablish the reciprocal border arrangement between the United States and Mexico whereby American citizens with business establishments or employment in Mexicali, Mexico, may reside in Calexico, Calif., and Mexican citizens with business establishments or employment in Calexico, Calif., or vicinity may reside in Mexicali, Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

846. Also, petition of the Parent Teachers Association of Pismo Beach, Calif., requesting Congress to take the necessary steps to secure immediate additional and adequate appropriations to provide for the development of strategic highways in the State of California and particularly to that section most affected by the national-defense projects and that said defense-highway development be made a definite part of the national-defense program and financed in its entirety by national-defense funds; to the Committee on Roads.

847. Also, petition of the Redwood City Chamber of Commerce, requesting Congress to take the necessary steps to secure immediate additional and adequate appropriations to provide for the development of said strategic highways in the State of California and particularly to that section most affected by the national-defense projects, and that said defense highway development be made a definite part of the national-defense program and financed in its entirety by national-defense funds; to the Committee on Roads.

848. Also, petition of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, urgently requesting Congress to take the necessary steps to secure immediate additional and adequate appropriations to provide for the development of strategic highways in the State of California and particularly to that section most affected by the national-defense projects, and that said defense highway development be made a definite part of the national-defense program and financed in its entirety by national-defense funds; to the Committee on Roads.

849. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the United Irish-American Societies of New York, opposing the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

850. By Mr. PATMAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, House and Senate, in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 38, urging Congress to pass drastic and effective legislation to prevent strikes and violence in connection with the national-defense program and to protect industries from such activities and to protect the patriotic citizens of this Nation who are working in such industries from violence and threatened violence while discharging the duties of their employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

851. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the International Association of Machinists, Lodge No. 1376, Williamsport, Pa., favoring House bill 4214; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

852. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Williamsport, Pa., favoring House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

853. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the sugar conference called by Gov. Charles Edison, at Newark, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Sugar Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

854. Also, petition of the Teamsters Local No. 822 of Norfolk, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

855. Also, petition of the International Lions Club of Seagraves, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

856. Also, petition of the Mascot Miners Union, Local No. 188, Mascot, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson antistrike bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1941

Rev. Albert J. McCartney, D. D., pastor, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Very presently this honorable body is to discharge memorial offices of affection and respect for those, your fellow Members, who during recent years have passed into the beyond. Our devotions, therefore, will have regard to these offices:

"Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat us.

"The Lord hath wrought great glory by them through His great power from the beginning.

"Such as did bear rule in their kingdoms, men renowned for their power, giving counsel by their understanding, and declaring prophecies.

"Leaders of the people by their counsels, and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people, wise and eloquent in their instructions.

"Rich men furnished with ability, living peaceably in their habitations.

"All these were honored in their generations and were the glory of their times.

"Their bodies are buried in peace; but their names liveth for evermore."

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who art Thyself the source of light and love, of life and immortality, we pray for the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that we may be instructed how to worship Thee under the shadow as well as in the sunshine; in the place and incident of death as well as in all the joy and service, the love, affection, and friendship of this present earthly pilgrimage. We praise Thee for our rich heritage of able and self-sacrificing men who have laid their lives upon the altar of the Nation's welfare. May these, Thy servants, who carry on, hear in the memory of their fellow Senators the strongest summons to be good and true. In these anxious hours of our Nation's destiny, may the brevity and uncertainty of life make us all more earnest to render a worthy account of our stewardship. May we more and more realize the necessity of seeking that counsel and that wisdom which cometh down from above and is profitable to direct. Make us willing as a people to make such sacrifices as may seem necessary for the preservation of our land and liberties.

O Lord God, save the people, establish us in righteousness, and give us peace. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 22, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 482) to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3486) to authorize an appropriation for an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 137. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri;

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 2532. An act designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified;

H. R. 2844. An act to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation;

H. R. 3191. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940;

H. R. 3394. An act to authorize the Attorney General to grant easements to States over lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control;

H. R. 3974. An act to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to adopt an official seal, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1942, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; and

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution relating to the Temporary National Economic Committee.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 28, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 9,000 additional copies of House Report No. 369, current session, entitled "Report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens," which shall be for the use of said committee.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the construction and maintenance of overhanging walks on the highway bridge, route No. 36, at Highlands, N. J., for public use;

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts; and

H. R. 3486. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, relating to defense housing, by authorizing an additional appropriation of $150,000,000, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXERCISES IN CONNECTION WITH UNVEILING OF STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR HUEY P. LONG, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BARKLEY submitted an order, which was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That on Friday, April 25, 1941, at the conclusion of the memorial addresses on the late Senators Logan, of Kentucky; Borah, of Idaho; Gibson, of Vermont; Lundeen, of Minnesota; Pittman of Nevada; and Sheppard, of Texas, addresses be delivered in the Senate Chamber in connection with the unveiling in Statuary Hall today of the statue of Hon. Huey P. Long, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Murray
Aiken	Ellender	Norris
Andrews	Gerry	Nye
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barbour	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Herring	Schwartz
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Hughes	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	White
Danaher	Murdock	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 482) to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, which was, in line 6, after the name "Ohio", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled."

Mr. BURTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LIMITATION OF THE LAW WITH RESPECT TO COUNSEL IN CERTAIN MATTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1254) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters, which was, in line 6, to strike out the word "appointed" and insert "because of his appointment."

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

INSPECTION AND INVESTIGATIONS IN COAL MINES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I submit the conference report on House bill 2082. The conferees on the part of the Senate are absent at the present time, but the report has been unanimously agreed to and signed. I ask for the present consideration of the report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors no person shall be so selected unless he has the basic qualification of at least five years' practical experience in the mining of coal, and is recognized by the United States Bureau of Mines as having the training or experience of a practical mining engineer in those essentials necessary for competent coal-mine inspection."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOE L. SMITH,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, and 7, and agree to the same.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
(per G. L. RADCLIFFE),
Managers on the part of the Senate.

SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. J. MANSFIELD,
FRANCIS D. CULKIN,
JAMES C. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISED REPORT ON NAVY DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the period commencing June 28, 1940, and ending September 30, 1940, on contracts negotiated under authority of section 2 (a) of Public Act No. 771, Seventy-sixth Congress, revised (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

NAVY DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS FOR BUILDINGS, FACILITIES, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the quarter ended March 31, 1941, of contracts entered into for buildings, facilities, etc., in accordance with law (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ESTATES OF INDIANS DYING INTESTATE WITHOUT HEIRS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION FOR FEBRUARY 1941

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for February 1941, including statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Local Union No. 1190, United Mine Workers of America, of Ellsworth, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Vinson antistrike bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of Middletown Post No. 218, American Legion, Department of Ohio, of Middletown, Ohio, favoring the rendering of prompt material aid to Great Britain, with United States ships to act as convoys, if necessary; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Mary T. Kelly, of New York City, N. Y., praying that the United States keep out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the fourteenth annual convention of California State Council of Carpenters assembled at Fresno, Calif., pledging its support in all projects to facilitate expedition of work in connection with the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the South Carolina Bar Association, assembled at Camden, S. C., protesting against the appointment of Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, under the seniority custom, to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; to the table.

By Mr. LUCAS:

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the town of Cicero, Ill., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the table.

By Mr. HERRING:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 33

"Whereas our Federal Government has recognized the necessity of placing the control of the production, manufacture, and distribution of many of our products under the supervision of a council of national defense; and

"Whereas there has been established a division of this Council of National Defense known as the Consumers' Division; and

"Whereas in a recent report of this Consumers' Division, a statement was made that recent increases in food costs were due mainly to a rise of 4 percent in meat prices, and advice was given in this same report that the consumers of this Nation would do well to look for cheaper cuts of meat and for meat substitutes, and to secure available information on the preparation of well-balanced meatless meals; and

"Whereas the Honorable Mark G. Thornburg, secretary of agriculture for the State of Iowa, has already very properly recognized that such statements from a Federal office will result in a decreased consumption of Iowa farm products and has in a letter to Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumers' Commissioner of the National Defense Council, voiced his objections to such statements on the grounds that—

"1. The total amount of meat in storage in the United States is 25 percent over the 5-year average and 9 percent greater than the amount in storage on February 1, 1940;

"2. Hogs are now selling for less than 79 percent of parity and more than 1,000,000,000 pounds of pork and pork products are in the various storage plants of the country;

"3. During the last days of 1940, an article concerning a Washington release was printed in newspapers throughout the Corn Belt, which, in effect, assured the farmers that the defense program now being inaugurated with all its new employment would more than make up for the foreign market which the Corn Belt farmers have lost. (We have lost a foreign market for 140,000,000 pounds of lard annually.)

"4. It is not with satisfaction that the Iowa farmer watches a Federal department in one year plow under crops and destroy livestock, and in another advise increasing hog production at a time when stocks of pork and pork products in storage are abnormally high, and then hears of another Federal department suggesting meat substitutes and well-balanced meatless meals; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently enacted the lend-lease bill which contains a provision whereby Great Britain could buy or borrow farm products as well as armaments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That for the reasons stated in the preamble of this resolution the membership of the Council of National Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Administrator of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation be respectfully requested to so coordinate their programs as they affect agriculture so that the farmers of the Nation will have adequate recognition of their problems and that surplus farm products will be more readily consumed by the consumers of this Nation and will be made available to the people of the democratic nations of Europe; be it further

"Resolved, That all sections of the Council for National Defense be respectfully requested to consider the advisability of starting from the premise that the farmer is one of the most vital factors in our national-defense program and that the important place of agriculture in national defense be recognized; be it also further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Vice President; the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable William G. Knudsen, Chairman of the Council for National Defense; the Honorable Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; and to the two United States Senators and the nine Congressmen who now represent Iowa in the National Congress."

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate 248

"Resolution memorializing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their efforts to modify the 'barracks' type of architectural construction in the housing project at Cocumcussoc, R. I.

"Whereas His Excellency Gov. J. Howard McGrath is deeply disturbed to learn that the housing project at Cocumcussoc, R. I., is to be patterned after the 'barracks' type of architectural abortion which now disfigures the Newport scene; and

"Whereas the general assembly agrees with the Governor that construction of this ugly type does violence to Rhode Island architectural traditions; that it scars the picturesque countryside which is part of our national wealth; that the tragedy of it is that a mere hundred or two hundred dollars extra per unit would have permitted architectural variations which might have made this project an asset; and

"Whereas it is to be regretted that the shortsightedness of the Government authorities will result in 'eyesores' in return for the ready cooperation this State has always given the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to make every effort to stay the program which is pushing the erection of this objectionable, unsightly 'barracks' type of housing project at Cocumcussoc, R. I., and to have modified those architectural features which contribute to the destruction of our colonial heritages of homes that beautify; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the United States Housing Authority."

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House 1020

"Resolution memorializing the President of the United States of America to aid the Government and people of Eire by releasing foodstuffs, clothing, merchandise, and/or military equipment to help the people of Eire to sustain themselves, resist aggression, and defend their democratic institutions

"Whereas the Honorable Frank Aiken, Minister for Defense Coordination of Eire (Ireland), has arrived in the United States of America; and

"Whereas under the lease-lend bill, now enacted into law, the President of the United States has the power to render aid to any nation whose defense is deemed to be vital to the defense of the United States and to those nations which are the unfortunate victims of the present war; and

"Whereas the people of Eire are in dire need of food and arms in order to sustain themselves, resist aggression, and defend their democratic institutions; and

"Whereas General Aiken is now officially here on a mission to arrange for such purchases and Ireland is a creditor nation, able and willing to pay for purchases made by it in this country for these necessary supplies: Now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the President of the United States of America be, and he is hereby, respectfully memorialized to exercise the powers fully vested in him as President of the United States of America during the present world chaos to aid, facilitate, and extend to the Government and people of Eire every facility, means, and assistance necessary to enable the duly designated representative of Eire to procure through purchase, lease, or loan in the United States of America for the people of Eire all foodstuffs, clothing, goods, merchandise, and/or commodities, and all such military equipment as in his judgment and as he may be advised is and shall be necessary and needed to avert starvation, disease, and/or famine, and that shall and will enable the armed forces of Eire to protect, defend, and preserve its liberty, freedom, and democratic institutions of government; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States with the request that they wait upon the President of the United States of America to urge upon him this course of action."

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 244

"Resolution requesting the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take all necessary steps to prevent any change in the home port of the frigate *Constellation* and preserve for the people of Rhode Island and New England this cherished shrine

"Whereas at the January sessions of 1936, 1937, and 1939 of the Rhode Island General Assembly resolutions have been passed—namely, Resolution No. 96, approved March 7, 1936; Resolution No. 11, approved February 2, 1937; and Resolution No. 49, passed February 21, 1939—urging the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress to take all necessary steps to prevent any change in the home port of the historic frigate *Constellation,* the oldest fighting ship afloat; and

"Whereas the people of this State are of the firm opinion that the frigate *Constellation* should be preserved and restored as a national museum, and that Newport, R. I., should be made its permanent home, since this renowned ship has for a long time now been an important part of the naval institutions and traditions in and about Newport: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this general assembly, adding the strength of its wishes to those of three previous Rhode Island Legislatures, does hereby respectfully protest to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Navy any change from the present home port of this ancient ship of war; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress, urging them to take all necessary steps to prevent any change in the home port of the *Constellation* and preserve to the people of Rhode Island and New England the shrine which they have so proudly cherised for so many years."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide funds for schools, equipment, and teachers for the educational training of children of persons employed on national-defense projects in and about naval reservations and military posts

"Whereas there has been an unprecedented activity in and near the naval reservations and military posts in Hawaii in the building of housing facilities for the increased personnel necessary to the carrying on of the national-defense program; and

"Whereas accompanying said personnel of defense workers are their families, wives, and children, many of said children being of school age; and

"Whereas the public-school facilities of the Territory of Hawaii in the vicinity of naval and military projects are now entirely inadequate to cope with the responsibility of providing these children with proper educational training; and

"Whereas under the Territorial school budget all available funds have been allotted and distributed to cover the educational needs of the Territory, so that there are no funds available for the emergency created as hereinabove referred to: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to include within its national-defense program for the Territory of Hawaii such necessary appropriations as will provide educational facilities, schoolrooms, equipment, and teachers so that proper and adequate schooling may be afforded the children of those employed in the defense-work program in and about the naval reservations and military posts; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commissioner of Education, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide adequate military defense of the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai

"Whereas the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai have vast areas of land devoted to agricultural and industrial activities; and

"Whereas enormous sums of money have been spent for wharves and docking facilities, agricultural and industrial development, and to the building of roads and highways and the expansion of public utilities on these islands; and

"Whereas the agricultural land on the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai is great in area, most fertile in productivity, and is available and will be necessary for further development in the event of a national emergency; and

"Whereas the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai are indispensable parts of the economic life of the Territory, and integral factors in the perfection of any national-defense program involving the Territory: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1941 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested and urged to provide for the adequate military defense of the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai in such manner as they may deem proper, and which will carry out the intent and purposes of this concurrent resolution in the event of a national emergency; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, the Committees on Military Affairs of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committees on Naval Affairs of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Hon. SAMUEL WILDER KING, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the commanding general of the Hawaiian Department of the United States Army."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Whereas it is apparent that international relations in the Pacific area are daily becoming more strained; and

"Whereas the welfare of the civilian population in Hawaii is vital to the national-defense program in this area; and

"Whereas Hawaii normally produces only 1 percent of the cereals, less than 5 percent of the oils and fats, 25 percent of the dairy products, 40 percent of the meat, fish, and eggs, and 50 percent of the fruits and vegetables consumed in the Territory; and

"Whereas a substantial increase in local food production would make available additional space in ships carrying essential defense materials; and

"Whereas in addition to the normal population of the islands thousands of workers on defense projects in Hawaii and the outlying Pacific bases are also largely dependent upon food shipped to Hawaii; and

"Whereas this deficiency in the food production of Hawaii, although a matter of grave concern to the commanding officers of the military and naval establishments in the Territory, is, nevertheless, at present entirely a civilian responsibility; and

"Whereas an increase in the production of food in Hawaii would be a very real contribution to the national defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Governor be, and he hereby is, requested to seek an immediate study of the facts by the President's Council of National Defense, and to obtain such financial assistance from that body as may be necessary in order to subsidize an increased production of food and to provide facilities for emergency surplus-food storage, and to seek recommendations for the administration of

a plan to be worked out by cooperation between the Federal and the Territorial Governments."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Whereas on November 25, 1940, the Attorney General of the Territory of Hawaii rendered an opinion construing section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended from time to time, and the laws of Hawaii relating to public lands, and said opinion so construes said statutes as to invalidate certain homestead leases and patents, and certain right of purchase leases, special homestead agreements, cash freehold agreements, and certificates of occupation, now outstanding or upon which homestead leases or patents have been issued, on account of one or more of the defects enumerated in the act hereinafter proposed for enactment by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas it satisfactorily appears that said homestead leases, patents, right of purchase leases, special homestead agreements, cash freehold agreements, and certificates of occupation were issued and received in good faith, and the same, if invalid, ought to be validated: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully requested to validate said leases, agreements, certificates, and patents substantially as set forth in the bill which is hereto attached and made a part hereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives of said Congress, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"'A bill to ratify and confirm certain right of purchase leases, special homestead agreements, cash freehold agreements, certificates of occupation, homestead leases, and patents issued under or in purported compliance with section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act and the laws of the Territory of Hawaii

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no right of purchase lease, special homestead agreement, cash freehold agreement, certificates of occupation, homestead lease, or patent issued on or before the 25th day of November 1940, under or in purported compliance with section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act or the laws of Hawaii, relating to public lands, shall be held invalid or void for or on account of: (a) Failure to publish a notice of the sale, drawing, or allotment of the lands described in such lease, agreement, certificate, or patent, for the period required by section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended by the act of May 27, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 444), or to determine the persons entitled to take said lands by drawing or lot, if, in either of such cases said lands were opened for sale, settlement, or occupation by public notice in compliance with the statutes in effect prior to said act of May 27, 1910; (b) if said lands were opened for sale, settlement, or occupation by any of the following methods, to wit: Right of purchase lease, special homestead agreement, cash freehold agreement, or certificate of occupation, the fact that said lands were not opened for sale, settlement, or occupation by the particular method followed in issuing such lease, agreement, or certificate, or homestead lease or patent based thereon; (c) the inclusion in one lease, agreement, certificate, or patent of detached or noncontiguous parcels of land, or two or more parcels of land originally offered as separate homesteads or lots.

"'SEC. 2. Such right of purchase leases special homestead agreements, cash freehold agreements, certificates of occupation, homestead leases, and patents are hereby ratified and confirmed to the extent hereinbefore set forth, and, to the extent so ratified and confirmed, shall be deemed and held to be perfect and valid from the day of the date thereof for all purposes, including the issuance of homestead leases or patents based thereon; all questions or disputes that may arise in relation to said lands or the titles thereof shall be decided and determined accordingly. Nothing in this act contained shall be deemed to construe as invalid, or to require or sanction any proceedings seeking to invalidate, any lease, agreement, patent, or other contract covering public lands heretofore issued by the Government of the Territory of Hawaii or any pre-existing government of the Hawaiian Islands for any irregularity in the issuance thereof which is not hereby expressly validated and ratified, but which lease, agreement, patent, or other contract for any reason would not now be open to impeachment by the Territory of Hawaii or the United States if this act had not been enacted.

"'SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'"

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 30

"Concurrent resolution respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon proposed legislation providing for an examination and survey of a ship canal connecting Lakes Michigan and Superior

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States a bill (H. R. 2490) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make an examination and survey for a ship canal connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, from Au Train Lake in Lake Superior to Little Bay de Noquet in Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas a canal along this proposed route would shorten lake traffic between Lake Superior and ports on Lake Michigan by approximately 340 miles; and

"Whereas because of the strategic importance of iron, copper, and wheat which is shipped through the locks at the Soo to the manufacturing districts at Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and other points; and

"Whereas the locks at the Soo and St. Marys River district, despite the precautions taken, are liable to attack by foes, which would cause a bottleneck at that point in case of sabotage by enemies of this country; and

"Whereas a canal in this location would provide an all-American canal and locks, which is of utmost importance from the national-defense angle, as it would provide two outlets from Lake Superior: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Michigan Legislature hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and approve the proposed legislation aforesaid; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to Vice President Henry A. Wallace; Speaker Sam Rayburn; United States Senators Prentiss M. Brown and Arthur H. Vandenberg; and the chairman of the Michigan delegation in the United States Congress.

"Adopted by the senate on April 3, 1941.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on April 9, 1941."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"House Concurrent Resolution 31

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for educational facilities in the communities where Federal funds are to be expended for housing of defense workers

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 to be expended through the Office of Production Management on housing of defense workers, which in Michigan would result in an acute lack in educational facilities in such communities, and the inability of the taxpayers in those communities to provide sufficient revenue to build the needed school buildings, supply the needed equipment, and furnish the required number of teachers to take care of the additional school enrollment; and

"Whereas in keeping with the defense program, the education of the youth of today, the citizens of tomorrow, in the true principles of democracy, is imperative: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Michigan Legislature respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for educational facilities in the communities where Federal funds are to be expended for housing of defense workers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 13, 1941.

"Adopted by the senate April 3, 1941."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 37

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 3570, providing for assistance in meeting the housing problem in areas with defense workers

"Whereas in many counties of the State of Michigan, especially in the counties of Macomb, Oakland, Calhoun, Genesee, and Saginaw, a serious housing and sanitation problem has arisen as the result of the influx of workers in defense industries; and

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the legislature that H. R. 3570, now before Congress, if enacted, would greatly benefit the congested areas of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Michigan Legislature respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 3570, as a step in assisting to meet the housing problem in areas with defense workers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

"Adopted by the senate on April 1, 1941.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on April 9, 1941."

A resolution of members of Buick Local No. 599, U. A. W. A.-C. I. O., in the State of Michigan, protesting against the enactment of legislation which may curtail, diminish, or nullify any of the rights of labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions of the board of directors of the Kiwanis Club, of Allen Park; the Commission of the City of Pontiac, and the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Alpena, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Detroit Chapter, America First Committee, of Detroit, Mich., pro-

testing against the convoying of vessels by the United States through belligerent zones; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying that the hardwood forest of the Porcupine Mountains area in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan be made into a national park so as to save the trees and natural beauty of the vicinity; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A resolution of the executive committee of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks in session at Detroit, Mich., favoring the enactment of the so-called Mead bill, providing for the establishment of a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 19

"Relative to memorializing the President and Congress to provide for the dredging of Bodega Bay and to reestablish harbor facilities thereat.

"Whereas, in this period of uncertainty in international affairs, intensive rearmament and preparation for national defense, it is of the utmost moment that suitable harbors and facilities be available on the Pacific coast, and

"Whereas, Bodega Bay, in Sonoma County, California, is exceptionally well suited for harbor development, and

"Whereas, plans for the dredging of Bodega Bay and for the reestablishment thereat of harbor facilities have been approved by the War Department, who has also recommended that appropriations be made by Congress for this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly). That the legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to make such appropriations as may be necessary to provide for such dredging and harbor reestablishment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate of the State of California is hereby instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States and to the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 32

"Relative to Kings River flood control

"Whereas the floods of the Kings River from time to time constitute a serious menace in that they cause soil erosion, obstruction of the river by debris, destruction of livestock and poultry, damage to homes and farms, and destruction of millions of dollars of farm crops along the river course and on its deltas; and

"Whereas the control of the waters of the river by the construction of dams would, within a few years, save sufficient property to pay the cost of such dams; and

"Whereas there are 1,000,000 acres of land which are irrigated from the waters of Kings River directly by gravity flow or from thousands of electric pumping plants; and

"Whereas flood conditions are generally caused by excessive run-off due to the melting of the snows in the high mountains, and not only menace the irrigated lands within the lower areas but in many seasons cause a lack of gravity water for irrigation in the higher areas, thereby forcing the farmers to operate their pumping plants, which greatly diminishes the stored water under the surface; and

"Whereas the construction of such dams would assist in the prevention of soil erosion, result in a more equitable and beneficial distribution of the water for irrigation purposes, aid in controlling subsurface waters, and help to reclaim waterlogged land; and

"Whereas the construction of such dams, together with hydroelectric powerhouses, would result in the generation of electric power, which is much needed in the adjacent territory, and the sale of which would go far toward liquidating the cost of the project; and

"Whereas the need for such dams is forcibly brought to the fore by the present threatening flood conditions; and

"Whereas the people along the river and on the delta land are financially unable of constructing such projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to include the construction of dams on the Kings River as one of the Federal construction projects and that Federal moneys be appropriated in sums sufficient to complete the construction of the dams and other works at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives of California are hereby respectfully requested to urge such action."

(The Vice President laid before the Senate two resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 23

"Relative to memorializing the President and Congress to increase the import excise on foreign eggs and egg products

"Whereas, present international conditions make it more imperative than ever for the United States to remain the principal source of supply of its basic food products, including eggs; and

"Whereas, imported eggs and egg products have sold at a price in the United States making the production of domestic eggs but slightly profitable; and

"Whereas, it is most necessary at the present time to insure a continued domestic source of supply of eggs; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the import excise on foreign eggs and egg products to a point that will encourage the domestic production of eggs; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Assembly is instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, which Senators and Members from California are respectfully urged to support the program set forth herein."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 39

"Relative to memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States in regard to reciprocal border rights of American citizens and Mexican citizens

"Whereas certain citizens of the United States, involving approximately 50 families, residing in Calexico, Calif., have maintained business establishments or have been employed in Mexicali, Mexico, and certain Mexican citizens, residing in Mexicali, Mexico, have maintained business establishments or have been employed in Calexico or vicinity, all under an existing reciprocal arrangement between the Governments of the United States and Mexico; and

"Whereas such reciprocal arrangement is also in existence at other points along the international line between the United States and Mevico; and

"Whereas under date of January 6, 1941, a Circular No. 5 was issued by Fernando Casas Aleman, notifying the American citizens affected that by April 24, 1941, or within 60 days of the date of notification, they would be required to move their respective residences to Mexicali, Mexico, if they desire to continue employment or maintain business establishments there; and

"Whereas a number of the American citizens who have business establishments in Mexicali, Mexico, also have them in Calexico, Calif., and it will be as impractical for them to reside in Mexicali and operate two establishments from Mexicali, as it may be held to be to reside in Calexico and operate the two establishments from Calexico; and

"Whereas, if the order contained in Circular No. 5 is put into effect it will seriously affect Calexico commercial interests, and will result in many American homes being divided because of the fact that some members thereof will be unable to attain residential status in Mexico; and

"Whereas the reciprocal arrangement in existence until the issuance of Circular No. 5 should be continued due to the fact that the Mexican Government invited investments by Americans and offered protection; and

"Whereas such arrangement should be permitted to exist so that the good-will policy between the United States and Mexico may continue; and

"Whereas it is vitally necessary that action in this matter be taken immediately: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and Secretary of State of the United States be memorialized to immediately enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico to have the order contained in Circular No. 5 by Fernando Casas Aleman, dated January 6, 1941, rescinded, and to reestablish the reciprocal border arrangement between the United States and Mexico whereby American citizens with business establishments or employment in Mexicali, Mexico, may reside in Calexico, Calif., and Mexican citizens with business establishments or employment in Calexico, Calif., or vicinity, may reside in Mexicali, Mexico; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be and he is hereby directed to forthwith send a copy of this resolution to Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United

States, and to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States."

[The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.]

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by Townsend Club No. 1, of Dodge City, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation to effectually prevent further strikes or lock-outs in industries engaged in the national defense, and protesting against the raising of additional revenue by means of a poll tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution by The Ministerial Alliance, of Kansas City, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating beverages in or near Army training camps and for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of such camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF KANSAS—IMPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS AND LIVESTOCK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, approved by both branches of the Kansas Legislature. This resolution calls attention to the importance of the American livestock industry, and urges that Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government follow the policy of using American products so long as American producers are in a position to supply the needs of the United States.

This resolution adopted by the Kansas Legislature also protests against admission of livestock and other agricultural products to this country from other nations "unless it is clearly apparent that the American producer is incapable of supplying home needs."

I merely desire to add, Mr. President, that so long as American farmers must buy manufactured goods in a protected market, it is only fair that the farmer be afforded that same degree of protection on the things he has to sell. I send the resolution to the desk.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 10

Concurrent resolution relating to the importation of livestock and agricultural products from foreign countries into this country

Whereas livestock is the most important branch of our agricultural industry and a decisive factor in national defense, both with respect to adequate sustenance of our people and as a source of income to defray increasing Federal expenditures, and it is highly important that the country's livestock business enjoy whatever degree of prosperity may come from preserving the American market for American producers, a protection to which it is fairly and justly entitled; and

Whereas recent press dispatches from Washington inform that the United States Government proposes to purchase greatly increased supplies of livestock products from countries other than our own; and

Whereas American producers are abundantly able to meet American requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we are unalterably opposed to the purchase or admission to this country of any livestock or agricultural commodities from other lands that compete with the crops and livestock produced in the United States, until and unless it is clearly apparent that the American producer is incapable of supplying home needs; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to the members of the Kansas congressional delegation in Congress.

RESOLUTION OF BARFIELD-PEASE POST, NO. 67, AMERICAN LEGION, MADISON COUNTY, MISS.—THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution of Barfield-Pease Post, No. 67, the American Legion, of Madison County, Miss.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Senator, the Honorable Pat Harrison; Senator, the Honorable Theodore G. Bilbo; Representative, the Honorable Dan R. McGehee; of the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., greeting:

Be it known unto you and all of you, that the following resolution was adopted by Barfield-Pease Post, No. 67, of the American Legion, in regular meeting assembled, and is made a part of the minutes thereof, to wit:

"Whereas the governments of certain nationalistic and communistic nations of the world are actively prosecuting programs of hostility and unjustified aggression toward the democracies of the world for the avowed purpose of destroying, and utterly effacing from the earth forever, the democratic manner of life and government; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America, under its constitution securing to all its citizens and peoples, the rights and blessings of life, liberty, and the happiness of a free people, self-governed, does constitute such democratic government and is, therefore, imperiled and jeopardized by the said threat of extirpation by the totalitarian powers; and

"Whereas other democracies of the world, akin in precept and principle and variously comparable to that of the United States of America, have lately been conquered and destroyed, and the peoples thereof enslaved, rendered impotent, and inoperative or are even now defending themselves against unprovoked invasion by the dictator states, and as a result thereof need the active and immediate support and aid of the democracy of the United States of America in the form of munitions, materials, and supplies for defensive warfare; and

"Whereas the United States of America can and of right ought to produce its fullest capacity of the said munitions, materials, and supplies vital to defense of world democracy, in order that it may adequately prepare for its own defense against the said actually threatened aggression, and in order that it may at the same time share in the defense and preservation of democracy throughout the world; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has provided for the procurement of the said munitions, materials, and supplies by enacting laws of the land authorizing the United States Government to obtain said defense materials from the sources of supply and manufacture thereof; but

"Whereas certain industrial elements of the Nation have placed and do place private personal and selfish gains in the position of greater importance than the means of defense of the Nation and the defense of democracy; and said industrial elements being delayed in or failing to accomplish such selfish ambitions, and while disputing one against another concerning such unpatriotic selfish ends, have deliberately caused the program of preparation for the national defense and the defense of democracy to be arrested in its progress in the presence of increasingly vicious aggression by the said dictators; and

"Whereas manpower for the national defense is properly provided by compulsory military service made lawful by an act of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Barfield-Pease Post, No. 67, of the American Legion does hereby deplore and protest the failure of the aforesaid industrial elements (which shall be construed to mean both employers and employees) in their sense of patriotic duty toward the people and the Government of the United States, and does hereby recommend and urge the enactment of adequate compelling authority to insure the immediate resumption of production of all defense materials whatsoever necessary to the defense of democracies of the world; and furthermore

"It is recommended and urged that nothing be allowed to stand against or otherwise delay or interfere with the making promptly available to the defenders of democracy wherever they may be, the aforesaid munitions, materials, and supplies; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we as your constituents, do hereby charge you singly and severally, that you vigorously and aggressively employ your whole efforts to the end that they shall secure to the people of America the full cooperation to which all are entitled in the defense of their homes, their country, and their Government; and in conclusion,

"That this entire instrument published in the press of the State concerned, together with any and all permanently written acknowledgment thereof, which shall have been duly received by the post commander of the said Barfield-Pease Post No. 67, of the American Legion, from each person separately to whom these presents are addressed. The said acknowledgments shall be received by the said post commander on or before April 30, 1941."

Done in the city of Canton, county of Madison, State of Mississippi, on this the 8th day of April, one thousand nine hundred and forty-one, A. D.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hearts and hands and have affixed our true and lawful signatures.

BARFIELD-PEASE POST, No. 67,
OF THE AMERICAN LEGION,
HOSEA R. STEWART,
Post Commander.

Attest:

DR. J. B. PRICE,
Post Adjutant.

FEEDING OF OPPRESSED CIVILIAN POPULATIONS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in these days when people are so sorely troubled throughout the world, Americans have been giving most serious consideration to the question of just where their duty lies with reference to feeding the oppressed in conquered lands. Mothers and children particularly call forth our sympathies while civilian populations generally are suffering from privation and want. The trend of a substantial and thoughtful portion of the American public is evidenced by a resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion in its special session held at Indianapolis, Ind., on March 15, 1941, for the proper reference and

insertion of which in the RECORD I respectfully ask unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the American Legion urges and recommends that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State use all possible means to obtain the friendly cooperation of Great Britain to the plan of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies so as to permit the feeding of these peoples whose countries are now occupied by Germany, under the following terms and safeguards:

1. That an international commission should be set up to manage shipping, to import, safeguard, and distribute the food;

2. That Germany undertake that none of the imports or domestic supplies of these occupied nations should be taken by the Germans;

3. That the equivalent of any supplies already taken by the Germans should be returned by the Germans to these people;

4. That the amount of food and supplies on hand at any time be so limited that, in the event of violation of the agreement and seizure of the food and supplies by Germany, it will not be sufficient to feed the German Army for more than a single day;

5. That Germany relax the blockade against these people so as to permit the Commission to import food from Russia and the Balkans, if possible;

6. That the belligerents should not attack ships carrying supplies;

7. That no United States shipping be employed;

8. That the entire cost of the purchase and distribution of this food and supplies shall be borne by the governments of the peoples benefited, without expense to the United States or to its citizens;

9. To assure these guaranties, the British would be free to stop the supplies any moment these guaranties were not fulfilled by the Germans.

RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—THANKSGIVING DAY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted unanimously by the New Hampshire Legislature endorsing S. 360, a bill which I introduced to make the last Thursday of November a legal holiday to be known as Thanksgiving Day.

The observance of Thanksgiving is one of the oldest customs which we have in America. It was started by the Pilgrims in the early years immediately following their landing in this country. Down through the centuries the tradition of Thanksgiving has been maintained.

In 1863, Abraham Lincoln, as President, issued the first annual national Thanksgiving proclamation. Since that time, for over three-quarters of a century, the last Thursday of November has been observed as Thanksgiving Day.

Two years ago the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, threw the Thanksgiving tradition to the winds, and proclaimed an earlier Thursday as the day for offering thanksgiving. As a result of this unwarranted move of the President, a great deal of confusion has arisen, Thanksgiving Day being celebrated in the District of Columbia and some States on one date and in other States on the last Thursday of the month.

The Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, a State which still believes in tradition, endorses the bill which I have introduced; and I am proud to have such an endorsement, it being a unanimous vote of both branches of the legislature of my State.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Whereas the Pilgrim fathers early instituted the custom of observing a day of thanksgiving and prayer; and

Whereas the first Thanksgiving Day proclamation of George Washington selected the last Thursday in November for observance; and

Whereas since 1863, when Abraham Lincoln formalized the tradition of the last Thursday in November with a definite proclamation, it has remained so with each proclamation until the year of our Lord 1939: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives (the senate concurring), go on record as favoring United States Senate bill S. 360, a bill declaring the last Thursday in November of each calendar year a national, legal, and public holiday known as Thanksgiving Day everywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress upon its passage.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 634. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to grant easements to States over lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control; without amendment (Rept. No. 198).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 774. A bill to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 197).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3066. A bill to amend an act to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 217); and

H. R. 4036. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act, approved May 3, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 216).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Gettings; without amendment (Rept. No. 199).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 853. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Frank Rublein and Paulina Rublein, husband and wife, for the losses sustained by them by reason of the death of their son, Ernest J. Rublein, resulting from the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps; with amendments (Rept. No. 200);

S. 1348. A bill for the relief of J. M. Swinney; with an amendment (Rept. No. 201);

S. 1352. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher; without amendment (Rept. No. 202);

H. R. 59. A bill for the relief of special tax school districts Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, Broward County, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 203);

H. R. 3269. A bill for the relief of Mary Fortune; without amendment (Rept. No. 204); and

H. R. 4063. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Herbert M. Gregory; without amendment (Rept No. 205).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 175. A bill for the relief of William T. J. Ryan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 218).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 438. A bill for the relief of Hughey Parsley; without amendment (Rept. No. 206);

H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 207); and

H. R. 694. A bill for the relief of the Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 208).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 583. A bill for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson; without amendment (Rept. No. 209);

H. R. 198. A bill for the relief of William G. Sullivan; without amendment (Rept. No. 210);

H. R. 224. A bill for the relief of Antone and Mary Lipka; without amendment (Rept. No. 211);

H. R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Ben Torian and Joe J. McDonald; without amendment (Rept. No. 212);

H. R. 3828. A bill for the relief of Sophrania Holmes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 213);

S. 1040. A bill for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle; with amendments (Rept. No. 214); and

H. R. 3827. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clyde Thatcher and her two minor children, Marjorie Thatcher and Bobby Thatcher; with amendments (Rept. No. 215).

By Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

S. Res. 53. Resolution providing for an investigation with respect to the development of the mineral resources of the public lands of the United States and laws relating thereto (submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on January 23, 1941); without amendment; no additional report.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR DEPARTMENT—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 196) thereon. In connection with the bill just reported by me I serve notice that at a later time, under rule 40, I will offer an amendment and move to suspend the rule, if necessary, so as to have consideration of the proposed amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, subsequently, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4183)

making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

"At the end of the paragraph under the caption 'Flood control, general,' insert the following: : *Provided further*, That in aid of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project on the Caney River, Okla. and Kans., authorized by the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1571), as amended, for the control of floods in the Verdigris River Valley, the Osage Tribal Council be, and it hereby is, authorized, upon payment of just compensation therefor, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to release and relinquish to the United States of America such right, interest, and control in and over the minerals reserved to the Osage Tribe by the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, as may be found by the Secretary of War to be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said Hulah Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided further*, That construction of said project may be undertaken when the amount of money to be paid to the Osage Tribe is just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized has been agreed upon by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Osage Tribal Council: *Provided further*, That the amount agreed upon as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized shall be paid by the Secretary of War out of appropriations made for flood control, general, to the Secretary of the Interior for disbursement in the manner provided by section 4 of the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, for the disbursement of royalties received from the leasing of minerals owned by the Osage Tribe.'"

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4183, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department, fiscal year 1942, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR SHEPPARD

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 98, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 98) submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on April 22, 1941, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Morris Sheppard, late a Senator from the State of Texas, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters; and

Harrison Parkman, of Kansas, to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department (reappointment).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

William P. Seaver, of New York, as Assistant Administrator in charge of project development of the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency.

Lee Farnum Johnson, of Colorado, as Assistant Administrator in charge of project management of the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency, vice William P. Seaver, transferred.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1375. A bill to provide for certain community facilities made necessary by the exigencies of national defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. McKELLAR):

S. 1376. A bill for the relief of the Tanksley-Drumright Cut Stone Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1377. A bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders and Henry G. Sanders; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1378. A bill to provide for the free transmission in the mails during the present national-defense emergency of letters from members of the land and naval forces of the United States who are on active duty; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 1379. A bill placing the position of postmaster in first-, second-, and third-class offices in the competitive classified service, and for other purposes essential to the establishment of the Post Office Department on a nonpolitical career basis; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for the cooperation of the Federal Government with colleges in providing additional facilities for the teaching of chemical engineers, and I ask that it be referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from North Carolina will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1380. A bill to provide for cooperation of the Federal Government with colleges in providing additional facilities for the teaching of chemical engineering; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1381. A bill for the relief of Victor S. Banks; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1382. A bill to provide for the deportation of aliens inimical to the public interest;

S. 1383. A bill to provide for the deportation of aliens in certain cases, and for other purposes; and

S. 1384. A bill prohibiting the issuance of immigration visas to quota immigrants, restricting the admission of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1385. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and all organizations, groups, or individuals associated therewith who seek to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence through the advocacy of criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazism, and criminal fascism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference an additional bill authorizing the appointment by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy of additional cadets and midshipmen among the sons of commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have served for at least 15 years in the armed forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from North Carolina will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1386. A bill authorizing the appointment by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy of additional cadets and midshipmen from among the sons of commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have served for at least 15 years in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1387. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. BUNKER, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BULOW, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. LEE, and Mr. STEWART) introduced Senate bill 1388, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1389. A bill for the relief of Brown County, Kans.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 1390. A bill to amend section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1391. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida A. Joab; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1392. A bill for the relief of Homer J. Swope and John W. White; and

S. 1393. A bill for the relief of the Edward Gillen Dock, Dredge & Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1394. A bill granting a pension to Abbie A. Geer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 1395. A bill repealing section 611 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; and

S. 1396. A bill repealing section 611 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1397. A bill to provide for the exemption from military service of certain aliens residing in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SMALL MINING LOANS BY THE R. F. C.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from Utah [Mr. THOMAS and Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and myself, I introduce a bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make small mining loans for the purpose of financing preliminary development work. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Cur-

rency and also that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1388) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make small mining loans for the purpose of financing preliminary development work, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 of the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is also authorized and empowered to lend, upon the security of a lien upon ore or mineral developed and an agreement to apply 10 percent of the net mill, smelter, or mint returns, or, in the case of minerals not milled, smelted, or minted, 10 percent of the net market returns, to repayment of the loan until it is repaid, not to exceed $5,000 to any one borrower for the purpose of financing the unwatering, retimbering, making accessible, or preliminary development of mine workings or the sampling or assaying of ore therefrom, when, in the opinion of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the expenditure of such funds may make accessible or reveal sufficient mineral showings to warrant the making of a development loan to such borrower."

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 137. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri;

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 2532. An act designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified;

H. R. 2844. An act to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation;

H. R. 3191. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940;

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1942, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; and

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution relating to the Temporary National Economic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3394. An act to authorize the Attorney General to grant easements to States over lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control; to the calendar.

H. R. 3974. An act to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to adopt an official seal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 8, line 20, to strike out "$72,680,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$72,880,000."

On page 9, line 5, after the words "necessary expenses", to insert the following: "*Provided further,* That the sum of $200,000 of this appropriation shall be made available for an additional amount for removing accumulated snags and other debris and clearing channels in navigable streams and tributaries thereof in the State of Louisiana to be additional to the amount authorized for this type of work by section 1 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1414)."

Mr. OVERTON also submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4183, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department, fiscal year 1942, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RADCLIFFE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on April 7, 1941, on the subject of the merchant marine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON AT AWARD DINNER OF NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY CONTEST

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BURTON at award dinner of National Traffic Safety Contest, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 21, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY HULL ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD SITUATION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the United States and the world situation, delivered by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, at the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the American Society of International Law at Washington, D. C., on April 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY KNOX ON AMERICA AND THE WORLD SITUATION

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Secretary of the Navy Knox at the annual dinner of the bureau of advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Thursday, April 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONGRESSIONAL MAIL BAG

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion participated in by a group of Senators and Representatives on the program of Congressional Mail Bag, on April 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM DE WITT D. BARLOW ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from De Witt D. Barlow, of Plainfield, N. J., relative to foreign affairs, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPAGANDA THEN AND NOW—ARTICLE BY VARDIS FISHER

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Vardis Fisher entitled "Propaganda Then and Now," published in the Idaho Sunday Statesman of April 20, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER ON THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger entitled "Our Greatest Exploration," published in the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEMISPHERE SOLIDARITY — EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (N. C.) DAILY NEWS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wilmington (N. C.) Daily News entitled "Hemisphere Solidarity," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM LABOR

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Will Make You Feel Better," published in the April 22 edition of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE SECRETARY OF LABOR AND THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before the memorial exercises begin, I desire to address the Senate very briefly.

On April 21 I sent the following telegram to Madam Perkins:

The Nation's reserve of bituminous coal is being rapidly depleted by the continuation of the coal strike. Many vital defense industries on the verge of being compelled to close, as well as public utilities and manufacturing plants generally. Without coal to operate the defense plants, the entire defense program must stop. Your public statement clearly indicates that your own efforts to mediate have failed. Why do you delay in certifying this strike to the National Mediation Board for immedaite action? The longer you delay, the more critical will become the condition and more difficult the task to accomplish mediation to immediately reopen the mines. There should be no further delay to imperil our national security. May I ask your prompt response as to whether you will certify this strike for immediate action by the United States Mediation Board; and if not, give your reasons for declining to do so?

HARRY F. BYRD.

Mr. President, Madam Perkins certified the coal strike to the National Mediation Board at midnight, Wednesday, April 23, 23 days after the strike began. During

these 23 days the stock of bituminous coal declined at the rate of 10,000,000 tons per week, until now many industries are on the verge of being compelled to close their plants, and the stock of coal for any future emergency is exhausted. Whether a general shut-down of industry can now be averted by the Mediation Board remains to be seen. Shut-downs are already reported in steel plants and other vital defense industries, and many others are imminent.

Certainly the bungling and lack of courage of Madam Perkins have greatly aggravated the situation; and her failure to act with promptness and firmness at the beginning of the strike greatly handicaps the efforts of the Mediation Board at this late hour, when only a few days may bring practically a complete stoppage of all industrial life in America by reason of the inability to obtain coal supplies.

During the period of the attempted mediation by Madam Perkins, bitterness and differences have developed between the conflicting interests which make the task of the Mediation Board doubly difficult.

It is commonly reported and generally believed that the failure of Madam Perkins sooner to certify this strike was because she did not desire to offend John L. Lewis, who has publicly declared that he would not permit the coal strike to be mediated by the National Mediation Board.

Is John L. Lewis bigger than the Secretary of Labor? He may be, but he is not bigger than the Government of the United States in this hour of national peril. Before this emergency is over I predict that the American people will not permit any man or group of men, whether it be a powerful labor leader or a powerful industrial magnate, to stand as an obstacle to the essential work of our national preparedness. Unless these obstacles to our preparedness program are removed by those in authority, in some way, somehow, the American people will do what is imperative under our democratic form of government to clear the path for such quick and expeditious preparedness as will best protect our country in this hour of national danger.

Madam Perkins today, as Secretary of Labor—the only person having authority to certify strikes for action by the Mediation Board—with her inefficiency and lack of decision and firmness in dealing with this responsibility, has made herself one of the most serious bottlenecks in our adequate preparedness efforts. From the very beginning of the strike problem she has performed her duties with an astounding inepitude and lack of capacity. The Allis-Chalmers strike, for example, she permitted to continue for 75 days, even after Chairman Knudsen had publicly declared that in the interests of national welfare the Allis-Chalmers plant should resume work. When, at the end of 75 days of serious delay in preparedness contracts, she finally reluctantly certified this strike to the Mediation Board, it was promptly settled.

Instance after instance of either a complete lack of understanding of the issues involved, or utter inability to meet her responsibility in a successful manner, has occurred since the defense strikes began.

I have only a casual acquaintance with Madam Perkins. She is an estimable lady, no doubt, and does the best she can within the limits of her capacity and inclinations. As a strike settler, however, she has proved to be a complete wash-out, and her record is one with only barren results. Whatever usefulness Madam Perkins ever had now is overshadowed by her complete ineptness, weakness, and inability to meet her responsibilities in the settlement of strikes.

Today nothing would do more to restore the confidence of the people of America in the determination of this Nation to go forward quickly and effectively in a national program of preparedness than to replace Madam Perkins as Secretary of Labor with a more competent successor. It is reported that the resignation of Madam Perkins as Secretary of Labor is on the President's desk. If so, he should accept it immediately. If her resignation has not been presented voluntarily, he should request it. The appointment of a two-fisted man in her place, who would be fair to labor but who would have the intestinal fortitude to say to labor as well as to capital that no interruptions in the defense program by unnecessary strikes will be tolerated, either on the part of labor or capital, would do a great deal to restore the confidence of the American people, who today are beginning to wonder and doubt as to why, in this crisis that now confronts us, our defense program should be held up by the arbitrary action of a few.

The strike trouble this country is experiencing today began some years ago when Madam Perkins as Secretary of Labor refused to condemn sit-down strikes as illegal or to utter one word of disapproval of such usurpation, although the common law from the beginning of organized government has prohibited the illegal occupancy of someone else's property. Of course, I know Madam Perkins was not alone in her weakness and ineffectiveness in dealing with sit-down strikes. Madam Perkins is an appointee of the President, but, after all, she is a public servant and an important official of our Government.

In this free democracy I and others have the right to express an opinion whenever we see fit to do so as to the fitness and capacity of all officials of our Republic. I mean no personal discourtesy to her, and it is with reluctance that I say to the Senate that her record in the critical days through which we are now going, and the new responsibilities she has under the defense program, has demonstrated such inefficiency, ineptness, and general incapacity as to require an immediate change in the public interest, and neither friendship nor compassion should prevent this change at once. During most of the strike crisis, when the defense program was being retarded seriously, Madam Perkins was away from her office in Washington and could not give detailed attention to this vital matter.

In view of this record, I think it is an act of utter folly to continue to tie the hands of the Mediation Board in settling and preventing strikes in defense industries by prohibiting this Board from acting until permission to act is first obtained from Madam Perkins. The National Mediation Board, handicapped as it has been by lack of proper authority to consider strikes in the first instance unless authorized to do so by Madam Perkins, and further handicapped because of no power to enforce its own decisions, has performed its work patriotically and effectively. It has as its members those representing capital, labor, and the public. Its success in cases where Madam Perkins has failed should influence the President immediately to give to the National Mediation Board original jurisdiction in all strikes, and then Congress should give power to the Board to enforce its decisions and provide that in all disputes between capital and labor both sides should be required to submit the issues to arbitration, to continue work during the arbitration, and to abide by the results of the arbitration in all work for national defense.

We have no more patriotic class of citizens than the labor class of America. They are the very backbone of our Republic. We have no class of citizens more anxious to see this country adequately and promptly prepared to meet any and all eventualities the future may hold for the American Nation. All that a vast majority of the American workmen want is justice, and this justice can be obtained through the Mediation Board, if it is given the power to act and enforce its decisions.

It is to me distressing that a willful minority of labor leaders and workingmen of America should be permitted to discredit the overwhelming patriotic majority of American labor.

The sooner that all engaged in the essential work of our preparedness program realize that the American people intend to tolerate no interruptions of this program the better it will be, I think, for all classes of citizens. And what I say in this connection has equal reference to the businessman who refuses to cooperate, as to those who persist in interruptions of defense work by unnecessary strikes.

The ominous events abroad, happening with lightning rapidity, should warn us that any and all obstacles to prompt and effective defense preparations should immediately be removed, even if it is necessary to tread on the toes of John L. Lewis or on the toes of the most powerful industrial magnate of America.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an able article by Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, entitled "The Course of a Strike That Wasn't Certified."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 23, 1941]

IN THE NATION

COURSE OF A STRIKE THAT WASN'T CERTIFIED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The stoppage of work in the soft-coal mines, and the events that led up to and protracted it, illustrated several needs if American defense production

is to reach its peak in time to balance the scales of the war abroad. Outstanding among these needs is a single machine for conciliation of labor disputes. The President's Executive order which set up the Defense Mediation Board failed to provide this.

On the contrary, it left with the Secretary of Labor decision when a strike or a strike prospect should be certified to the Board; it blessed but did not establish the cooling-off principle; it broke mediation into two distinct parts instead of contriving a continuous operation as in the railway-labor industry. In the instance of the soft-coal mine stoppage these flaws have proved costly to the prestige of the new Board and to the national-defense effort.

The President is said once to have observed that he could bring a more damaging charge against his official record than the Republicans ever did—the charge of poor administration. If Mr. Roosevelt did not make that statement before, it could be justified by the Government's procedure in the soft-coal dispute.

This dispute was well advertised in advance, and Secretary Perkins had in readiness a settlement formula. This was to continue the production of coal and arrange that any agreement reached would be retroactive. This formula was not attempted before the strike was called, and the Secretary was in Arizona when the call was issued.

Lewis wins his point

The C. I. O., still dominated by John L. Lewis, opposed the formation of the Mediation Board. And Mr. Lewis announced firmly that he would not cooperate with the Board if the soft-coal strike were certified to it. Though the Board was established to deal with the difficult labor disputes, and this was typical, the administration deferred to Mr. Lewis. This surrender was made possible by the failure to provide a continuous, unbroken process of mediation.

When the Railway Mediation Board begins operating on a threatened strike its own conciliator is sent out. When he exhausts his efforts he so advises the Board, which then orders him to keep the conferences going, and this he has usually been able to do. Without a break the Board itself steps in and on the basis of what the conciliator knows the procedure continues. Under the D. M. B. executive order a complete break occurs when the Department of Labor drops a dispute and the Mediation Board picks it up. Also a condition precedent is a confession of failure by the Department.

Secretary Perkins insisted on the certification arrangement. She was advised against this, it is said, by experienced members of the Government, and the C. P. M. tried for a change. But Madam Perkins insisted on a form which gives an incentive to her Department to hang on to a situation after its usefulness has passed, and permits such noncertification under challenge as occurred in the soft-coal dispute.

It also encourages last-minute certifications which make a strike doubly difficult to adjust. There are two recent examples of this, after a similar record in the Allis-Chalmers case. Last Friday a strike was ordered in the Kellogg Switchboard & Supply Co. of Chicago, effective Monday night. It was not certified until late Monday, and the Mediation Board, by sending out telegrams, was barely able to maintain a 24-hour status quo. The Minneapolis Moline Power Implement strike was held from the Board until 5:30 p. m. before the midnight it was called.

Unfounded optimism

These instances serve to explain some of the many reasons why, if the country—as the President said—is not aware of the peril in which it is placed by the international situation, the Government has some responsibility for that.

For many days publications of the joint conferences between the soft-coal operators and miners breathed optimism from Dr. Steelman, the Department of Labor conciliator, which each succeeding day failed to justify. If this was part of a technique to stave off a clamor for certification, it helped. But if such it was, the effect of the certification provision on the Department is to encourage its conciliators to cling to their task unduly in a quest for public credit, to prolong work stoppages, and make settlements more and more difficult.

Headlines in this newspaper over accounts of the conference reveal how continuous were these optimistic statements, and what has happened since reveals how slight was their basis.

April 2: Coal accord near. Steelman expects peace in 48 hours.

April 4: Reopening of mines by Monday is seen.

April 5: Progress is made toward coal peace. Steelman is confident mines will reopen Monday.

April 6: Sixty-five percent of bituminous mines to open. Dr. Steelman predicts rest will be working within a week.

April 7: Northerners sign today (they only initialed; they haven't signed yet).

April 17: Coal parley here agrees on terms. Lewis calls it tentative.

The last was the only exhibit anywhere close to a fact that matured.

This is part of the record in a labor dispute which the Mediation Board was especially established to deal with.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the exercises which are the special order for today; nor do I intend to enter into any discussion with respect to the merits of the present unfortunate controversy in the coal industry; nor as to the merits or demerits of the Secretary of Labor. Whether she delayed too long the certification of this controversy, I do not know, and I shall not attempt to say.

The difficulty in the coal industry grows out of a chronic situation which has been in existence a long time. It grows out of the rate structure which has been imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. We are in the situation of having one governmental body dealing with rates on coal from one part of the country to the other, and another governmental body dealing with wages in the production of that coal. There has been before the Interstate Commerce Commission and before the country for many years a controversy over the question of rate differentials between the northern and southern coal fields. That is a matter which, I suppose, can only be adjusted by the Interstate Commerce Commission because Congress has never attempted to fix rates, or to do more than to establish certain general standards by which the Interstate Commerce Commission shall act in the fixing of rates.

In all probability, it if were not for this chronic difference in the rate structure, there might not have been any controversy over wages; or if there had been, in all probability it might have been settled days ago. At any rate, the controversy has been certified to the Board of Mediation set up by the President. I think we will all agree that if labor and industry, if employers and employees, could adjust their own differences without having the Government impose itself upon their controversies, it would be a better situation than to have the Government intervene, even under favorable conditions, and I think it will be generally agreed that the Government ought not to intervene except when there is manifest impossibility for the laborer and the employer to compose their own differences.

We have seen in the newspapers many statements back and forth on each side with respect to this particular controversy in the coal industry. I believe it is true that all those interested desired, first, to have the differences ironed out in the industry itself, between the operators and the miners. That has been impossible up to now, and 2 days ago the matter was certified to the Mediation Board. The Mediation Board called both sides into conference today at 10 o'clock, and they are now in session in an effort to adjust this controversy. While they are in session and making an effort to draw both sides together and adjust the difficulty, it seems to me we might well leave it to them. If they fail, then, of course, some other method may have to be at least considered in bringing about a resumption of this industry, so vital to the United States.

DEATH OF LORD STAMP

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am about to make a request for unanimous consent to have something printed in the RECORD.

On the night of April 16 the reverberation of bombs which exploded in a house on the outskirts of London was to be felt in the homes of many Americans who personally knew the occupants of that home. In fact, its realism reached into the colleges of this land and into the industrial enterprises of this country. In that explosion in a peaceful home which was not at all connected with any war activity there were snuffed out suddenly the lives of three servants, the life of Hon. William Wilfred Carlisle Stamp, and the lives of Lord and Lady Stamp. Its significance is no greater than that of the destruction of other homes in England, but this publicity regarding Lord Stamp's life and tragic end may bring home to the consciousness of our people the proximity of the brutal attack upon all civilization being made by Hitler and his allies.

Lord Stamp's life paralleled the life of any typical American boy born in a small town in the United States. His title of nobility signified England's recognition of achievement and service to his countrymen. In this case it was a mark of service to the people of the United States of America as well. He had already been recognized in our country by honorary degrees from Harvard, Columbia, California, Northwestern, Johns Hopkins, Southwestern, Syracuse, Duke, and Washington and Lee Universities, as listed in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Thursday, April 17, 1941.

Daniel Willard, who is well known to all of us by achievement and service, as one of our own noblemen, and who has long sought to arouse us to the dangers threatening our precious heritage of freedom, has been a close friend of Lord and Lady Stamp for many years. Knowing of this friendship, I wrote Mr. Willard an expression of sympathy for what I knew to be a great personal loss, and thereupon received a reply, dated April 18, to which I have asked him to permit

me to give publicity. And now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from Daniel Willard to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

THE BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Baltimore, Md., on line, April 18, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR AUSTIN: It was very kind of you to write me as you did on the 17th instant with reference to the sad death of Lord and Lady Stamp. I had known Lord Stamp for upward of 30 years and with increasing intimacy as time went on. He was one of the most charming men to be with that I have ever known. He was in himself the best product of the English economic system. I am not sure that my use of the word "economic" is just right, but what I mean is this: He was a poor boy. He was obliged to go to school at night because he was compelled to work during the daytime, and this he had to continue to do until he was graduated with honors from the London University. Of course, during all of that period he acquired the habit of work, and his many activities bear evidence of his capacity to work and work satisfactorily. He was president and chairman of the largest railroad in England. He was one of the directors of the Bank of England. He was a member of the Board of Economic Advisors for the Cabinet. In addition to his many activities he had time to take an active part in the affairs of the Methodist Church, of which he and Lady Stamp were both members.

Lord Stamp has been over the Baltimore & Ohio line with me on numerous occasions. He inspected our shops and operating methods and took a very keen interest in everything. He was a man of fine character, broad culture, and wide sympathies with the working people and with all of the less fortunate. He was knighted in recognition of his services for the state and later on given a seat in the House of Lords, although he hesitated a year or two before accepting it because he felt that inasmuch as it would be hereditary and descend to his eldest son, it might place a burden upon the son that would be difficult for him to bear, because Lord Stamp was not a rich man.

I think it is unfortunate that in this country we have no way of showing public appreciation of a man of the type of Lord Stamp, except, of course, we may elect him for public office; but even so, the status is quite unlike that of Stamp's during the last years of his life. He was in position to be called on at any time for advice, and he was spared the effort which is frequently necessary in order to obtain public office in this country. There are a lot of good things about the English system which we are apt to sneer at at times when we talk about our boasted democracy. As a matter of fact, I think the English system of government is much more quickly responsive to the will of the people than is the case with us. A vote of lack of confidence in the Commons gives the people the opportunity if they want, to turn the rascals out and put another set in. The Upper House is really nothing more than a balance wheel, and a balance wheel serves a very good purpose in certain connections.

The death of Lord and Lady Stamp—and they both visited our home a number of times—means a real loss to Mrs. Willard and myself. The thing that interests me about the matter is, first, that that thought should have occurred to you, and, second, inasmuch as it had occurred to you, you did the next thing that would suggest itself to a man like you, you wrote me a letter suitable to the occasion. I appreciate very much the friendly thought which prompted you to write me as you did.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL WILLARD.

Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, following that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 18, 1941, glorifying the service and the great nobility of character of Lord Stamp.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 18, 1941]

LORD STAMP

A master statistician with a flare for quiet whimsy; a mind crowded with the cold considerations of economics but full of a warm kindliness; a character trained in the subtleties of domestic and international politics but finding its natural expression in straightforwardness—this was Lord Stamp.

Except for his title, Lord Stamp lived a success story which any American might experience, but which is more in the British tradition than many of his non-British admirers may realize. He was another of those hardworking Britons "of modest lineage" who rise to greater eminence than that enjoyed by much of the older nobility.

The bombs that shattered the Stamp household in London's most furious air raid came from a country for whose friendship Lord Stamp had worked long and sincerely. He shared Neville Chamberlain's hopes of finding a basis for understanding with Germany. But his last services to his fellowmen were dedicated to Britain's defense of freedom and decency.

If his efforts for good will were to be futile in one field, they were not to be so in another. Lord Stamp—it is still easier for many Americans to think of him as Sir Josiah—shared many of Lord Lothian's enthusiasms for the United States. Both these men in the United States were spokesmen for the British point of view, but in Britain they spoke rather as special emissaries for the "American way." The impact of bombs on Lord Stamp's house was felt in many an American home.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON DECEASED SENATORS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed. Under the order of the Senate previously entered, the legislative business of the Senate is now suspended in order that memorial addresses may be delivered on deceased Members of the Senate.

MARVEL MILLS LOGAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read and considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 99) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. M. M. LOGAN, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that a similar resolution will be submitted with respect to each of the deceased Members of the Senate in whose honor memorial services are being held today.

Mr. President, I wish briefly to address myself to the resolution which refers to my late colleague, Senator M. M. LOGAN, The list of our late colleagues in whose honor we meet today, consisting, as it does, of some of the most outstanding Members who have served in this body in many years, calls anew to our attention the shortness of life, and the unusual list of casualties which have been suffered by the Senate. It would be my desire, if I had the time, to have something to say about each of the deceased Members of this body. Later, if time permits, I may have a word to say about others than my late colleague. I now desire to speak concerning my late colleague, Senator LOGAN.

The life of Senator LOGAN typifies the opportunities of America as fully as does the life of any Member who has ever served in this body or anyone who has ever served in any public capacity. He died in the sixty-fifth year of his life. He was born in January 1875, in the county of Edmonson in the State of Kentucky. He was not born in affluent circumstance; he was not born of aristocratic parents, although he came of solid, substantial American lineage.

He was educated in the common schools of that county, whose county seat is the little town of Brownsville. He supplemented his education in the common schools by a term or two in a private institution. Like many other men who have later distinguished themselves in public or private life, he began his career by teaching school in the rural sections of his State.

To show his natural inclination to political life and his aptitude for it, at the age of 21 he was made chairman of the county committee of his party, which was the Democratic Party. Later he was elected county attorney of his county, although as a rule that county gave its allegiance politically to the party in opposition to that to which Senator LOGAN belonged.

He was not only interested in the law, but he began his public career by serving 2 years as a prosecutor. He was interested in education, and served for a while on the board of examiners for public-school teachers in the county in which he lived, and later served on the Board of Education of the State of Kentucky. He became a second assistant attorney general of the State, and later became first assistant attorney general, and later, without opposition, was nominated for the position of attorney general of Ken-

tucky, and was elected. Before his term expired he resigned to become chairman of the first State tax commission created by the legislature under a revised and somewhat modernized tax system which had been authorized. He served as chairman of the State tax commission, and showed in that capacity, as in all others, not only that he was a profound lawyer but that he had some knowledge of economics and the theory of taxation. I think I may say that it is due largely to the beginning this new tax system had under the chairmanship of Senator LOGAN that it has been as successful as it has been since its adoption and creation.

He resigned from that position before the term for which he was appointed had expired, and resumed the practice of law in the city of Louisville, and later in the city of Bowling Green, which is the seat of one of the great educational institutions of Kentucky; and that was his home until the day of his death.

He became a candidate for the highest court in the State of Kentucky, which we know as the court of appeals. He was elected to a full term of 8 years. As a member of our highest court, before his term had expired in that high position he was nominated without opposition for a seat in the United States Senate, and was elected in 1930, taking his seat on March 4, 1931, for the term beginning on that date and ending March 4, 1937, upon which date, by reason of his subsequent election to another full term, he entered upon his duties in this body in his second term.

So, Mr. President, beginning, as the life of Senator LOGAN did, in the most humble circumstances, reared among the rugged scenes of a somewhat hilly, if not mountainous, section of his State, breathing in from the very earliest childhood which he could recall the inspiration of rugged scenery and rugged surroundings, because of merit and because of ability and character which inspired the confidence of the people, he rose not only to one of the highest stations in American public life but to the highest estimation and esteem of the people of his State and the people of the United States.

Senator LOGAN was a great lawyer. His life was devoted to the law. There is not much difference between the practice of law and the enactment of laws. Every man who, in the performance of his duties here or in other legislative bodies, helps to frame or enact or interpret legislation which becomes the law automatically becomes more or less a lawyer. Senator LOGAN had a very well-trained and keen legal mind. Whenever he devoted himself assiduously to the study of a problem, and brought the fruit of his labors to the floor of the Senate, I think those who served with him here will testify to the fact that he illuminated it in an exhaustive way, not in excitement and not in frivolous allusion, not in any superficial way; but, being a profound student of the law, he brought his knowledge and experience to the dispassionate consideration of every legislative problem that faced him and faced the Senate during his incumbency as a Member.

Not only was he a great lawyer, Mr. President, but he was a great humanitarian. He believed in the brotherhood of man. He was a great fraternalist. He devoted much of his time and his talents to a great fraternal organization in the United States, known as the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, with which all of us are familiar, and of which some of us are members. He rose to the highest station in that organization—that of grandsire of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows—because of his devotion to that order and his belief in the doctrines and practices of fraternity. That particular organization has as its motto, "Friendship, love, and truth." No man within my knowledge ever more completely or more fully exemplified those attributes toward his fellow man than did Senator LOGAN.

Not only was he a great lawyer and a great fraternalist but he was a great Christian. I dare say that he is the only Member of the United States Senate who for 30 years, without interruption, no matter where he might be on a particular Sabbath, if there was an opportunity, taught a men's Bible class. For years he taught a men's Bible class in the little town of Brownsville, the county seat of the county in which he was born. While he was assistant attorney general and attorney general and a member of the court of appeals at Frankfort he taught a Bible class; and when he came to Washington as a Member of the Senate he taught a Bible class in this city on every Sunday unless he was unavoidably detained through some form of inability to attend.

Mr. President, in the busy life in which we are compelled to be occupied here, with all the complex and intricate problems that face us as legislators, and with all the clouds that hover about us not only as legislators but as members of organized society, it is an unusual tribute to be able to pay to one of our Members that in spite of all these things, for more than a generation he devoted himself on every Sabbath Day to the teachings of the Bible and to the inculcation of its principles into the hearts and souls and lives of men.

On March 2, 1938, in this Chamber, Senator LOGAN made a speech on religion and national defense which it would repay any Senator to read. I desire to quote a paragraph or two from that speech.

I may say—

Said Senator LOGAN—

that I am sufficiently old-fashioned to believe in the Bible. I believe in the God of Moses, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I believe sincerely that Jesus Christ was divine and that through His suffering and death He made possible the salvation of man. I believe in His teachings as found in the four Gospels when interpreted, as I am quite sure it was His intention to have them interpreted. Since I was a youth I have sought in my humble way, and perhaps feebly, to help spread abroad throughout the world the Christian religion. I believe it is only through following these teachings, so simple and so easily understood, that eventually the world may become a fit abiding place. I believe that it is through the instrumentality of men who are His followers that this achievement may be brought about.

I believe in churches and church organizations, regardless of creed. Believing those things and remaining steadfast in my faith, I cannot subscribe to a policy which, in my judgment, eventually will destroy the Christian religion to such an extent that through long ages man will have to establish these principles again in a benighted world.

Christianity has had its trials and its bright and dark days. Had it not been for Charles Martel at Poitiers in A. D. 732, the Arabs would have completed their destruction of all those nations who held to the faith which I have above expressed. If there were Christians in that day who railed against preparations for national defense, they were in exactly the same position as are the Christians in America today who protest against our making adequate preparations to defend our country.

I do not want war. I hope that I may never see another war. I have greater reasons than most men to hate war, and yet I am proud that there has not been a war since early colonial days in which my family, down to the present generation, has not made sacred some spot in our Nation with blood shed in defense of the things which have made our Nation great.

He goes on in the speech from which I have quoted to discuss further his belief in the things of which he speaks.

So, Mr. President, I mourn his loss, as we all do; so I know that the State of Kentucky, which honored him and which he honored, echoes the thoughts and feelings which will be expressed here today in tribute to his memory. I am proud to be able to speak these feeble words of appreciation of a really great American, in testimony of his service to mankind, to the sweetness of his soul, to the genuineness of his devotion to American democracy and the Christian religion and the civilization of which they are a part.

So long as real character, so long as sincerity and devotion are honored among men, so long as courage in the expression of opinions and views may be cherished in this Nation or in the world, the memory of Senator LOGAN will occupy a hallowed place in our minds and in our hearts.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I should like to add a brief word to the very beautiful tribute which has just been paid by my distinguished colleague to the late Senator MARVEL MILLS LOGAN, who was my predecessor in this office.

Senator LOGAN was born in 1875 in Edmonson County, Ky., which was then considered one of the remote districts of our country. By sheer courage and determination and will power, which exist so abundantly in the hearts of men in that section of the country particularly, he literally lifted himself up to an exalted position among the people of his own Commonwealth and among the people of the United States of America.

He was a product of the plain people and remained a plain and, in many ways, a simple man all his life. He was devoted always to the welfare of the plain people of his State and of the Nation. He held during his lifetime numerous public offices, commencing with membership on the board of trustees of the small town of Brownsville, Ky. He held, in succession, the office of county attorney of his

county, assistant attorney general for the Commonwealth; was elected to the attorney generalship of the State, without opposition, in 1915; later became the first chairman of the tax commission, and then a member of the highest court in the State, following which he was twice elected to the Senate of the United States.

Senator LOGAN was a profound student. He was a good lawyer. If he had desired to remain in the legal profession, it is my opinion that he would have made one of the outstanding judges of America.

In 1912 he married Miss Della Haydon, of Glasgow Junction, Ky., a childhood sweetheart from a neighboring county, and there survive him today four children, all of them good citizens of our country.

His devotion to the Odd Fellows' Lodge and his determination to see that young men and young women had opportunities which had not been given him in his early childhood distinguished his entire lifetime.

He gained almost every goal that he set for himself except wealth. It is a sad commentary that there are those men in public office today who work for little pay, who give to the country long hours of faithful public service, and wind up at the end of the road sometimes without a sufficient amount of money to meet the ordinary expenses or obligations which must be incurred.

He taught a Sunday-school class for more than 30 years. He was a devout and religious man, and believed sincerely in Almighty God.

They took him back, after his service had ended here, and buried him in the hills of Edmonson County, among the plain people whom he loved so much and by whom he was so greatly loved.

There are those of us who believe:

And those that were good shall be happy;
they shall sit in a golden chair;
They shall splash at a 10-league canvas with
brushes of comets' hair;
They shall find real saints to draw from—
Magdalene, Peter, and Paul;
They shall work for an age at a sitting and
never be tired at all!

And only the Master shall praise us, and only
the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no
one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of working, and each in
his separate star
Shall draw the thing as he sees it, for the
God of things as they are!

I think, perhaps, I can envision him today on the ramparts of Valhalla with his comets' hair brush undertaking to paint for the Master and to work for Him just as he did in his lifetime.

May his soul rest in peace among those rugged hills he loved so much; may the perpetual light of God's countenance be upon him always. He inherited a good name; he kept it for his children; his country and his Commonwealth are better, much better, because he lived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

WILLIAM E. BORAH

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, late a Senator from the State of Idaho.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President—

To gild refined gold, to * * *
add another hue
Unto the rainbow, or with taper-light
To seek the beauteous eye of heaven to garnish

Is the task appointed to me this day. And—

As in a theater, the eyes of men,
After a well-graced actor leaves the stage,
Are idly bent on him that enters next,
Thinking his prattle to be tedious.

I recognize my inability and realize that it is almost presumptuous for me to speak of our friend, Senator BORAH, to you who knew and loved him as I did. Yet I know that to tell of a man's greatness and goodness may kindle in the hearts of both teller and listener a flame which will light their way through the devious paths which that man has trod so well. So I accept my task with humility, and with gratitude that there was left for us such a shining pattern.

To me, Senator BORAH was the epitome of democracy. He was a towering symbol of unswerving principle and justice and kindness, fostered in a land where people love such virtues. His brilliance first won for him the jealously contested right to represent here in this Chamber the people of his State. But as through the years he marshaled his stalwart championship of right, his unabating loyalty to the common folk, and his abiding faith in our God-given Constitution to the service of his people, their admiration and respect deepened into a love which refused to release him from that service.

As these qualities became apparent, the entire Nation watched him. Men and women of the byways, too often duped by demagogues, said: "Here is a man we can trust; here is a man who is one of us, and for us"; and they claimed him as their own. They knew he was fighting their battles. They knew they could entrust into his hands for safekeeping their freedoms. They knew that no lust for power, no greed for wealth, could make him betray that trust.

We from the West loved him in a special way. We were proud of the fame he had brought to us, proud of his fearlessness, proud of his adroit oratory which more than once had bested the suavity and sophistication of our eastern cousins. We glowed with pride when we quoted his opinions and his aphorisms. Yes; he was a true man of the West, as rugged as our mountains, and as refreshing as the breezes which play about their snow-capped summits.

Mr. BORAH was a simple man. Truly, he "walked with kings, nor lost the common touch." The great and near-great of all nations beat a path to his door. To them he typified America. He had his fingers on its pulsebeats, and was sought after by those who knew his prescience and sagacity. Yet he was always kindly and common. Not for him the trappings of wealth, the cluster of satellites, the pomp of state, the display that many men draw about them as a covering for their nakedness. He had no need for them. He was a giant in his own right.

His greatest armor was his knowledge that he owed no man allegiance. He weighed his actions in the scales of right or wrong, of good or evil, and no consideration could make him choose other than right and good. Sometimes he walked alone, deserted by lesser men, but his step was firm and his determination resolute. "The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion." Such was the Lion of Idaho.

Senator BORAH was a God-fearing man. He had an impassioned belief in a higher being who was merciful and just, and who had invited mankind to live by His precepts and taste the joys of peace and happiness for all. He loved this great land of ours, and strove with every breath and every action to help it achieve the destiny marked out for it by its Creator. He wanted peace for that land, and he was valiant in the cause of peace. God will not forget him.

We miss Senator BORAH. We need him sorely. We need as never before his wisdom, his guidance. His death closed an era of security and well-being. The forces set in motion now are those which he fought throughout his lifetime. God sends great men to us sparingly—men whose leaven spreads throughout the mass of our littleness and bigotry, and raises us to a level we could not achieve alone. Senator BORAH was such a man. "These were honored in their generation, and were the glory of their times." I thank God that I knew him.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, on January 19, 1940, death closed the illustrious career of WILLIAM E. BORAH, marking the end of nearly 33 years of distinguished service in the Senate of the United States. The task of evaluating the part he played in shaping his country's destiny must be left to historians. It is my purpose to say a few words in memory of a great American whom it was by privilege to call friend.

When I settled in Idaho in 1909, WILLIAM E. BORAH had completed 3 years of his first term as United States Senator. I first made his acquaintance in 1912, when I did what I could to aid in his first campaign for reelection. As I became more closely associated with him through the years, my admiration for his keen intellect, his sincerity, and his integrity

of purpose, intensified. It was a great privilege when, from 1928 to 1933, I was permitted to serve as his colleague in the United States Senate.

BORAH's death brought to me, as it did to all his other friends, the shock of personal bereavement. Yet the loss is far greater than can be expressed in personal terms. Every man and woman and child in America, with BORAH's passing, lost a friend. That is not flowery eulogy. It is literally true. As have few other men, BORAH devoted himself completely and without reservation to the welfare of his country and its people. That fact, I believe, is the key to an understanding of Senator BORAH's life. His thoughts, his aspirations, and his ambitions were for his country rather than for himself.

My own memory of Senator BORAH is the memory of a man working—a man spending most of his waking hours studying, reading, thinking, with a single purpose in mind—to discover how best he might use his office and his great ability to promote the welfare of the American people.

In the very broadest sense, Senator BORAH was a humanitarian. He loved his country, and he loved and respected his country's people. That was the cornerstone of his belief in America and in democracy. He firmly believed that the instincts and judgments of the great masses of the people, over the long period of time, would lead to wiser decisions than could be made even by the most able leaders, who feel that it is necessary to conceal a part of the truth and to lead the public by means of strategems and half truths. The people of the United States returned the compliment, and I believe that much of the considerable influence Senator BORAH exercised throughout his years in public life came from the confidence which the people had in him.

Senator BORAH never "talked down" to the American people. He objected to doors being closed upon any of the deliberations concerning public policy in the United States. Through the medium of press, lecture platform, and radio, he presented his views on public questions to the country with the same frankness and candor he might have exhibited in talking to a colleague in the Senate. Never did he timidly wait to be swept along with a wave of public opinion. The reasons for his decisions he was always ready to submit to the judgment of the people.

Many times he took stands which he felt might be unpopular, and in not a few of these instances his became the popular side after a thorough public discussion of issues. BORAH's career is the superb testimonial to the wisdom and effectiveness of representative democracy.

Throughout his life Senator BORAH was guided by certain fundamental beliefs, from which he never wavered. His was a positive and affirmative faith. In one of his later addresses he stated a fundamental of his belief in a word of advice to youth. To youth he submitted his conclusion that history shows that—

> Success in public affairs, as in all other things, comes not to those who doubt but to those who believe. Those whom this Republic has placed among her immortals were not those who staggered through in unbelief, but those who believed that what constitutional government had promised constitutional government would perform.

Senator BORAH had profound faith in the Constitution and its principles. He believed that it secured to the masses, in a greater degree than ever known before, the blessings of freedom and well-being. Frequently was his able voice raised against concentration of economic power and monopolies, which he felt produced poverty and misery.

He rejected uncompromisingly the doctrine that economic democracy means the sacrifice of any part of our American freedom.

Within the constitutional framework of our Government he found all the essentials to a restoration of equality of opportunity to the American people, and in that same Constitution he saw the precious safeguards which alone would permit us to continue the enjoyment of those opportunities.

He contended that—

> The discretion and judgment of the citizen are not incompatible with, but are essential factors in economic security.

BORAH was never shaken in his belief that the restoration and protection of free competitive enterprise must be the means by which we can break the shackles of poverty and unemployment in America.

It would be almost impossible to speak of Senator BORAH without referring to the subject which was probably closer to his heart than any other. I refer to his foreign policy.

BORAH was not an isolationist. The word, he said, is a "term of studied reproach sought to be applied to those who are supposed to be overzealous in their support of American principles." He agreed most wholeheartedly with the words of President Roosevelt that—

> We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war.

Neither was he an appeaser.

While the democratic nations of Europe were conniving with the Nazi and Fascists in their plans to overrun Ethiopia and Spain, and many of their leaders were openly courting favor with Hitler as a potential ally against Russia, Senator BORAH was warning Americans against the dangers of fascism and nazism. Listen to his declaration against these twin evils on the Senate floor in May 1937:

> Some things are transpiring, however, which ought to convince us that democracy is worth saving; that it is worth fighting for, as men fought for it of old—not necessarily on the field of battle but fighting the forces which ceaselessly seek to undermine and destroy it in the very citadel of its greatest triumph here in the United States.

A few weeks later he declared in unmistakable terms, again referring to Fascist and Nazi ideals:

> These forces and influences which would sap and undermine the character and the stamina, and the loyalty of the American people ought not to find any compromise or any palliation or excuse by anyone in this country.

Here is no trace of appeasement, no trace of compromise with dictatorship. BORAH believed that nothing should be left undone to preserve democracy in what he called "the last citadel of its greatest triumph." But he felt that another futile attempt to impose our concept of democracy on Europe would result only in the possible final destruction of the American form of government.

After the Treaty of Versailles, BORAH devoted himself to keeping this country out of the war he knew would follow the vengeful injustices perpetrated by that treaty. Again and again, in language we must now recognize as prophetic, he denounced it because of the results it would surely bring. Listen to his words:

> It will bring sorrow to the world again. Its basic principle is cruel, unconscionable, and remorseless imperialism. Its terms will awaken again the reckoning power of retribution.

Probably BORAH is best remembered for his magnificent fight against our participation in the League of Nations. He was determined that the United States should not underwrite a peace which contained the seeds of inevitable war. In 1919 he lashed out at advocates of American entry into the League:

> Your treaty means injustice. It means slavery. It means war. And to all this you ask this Republic to become a party. You ask it to abandon the creed under which it has grown to power and accept the creed of autocracy, the creed of repression and force.

When war came, Senator BORAH devoted the final months of his life to the cause of preventing the United States from being drawn into its horrible destruction. He felt that our entering the war might well mean the end of democracy in its last great stronghold in the world, that by our staying out of war our opportunities for service to civilization and to the peoples of war-torn Europe would be far greater than if we became embroiled in the conflict.

I think I can pay no greater tribute to Senator BORAH's memory than to give voice to my sincere belief that his wisdom offers to us today our brightest hope of saving this democracy and this civilization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, no mortal words can add to the stature of a great character in human history. They can but acknowledge the vast and eternal debt of lesser men to the Olympians whom God occasionally gives to the Republic. It is in this humble spirit that I rise to speak a few simple sentences regarding the greatest man I ever knew. That he was the greatest friend I ever had in public life is my own personal legacy. That he was the greatest friend America had in my time and generation is the measure of the Nation's debt to the life and service and the vivid memory of the late United States Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH, of Idaho.

There was something in him of the rugged strength of the mighty mountains of the West whence he came. There was something in him of the spirit of the lonely pioneer who dares against all odds for the faith of his objectives. There was something in him of the divine genius with which God occasionally touches one

among us and bids him lead the sons of men. There was honor—against which no shadow of a syllable was ever lisped. There was power—the like of which this Senate Chamber has not known since the founding fathers made us what we are. There was simplicity—the badge of a great soul. And there was the gentle, kindly friendliness and simplicity which made him as beloved as he was respected and revered.

Others have spoken in detail of his great career. Volumes would fail to do it justice. I but add a postscript, as it were, in behalf of what I know was the aching sorrow of tens of millions of his fellow countrymen when they learned, in veritable consternation, that his great heart had ceased to beat and that his invincible eloquence was no longer available to the defense of truth and justice and the American way of life. He was one of those few statesmen—I can think of but two or three others in our history—who was greater than any President under whom he served, and for whom the Presidency itself could have added nothing to his stature or his laurels. He was an institution within himself. His patriotism is part of the American inheritance. When he died one of the Republic's pillars fell. We shall not soon look upon his like again.

Thirty-three fertile years he served within these walls. Within these walls? Ah, Mr. President, he grew so swiftly that no walls could encompass his influence and his authority. Swiftly he became not merely the Senator from Idaho but the Senator of the United States. Nay, more; his fame leaped the boundaries of his native land and spanned the earth. BORAH! It was an electric name in any capitol on earth. BORAH! It was a magnet to draw the throngs of our common citizenship wherever he appeared. BORAH! It was the personification of human aspiration at countless hearthstones beneath the Stars and Stripes. BORAH! If only we could still hear him answer "present" in these cataclysmic times.

Swiftly he grew in the talents which made him the greatest advocate and orator of his time. He became the greatest expounder of the Constitution since Daniel Webster. He seemed to be the living resurrection of all those voices which, for 150 years, have invincibly responded whenever reveille has called the defenders of the faith to their unyielding battle line. He became the greatest apostle of vibrant, self-reliant Americanism since Washington's Farewell Address. He became the Senate's dean, not alone in years of service but in the personal prestige of a unique and mighty character which was worthy of the Senate in its richest tradition since this Government was born.

He loved America—and America loved him. He believed in America and in her independent destiny with a passion that was the touchstone of his life—and America, whether it always agreed with or not, believed in him. It knew his courage. It knew his shining probity. It knew his soul-deep sympathy with human needs. It knew his deathless devotion to representative democracy. It knew his dedication to the common weal. It knew he was a man—in the maximums that term may imply—the noblest work of God.

Fifteen months have rolled down the tragic avenue of time since we bade good-bye to him one peaceful afternoon amid yon western hills which he knew and loved so well. Yet he is here among us at this hour as vividly as though in the flesh. Such spirits do not die. They live—they live—to become lamps to light the way.

Farewell, great patriot, great friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ERNEST W. GIBSON

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ERNEST W. GIBSON, late a Senator from the State of Vermont.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on the occasion of the passing of Senator ERNEST W. GIBSON on June 20, 1940, I expressed here in the Senate the sense of loss and bereavement of all of us who were associated with him in any way, and referred to specific deeds, the chronology of his life, and to his immediate family.

Today, in memoriam, we honor Senator GIBSON's patriotism as an enduring characteristic, and seek to stimulate its personification in others, by perpetuating a portrait of his character as a servant of God and country.

ERNEST WILLARD GIBSON descended from, and inherited qualities of personality of, sturdy New England ancestors. His rugged and thrifty forbears came to Windham County, Vt., about 1800. The family tree became deeply rooted there in the soil of the Green Mountains, and has remained throughout the century and a half of phenomenal change and development of our country. The storms of five wars have not uprooted it nor diminished its vigor. In two of those wars, the Spanish-American War and the World War, and in the Mexican border trouble, Senator GIBSON served in various grades, including captain. His son, Ernest, Jr., is a captain in the Three Hundred and Sixteenth Cavalry, Officers Reserve Corps, ready and willing to respond to the call for the defense of the country.

In passing, as further honoring his father, we record our appreciation of the distinguished service of Ernest Gibson, Jr., in this body, pending the election of my colleague, Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, to serve out the unexpired term to which Senator GIBSON, Sr., was reelected in 1938.

One of the most gracious qualities of Senator GIBSON was sympathetic concern for the men under his command. Veterans and their families were devoted to Senator GIBSON. He had a personal interest in them which began while recruiting—for he was a recruiting officer—and increased during the influenza epidemic which spread through his entire regiment. This sympathetic concern for his comrades was feelingly climaxed by his vote to override President Coolidge's veto of the soldiers' bonus bill. The depth of his anxiety for the security of veterans who had been through the valley of the shadow under his personal, as well as official, care, caused him to endure a political storm, and risk loss of reelection as Representative. This event occurred in the early part of his 10 years' service in the House of Representatives. He had just come through a contest for the Republican nomination for Representative, which in Vermont is tantamount to election, in which his support of the bonus bill was contemplated.

Before the temperature of the approaching election had been run up by debate, Senator GIBSON had been slated for chairman of the Vermont Republican State convention. Afterward, in view of Senator GIBSON's vote for the bonus, another chairman was chosen. He attended the convention, although he suffered from the implication of this action. Some years later he expressed his interpretation of the revocation with a good deal of satisfaction regarding the consequences, and revealed the saving sense of humor with which he was gifted to an unusual degree in an address at West Rutland, Vt., on Memorial Day, 1937, a paragraph from which I quote:

I have had many experiences since it has been my lot to become a public official. I have even been read out of my own party for doing my duty as I conscientiously saw it. And, strange to say, some of those who were active in the attempted political burial of 1924 are still active in the attempted burial of 1937. They bungled in 1924; they are bungling today. I am not going to have that kind of pall bearers. There is honor even in death.

Senator GIBSON was a member of the House Committee on World War Legislation, and while serving on this committee he was impressed by the lack of facilities for handling the cases of individual veterans. He was responsible for the creation of an office in the House Office Building manned by those familiar with veterans' laws. This office afforded Representatives an opportunity to submit their cases directly to representatives of the Veterans' Administration having technical knowledge of the subject, and proved to be a great success and very useful.

Of his service in the House he liked to recall his work on the District Committee. He always had a keen regard for the interests of the National Capital.

He envisaged the District of Columbia as a part of the State of Vermont. To be sure, it was a part equally shared by every other State. However, it was unique in that the Capital of the Nation to which Vermonters belonged was not in or under the control of any other State. Certainly it could not be taken away from Vermont or dominated by any other State or group of States. Always Vermont would, through Congress, participate in governing Washington in respect of all our requirements for a national Capital. He habitually revealed his pride in the city and urged our home people to come and see the improvements and beauty of their own Capital.

Representative GIBSON was responsible for the formation of a subcommittee to investigate all branches of the municipality, and to simplify and reorganize administration of it. He had pleasure in believing that this service resulted in a saving in operating costs of approximately a million dollars annually.

In my opinion, the service in the Senate, which he specially liked, was the work of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. The unsolved problem of government of our extracontinental possessions and territories intrigued him, as it does me. From personal observations some years ago, I can attest the honor and affectionate regard of the people of Hawaii and the Philippine Islands for Senator GIBSON. Guam honored him by naming a highway for him.

In the daily work of the Senate he was not conspicuous as a debater, but he was diligent in his committees.

A friend of mine, who was also a friend of Senator GIBSON's, once said to me:

> He had a most uncanny habit of sticking to some piece of legislation which had not been brought to a successful issue and appearing just at the right time to take it to a goal.

Mr. President, the essential spirit of Vermont, which pervades her mountains and valleys, her factories and homes, that spirit which manifested itself with the advent of the first settlers and developed through centuries of triumph over danger, hardship, and opposition, was exemplified in the life and works of ERNEST WILLARD GIBSON.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in adding my tribute to the memory of the late Senator ERNEST W. GIBSON, it is my good fortune to be able to speak of him not only as a United States Senator but also as a neighbor and as a friend. While I was still in school I learned to know Senator GIBSON. I learned to know the things that prompted him and guided him as a country lawyer, as a commander of military forces, as a public servant in his State, as a Member of the House of Representatives, and finally as a United States Senator.

The things that prompted him were an understanding of and a sympathy and love for his people. As a country lawyer he never made any money. His clients were poor. Large retainers never came his way. He always took the part of the poor people, and too seldom for his own good bothered to send them bills for his services. This policy kept him from having worldly goods and material enjoyments of life which another in his position might have had; but greater than material things he valued friendship and loyalty. When he gave his promise, that promise was kept. As a commanding officer in the Army, his thoughts were always for the welfare of his men. No one who ever served under Colonel GIBSON has been heard to speak ill of him. The ex-service men had a friend in him until the day of his death.

His loyalty to the common people, his devotion to the ex-service men, and his regard for his promises at one time threatened to end his political career abruptly. My colleague has already called attention to the incident which happened in the spring of 1924. At that time Mr. GIBSON had not long been a Member of Congress, but he had pledged himself to do all within his power to secure justice for the ex-service men of the World War. He knew what they had been through, and he knew that America could not adequately pay the debt it owed these men. He knew, too, how sorely most of them needed a little more compensation and assistance in the way of cash. He knew these things, but unfortunately much of the public did not. It was at the session in the spring of 1924 that the veterans' adjusted compensation bill was passed. Representative GIBSON supported and voted for the bill. It was sent to the desk of the Chief Executive. The President was a native son of Vermont, born only a few miles from the place where ERNEST GIBSON was born, and educated in the same high school. The President vetoed the bill. In the House of Representatives, abuse and vituperation were heaped upon the head of Calvin Coolidge for this veto. Among the first to resent the abusive criticism of the President was Representative GIBSON of Vermont. Regarding the veto message, he said:

> It is rather the honest statement of the objections of a courageous Executive in the faithful execution of the duties of his office.
>
> Service men appreciate and honor a man with courage. They may differ with him in his conclusions, but if they are true to honest impulses, they admire the man who stands out in the open and in an upstanding manner states his case. That is just what the President did.

Having thus defended the President for a courageous and honest action, Representative GIBSON then voted to override the veto. He kept his promise to the men who had served their country, though he must have known at the time that his political career was likely to be ended thereby. If he entertained any such fears, subsequent events justified them. As Members of the Senate have been told, the State convention of his party was held in Montpelier that summer. Representative GIBSON was not invited. He was not furnished a ticket to attend the convention. His life-long friend and associate, Colonel Hyland, secured a platform ticket from the secretary, and literally pushed Representative GIBSON to the platform, where he was forced to listen to the adoption of a resolution virtually reading him out of his own political party. Though he must have been hurt to the quick, he took this convention defeat like the soldier he was. After this incident he was firmly fixed in the hearts of the rank and file of Vermonters. Never again was he defeated for office; but he was reelected five times to the National House of Representatives, and twice to the United States Senate.

He never had the wholehearted support of the more powerful business and financial interests of his State. He had the open hostility of much of the press, but time and again he was reelected by ever-increasing majorities by the people who loved and trusted him.

I do not suppose his statue will ever adorn any Hall of Fame. I do not suppose he will ever be recorded as one of the greatest Senators of this great Nation of ours. He spent too much time helping people who needed his help, to carve any niches for himself. But thousands of homes in Vermont are happier today for what ERNEST W. GIBSON did for them. Long after the marble busts of the great and near-great have crumbled to dust, the effect of the good which he so humbly performed will live on. No greater or more lasting monument can stand to any man.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ERNEST LUNDEEN

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I submit the resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was read, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.
>
> *Resolved*, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.
>
> *Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, was born at Beresford, S. Dak., on August 4, 1878. He was married to Norma Matheson Ward, of San Francisco. They had two children, Ernest Ward and Joan Jessie. Senator LUNDEEN was a lawyer and was a member of the Minnesota House of Representatives for two terms, from 1910 to 1914. He was a Member of the Sixty-fifth (war) Congress, 1917–19, and voted against the United States entering the World War and against conscription for foreign service. He served as a private in Company B, Twelfth Regiment, Minnesota Volunteers, during the Spanish-American War. He was a member of the United Spanish War Veterans, and was an honor member of the Veterans of

Foreign Wars. He was a Mason, a Methodist, and was first vice president of the Civil War Veterans Association. He delivered the Memorial Day oration at the National Cemetery, Arlington, Va., in 1919, upon the invitation of the National Grand Army of the Republic. He was elected Congressman at Large to the Seventy-third Congress; he was reelected to the Seventy-fourth Congress from the Third District of Minnesota. Finally, he filed for reelection to Congress in the Third Congressional District primary in 1936, but upon the death of Governor Olson he became a candidate for the United States Senate and was elected on November 3, 1936, by an overwhelming majority.

He was a member of the Military Affairs Committee, the Interstate Commerce Committee, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Indian Affairs, and the Committee on Printing of the United States Senate.

Senator LUNDEEN died on August 31, 1940, in an airplane accident in northern Virginia. There was found in his pocket a poem that his family tells me he always carried with him, a poem by Ralph Chaplin:

Mourn not the dead
That in the cool earth lie—
Dust unto dust—
The calm, sweet earth
That mothers all who die,
As all men must;
But rather mourn
The apathetic throng—
The cowed and meek—
Who see the world's
Great anguish and its wrong
And dare not speak!

—*Ralph Chaplin.*

Mr. President, among the many good things that may be said of Senator LUNDEEN one is that he dared to speak. He was a brave man and a devoted patriot. The records of the American Congress, the records of the legislative assembly of Minnesota bear eloquent testimony to his courage to speak for what he considered the truth and for the welfare of his country. On April 5, 1917, a debate in the House of Representatives, of which he was at that time a Member, was conducted on the question of the adoption of a so-called war resolution. I recall that day to mind because on that day the late Senator from Minnesota as a Member of that House, made an address which I think has stood the test of time and will stand the test of history. I consider that the address he made on that day, that of the Democratic leader of the House at that time, Representative Kitchen, of North Carolina, and the eloquent addresses made in the Senate by Senator Stone, of Missouri, and Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, on that resolution have all stood the test of time and will stand the test of time to come in American history.

Senator LUNDEEN while in the Senate of the United States and also while a Member of the House of Representatives devoted his efforts, his energy, and his eloquence in behalf of the lowly and the poor, for those who had served their country on the field of battle, the American veterans, and particularly to keep the United States Government from becoming entangled in the politics and wars of foreign countries.

Upon this occasion time could be taken to show by the records of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and as well as by the records of the Spanish-American War veterans, that during his entire life the deceased Senator from Minnesota labored faithfully and well in behalf of the plain people and for the welfare of the Nation and its defenders. I shall not take the time of the Senate to dwell upon those activities of the deceased Senator, because they are of record. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the eloquent eulogy of Senator LUNDEEN delivered on the day of his burial by Dr. George Mecklenburg, of Minneapolis, who in his sermon covered the life, character, and achievements of Senator LUNDEEN more eloquently than I can do upon this occasion. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a brief obituary and the program of funeral services on the day of the burial of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

SERMON ADDRESS BY REV. GEORGE MECKLENBURG, OF WESLEY METHODIST CHURCH, MINNEAPOLIS

Text: "But Gamaliel who was highly respected by all the people stood up and said."—Acts vi: 34.

Gamaliel was a member of the Sanhedrin, the legislative body at Jerusalem. He stood out in the first century as a teacher of liberal thought and wide wisdom and prudence. He worked for laws for the poor gentiles so that they should have the same rights as the poor Jews in gathering the gleanings after the harvest. He rose above racial prejudice. He was humane. He advocated laws to protect wives against unprincipled husbands and widows against unscrupulous children.

In crucial moments, when it was not popular, Gamaliel stood up and spoke out. How like Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN. It seems that God always raises up great leaders, in every crisis, who are brave enough and strong enough to stand out against the forces of wrong. Today, again we are in one of the major crises of history. Therefore, the loss of Senator LUNDEEN, just at this moment, seems irreparable, and we can only pray that God again will raise up more strong and fearless leaders in Congress for days like these.

As we scan history we take courage. We note how God has always raised up great leaders who had the courage of their convictions and did that which they believed was right. Amos was such a prophet. He stood up and spoke the truth even at the King's banquet. Jeremiah dared to stand alone with God. Savanarola cried out against evil in Italy. John Huss never compromised with autocracy. Martin Luther at the Diet of Worms stood up for spiritual freedom. John Knox criticized Mary, Queen of Scots, to her very face. Voltaire stood up for truth and justice and tolerance. Wesley advocated a free evangelical Christianity. Roger Williams stood for religious liberty in our country. John Brown, Wilberforce, and Lincoln fought for the freedom of the slaves.

That is the way social and moral progress has always been made. Let us thank God and take courage in the fact that we do have people who dare to stand up and save the day for righteousness. If the time ever comes that our prophets are under the thumb of some social system or some totalitarian party, then pity civilization. To muzzle healthy protest is to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs of progress.

Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN stood up again and again in Congress and protested against the evils of our day. He will always be remembered by his friends as well as by his enemies as a man who believed tremendously, who worked sincerely for that which he believed. It mattered not what the popular clamor of the moment might be. He was not an ordinary politician. We might call him a statesman. It would, perhaps, be more true to call him a prophet—a secular prophet of our times.

His stand on the World War is the best example of that. In April 1917, in the House of Representatives, he voted "no" to the act of war that plunged our country into the European chaos for which we were totally unprepared. Before he voted, though he knew it was hopeless, he cried out like a prophet in the wilderness against it. He said: "We cannot hope to maintain the Monroe Doctrine and at the same time interfere in the affairs of other continents. I stand with George Washington and Thomas Jefferson on a policy of absolute neutrality. I place America first. I have but one allegiance, and that is to my native land. I have but one country, and that is the United States. Let America show love, not hatred, to the battle-torn people of Europe. Let us show compassion, not revenge. Let us play the part of the Good Samaritan. The spirit of Christianity, peace, and sanity must be preserved here in the United States. On Good Friday, about to break, you are proceeding to add to the agony of a world already crucified by war." Many people who severely criticized him at the time feel he has been vindicated in this stand. He was not carried off by the hysteria of war.

Senator LUNDEEN was a great friend, and he had hosts of friends. The thousands of letters, telegrams, and floral tributes that have arrived in Minneapolis the last 2 days from every State in the Union tell the story of the regard in which he was held by millions. Messages have been received from the President of the United States, down to a colored bootblack in Minneapolis. His political opponents are as generous in tribute as his coworkers.

The sorrow of the State of Minnesota and the Nation is deep and genuine. The masses have lost a friend and an advocate.

I saw a letter he wrote recently philosophizing the duties of a public servant today. I have picked a few sentences from this letter, and they read as follows: "After all, we are only the hired men of the people. Support all programs for security in old age. Remember the veterans of our wars. Remember the youth of America, who are entitled to an education and a permanent job. Remember the farmer. Defend the small merchant. Be a fighting, liberal progressive. Fight for a government such as was defined by Abraham Lincoln—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Senator LUNDEEN was always the champion of the poor. He fought for and really saved the bonus bill for our war veterans. He was the constant supporter of the post-office employees. He always worked for better labor laws.

He was implacably against war, because, he said, the poor pay the price of war. He believed no foreign war should be declared except by a vote of the people. He was not a pacifist. He believed in preparedness for America, but America only.

I maintain he was a Gamaliel. He was respected by the people, even though he stood up and spoke up whether it was good politics or not.

Now his work is suddenly cut off, and it seems to us that his task has not been completed. But is not that true of all life? We only start work here. It takes eternity to complete life.

The best thing about today is tomorrow. The best thing about time is eternity. Eternity completes, explains, and fulfills time. We certainly can see now that one world at a

time is not enough. It takes eternity to put vitality into sagging life.

I fear too many of us have a mechanical, barrenly theological, or magic idea of immortality. If we understood immortality as Jesus taught it, we would practice it and glory in it. Definite, practical, working immortality becomes ours when we realize that life is so unfinished that we need eternity to complete it.

Those who set their faces toward achieving great results, exploring great truths, mastering great tasks find life expanding until the horizons reach out into eternity itself.

Immortality to be anything but an intellectual or academic belief must become an experience of today. It is when we live imperishable values, when we are busy with eternal principles, that we begin to experience everlasting life. It is when life is bent on interests that transcend time that faith in immortality becomes vital. So it is life that determines immortality. That is what Jesus meant when He said, "He that knoweth God hath immortality." It is a present and eternal possession.

So the fulfillment of life beyond possibilities of this temporary and unsettled existence is the demand of life itself. God in eternity will complete these broken and incomplete lives of ours. History itself needs eternity for its fulfillment. Immortality is the very basic center of life philosophy. It is a living challenge to our day—a challenge to every form of materialism; a challenge to us to live a life of immortality here and now. It challenges every movement to treat men as less than immortals. It challenges every attempt to exploit men for profit; all movements of totalitarians that subject men to the government. The only effective basis for democracy and freedom must be found in the regal nature of man himself. The central weakness of our times is our lack of vital faith in man as an eternal being. Politics without God and immortality always ends in tyranny and dictatorships. On the other hand, immortals cannot be enslaved.

The whole Nation is in mourning over the 25 people who were lost in this major airplane accident of our country. We express sympathy to their dear ones. Mrs. Lundeen received yesterday a telegram from one of the mourners of this accident. It reads as follows: "My deepest sympathy goes out to you. I, too, had a sister on the same plane."

This tragic death of the Senator is a personal sorrow to me as his pastor. Only the other day I received a handwritten note from him reading: "George, don't get discouraged. Keep up the fight. The hope of the world, after all, is in religion. We'll make a good world out of it yet."

It is altogether fitting and proper that Senator LUNDEEN should be buried in Little Arlington National Cemetery at Fort Snelling. It was the Lundeen bill that created this cemetery which will become one of the beauty spots of Minnesota in time. There he will be laid to rest, but his work goes on. May God raise up workmen who will carry on.

There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some fairer shore,
And bright in Heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain or mellow fruit
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

The granite rocks disorganize
To feed the hungry moss they bear;
The forest leaves drink daily life
From out the viewless air.

And ever near us, though unseen,
The dear immortal spirits tread;
For all the boundless universe
Is life—there are no dead.

OBITUARY

ERNEST LUNDEEN was born at Beresford, S. Dak., August 4, 1878.

His father was the Reverend Charles Lundeen, minister of the Swedish Mission Church.

After graduating from Carlton College he graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School in 1904. He was admitted to the bar in 1906.

He married Miss Norma Matheson Ward, of San Francisco, Calif., in 1919. Mrs. Lundeen and two children, Ernest Ward and Joan Jessie, survive him.

Early in life he became interested in civic life. He felt he could best serve his country in politics. He was elected a member of the Minnesota House of Representatves for two terms, 1910–14. He became known then as an independent thinker and an independent voter.

Then he served as a Member of the Sixty-fifth (war) Congress in 1917–19. In this Congress he voted against war and against conscription for foreign service.

He served as private in Company B, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Volunteers, Spanish-American War.

Senator LUNDEEN was a loyal member of many organizations: United Spanish War Veterans; honor member, Veterans of Foreign Wars; the Masonic Lodge, No. 19, Minneapolis; the Wesley Methodist Church, Minneapolis; he was vice president of Civil War Veterans' Association.

Senator LUNDEEN delivered Memorial Day oration at National Cemetery, Arlington, Va., in 1919 upon invitation of the National Grand Army of the Republic.

He was elected Congressman at large to the Seventy-third Congress. Reelected to the Seventy-fourth Congress from the Third Congressional District. Upon the death of the late Gov. Floyd B. Olson he received the unanimous nomination of the Farmer-Labor Party for the United States Senate and was elected to that office on November 3, 1936.

In the Senate he served on the following committees: Military Affairs Committee, Interstate Commerce Committee, Territories and Insular Affairs Committee, Indian Affairs Committee, and Printing Committee.

ERNEST LUNDEEN

Born August 4, 1878—Died August 31, 1940

State Representative, 1910–14

United States Congressman, 1917–19, 1933–36

United States Senator, 1937–40

United States Senate and House of Representatives represented by United States Senator Edwin C. Johnson, United States Senator James E. Murray, United States Senator Rush D. Holt, United States Senator Henrik Shipstead, United States Congressman August H. Andresen, United States Congressman Elmer J. Ryan, United States Congressman Melvin J. Maas, United States Congressman, Richard T. Buckler, Sergeant at Arms Chesley W. Jurney.

THE FUNERAL SERVICES FOR ERNEST LUNDEEN, UNITED STATES SENATOR, STATE OF MINNESOTA

Rotunda of the State capitol, St. Paul, Minn.

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

Prelude.....String Quartet
Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra

Hymn—
Rock of Ages.....Wesley Church Quartet
Scripture and Prayer—
Dr. George Mecklenberg,
Pastor, Wesley M. E. Church, Minneapolis, Minn.
Solo, More Secure Can No One Be—
Mr. Rueben E. Holmquist
Sermon Address.....Dr. George Mecklenberg
Hymn, Beautiful Isle of Somewhere—
Wesley Church Quartet
Benediction.

Masonic services will be conducted under the auspices of Minneapolis Lodge, No. 19, A. F. and A. M., at the grave side in Fort Snelling National Cemetery.

Military honors by Spanish-American War Veterans.

Honorary pallbearers: Gov. Harold E. Stassen, Mayor John J. McDonough, Mayor George E. Leach, Hon. Guy Alexander, Hon. Hjalmar Petersen, Hon. George H. Lommen, Hon. Joseph Wolf, Herman Aufderheide, Hon. Charlie Munn, Hon. Victor Lawson, Hon. Nels A. Pederson, Hon. Edward Hagen, Hon. George Hagen, Hon. Paul Kvale, Dr. Paul Hartig, Judge J. B. Himsl, Judge George F. Sullivan, Judge Harry H. Peterson, Judge Vince A. Day, Judge John P. Devaney, Judge Mark Nolan, R. D. Cramer, J. B. Boscoe, A. F. Whitney, Hon. William Mahoney, A. Lockhart, Jack Lyons, M. E. Jerdee, Andrew Hawkins, Col. Walter E. Downey, William T. Boyce, Hugo Koch, Robert J. Johnstone, Tom Davis, William de Parcq, E. A. Rerat, Frank Osterlind, Hon. Elmer Benson, Hon. Dewey Johnson, Jacob Kunz, Frank Forestal, Otto Bremer, Walter Heynacher, Neil Messick, J. Fred Johnson, Dr. O. W. Schlopp, Hon. I. G. Scott, Edward Chalgren, John W. Graff, Julius Reiter, Otto Baudler, Charles Swenson, Charles Lundquist, C. L. Holt, George Lawson, Robert Olson, Gottfried Lindstein, William Mee, Lewis E. Lohmann, H. O. Peterson, Paul Rasmussen, Hon. Henry Arens, Philip de More, John Simcoe, and Hon. S. A. Stockwell.

Active pallbearers (Spanish-American War veterans): William R. Ambrose, Otto A. Zimmermann, Wirth H. Kelley, Ole Sandsted, Guy Thompson, and John W. Milligan.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, my colleague the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has spoken much more adequately than I could of the long and distinguished legislative career of the late Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN.

I should like to speak for just a moment of some of those warm, human attributes of the late Senator which impressed me. I did not know him intimately and my contact with him was entirely as a newspaper man observing and reporting political activities from the side lines.

I remember the first time I ever saw him in action. It was in a primary campaign in 1928 when he was running for the Senatorial nomination of his party, and I was sent out to cover a summer picnic at which he spoke. When his turn to speak arrived, he climbed on the truck which served as platform with the agility of a boy. My cub reporter's boredom at one more speech soon vanished and so did that of the audience as ERNIE LUNDEEN, with that artistry which was his, picked up their interest and held fast their attention as he developed his theme. Though I have forgotten what the issues were in that campaign, that speech of the late Senator still stands out in my memory as one of the most engaging, most human political talks I have ever heard.

To an exceptional degree, Senator LUNDEEN possessed the ability to enliven his arguments on weighty issues with apt and very human anecdotes and to drive home his points with simple, homely illustrations which carried their full meaning to every listener.

He won the nomination, though not the election, in 1928, but he tried again in 1930 and I recall how in that campaign

he covered our entire State in his old automobile, driving into one small town after another, stopping at the main intersections, setting up his own loud speaker and making his speech after playing a couple of phonograph records to collect a crowd. Then when he had finished, he would take up a collection from the audience, and the nickels and dimes contributed paid his campaign expenses. It was that sort of human, simple campaigning, carried on by ERNIE LUNDEEN in Minnesota in one election after another, that won for him the host of friends who were so shocked and saddened at his sudden death last August 31. And it was typical of their feeling for him that he was always ERNIE LUNDEEN to his home State, never the Honorable ERNEST LUNDEEN.

While the late Senator was not of my party and our views on many issues differed fundamentally, yet there were many things about him that his political foes admired as much as did his friends.

One was his unquestioned courage. He never hesitated to espouse a cause he believed just, regardless of how unpopular that cause might be at the moment. His dogged determination was a byword in the State. Senator LUNDEEN just never quit. I think he was defeated in running for public office about as many times as he was elected, and yet he kept on running and eventually won.

But perhaps the quality in Senator LUNDEEN that appealed most to me, as it would to most newspaper men, was his sense of humor. He fought long and hard for many causes, but he never lost his sense of proportion, never draped the Messiah's cloak from his own shoulders. He took his work and the political principles which he espoused very seriously, but he never took himself too seriously. To himself he was always just ERNIE LUNDEEN, a good soldier doing the best he could.

When the odds against him in a campaign were insurmountable and no one knew it better than he, Senator LUNDEEN could crack jokes about his chances and then go on to put up the best fight that was in him.

It was these very human, lovable qualities in ERNEST LUNDEEN that made him friends wherever he went and caused the people of Minnesota, of all parties, to mourn his untimely death.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

KEY PITTMAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution—Senate Resolution 103—was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. KEY PITTMAN, late a Senator from the State of Nevada and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the battle-born State has given much to the Nation. Its treasure, taken from its hills, contributed to the national wealth at a time when most needed. It has, besides, given the golden treasure of human ability, depicted by men who have represented Nevada in this Chamber, and it has exemplified the true spirit of the great West in the courage, foresight, and statesmanship of its great Senators who have passed on. But in no instance has it contributed more of human integrity, honesty, foresight, and ability than it did in the record and life of KEY PITTMAN, a Senator from Nevada, commencing his illustrious career here in this Chamber in 1913 and continuing until his death in November 1940.

It was my privilege to know KEY PITTMAN with as much intimacy as he usually permitted to his fellow men. It was my privilege to be a fellow pioneer with him in one of the great gold and silver rushes of western America, when he first took up his residence in the State which he afterward represented so well in the Senate of the United States.

Together, as residents of Tonopah, Nev., we saw the tide of humanity ebb and flow into the mining regions, where gold lured men and women from the ends of the earth. He brought with him into his then adopted State the experience and toughening that come to men who brave the far-flung reaches of the frozen north. KEY PITTMAN had tried his luck and courted fortune within the Arctic Circle. He mushed a dog team into Nome, there to mingle with men where cruel nature cast the weak aside and only the strong could endure and abide.

He was born in Mississippi. He received his law degree at George Washington University. He ventured into the practice of the law in the Northwest. He became one of the famous committee that formed the consent government of the boom town of Nome, Alaska. It was KEY PITTMAN who was a member of the consent committee which brought law and order to that region of the frozen north. He was possessed of a venturesome spirit, and, after having remained in Alaska for some years, he left that region to go into the newly discovered mining camps of southern Nevada. He was alone when he went into Alaska. He left there after having chosen his life's companion, Mimosa Gates, and it was she who was destined to be honored by his brilliant companionship during all the years of his great service in the Senate of the United States. It is she who mourns him most today, notwithstanding the great sorrow that we all bear by reason of his departure from our midst.

Few men there are who ever learned of the rich, scintillating, innermost being of KEY PITTMAN; but those who gained a glimpse of his real being were bound to him by hoops of steel, rejoicing in their acquaintance with him.

He was born in September 1872 in a fine old southern home, where the spirit of the true chivalrous South became a part of his very being. Notwithstanding the refinement that was a part of his nature, and notwithstanding his retiring disposition, he knew the language and the life of the lowly and the humble as well as of the exalted. He entered the miner's cabin with the same grace that was his in entering the mansion of the great.

He went into places of great power when in 1933, as a representative of his country, he went to Great Britain to a world monetary and economic conference.

He was comparatively only slightly acquainted in Nevada when he was first elected to the Senate, his majority on that occasion being less than 100 votes. He was elected and reelected, and met his last great success at the polls of his State when he was reelected in November 1940, although at that moment he was on the couch whence he never arose; and, indeed, so serious was his illness that he may never have known the fact that the people of his State had chosen him to succeed himself for the fifth time, and that time by the largest majority he had ever received.

The respect that was his among the people of his State was equally his to enjoy among his companions of the Senate on either side of the aisle.

He was recognized as an authority on matters pertaining to the West. The cause of silver was his abiding thought. His name, during the latter years of his life, was synonymous with monetary silver.

As chairman of a special committee having to do with the study of the cause of silver, he was an incessant worker. He saw his efforts crowned with success when in 1934 his Silver Purchase Act passed through this body and through the House and received the signature of the President.

Early in his senatorial career he became a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. His successive terms in this body gave him seniority in that committee; and when the present administration came into power on the 4th of March 1933, he was chosen chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to serve through some of the most important sessions ever held by that great and powerful group of the Senate.

KEY PITTMAN was an unswerving party man. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he carried the banner of the administration regardless of his own convictions. This was his policy in all things political. He stood high in the councils of his party at all times from the occasion when he first entered the Senate of the United States until the day of his passing. He was elected secretary of the Senate's Democratic Cau-

cus, and served in that capacity from 1913 to 1917. The Democratic conference of this body nominated him for President pro tempore of the Senate for the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, and Seventy-second Congresses; and finally, when his party came into power again in 1933 he was unanimously elected in this body to be President pro tempore of the Senate.

Thus, KEY PITTMAN, by this own efforts, and representing a State of only 110,000 population, became President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States and chairman of the powerful Committee on Foreign Relations at one and the same time, which high positions he occupied at the day of his death. He not only bore those honors with humility, but he bore them with profound ability, and he reflected the honor which he had won upon the State he represented and upon its people.

The National Democratic Party honored him as few have been honored. He was elected chairman of the platform and resolutions committee at the Democratic National Convention in 1928, and he was elected by that convention to notify Gov. Alfred E. Smith, of New York, of his nomination as a candidate of the Democratic Party for President of the United States.

In all things he undertook in his official life he gave unstintingly of his time and of his ability. He thought less of himself than he did of the cause or the country which he represented. His likes and dislikes for men and plans and policies were keenly marked and vividly evidenced. That trait of character which some men took for abruptness in his manner was in reality a reserve or reservation on his part. He was not quick to form conclusions, but was usually very tenacious when he had arrived at a conclusion.

He was fond of nature, and he loved life. Early in his career in this body he formed and continued to be a member of the Wildlife Committee. He made valuable contributions in the way of legislation for the preservation and protection of the Nation's resources in wildlife. His only mode of diversion from the duties of official life was in the field with his fellows, on the hunt, or on the brook. Those who joined him of an evening at the huntsmen's fire in valley or on mountainside were richly rewarded by coming in contact with his knowledge of the ways of nature in the rough.

And so, this man whose boyhood knew the fragrance of the sweet magnolia and whose early manhood found him braving the dangers of the frozen north, and whose mature life was spent representing a soverign State in the Senate of the United States and at the councils where power and affluence were present, this man, called Senator by some, called KEY by thousands, this man beloved in this Chamber and respected everywhere, rounded out a great career, the last worldly reward of which was the overwhelming call of his State to represent it again in the Senate of the United States. This man possessed of power, yet wielding it not; this man possessed of courage, yet showing only kindness—KEY PITTMAN, soldier of fortune, Senator, statesman, returned to the State he so much loved to close his life. His history and memory will abide on the hillsides, in the valleys, on the deserts, and plains of the "battle born" State. His name will never be uttered save with a mark of respect and an emphasis of sincere gratitude.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, as I stand here today on the floor of the United States Senate, with the vision before me of the man whom I had the honor to succeed, my mind goes back to the first time I ever saw Nevada's beloved KEY PITTMAN. Senator PITTMAN had traveled across the State on this occasion to speak in a little frontier town in Nevada. It was my home town, St. Thomas, a small community now gone forever in the advance of progress, the advance of a great enterprise made possible largely through this man's efforts. The waters of the lake created by the building of Boulder Dam now cover this historic city where KEY PITTMAN came that night so many years ago.

I remember how the people gathered from miles around to greet him. The old and young, the farmers and the miners, everyone who could walk or ride a horse was there for his appearance.

The crowd was thrilled by his address that evening. The force of his personality, the strength of his words, and the wisdom behind them, made a profound impression on me, an impression which has remained with me throughout the years. The memory of the greatness of KEY PITTMAN, which I first saw displayed that night, will continue with me all my life.

The blood of the pioneers of America flowed through the veins of KEY PITTMAN. Cradled in the home of democracy, he spent his early youth in the South, the section from whence came Jefferson and Jackson, the founders of the principles which are the ideals and concepts of the Democratic Party. Here was inculcated in his heart the democratic spirit, which never wavered throughout his lifetime. He carried this spirit on across the country as he searched for new frontiers. He first settled in Seattle, Wash., where, at the age of 20, he began the practice of law, following in the footsteps of his father.

Imbued with the restlessness which has marked our truly great pioneers, he moved northward into Alaska. Here Providence smiled on him, and, as in a storybook romance, he met and married Mimosa Gates. She contributed more to his success than did any other influence. For 40 years she was his confidante and companion along the path of his great career. Although his quest for gold was unsuccessful, he found that which is more precious than gold, the love of an understanding and devoted wife.

It was in Alaska that there came into being his passion for mining and for the metals of the earth. He returned to the States and settled in the mining districts of Nevada, where he developed his vital interest in gold and silver, which led to his career as one of the most famous metal experts in world history. In his early days, as he practiced law in Tonapah, he began his fight for the miners and their industry, which he carried on to the United States Senate, and championed until the day of his death. Just as the metals industry will never forget his efforts in their behalf, so the rugged prospectors who are the heart of this industry, will never forget that he was their spokesman and their champion. A few days ago I visited Senator PITTMAN's home town. I found many of his old-time friends, their hands scarred with years of toil, who spoke affectionately of their "friend, KEY." One of them put into words to me the feeling that is so much a part of them all. He said:

I voted for him the first time he ever ran, and for 30 years I've been voting the same way.

The spirit of a pioneering wanderlust that marked PITTMAN's life carried him on to conquer new fields. Not until he became a Member of this great body did he find himself. Here he found his life work, a work worthy of his genius. From the time he became a Member of the United States Senate, his creed was to fight for a cause, the cause of humanity, and in this battle, he fought with all the great talents at his command. It seems as though he brought Nevada back here in his heart. He drew strength from the hills, loyalty from his companions of the Western frontier, and vision from the vast expanse of valleys lying in the mountains of the West.

There is no need to speak further of his accomplishments in the Senate. His contributions at the Senate helm of our foreign relations and as a presiding officer here, as well as his many other achievements, are indelibly inscribed in the annals of this body, and are a lasting monument to his life and works.

As we look upon the career of KEY PITTMAN, we cannot help but feel that throughout his whole being there ran not a single thread of fear. In the present world crisis, we know that he would stand firm in the conviction that democracy will prevail and will continue to exist long after the dictators have been swept from the earth.

If PITTMAN had a hatred in his heart, it was for dictatorship and all the evils which it has heaped upon a free people.

PITTMAN loved freedom. He was a descendant of Francis Scott Key, who penned the words of our national anthem. It is men such as he who have lived these words which ring in the heart of America:

The Star-Spangled Banner, oh long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!

He lived these words and he died for these words. It was the 30 years of unstinting, loyal, and courageous service which he gave to his country that resulted in his death. It is written, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend." PITTMAN'S friend was his country.

The names of his colleagues who represented this body and traveled to his last resting place to do him honor will be forever written in the history of the

great State of Nevada. As the one who has the great privilege of succeeding him, I can only borrow the words of the great American jurist and statesman, WALTER F. GEORGE, who delivered the eulogy for the late Senator, and speaking in behalf of the people of Nevada I say, "KEY PITTMAN was our friend and we loved him."

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, one of Mississippi's greatest contributions to the ages has been the galaxy of fine sons and daughters who have migrated to other commonwealths to bless and enrich a Nation. At one time, about 3 decades ago, seven native-born Mississippians were serving together in the United States Senate.

High on the honor roll of men who have gone forth from my State to bring distinction to other regions is the name of our late revered colleague KEY PITTMAN, the pride of Nevada—KEY PITTMAN who, for 28 continuous and fruitful years, represented the great State of Nevada in the United States Senate, and who was for the last 8 years president pro tempore of this august body and chairman of the important Foreign Relations Committee.

On this solemn memorial occasion, the urgent and sacred voice of inspiration bids me speak for my State and for myself, a sincere tribute to the memory of this illustrious native Mississippian.

KEY PITTMAN was born in the year of our Lord 1872, in historic Vicksburg, close by the mighty Father of Waters. Born among such historic scenes and colorful associations, and to whose cradle a splendid heritage of birth brought the gift of sterling character and intellect, he emerged into the world to walk hand in hand with a destiny that led to various points of the compass. He was predestined, it would seem, to great adventure and achievement in far places.

The picturesque environs of the Father of Waters fired the young man's imagination at a time when the spirits of many men were inspired by the challenge of adventure and new enterprise. With an enviable native ability, embellished by a thorough education, he embarked upon a career such as falls to the lot of very few. He seemed to move within a charmed circle, as it were. It was as though he wore his name itself as a sort of magic talisman. It is certain that he had the key to the hearts of his fellowmen, the key to their minds, the key to open the doors of opportunity to service wherever he chanced to explore. He drew friends and followers to his bosom, as the sun draws the morning dew. He had the power to fathom the latent possibilities of other men of spine and make them think.

At the tender age of 20 years, with high purpose in his heart and a law degree in his portfolio, he responded to the lure of the new and plastic West. He hung out his shingle in Seattle, Wash., but soon the pioneering spirit which burned in his soul beckoned him onward to more distant horizons. He moved on out to wintry Alaska, and on that frontier he displayed at once a fine talent for statesmanship of a constructive order. He was one of the committee which formulated the "consent" form of government for Nome, Alaska; was first prosecuting attorney there, at a stage of life when the careers of most men are scarcely begun.

Returning to the States in 1902, he settled in Nevada, in the Golden West that so intrigued him. Possessed of an amazing faculty for leadership, aided by strong courage and rugged honesty, he soon entrenched himself in the public mind of his adopted State. The fact that he won the first and only public office he ever sought at the hands of the people—that of United States Senator—bears eloquent and convincing testimony to the love and confidence reposed in him by the people. In 1912, when he had been a resident of the State for only a brief decade, he was elected to represent the State of Nevada in the United States Senate. Over and over again he was returned to his post with the plaudit of his constituents, "Well done, good and faithful public servant. We are pleased with your record so resplendent with achievement, so replete with accomplishments that have called into action so many of your talents." He had just heard that significant plaudit once more; had just been reelected for another term, when on that fateful day last autumn, while the earth was wrapped in its flaming autumn glory, the Creator saw fit to end forever the earthly labors of our beloved colleague.

When the sad intelligence of his passing was flashed to us on that melancholy day of November last we received the somber tiding with stunned, bewildered minds. It was difficult for us to believe that our distinguished leader had departed on that great adventure from which no traveler returneth. He had almost reached the Biblical threescore years and ten, yet we were shocked to know that he had been snatched from us when his hopes and aims were still so warm and vital, actuated as he was by an unfailing energy and zeal that had ever kept alive in his breast the spark of patriotic fire and fidelity to duty. His loss pressed close upon our hearts and minds. His death cast a pall over the Nation as well. Indeed, it cast a long shadow across the seas to other nations, for his name was known to peoples of other lands. His extensive information and broad perspective gave him distinguished rank in any place or any country. It was KEY PITTMAN whom President Roosevelt sent as a delegate to the historic Monetary and Economic Conference in London in 1933.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations he stood before the world as a foremost representative of true American thought, among the boldest and clearest exponents of democracy. His rare gifts of tact and tolerance were recognized far and wide in a turbulent world threatened with ruin and desolation.

If the duration of a man's existence is to be measured by deeds, then KEY PITTMAN lived well beyond the allotted three score years and ten. Had he lived beyond the proverbial span, even as men measure time by the calendar, still we should have said that his going was untimely. But we bow to the will of the Infinite One who doeth all things well. In obeisance to the Higher Will we lay aside our robes of mourning, but we shall always miss the guidance and friendship of our departed colleague.

We shall meet, but we shall miss him,
There will be one vacant chair.

Mr. President, words would fail me, I am sure, if I should attempt to delineate in detail the fabric of his remarkable character. Nor do I think he would wish us to adorn his memory with effusive valedictories, for he shunned ostentation of speech and manner. He never made any effort to court the spotlight or vaunt his deeds. He was ruggedly earnest and forthright in all he said and did. The brilliance of his record shone in every path he trod; yet he went his way with modest unobtrusiveness. His attitude was—

Unblemished let me live or die unknown,
Oh, grant me an honest fame or grant me none.

I have the feeling, too, that if he could have spoken to us as the twilight shadows gathered around him he would have said, with the immortal Tennyson:

Sunset and evening star
And one clear call for me.
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

* * * * *

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark.

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.

We are loath to speak of KEY PITTMAN as dead. Except in the sense of ashes to ashes and dust to dust, such men do not die. For a man who goes before the bar of the Most Worthy Judge Eternal with his obligations so well fulfilled, what we call death is mere transition, a transmutation from mortality into immortality.

'Tis not the whole of life to live,
Nor all of death to die.

Good and lasting deeds live on to give immortal youth to mortal man. His star goes down only to rise and shine again in some other sphere.

When historians shall have written his imperishable biography, well may they say of KEY PITTMAN that every place where he has lingered bears the stamp of his forceful personality; his influence deeply etched into the places where he has served. Well may they trace the paths of his entire life and find his footprints on the sand of time. He built life well before the contemporary world and before oncoming generations. The fruits of his life work will be associated with many pages of illuminating public record.

We are mindful that in the lives of all men much of their career, like their mortal remains, becomes as dust. But there is so much to be remembered of KEY PITTMAN. Time alone can mature many of the fine things he has wrought or bring into full flower many a monumental measure he has sponsored or helped to sponsor through long, laborious years of consecrated service to his country.

The sweet remembrance of the just
Shall flourish when he sleeps in dust.

No one can say of KEY PITTMAN that he was not always wholly and altogether just, sincere, and true. No prejudice or dogma dimmed the luster of his reasoning. He fervently and valiantly carried the torch for the party of his political faith—the Democratic Party—but he always looked at men and measures with clear, discerning eyes unclouded by partisanship or extremity. He sought to assuage party differences with his calm manner and impartiality. His virile countenance, homespun honesty, simplicity, and tolerance characterized him as a living symbol of democracy, transcending all party lines.

He accepted disappointments with complacency, but not with compromise. When hopes or aims were thwarted, he girded himself to gather up the ashes of his shattered dreams and build again.

He made no truce with injustice or oppression. A bulwark of political and social justice, he labored for the advancement of all the people. By nature, by impulse, political sympathies, and fixed habit of mind, he was a true friend of the people—a humanitarian of purest ray. He believed in the people, as they believed in him. In his great heart he nurtured a poetic faith in the eternal rightness of a people's democracy. His creed, I think, is well expressed in the words of another, who said, long years ago:

Little by little the world grows strong,
Fighting the battle of right and wrong;
Little by little the wrong gives way,
Little by little the right has sway;
Little by little all longing souls
Struggle up nearer the shining goals.

His body has its fit resting place in the West he loved so well, but the spirit of KEY PITTMAN rests over a nation; it hovers over the Senate Chamber.

The good wife who mourns for her devoted husband, and all who knew and lived him best will find comfort in the knowledge that the world has been vastly enriched because he lived and worked and served.

His soul has joined that ever-lengthening caravan of colleagues who have crossed the Great Divide; joined now by another great statesman whom we tenderly laid to rest just a few days ago, under the canopy of the vaulted Texas skies—the venerable MORRIS SHEPPARD, the dean of Congress.

I am profoundly grateful for the inspiration, honor, and privilege of having served side by side with such men as KEY PITTMAN and MORRIS SHEPPARD and others whose lives we commemorate. Deep in the caverns of my memory I shall preserve a hallowed remembrance of those most excellent patriots and gentlemen; and I cherish the fervent hope that—

When crystal streams through endless years
Flow over golden sands
And where all hearts are young again,
I'll clasp my colleagues' hands.

May God rest their souls in everlasting peace and joy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

MORRIS SHEPPARD

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution, Senate Resolution 104, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on the 9th of the present month Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, weakened by exhaustion and wearied by overwork, fell at his post. The unusual demands upon his vitality made by representation of a populous and large State and the crushing burden of his duties as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs during the present emergency were more than his endurance could sustain.

Senator SHEPPARD will be widely and deeply mourned and missed in the Senate of the United States. A man of unimpeachable character and purity in both public and private life, he possessed a gentleness and an urbanity of manner by which he reached, without any exertion, a place in the affections and in the admiration of all with whom he came in contact. Here in this Chamber he was beloved on both sides of the aisle, beloved and esteemed by reason of the fine, manly qualities which distinguished his service and his private life. His vacant seat will be simply a symbol of what his outstanding services in this Chamber meant to the great constituency which he represented and to his colleagues in this Chamber; and today, Mr. President, the people of the great Commonwealth of Texas, Senators, and Members of the House, members of the judiciary and of the executive departments of the Government, all those throughout the United States who have come to form a personal acquaintance with MORRIS SHEPPARD, are grieved and saddened by his death.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was born in Morris County, Tex., in 1875. In the public schools, as well as in the university, he was distinguished by scholarship and by rare oratorical gifts. My first acquaintance with Senator SHEPPARD was while he represented the University of Texas in an oratorical contest which was held at another college, which I attended. I was a student at Baylor University, at Waco, Tex. The contest was held in the chapel of Baylor University. MORRIS SHEPPARD, then a student at the University of Texas, was its representative in that contest. At that time he was a man of great buoyancy and enthusiasm, a very charming, winning personality, and with a fluency and with an oratorical gift that held the listener absolutely to rapt attention.

In the fall of 1896 I entered the junior law class of the University of Texas. The future Senator SHEPPARD was a member of the senior law class; and from that time, when I first became well acquainted with him, until the hour of his death I have enjoyed an intimate and a very tender personal relationship and association; and as his colleague here in the Senate I have enjoyed 12 years of companionable and satisfactory association with him.

Senator SHEPPARD graduated in the academic department of the University of Texas in 1895, and in the law department in 1897. He then attended Yale Law School, from which he graduated with distinction in 1898. Shortly thereafter he located for the practice of law at Pittsburg, in Camp County, Tex.; but shortly thereafter, in 1899, he moved to Texarkana, which remained his residence until the time of his death.

Senator SHEPPARD's father, Hon. John L. Sheppard, had been distinguished in our State as a lawyer and as a district judge, and then as a Member of Congress. In 1902 Judge Sheppard, while a Member of the House of Representatives, vacated his seat by death. Among the other candidates for the position was his son, MORRIS SHEPPARD, then just a few months past 27 years of age. There was a large field of candidates—many seasoned politicians and many men who had spent years in public life and who were prominent at the bar and in the industrial and agricultural life of that section of Texas. But this boy, who had never held a public office and who had never been a candidate for public office, easily outdistanced them all in the primary and, as I now recall, against a field of five or six opponents received a majority of all the votes cast. He entered the House of Representatives in December 1902 and served in that body for a period of 10 years.

In 1912 in the Democratic primaries to select a nominee to succeed Senator Joseph W. Bailey in the United States Senate, MORRIS SHEPPARD, then a Member of the House, was a candidate, and was nominated in the primary and was elected by the legislature. Upon the convening of the legislature in January 1913, he was, in obedience to the nomination of his party, in the primary elected to the full 6-year term. In the meantime Senator Bailey had resigned, effective several months before the expiration of his regular term, and another had been appointed in his stead; but the legislature elected Senator SHEPPARD for the unexpired term as well as for the full term, and he took his seat in this body in January 1913, where he served continuously until the time of his death.

As is well known, Senator SHEPPARD was a member of a number of important committees, particularly the Committee on Commerce, in which he took a great interest because of its jurisdiction over the improvement of waterways and the deepening of harbors; and his particular interest, of course, was by reason

of the fact that the people of his State, bordering on the Gulf, are deeply interested in projects of that character. He was also a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which he became chairman, and where his unremitting energies and his undiminished toil, even in the face of weariness and sometimes illness, were largely responsible for his passing away at a relatively youthful age.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was a man of lofty conceptions of public duty, as well as splendid conceptions of private duty. He was a man of high moral character and moral courage. It is to be remembered that, through his activities in behalf of prohibition and temperance, he became the author of the eighteenth amendment. Though the sentiment of the Nation later changed, it did not change the sentiments of Senator SHEPPARD, nor did it in any way diminish his continued and loyal advocacy and support of the cause to which he had given his devotion. He was in no wise weakened by the fear of political consequences. In the face of certain defeat, he made a campaign in the State of Texas against the State voting to ratify the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and his course on that occasion, contrary to what most persons would expect, instead of weakening him with the influences which were opposed to him, caused them to be gripped to him in admiration of his courage and for his disregard of what, at the moment, might have seemed to be fatal political consequences.

Senator SHEPPARD was not addicted to flamboyant or spectacular action in order to gain political strength. He was a man of very fine ability, and was well versed in the history not alone of his own country but the history of the development of civilization all over the world.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was prominent in religious and in fraternal activities. For a period of more than 40 years, he was the trusted national officer of the Woodmen of the World. He was the national banker of the Woodmen of the World. He was entrusted with the safekeeping of the bonds and the other securities and assets of that organization, and he administered its business affairs for more than 40 years. He was prominent in church circles and was an earnest and sincere Christian. He was also a thirty-second-degree Mason of the Scottish Rite.

In 1909 MORRIS SHEPPARD married Miss Lucile Sanderson, of Texarkana, Tex., and to that union were born three very attractive and cultured daughters. Their home life was of the most beautiful and tender character, and was graced by their charm and by an affection that existed between all members of the family of unusual strength and beauty.

I feel that I should remark upon the fact that MORRIS SHEPPARD, in the face of an absolute avalanche of correspondence and requests and demands by a very large constituency, was so devoted to his public duty, as he conceived it, that he would give the most meticulous and careful attention and consideration to what some might regard as a trivial request by the humblest constituent in the State of Texas. I have seen him, day after day, make great drafts upon his energy and vitality by giving attention to the masses of detail and correspondence which came over his desk.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was a kind and gentle man. In all my association with him I do not now recall any reproach by him as to any other individual which bore any evidence of real bitterness or unkindness. He had about him a rare gentleness that endeared him to all who came in contact with him.

Senators, the body of Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD is enshrouded in the soil of his mother State, and his memory is enshrined in the hearts of the people of Texas; yea, more, I believe that the recollection of his personality, of his character, of his lofty conception and performance of public duty in this Chamber will long be remembered by those who served with him here.

Considering his service in the House of Representatives and his service in the Senate as a continuing service, he had been in the Congress at the time of his death longer than any other Member now living—a little longer than 38 years—and while that service was a long one, it was not so long as will be the length of time his memory and the recollection of his service will be cherished by those with whom he was associated.

While his body will turn to dust, and while his chair will, of course, be filled by another, the spirit, the example, the gentleness, the character, and the ability of MORRIS SHEPPARD will still have an influence in this Chamber to ennoble those with whom he came in contact and to give a touch of nobility to the causes and the services to which he gave his life.

Mr. President, as a college friend, as an associate while still in private life, as a colleague of MORRIS SHEPPARD in the Senate of the United States, I pay this inadequate tribute to his worth, to his character, to his gentleness, to his ability, and to his splendid services rendered through the years to his State and to our common country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, several resolutions, and two poems in memoriam of Senator SHEPPARD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE MORRIS SHEPPARD

Mr. Reed of Bowie offered the following resolution:

"H. S. R. No. 202, in memory of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD.

"Whereas Texas and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the death of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD on April 9, 1941, in the Nation's Capital; and

"Whereas Senator SHEPPARD was born May 28, 1875, at Wheatville, Morris County, Tex., and attended the public schools of Texas, graduating from the University of Texas academic department in 1895 and from the law department in 1897, and then from the Yale University Law School in 1898; and began the practice of law at Pittsburg, Tex., removing to Texarkana in 1899, where he continued in his chosen profession, during which time he married Miss Lucille Sanderson, of Texarkana, and where he made his home until called to rest from his earthly labors; and

"Whereas he was elected to the National House of Representatives to fill out the unexpired term of his father, Hon. John L. Sheppard, and was reelected to the Fifty-eighth through the Sixty-second Congresses and was nominated for United States Senator from Texas at the Democratic primary July 27, 1912, and was elected by the Legislature of the State of Texas January 29, 1913, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator Joseph W. Bailey; and he was also elected at the same time for the full term of United States Senator beginning on March 4, 1913, and was reelected four times. Senator SHEPPARD was in his thirty-ninth consecutive year of service in Congress, dating from October 11, 1902—a longer service than that of anyone living; and

"Whereas Senator SHEPPARD's handiwork left an enduring page in our national history when he became the author of the eighteenth amendment, which brought 14 years of national prohibition. His sincerity and straightforwardness in the advocacy of national prohibition and his stern fidelity to conscience and conviction enabled him to hold the respect and the affection of those who most sharply disagreed with him upon the principle of government involved in the eighteenth amendment; and

"Whereas Senator SHEPPARD was one of the leading orators of the country and never hesitated to lift his voice in support of those causes which he thought to be right; and

"Whereas he was a man of peace and a practical idealist, yet his feet were firmly implanted in the bedrock of lasting principles of government, and in his service as chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs since 1933 Senator SHEPPARD became a casualty of our monumental preparedness program and an American victim of war aggressors. True to his exacting conscience, he kept up meticulously with his other work on the Committee on Campaign Expenditures and Use of Government Funds, and especially as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, in which capacities he contributed much to the passage of the Hatch clean politics bill, and became known as an outstanding advocate of waterways; and

"Whereas Senator SHEPPARD was a man of unimpeachable honesty and integrity, exceedingly well versed in the science of government and public affairs, both by training and experience, courtly and gentlemanly in all of his dealings with his fellowman and a friendly counselor to all, and has left behind him a host of friends and admirers throughout the State and Nation to mourn his passing; and

"Whereas the untimely death of Senator SHEPPARD is a sacrifice he made willingly on the altar of his country in this time of great national emergency and the example of statesmanship and patriotism set by him is an inspiration to guide those who may follow him in paths of devotion to his country and of willing and constructive service for its safety and preservation; and

"Whereas Texas has lost a noble son, the Democratic Party a faithful apostle, the Federal Government a devoted, tolerant, and valuable leader, 'who never sold the truth to serve the hour,' and the spirit of human freedom and liberty a staunch and unwavering defender; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the members of the house of representatives to pay tribute to a life of such distinguished and patriotic service and to the blessed memory of this most eminent son of the Lone Star State—

'Who, like the stars by day
Is withdrawn from mortal eye
But not extinct, he holds his sway
In glory through the sky.'

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas,* That the passing of this great man be acknowledged by directing that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the

journal as an expression of the love, esteem, and respect in which this most distinguished gentleman, lawyer, orator, scholar, statesman, and patriot of Texas was held; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded, under seal of the house of representatives, to Mrs. Sheppard, the devoted and admiring companion and helpmate throughout the years, and to his three daughters, and that when the house of representatives adjourns today that it do so in silent tribute to the Honorable MORRIS SHEPPARD, whose name and memory shall abide with us always.

"REED of Bowie.
"MCCANN.
"HARDEMAN."

The resolution was read second time.

Signed: Leonard, Speaker; Allen, Allison, Alsup, Anderson, Avant, Bailey, Baker, Bean, Bell, Benton, Blankenship, Boone, Brawner, Bray, Bridgers, Brown, Bruhl, Bullock, Bundy, Burkett, Burnaman, Carlton, Carrington, Cato, Celaya, Chambers, Clark, Cleveland, Coker, Mrs. Colson, Connelly, Craig, Crossley, Crosthwait, Daniel, Davis, Deen, Dickson of Bexar, Dickson of Nolan, Donald, Dove, Duckett, Dwyer, Ellis, Eubank, Evans, Favors, Ferguson, Miss Files, Fitzgerald, Fuchs, Gandy, Garland, Gilmer, Goodman, Halsey, Hanna, Hargis, Harris of Dallas, Harris of Hill, Hartzog, Heflin, Helpinstill, Henderson, Hileman, Hobbs, Howard, Howington, Hoyo, Huddleston, Huffman, Hughes, Humphrey, Hutchinson, Isaacks, Jones, Kelly, Kennedy, Kersey, Kinard, King, Klingeman, Knight, Lansberry, Lehman, Leyendecker, Little, Lock, Love, Lowry, Lucas, Lyle, McAlister, McDonald, McGlasson, McLellan, McMurry, McNamara, Manford, Manning, Markle, Martin, Matthews, Mills, Montgomery, Moore, Morgan, Morris, Morse, Murray, Nicholson, Pace, Parker, Pevehouse, Phillips, Price, Rampy, Reed of Dallas, Ridgeway, Rhodes, Roark, Roberts, Sallas, Senterfitt, Sharpe, Shell, Simpson, Skiles, Smith of Bastrop, Smith of Atascosa, Spacek, Spangler, Stanford, Stinson, Stubbs, Taylor, Thornton, Turner, Vale, Voigt, Walters, Wattner, Weatherford, White, Whitesides, and Winfree.

On the motion of Mr. Hartzog, the names of all the members of the house were added to the resolution as signers thereof.

The resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote.

On motion of Mr. Reed of Bowie, a picture of the Honorable MORRIS SHEPPARD was ordered printed in the journal, and the front page of the journal was dedicated for the resolution.

Resolution on the death of Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, by the city of San Antonio

MORRIS SHEPPARD, our friend, is dead.

Historic San Antonio and all its people bow their heads and weep.

Like a soldier who dies a lonely death upon any battlefield, he died working, slaving, sacrificing for the people of the United States.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was a Christian gentleman.

He was a patriot.

Always he served his country and his God. In war and peace he did so. Always optimistic, always cheerful, he served his country to the last, to the very last, in these cruel times.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was a worker.

He knew no hours, and from early morning into the blackness of the night he worked, not only for those who loved him but those who abused him as well.

Like many men who have served in Congress, he worked too hard. Indeed, he worked so hard that he died.

So good-bye, MORRIS; God rest your soul in peace. May the spirit of our great and good Senator, MORRIS SHEPPARD, go marching on.

Passed and approved this 10th day of April A. D. 1941.

MAURY MAVERICK, *Mayor.*

Attest:
[SEAL] E. L. FRIES, *City Clerk.*

With a profound sense of loss which they have sustained, members of the Lions Club of Texarkana offer their highest tribute to the memory of Lion MORRIS SHEPPARD.

Whereas on the 9th day of April, A. D. 1941, our friend and fellow Lion, MORRIS SHEPPARD, born on the 28th day of May, 1875, at Wheatville, Morris County, Tex., passed from this earthly life at Washington, D. C., and,

Whereas we are all familiar with the beautiful and Godly life, as well as the colorful and successful career that ended so abruptly with the passing of this outstanding person. His life has been so eulogized in the past few days by Congressmen, statesmen, editors, and friends, that it is well known and appreciated by each and every one of us present tonight.

As a man he was ever in the presence of his God, giving unexceptionable adherence to his Bible, his church, and the teachings received at a mother's knee. He was compassionate toward weakness, a friend of the oppressed, and a worshipper of liberty. On every possible occasion he added to the sum of human joy.

As a private citizen he was an unshrinking patriot, his Government was the objective and recipient of his services and undying loyalty, and he demanded from all in its behalf the fealty he himself so freely rendered.

As a statesman, the words of the Greek historian said of Pericles are applicable to his career:

"He did not so much follow as lead the people, because he framed not his words to please them, like one who is gaining power by unworthy means, but was able and dared on the strength of his character, even to brave their anger by contradicting their will."

What more could be said of any statesman?

The tender voice which for so long enthralled the Congress of the United States and kindled enthusiasm and hope in the hearts of all who heard it is silent. A great man, a great citizen, a great statesman is tonight sleeping the dreamless sleep but his deeds, achievements, and successes are not sleeping, they will live forever in our hearts and memories and on the pages of history.

His worthy manner of living, his hope and enthusiasm, his undying loyalty to country and friend, his righteousness and goodness are among the many virtues that cause us to point and say with pride, "He was, he is a Lion." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Lions Club of Texarkana that in the death of MORRIS SHEPPARD this organization has lost one of its most distinguished and beloved members and one who will be greatly missed by the members herein, and by the citizens of this Nation, and; be it further

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Texarkana, individually and in its entirety, extend to the bereaved family sincere condolences and deep sympathy, and; be it further

Resolved, That this memoriam and resolution be placed upon the minutes of this meeting and presented to the family of MORRIS SHEPPARD and the executive board of the International Association of Lions Clubs at Chicago, Ill.

ROBERT A. VANCE,
Appointed to prepare and present the above resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Harrisburg, Pa.

RESOLUTION

From Washington flashes the news of the passing of another outstanding national figure, in the death of United States Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, widely known as the father of the eighteenth amendment and as chairman of the presently most important Senate Military Affairs Committee, having charge of all measures for national defense.

Senator SHEPPARD was a veteran in Congress, having first entered the House of Representatives in 1902 and having served without interruption in the House and Senate until the time of his death. His experience and knowledge of national affairs made his services invaluable, and his loss will be the more keenly felt: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pay fitting tribute to the memory of a great statesman and patriot and an able leader, in the affairs of the National Government; and that this commemorative resolution be spread upon the journal of this house, and a properly certified copy thereof be forwarded to the family of the deceased and to the Senate of the United States in which he served at the time of his death.

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced by Hon. J. Howard Franch and adopted by the house of representatives the 10th day of April 1941.

THOMAS J. CALLAHAN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
[SEAL] ELMER KILROY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK,
REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION.

Whereas the members of this department have learned with profound regret of the death of United States Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD; and

Whereas with his passing the Regular Veterans Association has suffered the loss of a stalwart and true supporter of those principles upon which our organization is founded: Be it therefore

Resolved, That an expression of our profound sympathy be tendered to the family of our late friend and benefactor and that a similar message of condolence be offered to his confreres in the United States Senate.

Given under our hand this 11th day of April 1941.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK, REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
By JAMES F. RITTER, *Chairman.*

IN MEMORIAM

(By Bill Smart, Dallas, Tex., April 9, 1941)

The night bird's eerie cry is heard as she flits from tree to tree
And clouds of mist are rolling in from off the troubled sea;
The pale young moon grows paler still as she sinks down in the west,
For MORRIS SHEPPARD lies asleep—a white rose on his breast.
It grieved our hearts to give him up—our souls are filled with pity,
But he is resting now in peace inside the golden city;
The elder Sheppard met him there in the realms of heavenly glory,
And it thrilled the father's heart to listen to his story.

The story of a valiant son who for decade unto decade
Had followed in the footprints that his staunch old sire had made;
And the face of Woodrow Wilson lit with a sad, sweet smile
When SHEPPARD's soul was ushered into heaven's holy aisle.

And as the turgid Sabine flows around each wooded bend
Will sing a requiem of praise for our departed friend;
While Calhoun, Clay, and Webster—knights of a golden age—
Read his fine achievements from history's shining page.

And as the April sun sinks down beyond Old Capitan,
Jim Hogg, Coke, and Reagan will meet him man to man,
And there beside the great white throne inside bright heaven's gate,
They will review the service that he gave to home and State.

Rest, dear MORRIS, rest in peace—your deeds of love and grace
Have earned for you a rich reward in heaven's holy place.
And when the trump of God shall sound, be it soon or be it late,
I know that you will greet us there beside bright heaven's gate.

SENATOR SHEPPARD

Senator SHEPPARD, the seer of the Senate,
Statesman whom men had to honor, is dead—
He could have truthfully, in his last minute,
Bowed in submission and, too, could have said,
As did the Christ on the cross, "It is finished";
For, 'mid earth's troubles and trials and strife,
That have increased faster than they've diminished,
He lived an unselfish, well-rounded life.

Senator SHEPPARD, whatever his mission,
Went about, doing good, day after day—
Serving the people was his chief ambition—
Their still small voice he was sworn to obey.
His oath of office was God's great injunction,
Passed down to him thru his conscience, and he
Made his mind, spirit, and body all function
In full accord with his Maker's decree.

Senator SHEPPARD, renowned son of Texas,
Pride of his Nation, beloved by his State,
Met fairly, fearlessly all that perplexes
This awful age, with its problems so great
That our best statesmen feel their limitations—
But, with a faith in God, fixed as the sun,
He truly won God's and man's approbations,
Thru his one prayer, "Not my will, Thine be done."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as Horatio said of Hamlet "now cracks a noble heart"; so it was when MORRIS SHEPPARD peacefully and quietly slipped out of the company of living men and went home to God.

For 39 consecutive years he represented Texas in Congress—10 years in the House of Representatives, 29 years in this body—a truly remarkable record of service, scarcely equaled by any other man in all the 150 years of our history. It is no faint praise to be elected to this body for even one term of service, and when such service is extended term after term and into the decades, such as was the case of MORRIS SHEPPARD, it is indisputable evidence that, by his character and ability, he had earned such a high place in the esteem and affection of his constituency that no thought entered their minds of replacing by another this invaluable public servant.

Public servant he was indeed. In all truth and sincerity he loved his fellow man. His was the smile and clasp of friendship. He needed no assurances, made no demands, exacted no promises. It was enough for him to grant the favor, to do the kindly deed, to extend the helping hand. He particularly delighted in serving his constituents. No man was ever more indefatigable or more painstaking or more conscientious in meeting the many calls that come to a Member of this body. It might be a request of petty significance from the humblest of persons, but it always received the very best and most expeditious attention possible at MORRIS SHEPPARD'S hands.

He labored for our country and all its people in a large way, but in a very definite and active way he served each one of his constituents as legislator, patriot, and friend. He was a prodigious, an indefatigable worker. He spent and was spent. He literally wore himself out in the cause of his country and for those who had honored him and whom he loved so well.

Many were the achievements of MORRIS SHEPPARD as legislator, as friend, as fraternalist, as humanitarian, and as patriot. Notable were his contributions to Federal legislation, covering a wide and varied field, all the way from the act which bears his honored name and which provides care and medical attention for the mother and babe who, pinched by poverty or because of fell circumstances, would otherwise be denied, to innumerable legislative measures which he fostered and guided for our country's defense.

MORRIS SHEPPARD held fast to his ideals, and was as constant as the north star in his loyalty. What man of lesser courage or lesser faith would have stood so fixed and immovable in his devotion to the cause of temperance and prohibition?

His record in this body proclaims that he was ever on the side of the underprivileged, of those whose voices were too weak to be articulate here; that he stood foursquare and forthright to give disadvantaged men and women a better chance, and that he labored that common men might enter into their inheritance.

Of all his splendid work in this body, perhaps MORRIS SHEPPARD'S greatest and most enduring monument will be his work as chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It was my privilege to serve on this committee under his able leadership, to witness his tireless and devoted efforts in the building of the Nation's defense. By his grace and understanding, by the very nobility of his character, and the example of his devotion and patriotic loyalty, he often softened the asperities of debate, reconciled differences, and won united and wholehearted support for a measure that had provoked much controversy.

We followed him because we loved him and because we had an abiding faith in his golden integrity, in his wise counsel, and in his steadfast and unfailing desire to do, always and under all circumstances that which was right. It will ever be recorded that in this hour of gravest danger to our country MORRIS SHEPPARD stood in the front rank of her patriots, played well his part, and contributed mightily to the defense and the security of our land.

And yet, Mr. President, at this time, when the forces of despotism and of destruction would seem to engulf all that is beautiful and free in the world, I like to think of MORRIS SHEPPARD not so much as one who played the great and worthy part he did in marshaling our Army and in building the engines and instrumentalities of armament and of defense, but rather as a man in whose heart and soul were so tempered the elements of tolerance, of patience, and of sympathy as to give sweetness and light to all men who came within the radius of his genial influence. I like to think of him as a man in whom there was no vanity, in whose spirit there was no retribution—a man who knew no littleness.

His gentleness, his tenderness, his fair courtesy,
Were like a ring of virtues 'bout him set,
And Godlike charity the center where all met.

In these days of darkness and of distress I like to think of MORRIS SHEPPARD, the gentle and kindly man, and the example of his life as an earnest of the faith that will yet open the windows and let the light of God's heaven into the dark places, that will yet subdue the mountains and remove the kingdoms and bring a peace such as we have never known to a suffering and bleeding world.

We may be sure that when the summons came and MORRIS SHEPPARD entered that undiscovered country, he did so unafraid, with his head up and a sweet smile upon his face, ready for the great adventure. Surely the trumpets sounded for him on the other side, and he found welcome among the choice and master spirits of the ages.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, today during these sad hours I have presented an eager ear for the reception of every word, every eloquent tribute uttered by my distinguished colleagues in reference to the passing of beloved Senators who served with us in this House of the Congress of the United States of America. As here I sat, I have listened unhappily to the tolling of the bells of sorrow—bells that have been sounded by the eloquent words that have fallen so sincerely and genuinely from the lips of those who loved our departed Members.

As here I stand and envision in my mind all our departed friends, I am sorrowful and unhappy when I recall the names of those who have preceded us to the Great Beyond—the Honorable M. M. LOGAN, of Kentucky; the Honorable WILLIAM E. BORAH, of Idaho; the Honorable ERNEST W. GIBSON, of Vermont; the Honorable ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota; the Honorable KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada; and the Honorable MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas—all of whom I learned to love as I did my brother himself.

I am privileged in my plain but earnest language to speak of one of these brothers, for whom, like others, I had the profoundest admiration and affection—MORRIS SHEPPARD.

Mr. President, I would that it were possible for me at this hour to command to my tongue's end words equally as elo-

quent as those spoken by my distinguished and learned colleagues of this body. I shall merely have to content myself, though at the same time pleasing myself, by employing the simple words which I shall utter.

Mr. President, I think that MORRIS SHEPPARD was one of the finest men I have ever known in all my life. It was my privilege and my honor to be associated with him for a period of more than 8 years, and I may add that I was intimately associated with him during that span of time, because it was my privilege to serve with him upon the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate.

If I were called upon to select an example and a real inspiration to be followed by American youth, I believe I can truthfully say that my choice undoubtedly would be none other than MORRIS SHEPPARD himself, for the reason that never during my association with him in life did I hear a word of profanity pass his lips; for the reason that his creed in life was, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you"; for the reason that I have never heard him at any time, anywhere, under any circumstances, speak ill of his fellow man, and I am happy to be able to state here today that I have never heard a single person speak ill of MORRIS SHEPPARD. The creed which he followed was, "If you cannot speak well of your fellow man, never speak of him at all."

I recall that a few years ago I was passing northward from our sister republic to the south. The highway upon which I traveled carried me within a hundred miles of Senator SHEPPARD's home town, Texarkana, Tex. My affection and admiration for MORRIS SHEPPARD were sufficiently great to occasion me to detour to the extent of wending my way along the lovely highways of the great Lone Star State of Texas merely for the purpose of affording myself, in passing, the opportunity of shaking his hand and basking in the sunshine of his friendly, golden smile. As long as I live I shall never forget that when I approached the outskirts of his home city I stopped at a filling station and made inquiry of the attendant as to where I might be able to locate the home or office of Senator SHEPPARD. He said, "Do you know him?" I said, "Intimately." "Well," said he, "he is the finest man I ever knew in all my life. We people here love him." I remembered that, because I was impressed with the fact that if he was loved by his own fellow townsmen, then he was possessed of the greatest wealth upon the face of the earth, the wealth of the love of his neighbors. What more could any of us mortals wish upon this earth?

Daily I was associated with MORRIS SHEPPARD in the Committee on Military Affairs, and daily I recognized his great worth to the American people, to the American Nation itself. Always when I entered this Chamber and sat in my place here I waited for the entrance of MORRIS SHEPPARD, because I was favored with a hearty, genuine handshake and with a pleasant, friendly smile whenever he passed my desk.

Then that fateful hour arrived, when the hand of God above was placed upon his shoulder, and he was taken to the Great Beyond. For me, for you, Mr. President, for all of us, it was an hour of sadness, one of miserable, utter bereavement, and even at this hour I cannot think of MORRIS SHEPPARD as resting beneath the sod of Texas. I see him here now, as he was daily with us, and I shall always wish and desire to remember him as we knew him in life.

His body rested in this Chamber, surrounded by lovely flowers, and beneath the dome of the Capitol of this great Nation we came to pay our last respects to the man whom we loved, whom we admired, who gave us inspiration, as he provided inspiration for all the people of the United States.

In passing I may say that prior to my coming to the United States Senate in 1932 I had heard a great deal about MORRIS SHEPPARD. I had read much about him, because my attitude concerning a great national issue was opposite to his. When I came to the Senate and met the man concerning whom I had read so much, I unhesitatingly recognized that he occupied a great position in the Nation and that his voice was widely heard and listened to with respect, because he was sincere and honest in his convictions concerning temperance, which he always preached in the Senate Chamber. Annually I and other Senators, regardless of our attitude, listened with great respect to what he had to say concerning God's worst enemy, the devil's best friend—liquor. He preached temperance with temperance. Therefore it will not be surprising for Senators to learn that I would select MORRIS SHEPPARD, who represented everything that was fine, as an example for the youth of our Great Nation, as one I would hold up to our youth as an ideal, and whose virtues I would endeavor to instill in the minds of American youth.

So, Mr. President, the sad hour came and passed, and I, together with other Senators, accompanied his remains more than a thousand miles southward, to pay our last respects to him upon his native soil, and within the confines of the great State which had honored him with a seat in the Senate of the United States. I, as one of his friends, stood there and saw thousands upon thousands of his fellow townsmen and his fellow Texans line the broad, long highway for miles from the church itself to the cemetery where he lies today. Thousands upon thousands of those who loved him, black and white, men and women, young and old, were there to pay their respects to our colleague whom we loved. His body is there, buried in his home State, his native State of Texas, but his spirit, thank God, remains with us at this hour, and so long as we shall live we shall never forget that man whom we loved as a brother.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, while altogether mindful of my inability to express in adequate or fitting words the things my heart bids me say with respect to our well-loved colleague who now sleeps in a new-made grave, I cannot restrain the impulse to offer my humble homage of love and admiration to the memory of MORRIS SHEPPARD.

His passing has been widely lamented as an irreparable loss to the Nation, and I thoroughly agree. To most of us it is more than a general sense of loss. To me it is a very deep and poignant personal loss. I honored him as a loyal, able statesman and I loved him as a friend. It was so from the very first time I met him.

Ah, yes!
I knew when first I clasped his hand
That surely I had found a friend,
And soon I knew that friendship would endure,
A thing of joy unto the end.
Somehow I sensed a warm and genial glow
Diffusing from his kindly eyes;
It warmed my heart and framed a halo bright
Like sunrays from the azure skies.
Ah, yes!
I well perceived a kindred spirit's beam
As radiant as the evening star,
And now I know its brightness will abide
Unto eternity's shining bar.

In sunlight or in shadow he was always the same understanding friend—the wise and kindly adviser.

Oh, I am sure that all of us, with hearts still heavy with fresh grief for this departed brother, must feel that something cheering has been lost from our own path of life.

Heedless of the warnings of family and friends, he kept to his arduous duties as chairman of the all-important Military Affairs Committee, preferring to go on with the same patriotic zeal and unflagging energy that characterized his almost twoscore years of eminent service to his country. Heedless of his personal welfare, he labored faithfully to the last. For him there was no rest when plans for the country's defense loomed so large in importance. According to his code of self-abnegation—

Rest is not quitting
The busy career;
Rest is the fitting
Of self to one's sphere.
'Tis the brook's motion,
Clear without strife,
Fleeting to ocean
After this life.
'Tis loving and serving
The highest and best;
'Tis onward, unswerving,
And this is true rest.

And now a nation mourns while a martyr sleeps.

He stood for his country's glory and honor and preservation first, last, and all the time. He was the type of true statesman who hallows a whole people and lifts up all who yield themselves to his influence.

"Till the sun grows cold and the stars are old," the superb example of his life will live on as a benediction to mankind.

We called him the Father of Prohibition, and he was. Even if his career had begun and ended with that single achievement, righteous people throughout the land would call him blessed. None save the Omniscient One on high knows or can know how many lives were saved from ruin, how many hearts spared from heartbreak, how many homes retrieved from dissolution by the saving

grace of the eighteenth amendment. That it was doomed to subsequent repeal was beyond the power of its noble sponsor to prevent. Its repeal was the one great disappointment and abiding sorrow of his life. Each year when MORRIS SHEPPARD made his celebrated speech pleading for the restoration of national prohibition, I am sure the pathos and conviction of his stirring appeal must have plunged deep into the hearts of all who heard it or read it. On those memorable occasions I was ever doubly grateful and proud that my State—Mississippi—has not repudiated the eighteenth amendment.

So stanchly in earnest in the pursuance of his holy cause, so intrepid in spirit, he never yielded up his ideals. Aside from innumerable other fine works that distinguished his long and useful public service, his enduring crusade for temperance has left him better title to remembrance than any other monument that might be erected to his memory.

Now that our beloved colleague has answered the roll call of eternity, we reflect with solemn retrospection on how many times each of us has heard him answer to the roll call in this Senate Chamber and we ponder how many times he answered the roll of Congress before any living one of us came to the halls of Congress. MORRIS SHEPPARD, the dean of Congress! Then we feebly attempt to portray a fitting sketch of his life, but in vain, because the task is too great. We see him as a chivalrous, animated, generous gentleman, embodying all the graces and virtues of a southern gentleman of best tradition.

Through the mind's eye we look back through the mists of time and see him as a buoyant, upright young man who early in life was imbued with the teaching of the wisest man of them all who said, "With all thy getting, get understanding." We see him as an exemplary young man who never forgot the Christian ideals taught him at his mother's knee.

He acquired a splendid education by his own efforts; and in school, as elsewhere, he was a leader. A brilliant law scholar, talented as a public speaker and a writer, he stood out among his classmates as a scholar of whom the schools were proud. He recognized music as a universal language and cultivated that too, to bring pleasure to his family and his friends.

A worthy son and successor of a worthy father, gifted and schooled in the science of law and parliament, he brought with him to the National Congress the learning and talents that made him an outstanding statesman from the first moment he drew the mantle of public office around him.

Always punctual, faithful, and attentive to duty, he was among the hardest workers in the Congress. His elevation to the Senate reinforced his patriotic zeal and sterling character. With a rare and happy fusion of native ability and formal education, augmented by several years' experience in the lower House, he forged ahead to occupy places of high trust and eminence in the highest lawmaking body in the land.

The measures to which he devoted his best efforts were always of as high a nature as any to which human faculties can be directed. He laid his life upon the altar of a great purpose founded upon a firmness, purity, and vigor of mind that challenged the admiration of even his most avowed opponents.

The faculty of reason was broad and strong in him. His courage to uphold the right was brave and his fortitude to endure was unassailable. He never straddled an issue, compromised a conviction, or dodged a responsibility.

He was ambitious, but his ambitions were unselfish. With an eye always single to the good of mankind, he looked ever to the welfare and happiness of the people. A good shepherd, always vigilant for the flock.

Wholesome and tolerant in his fellowship, he was ever ready to lend guidance to new Members, and never failed to give respectful audience to the views of any colleague who sought his counsel. Unsullied by false veneer, modest and unspoiled by seniority and personal achievement, his company was equally pleasing to the youngest and the oldest of his colleagues. The newcomer found in the warm handclasp of MORRIS SHEPPARD a staff of encouragement and confidence. To the discouraged and forlorn, his smile was like a band of light across the darkened night.

Truly, Mr. President, death loves a shining mark. And in the passing of MORRIS SHEPPARD a star of the first magnitude has been struck from our national firmament, but transferred, we feel assured, to a higher sphere.

His life was a living example of what is best and most admirable in American manhood, and more. It was, in truth, a sermon. We realized this profoundly as we followed his still form to its last resting place.

As we sat with tear-dimmed eyes in that little church where he long had worshiped, and as we lowered his familiar form into the soft warmth of his beloved Texas soil, we were intensely conscious that we were committing to the gracious keeping of the Heavenly Father a friend and comrade whose life we well might emulate.

I am afraid that we too seldom think seriously of the great inexorable event of death until the shadow falls across our own pathway. Then our hearts are heavy with solemn realization.

Friend after friend departs,
And when musing on companions gone
We doubly feel ourselves alone.

These fitting and time-honored memorial occasions, which MORRIS SHEPPARD himself helped to establish, remind us that the day is fixed when there shall come to each of us a strange, mysterious guest whose name is Death. How forceful is the reminder when we so recently have shed tears over the bier of one so loved and so deeply mourned as he. It comes as a poignantly impressive warning to teach us that in the midst of life we are in death. We are reminded anew that man is born but to flourish and fade as the leaves of the forest; that the flowers that bloom and wither in a day have no frailer hold upon life than mortal man.

There is a time we know not when,
A point we know not where
That marks the destiny of men
For glory or despair.

On these somber occasions we are brought face to face with eternal truths. We are constrained to put first things first, to dwell upon the things of the soul that eclipse our feeble, futile strivings for objects that are of the earth, earthy. At a time like this we clearly see how trivial are our differences and personal prejudices in the face of God's providence and weighed against that final accounting we all must make. We are made to recognize that sidereal time—the time of clock and calendar—is as nothing in respect of eternity; we are but sojourners for a little while, as were our fathers who now sleep in breathless dust. Soon we, too, shall bring our years to an end, as a final chapter of a story told, and the book will be closed.

Would that we might all be more like our late revered dean of Congress. He laid no claim to perfection, for he was vital and human, and possessed human frailties. But his faults were as few and his virtues as numerous as in any man who ever graced the Senate Chamber or blessed a nation with a long life of valiant service.

He lacked but 4 years of reaching the so-called allotted span, and though ripe in renown and honors and richly matured in the affections of his country, the inspiration and promising hope of springtime bloomed always in his heart. He loved the spring. In his sensitive and esthetic soul he never ceased to marvel at and be grateful for the lush beauty of spring's rebirth in the flower-strewn expanses of his State. It was touchingly and symbolically beautiful that the Creator chose the Eastertide for MORRIS SHEPPARD's last and final homecoming, his eyes closed forever to the springtime beauty of the land he loved. Though we accept with obedient grace the will of Him who works in mysterious ways His wonders to perform, our sorrow is heightened, because—

We had seen together how the Spring
Made miracles of tree and flower;
But the joy the season brought to us
Led us toward this mournful parting hour.

Undoubtedly, as the seasons come and go, spring with its bursting bud and balmy zephyrs will breathe its eternal secrets to the gentle spirit of MORRIS SHEPPARD.

Time will temper the overwhelming grief that has befallen the splendid family of our departed comrade whose fidelity and devotion to his home were as unblemished as his public record. He has left to them the imperishable legacy of love, honor, and devotion that sprang from a deep soul, an understanding mind, and a tender piety. They are bequeathed with the knowledge that the sum of his life's work rises as a bright and shining star to shed honor on his home, his State, and his country—a benefaction to all mankind. To the sorrowing loved ones we commend that hallowed beatitude,

Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted—

by the loving kindness and unfailing compassion of the Great Healer through whose dispensation the waters of life well up for the healing of all consecrated hearts. We offer them every expression of heartfelt sympathy, for we, too, loved him.

Ever in my heart will bloom a flower of remembrance for MORRIS SHEPPARD—a noble Christian gentleman, a learned scholar, an able statesman, a stalwart pillar of democracy, a friend of humanity—lovable, likable MORRIS SHEPPARD, my cherished personal friend.

May his soul bask forever in the sunshine and felicity of God's Paradise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

HUEY P. LONG

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of the Senate of today, addresses in connection with the unveiling in Statuary Hall of the statue of the late Senator Huey P. Long, of Louisiana, are now in order.

The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, 5 years ago, a few months following the death of Huey Pierce Long, the Senate set aside a day to commemorate his memory. Upon that occasion a number of addresses were made by various Senators in memory of Louisiana's illustrious Senator.

On behalf of the State of Louisiana, which in part I have the honor to represent in this body, I desire to express my very warm appreciation that the Senate has today by unanimous consent adopted an order setting aside another hour in which to pay tribute to Louisiana's deceased Senator. I wish to express my gratitude to the majority leader, the able and beloved senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for initiating that procedure, and to the Senate for the unanimity with which it adopted his suggestion.

On the occasion previously referred to, on January 22, 1936, I was accorded by this body the privilege of delivering on the floor of the Senate a memorial address in commemoration of Senator Long's character and career. It is my desire that portions of the eulogy then delivered by me be included in the RECORD at this point. Since these remarks come within the exception of the rule as to printing in small type, I ask unanimous consent that they appear in the usual RECORD type.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUEY PIERCE LONG

"Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on the 8th day of September 1935 in the forty-second year of his life, Huey Pierce Long, senior United States Senator from Louisiana, was stricken with a fatal wound and died 2 days later in Baton Rouge, the capital of the State.

"He was felled by the bullet of an assassin. He was shot down in the majestic capitol which his own genius had conceived and builded. He was, by direction of the Louisiana Legislature, laid to rest within its grounds and under the shadows of its lofty spire, which rises as a mighty shaft to mark his grave.

"There, 'after life's fitful fever,' he sleeps, beloved and revered as no other man in Louisiana's history by the great majority of her citizens.

"Senator Long's enemies, Mr. President, had constantly sought, and by various methods, his political destruction. They undertook time and again to defeat him at the polls, but they failed in election after election. They tried to oust him from the governorship of Louisiana by impeachment, but they failed. They endeavored to have him expelled from the Senate of the United States, but they failed. They sought to accomplish his ruin by having him indicted in Federal and State courts, but they failed. It took, Mr. President, the bullet of the assassin to cause the senior Senator from Louisiana to yield to his foes.

"No one in the political history of our State had at his age been elected to the high offices or attained the national and international prominence held by Senator Long. When only 37 years old he had occupied in succession the offices of chairman of the Louisiana Railroad Commission, Governor of Louisiana, and United States Senator, and at his death he was, with the possible exception of the executive heads of our greatest world powers, better known and more discussed throughout the world than any other man in public or private life.

"It has been repeatedly contended by many of his critics that Senator Long rose to political power by ruthless and unscrupulous methods. But those who make this charge, Mr. President, fail to appreciate, or else ignore, both the recent political history of Louisiana and the political career of the man they have sought to disparage. For some 25 years prior to Senator Long's election as chief executive of Louisiana that State had been controlled by Governors elected from the upper stratum of society and subservient largely to the interests of the wealthy classes. None could aspire to high office unless he was "to the manor born." The politicians of this regime did nothing toward a constructive development of the State or a recognition of the rights, necessities, and hopes of the humbler classes; yet their domination of the State and its affairs seemed to be permanent and unshakable.

"Against this long and firmly entrenched political aristocracy Huey P. Long, in 1928, unfurled his standard as candidate for Governor. He was a mere stripling; he was of humble origin; he was unschooled; he was ungrammatical; he had no organization, no political power. But he came with irresistible enthusiasm and dynamic force, hurling defiance at big corporate influences and political war lords and championing with convincing sincerity the cause of what his opposition had long contemptuously derided as the "poor white trash." He was then, as he continued to be afterward, the exponent of the rights of the poor, the humble, and the lowly. He was a champion of the masses, and he had their love and confidence. He was victorious. He did—

"• • • break his birth's invidious bar,
And grasp the skirts of happy chance,
And breast the blows of circumstance,
And grappled with his evil star.

"And, being victorious, he ousted and kept out of power and continued until his death to keep out of power the political lords of the old regime. That, Mr. President, was his great, unpardonable sin.

"The discredited political forces became determined that nothing should be left undone to drive him from power.

"Then began that ruthless warfare against Governor Long that is perhaps without a parallel in the history of our Government. His chief measures were fought before the legislature, before the people, and in the courts. Almost every conceivable attempt was made to discredit him and his administration. He himself was held up daily to public ridicule; his character was assailed, his motives misrepresented. So unrelenting were his enemies that they sought to subject to their political boycott all those who dared support him and his State policies. Within a year after his inauguration the old-line politicians, the big dailies, and certain powerful corporate interests united in an effort to drive from the Governor's chair the man they could not defeat at the polls.

"Thus, Mr. President, was changed the complexion of Long's political life and career. Before his election as Governor he said to me, with evident sincerity, that it was his ambition to give Louisiana a splendid, constructive administration, and then retire to the practice of law, which was his first and greatest love. But, in order to save himself, his friends, and associates from political annihilation, it was necessary for him to build and maintain an organization as ruthless, perhaps, as was the opposition. To the perfection of such an organization he brought to bear the unusual combination of a genius for organizing and a mass appeal as a public speaker excelled by few, if any, of his day and generation. This body itself has witnessed the many times the Senate galleries were filled as he rose to address the Senate, and emptied when he resumed his seat. His greatest political asset was the affection that the common people entertained for him and the confidence that they reposed in him. They regarded him as one of them. He might be called Governor in Baton Rouge, doctor of laws at Loyola University, or Senator in Washington, but he was "Huey" to those who live down on the bayous and at the forks of the roads.

"Mr. President, no man within my knowledge possessed greater political courage than did Senator Long. He was at no time subservient to any man, set of men, or organization. He did not hesitate to enter the arena against any foe, however influential and however long entrenched in power. In his memorable senatorial campaign of 1930, immediately following his attempted impeachment as Governor, he arrayed himself against a combination of the daily press of Louisiana, the regular organization in New Orleans, and all the erstwhile political powers of his State, and succeeded in

completely routing them by the greatest popular majority ever polled in Louisiana up to that time.

"While it is true that in the United States Senate he put through to final passage no bill or measure, yet it may be said without exaggeration that in the 4 years of his service as a Member of this body he acquired a national following as an independent leader and established a reputation as a skillful debater excelled by none in our public life. So great had become his following that it can be said with truth that the assassin's bullet that sent him to his untimely grave likewise shot despair into the hearts of hundreds of thousands of his countrymen, for he was regarded by the common people generally as the poor man's friend and as a great apostle of the rights of the laboring classes in city and country. He was possessed of the brain, the energy, the persuasive power, and the purpose, had he lived, to have established during the many years of ordinary life expectancy that lay before him a long record of useful and splendid service to the toiling masses and the underprivileged of humanity.

"When, however, Mr. President, we turn from his work in the Senate to his career as chief executive of Louisiana we find that he left as Governor a record for constructive administration of a State's affairs unsurpassed by that of any other executive in our national history.

"He literally lifted Louisiana out of the mud and left her with one of the finest systems of hard-surfaced and graveled roads in the United States. He abolished our toll ferries, substituting therefor magnificent toll-free bridges over the many broad rivers and bayous of Louisiana, and culminating in the great Huey P. Long Bridge that spans the Mississippi River at New Orleans.

"He lifted more and more the burdens of public education from the poorer communities, equalized educational opportunities throughout Louisiana, and more than doubled the State's contribution to the cause of public education.

"He enacted into law the permanent policy of distributing free of cost schoolbooks to every child in Louisiana attending school, public or private, and regardless of race, color, or creed.

"He enfranchised the 'poor whites' of Louisiana by repealing the poll tax prerequisite to vote.

"He subtantially relieved the poor man's taxes by exempting all homes up to a potential value of $2,000, and by shifting generally tax burdens from the masses to the wealthy classes.

"Before Long occupied the executive chair of Louisiana, legislatures had assembled and adjourned, Governors had come and gone in monotonous succession for over a quarter of a century, and all had left the Pelican State practically as they found it. But within the span of a few years Long made Louisiana noted throughout the world for its spirit of progress, and studded the surface of the State with the monuments of his inspired vision, dynamic energy, and capacity for achievement.

"Mr. President, he was a loyal friend—surely I may bear testimony to that fact—and he was an open foe. He fought none secretly. He battled always in the open. He was a man of strong convictions; and neither fear nor favor, nor dread of punishment, nor hope of gain, prevented the outspoken expression and advocacy of his views. There was no duplicity about him. The same opinions and sentiments that he uttered in private discourse he maintained upon the hustings and on the floor of the Senate. Shortly before his death, in the rapid fire of debate in this body, he gave the following truthful characterization of himself, eloquent in its frank simplicity:

"Mr. President, I am not undertaking to answer the charge that I am ignorant. It is true. I am an ignorant man. I have had no college education. I have not even had a high-school education. But the thing that takes me far in politics is that I do not have to color what comes into my mind and into my heart. I say it unvarnished. I say it without veneer. I know the hearts of the people because I have not colored my own. I know when I am right in my own conscience. I do not talk one way in the cloak room and another way out here. I do not talk one way back there in the hills of Louisiana and another way here in the Senate. I have one language. Ignorant as it is, it is the universal language of the sphere in which I operate. Its simplicity gains pardon for my lack of letters and education.

" 'The friend of the poor' is the epitaph which I think Senator Long would himself have preferred to all others. It is the epitaph which hundreds of thousands of fellow Americans bestowed upon him. It is an epitaph whose verity none may justly question."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the more than 5 years that have elapsed since I delivered this memorial have not altered, they have confirmed the appraisement I made of Louisiana's most outstanding political contribution to the political history of our Nation. In far more durable form than any passing tribute that may fall from my lips, Louisiana will today commemorate its illustrious dead by the unveiling of his statue in our National Capitol.

Four years ago I said that Huey Long, as Governor of Louisiana, left a record of constructive administration unsurpassed by that of any other State executive in our national history. So brilliant, thorough, and comprehensive were his accomplishments for the relief of the poor and underprivileged and the material development of Louisiana that all preceding State administrations shrink by comparison into the conventional commonplace. Let me now make the further observation that subsequent State administrations in Louisiana suffer equally by comparison with the administration of Louisiana's great builder and commoner. In the long list of Louisiana's Governors, Huey Long, to borrow the imagery of Lord Macaulay, "was eclipse; there is no second."

Huey died amid the tears of countless friends and the maledictions of many foes. Neither the flight of time nor the sacredness of the tomb has altogether silenced his slanderers.

The late J. Hamilton Lewis, paragon of knightly courtesy, in eulogizing Senator Long, said:

Of the dead speak nothing but good • • • there will be an epitaph from this honorable body to this honorable dead, "pace humani"—"this man, may he rest in peace."

Alas, Mr. President, the memory of the honorable dead is still at times desecrated by sensational libels on the part of some writer seeking to sell his otherwise unsalable wares, or some politician striving for a notoriety which his own mediocrity is unable to command. Gone and forgotten will be his carping critics while yet history records the works of his genius and while yet his image stands enshrined in America's Hall of Fame.

In justice to the memory of the departed Senator, let it be recorded in the everlasting records of this august body that thorough investigation by Federal and State authorities during his life and following his death disclosed no act of dishonesty by him committed. Let it be further recorded that all indictments filed in State and Federal courts in the so-called Louisiana political-scandal cases are based on transactions postdating the death of Huey Long. None are connected with his gestion of affairs, either as Governor or when, though Senator, he still dominated the official life of his State.

If, Mr. President, from the portals of another world Huey could fashion the tributes this day being paid him, he would not perhaps countenance a defense of his memory against unjust assault. In life he never asked for quarter. "Ever with a frolic welcome he took the thunder and the sunshine." He would probably say to us in the language of his favorite poem so often quoted by him:

In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winched nor cried aloud.
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody, but unbowed.

• • • • •

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, one of the very wise laws passed by the Congress was that which authorized each of the various States of the Union to place within what has become known as Statuary Hall, or the Hall of Fame, statues of two of its favorite sons or daughters. Under the provisions of that law the State of Louisiana is placing the statue of one of her illustrious sons, Huey Pierce Long.

I deem it a privilege to join with those who are assembled here today to pay homage to the memory of this great man. The highest personal tribute I could pay him would be to say that he was my friend.

In a democracy it is possible for one, even though he be born amid humble surroundings, to rise to the heights of national prominence and esteem. Huey Long, by his own efforts, attained a high place in our national life. He was quick to admit that he had not had the benefits of a high-school or college education. He came up the difficult way. He climbed the ladder of success, unaided and alone. At an early age he gave evidences of his intense love for the so-called common people. Success did not change this attitude. He never deviated from his love for

and the desire to aid the poor, the unfortunate, and those who, too often in our public life, do not have those things to which they are entitled under the American way of life.

Early in our careers in the Senate Huey Long and I became fast friends. He sat near me. We often discussed the merits of those humanitarian issues in which we were both interested. While I did not always agree with Senator Long, I respected his judgment and his sincerity of purpose. In the majority of cases I found that we were in agreement upon what has been termed a liberal course of government.

This friendship ripened as time went on and never lessened until the day of his death. He was a loyal friend. No one knows that fact better than do I. In the rapidly moving field of politics I came up for reelection. Senator Long volunteered his aid in my campaign. His desire to aid was sincere and without ulterior motive. He had little to gain if I were successful. He had much to lose if I failed. Let me say, to the credit of Senator Long, that he never sought to take legislative or political advantage of his assistance to me in that campaign. To the contrary, when it so happened that I disagreed with him he showed no displeasure, but praised me for doing that which I thought was right. He at all times showed me every courtesy and consideration.

I became acquainted with, and later served with, his estimable wife. As in the case of her husband, our friendship was real and genuine.

Today Huey Pierce Long sleeps within the bosom of the State of Louisiana which he loved so well and for which he gave his life. He died a martyr in the political battle which he fought for those in whose cause he believed.

Again let me say that I consider it an honor and a privilege to be permitted to pay this brief but none the less sincere tribute to the memory of a great man.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President and colleagues, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a great statesman and friend of the common people, Huey P. Long.

The people of the Northwest, familiar with his deeds and uninfluenced by vicious newspaper propaganda, think of him today with warmest affection. It has been said that "once or twice in a generation nature spawns a great commoner"—one who combines the simple, humble, honest virtues of the common people, the inherent fairness and decency of the great mass of good folks, their quick anger at injustice and greed. He was such a man.

Perhaps the greatest reason for Huey Long's splendid leadership in the Northwest farming States was due to the times in which he lived—7-cent oats, 24-cent wheat, 11-cent rye, and 17-cent corn are farming disasters which demand an enlightened fighting champion.

In his visits to the Northwest Huey Long sensed that the people had produced enough to feed themselves for thousands of years, and yet they were on the verge of destitution, at the mercy of outside interests, and that they needed a leader who would secure for them fair prices and all the remedies covered by social insurance. Within a short time he had over 400 share-the-wealth clubs in North Dakota alone, and these share-the-wealth clubs in our State were there primarily for the protection of the family. He advocated insurance against industrial accidents, against sickness, against permanent invalidity, including blindness, against old age, and against contingencies affecting members of the wage-earner's f a m i l y — contingencies such as the dependency of the widow and orphans upon the death of the breadwinner, against sickness and burial and maternity, and also, because of the very high cost of private insurance, he seemed to the masses as the man whose program would give them permanent social security.

Because he lived several thousand miles away from us, few citizens from the northwestern agricultural sections knew Huey Long personally, but thousands heard him over the radio, read his speeches, and believed in him.

To the farming people he was the genius who would solve the grim paradox that, with our granaries bulging with foodstuffs, with our warehouses filled with shoes and clothing to overflowing, thousands of men, women, and children were going hungry and naked; and it was not only the farmers but the underprivileged one-third all over the Nation who looked to him as their long-awaited fighting leader. The men and women to whom Huey Long appealed know only too well that at any moment the worker of a family may become ill, and that the wage earner then, in addition to the loss of wages, is burdened with the expenses of doctor, medicines, and hospital care. They know only too well that being sick is one of the most expensive luxuries; that the birth of a child often drains a family income at a time when it is most needed, that the death of a child is frequently disastrous, and that the cost of the burial often results in serious debt which cannot be met for years.

Huey Long's friends knew that the worker is weighed down by the fear of sudden death, and the prospect of leaving his wife and children utterly dependent and destitute.

It was these people, these common people, workers, farmers, and unemployed, to whom Huey Long appealed.

I doubt whether any other man was so conscious of the plight of the underprivileged or knew better the ruthlessness of those in control. And it was because Huey Long knew how to fight, knew how to fight fire with fire, knew how to combat ruthlessness with ruthlessness, force with force, and because he had the courage to battle unceasingly for what he conceived to be right that he became an inspiration for so many in their own fight for a square deal, and the object of such relentless persecution on the part of his enemies.

The fight he waged was such a desperate one that even in death he has not been immune from attack. So we find that 5 years after his body had been lowered into the grave—that grave which will forever be a shrine for those who love decency, honor, and justice—attempts are still being made to besmirch his character.

This is not fooling the farmer, the worker, the small businessman; it is not fooling the child who can read today because of the free textbooks that Huey Long obtained; it is not fooling the citizen who can vote today because Huey Long abolished poll taxes.

The people know from Huey Long's life that, as they fight for better things, there will always be the inspiration that fighting with them in spirit will be that fearless, dauntless, unmatchable champion of the common people Huey P. Long.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, immediately after the adjournment of the Senate today there will be unveiled in the old Hall of the House of Representatives, in the Capitol of the United States, a bronze statue of the late and lamented former United States Senator, Huey Pierce Long.

Under date of July 2, 1938, the Governor of the State of Louisiana approved act No. 157 of the Legislature of Louisiana, making an appropriation of $15,000 and creating a commission composed of three persons, to be appointed by him, to procure such a statue. The commission is composed of Mrs. Rose McConnell Long, widow of the late Senator Long and a former United States Senator; Hon. Earle J. Christenberry, secretary to the late Senator Long and myself. Pursuant to the provisions of the act we have procured the statue and caused it to be placed in the National Statuary Hall, in the Capitol at Washington.

Huey Pierce Long was born on a farm in Winn Parish, La., on August 30, 1893. He was the seventh child in a family of nine. His early life was spent in the midst of toil; and, like most men who have climbed highest on the shining ladder of fame, he commenced at the lowest round.

Huey was an ambitious lad, with a burning desire for knowledge. At the tender age of 13 he worked as a printer to earn money to further his education. This he did while attending elementary and high school at Winnfield, and after doing the chores assigned to him by his parents in and about the house and on the farm. In high school his proficiency and brilliance in debate won for him a scholarship to Louisiana State University; but, due to lack of sufficient funds and the inability of his parents to add to those he had saved, he was unable to take advantage of a 4-year college course.

At the age of 17 Huey left high school and obtained employment as a traveling salesman; and for a period of 4 years he remained in that field. He sold pie plates, cook books, shoe polish, and canned goods. While working as salesman for a produce company in Oklahoma City he was able to attend the University of Oklahoma for a period of 5 months, during which time he studied law. When he was under 20, and while still employed as a salesman, he married Miss Rose McConnell. In 1914 he matriculated as a law student at Tulane University, completing the course in the short period of 7 months, and on May 15, 1915, he passed the Louisiana bar examination and became a full-fledged lawyer.

Huey Long was always a student. He had a profound knowledge of the Holy Bible. He never finished his education. Until the night when he was felled by an assassin's bullet he was a pupil, a learner, an inquirer, a seeker of knowledge. He was also a born salesman, and his early association with thousands of men, women, and children of every walk of life sharpened his natural wit and keen observation. He was unaffected, devoid of pretense, and genuine in his thought. He learned to understand the nature of people, their wants, their desires, their moods, their surroundings, and their way of living, all of which was of inestimable value to him during his career as an attorney and statesman.

Huey Long was a great lawyer. He crossed swords with some of the ablest attorneys in the country. He always endeavored to get at the truth, at the very core of a case. He had a clear head and a good heart. He was logical. He was not a case lawyer; he was original, thoughtful, and profound. His genius soon won for him the admiration of the court and of his fellow members of the bar. When he argued there was no quibbling; he was as direct as light. The late Chief Justice Taft of the United States Supreme Court said of him that Huey Long had the most brilliant legal mind of any lawyer who ever argued before his court.

Soon after being admitted to the bar Huey Long engaged in politics; and at the age of 25 he was elected railroad commissioner for the north Louisiana district. In that capacity he gained prominence as an advocate for the masses. He became chairman of the railroad commission, the name of which was afterward changed by constitutional amendment to the public service commission. As chairman and chief counsel of the commission he was constantly engaged in complicated legislation, which resulted in reduced telephone rates, cheaper gas charges, and lower streetcar fares, all of which inured to the benefit of the masses, as was intended by him.

After leading an unsuccessful fight for small independent oil operators, Huey then fought the large, well-established oil companies that were doing business in Louisiana. The large companies refused to transport in their pipe lines and to manufacture in their refineries the oil produced by the small operators, and naturally forced them out of business.

At that time Long was too young to qualify as a candidate for Governor; but he supported an independent candidate and made the transportation and taxation of oil one of the issues of the campaign. His candidate won the election but was later charged by Long with having failed to carry out his campaign pledges, thereby affording to Long the opportunity of becoming more and more prominent in his advocacy of the cause of the downtrodden, so-called common man. He became his champion. On August 30, 1923, at the age of 30, which is the minimum age in Louisiana for a candidate to qualify for Governor, he announced his candidacy in the primary election to be held in January 1924. He lost that election, but this defeat did not alter his determination to become Louisiana's chief executive. On the contrary, it seemed to spur him on, for, immediately following this set-back, he announced his candidacy for Governor for 4 years later, at which time he was successful.

He had no organized group supporting his candidacy. He fought well-entrenched, old-line politicians, and the so-called privileged class of the State. For generations past candidates for Governor of Louisiana had made innumerable promises to aid the poor, the down-trodden, and the helpless, but after election the promises were soon forgotten until the next election came along.

That was not the case with the intrepid, fiery, ambitious young Governor who hailed from the red hills of North Louisiana. He had boasted of being, and actually was, one of the masses, and had determined since early childhood to acquire a position in life in which he could help the underprivileged. As Governor, his opportunity had now arrived. He had an ambitious program, and in the face of almost insurmountable opposition he set to work to execute it. Because he had promised free school books, modernized schools and colleges, elimination of adult illiteracy, free bridges, paved highways, increased free hospitalization for the poor, and many other proposals in aid of the needy and underprivileged, the raising of money soon became the paramount issue of his administration.

During the first regular session of the legislature Governor Long had little or no difficulty in having enacted most of the necessary legislation to carry out his program, all dependent, however, upon tax legislation of sufficient scope to raise the necessary revenues. He would not tax the poor, who were already overburdened; therefore he resolved to tax the wealthy, principally those engaged in acquiring riches from Louisiana's vast natural resources, and also to impose corporate franchise taxes, income taxes, and taxes of a like nature that would have to be borne principally by the so-called privileged class. This policy placed him and his administration in bitter disfavor with the press of the State, which was dependent on big business for its life blood.

During the first session of the legislature Long succeeded in raising some money from new taxes, but not enough to carry out his ambitious program; and on March 3, 1929, he called an extra session of the legislature, with further taxation as the moving reason for the call. In the meantime the dissatisfaction of big interests was growing more intense and the opposition had grown stronger, and Governor Long was severely criticized as being "incompetent" and "temperamentally unfit to hold the high office of Governor," while such epithets as "dictator" and "briber of legislators" were applied to him. He gave no attention to his accusers, but remained firm in his conviction that those best able to pay should bear the burden of taxation.

When he realized that he would have difficulty in enacting his proposed measures at the special session, he resolved to bring about an adjournment of the legislature, but to no avail. In the meantime his opposition gathered momentum and impeachment charges were preferred against him.

His enthusiasm for what he believed to be right knew no bounds. Never for a moment did he despair during the hearings before the House of Representatives, which had resolved itself into an inquisitorial tribunal to investigate the charges preferred against him. He carried his fight to the people. He was a great orator, clear, sincere, and natural. He had but one language. He did not pretend. He said, not what he thought others thought, but what he thought. He brought the real issues home to the people in clear, simple language. To offset the constant attack of the press and its attempts to becloud the real issues, he flooded the State with convincing circulars. When the State senate met, organized as a court of impeachment to try him, it heard arguments and some evidence, and adjourned sine die by reason of the unconstitutionality and invalidity of all impeachment charges before it.

He anticipated more obstructions to his program when the legislature would meet in the next regular session, and he again made a direct appeal for support to the people, in whom he had never lost faith.

As was expected, the opposition forces tried to destroy his organization by attempting to recall the speaker of the house, but that movement failed. The house of representatives enacted all the legislation proposed by Governor Long, but he encountered a filibustering senate that prevented the enactment of any of his legislation, so that the regular session of 1930 came to naught.

When that occurred, Huey again made his appeal to the people. While fighting for the masses with one hand, he fought off his political enemies with the other. He offered himself as a candidate for United States Senator, with purely local matters as the issue in his campaign, contending that if defeated for Senator he would resign as Governor or not attempt to put his program through. The people responded. He gained an overwhelming victory at the polls, and less than 30 days after his election to the United States Senate he again called an extra session of the legislature, and at this session his entire program was adopted.

Huey Long's battle against entrenched politicians and the so-called privileged interests is an epoch in Louisiana's history. Under his leadership the government of Louisiana for the first time was really and truly responsive to the necessities of the people. After he became a Senator of the United States he maintained his influence in State politics, and directed the enactment of further legislation to benefit the masses. Included in these were the abolition of poll taxes, tax exemption on homes, and a further expansion of all universities and colleges.

Like all great Americans who have devoted their efforts and talents in behalf of the masses, who have sought to help

the so-called common people, the humble members of society who have not the influence to secure recognition, Huey Long was lied about, abused, slandered, and vilified. In that respect his life is but a replica of that of other great leaders.

All of us honor Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our great party, the champion of the common people. Because of his noble fight against entrenched wealth and affluence, he had to battle the press, Federal judges, and the powerfully rich who were stantioned in high Government positions. His enemies heaped abuse upon him, labeling him "American prototype of Robespierre," "Red Jacobin," "Evangelist of Anarchy," "Creator of Class Hatred." The incomparable Jefferson took all these invectives in stride, never wavering from his determination to place human rights above property rights.

We pay tribute today to Andrew Jackson, the matchless champion of the common people; yet during his time he was vilified and denounced by the press as "rash," "dangerous," "destructive of the American institutions, and of the courts." Andrew Jackson ranks as one of our foremost and greatest Americans.

Let us not overlook the blasts that were directed at another great American, the friend of the masses, Woodrow Wilson. Oh, yes, Mr. President, Woodrow Wilson's opponents did not spare him. They poured forth their bitterness in the press, and such terms as "The Evangelist," "The Man of Mystery," "The One-Track Mind," "The Temperamentalist," were common from his contemporaries.

Last but not least, volumes of newspaper abuse have been hurled at our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was thrice elected to the Presidency. A greater champion of the masses is yet to be born. Here are a few examples: "Dictator," "Spendthrift," "Usurper of Power," "A Warmonger." Those are but a few of the choice descriptive epithets which have been voiced against him.

Long has been accused of creating a dictatorship in Louisiana. No, Mr. President, Huey Pierce Long was not a dictator. He fought valiantly and gave his time and talents and life to lift the mantle of poverty from the poor and oppressed by affording to them numerous benefits at the expense of the citizens of Louisiana best able to bear the burdens of taxation. He fought for the poor and oppressed with his convincing oratory, with his pen, with his wits, with his great intellect and knowledge of human character.

Some day the true greatness of Huey Pierce Long will be fully understood and appreciated by our people. History will give acclaim and credit to him for his broad vision and wonderful accomplishments. As the years go by, more people visit the monuments that Huey has built for Louisiana. They stand as beacon lights to his genius as a great builder and founder of a new State.

Mr. President, I repeat, Huey Pierce Long was not a dictator. He was a doer of things for the benefit of the masses; and, after all is said and done, his philosophy of distribution of wealth, his advocacy of pensions for the aged, shorter working hours for labor, and in fact his continued fight for the masses, which marked him for death, will remain as a challenge to true democracy in this treasured land of ours.

But Huey Long's critics are still loud in their denunciation of him and his policies. They continue to tear asunder the character of this dead leader, whose memory is revered by the lowly, the destitute and humble of the Nation. My candid judgment is that the name of Huey Pierce Long will go down in history as another of our great American statesmen while most of his critics will be forgotten before they are cold in their graves.

In closing, Mr. President, permit me to quote from one of our country's great leaders, Theodore Roosevelt, a quotation which I deem strikingly appropriate:

It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause; who, at the best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievements; and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Immediately following the adjournment of the Senate today, the unveiling of the statue of the late Senator Long, presented by the State of Louisiana, will take place in Statuary Hall.

The addresses contemplated by the orders adopted by the Senate having been concluded, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senators, the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday next.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, April 29, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25, 1941:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Thomas F. McAllister, of Michigan, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, vice Hon. Herschel V. Arant, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

John Bright, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, to fill a new position.

Simon H. Rifkind, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William Fleet Palmer, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California, vice Benjamin Harrison, resigned.

Malcolm E. Lafargue, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana, vice Harvey G. Fields, whose term has expired.

Charles F. Uhl, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James Joseph Gillespie, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa, vice George E. Miller, whose term has expired.

H. Chess Richardson, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1941.

Louis E. LeBlanc, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1941.

Granville T. Norris, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1941.

Joseph C. Reing, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. Mr. Reing is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 9, 1941.

William Holroyd McGinnis, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia, vice George P. Alderson, resigned.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Robert H. McBride, of Michigan, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

John M. Morin, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of 6 years from March 15, 1941. (Reappointment.)

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Harry N. Child, of Washington, to be Register of the Land Office at Spokane, Wash. (Reappointment.)

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE A CHIEF GUNNER

Gunner Ralph A. Taylor, to rank as such from May 1, 1941.

TO BE A CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Radio Electrician John T. Oden, to rank as such from May 1, 1941.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Leo Myron Kreber, Field Artillery (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Sidney Parker Spalding (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Godfrey Cheshire, Field Artillery (National Guard of the United States).

Lt. Col. Harry Clyde Ingles, Signal Corps.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Augustin T. Beauregard to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of April 1941.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Thomas J. Doyle, Jr., December 1, 1940.

William W. Meek, February 1, 1941.

Carl H. Jones, April 1, 1941.
Paul A. Stevens, April 1, 1941.
Alfred P. H. Tawresey, April 1, 1941.
Theo D. Westfall, April 1, 1941.
Robert H. Grayson, April 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:
Gerald W. Thomson, July 1, 1939.
Carlton R. Todd, April 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:
John A. Glick, December 1, 1940.
Gordon A. McLean, December 1, 1940.
John L. Woodbury, January 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:
William L. Dawson, December 1, 1940.
Dale Mayberry, December 13, 1940.

Ensign Bethel V. Otter to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1940.

Medical Inspector Melville J. Aston to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 1st day of July 1940.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Fred L. Haerlin, Jr., to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of October 1940.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the date stated opposite their names:
Ross G. Linson, October 1, 1940.
Thomas P. O'Connell, December 16, 1940.

The following-named civil engineers to be civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the date stated opposite their names:
Henry F. Bruns, June 23, 1938.
James T. Mathews, July 1, 1940.
Paul J. Searles, July 1, 1940.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of January 1941:
William O. Kuykendall
Alexis T. Terrio

Gunner Tribble R. Sanders to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 2d day of February 1941.

Machinist Pat N. Wilson to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of March 1941.

Pharmacist Charles H. Redfield to be a chief pharmacist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of January 1941.

Assistant Paymaster James E. Bullock to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:
Francis X. Forest, June 26, 1940.
Louis L. Vodila, December 1, 1940.
Robert G. Armstrong, December 13, 1940.
Joe B. Paschal, December 16, 1940.

Pay Clerk John C. Le Clare to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of January 1941.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Burden R. Hastings to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of January 1941.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for the story of Thy mercy and grace. Grant that we may commit our ways unto Thee so that we shall not be paralyzed by disorder, nor impoverished by anxiety. Empower our wills, enlighten our minds, and hold us when life leaps into some sudden emergency. Keep us free, blessed Lord, from the havoc of worry and fret that Thy gracious Spirit may steal into the threatened parts of our lives, giving us peace, allowing Thy beauty to permeate our vision. We thank Thee that Thou dost pity us in our weaknesses and tendencies and when we stumble we fall into the waiting ministry of Thy love. In all the pages of living tenderness, in the countless numbers which have sought and molded their characters into Thy image, we behold Thy inspiration and lift our hearts in gratitude. We commend our President to Thy merciful care, together with his official advisers; endue them with the greatest wisdom as they direct the affairs of state through these perilous times and unto Thee be the glory forever. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ACQUISITION OF MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Saturday night within which to file a report on the bill H. R. 4466, dealing with the acquisition of ships; and that the members of the committee, or any of them desiring so to do, may have similar privilege to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD. I find the estimate from the Public Printer shows this is somewhat in excess of the usual limit. It will amount to something over four pages, but I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TAXATION AND APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, probably one of the most important hearings ever held before a committee was held yesterday before the Committee on Ways and Means, when the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before that committee in advocacy of a tax measure that would raise $3,500,000,000. I was particularly impressed with one feature of his remarks, with which I so fully agree. He said, in effect, that it would be possible to save at least $1,000,000,000 from the appropriations that are now being suggested to Congress. I think that is the first thing we should try to do [applause], to save money rather than expend it so extravagantly. We ought to do this before placing any more taxes on the people.

Further than that, he said there should be cooperation between the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, and that I most heartily approve, having in mind the possibility of the economy in expenditures that he so well advocated yesterday.

I therefore urge the adoption of my resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) providing for a joint study of our finances by representatives of those two committees. In this way we could get an over-all picture of our financial problems, and deal with them as a whole, instead of separately, as we now do, whereby extravagant appropriations are made that the Ways and Means Committee are expected to provide for with burdensome new taxes. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TREADWAY was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

THE LATE HON. DENNIS D. DONOVAN

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow I announce the passing of Dennis D. Donovan, a former Representative from the Fifth District of Ohio; born in Henry County, Ohio, January 31, 1859; attended the common schools and the Northern Indiana Normal School, Valparaiso, Ind.; studied law at Georgetown, was admitted to the bar in 1895, and commenced practice in Deshler, Ohio; taught school; engaged in the mercantile and timber business; appointed postmaster of Deshler by President Cleveland on July 21, 1885, and served until January 27, 1888; member of the State house of representatives in 1887 and 1889; elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses March 4, 1891, to March 3, 1895; died at Napoleon, Henry County, Ohio, April 21, 1941.

My district mourns a fine American, a gracious gentleman, a sterling, loyal Democrat.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of Ireland's neutrality and to include a letter from John J. O'Connor to William Griffin, editor of the New York Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. HUEY P. LONG

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLS of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the business on the Speak-

er's desk and any other special orders that have been granted today, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial written by Hon. Frank Smith, editor of the Lake Charles American Press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKES IN THE COAL MINES

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, due to the importance of iron ore in the present defense picture, our Government, through the United States Coast Guard, this spring expended a considerable sum of money to open the Straits of Mackinac ahead of the normal opening of the navigation season. Through the splendid efforts of the officers and crew on the Coast Guard cutters *Escanaba* and *Tahoma*, as well as the officers and crew of the ice-breaking car ferry *Sainte Marie*, these straits were made open to navigation on April 1, and the first Great Lakes freighters went into operation through the Straits of Mackinac on April 2. Normal navigation does not open until April 15. These cutters and the ice-breaker continued on up the St. Mary's River, past Sault Ste. Marie and through Whitefish Bay in Lake Superior, opening this entire channel to early transportation by the large fleet of ore carriers on the Great Lakes. As a result, during the month of April this year, the large fleet of ore carriers on the Great Lakes will have transported some 5,000,000 more tons of iron ore than ever before in the history of Great Lake's transportation.

However, Mr. Speaker, I called your attention on Tuesday to the fact that the coal-mine strike now threatens to tie all of these ore carriers to the docks, unless coal is forthcoming immediately. I called your attention to the fact that the large and very important coal dock at Lime Island at the mouth of the St. Mary's River will be completely out of bunker fuel this week.

Yesterday there appeared before our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee a gentleman representing the shippers on the Great Lakes, who stated in answer to a question propounded by me that unless coal was forthcoming the early part of next week the entire Great Lakes fleet of ore carriers would of necessity go to anchor or be tied to the docks.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely serious situation and demands immediate action. If our Government is going to play fair with the young men who have been taken away from their fireside, off the farms, away from their stores, away from their benches, and drafted into the Army at $21 per month; I say if we are going to play fair with those young men, then it is up to the President to see to it that this coal-mine strike is settled and settled promptly, and a steady stream of coal again finds its way into industry and to the shores of the Great Lakes in order that there may be no interruption in the steady flow of iron ore to the great steel producing centers of this Nation.

It is indeed gratifying, Mr. Speaker, to learn that our Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, has finally succumbed to pressure from the Congress and from public opinion and has swallowed her pride of lack of accomplishment and has finally submitted this matter to the National Defense Mediation Board. All America hopes that this Board may be successful in arriving at a speedy and satisfactory solution to this problem. Should it fail, then it is up to the President to demand, and obtain, prompt action in the settlement of this dispute. Soft words and "pussyfooting" tactics will longer avail. Action must be had and had now. Let there be no more fiddling while Rome burns. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Bainbridge News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two editorials commenting on a recent talk given in Milwaukee by Senator WHEELER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters received from the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKE METHODS OF THE C. I. O.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

I see the agents of the C. I. O., communistic group, "fifth column" boys are again stopping the program of national defense in this country in Baltimore. Permit me to read an excerpt from one of my letters from San Pedro:

In San Pedro on Monday, April 14, 1941, a shortage of stevedore gangs existed and it developed that many of the men were absent from their usual work because they were registering at the California shipyard so that in the event of an election there they would be in a position to vote and swing the election in favor of the C. I. O.

They did not work there but they registered as though they did.

A number of longshoremen also were picketing the employment office of the shipyard, making every effort to force new registrants to join the C. I. O.

That is the way the C. I. O. establishes itself in industry, and, unfortunately, through an agency of the United States Government, the National Labor Relations Board, these men are abusing the power of the Government, taking the law into their own hands, and the communists in their ranks have been able to deliver our industry into the hands of our enemies. How can we expect national defense under such circumstances? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters received from Mr. and Mrs. Melvin E. Good, residents of Montana, on our foreign policy, which I think puts the whole question in a nutshell.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONVOYS AND WAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much alarmed when I picked up the morning paper to find that Secretary Knox and Secretary Hull say we are just about in the war and it is our duty to do everything we can to further the war that is now going on in Europe. The President agreed to and approved their remarks, so the news item stated.

President Roosevelt said that convoying means shooting, and shooting means war. If we start convoying ships across the Atlantic we shall be in the war and have to send our boys there. I am and always have been against our intervention in the affairs of the European and Asiatic countries that lead us to war. Let us use our good office by peaceful means to stop the fighting.

I say that the war in Europe is not the war of the United States of America; that the thing for us to do if we want to preserve our national unity, if we want to preserve our country, is to stay at home and attend to our own business. Keep America out of war. The American people want no war in Europe, nor do I. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to ask the Congress what it expects to do if with the all-out aid we voted and the $7,000,000,000 we voted all goes to the bottom or seems likely to go to the bottom of the sea? What do you gentlemen propose to do about it?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes. I am asking that as a question.

Mr. RICH. I did not vote for the lease-lend bill. I did not vote for the $7,000,000,000 aid bill. I was opposed to it then, and I am opposed to it now. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. I can see the gentleman's position. I spoke on this subject yesterday. But those of us who voted the other way; those of us who voted for the program; those of us who voted for the $7,000,000,000 want to see our aid effective. I can understand how those who voted against the general program would not be enthusiastic about carrying it out, but I am saying that all who voted as I did, making a majority, we who voted and who put it through, are asking what the Congress proposes to do to see that aid made effective? Are we willing to sit still and see it all go to the sea bottom? That is a question this Congress must answer. Thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include my statement made before the Appropriations Committee in connection with irrigation at Bonneville, Oreg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of the legislative business in order for the day and after any previous orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

INTERFERENCE BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me call attention to a real kindly act committed by a department official down here. I have a letter which came from the manager of a farmers' cooperative, who was visited by one of these administration wage-hour men. The manager of this farmers' cooperative writes as follows:

Another thing I did not like—Mr. Thoroman (a wage-hour employee) told my boys he did not understand why they worked here in our feed room for $21 to $24 a week in these little towns, when in Detroit they can earn big wages, such as 85 to 90 cents an hour. Why try and make our employees discontented? They now get $24 and $27 a week. That's more net than big-city pay.

Why does this Government official, on Government time and on Government pay, go around interfering in these little towns with men who are contented, who want to live there in these towns, and try to induce those men to give up their jobs and seek employment in the cities? Just when will these nosey, swell-headed Federal employees quit seeking to run the business of better men? Just why does a Federal job, paid for by tax money, make the Federal hired man—and he is no more than that—think he owns the farm? Call off your agitators, Mr. Fleming.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

SHALL WE CONVOY?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I listened very patiently yesterday to a discourse by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] upon the proposition of whether or not we were going to permit this huge quantity of materials, $7,000,000,000 worth, to strew Davey Jones' locker. I am wondering if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] has taken into consideration the possibility that the bodies of 7,000,000 of our boys will strew that same Davey Jones' locker unless we watch what we are doing. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by myself at Corsicana, Tex., before the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

MOBILIZATION OF WOMEN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 I addressed myself at some length to a proposal for the mobilization of the womanhood of America which had the genesis in a White House conference in January. At that time I indicated to the House the authority for the statements which I made, and at the conclusion of those remarks my good friend, the majority leader, vigorously assailed my observations with this language:

My purpose is not so much to pay attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois as it is to point out the cleverness of his statement: That he takes a rumor and then proceeds to argue the rumor as if it were a fact; that the women of the country are going to be mobilized, when every one of them knows there is not foundation for the statement. Only the other day Secretary Early, if I read the papers correctly, made the statement that there was no justification for it. That shows how far statements based on rumor can be made that results in a smearing of the President of the United States, and to undermine the President of the United States, when the President, either directly or through his secretary, has been compelled to deny malicious and false statements and rumors.

Mr. Speaker, I allude to this matter today for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the House an article appearing on the front page of the Washington Post, in the issue of Friday, April 25, which bears the following headline:

Mrs. Roosevelt urges United States draft and train girls to aid defense.

[Applause.]

TAXATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to be alarmed over statements made on the subject of taxation and the fiscal policies that are now being pursued. If we are going to levy all of these taxes on the little fellow and refuse to raise the inheritance tax and the income tax in the higher brackets, it will continue to concentrate the wealth of this Nation in the hands of a few men. Less than 5 percent of our people now own more than 90 percent of our wealth. If this condition continues the Government will collapse.

Again, it is proposed, not to expand the currency but to freeze prices, which will grind American farmers into the

dust. The farmers cannot, and the small businessmen cannot, meet their obligations on the present price levels. If we are going to freeze prices on their present levels, maintain the gold standard based on the gold buried in Kentucky, hold prices down by refusing to expand the currency, in order that the ones who have their wealth accumulated may wring interest from the American people on their vast fortunes for the next hundred years, if we are going to guarantee these shylocks their pound of flesh, we ought to have the courage to tell the people so now. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

REEMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS RETIRED UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 881) to permit the reemployment by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of persons retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SURRENDER OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future the St. Lawrence seaway proposal, a treaty, will be before this House in the form of a resolution. I am opposed to the project. My opposition is based upon my opinion that it is not in the public interest. It would be definitely harmful to labor, agriculture, rail transportation, motor transportation, and industry in this country.

Its proponents argue that it is necessary for the national defense. They admit that it will require from 5 to 8 years to complete and that it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars at a time when the backs of our taxpayers are breaking. If this World War lasts for so long a time as indicated by the proponents, the seaway will be too late to be of any use to us.

One of the best informed men on the subject of water transportation and its relation to other forms of transportation is Mr. Cleveland Newton, of St. Louis, Mo. He is general counsel of the Mississippi Valley Association and a former Member of this House, representing for a number of years approximately the same district which I now have the honor to represent. I sought to get from him pertinent facts concerning this treaty's effect upon the great Mississippi Valley. I here express my gratitude for his authoritative information.

It is my purpose to throw light on certain important phases of the project, namely, the surrender of Lake Michigan, the treaty and the improper method of attempted approval, and the relation of the project to our present midwestern waterways system. Careful study of the treaty has caused me to brand it as the surrender of Lake Michigan.

SENATE REJECTED 1933 TREATY

The Constitution and laws of this country require that a treaty between the United States and any foreign country shall be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Approximately 8 years ago the President submitted to the Senate for ratification a treaty which had been agreed upon between the United States and Great Britain and Canada, providing for the building of a seaway from the Great Lakes down the St. Lawrence River through Canada to the Atlantic Ocean. This treaty was submitted to the Senate in January 1933 by President Hoover, but was not ratified during that session of Congress. On January 10, 1934, President Roosevelt sent a message to the Senate in which he said, in part—

To the Senate:

I request the consideration of ratification by the Senate of the so-called St. Lawrence Treaty with Canada. Broad national reasons lead me, without hesitation, to advocate the treaty. There are two main considerations, navigation and power.

This treaty of 1933 failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate, and hence failed of ratification.

From the viewpoint of the Mississippi Valley States, the principal objection to that treaty was that it surrendered to Great Britain and Canada sovereignty over Lake Michigan. Lake Michigan is an all-American lake, entirely within the American watershed, and into which no drop of Canadian water has ever flowed.

Article VIII of the treaty of 1933 was especially objectionable to the Valley States and to the Mississippi Valley generally, because it incorporated in article VIII of said treaty a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States dealing with the Chicago River as a part of the port of Chicago, and limiting the diversion of water from Lake Michigan to the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to an annual average flow of 1,500 second-feet.

HENRY CLAY—TREATY OF GHENT

For more than 150 years Lake Michigan has at all times been an American lake. After the War of 1812, while the Treaty of Ghent was being written, a controversy arose among the delegates regarding the status of Lake Michigan. The British representatives insisted that Lake Michigan be included in the boundary waters. Our representatives, among whom was Henry Clay, refused to agree to this contention, and after an extended controversy Henry Clay served notice upon the British delegates that the United States would never yield to their contention, and that rather than do so, they would come home and continue the war for 6 years longer.

ELIHU ROOT—TREATY OF 1910

During the preparation of the treaty of 1910, Great Britain undertook to write into the treaty a provision limiting the diversion from Lake Michigan for use in an all-American Lakes-to-the-Gulf waterway to 10,000 cubic feet per second. Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, refused to agree to this limitation. Secretary Root explained to the Senate that his reason for refusing to agree to this provision was that Lake Michigan was an all-American lake, entirely within our country, and that he refused to have anything in the treaty about Lake Michigan. He said that he would not permit Lake Michigan to be mentioned in the treaty.

In the treaty of 1933 the sovereignty of Lake Michigan was involved by limiting the right of the United States to divert more than 1,500 second-feet annual average from this all-American lake. The treaty now proposed by the President is much more explicit in dealing with the sovereignty of Lake Michigan. Paragraph (b) of the preliminary article of the proposed treaty reads as follows:

(b) "Great Lakes system" means Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron (including Georgian Bay), Erie, and Ontario, and the connecting waters, including Lake St. Clair.

Our Government specifically prevented Lake Michigan from being mentioned in the treaty of 1910, and when they included Lake Michigan as a part of the "Great Lakes system" they clearly challenged the right of this country to complete sovereignty over Lake Michigan. The surrender of sovereignty over Lake Michigan is further indicated by part of paragraph (c) of article VIII of the proposed treaty of 1941, which reads as follows:

(c) If any diversion of water from the Great Lakes system, other or greater in amount than diversions permitted in either of the countries on January 1, 1940, is authorized, the government of such country agrees to give immediate consideration to any representations respecting the matter which the other government may make.

On January 1, 1940, the Supreme Court decree limiting the diversion from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi Valley waterway system to 1,500 second-feet was in full force and effect, and the diversion in the treaty proposed by the President is therefore limited to 1,500 second-feet just as effectively as if the Supreme Court decree had been incorporated in the new treaty as it was in article VIII of the treaty of 1933.

It is well to compare the provisions of article VIII of the proposed treaty with the similar provisions of article VIII of the treaty of 1933, largely because of the dangers to our sovereignty over Lake Michigan. Paragraph (A) 1 of article VIII of the treaty of 1933 reads as follows:

(A) 1. That the diversion of water from the Great Lakes system through the Chicago drainage canal shall be reduced by December 31, 1938, to the quantity permitted as of that date by the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States of April 21, 1930.

The similarity between the provisions of article VIII in the treaty of 1933 and those contained in article VIII of the proposed treaty of 1941 are very, very striking. The principal difference is that one refers to the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States which limited the diversion from Lake Michigan to 1,500 second-feet annual average, while the other limits the diversion from Lake

Michigan to the amount being taken on January 1, 1940, which was, in fact, 1,500 second-feet annual average, the amount which had been fixed as the limit by the decree of the Supreme Court. If the sovereignty of the United States over Lake Michigan was involved in the treaty of 1933, it is clearly involved in the treaty now proposed by the President.

The proposed treaty provides that if any diversion of water from the Great Lakes system, which under the new treaty would include Lake Michigan, other or greater in amount than the diversion permitted in either of the countries on January 1, 1941, is authorized, then each country agrees to submit to arbitration the question of such increased diversion.

ARBITRATION PROVISION

Before an arbitration over an increased diversion from Lake Michigan could be set in operation, it would be necessary for the United States to authorize an increased diversion from Lake Michigan, and the only power in the United States which could authorize such increased diversion would be either the Supreme Court or Congress.

If the treaty as proposed with article VIII is ratified or approved by Congress containing a limit of 1,500 second-feet annual average from Lake Michigan, it is extremely doubtful whether the Supreme Court or the Congress could be induced to authorize a diversion in excess of the amount provided in the proposed treaty. Either the Supreme Court or the Congress would undoubtedly tell the proponents of such increased diversion that their remedy should be a new treaty authorizing such increase. It is very doubtful under the terms of the proposed treaty whether an arbitration for an increased diversion could ever be set in motion.

YIELDING CONTROL

So long as our sovereignty over Lake Michigan continues, a decision of the Supreme Court or an act of Congress authorizing an increase in the diversion from Lake Michigan will be final, but if the proposed treaty is ratified or approved by Congress, then Canada is authorized to appeal from a decree of the Supreme Court or an act of Congress to an international arbitral tribunal set in motion by a foreign government. This seems a rather unusual power for this Government to confer upon any foreign country. Furthermore, this might become a dangerous precedent.

As above stated, the treaty of 1933, largely because of the reasons mentioned, fell far short of the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate. It is perfectly apparent that the document which the President has submitted to Congress and which he chooses to call an agreement to be approved by a bare majority of a quorum in each House of Congress is in reality a treaty between Great Britain and the United States. It deals with an international question which, under the Constitution of this country, should be submitted to the Senate of the United States for approval or rejection.

There is no more reason for calling this document an agreement than there was for calling that document of 1933 an agreement which was submitted to the Senate and which was rejected by the Senate in 1934. The only real difference is that to ratify a treaty requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate, while to approve an agreement requires only a majority vote of each House. In view of the fate in the Senate of the treaty of 1933, it is not surprising that the proponents of this treaty should seek to avoid the two-thirds vote required for a treaty on the new document now proposed.

A TREATY AND NOT AN AGREEMENT

The document which the President has presented to Congress and which he sees fit to call an agreement is nothing more nor less than a treaty between the United States and Great Britain, and under the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification.

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties; provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Thus, the Constitution has prescribed the method by which treaties may be made.

A TREATY DEFINED

What is a treaty? Our courts and law writers have defined a treaty as follows:

A treaty is a contract between nations. *Goetge* v. *United States* (103 F. 72); *Sontovinoenzo* v. *Egan* (280 U. S. 30).

At the time the Constitution was adopted, the great authority on international law was Vattel. He died before the Constitution was adopted, but his treatise was widely accepted as containing sound treatment of all international questions.

In section 152 of Vattel's work appears the following:

A treaty in Latin foedus, is a pact entered into by sovereigns for the welfare of the state, either in perpetuity or for a considerable length of time.

Section 153 of Vattel's work provides:

Compacts, agreements, or conventions. Pacts which have for their object matters of temporary interest are called agreements, conventions, compacts.

In the case of *Altman & Co.* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583), Mr. Justice Day uses the following language:

Generally a treaty is defined as "a compact made between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare" (2 Bouvier's Dictionary 1136).

DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

This so-called agreement presents other serious problems. It changes the terms and provisions of a number of treaties which have heretofore been solemnly ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. By what authority, under the Constitution and laws of this country, can a treaty, duly ratified and in full force and effect, be changed by a resolution approved by a bare majority of a quorum in each House of Congress? It would seem that the dangers of such a precedent would be worth the serious consideration of the Congress and the country.

CONSTITUTIONAL DOUBT

Congress has no power except that delegated to it by the several States. The States retain all other rights and powers. They have not delegated to Congress, or the President, the right to cede sovereignty. It follows, therefore, that neither the President nor the Congress have any right to cede any territory or any sovereignty over any territory to any foreign country. Lake Michigan is sovereign territory and a part of the United States.

TREATY PROPOSED 1938

There is another historical fact which should be given serious consideration in connection with this proposed treaty.

On May 31, 1938, the State Department gave out a press release, No. 256, containing a report of that Department relative to proposals of the United States for a new treaty with Canada. This press release also included a letter from Secretary Cordell Hull, addressed to the Honorable Sir Herbert Marler, Minister of Canada, and a copy of the proposed treaty.

Article VII of that proposed treaty contained the following:

Nothing in this article, or in any other article of this treaty shall be construed as infringing or impairing, in any way, the sovereignty of the United States of America over Lake Michigan.

As above indicated the State Department in its attempt to get Canada to agree to a seaway treaty in 1938, and to approve certain objections in this country, made an effort to protect our sovereignty over Lake Michigan. Why did the proposed treaty of 1941 omit this safeguard? The presumption is that Canada objected and that our State Department yielded.

It is clear that our sovereignty over Lake Michigan is in far greater danger now than it was under the treaty of 1933.

MILLIONS IN WATERWAYS

Congress has expended hundreds of millions of dollars for the improvement of a great inland waterway system in this country. This system comprises the Mississippi River from the Twin Cities to the Gulf, the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi, the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth, the Intracoastal Canal from Corpus Christi to a point connecting with the lower Mississippi River, and a great waterway from the Great Lakes system, down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf and out to the sea. A commercially useful waterway from the Great Lakes to the Gulf through this great productive area of the United States cannot be made secure without an adequate diversion of water from Lake Michigan. Prior to the Supreme Court decree, more than 8,000 cubic second-feet of water from Lake Michigan, for a period of more than 30 years, flowed from Lake Michigan into this Lakes-to-the-Gulf waterway without any injury to the navigation upon the Great Lakes.

General Pillsbury, one of the greatest hydraulic engineers of the War Department, testified before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee when the treaty of

1933 was under consideration that a diversion from Lake Michigan of from 3,500 to 4,000 second-feet could be taken from Lake Michigan without any injury to navigation upon the Lakes; that any lowering that might result to the Great Lakes system could be more than overcome by regulating works in the connecting channels between the Lakes.

DANGEROUS TO THE FUTURE

It is now proposed to limit for all time the diversion from this all-American lake to 1,500 second-feet, and no one can now tell what the future needs of the United States for the use of water from Lake Michigan may become. Suppose for argument's sake that 1,500 second-feet would meet our present requirements, who can now tell what our future needs may become?

The success of this great inland waterway system is involved in this proposed limitation of diversion. In the Mississippi River at the Chain of Rocks near St. Louis is a bottleneck through which the navigation of the various sections of this great waterway system must pass. I am advised that a dependable 9-foot channel through this bottleneck cannot be maintained during the low-water season without an adequate diversion from Lake Michigan.

Through this bottleneck must pass all the navigation from the Missouri River Valley, from the upper Mississippi River Valley, from the Great Lakes and Illinois River, before the commerce of these great interior sections can reach the lower Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. On the other hand, the commerce from the Ohio River Valley and the great area tributary to the lower Mississippi must pass through this bottleneck in order to reach the Missouri, upper Mississippi, and Illinois Rivers.

An unusual fall in the river in the vicinity of the Chain of Rocks creates this bottleneck. With an adequate diversion from Lake Michigan the problem is solved. So serious is the problem that the Army engineers have already recommended a canal with a series of locks and dams to be constructed around the bottleneck. This, of course, would be a great handicap to navigation.

There is a point in the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, St. Louis, where experienced navigators agree that a 9-foot channel cannot be maintained during the low-water season without an adequate diversion from Lake Michigan, a much less diversion than has been flowing out of Lake Michigan for more than 30 years. Navigators advise that barges cannot carry adequate loads without scraping this rock bottom, and they further report that there are a number of reports such as this between the mouth of the Missouri River and the mouth of the Ohio River, which present the same problem and where a dependable 9-foot, commercially useful channel cannot be maintained without adequate diversion from Lake Michigan.

Eminent engineers, both American and Canadian, have agreed that a diversion of 5,000 second-feet annual average from Lake Michigan would mean a difference in lake levels of only 2¼ inches. Other hydraulic engineers have agreed that an annual average diversion of 5,000 second-feet from Lake Michigan would meet the problems of navigation as herein presented in this great inland waterway system of this country.

In the near future, the so-called St. Lawrence seaway project will come before this House for consideration. Ordinarily, and in the regular course of constitutional procedure, this matter would be handled as a treaty and would come before the Senate only for ratification.

Now, the Congress is asked to set a precedent, a dangerous one, I believe, by attempting to do by simple resolution, in both Houses, that which the Constitution provides should be done by executive action and Senate ratification.

Mr. Speaker, I am against both the project and the method of procedure. They are both dangerous to America. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give us an idea as to what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District day, and if the Committee on the District of Columbia has any business that will be in order. Otherwise all I can advise my friend and the House now is that on Wednesday the Interior Department appropriation bill will be considered. That is the only thing I can foresee now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

HUEY LONG, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the unveiling of the statue of Senator Huey P. Long in Statuary Hall today, I desire to pay a tribute to this great Louisianian and great American. I speak as one who was reared in the same community as he was and who knew him as a classmate in high school. I knew him as a neighbor and as a struggling young lawyer and I watched his success in the legal field and the political world. I feel, therefore, that I am qualified to speak of this very remarkable man.

Huey Long had perhaps the greatest mind I have ever known. Few men could think as rapidly, as accurately, and as logically as he. He had no difficulty in speedily drafting complex legislation in new and untried fields that successfully met every challenge in the United States Supreme Court. He was one of the best read men of his age. Although he did not have the advantages of a full college education, he could quote freely from authorities in history, literature, philosophy, religion, and even ancient languages. He could concentrate quickly and effectively. He was a student all his life.

Huey Long was one of the greatest humanitarians of his day. He was truly of the common people. His first suit of any consequence was fought for a poor widow without remuneration. That suit was the key to his life work. He delighted to do battle for the poor and to ease the burden of the oppressed. He brought education within reach of all, distributed free school books to all children and opened up the way for hospitalization to the humblest homes. The tax burden was shifted from the backs of the poor and their homes were made secure to them.

Huey Long was a great progressive. He was a pioneer. He cared little for precedent and was concerned with results. He was always a man of action and quick decision. There is no question in my mind that he thought ahead of his time. He was a student of history, a close observer, and in certain causes in his day he was able to see effects which have come to pass since his death. There is every reason to believe that had he lived he would have played a much larger part in national thinking and acting. This age has produced few men with the energy, the intellect, and the forthrightness which he possessed. His great qualities of statesmanship are sorely needed in this world of chaos, indecision, and fear.

The progressive work of Huey Long in Louisiana can never be erased. He made of our great State a leader in social and economic legislation. Under his unparalleled leadership, he built one of the greatest universities in the Nation and raised the entire educational system to a point worthy of any State. Through his leadership Louisiana today has a system of paved highways as good as any other State and has more concrete bridges than any other. He lifted Louisiana out of the mud. His versatile brain and willing hand touched practically every phase of human endeavor calculated to improve and add to the well-being of our people. Always a hard worker, he was willing to give his time and attention to the problems of all the people. He never worked at anything half-heartedly.

One of the secrets of the success of his life was loyalty. He expected and received loyalty and he likewise gave loyalty. In his devotion to the principles of Americanism there was no room for a divided allegiance. He was a stanch believer in and defender of the Constitution and the great principles and concepts of democracy. He believed in Americanism in all that that term implies.

Huey Long is gone, my friends. His eventful and useful life was suddenly cut short, but I want to assure you that his name will never be forgotten by Louisianians and his influence will live long after all of us have passed to the Great Beyond. Little children who were the beneficiaries of his creative brain will still hold his name in grateful memory even when they have grown to old

age. His handiwork in Louisiana is evident everywhere you turn and it will be so for ages to come. Yes, Huey Long is gone. But I stand here today as his boyhood friend to tell you that the work which he did will not die. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an Associated Press report from Montgomery, Ala., showing the statement made by William Green with reference to assurance having been given by the President of the United States during debate on the lease-lend bill that convoys would not be used. I feel certain the President will keep that assurance given to the public at that time, notwithstanding what Secretary Knox and Secretary Hull had to say last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics, and in one to include a statement from Bishop F. J. McConnell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the program of the last meeting of the Inter-American Bar Association, the report of the organizing committee, and the declarations, resolutions, and recommendations adopted by the first conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONVOYS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] called attention to an article appearing in the Times-Herald which stated, in substance, that the administration was sending convoys to insure the delivery of materials to Great Britain. Immediately thereafter the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] arose on the floor and stated emphatically that there was not a word of truth in the newspaper report.

Then I asked the gentleman who had the floor whether we should follow the statement of the administration or whether we should take the press for it, because so often we have had this conflict in information. It is rather difficult for a Member to learn just what is happening.

This morning, the 25th, here on the front page of one of the Washington papers is this headline:

Hull, Knox hint convoy need.

This is just after we were told by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]—and no one doubts the word of the gentleman from Virginia; someone must have told him, someone down at the other end of the Avenue, somebody connected with the White House, with the administration, must just have deceived Mr. WOODRUM most shamefully, because he just got right up here and said, in substance, "There is not a word of truth in this newspaper report."

Then here comes this paper. Let me read a little bit. This is by George Bookman, Post staff writer. I do not know whether George is a liar or not. I do not know whether he is dumb or not. I do not know whether he can tell the truth or not, but I rather suspect from the fact that he is a reporter that he is an accurate observer, a good listener, and that he correctly narrates what he sees and hears, otherwise he would not long be a reporter, and here George writes:

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, last night placed the weight of his high official position behind the growing pressure for protection of shipments to Great Britain, with a declaration that aid to that embattled land "must reach its destination."

George then continues:

The Government's declared policy of aiding Axis enemies "means, in its practical application," he said, "that such aid must reach its destination in the shortest of time and in maximum quantity."

"So ways must be found to do this," Hull said, in the most outspoken public plea for protective steps for ships moving across the Atlantic yet to come from so high an official.

At about the same time Secretary of Navy Knox in another address declared, "We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Altantic," and added that "we must make good our promise to give aid to Britain."

Having gone this far, we can only go on.

Now, just what is the average, ordinary, dumb, ignorant Congressman, if there be such, to do when he gets this kind of—can I say information? You cannot say "information" really unless it is accurate, but when you read these things in the paper, what is a fellow going to do about it, and whom are you going to rely upon? Is it not about time that the administration at least tells us the truth?

You know the President the other day said there was a lack of unity. Well, if you read the papers and if you read at the head of the column the name of some man you happen to know or the name of some man who has a reputation for truth and veracity—and these boys in the gallery, the reporters, they can only hold their jobs by telling the truth at least once in a while, otherwise the papers would not keep them. They report some of these things like society items, dances, and tell who went where and when, and if they got that all wrong the women would be down on them and the boys would be out of a job. So if I must make a choice between the Chief Executive, your President and mine—oh, if I must make a choice as to which one, Mr. President, the administration or the reporters, is telling the truth, experience forces me to go along with the reporters, much as I regret that that is the only safe course.

Now, here is another item about this man, Wickard, the Secretary of Agriculture, and I was down there yesterday. We were down there for the apple growers who would like to have a little fair treatment as compared with the treatment that is being given the growers of citrus fruits, and there was Dr. Stanley, a mighty nice lady, about my age, sitting there, and she, apparently, had put out the bulletin, and one of the boys, I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] made a very instructive statement about the value of apples. He had been before the Department and among other things he had told this doctor—not Dr. Stanley but one of her subordinates, another lady, and evidently a lady of vast experience—he told her that apples were good food and had qualities about them that aided in the elimination of whatever poison might be in the alimentary canal, and do you know what this lady in the Department told the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]? She said, "I will have to have some scientific proof. Have you any document to prove that statement of yours?" Of course, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] had some, but my suggestion to Dr. Stanley was that she call this lady of hers, a chemist or whatever she might be, into her office and that we do two things; that we give the lady a glass of nice, sweet cider, and then if this scientist objected that that was not an apple, that we give her three or four sweet apples and see what happened. [Laughter.] I would bet you, were I a betting man, which I am not, that that lady, this scientist or this doctor in the Agricultural Department, would have more liberal views, as we might say, about the effect of eating apples, and she would have more real knowledge than she had before. A little book learning is sometimes an unsafe guide; experience sometimes a sure teacher.

For the purpose of adding to the knowledge of Dr. Stanley's assistant, who evidently will not accept any information unless she gets it out of a book, writing, or from the lips of some other scientist, permit me to suggest that the sweet cider, the sweet-apple treatment, will convince her that apples have some value other than as a passport out of the Garden of Eden.

Now, this man, Wickard, states here in this paper—

If Great Britain wins, there will be sweeping readjustments in agriculture. The changes would be immediate and drastic and

they would mean complete regimentation and Government control for all agriculture and all farmers.

Then he painted two contrasting pictures, and in one of them if Britain did not win, he said our farmers were going to be put out of business.

I was wondering while I read this about the letters I have received from my apple growers. We grow many, many carloads of apples of the highest quality in Michigan. And along came letters a little while ago from the farmers' co-op saying that the apples coming in from Canada at that time were breaking our apple market.

The thought comes to me, and I am sure it comes to millions of our citizens, how much longer is this administration going to continue its policy of fraud and deception?

FIRST HANDING OUT A BENEFIT, THEN DOING AN INJURY

In one mail I received a letter from the county agent at Dowagiac, Cass County, in the fourth district, telling me I could buy fertilizer for my orchard at less than the regular market price by purchasing through the Federal Agent. That was a fine thing for me but how about the businessmen or the farmers' co-op's which in the same locality sold the same kind of fertilizer and in addition, each year made a contribution by way of tax to the maintenance of the Federal Government.

Does the Agriculture Department, because it has access to the Federal pocketbook and can continue to undersell this merchant and that merchant in the local communities and in the end put him out of business, think it can still collect tax money from him after he is out of business?

These agents of various departments who are playing one class against the other are not so much interested in the people they serve as they are in a continuation of their own jobs, in the expansion of the several departments.

At least those in the Agriculture Department, if they know anything at all know that they cannot continue to milk the Federal cow unless she gets now and then a little tax money and unless private business is permitted to exist, it cannot contribute taxes.

Let me repeat, just how much longer is this administration to continue its policy of fraud and deception, of robbing Peter to pay Paul, of taking away from one group, one class, to pay subsidies, premiums, or whatever you want to call it to another group? The same policy of deception is being used in connection with our foreign policy.

First, there was the repeal of the Neutrality Act, to keep us out of war. Next we had the lend-lease bill, to keep us out of war. You gentlemen heard that on the floor. It was to keep us out of war. We were to be kept out of war by passing that bill. Then there was the $7,000,000,000 bill which was to keep us out of war. Then we were told that to keep us out of war we must send aid to Britain. In effect, we were promised by the President and all of his spokesmen that if we would just vote to aid Britain there would be no convoying, nothing to get us into war. The President in substance said that convoying meant a shooting war and that he not only hated war but that he was going to keep us out of it.

I did not believe him but millions of American citizens ignored his previous record and took him at his word. I hope I was mistaken, that they were justified. Now there is this convoying of ships, as was stated here this morning in the newspapers, and this protection zone which will extend for at least 1,000 miles. Everyone knows that that means war. If the President wants unity, if he wants the confidence of the people, why in God's name does he not once in awhile have somebody speak the truth for him, or why does he not himself tell us the truth, tell us what he intends to do? If he means war, why does he not say so?

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] yesterday, and again this morning, made the argument here on the floor when he said, "You have appropriated $7,000,000,000. Are you going to let it go down to the bottom of the sea?" A gentleman answered him and said, "Suppose we do make a mistake," or, if you do not want to do that, admit the fact that now, in order to get that material through, we would have to send our warships, manned by American boys; and there is not a man on the floor, there is not a Member of this House who does not know that if we do that it means war. Are we to send an expeditionary force to Europe? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] said yesterday in answer to me (RECORD, p. 3291), when I called attention to the fact that every nation, every people that had followed England's advice and gone to war had been defeated, "So what?"

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] had just made an argument, the gist of which was that having appropriated $7,000,000,000 for which to aid England, and it appearing that the aid was not reaching England because of the destruction of ships, the American Navy, our Government should see that it did reach England.

Speaking of those who voted for the $7,000,000,000 appropriation, the gentleman said (RECORD p. 3288):

> It seems to me that those who had conscientious convictions, as I did, are charged with the responsibility, if they are as sincere as I feel in my heart I am, of delivering the goods and in standing behind what we undertook when we said that we would deliver to England and to the Allies—and England is about the only ally left—the wherewithal to fight a battle that we feel sure is also America's fight.

And again the gentleman said, referring to the delivery of aid:

> If we are going to do it, we have got to deliver it to the Allies * * * if it comes to the point that we cannot by present means deliver—and this looks more than likely—shall we take all of this material, shall we take all of this vast money that we are raising through taxation, and everything we have scraped together, when we have turned our factories into a new kind of business, and shall we say that it must all go for naught at the bottom of the sea? Davy Jones' locker is no place for the sweat, the products, and the sacrifices of the American people. Since I voted for it, and I do not see how anybody who voted as I did on the lend-lease bill can think otherwise, and this may exempt you gentlemen who voted against it—I repeat, I do not see how anybody can do that and be consistent and go on to say that if necessary, if it can be delivered only by that means, that we should not convoy.

The inevitable result of the plan advocated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is war, and my answer to him is this: Let the President, let the Congressmen who prior to election promised the people they would not take them into this war, hold sacred those promises. Let the whole $7,000,000,000 go to the bottom of the sea, go to Davy Jones's locker, rather than now, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSON] protested this morning, send several million boys to the bottom of the sea. Let the $7,000,000,000 and all it bought go to the bottom of the brimstone pit rather than engage in a war which we are in no way prepared to fight, which we cannot prepare to fight unless this administration or this Congress reestablishes liberty here in America and permits our loyal American workers to proceed with the task of preparing for national defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article published recently in the Times-Herald of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the latest Gallup poll on the use of convoys.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House previously made, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LATE HON. HUEY P. LONG

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th day of September 1935, an assassin's bullet took the life of Huey Pierce Long, senior Senator from Louisiana, and thus ended in a dramatic way the colorful life of Louisiana's most outstanding political leader. Today, we meet to dedicate a memorial statue, placed by the Legislature of Louisiana, in the Hall of Fame in the Capitol here at Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Huey Long many years during his fiery career in Louisiana. I knew him when he practiced law at the bar of my own home city of Shreveport, where he handled many cases with outstanding success and great dexterity. I saw him elected State railroad commissioner, Governor of Louisiana, and United States Senator—always fighting against most determined opposition and yet never discouraged. Both as a private practitioner and as a public official, he chose the side of the underprivileged, and fiercely and unrelentingly battled for the cause which he in his judgment had unhesitatingly chosen to champion. As Governor of Louisiana, with the zeal of a crusader, his boundless energies flooded

over the hill-land in the north, and the bayou parishes in the South, building toll-free bridges, concrete and gravel roads, fine schools, colleges, hospitals, and public buildings. Not content was he, until his genius had created the State capitol at Baton Rouge, beneath whose lofty battlements the last mortal remains of our leader lie in peace and tranquillity today.

As Huey Long's life broadened out into its national aspect, he took up the fight for a greater diffusion of wealth among the common man. Even when his earthly career was brought to a sudden end, he was at that very moment at his post of duty, fighting with fixed purpose to help the poor and the needy.

I cannot rest from travel; I will drink
Life to the lees. All times I have enjoy'd
Greatly, have suffer'd greatly, both with those
That loved me and alone.

Mr. Speaker, many and vicious are the criticisms to which he has been subjected; and although 6 busy years have passed since the "one man, one gun, and one bullet" tragedy took from us our friend, even today his life and purposes are misunderstood by many. In summarizing, there is one phase which shines through the fog and maze of misrepresentation and misunderstanding—that is the fact that he fought on behalf of those underprivileged in our midst who need the help of the Government and of society in their struggle for existence.

Misunderstanding there may have been in some things but there is no misunderstanding regarding the devotion of Louisiana. The tremendous outpouring of humanity into the city of Baton Rouge, capital of Louisiana, on the day when his body was lifted for the last time by his friends, and brought down through the sunken gardens in front of the capitol and lowered to its final resting place, attested to the love and affection in the hearts of our people.

I attended this funeral, arriving with friends about 4 o'clock in the morning. Even at this early hour, the tide of humanity still flowed by the casket of the departed leader; and I learned that the line of people had continued, in column of fours, at a steady pace all night long, as Louisiana sought to make known the sorrow in its heart.

By the hour of the funeral, the crowd had increased to 150,000, and all roads and railroads leading into the funeral city were clogged with masses of friends still anxious to attend. Messages of condolence came from foreign sovereigns, and flowers from all of the seven continents.

To my mind the impress of the life of Huey Long has been indelibly made upon the character of our Government and upon its laws. Too remarkable was his career, and too sincere his purposes to be easily forgotten. In the lines of the poet, we may say:

Thou art not Death, the End!
In accents winning
Came the answer—"Friend,
There is no Death.
I am the Beginning,
Not the End."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3486. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, relating to defense housing, by authorizing an additional appropriation of $150,000,000, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, April 28, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will continue hearings on the following days:

1. Monday, April 28: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the western and southwestern Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado and west Gulf rivers.

2. Tuesday, April 29: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Missouri River and tributaries.

3. Wednesday, April 30: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Mississippi and Great Lakes region.

4. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

5. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

6. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

7. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

8. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

9. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

10. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

11. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

12. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

13. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

A meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will be held on Monday, April 28, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 4490.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4499, a bill to authorize the heads of the various departments and agencies of the United States to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when it is in the interest of the national defense, to authorize the President to give priority to deliveries under such contracts, and for other purposes, on Thursday, May 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 4.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, May 7, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4215 (Mr. ALLEN), to exclude certain aliens.

Consideration of House Resolution 94 (L. M. FORD) and private bills Thursday, May 8, 1941.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4466. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4478) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Sparks, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4530. A bill to promote the national defense and preparedness through the further development of the 4-H Clubs and other extension work with rural youths, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 4531. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4532. A bill to establish a Department of Air Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4533. A bill to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4534. A bill to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," in order to extend the power to establish priorities and allocate material; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DITTER:

H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Publicker Commercial Alcohol Co., Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Terwilliger and Alberta M. Terwilliger Palmer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 4537. A bill for the relief of H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodward, and J. M. Creech; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4538. A bill to authorize the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor for distinguished service to Basilio Chianelli; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

857. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petition signed by John J. Hafner and 145 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 4000, proposing to stop the sale of alcoholic beverages inside Army and naval camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

858. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of John F. Trommer, Inc., Trommer Brewery, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing further increase in tax on fermented malt liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

859. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California favoring consideration of resolution relative to encouragement of sugar-beet production in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

860. Also, memorial of the city and county of San Francisco, favoring consideration of resolution to adopt amendments to Social Security Act and Welfare and Institutions Code to provide for Federal and State assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

861. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the antiwar rally held in Detroit, Mich., April 17, protesting against the use of convoys which might lead to involvement of the United States in the European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

862. Also, resolution of the Central Cooperative Wholesale, supporting the La Follette amendment to Guffey Coal Act, permitting consumer cooperatives to act as wholesalers for their affiliate societies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

863. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Topeka Building and Construction Trades Council, Topeka, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Father in heaven, we thank Thee for the generosity of all nature. Do Thou enable us to rejoice in giving and thus avoid the penalty of those who know not how to live. To follow the law of love is to make life wiser, happier, and more divine, dismissing the feverish disquietude of undue care and fear. Having great deeds to perform, we pray not for an easier way but to be given more courage, more strength, and more poise to stand the test. O Thou who art the satisfaction of the unsatisfied longing of the human soul, pour into our hearts the blended music of faith and eternal hope. We pray that all hindrances, all divisions, and separations may pass away in every section of our country, and may our fellow citizens dwell in unity and concord, making them strong and valiant in this hour of our threatened peril. Be pleased to bless our President and those who are united with him in administration, walking in the fear of God before men. Putting aside the unworthy things which beset us, may we so live as to be an inspiration and a blessing to those whose lives are touched by ours, and Thine shall be the praise and the glory forever. In the name of our Saviour and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 99

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 25, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. M. M. LOGAN, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 100

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 25, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, late a Senator from the State of Idaho.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 101

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 25, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ERNEST W. GIBSON, late a Senator from the State of Vermont.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 102

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 25, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased .

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 103

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 25, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. KEY PITTMAN, late a Senator from the State of Nevada and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 104

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

April 25, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these extrcises shall stand adjourned.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 482. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio; and

S. 1254. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2082) entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3252) entitled "An act to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes."

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the House passed a bill providing for an additional Federal judge in the eastern district of Missouri, which includes all or part of 8 congressional districts of the 13 in the State of Missouri.

At that time in debate I called attention to the condition of the docket and predicted that a large number of new condemnation suits would be filed in that district. One hundred and fifty additional condemnation proceedings have been filed instituted by the Government. To give you an idea of how long it requires to handle one of the suits, a case was called last Monday. I received a letter from an attorney written at noon on Thursday and that case was still under consideration by the court. In 3½ days one suit had not been disposed of.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. Are those condemnation proceedings in connection with the Jefferson Memorial?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; they are not. They are for property desired by the War Department.

Mr. RICH. Thank goodness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE LATE HON. JOHN J. ESCH

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to deliver a eulogy on a former Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my very sorrowful duty to announce to the House of Representatives the death on yesterday, Sunday, April 27, 1941, of a former Member of this House, the Honorable John J. Esch, of La Crosse, Wis., who represented what is now the Third Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin for some 22 years. John Esch was one of the distinguished citizens of the Nation. He was a strong man, long a familiar figure in the Halls of Congress, whom his colleagues respected and his constituents and the people of the great State of Wisconsin trusted and repeatedly honored through his public career of a third of a century. While here, John Esch was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

John J. Esch, our former colleague, who is now gone to his great reward, was an honest man. He was a plain man and a true representative of the common people. He was a good man and a manly man, who spent his entire life in the service of others. For 22 years he represented a great and intelligent constituency in this Chamber, where the greatest men of our Republic have served and aspired to serve. That achievement alone would mark John J. Esch as a man among men. And after serving almost a quarter of a century in these Halls, he served the public on the Interstate Commerce Commission and served as Chairman of that body at one time. After leaving public life, our friend and colleague practiced law in the city of Washington. He was a member of the Mount Pleasant Congregational Church in Washington and of the First Congregational Church of La Crosse, Wis. He was a former president of the American Peace Society and of the Association of Practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Our old friend John J. Esch was gifted with intelligence, discretion, industry, and vision. He was an orator of the first order; eloquent beyond most men, he was forceful in debate. His eloquence and his genius were always used on the side of the common people. He never had any ulterior purpose to serve. Among those who knew him best he was trusted without question, and this trust reposed in him was justified. He never violated a confidence, and his friendship was enduring. His integrity knew no turning. He stood foursquare before his God. His purpose in life was to make life happy for others. His many friends and acquaintances who survive and who knew him since childhood, as did your speaker this morning, look forward to the time when we shall all meet again and enjoy those happy associations where sickness and the infirmities of life and sorrow and death are no more.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] before the Thomas Jefferson Club in my home city of Parkersburg some days ago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 149.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a brief editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE TAX IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a joint resolution adopted by the State Legislature of the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the completion of the regular business before the House and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Bridgeport Post of April 25, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the regular order of business and other special orders for tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers, also some addresses with reference to tax problems delivered before that body; and I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted even though they run beyond the limit provided by the rules.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial; second, to extend my remarks and include a resolution with regard to our late colleague Pius Schwert.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of the business for the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a statement on the Los Angeles health program by the Los Angeles County Health Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NO RIGHT TO STRIKE AGAINST PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a few words, as follows:

There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, any time, anywhere.

These words were pronounced by Gov. Calvin Coolidge at the time of the Boston police strike in 1919. Contrast this statement with the statement of the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, who says the C. I. O. has a right to strike and that right is paramount to the national-defense program of the United States; and also contrast these words with the inaction of the Russian revolutionist Hillman, who now sits in a position to best stop and sabotage our program by not saying to the C. I. O.: "Get busy, boys, get to work for the sake of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, consider all those words. Those first words made Calvin Coolidge President of the United States. I think their substance is just as important today as it was at the time they were uttered. [Applause.]

How different they are in spirit and meaning from those words and actions we receive from Madam Perkins and Hillman. If the course of these last-mentioned two prevails it will mean the end of the United States as the Republic we know. Why can we not realize this and rid this Government of all such as these?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rural electrification and include therein a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIZLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter by Mr. John S. Kowalik, of Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution recently adopted by the California State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from the News-Herald of Franklin, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter received from the President of the United States and a letter from the Secretary of Labor, as well as a telegram that I sent the Solicitor of the Labor Department this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after all the business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include three items in the Appendix of the RECORD. One is a letter on parity for agriculture. The other two are editorials from South Dakota newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the legislative business has been concluded and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article on the cooling-off period from the Indianapolis News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

COAL MINE INSPECTION ACT

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors no person shall be so selected unless he has the basic qualification of at least five years' practical experience in the mining of coal, and is recognized by the United States Bureau of Mines as having the training or experience of a practical mining engineer in those essentials necessary for competent coal-mine inspection."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOE L. SMITH,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2082) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill provided in effect that any person selected for appointment as a coal-mine inspector under section 9 of the bill should be an accredited mining engineer or the equivalent thereto with the basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal.

The Senate amendment merely required that such inspectors should have a basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in coal mining.

The conference agreement provides that no person shall be selected for appointment as such an inspector unless he has at least such 5-year basic qualification, and is recognized by the United States Bureau of Mines as having the training or experience of a practical mining engineer in those essentials necessary for competent coal-mine inspection.

JOE L. SMITH,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY PROVISIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, a unanimous conference report agreed upon by all of the conferees, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, and 7 and agree to the same.

SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. J. MANSFIELD,
FRANCIS D. CULKIN,
JAMES C. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Per G. L. RADCLIFFE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 2 (a) (1) of the House bill would authorize, during the emergency declared on September 8, 1939, but not after June 30, 1942, the Maritime Commission, with the approval of the President, to negotiate, without advertising or competitive bidding, contracts for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, alteration, reconditioning, repair, outfitting, or equipping of vessels, which the Commission is presently authorized to enter into under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. These contracts cover the long range replacement construction program of the Commission.

The Senate amendment would grant like authority to negotiate contracts for construction of, and other work in respect of, vessels, or parts thereof, which the Maritime Commission is now authorized to carry on for other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, under section 4 of Public Law No. 5, approved February 6, 1941; and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2, 4, 5, and 6: Section 2 (a) (2) of the House bill would authorize the Maritime Commission with the approval of the President to modify outstanding contracts for the construction of, or for other work in respect of, vessels under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in conformity with the provisions of the bill relating to negotiation of contracts, when such action is determined by the Commission to be in the best interests of commerce and national defense because of changes occurring after the execution of the contract in question, the aggregate payments under the modified contract not to exceed the amount payable if the contract had been negotiated under the bill.

The Senate amendments struck out these provisions of section 2 (a) (2) and the language in section 2 (c) referring to contracts modified under section 2 (a) (2). The Senate recedes on these amendments.

Amendment No. 3: Section 2 (c) of the House bill provided that in negotiating contracts under section 2 (a) (1), contracts might be used providing for a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract, or a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form with such penalties in reduction of the agreed fixed fee and such bonuses in addition to the fixed fee as the Commission might deem necessary to secure maximum performance under the negotiated contracts, that such fixed fee should not exceed 7 percent of the estimated cost of the contract (exclusive of the fee and any bonuses), and that the aggregate of the fixed fee plus any bonus should not exceed 7 percent of such estimated cost (exclusive of fees and any bonus).

The Senate amendment provides that the fixed fee shall not exceed 7 percent and also that the aggregate fee; that is, the fixed fee plus any bonuses, shall not exceed 10 percent. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment adds a new section 5 to the House bill. The new section provides that sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 5, approved February 6, 1941 (providing for the construction by the Maritime Commission of emergency cargo ships in addition to its regular 1936 act program) should apply to the construction and activities of the Maritime Commission performed under the act of March 11, 1941, the so-called lend-lease law. Sections 1 and 2 of the said act of February 6, 1941, authorize the Maritime Commission to carry on its activities under that act, in accordance with the authority of section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and the act of October 10, 1940 (providing pay at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate for all overtime for laborers and mechanics under Commission contracts) but without regard to certain requirements of law applicable to normal construction and procurement activities of the Government agencies. The House recedes.

SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. J. MANSFIELD,
FRANCIS D. CULKIN,
JAMES C. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BLAND (interrupting reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement may be dispensed with, and I shall answer any question that may be asked.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the only amendment that was put on this bill at the time it passed the House was the reduction of 10 percent contained in the bill to 7 percent. This was at the instance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. When the bill went over to the Senate, that body put on amendments which would have brought within the terms of this bill the work that the Maritime Commission is authorized to do under Public Law No. 5. That was the emergency shipping construction. Those amendments were added so that this law would apply also to the emergency ship construction.

Another amendment was to strike from the House bill a provision that would have allowed the Maritime Commission to negotiate with reference to already existing contracts which it was deemed necessary should be treated in the same way the bill treated future contracts, because failure to do that would have slowed up construction and would have subjected the contractors to increases. Those problems should be solved by negotiation.

When the bill was taken up in conference there was no contest. The conferees agreed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] had discussed the matter with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and satisfied him that the provision originally presented in the House report was desirable.

The other material amendment which dealt with existing contracts was very carefully considered, not only by the conferees on this side but by the Senate conferees and we are in agreement.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It was stated here on the floor several weeks ago that the Maritime Commission was full of Communists and that if anything happened to this country we would not be able to operate our boats. What is the gentleman's committee doing in order to eliminate this situation?

Mr. BLAND. The committee has held hearings. One bill has been introduced with reference to radio operators. A subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is chairman, has a committee print that will be considered in a few days and we are also considering other legislation.

Mr. RICH. You are considering it in committee, but are we going to get it in the House? Is the gentleman's committee going to take some action to clean out the Maritime Commission of all Communists?

Mr. BLAND. The charge of communism was not brought against the Maritime Commission. The charge that was made here was against seamen and radio operators. Consideration will be given to strengthening the power of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation whereby Communists and undesirables may be eliminated.

Mr. RICH. We are charging the gentleman's committee with that responsibility, so that if anything happens his committee will act, or should act, and the Congress should have the opportunity to clean these Communists out of America.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to be able to do that and I would if I could.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the gentleman believe it is necessary for the Government to offer a possible maximum profit of 10 percent to shipbuilders before cooperation may be forthcoming from them in this shipbuilding program?

Mr. BLAND. That is not the question. The objection that was interposed by the gentleman from New York was that other provisions in the Navy contract provided 7 percent. This proposal contemplates that the fee shall not be above 7 percent, but there are penalties provided so that if the estimated basic cost as provided in the contract should be exceeded then penalties apply. These penalties will reduce that 7 percent. The fee provided in the contract may actually be below 7 percent, but provision is made to reduce the fee if the cost of construction falls below the estimated basic cost as provided in the contract.

As a reward for saving money on the cost of the ship, there is a provision that the fee may go up to 10 percent, but that operates in such a way that the increased fee must come out of savings. In other words, unless the contractor saves on the basic cost, he gets nothing additional on the fee. If he fails to keep down to the basic cost, penalties follow. It is the judgment of all who considered this proposal that it is the best system that can be worked out. The result is to offer a premium for reducing the cost, and then out of that saving the additional premium is paid.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman believe that any cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system offers as much incentive to saving as does a lump-sum contract, where the savings inure to the benefit of the contractor?

Mr. BLAND. I think that this is the best system that has been devised—that is, the system here, whereby there is a fixed fee with a penalty if the basic cost is exceeded and with a bonus which comes only out of savings if the basic cost of the ship is decreased.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do the amendments or the provisions of the bill provide in any way for a real saving to the Government comparable with that possible under the lump-sum contract?

Mr. BLAND. I believe this offers a greater opportunity to save than the lump-sum contract.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there anything in the bill or in the amendments that definies what this fixed fee covers?

Mr. BLAND. The fixed fee is a percentage of the estimated cost of the ship. It cannot exceed 7 percent. It is supposed to be made at 5 percent and then, based on the estimated cost of the ship, if there is a saving the fee may go up to but not exceed 10 percent. If there is not a saving they are penalized and the fee may be reduced.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason I am asking this question is that it recently came to my attention that in a contract that was proposed for the Navy Department, I believe, after the fixed fee was agreed upon, one of the elements entering into the cost of the contract was $200,000 for supervision, and that it is customary in many of these cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts for the contractor to fix his fee and then immediately to place upon the pay roll as part of the cost of production the salary for his manager or his general superintendent, and in that way add to the costs.

Moreover, I believe the Congress is seriously deluding itself and seriously fooling the country temporarily by this whole cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system. I base that upon the record that has been shown in the construction of Army camps. The testimony that has been presented in our hearings shows that the cost over the whole field of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts is exceeding the original estimates by 35 percent more than the amount by which the lump-sum contracts exceed the original estimates.

Further, the testimony indicates that this cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract is one of the most serious sources of labor trouble. For instance, it was recently called to my attention that a certain contractor has a contract under the lump-sum system and also under the fixed-fee system. Under the lump-sum contract he is having absolutely no interruption in his work. No labor-wage increases are demanded of him. However, where he has the fixed-fee system so that the cost does not come out of his pocket, he is continually beset by demands from labor and by demands from subcontractors to increase the element of cost entering into it. These things are responsible for the 35 percent excessive cost in the fixed-fee system.

I do not believe it is necessary to have that fixed-fee system. I recently returned from the Canal Zone. There I saw construction undertaken by the construction quartermaster of the War Department where he absolutely refused to have anything to do with the fixed-fee system, and his work is ahead of schedule. It is ahead of schedule both as to time and as to costs that were anticipated. I believe we are making a serious mistake in agreeing to this fixed-fee system.

Mr. BLAND. In my opinion, all of the criticisms that the gentleman has made cannot be made against the system that is provided in this bill. I believe this is a fairer system to the Government than any I have known yet to be devised.

Let me read from the Senate report an example of how this system will operate:

> For example, if it be assumed that the estimated cost of the vessel contracted for (exclusive of the fee) is $2,000,000, and that the basic fee is fixed at 7 percent, the fee would be $140,000.
>
> That cannot be changed except in the way we change it.
>
> If the vessel is built for the estimated cost, it costs the Commission $2,140,000.

If the ship is actually built at a cost (without the fee) of $1,900,000, the cost is reduced below the estimate by $100,000. If the contract allows the contractor as a bonus, say, one-half of this reduction, the aggregate fee to the contractor will be $190,000 (not in excess of 10 percent of the estimated cost), and the cost of the ship (with the fee included) to the Commission will be $2,090,000, a saving to the Government of $50,000.

By every device that I can see, that would be applied to this system, penalizing if the estimated cost is exceeded and rewarding if the estimated cost is reduced, the inducement is to bring the cost as low as possible and thus increase the fee. The provision to which the gentleman refers does not apply.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even with the explanation the gentleman gives, I am quite sure there is no incentive to a contractor to keep costs down such as exists when he knows exactly what he is going to be paid for the job and knows that every cent of saving will be to his benefit. At the same time it must be recognized that the amendment of the Senate, which the gentleman has explained, appears to be better than the original bill. Since this particular question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment, of course, no objection can be raised. I dare say a year from now the gentleman will be unable to stand on this floor and compare the results of the fixed-fee system with the fixed lump sum contract system and prove to the House that any benefits accrued from adopting this system.

Mr. BLAND. If a saving does not accrue, I shall not undertake to convince the House that it has accrued.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it still the policy of the Maritime Commission to build ships only on the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman will look at the contracts which have been made on the Pacific coast, I am sure he will find that is not the policy. I think they are building wherever they can within local limitations.

Mr. PITTENGER. How about the Great Lakes area?

Mr. BLAND. I do not know whether they are building there or not. I think some smaller boats are being built there within the limitations. So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitancy in saying that if the Great Lakes shipyards can take care of such work I shall be glad for them to do so.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a statement by Prof. Edward V. Huntington on the question of congressional apportionment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD pertaining to domestic aviation and include a short editorial on English aviation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by Prof. Felix Morley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on West Point and Annapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3981, the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I secured unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain documents with reference to the Inter-American Bar Association. It has been found that this material will require four pages of the RECORD. I have an estimate of the cost, and I, therefore, renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence may be granted to my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE LATE GEORGE ARTHUR MATHEWS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CASE of South Dakota addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two brief articles from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Daily Mining Gazette, of Houghton, Mich., on the price of copper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief announcement in respect to the business of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the conference report upon the Naval Department appropriation bill is in, and that will be called up the first thing tomorrow. After that, if the Rules Committee, the chairman of which has received permission until midnight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 149, reports out that resolution, relating to marketing quotas and loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, it will be called up tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As to the naval conference report, is there any opposition to it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] thinks it will take about half an hour. I ask the gentleman from Nevada whether there is a unanimous report upon this conference report?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; with the exception of certain amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. And for the information of the House, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, about how long does the gentleman from Nevada think it will take tomorrow?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. About 30 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is my understanding that the Interior appropriation bill is to come up on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And there is not any likelihood of the Vinson bill being called up this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. It will not be called up this week.

Mr. FISH. It will not be?

Mr. McCORMACK. Even if a rule is reported for its consideration, the bill will not be called up this week.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman inform the House when it is the intention to bring up the ship-seizure bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Next Monday.

Mr. FISH. Under a rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I assume the rule will be reported on that bill.

Mr. SABATH. The Rules Committee will consider that tomorrow.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

CANTEEN AT GLENN DALE SANATORIUM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4401) to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, Glenn Dale, Md., and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the superintendent of Glenn Dale Tuberculosis Sanatorium is hereby authorized, with the approval of the health officer of the District of Columbia, to permit such person or persons as may be designated by said superintendent to operate as a concession a commissary or canteen in such sanatorium, in a location and manner satisfactory to the said superintendent, for the purpose of vending periodicals, confections, tobacco products, and such other articles as may, in the judgment of said superintendent, be properly sold to persons or patients therein.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BLACK-OUTS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 4342) to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall be very delighted to explain the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to know the purpose of the bill and expense entailed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall be glad to explain that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). Is there objection to the consideration of the bill as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4342, which comes before the House this afternoon, is a measure of much importance. There will be no disposition on the part of the chairman of the committee to fail to answer any questions propounded to him during the discussion. The bill is here with the unanimous report of the District of Columbia Committee, and it comes after study by the subcommittee on national defense of the House District of Columbia Committee.

At this time, as the shadow of war comes closer to the United States, whether we like it or not, it behooves each and every thinking American to discharge, as far as possible, his individual duty in connection with the proper preparation for any eventuality of war which may strike at this Republic. We know that increasingly wars are being fought in the air. We understand full well that the capitals of Europe, 14 of them, have now fallen into the hands of the army of Hitler.

We know that in each and every instance, as a contributing factor to the success of the German war machine, has gone the power of the striking force from the air.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, if you do not get the mines operating so you can have coal to produce electricity, this black-out will become automatic, will it not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know the gentleman's interest in the subject of having the miners go back to work. I join him in that earnest desire.

Now, to continue, let us for a moment visualize what could happen, not what will happen. We, as thinking, intelligent, patriotic Americans, have a responsibility as to what could happen as well as what will happen. It is entirely possible—and I say this with no reservations—it is entirely possible, if the United States actually enters into the war—and there are many who think we are now at the brink of it or have gone entirely over the abyss—if the United States is engaged in this war, it is possible for our enemy or enemies to bring across the ocean, flying at heights of eighteen or twenty thousand feet, a squadron of bombers, and those bombers certainly would be on a mission of devastation, of destruction, and of death. Although they might strike at New York or at some other city, it is safe to believe that one of the initial points of attack would be the National Capital itself. Those planes might conceivably come here. They would not badly cripple the District of Columbia in one raid, yet they could in a very few minutes drop bombs on the Government buildings in the city of Washington and spread a certain fear in the hearts of our people by the disruption of governmental business; and that fear would spread from the National Capital to all parts of the United States.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Who has requested or sponsored this bill? Who is behind it?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The War Department, for one, is behind it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think that through the implications and the way the administration has been handling affairs in Europe, or at least trying to, that this country is becoming so involved that eventually we will get into the European war, and then it will be necessary for us to have black-outs and look out for any of the planes that may be coming across 3,000 miles of water to drop bombs on America? Does the gentleman believe we are that close to war now?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Whether we are one week or one month away from the conflict or whether we never get into this war, I am convinced that it is the part of good Americanism to so prepare ourselves that we will be ready to take care of any attack that may come to our shores at any time.

Mr. RICH. I think we ought to be prepared for any emergency and to protect America, but I think we ought to be very careful that the Chief Executive of the United States and the Cabinet and those who are trying to promote this war do not get us into it where we will have to fight on European soil. It is our business to stay at home and attend to our own business, so that we do not become involved in any European war. We tried it once and what good did it do? Let us never try it again.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is it necessary for the House to pass legislation in order to have a black-out? It would seem to me that that was a legitimate exercise of the police power.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We thought that matter through very carefully and we decided it would be best to throw safeguards about any experimental black-out that would be held in Washington, so that our people might realize the seriousness of the problem and that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia might proceed in cooperation with the War Department; and also that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia might negotiate with the States of Virginia and Maryland in that there might be a synchronized effort which would pull in the suburbs which lie outside the District of Columbia but which are a part of this so-called greater Capital area.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is just my point. If this legislation is coming in here merely in order to make people realize the seriousness of the situation, that is a very controversial point. Some of us believe that is very dangerous, indeed. That is equivalent to making a war of nerves on our own people. [Applause.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentlewoman certainly has a right to her own viewpoint.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. As far as the legislation is concerned, I want to commend the gentleman, but does it go far enough?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know that up to 10 days ago no effort was made to educate members of the District fire department in the handling of bombs. That is just as important as a black-out. They should know something of bombs of every character. They should be educated with regard to the handling of bombs in the event anything should happen, which, of course, we all pray will never happen. I think the gentleman's subcommittee on national defense should look into that matter and insist that the District of Columbia Commissioners have those in the fire department study the question and educate the members of the fire department with reference to the handling of bombs.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman. His observation is timely. Certainly America, with its national-preparedness program, must increasingly bring civilian groups into the defense picture. Firemen and policemen and men and women in all walks of life, not engaged strictly in national defense, must understand their responsibilities.

Mr. STEFAN and Mr. SHORT rose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I always yield, and I am going to continue to do so. I would prefer to complete my statement, but if some Member desires to ask a question at this particular time I will, of course, yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I understood the gentleman to say something about how much money this would cost. We are going to have special police. The gentleman indicated that nearby Maryland and Virginia would participate in this program. It has been my observation that in all programs of the District in which nearby Maryland and Virginia have participated they have not participated in any of the expense. I wish the gentleman would tell us something about how much this is going to cost.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Not a single penny.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; it is.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Well, I am answering the gentleman's question. He can disagree with me if he wishes.

Mr. STEFAN. We shall have to pay the special police.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; the special police will be volunteers. The American Legion has 8,000 members in this District who have said they will come forward. The Boy Scouts join them in that feeling. If in times like this the American people cannot afford to contribute a minute, an hour, a week, or several weeks on a matter of this kind, it is to be regretted. I know we would have the fullest cooperation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I take it the gentleman's committee has given serious consideration to the danger that will be caused by any black-out we might have. I am sure he is aware of the fact that in the first few weeks of the war there were many more deaths in the city of London caused by black-outs than there were by bombs or attacks made upon the city. If a black-out is held, I trust it will not be held until sufficient time has been given for the people to become educated to the dangers involved.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman can rest assured that before an experimental black-out there would be weeks of intensive preparation and the widest diffusion of knowledge through the radio and the press and all the agencies of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman this question: In reading this bill it appears it is applicable and is to be placed in operation in the event of a national emergency. Will the gentleman direct his remarks to these words in the bill and indicate by what period he anticipates there will be a state of affairs that can be classified or designated as a national emergency?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I give my own personal opinion of the matter. I think there is a national emergency now in the United States in relation to our prompt preparation for any eventuality that might come. May I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that experimental black-outs, while they would be new for Washington, are not new in the United States of America. We have had experimental black-outs already in Seattle, in Pittsburgh, in Boston, in New York, in El Paso, Tex., and other sections. I want to read some statements made by the governing officials of those cities in regard to what has taken place.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Did the gentleman see in this morning's paper the large advertisement of the Fight for Freedom Committee asking the people to send signed statements to Members of Congress? The ad contains the statement:

We are at war now.

It is an effort on the part of this organization to arouse the people of the country to try to get the Members of Congress to keep us out of war.

How many Members of Congress does the gentleman believe want to go to war? How many Members of Congress does the gentleman believe are interested in trying to drag us into a fight with some foreign country by sending our boys abroad? I hope there is no one in Congress who wants to do this. I think this Fight for Freedom Committee is just trying to get money out of the people of this country maybe to further their own interests. I hope the people will be wise enough to keep their dollars in their pockets, because they will have to use all they can scrape together to pay the tax bill we are going to saddle upon them. We are going to bend the backs of the people of America and they should save their money for that purpose so we can have national defense. We want the money for our own national defense, not for aggressive warfare.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman has, of course, mentioned a very active committee that has as its honorary chairman the distinguished Senator from Virginia, CARTER GLASS; there are other committees just as active in opposition, and I imagine the American people are going to decide this finally themselves.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I yield again to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not quite satisfied with the gentleman's answer to my question. This bill provides that it shall become effective in the event of a national emergency. There is a provision in the draft law, for example, that upon the declaration by the Congress that the national interest is imperiled—I think that is the language used in the draft law—certain provisions of the draft law shall not be effective. For instance, the 1 year's military training. I would like to know who is to be the individual or the agency or the department of Government that shall determine when there is a national emergency?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The national emergency, certainly from the standpoint of this legislation, would be when the War Department, as the bill specifically states, gives its approval to the District of Columbia Commissioners to hold an experimental black-out here in the National Capital. There would be weeks of careful preparation. The black-out itself only takes 5 minutes. There is a long period of study to acquaint our people with what might happen if the city is blacked out.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman explain to me where there is anything in this bill that authorizes the War Department to declare the existence of an emergency so as to make this bill operative?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In line 7, page 1, the Commissioners are authorized and directed to order black-outs in said District at such times and for such periods of time as they may deem desirable, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; but that is all conditioned upon the event of a national emergency, the line that precedes it. I would like to know who is going to declare it; and if we are in a national emergency, which we all believe we are in, why do we not write it into this bill positively and say that this Nation is now in a state of national emergency, therefore this legislation is necessary? Let us have a congressional declaration on this subject now instead of leaving it open so that nobody knows who is going to declare the existence or nonexistence of an emer-

gency. Let us make this law effective and put it into operation. That is the point I am trying to raise.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Personally, I would be glad to go along with the gentleman in connection with a provision of that kind.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman mentioned the city of Pittsburgh as being one of those cities having had a black-out. Rumor has it, and it is common understanding, that Pittsburgh has a black-out about every day in the year. I am glad to know that that city, after having been greatly maligned, has at last vindicated itself and that stories of its uncleanliness have been greatly exaggerated.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I conclude by saying that there is not a single air-raid shelter in the National Capital. I am not saying there should be, but there is not a single bomb-raid haven at the seat of the government of this land. There are very few antiaircraft guns here that could be used in the defense of this National Capital. About the only ones that are now existent are certain pieces held by the District of Columbia National Guard.

There is no system of siren warnings in the District of Columbia if any trouble should occur. There are few aircraft that would be helpful to us. Bolling Field is more of a show place than it is actually an airport from which Army planes could operate in defense of this city.

I have mentioned the communities that have had these experimental black-outs.

Before going into the testimony I would like to refer to a letter received from Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, dated April 8, 1941, which he sent to the Commissioners, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks this letter, as well as a letter from John E. Carroll, formerly mayor of the city of Seattle, and a letter from Rear Admiral S. C. Freeman, United States Navy, commandant at Bremerton, Wash.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call attention first to the letter of Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, which reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 8, 1941.

Hon. MELVIN C. HAZEN,
President, Board of Commissioners, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAZEN: I have given careful consideration to your letter of March 27, 1941, in which you ask my opinion as to the propriety of a proposed black-out for the District of Columbia at the present time, and as to whether such a black-out without simultaneous and similar action in the metropolitan area (Maryland and Virginia) would be effective. I have also read with interest your statements indicating that the District government fully recognizes its responsibilities reference the self-protection of the community in an emergency and has established an organization to handle such civilian passive defense measures as black-outs when necessary.

The efforts you are making interested me because the War Department has a similar responsibility in the passive defense of its own reservations and establishments, as well as the responsibility of active air defense of the Nation, which involves the operation of ground and air forces in combatting hostile aircraft or hostile troops landed from aircraft. I am much impressed by the amount of organization and training necessary in both of these classes of defense in order that the civilian communities and the combat forces may be properly prepared in the event of an emergency. It is obvious that close mutual cooperation between the organizations charged with these classes of defense is essential if they are to function successfully.

I believe that a practice black-out in the District of Columbia at any time would be helpful, since it would serve not only to give experience in the necessary planning and execution to the organization charged with this activity but also to instruct the inhabitants in the procedure which must be gone through to produce a black-out and accustom them to the effect of the lack of lights upon their normal life. Further, it might impress on them to a certain extent their responsibilities during an emergency requiring a black-out. However, I am of the opinion that before a black-out is attempted there should be a period of intensive instruction in the methods of controlling light and the effects of a black-out on the life of the community. Without this period of instruction, it is believed very much less than the maximum would be gained. In fact, some harm may be done because of lack of proper preparation. In this connection it is stated that the War Department now has under preparation a pamphlet on the subject of black-outs. This pamphlet will not be completed for some time, but when it is published it will be given general distribution.

Regardless of how well a community like the District of Columbia is instructed and prepared for a black-out, such an exercise would not prevent the location of the District by aircraft unless the surrounding communities were also blacked out. Experience of the War Department leads me to believe that the lack of lights in a comparatively small area enables air observers to locate that area with greater ease than if lights were present. I am therefore inclined to agree with the opinion of the Commissioners that a successful black-out of the District would require action by the adjoining communities.

In view of the foregoing, it is my opinion that a practice black-out should not be attempted in the District of Columbia until its citizens have had thorough instruction on this subject and arrangements can be made for a simultaneous black-out of the surrounding areas. However, in the event a black-out is attempted, the War Department stands ready to cooperate.

Thanking you for bringing this matter to my attention,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, I read now a letter addressed to Mr. John Russell Young, commissioner, under date of April 8, 1941, signed by Mr. John E. Carroll, formerly mayor of Seattle:

THE CITY OF SEATTLE,
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,
April 8, 1941.

Mr. JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
Acting President, Board of Commissioners, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reference to your communication of March 31, having to do with a proposed black-out in the District of Columbia, I will answer your questions very briefly as follows:

Based on our experience here, I would say that a test black-out would be a good thing for any American city. In that connection, I attach hereto a copy of a letter received from Admiral Freeman, United States Navy, dated March 8.

We tried to time our black-out on a date that would normally be cloudy, also giving consideration to the stage of the moon. We held the black-out on a Friday night at the request of the local school authorities and fixed the hour at 10:40 p. m., which proved to be very satisfactory.

A black-out in a large city should not last more than 15 minutes, allowing a 10-minute prelude after the warning signal is given before the street lights are turned off. To promote safety t the community, the regular police force was augmented by several thousand air-raid wardens, who patrolled all streets and highways throughout the city.

We had the full cooperation of the local newspapers and the radio stations in giving publicity to the test black-out, and in addition a copy of my proclamation as mayor was left in all homes, hotels, apartment houses, etc., throughout the city. Copies of these were distributed a few days before the black-out by the wardens.

We are now having prepared a report on the black-out and as soon as it is completed I will be pleased to forward you a copy which will give you much more information than this short letter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. CARROLL,
City Councilman (formerly mayor).

Mr. Speaker, the letter just read refers to Admiral Freeman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Admiral Freeman's letter is as follows:

COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
PUGET SOUND NAVY YARD,
BREMERTON, WASH., *March 8, 1941.*

The Honorable JOHN E. CARROLL,
Mayor of Seattle, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MAYOR CARROLL: In thanking you again for the privilege you afforded me of viewing the test black-out of the City of Seattle last evening, I wish to add my congratulations to the many you must already have received over the success of this initial peacetime black-out of a great American community and to extend through you a word of praise to those who labored with you in making so signal a contribution to the civil problem of national defense.

I believe I am able to appreciate the elaborate and detail planning that must precede so effective a demonstration of civic discipline as the people of Seattle staged during the brief 30 minutes of last night's test. The precision of accomplishment of this skilfully and efficiently organized mass contribution to antiaircraft defense made the minor flaws of the first major American black-out since the World War relatively insignificant. Such defects do emphasize, however, the need of training and repetition to insure a flawless performance, which no perfection of planning on paper can bring about. It is to be hoped that other large American cities may see fit to emulate Seattle's example and to place the potential safety of their citizens in the event of attack from the air above the expense and labor that a black-out involves.

My tribute to the city of Seattle and its black-out is best expressed in the sailor's benison, "Well done."

Sincerely yours,

C. S. FREEMAN,
Rear Admiral,
United States Navy Commandant.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. A very considerable portion of the illuminated part of this country lies in the States of Maryland and Virginia, beyond the authority of the District Commissioners. Have steps been taken to secure the cooperation of those States?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. Under the provisions of this bill the District Commissioners would be authorized to enter into negotiations with the States of Virginia and Maryland in connection with these nearby communities.

I read from the letter addressed to the District officials by Mayor Scully, of Pittsburgh:

The Army officers in Pittsburgh were of the opinion that the black-out was a success, though it was not intended to be a complete one. The citizens of Pittsburgh cooperated extensively.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter, together with the proclamation of the mayor of Pittsburgh, be included in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

CITY OF PITTSBURGH, *April 25, 1941.*

Mr. RICHMOND B. KEECH,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEECH: In response to your request of April 21 I am sending you the enclosed copy of the proclamation issued for the block-out test last Friday, April 18.

The Army officers in Pittsburgh were of the opinion that the black-out was a success, though it was not intended to be a complete one. None of the industrial plants were asked to shut down operations and lights of the bridges were not turned off. There was no penalty stipulated for failure to observe the request that all lights be turned out. However, the citizens of Pittsburgh cooperated extensively and received quite a thrill from the air show.

Sincerely yours,

CORNELIUS D. SCULLY,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the United States Army has requested a 5-minute black-out test for the city of Pittsburgh on Friday, April 18, 1941, between 10:10 and 10:15 p. m.; and

Whereas this test is of supreme importance at this time when many of the nations of the world are at war; and

Whereas black-out demonstrations have already been successfully tested in the cities of Seattle, Boston, New York, and El Paso;

Now, therefore, I, Cornelius D. Scully, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, do hereby declare the evening of Friday, April 18, 1941, black-out night, and urge the citizens of Pittsburgh to patriotically and wholeheartedly assist in making this test a success, and in order to accomplish this purpose the following events will occur:

The black-out test begins at 10:10 p. m., and lasts 5 minutes, until 10:15 p. m. During the time of the black-out, a fleet of United States Army planes from Harrisburg will fly over the city and simulate an attack on Pittsburgh. During the course of this attack, their actions will be broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up by station KDKA.

All street lights will be turned out.

All exterior building lights to be turned out.

All interior building lights, which can be extinguished with safety, to be turned off.

It is not absolutely necessary to extinguish lights inside of residences, but all window shades should be drawn.

All automobiles should pull over to the curb and extinguish their driving lights. Parking lights are not to be extinguished.

All stores are requested to extinguish their window-display lights.

All outdoor electric advertising signs on buildings, on boulevards, and on top of buildings and on hillsides should be extinguished.

CORNELIUS D. SCULLY,
Mayor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that a news account of this black-out contained in the Pittsburgh Press of Saturday, April 19, and written by Phelps D. Sample, be included in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of April 19, 1941]

(By Phelps D. Sample)

Blackness fell on Pittsburgh last night as a lesson in what some day may be needed to keep the light of freedom burning in our world.

It was a black-out—a partial, practice, test black-out—designed to show how a city, especially an industrial city like Pittsburgh, must in time of war either black-out or be rubbed out.

It was a dress rehearsal for a blitzkrieg—without mourning clothes.

"Eighty-percent successful," was the terse comment of Maj. E. S. Wetzell, Army man in charge of the aerial maneuvers.

THOUSANDS WATCH "BOMBERS"

But it was a show, a show witnessed without doubt by the greatest audience that ever assembled in western Pennsylvania.

From hundreds of hilltops, thousands of spectators craned their necks, first skyward to see the "enemy bombers" go zooming over the Golden Triangle, then downward to see the lights blink out as zero hour—10:10—arrived.

Main traffic arteries were jammed by motorists who dimmed their lights, according to advance instructions, and sounded their horns.

Here and there a searchlight was turned skyward in simulation of anti-aircraft batteries.

And as the pseudo bombers roared overhead and the lights flickered out one by one, many among t' · thousands must have been thinking of London, Coventry, Liverpool, Warsaw, Belgrade, Amsterdam, and where not else?

MARKED CITY FROM AIR

From the air, Pittsburgh at night is 10,000,000 lightning bugs, flashing in brilliant chains up and down three rivers, and splashed with dots of red poured into the air by the larger electric signs.

From the air Pittsburgh is a marked city, marked by the lights of a score of bridges pointing as so many beacons toward the Golden Triangle.

Pittsburgh is marked, too, by the fires of its steel mills, which, in time of war, would be the military objective.

But since last night was merely a rehearsal, the steel mills, preparing the country against the day when—and if—a real black-out might be imperative, were not required to douse their coals.

And, since it was merely a rehearsal, Allegheny County was not required to extinguish the tell-tale bridge lights.

SUCCESSFUL IN CITY

The black-out was chiefly successful in the city of Pittsburgh, where the Duquesne Light Co. had instructed its powerhouses to turn out street lights section by section.

The master switch, which would have plunged the entire community into darkness, was not pulled, inasmuch as individual home residents had been asked to draw their shades.

But stores and theaters cooperated wholeheartedly, in most cases, by turning out their neon signs and marquee lights at the appointed hour.

And all day yesterday the electrical billboard sign people had sent crews throughout the city setting the automatic clocks on the flashing displays so that they would turn off at 10:10.

The mock air raid was broadcast by KDKA, but in order to avoid a repetition of the "Man From Mars" scare, announcers at frequent intervals advised listeners that there really wasn't an air raid.

Eight planes took part in the mock raid, six of them Army ships, one a dive bomber piloted by Maj. Hal G. Beasley, and the other a T. W. A. transport ship carrying public officials.

It was from this latter ship, posing as a bomber, that Mayor Cornelius D. Scully broadcast.

The T. W. A. ship kept at a height of 3,500 feet during the maneuvers, but the lighter planes swooped as low as 2,000 feet.

DIDN'T HIDE PITTSBURGH

To his "80 percent successful" comment, Major Wetzel added this comment:

"This black-out certainly didn't hide Pittsburgh. Enemy bombers could have hit the Triangle without difficulty. But precision bombing—that is, bombing to strike a definite objective—would have been impossible."

Of all the downtown buildings, the Koppers and Gulf Buildings were the most successfully hidden from the air.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a letter from the vice president and general manager of the Potomac Electric Power Co., in which that official speaks of the full cooperation that will be given in case there is a black-out in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

APRIL 9, 1941.

Mr. A. G. NEAL,
President.

DEAR SIR: The following is in reply to a communication, dated March 31, from Commissioner Young in reference to plans for a black-out in the District of Columbia. The Commissioner refers to the testimony of Mr. Bisset before the House District Committee, in the course of which he is quoted as stating that this company was contemplating the possibility of installing some remote control device for cutting off lights, presumably street lights. As Mr. Bisset recalls his statement, he informed the committee that some of the street-lighting circuits were controlled directly from substations, but that in the main they were controlled by automatic time clocks at 168 different locations, many of them being in manholes. He pointed out that a year or so ago we anticipated the possible necessity for black-outs in connection with our talks with representatives of the Army on the general subject of protection of utility facilities from aircraft and/or other

attack. In this connection we realized that if street lights were to be totally extinguished there probably would be very short notice, and we worked out a tentative arrangement whereby emergency crews, notified by our radio or by other means, would be dispatched to prearranged points to cut off lights as promptly as possible. Our present plan contemplates only this arrangement. Mr. Bisset pointed out, however, that some consideration had been given to various schemes through the operation of which street lighting could be cut off more promptly by the operators in the several substations. All of the schemes so far considered are very involved, and to put any of them into effect would require considerable manpower and be very costly. Regardless of these factors, none of the schemes so far considered are regarded as entirely satisfactory. Nevertheless, we still have the matter in mind. In connection with the subject of street lights, we would point out that the street railway company maintains, along certain of its routes, light clusters supplied from their trolley system. We have not discussed this matter with them, and we suggest that this matter, as well as the question of extinguishing lights in street cars, be taken up with the Transit Co.

It was also pointed out that there are more than 900 fire-alarm posts equipped with designation lamps which can only be extinguished by removing the lamps from the sockets. The operation of removing these lamps would be difficult of accomplishment in any reasonable period of time, and at the moment we have been unable to work out any scheme which is worthy of suggestion.

In addition to the above, there are over 1,800 traffic signals at approximately 460 intersections and controlled by some 65 automatic switches. The cutting off of these switches, however, would not accomplish the extinguishment of the traffic signals, since it would only result in their stopping on one or the other of the signal colors. To remove these from service would require that someone go to each of the 460 intersections.

We do not know what importance the military authorities may attach to the extinguishment of the fire-alarm designation lamps and/or the traffic-signal lights. Certainly it seems to us that the extinguishment of fire-alarm designation lamps would be accompanied by considerable hazard if fires broke out during the period of the black-out.

We have not considered the wholesale cutting off of power from the generating or substations since such action would result in the cutting off of power from the city water-pumping station, hospitals, police stations, and any other institutions of like importance, and in addition would result in technical difficulties in connection with the restoration of power after the black-out, which present to us a very serious problem.

We have made a number of experiments and test black-outs with our own generating plants and substations, and we believe that we have this worked out so that while maintaining service in the two generating stations and 53 substations no light would be visible from the outside.

As a final suggestion I would mention that from information I have received there has been no attempt in England to extinguish street lights or similar illumination. I understand that all such lighting units are covered with some sort of shade so that the light is not directly visible from the air and that lamps with a bluish color have been used so that the intensity on the ground is reduced to a degree that such lights are not visible from airplanes.

I believe the above outlines our situation in connection with this problem.

Very truly yours,

J. H. FERRY,
Vice President and General Manager,
Potomac Electric Power Co.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman state what objective is sought by having a so-called black-out here in the Capital of the United States?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to reiterate what I said earlier in my remarks, that it is the responsibility of the civilian population of the United States, especially in our National Capital, to be so prepared that in the eventuality of need for a black-out we would be ready to take care of ourselves.

Mr. WHITE. In view of the danger involved in a situation of that kind and in view of the risk we would be taking in connection with traffic, since we have the heaviest traffic in the world here in Washington, does the gentleman believe the results would be commensurate with the risk we would be taking?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I absolutely do. The War Department thinks so, Seattle thinks so, and Boston, New York, El Paso, Pittsburgh, and these other communities believe that the advantages far outweigh any disadvantages which might occur.

In conclusion, I desire very earnestly to impress upon you the need for the District of Columbia being the scene of an experimental black-out. I do not say that it should occur next month or the month after that, but it should occur. The most careful planning will be necessary. The fullest cooperation of the citizenry of this area of a million people will be involved. The War Department certainly would not act with haste, but would act with deliberation. We, as legislators charged with the responsibility for passing bills directly affecting the National Capital, by passing this bill this afternoon will not only discharge our duty in this instance to the District of Columbia itself but here at the National Capital will bring into being a test of the cooperation of the civilian population of our Nation in a way that will reflect to all parts of the country. Other nations who are watching America in these hours will realize that we are not asleep. Let them know that at the National Capital and throughout America the people of this Republic are preparing in every possible way to take care of themselves if the hour ever strikes when we must do that. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the pending bill. I would, however, in connection with this bill, offer a few observations with respect to another bill on which action was intended today but which has been temporarily withheld by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

May I preface my remarks by saying that you can black-out a city or a community in more ways than one? You can black-out a community by turning out the lights, but you can also black-out a community by developing a degree of traffic congestion and confusion and of centralization of authority until that particular area no longer functions efficiently, whether it is as a municipality or whether it is as the seat of government.

I suggest to you this afternoon that, if this House ever undertakes to deliberate the so-called Overton bill to provide about $9,000,000 in a lump sum as a donation to the District of Columbia, we ought to give a little more attention to the black-out of the efficiency of the seat of government at the present time.

The census of 1940 shows that Washington gained 36.2 percent in population in the last 10 years, and since that census was enumerated, in the spring of 1940, it is estimated that another 70,000 people have come here to find their place on the public pay roll. There are at the present time 186,000 people on the Federal pay roll in Washington, D. C. Think of it. This compares with 65,437 on the 30th of June 1933, shortly after the present administration came into power. There are 3 times more people on the pay roll now than there were on June 30, 1933.

At the peak of our war enterprise nearly a quarter of a century ago, we reached on Armistice Day 1918 a total on the pay roll in the District of Columbia of 117,760. There are 70,000 more people on the pay roll now than there were on November 11, 1918, when the World War officially came to a conclusion.

How are you going to concentrate all those functions and all the personnel who articulate those functions without developing a congestion of a kind that destroys efficiency here, that makes for added governmental cost, and that must ultimately have a remedy?

I give you another figure that is rather interesting to me. Uncle Sam now occupies 22,219,000 square feet of floor space, of which 4,900,000 is leased at approximately an annual average of $1 per square foot. They are talking now about more buildings in Washington. Did you see the statement last week that they are going to build some temporary buildings and they are thinking of putting them on the Mall?

When I came here in 1932 there were still a lot of the relics of World War days that were dotting the Mall between here and the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. A few are left, but this whole area was dotted with stuccoed buildings and it is proposed now because there is not room to house this great influx of people, to build new temporary buildings on the Mall.

When you leave your office at night and go down Pennsylvania Avenue, you look off to the right after you pass the Standard Oil service station and there you see the new District Municipal Center. Do you know that the War Department is going to take over one-half of that space or 225,000 square feet? The deal has already been made. When the Red Cross wound up their annual convention here the other day, they indicated they were not coming back to Washington. Why? Because of the

housing and the congestion and one thing and another that prevails here at the present time.

Then may I give testimony to this traffic congestion and the inefficiency in handling the traffic that is developing here. Did you observe in your papers last week that a new traffic plan has been proposed to take care of the increased traffic loads in the District, and the projected plan calls for more than $24,000,000 to be expended over a period of years? Think of it. There is testimony to what is troubling us at the present time, and, gentlemen of the Congress, it is going to have some attention. It is common now for businessmen coming here to confer on war contracts to find lodging over in Baltimore or down in Alexandria or elsewhere and then commute back and forth on the essential business of the people at the present time, a testimony to this great influx and centralization, not only of workers, but more basically and more profoundly a testimony to the concentration of Federal functions in the District of Columbia, and that is a thing that must have attention.

Now, I called the attention of the Congress to this in January and introduced a resolution which is now pending and on which there has been no action as yet by the Rules Committee. It purports to set up a committee, a new subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, to investigate this matter of centralization and then, perchance, to recommend the decentralizing of those functions that can be articulated and translated in other sections of the country as well as in Washington, D. C.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would suggest that a mighty good plan for decentralization would be to send some of these powers and governmental responsibilities back to the States and smaller units of Government, where they ought to have stayed all the time. [Applause.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will give the gentleman from Texas applause on that myself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I inquire if the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has a bill that will send some of those powers back to the States that we can vote on?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman disagree?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I want to vote for it. I want to do something besides talk about it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the gentleman would do as much "doing" as he does talking, we would certainly do business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And if the gentleman would give us one-tenth in action of the time he takes on the floor advocating these things, that probably would be better, too.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would not want to be responsible for correcting everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but just one thing, some day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all right.

May I make this suggestion? There is no one here who will contend that many of the functions of the Railroad Retirement Board, the Social Security Board, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the National Labor Relations Board, the Employees Compensation Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Securities and Exchange Commission could not just as well be discharged, in large part, in other sections of the country as they can in Washington. They are nondefense functions. Is there any reason why these great, overloaded agencies could not have a skeleton staff here and send some of their force to Chicago, to Boston, to Baltimore, to San Francisco, to Louisville, to Cleveland, to Peoria, or any other place where space is available and where those functions can be discharged as well as they can in Washington? Take, for instance, the Interior Department. We find a huge establishment down here, inadequate for the purpose, so we appropriate the money and build a new Interior Building, marvelously appointed, and it is filled with all kinds of functions.

Is there any reason why the Reclamation Service, the Bituminous Coal Division, the Indian Service, the Geological Survey, and others could not be brought closer and identified more closely to the areas where those functions are translated? That would also be true of the Department of Agriculture. Recently they completed a majestic, modernistic building on Connecticut Avenue. It is the last word in business buildings. It is known as the Longfellow Building. I was fairly amazed when the Rural Electrification Administration moved in and took the whole building. I can look out of my hotel apartment window at night and see the lights burning in this mass of glittering glass and masonry. There are a vast host working here. Why not send them out into the field, where they are providing rural electrification for the farmers, why not send them out to the Middle West, the Northwest, the Southwest, the South, or anywhere. Must we have this concentration in Washington?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is also true of the Forest Service, the Farm Security Administration, the Commodity Exchange Administration, and many other agencies in the Department of Agriculture. The attention of the Bureau of the Budget has been directed to the matter, but here we are living in congestion, falling over each other, weaving our way through the mass of traffic, meanwhile adding constantly to the traveling expenditure of the Government as people must come to Washington to go to the great illuminated dome of the Nation's Capitol. Our mileage bill in the first quarter of 1941 amounts to $47,000,000. Just stop and consider that. That is the first quarter. Those are the Budget Bureau figures. For the fiscal year 1941 we will probably expend over $150,000,000 or $160,000,000 for travel alone, to carry on the functions of the Government. I can see opportunity to save a little money. I can see opportunity to solve this congestion and have a greater degree of efficiency by decentralizing the nondefense functions here in the Nation's Capital, giving those folks a chance to breathe and work with that degree of efficiency that should be required of one who is on the pay roll.

By way of recapitulation, there are three times more on the pay roll today than there were on the 30th of June 1933; there are 70,000 more Government employees in Washington today than there were in the peak of the World War days, and that situation, Mr. Speaker, demands earnest consideration on the part of this Congress. It should be investigated. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. This Congress should not become hysterical or jittery, and as a Congressman representing the entire State of Ohio, as Congressman at Large, I feel in regard to this pending bill providing for a black-out for the District of Columbia that if I am the only Member here today to do so, I for one shall vote against it. [Applause.] I feel that it would be most unfortunate for word to go out to the country that those of us who are representatives of the people are fearful and jittery. It is my view that this is not a war Congress. It is my view, and I know it is your view, that only Congress may declare war. In considering this measure let us be guided by the lamp of experience. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] raises an important question. In London there have been many deaths and injuries due simply to the black-outs. In this time of peace, and until today as a Member of Congress from Ohio, I have been happy to observe that there is less talk of war in Washington than in recent weeks.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. In a moment. At least there is less talk of war today than there was 6 weeks ago. It seems to me that this is an absolutely unnecessary bill. If there is a black-out, certainly there will probably be some traffic deaths and injuries due to that blackout and there will rest upon us a responsibility, and that will be upon our consciences.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. I take it the gentleman from Ohio would not want to assume the responsibility either for the robbery and the rape and murder that might be committed during those black-outs.

Mr. YOUNG. No; I do not want to be responsible for them. I know that this country now has a navy, so powerful in

fire power, in manpower, in tonnage, and in morale, that it is unequaled in the world.

Our air force is entirely adequate to protect this country. We are rapidly mechanizing our Army. I do not want to be responsible for the appointment of several thousand special policemen who will serve absolutely without bond and may act in a high-handed and entirely officious manner.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman feel perhaps that this bill is to further condition the mind of the American people to drag us into actual combat?

Mr. YOUNG. I am afraid that it will cause the people back home to feel that we, as their representatives, consider that war is imminent. I, for one, do not consider that this country is going to war against any country.

Mr. SHORT. And this hysteria will soon become insanity, and all the American people will fall victim?

Mr. YOUNG. Well, I do not go as far as to say that this bill is insanity, but I do take the position that it is a lot of spinach. [Laughter.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. In just a moment.

Section 5 of the bill says the municipality of the District of Columbia shall not be liable for any damage sustained to a person or to property as a result of or during the black-out. From a legal standpoint I think that is bad. Furthermore, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has raised a very important question. This bill becomes effective in the event of a national emergency. Are we going to permit some employee in the War Department to say that we have a national emergency? Certainly it is for the Congress or for the President of the United States to say that there is an emergency.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman refers to this measure as a "lot of spinach."

Mr. YOUNG. That is my judgment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know it is. I may say that spinach is always believed to be a good part of a man's diet, and I believe it is a good part of the legislative diet to have a spinach bill of this kind. The trouble today in America is that we are treating this entire problem of preparedness with too much complacency. Certainly the gentleman from Ohio knows that we must have preparation in our civilian population today just the same as we have in our Air Corps, in our Army, and in our Navy. There have been in the United States in these large cities where experimental black-outs have been held not a single death and no disruption of the civil affairs of those communities.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman from West Virginia and you gentlemen know that I in my capacity as Congressman have supported preparedness measures of this administration. I do support them, and I am glad to know that at the present time we have in the armed forces of the United States more than 1,500,000 of the finest young men of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio, if we pass this legislation will it not be the same as saying to every community in the United States that we here in the United States Capital believe that war is imminent?

Mr. YOUNG. I fear that; and the gentleman and I will agree that our armed forces are absolutely adequate at the present time.

Furthermore, there are some other very strange things about this bill. Section 7 provides that the penalty for conviction of any crime against the United States committed during an authorized black-out shall be doubled. Of course, it omits treason and murder, I suppose on the theory that you cannot hang a man twice. [Laughter.] But it does give a judge authority to double the penalty.

It seems to me that this bill should either be defeated or recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia; and I, for one, in my capacity representing my people, am going to vote that way, notwithstanding that they had a black-out which they say was successful in Pittsburgh. En route from Cleveland, my home city, to Washington I pass through Pittsburgh, and I have observed black-outs there on many, many occasions, and it was not necessary to have legislation for that. [Laughter.]

I feel that it is most unfortunate that we are called upon in the Congress at this time, as Representatives of the people, hoping to keep this great country at peace and hoping to help write into history, not of war but of humble people devoted to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—I believe it is unfortunate that we have a bill of this sort before us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitated to rise today to speak in favor of this bill, because I did not think I would hear any opposition to it on the floor of this House. To my amazement, I have heard some remarks here today even comparing this bill to a piece of insane legislation. If patriotism and being prepared is insanity, Mr. Speaker, I for one want to plead guilty to being the most insane person in this House.

Some years ago, had a Member of the House risen on the floor and advocated the great preparedness program we have in motion today he would not have received a very hearty welcome. As a matter of fact we did not hear much about it then. It is because we had fallen into a degree of complacency which some gentlemen have perhaps described as insanity that we are in a mad rush today to really prepare ourselves and have black-outs not only in Washington, in the Capital, but black-outs all over this Nation, which will make people realize and know our danger and keep us from going further down that road of unpreparedness which has put us in our present situation. If that will be the result, then I say give us black-outs in every city of the United States, so we shall know just where we stand. [Applause.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to add to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] with reference to the situation here in the District of Columbia by calling attention, first, to the little consideration that is given on the floor of the House to legislation coming before Congress affecting the District of Columbia. We, as Members of Congress, should give it more of our attention. I should like now to direct attention for just a few minutes to the so-called Overton plan that is going to be considered by the House in about 2 weeks. I think we ought to be ready for this measure when it comes and become familiar with its terms and effects.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today that provides for increasing the tax rate on real and personal property in the District of Columbia. It raises the rate of tax from $1.75 to $2.50 per hundred. This will increase the revenue $10,000,000. I have introduced this bill for the reason that, in my opinion, the people of the District of Columbia do not pay their fair share of the District expenses.

For several years the Federal Treasury has made contributions of millions of dollars to help pay the expenses required for the running of this city. The appropriation has run from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000 annually.

A bill known as the Overton plan recently passed the Senate and has been reported in the House. Under that measure the Federal Treasury would contribute $9,000,000 for District expenses.

According to this report, the total expense for running the city of Washington is approximately $45,000,000. The excuse given for the Overton plan is that since the Federal Government occupies about 20 percent of the land in the District it should pay about 20 percent of the expenses required for running the District.

Let us carry this reasoning a little further. If the Government is obligated to contribute funds for the upkeep of the District, because it owns land occupied by the Nation's Capital, then why not assess the value of my State capital and let the entire State of Kansas contribute to the upkeep of Topeka—the city where the capital is located? The same would be true of other situations. Do you mean to say that because you may be fortunate enough to have a fine, new Federal building in your town, the Government should

contribute to the taxes in your city according to the value of the land upon which the building is located? Do you mean to say, for example, that because I have an Army post in one of the counties in my State, occupying about half the county, that the Government thereby should contribute every year in taxes to that county and the adjacent city, accordingly? Certainly not.

I realize Washington is the Nation's Capital. Congress does not want to shirk its obligation to assist in carrying the expenses of the District, if it is fair to do so. My objection is that the tax now being paid by the citizens of the District is far out of line. When they pay their fair share of the expenses for running the District there would then be no objection to an appropriation from the Federal Government to help take care of its needs. But I think it is manifestly unfair to require the taxpayers of this country to contribute to the expenses of the city of Washington when the tax rate and tax burden of its citizens is lower than in any other city in the United States of nearly comparative size.

May I call your attention to some figures that I think are of importance. The tax rate in the city of Washington is $1.75 per hundred. This rate is levied against real estate and is supposed to be levied against personal property. Only a small amount of taxes is raised in the District on personal property. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is an individual tax exemption on personal property of $1,000. Bank deposits, I am informed, are free from tax, except a tax is levied against the income, if any, that may be derived from bank deposits. Washington has been favored with a very low income tax, and there is no sales tax.

I have just told you that the tax rate in Washington is $1.75 per hundred. Let me give you some tax rates of other cities, in which I think you will be interested:

[Rate per $1,000]

Jersey City	$52.98
Lowell, Mass	48.60
Columbus, Ohio	41.57
Detroit	33.23
Pittsburgh	36.37
Boston	40.60
St. Louis	27.40
Milwaukee	37.81
Oklahoma City	43.43
Covington, Ky	34.20
Denver	41.94
Long Beach	50.00
Salt Lake City	42.00
Kansas City, Mo	39.60
Wichita, Kans	37.60
Quincy, Ill	34.80
Fargo, N. Dak	56.00
Topeka, Kans	42.10
Phoenix, Ariz	60.00
Cumberland, Md	30.82
Sioux City	42.10
Memphis, Tenn	30.00

There will be some discussion to the effect that property in the District of Columbia may be taxed at its actual value. I do not think investigation will bear this out. If I had time, I would like to cite a number of examples where property has been sold during the past 2 or 3 years for a great deal more than is shown by the tax records. Furthermore, the value of real estate in the District of Columbia for the purposes of taxation in 1932 was listed at a total of $1,226,691,000. In 1939 the figures given by the District authorities are $1,171,330,000. There is a decrease in the value of real estate for tax purposes during that period. You know very well real-estate values have increased and not decreased in Washington during the last 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the District of Columbia, generally speaking, have not really known there was a depression. When the so-called depression began in 1933, there was a great increase in the employment here by the Federal Government. Many new bureaus and commissions were added. The increase has continued. We now have about 38 percent more people in Washington than 10 years ago. There never was a time in the past 10 years that Washington did not prosper. It is right now the "boom town" of the Nation. Our Capital City has the biggest income per capita of any city of its size. More money is spent here for luxuries than in any other city. For example, here is an item from a Washington paper that says people in the District of Columbia spent more for amusements last year than 24 of our States put together. I realize that part of that money was spent by visitors, but the city of Washington had the benefit of that spending. The total bill for amusements alone last year was $9,960,000.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is undisputed that living expenses here are higher than almost any other city. Rents are higher than other places—and they are soaring right now. In view of all these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is unfair to the people of this country to permit Congress to dip into an already bankrupt Treasury to contribute $9,000,000 to help run the District of Columbia.

As a matter of fact, the reason these properties have such great value in the city of Washington is because they are located in the Nation's Capital, and if the Government buildings were not here, private property would have little value.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the time to call your attention to the millions of dollars expended by the Government, from which the residents of this District have benefits. For example, we are now completing the finest, biggest airport in the world just outside of Washington. It has cost the taxpayers of this country more than $20,000,000. I am glad we have it, but I call your attention again to the fact that the city of Washington, as such, has made no direct contribution on account of it. Can you find an airport anywhere else in the country near any of our large cities where the Federal Government has borne all the expense?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be misunderstood. We are all proud of our Nation's Capital. It is the finest and greatest in all the world. We want to keep it so. All I ask is that the people of Washington pay as much taxes for the upkeep of their community, comparatively, as other taxpayers are required to pay, in cities of comparative size. When they have paid their share, and the revenue is then not sufficient, there would be no objection to a contribution from the Federal Government. But I say to you that they are not now paying their fair share. I also say if you will raise the tax from $17.50 per thousand to $25, you will even then have a lower tax rate than in most cities. It will still be below the thirty-dollars-plus average for the cities throughout the country, but it will raise the additional $10,000,000, which will be more than the contribution demanded of the Federal Government under the Overton plan.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the national emergency, with due regard to the people of the city of Washington, and in fairness to the taxpayers of your community and mine, the Overton plan should be defeated, and the measure which I have introduced should be approved. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I would like to have the gentleman clarify somewhat his line of reasoning in regard to the Federal Government not being called upon to contribute to the expenses of the District government because of the fact that these are Government buildings occupying this ground, therefore, inferentially, as I understand the gentleman, they should not be subject to any form of taxation. As a matter of fact, those buildings were erected and are occupied and are used for the benefit of all of the people of this country; consequently, is it not fair when you take land out of tax circulation there should be a quid pro quo from the Government to the District to take up that slack in tax revenue?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am very much surprised at the gentleman from New York taking that position. The gentleman, I believe, knows that if it were not for these fine Government buildings that are in the District of Columbia, the value of real estate in the District would not be worth half its present value.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the press each day for the last week has been telling us of some British reversal, all of us, I think, can agree with the members of the committee who have spoken in favor of preparedness. I will go further than that and say I am in favor of a black-out. However, it seems to me it is about time we quit our foolishness, our fussing around, our talking, and really get a black-out of some things which are endangering the future of our country.

The gentleman from Texas made a statement awhile ago that I talked a good deal. It is true I do, but I want you to remember that every time I have criticized a national policy or an administration policy I have offered a bill to correct what I thought was the evil. Every single time I have spoken on this floor I voted in accordance with the argument I advanced. I have never yet hunted for cover, and I am not saying anyone else did, but we have not had the

support for some measures we should have had from the majority.

Mr. Speaker, the black-out I am talking about is the black-out of these subversive activities which are interfering with real national defense. Why talk about turning out lights in Washington when every Member on this floor knows, if he reads the papers and advises himself, that within a few weeks, if the present coal strike is not ended, we are going to have a black-out in practically every furnace producing steel or national munitions in the country. Why play the childish game turning off the lights in the city of Washington, while labor leaders are putting out the fires of industry?

The southern mine owners and the southern miners stand ready today to dig coal. There is no reason on earth why the northern operators and the northern miners, having agreed upon all matters which were in dispute between them, should not dig coal. Except that John Lewis says they shall not. Now, let us black-out John Lewis. I call on the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. SUMNERS], who has had before him for weeks proposed legislation which would kill these strikes without prohibiting them. I call upon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] to follow his words with action. That is, make it possible for every American citizen who wants to work in defense of his country to work in defense of his country without paying tribute to any organization or to any man.

I see the leader of the Democratic Party is present. He, too, is in favor of defense. Why not marshal your political army behind some of this legislation which will make it possible to have here in America, here in these United States, that equality of opportunity that the President talked so much about when he delivered one of his messages to us? Why travel 3,000 miles across the ocean to bring equality of opportunity, to bring the opportunity to work to somebody away over there when here in our own cities, in our own communities, our own people cannot work because of these racketeers who demand a price for the privilege of working in the defense of their country?

Where is there justice in compelling a boy to go to a training camp for $21 a month, to be sent where the President or the Commander in Chief of the Army may will, to do whatever task may be assigned to him, whether it is manual labor or something else? You compel him at the point of a bayonet to do that, yet you let these men in Allis-Chalmers, in Ford Motor Co., and in the coal mines refuse to assist the boys that you have taken and put in camps. I say to you on the majority side, let us have a little less talk; give us some legislation, some enforcement of the laws we have, and you will find that we on the minority side will uphold the hands of the President for national defense and for national preparedness. [Applause.]

COPPERHEADS AND BENEDICT ARNOLDS

Friday, losing his temper, the President characterized as copperheads Colonel Lindbergh and all of those who oppose sending an expeditionary force to Europe, who doubt our ability to invade Europe and "destroy the Axis Powers."

The copperheads were those who, in the North, during the Civil War, sympathized with and desired to aid the South. Neither Lindbergh nor those who agree with him that we should think of America first sympathize with or desire to aid Hitler. There is no similarity whatever between the position taken by the copperheads of Civil War days and those who today, accepting realities, think of America first.

The President may yawn. He may laugh and wisecrack at his press conferences. He may continue to hurl threats at Hitler and Mussolini. He may frighten us by tales of the bombing of Omaha, St. Louis, and our interior cities. He may see submarines off the harbor of New York, and, if they are there, it is because of his provocative acts. He may hint at German occupation of Greenland and South America, and much of the danger to which he refers may be real.

But the real answer, the only answer, to that danger is preparation for national defense, not the sending of outmoded equipment to the seven seas.

Our first duty is preparation here at home; a sound, solid foundation on which to build. Caution and circumspection before we send our ships to be sunk; a million or more men to be drowned, in a fruitness effort to land in Europe.

To characterize, as the President did Friday, all those who believe that the President should abide by his promise solemnly made to keep us out of war; all those who are skeptical of our ability to destroy the military might of Hitler and Mussolini; all those who know that we are now unprepared to drive Germany's naval forces from the sea and successfully land and maintain an expeditionary force in Europe capable of destroying the armed forces of Germany, as copperheads but demonstrates that the President's anger and intolerance, rather than sober judgment, rode him into a harsh and inaccurate comparison.

If the President wishes to retain some of the respect which the people should have for a President, he will do better to leave the name-calling to his hatchet man, Ickes.

With as much justification might Colonel Lindbergh and all who believe that we should not be the tail on England's kite; that we should not fight her battles; that we should not foolishly dissipate our defense, charge the President and those who, admitting that we are unprepared to meet Hitler here, are stripping our country of its naval and military strength, with being Benedict Arnolds, who, as you know, sought to give West Point into the possession of the British.

The President makes no contribution to national unity by charging those who disagree with him with being traitors to their country. All too many of us have in mind his record throughout the past 8 years. We remember that he failed to solve a single one of our domestic problems and many of our people have no confidence whatever in his ability as an administrator or a military strategist to do what Great Britain and the countries of Europe have failed to do—defeat Hitler.

Although warned by Colonel Lindbergh, England refused to prepare; damned Lindbergh as a German sympathizer, when he but told the truth as to Germany's might.

The President and this administration, warned by Lindbergh of our lack of preparation, follows the English course and publicly damns him as a German sympathizer. The people of this country know something of Hitler's power. They are not afraid. On the other hand, they are not foolish enough to, unprepared, desire to enter a conflict 3,000 miles away, where the odds are all against them.

We are not getting production here at home. It is matter of common knowledge that time and again, for weeks at a time, factories upon which this Nation was dependent for national-defense materials have been shut down; delivery of materials necessary for the use of the Army, the Navy, and the air force denied to the Federal Goverment, because Communists, labor racketeers, labor organizers—the latter two groups encouraged, aided, and abetted by the President—have insisted that their interests, the interests of the unions, should be served prior to those of the Nation.

Today the people of this Nation know that there is not coal enough on hand to keep our steel industries, other industries, production in which is vital to our national existence, in operation for more than 2 weeks.

Yet the President, stubborn, playing politics, so far has backed the unions, refused to give protection to hundreds of thousands of patriotic, loyal American workers, who would dig coal, bring about peak production in industrial plants.

The people as a whole know that it was internal strife that made France fall, an easy victim to Germany. The people know that here in America, instead of upholding the provisions of the Constitution, enforcing the Federal laws, making it possible for the industrial plants to turn out the material which is necessary if we are to continue as a Nation, the President, through the National Labor Relations Board, through Sidney Hillman, through others whom he has appointed to positions of authority, has aided those whose actions make us vulnerable.

John L. Lewis has said that, until the mine owners agree to his terms, coal will not be taken from the mines, and, from April 1 until today, has made good that threat.

Today the threat is heard that, if Congress passes the Vinson bill or any legislation which will interfere with the program of certain labor leaders, there will be no national defense.

Patriotic Americans, whose boys have been drafted at $21 per month, their neighbors and friends, are ready for this issue. If it be true that young men can be taken from their homes and forced into camps, there to perform any and all tasks assigned to them, and that at $21 per month, is it not equally true that other men, even though they be members

of labor unions, can be compelled to defend their country?

If there be in this country any group or any organization which thinks it can defy the Federal Government, then it is time that that defiance be brought out in the open and the issue decided now, before any foreign enemy makes an attempt to invade us.

Let Franklin Delano Roosevelt, if he be President of these United States, if he be the President of all the people, insist that his political friends, even though they be labor leaders or industrialists, serve the Nation with the same degree of loyalty, in the same self-sacrificing spirit, that is demanded of our conscripted men.

No man can serve two masters, and the next few weeks will disclose whether Franklin D. Roosevelt is the President of the United States or whether he is the tool of the warmongers or his political bedfellows; those who hamstring our defense efforts by refusing to dig coal, permit others to dig it; to operate industrial plants, permit others to operate them.

No; we who insist that our country comes first, that it should not foolishly attempt to conquer the world, are not copperheads. The President has no more justification to so characterize us than have we to describe him and those who believe that the interests of Britain come first as Benedict Arnolds.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Page 2, line 6, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2A. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to furnish sandbags for the Capitol, the White House, and Supreme Court; to provide dugouts, tin helmets, asbestos suits, and gas masks for the Members of Congress, the Chief Executive, and the Justices of the Supreme Court; to place air-raid watchers on the Washington Monument; to install air-raid sirens on all public buildings except the Department of Labor; and that the subways between the Senate and House Office Buildings and the Capitol be comfortably furnished as air-raid shelters for Members of Congress only."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given until tomorrow at midnight to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 4139.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have supported practically all national-defense measures in the last few years, including $5,000,000,000 for a two-ocean Navy. We have today the greatest Navy in the world, the largest Navy, and the best Navy. I do not believe this proposal now before the House has anything whatever to do with national defense, but is a part of a campaign to spread war hysteria, fear, emotionalism, and war propaganda.

If Congress adopts this bill, it will mean that war hysteria and war propaganda will spread all over the land. Our example will be followed by every little hamlet, town, and village, which will be immediately demanding black-outs in those hamlets, towns, and villages. It is an utterly useless and provocative proposal.

We are not in this war, and I do not believe we are going into this war. No American blood has been spilled, no American has been killed, no American ship has been sunk, and yet there are those in this country who will tell you we are in the war now. This is just another part of their propaganda program to break down the will of the American people for peace and to get us into the war.

The President of the United States during the last Presidential campaign went out in the Middle West and, speaking at Denver and Omaha, told the people out there that they had better get ready because they might be attacked by airplanes. That was also spreading more war hysteria. The people out near the Mississippi River Valley are now demanding battleships for the Mississippi River for protection, and soon they will be asking for submarines in the Dust Bowls if this bill passes.

In the name of common sense, we already have far too much hysteria. If the women of this country believe one-half they read in the interventionist press in the East and one-half they hear over the interventionist radios and read in the writings of war-making columnists, they will soon be looking under their beds every night to see if there is not some Jap, Nazi, or Fascist there ready to pounce upon poor little defenseless America and gobble up North and South America at one bite. The goblins will get us if we do not watch out. That is exactly what this bill proposes. It is a goblin bill. It is aimed to promote fear and hysteria in the greatest and most powerful nation in the world.

I do not impugn the motives of anybody, no matter how he stands on any legislation, but from my point of view I regard this bill as craven and cowardly in a country of 130,000,000 people, with the greatest Navy in the world, with an Army of 1,500,000, and with, presumably or in the near future, a great air force.

I challenge anyone to state what nation could attack us with airplanes today and what nation has any thought of attacking us with airplanes. From where would they attack us? No airplane has yet been invented that can fly over here for a military purpose and bomb our American cities and get back to its base in Japan, Germany, or Italy. Yet we rush in here, at a time when the worst thing that can happen in this country is to spread hysteria, and bring in a bill to black-out the city of Washington.

To black-out the city of Washington means that our example will be followed all over the country and black-outs tried in other American cities, and then the people will be led to believe that we are at war. That is part of the propaganda that the 85 percent of the American people who want to stay out of war are trying to combat. It is abetting the interventionist propaganda that tells us we are in the war, that it is our war, that we started the war.

I am opposing this bill with ridicule and in every other way I can in order to try to put a stop to this campaign of hysteria, fear, and dread, and to expose this campaign of propaganda for war, that aims to drag the United States of America into war when 85 percent of the people want to stay out.

The American people will go to war quickly enough if anybody attacks us. They will go into war quickly enough if any nation sends airplanes over here to attack us. The American people will be overwhelmingly for war if any aggressor comes over here with airplanes, although I do not know where they can come from.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. This is along the line of what happened 2 years ago. This is nothing new. Two years ago the people of New Jersey, listening to a radio play, and being constantly fed with hysterical propaganda, thought they were being attacked by warriors from Mars. If you pass this legislation, people all over this country will be wondering who is going to attack us. What happened in New Jersey can happen anywhere, in West Virginia, or in any other State.

I ask, in the name of common sense and reason, that we put an end to this war hysteria. Let us spend money for national defense, but let us not go out looking for war and trying to create the hysteria that will make the people at home believe we are in this war. We will go into war when anybody comes over here looking for a war, or when anybody attacks us, but do not let us black-out all our American cities, following the example proposed in this bill, and thereby help to create a situation that will push us into a foreign war. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia told us that we did not have an antiaircraft gun here in Washington, and that no planes were here.

Mr. FISH. Let them buy antiaircraft guns; I am for that. The gentleman is a very fine Member of this House and I do not mean any reflection on him at all.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If we are in such danger we ought to begin to get aircraft.

Mr. FISH. Let us spend whatever is necessary to insure our own national defense; aircraft, antiaircraft guns, or other necessary defense weapons. That is what we need it for. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to discuss the merits of proposed black-outs, but I think it is only fair that it be called to the attention of the House that this experiment has already been put to test. The city of Seattle, my home town, conducted a very successful black-out. Why they had it, I do not know, but they did have a black-out in cooperation with the Army and the Navy and all the military authorities. It was publicized all over the Nation, and as I said, it was done very successfully, with no inconvenience to any of the citizens and as far as I can ascertain from reports from Seattle, no one was hurt. They found out what to do if the occasion should arise and every cooperation was given by the military authorities; in fact, they participated in the black-out. I think one messenger boy, in the darkness, fell off his bicycle and broke his arm, but other than that, no casualties were reported. So this can be done practically and whether it should be or not I shall leave to the judgment of the House, but I thought it fair to point out that it has been done in a large American city. [Applause.]

Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. DONDERO rose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of offering any statement on this bill, but a thought has occurred to me to which I think the House might give some consideration.

If a black-out were ordered in any city in your district it would create, or arouse, very little interest outside of the local community, but when you do something here in the Nation's Capital it seems to have the official stamp of the Nation, and as such is heralded from one side of this Nation to the other. It would be viewed with more significance, and the American people would look upon it, perhaps, as an example of what is to come. For that reason, when we do something here in the District of Columbia, in this Capital City of the Nation, let us be very careful that we do it cautiously and after the most careful consideration.

I want to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia to the fact that if you order a black-out for the city of Washington alone, situated as we are here in this valley, with the District of Columbia ringed with a number of other municipalities in Virginia and Maryland that would not be blacked out, we would make a virtual target out of the Nation's Capital if a black-out were not ordered in every town and city and borough which joins the District of Columbia. It would be futile and utterly useless to accomplish the purpose that the bill intends.

Let us not do anything rashly here that would simply attract attention to the Nation's Capital and cause apprehension and fear. [Applause.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, in my opinion, makes a terribly weak argument when he attempts by ridicule to defeat any legislation on this floor. Certainly the only way that any bill should be defeated is by the argument of its opponents and as then reflected in the votes of the Members of the House. The gentleman from New York makes a grave mistake, in my opinion, when he charges that this measure is craven and cowardly. Its purpose is just the opposite. Time will so demonstrate. I have no doubt on that score. The District of Columbia Committee is composed of 21 Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats alike, and they bring this measure to you with a unanimous report. They bring it here because they believe in doing so they are discharging a very high obligation in the jurisdiction for which they legislate through the Congress of the United States.

I do not look under my bed every night for a goblin, and you do not do so. I do not call every man a "fifth columnist" who disagrees with me. Neither do I hurl the charge of fascism or nazi-ism at those individuals who are not in accord with my views. I do, however, stand here this afternoon as a member of the House District Committee and as a Member of the Congress of the United States and say that in my honest opinion, in my considered judgment, in my best thought, I am firmly convinced that we will do a real service not only to Washington but to the Nation at large by the passage of this bill.

Remember, Members of the House, the District Commissioners could, under their authority, have ordered a black-out; but the District of Columbia Committee believed that we wanted to have it proceed under most careful planning and under the best safeguards, and for that reason we have called on the Secretary of War, and we will have his approval and assistance in any black-out that is held. We have said that the District Commissioners would negotiate with the nearby States of Virginia and Maryland, and there would come the cooperation of Alexandria, Hyattsville, Bethesda, and the other communities that cluster about this ever-growing Capital. I repeat we will fail in our duty today if we continue a complacent attitude toward a situation that concerns proper preparation of the civilian population of our Capital City in the event of a possible war.

Remember this—and I say this with all of the feeling that is within me—the period of black-out is only momentary, at most 3 to 5 minutes. It is the weeks of preparation, the cooperative spirit shown by all of our agencies, governmental and civilian, our American Legion, our Veterans of Foreign Wars, our Boy Scouts, and Red Cross and service organizations, that make the plan important. All of these units, including our industrial enterprises and public utilities will join together in a cooperative, voluntary effort in this matter. No black-out will be called quickly in Washington. I remind you again, it takes weeks of careful planning, and would never be put into effect unless the War Department approved the plan of the Commissioners.

I do not mind a disagreement on this subject. If the House votes it down, there will be no personal feeling on my part. I believe in my stand on this subject. I know that in Boston and in New York, Seattle, Pittsburgh, in El Paso, black-outs have been highly successful, and the Government through the Army and the Navy have assisted in bringing them about.

I refer to my home town for one moment, because it is a small community like those other communities spoken of here this afternoon. It is Elkins, W. Va., a town hidden in the mountain fastnesses of our State. Last October that community put on an imaginary air raid at night. Approximately 40,000 men, women, and children lined the mountain side of our natural amphitheater on the campus of Davis and Elkins College to see the show. We had planes from our municipal airports fly across that city during the black-out, and we had anti-aircraft guns firing at those ships in the air, also searchlights, sent by the National Guard of the District of Columbia, to point out the flight of the planes in the air. What happened? Those patriotic men and women rose as one and thanked the District of Columbia National Guard and the civic officials who brought that demonstration about and they went home sobered in thought and not hysterical. They were realizing that what had happened over there could happen here, and as Americans they were ready to face the reality. The amendment is ridiculous and should be defeated. My colleagues, do not be short-sighted. Take the long look. Beyond the horizon of our vision we trust lies peace. We pray for a continuance of peace—but let us take every precaution in the event war comes. Let us proceed to properly prepare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I agree that the amendment should be again reported, because it will show the ridicule that has gone into the argument.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Fish amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the Fish amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISH) there were—ayes 6, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged motion, which I send to the desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves that the enacting clause be stricken from the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 63, noes 35.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 117, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—172

Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ind.	Oliver
Andersen, H. Carl	Guyer, Kans.	O'Neal
	Gwynne	Paddock
Anderson, Calif.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pfeiffer, William T.
Angell	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Baumhart	Harrington	Rankin, Miss.
Beam	Hart	Rankin, Mont.
Bennett	Harter	Reece, Tenn.
Bishop	Healey	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Heidinger	Reed, N. Y.
Bonner	Hill, Colo.	Rees, Kans.
Boren	Hill, Wash.	Rizley
Bradley, Pa.	Hinshaw	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Robinson, Utah
Bulwinkle	Holmes	Robsion, Ky.
Byrne	Hook	Rockefeller
Canfield	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Carlson	Houston	Rolph
Cartwright	Howell	Rutherford
Chenoweth	Hull	Scott
Chiperfield	Jackson	Short
Clason	Jarrett	Simpson
Claypool	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Jensen	Smith, Ohio
Coffee, Nebr.	Johns	Snyder
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Calif.	Somers, N. Y.
Cole, Md.	Johnson, Ind.	Spence
Collins	Johnson, Okla.	Springer
Colmer	Jonkman	Stearns, N. H.
Copeland	Kean	Stefan
Costello	Keefe	Stevenson
Cravens	Kelly, Ill.	Stratton
Crawford	Kirwan	Sumner, Ill.
Crowther	Knutson	Sutphin
Culkin	Kocialkowski	Talle
Cunningham	Kramer	Tenerowicz
Curtis	Lambertson	Terry
Day	Landis	Thill
Dewey	LeCompte	Thom
Disney	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Dondero	McGregor	Tibbott
Dworshak	McKeough	Tinkham
Eaton	McLaughlin	Treadway
Eliot, Mass.	McLean	Van Zandt
Elliott, Calif.	Magnuson	Vincent, Ky.
Engel	Mansfield	Vorys, Ohio
Englebright	Martin, Iowa	Walter
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Weaver
Fenton	Mason	Wheat
Fish	Michener	Wigglesworth
Folger	Moser	Wilson
Fulmer	Murdock	Winter
Gale	Murray	Wolcott
Gehrmann	Nichols	Wolverton, N. J.
Geyer, Calif.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gilchrist	O'Connor	Young
Gillie	O'Hara	Youngdahl
Gore		
Graham		

NAYS—117

Allen, La.	Connery	Gathings
Andrews	Cooper	Gearhart
Arnold	Courtney	Gossett
Barnes	Creal	Green
Bates, Ky.	D'Alesandro	Gregory
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Ohio	Harris, Ark.
Beckworth	Dingell	Harris, Va.
Bloom	Dirksen	Hébert
Boggs	Doughton	Heffernan
Boland	Downs	Hendricks
Brooks	Doxey	Hunter
Brown, Ga.	Ellis	Imhoff
Bryson	Faddis	Izac
Buck	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Luther A.
Camp	Fitzpatrick	
Cannon, Fla.	Flaherty	Johnson, W. Va.
Case, S. Dak.	Flannagan	Kee
Casey, Mass.	Fogarty	Kefauver
Chapman	Forand	Kerr
Cochran	Ford, Miss.	Kilday
Lanham	Pierce	Smith, Wash.
Larrabee	Pittenger	South
Lesinski	Plauché	Sullivan
Lewis	Poage	Sumners, Tex.
McCormack	Priest	Thomason
McGehee	Rabaut	Tolan
McIntyre	Randolph	Traynor
Maciejewski	Rivers	Vinson, Ga.
Mahon	Robertson, Va.	Wadsworth
May	Rogers, Mass.	Ward
Meyer, Md.	Rogers, Okla.	Wasielewski
Mills, Ark.	Russell	Weiss
Mills, La.	Sanders	West
Monroney	Satterfield	Whittington
Norrell	Sauthoff	Wickersham
O'Brien, Mich.	Scrugham	Worley
O'Toole	Secrest	Wright
Patton	Shanley	Zimmerman
Peterson, Fla.	Sheppard	
Peterson, Ga.	Sikes	

NOT VOTING—142

Anderson, N. Mex.	Gamble	Norton
	Gavagan	O'Day
Andresen, August H.	Gerlach	O'Leary
	Gibson	Osmers
Arends	Gifford	Pace
Baldwin	Granger	Patman
Barden	Grant, Ala.	Patrick
Barry	Haines	Pearson
Beiter	Halleck	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bell	Hancock	
Bender	Hare	Plumley
Bland	Harness	Powers
Boehne	Hartley	Ramsay
Bolles	Hess	Ramspeck
Bolton	Hobbs	Rich
Boykin	Holbrock	Richards
Bradley, Mich.	Jacobsen	Romjue
Buckler, Minn.	Jarman	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Sacks
Burch	Jennings	Sasscer
Burdick	Johnson, Ill.	Scanlon
Burgin	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Mo.		Schuetz
Capozzoli	Jones	Schulte
Carter	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer, Mich.
Celler	Kennedy, Martin J.	Shannon
Clark		Sheridan
Cluett	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Conn.
Cole, N. Y.		Smith, Pa.
Cooley	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Cox	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Crosser	Kinzer	Sparkman
Cullen	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Davis, Tenn.	Kopplemann	Steagall
Delaney	Kunkel	Sweeney
Dickstein	Lea	Taber
Dies	Leavy	Tarver
Ditter	Lynch	Taylor
Domengeaux	McArdle	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	McGranery	Voorhis, Calif.
Drewry	McMillan	Vreeland
Duncan	Maas	Welch
Durham	Maciora	Wene
Eberharter	Marcantonio	Whelchel
Edelstein	Merritt	White
Edmiston	Mitchell	Williams
Elston	Mott	Wolfenden, Pa.
Flannery	Mundt	Woodrum, Va.
Ford, Leland M.	Myers, Pa.	
Ford, Thomas F	Nelson	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Burch with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Cooley with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Maciora with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Kunkle.
Mr. Hare with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Carter.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Beiter with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Ramsay.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Wene.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Sasscer.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Pearson.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Edmiston.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Whelchel.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. McGranery with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Leavy with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. White with Mr. Smith of Connecticut.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Shannon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. SHORT a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the legislation from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it it so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert therein a short editorial and a news item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it it so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a memorandum, a letter, and a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it it so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Mr. R. E. Tillman, president of the California Oil & Gas Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it it so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it it so ordered.

There was no objection.

ATHENS

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] object to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] proceeding for 2 minutes before his special order?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will not object to this, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize any other Members to proceed for any length of time before the gentleman from Texas proceeds, even though he does yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I thank the Speaker, and I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. Speaker, I read in the paper this morning that Athens has fallen; that Greece has fallen; the country where Leonidas fought, where Socrates taught, and where Homer sang. But I picked up my Macaulay yesterday, the greatest master of English prose, and I read this about Athens:

> And when those who have rivaled her (Athens') greatness shall have shared her fate, when civilization and knowledge shall have fixed their abode in distant continents, when the scepter shall have passed away from England, when, perhaps, travelers from distant regions shall in vain labor to decipher on some mouldering pedestal the name of our proudest chief, shall hear savage hymns chanted to some misshapen idol over the ruined dome of our proudest temple, and shall see a single naked fisherman wash his nets in the river of the 10,000 masts, her influence and her glory will still survive, fresh in eternal youth, exempt from mutability and decay, immortal as the intellectual principle from which they derived their origin and over which they exercise their control.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that Athens has not fallen. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

PUBLIC OPINION: ITS RELATION TO STRIKES AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin with attention, because I do not purpose to try to make a speech or engage in oratory.

In great crises of the past—and we certainly confront a great crisis—Members of this great body have met in serious counsel. We must do it now. Notwithstanding the fact that during a great many years the Congress of the United States has not been, in a constitutional sense, the body where the public policy of the Government is fixed. I have a pretty definite notion that Congress must assume that responsibility, not in any antagonistic or combative sense but with self-respect, consciousness of responsibility, and purpose to help.

In its resumption of this power Congress must not be unmindful of the situation which has developed since the surrender of that primary responsibility. In great crises the Anglo-Saxon system of government—and I speak governmentally and not racially—sometimes requires quicker pick-up and stronger power than our institutions, functioning separately, are able to develop, and in such a situation there is concentrated emergency power in the Executive to deal with an emergency situation with the retention of the power to control its exercise. Whether this situation—this long suspension of the normal constitutional functioning of the Congress to which I have referred—has resulted from recurrences of that interesting phenomenon not infrequent in Anglo-Saxon history, we do not have time now to discuss. But it seems to me perfectly evident that the situation that now confronts the country challenges the best which the Congress, conscious of its responsibility, can develop, and the best which public opinion can contribute.

May I stop for a minute to discuss public opinion and the relationship which public opinion sustains to the operation of a democratic system of government?

I assume all of you have made some examination of public opinion, how it develops, and its place in the scheme of free government. If you have, you have discovered it to be perhaps the most fascinating thing you have examined with regard to popular government and the influences which control its operation. It is somewhat difficult to get a physical illustration of a thing like public opinion. When you go out into the country and you talk to this person, that person, and the other person and so often discover ignorance, prejudice, and predisposition, you wonder how it can be possible that public opinion can be, as it is recognized to be, the only possible safe guide of a free people.

It is interesting—it is intensely interesting—to examine it, and as you proceed in your examination you discover that public opinion—a good illustration of public opinion is difficult—is somewhat like the gold that comes from a low-grade ore. This is not a perfect illustration, but I believe you will see the likeness.

In the process of discussion by the people, in the process of determination, in the process of debate, the dross is burned out. One person may have 100 notions and none of them be perfect; but if he can make the contribution of 1 thing that is sound, the 99 things are burned out and the thing that is sound lives. Those sound things that many people contribute in the aggregate make up public opinion. I am definitely of the conclusion from my examination of the nature of popular government, the origin of popular government, the natural laws under which popular government functions, the influences which control it, that public opinion has been provided by God Almighty for the guidance of free governments. I do not believe there can be much doubt in the minds of students of government—not theories with reference to government, but the thing itself—that free government is the sort of government intended by nature for human beings. There are many evidences of this fact. I will mention only one. It is perfectly clear that human beings are developed by difficulties; and it is free government, popular government, which gives the individuals the greatest necessity to study, to do, and to work, and, therefore, the greatest possible opportunity to develop.

Now, then, we come with these introductory statements to examine our situation. I have just heard my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] facetiously discussing the possibilities of making arrangements for air-raid protection in the District of Columbia. Upon my responsibility I make the statement that if we continue as we are going now and if conditions continue to move as they are moving now, the danger facetiously stated will become an actuality. The quicker the American people realize that fact and quit playing with the situation, the better chance we shall have for that not to be the picture. You cannot tell me differently. Here we stand challenging every nation on earth that is able to fight, except Britain, saying to all the world: "You stay out of this hemisphere from tip to tip," telling them what to do in Asia, in Europe, and in Africa, and challenging the greatest fighting machine ever organized and functioning on earth. Are we crazy? Can anybody face this fact and not know what it means? In every item of preparation we point to somebody, to some nation organized and equipped for war.

The thing that disturbs me, and I think it disturbs you and disturbs everybody else when we really face the facts, is to see how step by step—and we do not deviate insofar as I can discover in one single important detail—step by step we are going in the footsteps of France. And people get up here and play like children with the safety of the last remaining great republic on the face of God Almighty's earth. People are at play, having a big time going to parties, strutting, blustering, and threatening, having a big time as day by day we draw nearer to actual fighting. Everything we have is at stake. We do not have to get jittery in order not to be fools. The American people have sense. The American people have their feet on the ground and their heads on their shoulders and are thinking more soundly, I believe, than we are. The American people are willing to do this if we could get them conscious of our common danger that exists. There is no greater solidifying influence than that. But every time I try to warn the Nation of its impending peril, some people in high places say, as they said in France: "Tush! Nothing to fear!" When Germany was marshaling its mighty forces and moving them toward the Maginot line, owners of factories, operatives in factories, were fighting for profits and fighting for social gains. How was that possible? France had gone to pieces before the Germans struck the Maginot line, or the Germans never could have

taken it. France had gone to pieces inside or they would not have been doing this foolish thing while thus imperiled.

When I look at my Nation now I see people considering profits and gain when we are on the brink. We are next on call. Why, your offices are full of men who come here from the States to make profitable contracts with this Government. Sixty-five billions of dollars, the limit on the national debt, we are exhausting in a perfect riot of extravagance—an amount of money equal to the value of all the farm lands from the frozen seas of the North through Canada, all of our States to far down beyond the Panama Canal. Have we no sense of responsibility for the expenditure of public money? This is possibly a strong statement, but it is not far from being right. Boys who had been glad to make $2 a day in the country are drawing $15 a day out of this authorized credit. I know one man at home who used to get $120 a month but now is drawing $500 from the Government. In factories, manufacturers who were doing their best to stay afloat before this emergency, are now making large profits. Labor leaders are boasting that they have been able to put their fingers upon the throat of industry, upon the throat of government, and compel enormous increases in compensation. I do not believe such a people can win. We have the stuff in us to win, but it is latent. The French people had the stuff in themselves to win. They demonstrated it after the Maginot line broke, but it was too late.

The great difficulty is that the people do not seem to be conscious of what they are doing to the Nation and to their chance to survive. One group, opposed to labor, and another group opposed to industry, misquoting and twisting the statements that Members make on the floor of the House, in an attempt to get some gain or advantage, make it impossible to do the very thing we must do. What is that? It is to solidify a great nation of people, make them conscious of a common danger, and united in a common effort.

Do you tell me in a great crisis like this, patriotic men in these factories, if they were conscious of the danger to the country, would paralyze the industries of the United States and make it impossible to produce guns, put planes in the air, and battleships on the seas to defend their own boys who are putting on the uniform of this Nation? They would not do it.

I think this administration has failed to do one most important thing it ought to do. Some of its spokesmen have minimized the danger to this country and the consequences of these strikes.

People who are conscious of responsibility and who have any sense do not wait until a thing absolutely happens. They look to see which way they are moving. Do you not do that? You do not wait until you go off the precipice before you get concerned. If today you are closer to the precipice than you were yesterday, you become concerned.

Here is what the figures furnished me show. In January, according to the figures given me, there were 101,540 man-days lost by strikes in industry essential to the military preparation, exclusive of solely naval preparation, of this country. In February we lost 429,879 man-days. In March we lost 664,519 man-days, and in the first 17 days of April, including strikes in the coal fields and in Ford plants, there were lost 5,625,069 man-days. Yet these men who are supposed to be the watchmen in the tower tell the American people everything is coming along not so badly.

I have done my best to try to reach the loyal working man. I was up in the coal mines of West Virginia a short time ago. I went around and visited. They did not know who I am. I know how to talk to the people because I am one of the people. When I left there I knew that the man in the coal mines of West Virginia does not want to hurt his country. But they have been fed on the notion that there is to be no loss of what they call social gains. From high up in governmental power they have been assured that there is to be no loss anywhere, no sacrifice, no dedication to the public interest. Everybody—not everybody, but too many—started out to get rich off of what is possibly the greatest war that has been on this earth, and one in which everything we hold dear is rapidly becoming involved, is rapidly becoming endangered. Let nobody fool himself that there is not going to be any sacrifice before we get through. When they look back over their lost opportunities, profits and gains in industry and labor must seem mighty insignificant to the people of France and England now. Fooling the people; that is the great injustice to the American people. They will do the job in America if they know what the job is. Convinced of our dire emergency and told the truth about the danger, everybody who is loyal to America will cooperate. I believe that. That is why I am making this speech today. I may not get anywhere. I am not responsible for results. I am responsible for doing my best.

I speak now to the American people. I am appealing to the American people. This is their country and they are their boys who are being put into uniform. It is their boys who will make cannon fodder unless we can thoroughly equip ourselves before those whom we have challenged can get to us. That is all there is to it. That is why I am driving hard today. I want only to do good for my people and my country. France sat down behind its Maginot line. Its men were striking, the owners of its factories were clamoring for profits, its people were playing at their selfish games when the mighty forces of Germany were marching toward the Maginot line. When that line broke, as I stated the other day from testimony before our committee, men, women, and children of France made as magnificent an effort as was ever made by human beings to save the liberty of a great republic. But it was too late. They worked until they dropped in their tracks, these men, women, and children; they forgot all about profits, they forgot all about social gains. They had but one business and I tell you, my countrymen, today, and I am speaking to the American people, and I take the responsibility of speaking to the American people: There is but one business in America in this solemn hour of our Nation's peril, and that is to make this country secure. [Applause.]

We see the spectacle of leaders strutting their stuff and bragging about what increases or profits they got by paralyzing these industries and agencies of this Government upon which the Nation depends for its security. I am trying to reach the people today, and I hope the press will help me as I try without prejudice or partiality, with no purpose to criticize or to shield, to serve my country's vital interest. We are dealing now with the safety of a Nation. Men do not count, not when the security of the Republic is at stake. The heart of labor is sound. I know that is so. If it is not, there is no use building planes; there is no use doing anything. But it is sound. I have stated that time and time again on the floor of the House. The heart of business is sound. The heart of the American people is sound. We are their watchmen on the tower. It is our business to give the danger signal to arouse the people to their dangers. It is our duty to arouse public opinion, solidify the people, and make them conscious of their common danger.

Of course, there are enemies in this country, possibly planted in every major defense factory of the land. They were in France. When the French were retreating behind the River Meuse to a strong position and were preparing to blow up the bridges, enemies of France had cut the wires. The Germans marched victoriously over the bridges of France. In Norway, Denmark, Holland, everywhere, enemies of these countries were doing the service of Germany. Some of them were in the factories, former Ambassador to France, Mr. Bullitt, testified. In the factories today decisive battles of wars are fought.

When we have aroused public opinion, when we have separated the loyal element of labor from the disloyal element, when those fit to live in this country are solidified by a common danger, impelled by a common purpose, inspired by a common patriotism, they will do business with that type of people whose treachery has opened the way for the conquerors of the world's democracies. That is, in effect, what I said a month ago. That is what I favor. Why not? I regret to say, however, that a statement of mine on March 27 was picked up, cut from the context of my speech, twisted, and sent all over the Nation as a declaration by a Member of Congress that he was in favor of electrocuting strikers.

Of course, such misconstruction of what I said blocks me from any chance to reach the unprejudiced consideration of the loyal people in labor. It puts me in the situation of being either a fool or a brute, or both. If I alone were involved, it would not make any difference. I am trying to do a job, a necessary job, as I see it, if we are to survive. I hope you boys in the press gallery will see that that sort of thing does not come out of this speech.

Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned about what may happen to me. I am not trying to get on the front page. I do not

like public display, and I do not like the front page. The glamor of all this does not appeal to me. But in this hour of my Nation's peril, I am trying to do my best, trying to reach the people of the Nation, trying to tell them what I see as one of their watchmen on the tower. I think this thing called hero worship is the most contemptible and disgusting thing of which any people can be guilty. I do not want anybody looking up to me, because I am not up there, and I do not look up to anybody because they are not up there either. [Applause.]

A nation of bootlicking man-worshiping folks cannot win through, cannot preserve this Republic. I do not want any of that sort of stuff, not that I am in any danger of getting it. I want to arouse my people to a sense of their danger, their responsibility, and to the place and power and dignity of the private citizen in the structure of our Government. The forces that are sweeping through the earth are running mighty deep. These are not usual times. There are reminders in them of the Testament references to those who have eyes to see but see not, and ears to hear but hear not. We are reminded also of that great declaration of fundamental law that has come down through the centuries stated something like this: "Thou shalt lift up thy voice to Jehovah, and thou shalt have no other gods before me." To me as a boy that did not seem to be the sort of declaration a great God should make, nor, if I may be pardoned the expression, did it seem fitting that He should create some folks to be kowtowing to Him and playing on instruments before Him. It just did not seem right with me. It bothered me. But when I began to look into the history of time, when I began to examine human nature, I discovered that that was perhaps the greatest law ever promulgated by God Almighty dealing with human happiness and human interests. Look up to God, emulate God. I speak not as a religionist but as a student of facts. You can take the history of time. Whether you look at Alexander and his people, the Caesars and theirs, Napoleon and his, or whatnot, you will find that no people who ever gave to human beings the worship which in nature it is only safe to give to God has escaped the penalty for the violation of that law which was promulgated not for the glory of God but for the good and the guidance of man on this earth.

I am not now reflecting on anybody. What I am trying to do is to call the people of my Nation to a consciousness of their responsibility, to a consciousness of their dignity, and have them again speak the voice of government. An aroused, patriotic, and determined people, guided by the laws of God Almighty which govern free governments, can win. Only such a people, a great people, can win through the difficulties of this hour. Just passing laws will not do this job.

I am sorry today that I have a disposition to quarrel a bit with people who seem to have the notion that if you pass a law something will happen as a result of the enactment of that law. It is an American disease to believe that everything can be cured by passing another law. It seems that we believe if we have one law that is not enforced, the thing to do is to pass two more, and immediately the first law will thereby be enforced.

I do not know what the difficulties of the administration are. I know it is dealing with a difficult situation regardless of where responsibility lies for its creation. I believe the Committee on the Judiciary up to this time, at least, has taken the right position, although we have come under criticism. The Executive says it wants no additional legislative power to keep these plants in operation. We have given to the President of the United States men. We have also given to the President of the United States in one week $11,000,000,000. The Committee on the Judiciary as an agent of the Congress has said to the executive branch of the Government, "Do you need any other legislation?" We presumed to say that we want these factories kept open. "Do you need any other legislation? If so, what legislation do you need?" It is up to the President and public opinion in America, and that is where it must be. It is a serious thing to do otherwise with reference to this Executive responsibility, with the men and the money already provided to give them the best equipment that money can buy. It is a serious matter to intervene in such a situation with legislation which the President says he does not want. As I see it, this is an Executive job, now an Executive responsibility, and the Committee on the Judiciary stands ready to report out any additional legislation within its jurisdiction to give any additional power requested, necessary to keep these factories open.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and, if it should seem helpful, to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have listened to the gentleman with a great deal of interest, and I am unable to reconcile the gentleman's remarks with the bill he introduced on Wednesday.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I cannot at this time turn aside from what I am trying to do to discuss a bill.

We have first to agree on some fundamental policies and after we shall have agreed, then we are prepared to go somewhere. I say to my good friend I think it would confuse the situation when we are trying to determine and agree upon some fundamental policy to discuss the details of a bill which the chairman of a committee may have introduced. I hope this statement will not be accepted in criticism of my friend or as an indication of any disposition to avoid specific discussion of a bill, but, and I say this with all respect, I do not believe that in this hour when we are trying to determine upon some policy we can afford to divide upon the mechanics of specific legislation. One of the reasons why I am driving hard, one of the reasons why I feel that we are not really alive to our common danger is the frequency with which we are divided in our votes by this center aisle. There is more lining up along party lines than would occur if we realized the dangers which I am convinced exist. I, of course, do not, in this statement, criticize one side as against the other.

If we were conscious of our danger there would be less division between the two sides of this House along party lines. The death and devastation of this war are paying no attention to the party line of the peoples being destroyed. They forgot their party cleavages and their vocational cleavages, but only after it was too late. If we were conscious of our danger, newspapers in this country would not think—as some of them apparently do—that the main business yet is to put something in their papers that will sell them.

A good many years ago I talked to one of my friends, a newspaperman. I know many of them have a kindly attitude toward me and I appreciate it. I know I am possibly sacrificing that by being misunderstood by what I must say.

I asked this friend, "Why do you not help us to get across to the country an analytical statement of things, instead of presenting our discussion in a controversial sort of way, or picking out some statement which separated from the context is sensational?" He said, "It is no news to say that a dog has bitten a man, but it is news to say that a man has bitten a dog."

I see a definite disposition on the part of the press of this country to abandon that policy of choosing dog biters. It was just a sort of habit. It was what the people were supposed to want. I think that progress is being made tremendously fast on the part of the press of this country to present these things analytically. They can do the job if they will. People are hungry for something solid now. Of course, the thing that concerns us is, Will we wait until it is too late? Will we do it in time? I do not want to be offensive; I realize I am driving hard. When I look at the tragedies of Europe, when I look back and see their people finally getting together, making as magnificent a fight for the things that men love as could be made, but too late, I wonder about America when I see what we are doing. America is going to get on the job, but the question is whether it will be too late. It never has gotten through the egotistical hide of the average American that there is at this very time a chance of America's being defeated, a chance of its joining the list of the democracies whose course before their destruction was identical with our own now, except that we have assumed a sort of world-wide responsibility when we are not even prepared to defend ourselves against those whose power we challenge. We are challenging the world, yet unable or unwilling to keep all of our own gun and plane and ship factories in operation.

Of course, we are flirting with defeat. That is just something that the average

American cannot imagine could possibly happen. We have had a notion in America that in some sort of way we in America are to be spared from the necessity of demonstrating in this high peak of all time that we are a people fit to survive. Have you ever thought about that? I do not like to continue to say this. I am going to hurry through and quit in a few minutes, but I feel deeply today.

I have studied these things. I have examined the facts and I am sad today to see my Nation walking in the footsteps of France, walking toward the common doom of the democracies of the world. This may not be agreed to now, but I declare to the American people that the only thing that will or can save us from their fate is for the American people from ocean to ocean to become conscious that they have but one single job in America worthy of consideration, and that is the preparation of this country for every possible emergency. I have been out in the country where these essential industries are closed down as silent as the grave. We are proclaiming ourselves the arsenal of that group of peoples who one by one are being conquered, while we are moving day by day unprepared into a position of major responsibility against the most powerful and perfectly functioning fighting machine which has ever existed on earth. We act like crazy people.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I share with the distinguished gentleman the same concern for the fate of our country in this critical hour of its history. What we need are facts. I wonder if I myself have been misinformed. This is a startling array of figures given by the gentleman just a few moments ago showing the mounting number of hours lost through strikes or stoppage in defense industry. I have been led to believe, on what I thought was good authority, that our defense program was coming along nicely, in fact, remarkably well, and I have said so in print. Am I wrong? I seek the truth. What are the facts in regard to our defense production? If it really is not what it could be, who is to blame?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the gentleman had gone with me through the coal fields of Virginia and Pennsylvania and had seen the very heart of the industrial life of America paralyzed, could he have thought things are coming along well?

These strikes are not the things of fundamental trouble. These strikes are merely an indication of what lies deeper than that. These strikes are an indication of the softness, the unfitness of the American people to win. If they were fit there would not be these strikes. [Applause.] That is what scares me, if I may use that expression, and I do not think I am jittery.

When I see 1,400,000 boys going to the front, in effect, in uniform—sons of America, the pride of America, the flower of the young manhood of America—and mines and factories idle that are necessary to put coal in the furnace, to put planes in the air, to put guns in the hands of those boys—machines and factories idle while people fight among themselves, it scares me, if I may use that expression, and I do not use it in a jittery sense.

We have grown soft in America. We have had the crazy notion in America that we are God Almighty's especial charge and ward on the earth. We can strut and bluster as we please, and nobody is going to shoot at us first. Right under the shadow of the greatest war that has ever obtained, a nation that has its coal mines closed down because it cannot or will not keep them in operation, and yet is challenging every people fit to fight, if England breaks, has something so fundamentally weak and crazy in its structure as to arouse the deep concern of all thoughful people. It could not happen if we were now fit to win, strong enough to win.

France stood behind its Maginot Line and when that line broke it did not have a people strong enough inside to re-form it. We are behind a Maginot line too, a thin line of battleships across the seas—that is all. If that line breaks, I dare say there is not an American port that can stand a major attack from the sea, and yet we are playing around on this job like a lot of children at school. Factories that are essential in their operation to give these boys a chance to defend this Nation are not functioning.

Is anybody foolish enough not to know that we have but one chance not to have to fight, and that is to be so well prepared that nobody will dare attack us. Is there anybody in America, with all this struttting we have been doing, with all this challenging we have been doing, with all this attempt to have a say with regard to what happens in every quarter of the earth—who thinks we will escape unless we are so well prepared that nobody would dare to attack us? Is there anybody dumb enough not to know that if we are attacked we cannot survive unless we are prepared to win?

We are building planes that fly 8,000 miles without refueling. Other people can do the same. If our battle line breaks, who is to push back those who may break that line from establishing naval bases right at the door of America? Are we fools? This is a solemn hour in the life of our Nation and we are playing at the game. Laws, people trusting to laws! Laws, more laws, would do this job. I want something else to happen in this country that will dispel the belief of the people that all you have to do is to pass a law and then go home and go to sleep.

We need in operation the one supreme law of a republic, and that is the law of public opinion, and, you bet your life, if we can get that stirred up in America, it will stop these strikes. Public officials, State and National, will get busy applying and enforcing the laws we have. Patriotic people in these mines and factories will get busy and they are in the vast majority. From the White House to the Congress—everybody—when the determined purpose of an aroused people gets busy, when that supreme law of public opinion, coming up from the mothers and the fathers whose boys we put in uniform, gets into operation, things will begin to straighten out. When we put uniforms on the boys, they will see to it that we put guns into their hands, planes in the skies, and ships on the seas as fast as the productive energy of the country will make possible; and these men in the factories and in the mines who are not disloyal will be glad to do it. They will be conscious that the lives of their boys and the security of their country are at stake. [Applause.] This soft soaping around here must stop. If the Executive has enough law, then it is a matter between the Executive and public opinion whether he will apply and enforce it. If he has not enough law, if these agencies of the Government have not enough law to do this job, then Congress stands ready 24 hours in the day to provide any additional legislation that may be required. I do not want the American people to get the notion by our talking here in Congress, that by piling laws on top of laws, all will be accomplished and they will be relieved in this extraordinary emergency of the imperative and controlling necessity of putting into operation now the supreme law—the public opinion and public purpose of an aroused, determined, and patriotic people. I want them to get concerned and on the job. Unless I have misjudged these times, only a great people on the job have a chance to preserve this democracy against its dangers both from without and from within.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman think it about time we had a Secretary of Labor who has enough imagination to crack down on John L. Lewis or any other labor leader who is sabotaging our national-defense program? [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I suppose we are going to have to face that sooner or later and we had as well do it now. Madam Perkins is not in her job because she went down there and threw somebody else out and sat down in it. Madam Perkins is Secretary of Labor because she has been appointed by the President to be Secretary of Labor. She could remain there less than a split second if the President did not want her there. I am for the President of the United States. I want to help him do this job. He is Commander in Chief.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I do not know that you have indicated whether you felt we ought to have a new Secretary of Labor or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I repeat what I said. I get along all right with Madam Perkins. They tried to impeach her one time, and I would not stand for it. I believe we are wasting a lot of energy chasing around pointing fingers of accusation at appointed people.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that a great deal of this trouble we are in today is because we have coddled a lot of communistic labor leaders in this field, who should have been purged a long time ago and who might have been eliminated had we had

someone in the Labor Department who had courage enough to step on them?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Well, I do not want to go too far afield and get into that discussion. I am trying to hold this discussion to fundamental considerations. I do not believe we will get anywhere by trying to make the people believe that if they will get after some certain appointed individual it will be all right. I think we are leading them astray. It is a delicate thing for me to discuss. I want to help the President, but I am not going to pretend to believe, since I cannot ignore this question, that Madam Perkins has final responsibility for the operation of the Department of Labor. Madam Perkins is there at the selection of the President. She speaks the President's voice and exercises the President's will, or she is subject to immediate removal. Is that clear enough?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not believe the gentleman wants to imply by his address, which is very remarkable, that these strikes are all due to the cause of labor.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Not at all; not at all. I tried to make that clear. I will look over these remarks and if they are not clear I will change them. It is very difficult, speaking extemporaneously, to get these things always entirely clear.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have read a great deal about these strikes. I want to say that in my opinion many of them have been caused by the arbitrary acts of the employer.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have examined human nature. I have examined our people. I do not find any line of cleavage as between the operator and the operatives by which on one side you can put the patriots and on the other side put the people who are not patriots. As I went through the coalfields of West Virginia, and talked to people, I found men who wield the picks as fine and rugged American patriots as you can find anywhere on the earth. I found it down with my own people who are engaged in labor.

There is another point where we make mistakes. We are all going around looking at our own perfections. What we need is to turn the searchlight on ourselves. I have fallen down. I have not failed at the particular place where many other people have failed, but I failed just as badly. A long time ago I began to examine the nature of government. Early when this particular period began it impressed me as the beginning of perhaps the most important period of the world. By the early twenties it was definitely taking shape. In 1928 it was clear and on the floor of this House I pointed out—I quote:

> We are moving rapidly toward the crisis. Nobody can forejudge it.

I watched the development shaping up and tried to warn the people from time to time in advance of the inevitable consequences of our policies. The people would not listen then. But I did not drive as hard as I ought to have done. There is where I failed. I know it now. I did not want leadership. I do not like the prominent place. I was not willing to pay the price.

I was selfish and I did not realize it. Now I am trying in dead earnest to make amends. I began in earnest last summer. I see my country moving toward the common doom of the world's democracies as clearly as I see you. I am doing my best now. The thing that concerns me is: Am I too late to help save my Nation? I do not know. I believe our people have latent in them the elements of greatness as a people. A great people can do the job, but only a great people can do this particular job, I am doing my best.

I thank the Members tremendously, Mr. Speaker, for the attention they have given me. I have not made a connected speech, I have made mistakes in this speech, no doubt, but I know this much: I know that no concern for myself has made me do it. I know that when I see all over the world hundreds of thousands of people willing to die in an effort to preserve a government not so good as ours, this little puny political job I have becomes of no importance to me. I would be glad to cash in—physically, politically, or in any other way—if I could help save the greatest democracy that has come down through the ages. If I were not I would be utterly ashamed of myself.

I believe there are many Members of the House now who feel as I do. They are not concerned in these times whether they can remain in Congress, they are concerned, I trust, only with the preservation of our country. I believe that is a natural, rational attitude in times like these. These boys in the camps are getting that spirit and so are the people. Therein lies our hope. A people willing to die if need be to make this world fit to live in may not have to die. Only such a people can survive. The trouble is we do not yet realize what we are up against. We are next on the call. We are next on the call and we are walking in the footsteps of France. That is why I am taking your time.

If I could arouse the American Nation, if I could make the American Nation conscious of our danger, I would feel better. I hope the American Nation will not listen to some of the speeches that are being made here minimizing this danger, which is as grave a danger as any people ever faced in the world. We do not want to repeat here what the politicians in France were doing, making political merchandise of the safety of their Nation when it was on the brink. We must not do that in America. I do not mean we must go into this war. I mean that only complete preparedness can keep us out or preserve us if we become an active belligerent. In such a situation, with the example of England and of France and the tragedies of other nations before our eyes—these idle mines and silent factories raise the question whether as a people we are fit to survive or can survive.

If the Members of Congress would tell their people the truth, under the consciousness of our danger and the challenge of our duty, we would have a regeneration in America. So-called leaders responsible for their contributions to the perils of this country would make amends for what they have done or be driven from power.

I thank you. God bless you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three particulars and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POAGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PAY DAY HAS ARRIVED

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for this afternoon of 10 minutes. In view of the fact my committee is in session I shall not take the time, but ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout the last 8 spending years some of us in Congress have been constantly warning that the extravagance, and worse than extravagance, of the New Deal political bureaucracy was plunging this Nation into debt at a frightful rate, and that some time pay day would come around. Our warning fell on deaf ears, and the administration continued to persuade the people that the new dealers had discovered economic magic under which the Government could give the people something for nothing.

The New Deal administration had made no such discovery. Quite to the contrary, the administration had gone back to the old and well-known device of borrowing the funds which it was spending and wasting instead of doing the politically unpopular thing of asking the people to dig up in the form of taxes the vast sums to pay for all the boondoggling and experimentation in which the New Deal administration indulged for 8 years. Under these conditions the people were not asked to make any real sacrifices, and the New Deal rolled merrily on its way.

But pay day has now arrived. The American people are going to be dreadfully shocked in the pocketbook nerve by the taxes which the New Deal administration is now going to impose upon them, and the new tax bill now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee is only the beginning. This first shock of the impact of increased taxes against the purses of the people is only the first of a succession of shocks which this administration will have to administer as a direct result of its spendthrift policies of the past 8 years.

No longer do administration officials sneer when Members of Congress point out that we must now begin to "pay the fiddler" for the wild political dervish dance through which the Nation has been whirled by the New Deal for 8 years. Instead, administration officials, having found in our international

relationships and our utter lack of an adequate national defense, reasons which they hope will justify them in the minds of the people, are now, somber and with grave misgivings, searching hither and yon for new sources of revenue while they wonder how on earth the people can stand the pressure of the excessive taxation which the new dealers privately admit has become an inescapable necessity.

It is regrettable that the administration and the Nation paid so little heed to the warnings of the Republican defense-study committee which, in February 1939, warned that—

When we entered that war in April 1917 the national debt stood at $1,100,000,000. In the 18 months of our participation we spent something in excess of $35,000,000,000. To meet that expenditure we raised about ten billions through taxes. We borrowed the remainder and came out of the World War with a national debt of twenty-six billions. * * *

Compare that to our present situation. For 8 or 9 years the Federal Treasury has been running in the red. Through all these years we have been spending much more than we have collected from taxes. The more we have spent the more we have borrowed. As a result, we have piled up a huge national debt. * * *

Let us remember, therefore, that should we be drawn into a war of first magnitude, we should have to start with a debt of at least forty-four billions—probably more—and then finance the efforts on top of that debt. It is a prospect which must concern every thoughtful person in the land. * * *

No one at this time can foresee accurately the measures we might have to employ were we drawn into war but all of us can visualize the danger to our institutions were we forced to resort to inflation, to confiscation, and ultimate repudiation. Could our free institutions survive such a strain? Similar institutions have perished in other lands within our time. Driven to such expedients it might well be that we shall have failed actually in our defense. * * *

Our plea is that the Congress, and others in high authority, reestablish thrift as a virtue in the conduct of government, as it is a virtue in the conduct of the individual.

This earnest plea by the Republican defense-study committee was met with scorn, ridicule, and indifference by the administration.

It goes without saying that we must have an absolutely invincible national defense. The unneutral acts of the administration for the past 4 years have made this necessary. We must consider the disastrous economic consequences which will inevitably follow the war and we must prepare our defense against the repercussions of that coming economic disaster.

Too dangerously long the New Deal administration has deferred the politically unpleasant and unpopular task of telling the people frankly that they must pay, and pay dearly, for all of these experiments, trials of theory, and financial favors which the New Deal bureaucrats have passed out with such a lavish hand.

Pay day has arrived. Taxes are to be doubled, tripled, and quadrupled—and the end is by no means in sight. It is a pity, but a necessity, that the billions so gaily squandered by the New Deal spendocrats on the come-easy-go-easy plan must now be paid for by the people in the hard way—through excessive taxation. Unfortunately there is no other way.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] today, and also to hear him a few days ago. I have heard many speeches since I have been a Member of this body but I have heard none that to my mind equalled for serious import and for sincerity these speeches of the gentleman from Texas. I regret that the other speech he made lost its big effect to the Nation by an interjected remark which caught the attention of the press and made the headlines. It has often been said it matters little what a Congressman does here, but it does matter greatly what the press says he does. Judge SUMNERS was speaking extemporaneously, without notes, but he made a most impressive speech which held the complete attention of the Members.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to listen to many of the great speakers of America. I heard Ingersoll in his prime when I was a boy, heard him many times—the greatest of all public speakers in my estimation. I heard Bryan many times. In 1924 he was my guest for several days in the State of Oregon, when I was Governor of the State. But I have never heard two speeches more earnest, more sincerely earnest in an effort to drive home the facts to those present in this Chamber than these speeches of the gentleman from Texas. He deserves great credit for his earnestness and the clarity of his presentation.

As I listened to the speech today I felt as though this speech I have written was much out of place, following such an eloquent appeal. I feel we should all be devoting our time, our attention, and our effort on both sides of this aisle to the serious business of this hour.

In the Washington Post this morning, in the correspondents' column on the editorial page I read a letter written by a lady in Austin, Tex. I suggest that you read it. It is not long. In it she states her position very clearly. It is certainly the position of many Members of this House.

I feel we are living in a desperately tragic hour. I fear that the institutions of democracy are faced with a real and serious trial if England goes down. Those who heard Churchill yesterday, and I was among his listeners, could not help but see how serious the situation is over there, and what will happen if Britain is finally broken down. I do not look for an invasion of America, but there will be an undermining of all our business in the Atlantic, then South America, then in the Pacific. How are we going to make good in the Philippines by ourselves? Then there is Pearl Harbor, then the fisheries of Alaska. How easy it will be for Hitler to say that the Japanese have earned that.

Mr. Speaker, let us forget our politics. Let us forget whether we want to tear down Roosevelt or to sustain him. Let us study the question that is paramount above everything else and let us sincerely thank the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, for a most wonderful speech.

I turn now to a subject always of interest to me and most important—public power.

ACRES OF DIAMONDS

Who shall hold the franchises to furnish light and power; shall we have public benefit or private profits?

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, Throughout the Pacific Northwest today numerous communities are finding themselves brought within the areas served by transmission lines which carry Bonneville power to their city gates. The question now uppermost in the minds of citizens of those favored localities is, Who shall distribute that power? Shall the communities vote to themselves the valuable franchises for monopolization of local light and power business, or shall they follow the old-time, easy method of presenting that valuable franchise (right or privilege) to a private company? Shall the community continue to pay tribute to a private company which will enrich its absentee overlords on the Atlantic border? The latter course would be followed only because of indifference or lack of information on the part of those who really have the right to the benefits.

ACRES OF DIAMONDS VERSUS "GOLD BRICKS"

Our towns and villages are literally giving away "acres of diamonds," or they have traded these glittering gems for the proverbial "gold bricks" offered by the confidence men who mislead and misinform our citizens. They subsidize their own influential and often undisclosed agents at the cost of the local rate payers.

It goes without saying that all these incorporated places have found it possible to furnish their citizens at the lowest rates, bountiful supplies of water, necessary sewerage systems, fire protection which keeps their insurance rates within bounds; schools, and sometimes hospitals and other public services which are most advantageously handled cooperatively. Some have lagged in furnishing an abundant and cheap supply of electricity for light and power. This is now recognized to be just as much a necessity as are the other public services, all of which are our "public utilities," and which have not been left to private agencies to be operated for private profit.

THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION INVESTIGATION

What kind of a persuasive argument could be put up to swindle the public out of the profits of its most profitable, most necessary, and most exclusive business? Nothing aside from money widely and profligately distributed.

A recent extensive investigation, with full hearings, made by the Federal Power Commission, shows that in the last 5 years the electric utilities spent over $1,000,000 in cash to corrupt public power elections in the States of Oregon and Washington. I have seen and read the incriminating testimony. Men right in our midst, makers of public opinion, have been secretly drawing their living for years from these special interests; men

highly honored by the people in their communities. These men have received retainers from private utilities in exchange for influence—a word here, a question there. The report says:

Such individuals appeared to give disinterested advice to the electorate—

but—

were paid to carry the torch for the private utilities.

The Benedict Arnolds are busy wherever public-utility district elections are pending.

In its opinion 59, based on that investigation, the Commission has shown the brazen methods used. Everyone interested in public affairs should read this enlightening opinion, reprinted, in full, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 3, 1941. People must learn to vote their own interests.

TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION

Everyone should understand that the transmission lines take the electric current from the generator to the distributing system. Distribution to homes, business houses, factories, industries, and farms is all that is usually under discussion when we speak of public or private ownership in the Northwest. It is the retailing of electric current. The private utility companies have in the past been forced to generate their own power, usually using water or steam plants. They are now seeking contracts for the use of Bonneville power, wholesale, claiming that they will distribute it retail as cheaply as would public agencies. The weakness of such a statement lies in the fact that they must make profits not only for themselves but for tier upon tier of overlord holding companies, who live off their profits. I shall point out that they have other huge expenses which are not incidental to public ownership, such as great accumulations of indebtedness, sometimes amounting to around $500 per meter, and accounted for by stock manipulation or bad management. The business in itself is always profitable.

TRANSMISSION LINES PROVIDED

Bonneville transmission lines as far as Pendleton have been authorized and covered by congressional appropriations. A further line from Pendleton to La Grande is included in this year's Budget, and, in my judgment, will be approved. Existing lines from La Grande to Baker can be used to transmit power through purchase or agreements. If barriers are erected by the private company, the Federal Government is authorized to initiate condemnation proceedings, or can lease or build lines. Sufficient funds will be available in this year's Federal Budget to meet the cost of any of these courses. Furthermore, the transmission lines south of Baker can be used, under intercharge agreements, for back-up service from the Federal plants in Idaho. The electricity now being used in Baker comes from Federally owned generating plants under an arrangement with private companies. Federal legislation is now being proposed to offset tax loss on Federally owned transmission lines in case of acquisition by purchase or condemnation. Interchange agreements with the Bonneville Administration can provide for the maintenance of local tax revenues accruing from such transmission facility use.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP PROVEN PROFITABLE

The marvelous development on the Columbia River has changed the whole aspect of the electric light and power matter in our section. The waters of the Columbia River generate the power so bountifully and so cheaply that it can be had anywhere at the lowest rates in the world. Yardstick experiments have proved to the communities that they have been paying too much for electric current. Progressive localities have experimented successfully with public ownership. They have proved that it not only saves money but makes money for the community. In Eugene, Forest Grove, McMinnville, Canby, Cascade Locks, and Milton, all in Oregon, the municipalities are operating their own plants, paying off the initial indebtedness, reducing rates, and proving, by example, the feasibility of public ownership of electric-power facilities. The same thing has been true in our neighboring State of Washington. Tacoma has furnished an outstanding example for the whole country, and over a long period of years.

Public ownership with us is nothing new, but it has not been given sufficient publicity. The newspapers have not carried this success story to their readers, and the private power companies have taken great pains to keep the facts hidden.

NO COMPETITION

Public ownership of such a public utility does not put the Government into competition with its citizens. There is no competition in the electric business. It is just a question of how the community can get the best and cheapest service for its people and who shall benefit from the monopolization of streets and homes as far as wires are concerned.

If a public light plan is socialistic, so also is a public water plant, a library, a sewer system, the fire company, and above all, our public-school system. All are public agencies for furnishing necessities of community life. There can be no competition in any of them, they are natural monopolies.

RATE REDUCTIONS UNDER PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

All these public power systems have had a history of constant rate reduction. Milton, Oreg., the near neighbor of counties now debating whether they shall undertake the public distribution of electric current, has just announced a new schedule of reduced rates effective June 1, resulting in a total saving to customers in that little city of approximately $11,250 a year. They had other reductions in 1934 and 1939.

Forest Grove has just published a special edition of a paper headed "First year of Bonneville shows 33-percent rate cut, 18 percent more power used—$15,780 profit—no increase in city taxes—cash saving $20,096."

In March 1941, Canby announced that, as a result of their Bonneville contract, retail rates to the city power plant customers would be reduced by an average of 16 percent. This is its second rate reduction since its purchase of Columbia River power. Combination of the two reductions represents an over-all cut of 43 percent in domestic power rates and 50 percent for commercial consumers. Under these low rates the community has pioneered in electric irrigation and heating development.

Cascade Locks City Light shows rate cuts and sufficient profits to buy its own bonds in order to save interest payments.

If any eastern Oregon city or district doubts its ability to make a success of a public power distribution system it might call in competent experienced men from all over Oregon where they have made a success of their own public business.

According to the Oregon Hydroelectric Commission's report, the proposed Baker County Public Utility District would be able to effect savings of approximately $2,000,000 to the county in the next 30 years. Rates would be reduced from 22 to 44 percent. If formed now, the district would be able to cooperate with Union County P. U. D. in buying the whole system at one time.

CAN RATES BE REDUCED BY STATE REGULATION?

The private utilities originally most bitterly resented efforts toward State and Federal control and rate regulation. The trend has been, however, toward the warm and eager acceptance by the utilities of State regulatory bodies, because they have found it an easy matter to regulate the regulators.

Rate reductions have been announced by the State Utility Commissioner in Oregon constantly since the threat of public ownership and the Bonneville yardstick has hung over the private electric utilities. I pick up an eastern Oregon paper today to read headlines about rate reductions in eastern Oregon cut as much as 15 percent in the territory which is now proposing to vote on public ownership. It is not a great compliment to a community to be considered the kinds of suckers who can be played that way. These reductions are often worked into complicated rate structures which very few people are capable of understanding. There may be reduction of residential rates to the amount of a few cents a month, which will be quickly picked up in changed methods of computation in other rates.

The Federal Power Commission tables, from which rate comparisons are quoted below, represent the published effective tariffs today. The very extensive power company newspaper advertisements this week in eastern Oregon, carrying the message "cut again," publish rates effective May 22, 1941. These apply only to residential service and follow the trick formula well known to people informed on such matters. The cut is a small one in which real facts are disguised by the method of presentation. These new rates, when applied to actual consumption, will give bills about double those of Eugene. Reading these advertisements carefully, one notes that, for example, the bill of $1.72 covers 35 kilowatt-hours in

Pendleton, and 30 kilowatt-hours in many other cities. The trick consists of adding 85 or 95 cents in the first step on top of a normal block rate. These new rates also discriminate between communities, apparently according to the pressure of the public-power movement.

I have yet to see in an Oregon newspaper a release by the State Utility Commissioner publicizing rate reductions by a publicly owned plant. It is left to the Federal Power Commission or the Bonneville administration to acquaint the public with the facts on public ownership.

RATE COMPARISONS

"Typical Electric Bills in Oregon, 1941," is the title of a pamphlet just issued by the Federal Power Commission. It gives authoritative and conclusive evidence of the advantages of public ownership. It also exhibits a startling variance in rates charged for the same electric service. Residential rates for 100 kilowatt-hours range from $1.80 in Eugene to $3.75 in Klamath Falls, $4.19 in Bend, and $4.33 in Astoria. Among smaller cities under 10,000, they vary from $2.75 in McMinnville to $3.60 in Ontario, $3.90 in Pendleton, $4.28 in Baker, and $4.60 in Burns.

Commercial light service which costs $11.22 for 750 kilowatt-hours in Eugene and $14.75 in McMinnville collects $34.90 in Baker, $33.34 in Bend, $30 in Klamath, $29.37 in Ontario, and $35 in Pendleton.

Discrepancies in costs of commercial power service are even more startling. An industry in Eugene, say, a dairy or refrigerating plant, pays $9.20 for 750 kilowatt-hours. The same quantity of power in eastern Oregon is: Baker, $31; Bend, $31.82; Klamath, $23.25; Ontario, $25.02; and Pendleton, $26.05.

All these places would pay the same wholesale price for Bonneville power.

These excess charges are all passed on to be paid by small customers. When they are added to the businessman's bill, he, in turn, collects from the farmer, who is always the fellow who cannot pass on the load because he does not fix the prices of the products he sells.

DIFFERENT PRICES FOR THE SAME PRODUCT

Would sensible people submit to such an amazing price system for any other commodity? The "gold bricks" surely tip the scales in favor of the profit-seeking private utilities. They are forced to demand higher rates in order to carry the debt structure they have built up through holding-company manipulation or corrupt practices.

How can those who cling to the old private monopoly system compete with cities which will attract industries by offering low-cost power? Remember, some of these low-rate cities have not yet had Bonneville power and some of them have operated with steam or Diesel plants, both of which cost more in our section.

FOUR METHODS OF PUBLIC OPERATION

It would seem that public ownership would spread like wildfire. Oregon has four ways through which it can be accomplished: (1) Formation of a People's Utility District (P. U. D.) by popular vote, under a special Oregon law. (2) Municipal ownership, to be voted by the city. The shortcoming of this method is that cities sometimes refuse to serve adjoining territory. (3) A cooperative association like that serving West Salem and part of Salem. This is a good method to use as a starter, where P. U. D.'s are voted down because of opposition in controlled territory. (4) A Rural Electrification Administration project, especially adapted to rural territory and limited by law to noncompetitive territory not served by any existing utility—examples are plentiful: Hermiston, Central Oregon, Malheur, Wasco, and Jordan Valley, citing only those in eastern Oregon. I have a bill pending in Congress to remove the restriction against going into territory already served. The R. E. A.'s are also cooperatives organized under Federal law.

In Oregon we have a State Hydroelectric Commission, which surveys and investigates fully the feasibility of every proposed Public Power District. It reports to the people the possible costs, rate reductions, and other business, technical and financial information which is a necessary preliminary to entering into this business. It does not fix an election date unless the project is found by its engineers to be feasible and desirable. The Commission sets the date for a P. U. D., or Public Utility District, election to determine who shall retail the cheap wholesale power—who shall have the certain profits, the public or a specially privileged monopoly.

All things considered, it is probably best to organize the P. U. D.'s as provided by Oregon law, to distribute the Columbia River power.

COUNTRY AND CITY SHOULD UNITE

Cities in our section live off the surrounding country. They are mostly agricultural centers. They often talk loudly about cooperating with the farmers. They want farm trade and they want farm money, but sometimes, when it comes to the establishment of a Public Utility District, the cities refuse to consider the welfare of the surrounding country and their farmer friends. The issue of public power brings the country people right up against the question of where their interests really lie. It is indeed highly desirable that cities and country should unite to secure the benefits of public power, even if it makes the city rate a little higher because the country patrons are somewhat scattered.

WHAT HINDERS THE SPREAD OF P. U. D.'S?

We have legislative machinery; we have the cheapest electric current in the world; we have the benefit of wide experience; the people have the "know how." What is to keep our communities from profiting by this wonderful combination? Why is it possible to find any community not willing to stand on its own feet and operate its own light and power system? Why should any group of fine American citizens crawl on its knees to the private power system begging low rates? The values the community itself created and gave away as a free gift to Wall Street should be restored to the community. If the public yardsticks had not forced rate reductions they would never have been made. The threat of public ownership has been the stick behind the door. It ought to be something more.

P. U. D. ELECTIONS PENDING

There are several P. U. D. elections to be held in the very near future in my congressional district in Oregon. I am deeply interested in these—one in Baker County, two in Umatilla County, and probably one in Malheur County. There have already been successful P. U. D. elections in Wasco, Hood River, and Union Counties where they have contracted for Bonneville power and are negotiating for the purchase of private distribution systems. I am very anxious that the citizens of these contemplated districts should assert their rights to grant themselves the franchise to use their streets and facilities for their own benefit and vote for the establishment of these districts. The only possible way for the citizens of these counties to enjoy the great gift of Bonneville power is to establish these power districts and cooperatively distribute the power.

COLUMBIA RIVER POWER

The Federal Government has invested, in the last 8 years, millions of dollars in the dams and electric generating plants at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. This river is the greatest power stream in the world. Twenty million kilowatts of electric energy can be generated in feasible hydro plants on this river and its tributaries. Such an immense quantity of power can be comprehended more clearly if it is remembered that there is now developed in the entire United States 40,000,000 kilowatts, including both steam and water power. This includes all the electricity used in all the cities everywhere in the United States. In other words, the Columbia River and its tributaries can increase the electric generation in the United States 50 percent.

Besides investing the money in the dams, the Government has also invested millions of dollars in transmission lines carrying the current throughout the whole region so it will be equally available to all communities. The Bonneville Administration, which is intrusted with the transmission and sale of power from the Government projects at Bonneville and Coulee, is now ready to deliver electric energy at La Grande, Baker, Pendleton, and surrounding territory. Bonneville offers to sell this current at the extremely low rate of $17.50 per kilowatt-year, or at less than 2 mills, one-fifth of a cent, per kilowatt-hour, wholesale. This wholesale rate cannot be duplicated anywhere in the United States.

This low rate of $17.50 per kilowatt-year, 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, is known, in the Columbia River territory, as a postage-stamp rate. That is, the same rate is given by the Government to Pendleton and throughout the territory covered by transmission lines as is given to The Dalles, 50 miles from Bonneville. Pendleton is almost 200 miles east of the Bonneville Dam. Baker is over 300 miles

from the dam. This wholesale rate is always the same except for a small circle of 15 miles around Bonneville where there is given what is known as a bus-bar rate of $14.50 per kilowatt-year.

WHO WILL MINE THE GOLD?

Such a gold mine, such an opportunity for widespread use of such a useful and beneficial commodity has never before been offered anywhere, at any time, by any Government except our own. The question now is, Who shall profit from this low wholesale rate and who shall retail the power to the citizens? Are the citizens of these communities any less competent, progressive, intelligent, or honest than others who have made a success of retailing or distributing power? If not, why should they hesitate to act for their own benefit? Should the people avail themselves of this golden opportunity, the chance of a lifetime, their electric bills will be cut in half and in a few years they will own the distributing systems free of debt, and a source of income to meet other municipal expenses.

The only possible way for the citizens to enjoy this great gift is to establish districts, or units, for cooperatively distributing the power. It does not matter what the friends of private utilities or any of their hired men or satellites claim, they simply cannot offer anything like these rates delivered over lines owned by private companies, except in a rate war, from which they will react like thunder if the people again become their victims.

THE COST OF ELECTRICITY

With water-power developments the cost of generation of electricity is the smallest part of the over-all cost. Such generation cost amounts, on the average, from only 7 to 11 percent of the consumer's dollar. Steam-generating costs in our section are double those of water-power plants. Transmission costs are also small. The average private company, with short, low-capacity lines, spends for transmission only about 2 cents out of every gross dollar of income. Transmission costs at Tacoma amount to only 5 cents of the dollar income, and, with long, heavy transmission lines like Bonneville is building, such costs will run around 8.5 cents.

Old-line companies fool the people by raising an unfounded tax argument and by saying that they will give the people the benefits of the cost reduction in generation. The joker in such propaganda is that the cost of generation is such a small part of the consumer's price. The heaviest load of consumer cost comes from distribution and profits. If the juice that is now sold in Baker, perhaps generated at American Falls, Idaho, 300 miles away, does not cost very much more than the current manufactured at Bonneville, 300 miles west, it will still be a great saving to the people of Baker to purchase this energy at wholesale and to distribute it themselves.

For distributing electric energy the cost varies from 16 to 25 percent of the customers' bills. Profits are the difference between the combined costs of capital, generation, tranmission, distribution, and taxes and the amount that the consumers pay. This amount, which varies from 35 to 50 percent, is paid out in dividends to stockholders and in lump sums to overlord holding companies, which buy up utility stocks and control them for speculative purposes. What a crime for our economic system to allow gamblers to speculate in the necessities of community life! Aside from dividing up with the holding companies, they pay out vast sums to control elections, select candidates, and keep the legislators in line. Amortization theoretically is supposed to come out of profits, but private utility profits are generally used for other purposes than sinking funds for debt payment.

CAPITALIZATION

All private electric utilities are capitalized for far more than they are worth, far more than they cost. All the accumulation of debts, costs of holding-company manipulations, slush funds, and unwise investments and expenditures constitute the basis for claims as to rates to be charged under permission of the State Public Utilities Commissioner. The debts vary from $300 to $800 per installed meter. In an early day the income was so large, compared to the investment, that it did become necessary, from the standpoint of the utilities, to have a high capitalization so they could pay big dividends. It was to disburse the profits and hide them, by subterfuge, that many of the holding companies came into existence.

Selling of electric energy has always been a fine business financially; the profits are big. It has made many men and firms wealthy. One of the great differences between private and public utilities is that the publicly owned utilities are constantly reducing their indebtedness. The private utilities never pay off, but keep capitalization high, and higher. They have adopted the old rule of Harriman, the great railroad magnate. He used to say to his men, "Every time you lay a mile of railroad track, issue a bond." That same spirit exists in the private electric utilities. Whenever they have built a mile of transmission line they have either added to their capital or their bond issue. They have always acted upon the principle that the courts and the State utility commissions would make the rates higher so they could pay dividends on high capitalization.

Private utilities pile debt upon debt, using profits as plunder for their overlords and speculators. Except under public pressure and exposure, they never arrive at the point where interest or indebtedness vanishes and costs are materially reduced. They have all the expenses of public power plants and many others, legitimate and illegitimate.

No wonder the private electric utilities are making a desperate fight to keep their gold mines, the best business in all the land—for the Wall Street manipulators.

I mentioned dividends to the stockholders, but all Oregonians know the story of the fraudulent treatment of stockholders by the Oregon private utility, which had the richest territory and the best gold mine. Thousands who trusted them lost all their savings. Manipulation turned the profits eastward to Wall Street and into a very few pockets in Oregon.

It seems incredible that anyone in Oregon would listen respectfully to advice and guidance from those pirates who robbed so many.

PUBLIC POWER DEBTS ARE LIQUIDATED

The Government has a large actual capital investment in the Bonneville power facilities. The Bonneville Administration is obligated to fix rates that will liquidate this investment, which benefits both public and private groups contracting for power. It does not seek a margin of profit beyond repayment of all initial and operating costs, with interest at 3½ percent. Unlike most private utilities, it is under obligation to amortize its debt. All the money invested in dams, transmission lines, and facilities and equipment will be returned to the Government, with interest. This sum will be easily earned, even at the low rates offered by Bonneville to distributing agencies.

Study of published statements made by municipal public power systems reveals careful accounting, with necessary sums set aside for bond reserve, renewal fund, taxes, bond retirement, earned surplus, depreciation reserve account—all are cared for.

With an entire monopoly, and rates allowed to cover all expenditures and large profits, why are private electric utility companies found in bankruptcy courts, and why are investors defrauded of savings? The answer is manipulation for control of stock and profits by speculator holding companies. Rarely now is a local operating company owned, controlled, and managed by local men.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE REVENUE DOLLAR

A brief study of financial actualities as to income from electric utilities may not be amiss in a presentation of arguments for public operation. Public plants purchasing Bonneville power wholesale are relieved from the direct operating and maintenance expenses incident to generation and transmission of that power. These operating expenses amount to about 12 cents out of each revenue dollar under the best conditions and can run up to 20 or 25 cents under less favorable or efficient operation. In addition, the public power district will be saved an investment of around $200 per customer in new power plants and major transmission lines. The fixed charges saved on such investment will be practically double the fixed charges on the local distribution system.

In order to show how the revenue dollar is distributed in the operations of a public power district purchasing wholesale, I have taken the Tacoma reports, and, after deducting the production and transmission expense items, adjusted the remaining expenses on the basis of national averages. This information I present in a table. The national average figures reflect little amortization or debt

payment. As a public plant proceeds it reduces its debt and has a larger part of the revenue dollar available for amortization, surplus, and extension costs. Eventually it produces an annual surplus, with all debts paid, and rates reduced to the point where every citizen can use all the electric current he desires.

How each dollar of income is spent

Item	Total amount	Labor proportion
Deductions from gross income:		
Direct taxes	$0.10	
Tax contributions	.05	
Interest and amortization	.30	
Total deductions	.45	
Operation and maintenance expenses:		
Subtransmission and distribution	.11	$.07
Commercial accounting	.04	.03
Sales expense	.03	.02
Administrative and general	.08	.05
Total expenses	.26	.17
Net income	.29	

This net income is available for depreciation reserves, extensions, increased amortization, and surplus. As amortization proceeds, this net income will increase through the reduction of the interest proportion of the above deduction. This distribution is based primarily on actual results accomplished at Tacoma under the lowest rates in America. Therefore, initially, a public district has another factor of revenue safety in approaching the Tacoma rate level by steps which will permit revenue recovery before additional rate reductions. This table substantiates my statement on the relatively small amount any electric utility invests in labor costs.

DO PRIVATE UTILITIES HAVE A PRIOR RIGHT?

The streets of a city belong to the municipality. The roads of a county belong to that county—to the people collectively. If a private electric utility applies for a franchise, which is the right to use for private profit the streets of a city or county, and the franchise is granted for a fixed number of years, has the private company, by reason of that franchise, acquired a vested right to the renewal of the franchise? Has it perpetual privileges in that community, privileges which it can barter and trade? The courts have repeatedly held that they have not acquired any special or prior rights in perpetuity by reason of the use of the roads and streets. Granting of a perpetual franchise to a private utility for the use of the roads or streets has been held, in many cases, to be unconstitutional. An exclusive franchise, for a given number of years, to a private utility to use the streets or county roads has also been held as unconstitutional by the courts. Even a corrupt city council or county court cannot give away inherent rights of the people. When a franchise expires, the company which has enjoyed its privileges has no inherent right to a renewal. The municipality or county can legally and quite properly say to the utility, "remove your poles and property from the public highways and streets." Certainly, profiting from experience, the local government should carefully consider what is best for the economic welfare of the community.

I regret to say that it is true, in this land of ours, that a privilege once granted often becomes a monopoly, and fixed rights are claimed by those who have benefited from the privileges that have been granted. However, it should not be so. The rights and privileges of the people as a whole should always be paramount.

WHEN THE PEOPLE ACT FOR THEMSELVES

When the people take upon themselves the business formerly transacted by a private utility, it is always best to pay a fair and reasonable price for the facilities and equipment used by the private utility. The reasonable price for the poles, wire, and equipment should never include anything for a "going business"; that is, for the public favor. Nothing should be allowed for the franchise, which the public may give or take at will. The public creates the value of the franchise. The price allowed the operating company should be the actual investment or cost value of its facilities, which is the only value the company created. It is my belief that the people should claim the right to pay that amount in a series of annual installments, with reasonable interest, to be collected from the rate payers.

Negotiations for transfer of the local electric business from private to public operation can be conducted under the guidance of the Bonneville Administration or with other expert advice. Such properties have long been evaluated by State and Federal authorities, as a basis for taxes and for rates to be charged consumers. These records are open to the public, values have been filed and established, as the business has been recognized as a public service subject to regulatory supervision. Records of cash investments are available, rules for physical valuations are established. Whatever the private company has to sell, whatever belongs to it, and not inherently to the public, can be competently and speedily appraised. It often hurts to return borrowed finery to the rightful owner, but in the case of private utilities, rich returns have already been realized on the right or franchise granted by the public through its city council.

TAXES

Under the 1939 law in Oregon, every P. U. D. is assessed and pays taxes the same as a private utility.

Prominently featured in the press in tax-paying periods are headlined statements about taxes paid by utilities, showing the percentage of county taxes they bear, and imposing totals. I have never seen such newspaper publicity given any statement of the amount the community had paid the electric utility company annually in rates for its service. Nor does the press report the computed capital value and interest value of the franchise given the companies by the cities.

Very naturally, the private electric utilities stress the tax contributions and give them wide publicity. Some agency should compile and publish the other side of the ledger. This is an especially important item to consider and publicize in the P. U. D. campaigns.

Most especially interesting would be a statement of the difference between a public-power yardstick rate and the going local rate in charges for all classes of power used in the community. The proponents of public power should use the Government rate tables, the State Utilities Commissioner's reports and the county tax returns, for the compilation of a statement which the press would surely give first-page publicity.

Most of the electric utilities of the United States are owned and controlled through holding companies, by the Wall Street group of speculators. No money comes out of Wall Street to pay taxes in Pendleton or Baker or anywhere else. The taxes are paid out of money collected from the people, in rates, being part of every month's bill under either private or public operation. The consumer always pays the taxes. The company simply acts as a collector and usually charges a mighty high fee for its service in that capacity. If the taxes are high enough to threaten the dividends and profits of the utility, all the company has to do is to apply to the State Utilities Commissioner and have the rates raised. In short, the private utility has a cost-plus proposition. The people pay the fiddler, although the tune is called by the Wall Street manipulators.

It makes no difference who operates the utility, the tax money will come out of the rate payers, whether under transaction of the business by a P. U. D. or under the Wall Street manipulators.

The Federal Power Commission, after an exhaustive study, concluded that municipal and other public power projects pay to the communities they serve, in taxes, free services, and contributions, almost twice as much as the taxes paid by the private companies. The little city of Cascade Locks, Oreg., set aside from its earnings for taxes in 1940, $1,490.84.

The average paid by public plants for the United States as a whole, on the basis of percent of base revenues is 26.8 percent whereas for the private plants it is only 14.4 percent.

Those who have an ax to grind resort to inaccurate tax statements in order to support a plea for the continuance of private profiteering in electric-current distribution. An example of such inaccurate statements or half truths can be found in the recent propaganda asserting that local taxpayers will foot the bill on Federal and franchise taxes in the event that a public-utility district is established. This is an imposition on average intelligence. Any informed person knows that the Bonneville wholesale rate includes a carrying charge 40 percent above the cost of the money the Federal Government has invested as a loan. This more than compensates for any Federal tax. Furthermore, the indirect tax benefits from increased industrial business, without considering the actual payments made through the wholesale rate, will amount to more than all the Federal taxes paid in a prosperous county. The same applies to the so-called franchise

tax, which is a relatively small item. These same tax arguments were recently presented to the Tennessee Legislature by the private companies as the basis for a plea for increased tax equivalents from public plants. On investigation, the arguments were found so inconsequential that the legislature adjourned without action on such a petition.

To assert also that the school districts will lose taxes on the acquired transmission lines is grossly inaccurate. Such a statement shows unfamiliarity with Federal and State statutes and the working of interchange agreements. If the private company is really concerned over such a transmission-tax argument, it is in a position to maintain existing local tax revenues by offering its transmission lines to the Bonneville Administration for operation under a common-carrier lease.

The Public Utility District is given the right to levy for preliminary organization expenses a tax not to exceed 2 mills, or $2 on each $1,000 assessment. That small amount will soon be earned in profits by the community and returned to it many times over.

PRIVATE-UTILITY PUBLICITY

A check through newspaper files in Oregon and Washington reveals a tremendous increase of private-utility advertising since public power discussions have been going on. This is greatly accelerated during a P. U. D. campaign. Half-page maps of the private system adorn our papers. It would be amusing to estimate the costs of such advertising and to note the favorably placed news articles and editorials about rate reductions and the virtues of the private operators, except that indignation follows because the costs of the advertising are charged back to the people who turn the switches. Often the cost of the current is almost prohibitive. Everyone wants the service and will make almost any sacrifice to get it. Since I have been in Congress I have helped many hard-pressed people secure loans through the Federal Security Administration, and when I have asked them what they want most after the bare necessities of life have been supplied they have answered that they wanted their electricity brought back. There is hardly a housewife who will not find some means to pay for the electric lights she so much enjoys in her home.

It is not necessary for any company in the light business to advertise. They have an exclusive business; no opposition and no competition. No one can buy a better product; it is all the same. If advertising is done—and I must confess it is done to the tune of millions—it is clearly for the purpose of creating a friendly press. Many a paper, depending for its very existence upon its advertising columns, is glad to welcome the power-company representative who brings the copy, although the editor must know that it is given to influence news columns. Friends fighting for public power have often expressed to me their amazement over the fact that so many newspapers discourage the people from undertaking operation for themselves. Many brave men struggling along with small papers have been guided by conscience and the public good, refusing to be controlled. They should have strong local support.

The frequent reproduction of "canned" editorials of the Industrial News Bureau of Portland, Oreg., is indicative of indifference or submission on the part of the editor. This Bureau became notorious under Federal Power Commission investigation and publicity a few years ago. Its editorials are well written and forceful. They are reproduced, usually, without being attributed to the Bureau. They afford painless editorials but should honestly be labeled "paid advertising" for the private utilities.

The power of the utilities to ruin a newspaper financially can be gaged somewhat by what happened to George Fort Milton, who ran the daily Chattanooga News in a thriving city in Tennessee. In an election over the use of T. V. A. he favored the people's cause in the columns of his paper. The private company commenced a campaign against him. They subsidized a small afternoon advertising sheet, which soon became the leading paper of the town. The Chattanooga News won the people to its line of thinking, and Chattanooga has today its own light system operated by the people. It is saving them millions of dollars annually. The private utility kept up its campaign against Milton and ruined him financially, crushing all of his attempts to run a paper. He won for the people, but the utility, through its bank control and its other lines of influence, ruined his paper. A Federal Trade Commission report shows that the Commonwealth and Southern spent $25,000 to kill this newspaper favoring public ownership of utilities and was found guilty on 917 counts of violating the law.

The Federal Trade Commission recently issued a 73-volume report showing how the National Electric Light Association, now the Edison Electric Institute, spent $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year corrupting the public mind, largely through the newspapers. The journalistic apologists for the press have been saying that the public utilities no longer engage in dirty business, but the records show differently.

I quote from that report:

> Today the principle of public regulation is being applied to the electric and gas utilities, as well as other industries, but only over their bitter and relentless opposition. Their business association, the Edison Electric Institute, has resorted to the courts to obstruct and defeat Federal regulation. The Institute inspired the suit against the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the Public Works Title of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and the Public Utility Holding Company Act, although in none of the suits did it appear as a party.

SPREAD OF STOCK

Another and most valuable source of publicity which molds public opinion is the small stockholder who owns a few shares of stock in some private electric company. He talks about "our company," inveighs against any legislator who proposes fair regulatory laws, and bitterly criticizes advocates of public ownership. Often he is victimized of all his "investment," but he is then led to oppose any change which may hazard the little he could expect to retrieve. A few years ago a well-planned and determined effort was made in Oregon to scatter the stock of the utilities among the people so as to subsidize and influence them. Bank advisors were paid to influence widows and orphans to purchase the stock. They also urged it upon school teachers, ministers, doctors, editors, those who were supposed to be influential in the community.

THE BEST BUSINESS IN THE WORLD

Why do the overlords of the utility world fight so desperately to prevent public ownership? The private utilities fight with all their power to maintain their hold because the selling of electric energy is the very best, most profitable business in the community. If utilities are honestly managed, there are no failures. There are many reasons why. Here are a few:

It is a natural monopoly: William Jennings Bryan, in the heyday of his power and strength, used to say:

> A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable; indefensible because you could not possibly defend it; intolerable because you could not possibly tolerate it in a democracy.

The line of demarcation between a business that should be exclusive and one that should be competitive is easily drawn. It applies to all the essentials or public services of community life. Everyone can see that there should be but one water main through the city and one company selling water; there should be but one set of poles delivering electric energy throughout a municipality. The business is naturally exclusive, and does not admit of competition. If there are two private companies selling electricity, as there are in Portland, it shows incompetence and bad administration somewhere, or injurious collusion. The people's rights are paramount to any individual or company. The county or municipality should grant to the people a second franchise, if necessary; or, in other words, they should organize their own distributing system when the private utility has become intolerable. Any doubt should be resolved in favor of the community and its rights.

No bad debts: The failure to collect what is due has ruined many a storekeeper, thousands of banks, and businessmen everywhere. Who would not like a business where there were no bad debts, where all obligations were paid? That is true of the electric light and power business. Bills come due every month, and it is very easy to cut a wire off, if the debt is not paid. Yes, they have a cinch. They did not fail in the hard times of 1929 to 1933, where they were honestly managed. Collections in utilities are 100 percent.

Small pay roll: The power company does not have to employ many men. Bookkeeping is very simple. One man can read many meters. People are glad to come to the office to pay their light bills. Sometimes they get a slight discount, more often not, and the payment is in cash. A hydro-generating plant is practically automatic. Distribution systems require more labor, but labor conditions are the same under private or public

ownership. Operating costs are lower than in most businesses.

No advertising expenses: Being an exclusive business without competition, the generation and distribution of electricity does not require any advertising. It is not necessary for the electric investor to have much of his money invested in that kind of advertising, which takes such a large percentage from various industries in the United States. Advertising agencies, like newspapers and magazines, were early shown that advertising granted to them was really a gratuity. The utility did not have to have it, but if the company wanted to pay out a few thousand dollars for nice-looking "ads," those receiving them and getting paid for them were made to understand that they were given to them as a special favor.

A growing business: For the last 40 years the use of electricity has developed in the United States with a constantly increasing demand and annual expansion. Cheap rates bring more customers. Electric appliances have ceased to be luxuries.

An ideal light: Mankind has used many different devices for lighting his cave, home, or palace, but nothing has ever equalled the electric light. It is the cheapest light ever given to the public; that is, it costs but little to generate. The quantity is unlimited; it comes out of the air and water. It cannot be stored; it must be used when made.

Plants do not wear out: When an electric-generating plant is installed and a distributing system built, it lasts for many, many years. If the power is acquired from water, the dam is supposed to last for centuries. The wire, whether aluminum or copper, is indestructible. The insulators are good for generations. The poles, when restubbed, last for years. There are still being used in Union and Baker Counties transmission lines that I constructed more than 30 years ago. The poles have been restubbed, many poles replaced, but the same insulators and the same copper wire that I placed on those poles a third of a century ago are serving, but at what different valuations! Transformers are good for ages.

No bad capital investment: No business since time began has charged off so little for bad investments as the utilities. They may build a line too expensively, but it is charged into the capital for rate-making purposes. They may make too expensive a building in the center of the town, but it is carried into capitalization. Much of the money used to corrupt elections and for advertising intended to influence the press is carried into capitalization. It is extremely difficult for accountants to follow the intricate threads and discover the line of demarcation between honest and dishonest capitalization.

Accommodating State utility commissions have been extremely kind to the utilities in allowing them to build up their capital, and never demanding that the capitalization be reduced, making it a load for the rate payers to carry.

Water: Easy, oh, how easy it has been to pump water into the capitalization in a quantity that has drowned out many an honest investment. The Federal Power Commission here in the National Capital has estimated that all of the private utilities of the United States have an investment of around $6,000,000,000. They are capitalized for more than thirteen billions and are collecting rates to pay their overlords interest and dividends on this $13,000,000,000. So, on an average, the capitalization is one-half water. Public ownership wrings out the water and brings in true values.

Big expenses, high salaries: The utility commissions of the United States have allowed private companies high salaries and big dividends, and in many cases they have been sustained by the courts. What businessman has a State commission to guarantee him 6 to 8 percent steady profit and fix prices which the public must pay for his product?

Taken all in all, private electric utilities have an ideal business. They lost public confidence by overreaching and political corruption and by transfer of properties to absentee banks and holding companies. Congress has legislated to control the holding-company evil, but it is not yet exterminated.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP MORE DECENT

Public ownership can never become more political than private ownership has been. Electric utilities have flourished and gained their privileges through political corruption. Public ownership actually removes an essential service from political control.

COLUMBIA RIVER AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

I became convinced a third of a century ago that the only possible solution of the power situation was cooperative distribution. When Governor of the State, I stressed the great resources of the Columbia River and hoped the day was not far distant when those resources would be developed by the United States Government. Years before, I had organized a league to promote power development on that river. I saw that dream come true in the summer of 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt came to the Presidency. I introduced him to that great audience in Portland, Oreg., in the fall of 1932, when he stated:

> The next great development of electric power must be on the Columbia River.

He kept faith, and in the fall of 1933 he authorized the Grand Coulee and Bonneville developments. He has aided at every turn of the road.

Umatilla Rapids dam is the next logical step in Columbia River development. For many years I have presented to the Congress the advantage of and the real necessity for building that dam. It is part of the projected river plan shown in the report of the Army Engineers. I am hopeful that its construction will be undertaken as part of the defense program to which Bonneville and Coulee are so vitally important.

I ask critics where we would be today, with defense needs so urgently before us, if the development on this great river had not been commenced by our far-seeing President 8 years ago. By midsummer more than one-half of our production of aluminum, which is so necessary to defense in modern war in the air, will be developed by power from the Columbia River. Remember, it takes 2 kilowatts of continuous power for 365 days to produce 1 ton of aluminum.

The two dams are complete; installation of the generating unit is moving under pressure night and day. In a short time the magnesium, as well as the aluminum, so necessary to our national life will be developed in the Pacific Northwest.

At less than one-fifth of a cent per kilowatt-hour, wholesale, this power is available in the Pacific Northwest where the transmission lines are built. It can be used to warm our homes, cook our food, wash and iron the clothes, do the drudgery of life, turn the wheels of industry. With it we can make the cities of the Northwest shine in a blaze of light. What an opportunity! The thoughtful, intelligent citizens of the Pacific Northwest will, I am sure, avail themselves of the chance of a lifetime.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE]?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the committee has given careful consideration to this resolution. The committee is unanimously of the opinion that the time for the completion of a report upon the subject matter of the original resolution should be continued until January 3, 1942. This will give the committee the opportunity to study the question of oil production and its attendant problems in the light of the needs created by the present emergency and make such recommendations from time to time as the changing conditions may require in making proper defense for our Nation and its people.

The committee recently completed a survey of several of the oil fields in the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. We were gratified by the progress that has been made in the conservation of our oil reserves. State authorities and the oil industry have cooperated with Federal authorities in producing this highly beneficial result. Furthermore, we were amazed at the progress that has been made in the last few years in obtaining finer and better grades of gasoline and in larger quantities per barrel of crude oil than heretofore. What is true of this one product, taken from crude oil, is equally true of the numerous and varied products originating from petroleum. The advancement that has been made in all branches of the oil industry has been so great that it is almost unbelievable. Suffice it to say that our observation of what the oil industry is doing, and is prepared to do in behalf of national defense gives assurance and courage to all who are interested in our national security and defense. The oil industry can be depended upon to do its patriotic part in fulfilling whatever task is laid upon it in the days that are ahead.

The committee that has the responsibility of making recommendations to the

Congress for legislation dealing with this great industry believes that it can best perform its duties and fulfill its responsibilities by continuing in existence during the emergency that now exists, and making recommendations based upon conditions as they arise. We therefore ask that the House give its approval to the resolution that has been offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE] the distinguished chairman of the committee since it was first appointed in 1934 and with whom it has been a pleasure and privilege to serve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 188

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee or otherwise, to continue until January 3, 1942, the investigation begun under House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 15 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Any unexpended balance authorized for use of the said committee under House Resolution 291, Seventy-sixth Congress, is hereby continued for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], who has served throughout the life of the committee investigating the petroleum industry, over which I have had the honor to preside as chairman for the past 7 years, mentioned the recent experiences of the committee in Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Texas. That experience presented to the committee knowledge which Congress should have and which we will be glad to make available to the membership of the House when and at any time the individual Members desire it.

In 1939, when the President of the United States requested Congress to authorize further investigation of the petroleum industry and specifically designated the bringing up to date of the investigation conducted in 1934, the subcommittee set out not only to cover as much of the general subject as we could but to give specific consideration to H. R. 7372 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which I introduced at the request of the President.

It was the intention of the subcommittee to report to the House on January 3, 1941, as House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress directed, but on November 29, 1940, the President addressed a letter to the committee referring specifically to the national-defense needs for petroleum. This justified further hearings, which were set for December 16, 1940. Because certain agencies, willing to appear and discuss definite aspects of the problem before us, could not be adequately prepared, hearings were postponed in order to provide the time required and for their observations to become an official part of our investigation. Congress, therefore, by House Resolution 15, continued our investigation until May 1, 1941. The hearings before the committee as a result of that continuing resolution covered not only some of the defense problems but also the oil-pipe line situation in the Southeastern States, which had been specifically called to the attention of our committee by a letter from the President dated January 23, 1941.

The testimony taken in the last few weeks is both interesting and instructive. The evidence at the recent hearings has just been completed and that, along with some reports covering a trip which the committee has taken through some of the southeastern oil fields, will constitute, the committee hopes, the final volume of our hearings.

It is the intention of the committee that the pipe-line situation in the Southeastern States, mentioned hereinbefore by the President's letter of January 1941, will be reported on very shortly, and subsequent thereto other phases of the general subject before us will be presented to the Congress.

It is pleasing to the committee to be able to report at this time, however, preliminary to our final report, that the petroleum industry is apparently in shape to meet almost any conceivable demand made upon it in these serious times. The conduct of certain States toward conservation of this most important natural resource is not what it should be, but we are hopeful before our final report is made that that situation will be materially improved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding, may I inquire how many special orders there are on the desk for tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are four special orders.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, following the special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I may be permitted to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to address the House for 30 minutes today on the subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway project. There are only a few Members left and I shall make this speech on Wednesday next.

The only reason I take the floor at this time is to say to the visitors in the gallery that they should not go away with a bad impression of the House of Representatives. I am prompted to make these remarks because time and time again visitors have told me that they have come here, they have sat in the gallery, and there is no attendance of Members; and they therefore indulge in the thought that it is a reflection on the Members of the House of Representatives. Such should not be the case.

The daily routine of a Member of Congress calls for a schedule somewhat as follows: He goes to his office in the House Office Building at 9 o'clock in the morning and with the aid of his secretary opens up his mail, dictates correspondence and attends to department requests. Then at about 10 or 10:30, leaving a lot of work uncompleted, he goes to committee meetings. Most Members of Congress serve on two or more committees. These committee meetings usually run from 10 or 10:30 in the morning until 12 o'clock noon, at which time Congress convenes.

The House of Representatives has been in session today since 12 o'clock and it is now 4 o'clock. I venture the statement that 9 out of the 10 Members who are not on the floor at this time are now in their offices completing the various departmental requests they have received in today's mail and answering correspondence they were not able to answer on this day or the preceding day.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true also that during the last several months the correspondence of the Members has been so heavy that it has been virtually impossible to keep up with it?

Mr. PITTENGER. I may say to my colleague that he is correct. Not only that, but the departmental requests on account of the national-defense program have increased 300 percent, in my opinion.

Let me say to our visitors in the gallery that some of the committees about which I am speaking are meeting even this afternoon. Those who visit here to learn something about the machinery of our Government ought to know—and I am putting this in the RECORD deliberately for the benefit of those who do not know it—that practically all of the work of Congress is done in committees. A bill is introduced. It is referred by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to a committee. The committee then proceeds to hear the people who are in support of the legislation and then those

who are opposed to the legislation. Hearings of this sort may go on for 2 or 3 weeks.

When the committee has finished its hearings, if it is favorable to the legislation, the legislation is then reported out to the House for action. Then under the rules of the House ways are found, if the administration leaders who are in control want the legislation acted on, to bring it before the House for a vote, and ways are found for debate.

In my opinion, very few people change their minds in connection with legislation as a result of speeches that are made, although in fairness it must be said that a lot of Members get information from those who are handling the legislation, and that is of value to them on the floor.

When this House is considering controversial legislation it sometimes meets at 11 o'clock in the morning, and I know from my own experience that it has on many occasions been in continuous session until 8, 9, and 10 o'clock in the evening.

So I say to you visitors that if you do not see your Member on the floor, make up your mind that he has plenty to do and that he is in his office doing it.

If you are here Wednesday, I shall talk to you about the St. Lawrence seaway project, a project that is coming before Congress very shortly. The Department of Commerce has conducted a survey and has published two pamphlets, which I should like the Members of Congress to read. Attached to one of those pamphlets is a pictorial map that tells the seaway's own story.

I hope to be able to inform the Members of Congress next Wednesday on this important project, a project that is of vital interest to the welfare of the whole American people, a project that directly and vitally concerns 16 States in the landlocked empire in the midwestern region of the United States, a project that involves a series of the greatest lakes in the world, Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, and Lake Ontario, and the great St. Lawrence River. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PLUMLEY, at the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], for 3 days, on account of official business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the reading of the Journal, and following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I asked unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD. I said that estimates indicated that the matter was somewhat in excess of the usual limit and that it would amount to something over 4 pages. There was a good deal of confusion in the House Chamber at that time and the reporter understood my statement to be that the Public Printer had made that estimate. That was not an estimate by the Public Printer but by me. However, this morning I went to the Government Printing Office and had my manuscript estimated. It is to the same effect as my estimate—namely, that my extension makes four and one-quarter pages in the RECORD. I do not wish it to appear that on last Friday I tried to convey the impression that the Public Printer had made that estimate prior to Friday. So I make this statement in explanation, and ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, April 25, 1941, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3486. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, relating to defense housing, by authorizing an additional appropriation of $150,000,000, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will continue hearings on the following days:

1. Tuesday, April 29: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Missouri River and tributaries.

2. Wednesday, April 30: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Mississippi and Great Lakes region.

3. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

4. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

5. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

6. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

7. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

8. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

9. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

10. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

11. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

12. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 29, 1941.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4499, a bill to authorize the heads of the various departments and agencies of the United States to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when it is in the interest of the national defense, to authorize the President to give priority to deliveries under such contracts, and for other purposes, on Thursday, May 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 4.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, May 7, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4215 (Mr. ALLEN), to exclude certain aliens.

Consideration of House Resolution 94 (L. M. FORD) and private bills Thursday, May 8, 1941.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

470. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a fuel depot at Middle and Orchard Points, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

471. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to certain estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942 for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, involving an increase of $151,500 in such estimates (H. Doc. No. 185); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

472. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill

relating to obligations incurred by, or on behalf of, Indians under section 208 of the act of June 16, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

473. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Reclamation report on the Bullshead Dam project on the Colorado River where that stream forms the boundary between Arizona and Nevada (H. Doc. No. 186); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

474. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to $1,197,500 for the Federal Works Agency, and $105,000 for the Department of Commerce, in all, $1,302,500 (H. Doc. No. 187); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1608. A bill establishing overtime rates for compensation for employees of the field services of the Navy Department and the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUTPHIN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1801. A bill amending the act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144); without amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2784. A bill for the relief of the present officer in charge of the Navy School of Music; with amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3536. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4368. A bill authorizing a reduction in the course of instructions at the Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 376. An act providing for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the line of the United States Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 993. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer, without cost, to the estate of Rolland H. Denny a triangular parcel of land containing one-half an acre situated at Seattle, Wash; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3538. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes," approved April 28, 1906; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2097. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k); without amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 3857. A bill authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon Borglum; with amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 187. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 149, relating to marketing quotas and loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 4490. A bill to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District; without amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 15. An act to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District; without amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCRUGHAM: Committee of conference on the disagreeing vote for the two Houses. H. R. 3981. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 454). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 4539. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve and safeguard the financial integrity of the Farm Credit Administration by effecting a better coordination of Federal lending and marketing activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 4540. A bill relating to the terms of the district courts of the United States for the eastern and western districts of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 4541. A bill to provide for a survey of the old Jackson Military Road and the establishment of a national parkway along the route thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4542. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4543. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, approved August 15, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 4544. A bill to require parity prices to be paid for agricultural commodities for the use of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4545. A bill to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4546 (by request). A bill to amend article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4547. A bill prescribing a minimum real-estate and personal property tax rate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4548. A bill to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (title 8, sec. 109, U. S. C. A.); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4549. A bill imposing a tax on the retail sale of motor-vehicle fuel in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4550 (by request). A bill to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; to restore full employment and production; to prevent inflation and depression; and to provide a stable currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4551. A bill to provide security in grade for noncommissioned officers and petty officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4552. A bill for the completion of the construction of the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal across Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to construct a filter plant and pumping station and necessary pipe lines from the Harwood's Mill Reservoir in York County, Va., for the purpose of furnishing additional water for the inhabitants in the Newport News-Hampton, Va., area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution acknowledging the felicitations of the Congress of Costa Rica; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolutions Nos. 15 and 19, concerning rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 28, concerning sugar-beet production in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Memorial No. 6, with reference to establishing at St. Augustine, Fla., an inter-American cultural center; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution 2, concerning Territorial legislation; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated April 17, 1941, with reference to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their memorial dated April 16, 1941, relative to national defense and suppression of vice in the vicinity of ordnance plants or projects; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4553. A bill for the relief of Margaret May Thompson and Eunice Juenita Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Carrie Lavada Wiggins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 4555. A bill for the relief of the estate of Vira Stokes Flowers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4556. A bill for the relief of L. S. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4557. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edna B. Crook; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4558. A bill for the relief of C. E. Luter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 4559. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Theodore Katzenstein; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4560. A bill for the relief of George T. Easton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNS:

H. R. 4561. A bill for the relief of Della Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 4562. A bill for the relief of Leslie Charteris (Leslie Charles Bowyer Yin) and Patricia Ann Charteris; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 4563. A bill granting a pension to Homer C. Chapman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4564. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4565. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Lelia M. Dodd; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 4566. A bill for the relief of Angelo Carlino; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4567. A bill for the relief of the estate of Peter Duffy; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 4568. A bill for the relief of Christopher D. Eger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4569. A bill for the relief of Harold G. St. Clair; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4570. A bill for the relief of Regis Moxley and Frances Moxley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4571. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4572. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Fink; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

864. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of residents of the First Congressional District of Wisconsin, urging passage of House bill 4000, to stop the sale of all alcoholic beverages around Army and Navy camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

865. By Mr. BOYKIN: Petition of the Mobile (Ala.) Chapter, No. 7, Disabled American Veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

866. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting that all necessary steps be taken to prevent any change in the home port of the frigate *Constellation* and preserve for the people of Rhode Island and New England this cherished shrine; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

867. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey Council, Trenton, N. J., requesting that there be no modification in the Sugar Act of 1937 of the existing quotas which would directly or indirectly reduce the quantities of tropical raw sugar now permitted to enter New Jersey and other States for subsequent refining and distribution to consumers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

868. By Mr. HOOK: Petition of Jacob Hoskins and others from Gogebic County, Mich., favoring the Hook bill (H. R. 3793), to save last great stand of virgin hardwood in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

869. Also, petition of Sam Bastianelli and others from Iron County, Mich., favoring the Hook bill (H. R. 3793) to save last great stand of virgin hardwood in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

870. Also, petition of Lina Johnson and others from Ontonagon County, Mich., favoring the Hook bill (H. R. 3793), to save last great stand of virgin hardwood in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

871. Also, petition of Harvey Miller and others from Ontonagon County, Mich., favoring the Hook bill (H. R. 3793) to save last great stand of virgin hardwood in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

872. Also, petition of Carl Puekkila and others from Ontonagon County, Mich., favoring the Hook bill (H. R. 3793) to save last great stand of virgin hardwood in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

873. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of the Jones Conner Unit 402, American Legion Auxiliary, East Brady, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 4; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

874. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Lewis French and R. E. Lowe, of Mart, Tex., route 4, favoring Senate bill 935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

875. Also, memorial of L. R. Hall, secretary of Navarro County Farm Bureau, Corsicana, Tex., favoring 100 percent parity prices on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

876. Also, petition of J. B. Bradley and 53 other citizens of Navarro County, Tex., favoring 100-percent parity price on cotton; to the Committe on Agriculture.

877. By Mr. KERR: Petition of the Rocky Mount Junior Chamber of Commerce, of Rocky Mount, N. C., adopted unanimously on Wednesday, April 16, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

878. Also, petition of the Greater Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, Wilmington, N. C., opposing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

879. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the city council of the incorporated city of Lynwood, Calif., recommending the immediate construction of a freeway highway along the banks of the Los Angeles River to the San Fernando Valley, in Los Angeles County, Calif., the project being set forth in House bill 4142, by Mr. KRAMER, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

880. Also, petition of the Townsend Club, No. 66, urging immediate consideration and passage of House bill 1024, by Mr. GEYER of California, known as the anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

881. Also, petition of the Townsend Club, No. 67, of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the immediate passage of the anti-poll-tax bill (H. R. 1024), by Mr. GEYER of California, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

882. Also, petition of Clovis Grange, No. 536, of California, urging that Congress act favorably upon the House bill 3844, which would authorize the construction of a veterans' hospital in the San Joaquin Valley; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

883. Also, joint resolution of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing Congress of the United States to take necessary steps to encourage a greater production of sugar and sugar products in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

884. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of California, endorsing the fullest development of the harbor at Crescent City by the Federal Government, and respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States that among the allotments of Federal moneys appropriated for improvement to rivers and harbors provision be made for the harbor at Crescent City, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

885. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, that the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to make such appropriations as necessary to provide for the dredging and reestablishment of the Bodega Bay, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

886. Also, petition of the Townsend Club, No. 26, Los Angeles, Calif., urging immediate consideration and passage of the House bill 1024, by Mr. GEYER of California, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, known as the anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

887. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, Calif., requesting Congress to take the necessary steps to secure immediate additional and adequate appropriations to provide for the development of strategic highways in the State of California and particularly to that section most affected by national-defense projects and that said highway development be made a definite part of the national-defense program and financed in its entirety by national-defense funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

888. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Bluestem Grange, No. 776, Bluestem, Wash., resolving in favor of a two-price system for wheat; e. g., parity price for domestic consumption and excess be used only for crop insurance, and to maintain the ever-normal granary, or for export purposes, and recommending that marketing quotas and proposed loan value be announced before taking the vote on marketing quotas, pointing out that the loan value should be established at full parity, inasmuch as the loan value in the past has had a tendency, in areas of low average yield, to put the small farmer out of business; to the Committee on Agriculture.

889. By Mr. LEWIS: Senate Joint Memorial No. 5 by the Colorado State Legislature, urging the Congress to pass the necessary legislation providing for certain wage increases for men in the national-defense forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

890. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 2, by the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing

the Congress to amend the Social Security Act provisions regarding State plans for aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

891. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Michigan, urging enactment of House bill 3570, providing for assistance in meeting the housing problem in areas with defense workers; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

892. By Mr. SIKES: Memorial of the Florida Legislature, House Memorial No. 3, memorializing Congress to consider locating munitions plants in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

893. Also, memorial of the Florida Legislature, House Joint Memorial No. 2, a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, petitioning the immediate passage of the General Welfare Act now pending before Congress and known and designated as House Resolution No. 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

894. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa, Washington, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

895. Also, petition of the Rotary International, Baton Rouge, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

896. Also, petition of the Painters Local, No. 487, of Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

897. Also, petition of the United Mine Workers of America, Local Union No. 12148, of Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

898. Also, petition of the International United Automobile Workers of America, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

899. Also, petition of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, Local No. 735, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

900. Also, petition of the City Council of Gardner, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Work Projects Administration program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

901. Also, petition of the Eunice Young Men's Business Club, Eunice, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

902. Also, petition of the Humboldt County Building and Construction Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, Eureka, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

903. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 3, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4139, known as the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1941

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, who art revealed in the glory of dawn, the warmth of noon, and the flame of the setting sun: Grant that all mankind may seek Thee in life's morning to dedicate its opening hours to Thee; and, having found Thee, O Lord, may we not forsake Thee in the noonday when the fever of life runs high, when we strive toward man's full stature, and would dare to stand alone. Then, O gracious Lord, lest we stumble or wander from Thy path, of Thy mercy be Thou our Comrade all the way, that on life's mountaintops we may be transfigured with Thee, and in the darkness of the valleys we may feel the protection of Thine everlasting arms. So shall the evening of life be free from shadows as we seek our rest, and the record of our passing become life's afterglow, lingering in the western sky, the harbinger of Thy dawn; and, life's entire day being consecrated to Thee, we may be pure and holy citizens, worthy not only of this our homeland but of Thy Heavenly Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations and withdrawing a nomination were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2032) relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3252) to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4401) to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, at Glenn Dale, Md., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF ACTS RELATING TO STABILIZATION FUND AND METALLIC CONTENT OF THE DOLLAR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter addressed to him by the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 28, 1941.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. WALLACE: The powers conferred by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, dealing with the stabilization fund, and the powers specified in paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III, of the act approved May 12, 1933, as amended, relating to the fixing of the metallic content of the dollar, will expire on June 30, 1941.

The existence and use of these powers have enabled the Government to take important steps in the field of international monetary and economic cooperation and to safeguard the country's interests. Unfortunately, present worldwide circumstances, including the international monetary and economic situation, is not such as would warrant the termination of such powers. Under all the circumstances, I believe that it would be in the Nation's interest to extend these powers until June 30, 1943.

The Secretary of the Treasury and other representatives of the Treasury Department would, of course, be available to discuss in detail with the appropriate committees of the Congress the problems relating to the extension of such powers.

Very truly yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

CONGRATULATIONS OF SENATE OF CUBA ON ENACTMENT OF THE LEASE-LEND BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, at the request of the American Ambassador in Habana, Cuba, a communication or resolution dated March 24, 1941, addressed to the President of the Senate and unanimously congratulating the Congress of the United States on the enactment of the lease-lend bill, with accompanying papers.

The letter of the Secretary of State and the accompanying papers will lie on the table; and, without objection, the resolution of the Senate of the Republic of Cuba, and the first two paragraphs of the letter addressed to me from Ambassador Messersmith at Habana will be printed in the RECORD.

A translation of the resolution above referred to, is as follows:

REPUBLIC OF CUBA,
SENATE PRESIDENCY,
Habana, March 24, 1941.

The Honorable PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, United States of America.

HONORABLE SIR: The Senate of the Republic of Cuba, at a session held on this date, unanimously approved the following motion:

"Whereas the Senate of the United States of America on March 8 approved the bill known as the 'law to aid Great Britain,' which permits the chief of the executive power 'to order the manufacture of war material in government arsenals or private factories and to sell, exchange, lease, lend, or transfer title to such material to countries whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the state'; and

"Whereas the action of the Congress of the United States in approving such transcendental legislation is a step toward the effective

realization of the plans for continental defense which public opinion in that country and in the rest of the nations of this hemisphere considers indispensable to the perpetuation of our democratic institutions, menaced by the antidemocratic countries; and

"Whereas the countries of America are prepared fully to carry out their plan of mutual defensive cooperation against totalitarian aggression, in compliance with the declaration of mutual assistance proclaimed at the meeting of ministers of foreign affairs held in Habana; and

"Whereas the first-line trench of the American hemisphere in the Atlantic is the British Isles, which are being defended with gallant courage and increasing success by the English democracy; and

"Whereas the extraordinary significance of this law of the American Congress, which should be recognized, moves the Senate to adopt the following agreement:

"The Senate of the Republic of Cuba extends its most sincere congratulations to the Congress of the United States of North America for the extraordinary facilities offered to Great Britain in the vital defense of its democratic institutions."

I have the honor to transmit the foregoing to you, with the request that it be made known to the Honorable Senate and to the Honorable House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

A. BERUFF MENDIETA,
President.
J. M. GUTIÉRREZ,
Secretary.
E. ROSELL, *Secretary.*

The first two paragraphs of a personal letter from Ambassador Messersmith addressed to the Vice President are as follows:

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Habana, April 4, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am very happy to tell you that some days ago the Cuban Senate by unanimous vote passed a resolution congratulating the Congress of the United States on the passage of the lend-lease bill. Senator Capestany, the author of the motion, came to see me by direction of the president of the senate to deliver a copy of this motion for transmission to you as President of the Senate. A despatch has been forwarded to the Department of State, which should reach it at the time that this letter comes into your hands, forwarding this resolution of the Cuban Senate for delivery to you. I am sure that this resolution will reach you, therefore, in due course. You will note that in the resolution you are requested to inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives of this motion.

This action of the Cuban Senate, which was entirely spontaneous and without any suggestion from without, and which was taken by unanimous vote, is, I believe, characteristic and indicative of the attitude of the Senate of Cuba with respect to matters involving cooperation with the United States in political, economic, and defense matters. As a matter of fact, it is really most encouraging and in some ways interesting that there is this unanimous feeling in the membership of the senate.

* * * * *

RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE ON THE DEATH OF SENATOR SHEPPARD

Mr. CONNALLY presented resolutions of condolence adopted by the fifteenth annual convention of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce at Corsicana, and Mountain Creek Post, No. 345, the American Legion of Dallas, both in the State of Texas, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution passed by the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, fifteenth annual convention, Corsicana, April 22, 1941

Whereas in the untimely death of United States Senator Morris Sheppard, East Texas, the State and our Nation have lost a trusted leader, a tireless worker, and a loved friend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, by this formal resolution, express its love and respect for this distinguished American and kindly citizen; and that we further

Resolve, To cherish his memory, ever remembering in his personality and his service the highest exemplification of citizenship in action.

Whereas Almighty God has called to His eternal reward our friend and brother, the Honorable Morris Sheppard, United States Senator from Texas; and

Whereas our country has lost a most valuable citizen and each of us a beloved friend; and

Whereas our deepest sympathy extends to the bereaved family, we knowing that their loss is greater than ours: Be it

Resolved by Mountain Creek Post, No. 345, the American Legion, Dallas, Tex., in session assembled, That this resolution of sympathy be forwarded to Mrs. Sheppard and family.

That the post charter and colors be draped in mourning for 30 days.

That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this post.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senate, to Texas department headquarters, to the fifth district commander, and to the local press.

By authority of Post No. 345, the American Legion.

REX B. HOUSE,
Commander.
By TOM BAMFORD,
CONLY K. STEVENS,
HOWARD BROWN,
Committee.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 10, 1941.*

SENATOR FROM TEXAS—CREDENTIALS

Mr. CONNALLY presented the credentials of ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, appointed a Senator from the State of Texas to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Morris Sheppard, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Texas, I, W. Lee O'Daniel, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Morris Sheppard, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, W. Lee O'Daniel, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Tex., this 21st day of April, in the year of our Lord 1941.

By the Governor:

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Governor of Texas.
[SEAL] WM. J. LAWSON,
Secretary of State.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS OF CERTAIN JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted the following notice, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nominations of John Bright, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, to fill a new position; and

Simon H. Rifkind, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, to fill a new position.

As chairman of the subcommittee considering these nominations, and as required by rule 1 of the Judiciary Committee, I announce that Monday, May 5, at 3 p. m., has been set as the time for the hearings on the nominations in the Judiciary Committee room at which all interested parties will be heard.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

NATIONAL-DEFENSE ACTIVITIES, DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 50)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year 1942, involving an increase of $103,000 for national-defense activities, Department of State, Emergency Fund for the President, etc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

OBLIGATIONS, LAND, AND IMPROVEMENTS ACQUIRED BY OR ON BEHALF OF INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to obligations incurred, and land and improvements acquired, by or on behalf of Indians under section 208 of the act of June 16, 1939 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, 1921

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, approved August 15, 1921, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RECREATION BOARD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the District of Columbia Recreation Committee, signed by Frederic A. Delano, chairman; J. Russell Young, Commissioner; Irving C. Root, Superintendent, National Capital Parks; and Dr. Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine,* That application be and it is hereby made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'Article —

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualification that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limi above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power, while the United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"'SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"'SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect'; and be it further.

"'*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislature of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine.'"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninetieth legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation, designated as Senate file 860, providing for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has located in the State of Maine, and may hereafter locate in this State, forts and training camps, which may be deemed desirable in the development of the national defense; and

"Whereas it is desirable in the interest of the common defense to provide for the suppression of all forms of vice in the vicinity of such forts and camps, and the people of the State of Maine are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to give early consideration to Senate file 860 now before the Senate, and to the enlargement of the provisions thereof in order to include the suppression of vice in the vicinity of ordnance plants or projects now or hereafter erected and maintained by the Federal Government in the development of national defense, and to enact such legislation at an early date; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state by registered mail, to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing Congress for the enactment of House bill 3570, providing for assistance in meeting the housing problem in areas with defense workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor. (See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. VANDENBERG on the 25th instant, p. 3296, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress to validate certain homestead leases and patents in Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. (See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. TYDINGS on the 25th instant, p. 3295, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the Falls Cities Carpenters' District Council of the United Brotherhood Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Louisville, Ky.; Teamsters Local No. 822, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, of Norfolk, Va.; the Building and Construction Trades Councils, of Bremerton, Wash., Topeka, Kans., Missoula, Mont., and Sacramento-Yolo Counties, Calif., and the Atlantic County Building Trades Council, of Atlantic City, N. J., pledging that there will not be any stoppage of work on account of jurisdictional disputes between any building and construction trade on any building or construction project essential to the speedy and successful completion of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions of Teamsters Local, No. 822, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, of Norfolk, Va.; the Building and Construction Trades Councils of Bremerton, Wash., Topeka, Kans., Missoula, Mont., and Sacramento-Yolo Counties, Calif., and the Atlantic County Building Trades Council, of Atlantic City, N. J., stating that, under employees who are recognized as being fair to organized labor, when any or all of the building- and construction-trades organizations are unable to supply a full force of building-trades men to man defense projects, every organization affiliated with such labor organizations agrees that a union employer shall be privileged to employ others than members of the building and construction trades affiliated with such labor unions until such time as the labor organizations so affiliated can replace nonunion men with members of their organizations, or until such nonunion men are requested to become members of the respective unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted at a legislative conference of the Michigan State Industrial Union Council (C. I. O.) at Lansing, Mich., protesting against the enactment of any legislation adversely affecting the bargaining power of labor and requesting that such proposed legislation be brought before open hearings before any consideration thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the Thirtieth General Convention of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America, at Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Vinson bill, relating to labor strikes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter from Mrs. Mary A. Puller, of Detroit, Mich., relative to old-age pension legislation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of Townsend Club, No. 1, of Priest River, Idaho, favoring the enactment of House bill 1036, granting old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the sugar conference called by Gov. Charles Edison, at Newark, N. J., protesting against the enactment of legislation which would directly or indirectly reduce the quantity of tropical raw sugar now permitted to enter New Jersey, or other States, for refining and distribution; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter from C. Pierce, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to the international situation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Philadelphia, Pa., Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the enactment of legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the granting of aid, especially food, to the Irish Free State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of W. Keenan, of New York City, N. Y., praying that the United States declare a state of national emergency which shall include the use of the armed forces of the Nation to control the whole North Atlantic area, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of Major Frank Keck Camp No. 53, United Spanish-American War Veterans, New York City, N. Y., favoring the employment of United States armed ships and airplanes to convoy through belligerent zones merchant vessels carrying goods to the aid of Great Britain and other small European nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Building and Construction Trades Council of Missoula, Mont., favoring the establishment of aviation and Army training camps in the State of Montana, in conjunction with the national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 28

"Relative to encouragement of sugar-beet production in the United States

"Whereas there is imported into the United States more than two-thirds of the sugar which is consumed therein; and

"Whereas California is one of the large beet-sugar-producing sections of the country

with many sugar refineries employing many people at good wages thereby assuring prosperity in sugar-beet-growing sections of the State, not only to the refineries and their employees but also to the farmers growing the beets for the refineries; and

"Whereas movements are on foot to bring about a curtailment of sugar production in the United States which if accomplished would have a tendency to disturb the balance of trade to the disadvantage of this country, would bring unemployment to thousands of working people and would tend to cause overproduction in other lines of agriculture; and

"Whereas it appears reasonable that the Government should encourage the production of such commodities as sugar when there exists such an unlimited market therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to take such steps as may seem best to encourage a greater production of sugar and sugar products in the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor be requested to forward copies of this resolution to the President and to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Relative to the improvement of the harbor at Crescent City, Calif.

"Whereas Crescent City is a natural outlet for the products, especially lumber, of northern California, and southern Oregon and the States adjacent thereto; and

"Whereas the present harbor at Crescent City is fully capable of being improved so that it may be used not only as a harbor of refuge in case of emergency but also regularly by large ocean-going vessels; and

"Whereas the full development of this port is vital to the interests of the State of California in that economical transportation is a necessity for the northern portion of the State: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California endorses the fullest development of the harbor at Crescent City by the Federal Government and respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States of America that among the allotments of Federal moneys appropriated for improvement to rivers and harbors, provision be made for the harbor at Crescent City; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of War of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 19

"Relative to memorializing the President and Congress to provide for the dredging of Bodega Bay and to reestablish harbor facilities thereat

"Whereas in this period of uncertainty in international affairs intensive rearmament and preparation for national defense it is of the utmost moment that suitable harbors and facilities be available on the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas Bodega Bay, in Sonoma County, Calif., is exceptionally well suited for harbor development; and

"Whereas plans for the dredging of Bodega Bay and for the reestablishment thereat of harbor facilities have been approved by the War Department who has also recommended that appropriations be made by Congress for this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to make such appropriations as may be necessary to provide for such dredging and harbor reestablishment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate of the State of California is hereby instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two joint resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the United States convoying vessels through belligerent zones; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Takoma Park, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the Rotary Club of Fort Scott, Kans., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for a popular referendum on war, for full pardon to conscientious objectors to the draft, and also remonstrating against the use of American vessels for convoy purposes and the sending of American troops to fight on foreign soil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF THE MINISTERIAL ALLIANCE, KANSAS CITY, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution I have received from the Ministerial Alliance, of Kansas City, Kans., expressing their approval of the plan suggested by former President Herbert Hoover for supplying Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and central Poland with food which may be imported under agreement with England and Germany and be distributed by a neutral organization. Personally, I think this is a constructive program, and I am glad to do everything I can to encourage it.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MINISTERIAL ALLIANCE,
Kansas City, Kans., April 10, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the National Committee on Food for the Five Small Democracies has advanced a proposal made by former President Herbert Hoover by which supplies may be imported under agreement with England and Germany and distributed by a neutral organization to the suffering people of Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and central Poland: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas City, Kans., Ministerial Alliance extends heartfelt sympathy, to the unfortunate millions in the five stricken countries and that we endorse the proposal for relief.

W. R. HOLT,
President.
E. S. KREIDLER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

FOOD SUPPLIES FOR SMALL EUROPEAN DEMOCRACIES—RESOLUTION OF OHIO SENATE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I present a petition or resolution of the Senate of the State of Ohio, of which I shall simply read the final clause.

Be it therefore resolved by the Senate of the Ninety-fourth General Assembly of Ohio, That the plan and purpose of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies be endorsed and approved; that the ideal of the United States of America of aiding the suffering, starving, helpless victims of war's brutalities be reaffirmed; that our Federal Government be urged to use its agencies to encourage cooperation of the warring nations in order that the helpless victims of the small democracies may be saved from wholesale starvation and death.

I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred and placed after the order of business of petitions and memorials.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The resolution is as follows:

Senate Resolution 45

Resolution relative to supplying food to the small democracies of Europe

Whereas in January 1941, a commission of men of high integrity and ability, motivated by a sincere desire to ascertain the truth relative to the supply of food available to the women and children and the aged people in Belgium, made an investigation thereof and a report thereon, and shortly thereafter another commission of men of high integrity and ability, including Prof. J. I. Falconer, of Ohio State University, and representatives from the Universities of Wisconsin and Johns Hopkins, checked the report of the first commission, and, in addition, conducted a searching investigation of data in the United States Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, and of British records and other sources of information relative to the food condition in the small nations of Europe; and

Whereas the reports of these two commissions established without any doubt or question that millions of women and children and aged and other helpless noncombatants in said nations are slowly starving, and that their present meager source of food will be exhausted within a few weeks, and that pestilence and disease is soon certain to follow which will bring death to millions of the innocent and helpless and stunt the bodies of those who survive; and

Whereas to meet this hideous challenge to humanitarianism and to cement the ties of friendship between our people and the suffering peoples of occupied Europe, there has been created a Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, composed of persons of unquestioned sincerity and integrity from all walks of life, with Herbert Hoover as chairman, which committee has developed

a plan for providing food, to be used experimentally in Belgium first, and, if successful there, to be followed in other small democracies, which plan, in substance, provides:

(1) That the cost of food and its distribution shall be borne by the governments of the peoples benefited;

(2) That an international commission be created to supervise the physical delivery of food directly to the recipients from kitchens maintained and operated by the commission;

(3) That no United States shipping be used and only such ships shall be used as are not subject to any belligerent power;

(4) That only so much food shall be on hand at any one time as would, if seized by a belligerent power, be of an infinitesimal military value;

(5) That belligerents agree to grant free passage of food-carrying ships from the United States to their destination;

(6) That other measures to safeguard the purposes of the plan be adopted from time to time as may appear to be proper, to the end that only the hungry, starving, and helpless shall be benefited; and

Whereas General Pershing after a study of the proposed plan has stated:

"There is no doubt millions are in jeopardy unless they are given aid from somewhere. From my own war experience and some knowledge of the problems involved, I have every confidence that the salvation of these peoples can be worked out along the lines proposed by Mr. Hoover, without military loss or benefit to either side. The interest of this committee in maintaining American ideals and friendship to America of those nations by saving these millions is worthy of every support." And

Whereas the American Legion through its national executive committee, on March 15, 1941, after thorough and careful investigation of the plan of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies approved the same: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Senate of the Ninety-fourth General Assembly of Ohio, That the plan and purpose of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies be endorsed and approved; that the ideal of the United States of America of aiding the suffering, starving, helpless victims of war's brutalities be reaffirmed; that our Federal Government be urged to use its agencies to encourage cooperation of the warring nations in order that the helpless victims of the small democracies may be saved from wholesale starvation and death; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and to the United States Senators and Members of Congress from Ohio.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTION OF ASHLAND BOROUGH COUNCIL, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the building of the St. Lawrence waterway will have a disastrous effect on many States, especially Pennsylvania. I do not believe that the people of this country desire that one section of the Nation should benefit at the expense of another. Among other workers, coal miners in Pennsylvania would be thrown out of work. I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by Ashland Borough of Pennsylvania showing that the livelihood of 7,000 people, mostly miners, would be seriously affected by the building of this project.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas certain legislation is now being proposed in Congress for the development of the St. Lawrence River for power purposes: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved by the Council of the Borough of Ashland, Pa., an anthracite mining community, representing 7,000 people, mostly miners, that they protest and oppose any development of the St. Lawrence power project or any other water project in the eastern part of the United States that would tend to further cripple the anthracite coal mines; and be it further

Resolved, That the Ashland Borough Council requests their Congressmen and Senators to oppose any legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence River for power purposes; likewise to oppose the development of any other river in the eastern part of the United States for such purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be authorized to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and Representatives in Congress from this district.

Passed this 2d day of April A. D. 1941.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 158. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, with an amendment (Rept. No. 219);

S. 588. A bill to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, without amendment (Rept. No. 220); and

S. 1390. A bill to amend section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 221).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims:

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution for the relief of South Dakota Wheat Growers Association, Inc., with amendments (Rept. No. 222).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment.

S. 1147. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa," approved August 7, 1939 (Rept. No. 225);

S. 1223. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across or tunnel under the Patapsco River at Baltimore, Md., and a bridge across Chesapeake Bay from a point at or near Millers Island, Baltimore County, Md., to a point at or near Tolchester, Kent County, Md., or a bridge across or tunnel under Chesapeake Bay, or a combined bridge and tunnel, from a point at or near Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, Md., to a point on Kent Island, Md. (Rept. No. 226);

S. 1226. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg. (Rept. No. 227);

H. R. 1824. A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind. (Rept. No. 228);

H. R. 2684. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard (Rept. No. 229);

H. R. 2766. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 230);

H. R. 2829. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa. (Rept. No. 231);

H. R. 2830. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa. (Rept. No. 232); and

H. R. 3682. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River in the village of Lowellville, Mahoning County, Ohio (Rept. No. 233).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 961. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 224).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 238).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1045. A bill to increase the earnings of the United States Government life-insurance fund and the national service life-insurance fund by expediting the investment of the moneys thereof, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 234).

By Mr. HERRING, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3974. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to adopt an official seal, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 235).

By Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4239. A bill to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 236).

By Mr. GERRY, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3835. A bill to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use; without amendment (Rept. No. 237).

OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported a resolution (S. Res. 107), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 8,000 copies of House Document No. 152, current session, entitled "Our American Government: What is it? How does it function?" be printed, with illustrations, for the use of the Senate Document Room.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 28, 1941, that committee presented to the

President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the construction and maintenance of overhanging walks on the highway bridge, route No. 36, at Highlands, N. J., for public use; and

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Elinor Leugers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1399. A bill to provide aid to the States in carrying on programs for the control of starfish and certain other marine life; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1400. A bill to prevent discrimination against persons on account of race, color, or creed in the distribution and enjoyment of employment opportunities made possible by national-defense contracts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. BRIDGES introduced Senate bill 1401, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1402. A bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia;

S. 1403. A bill to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1404 (by request). A bill to provide shorter hours of duty for members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce two bills. The first is introduced at the request of the Treasury Department, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. It deals with contracts, advertising, and priorities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Utah.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1405. A bill to authorize the heads of the various departments and agencies of the United States to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when it is in the interest of the national defense, to authorize the President to give priority to deliveries under such contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The second bill, Mr. President, I am introducing at the request of several persons who have attempted to put into a prospective law the obligations which will be America's and which we will ultimately have to consider if we continue our program in regard to cooperation between the Americas. I trust, Mr. President, that this bill will be sent by the Committee on Foreign Relations to the various departments concerned, and that it may result in a study of the problems which are facing us as a result of our treaties and also as a result of our aid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from Utah will be received and referred as requested by him.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1406 (by request). A bill to contribute to the defense of the Western Hemisphere against external aggression, and to promote the mutual understanding and insure the continental solidarity of the peoples of the American Republics by the interchange of students and professors; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1407. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1408. A bill for the relief of the Luedtke Engineering Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1409. A bill for the relief of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, and the estate of C. E. Wells; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. McCARREN introduced Senate bill 1410, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1411. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1412. A bill to amend the act of June 11, 1940 (Public, No. 590, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), providing for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1413 (by request). A bill to promote the general welfare of the Indians of the United States by amending the acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984); May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250); and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1414. A bill to amend section 2, chapter 368, Forty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 1467, March 2, 1931, relating to extra compensation of inspectors and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1415. A bill to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (title 8, sec. 109, U. S. C. A.); and

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1417. A bill to provide for the delivery of mail on rural free-delivery routes on holidays other than Sundays; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1418. A bill for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Roy B. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1420. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration Facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the County of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway widening purposes; and

S. 1421. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quit-claim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration Facility, Roanoke, Va.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to determine what factors or conditions are responsible for existing discrimination against workers, on the basis of age and physical requirements, in obtaining and retaining employment in private industry and in public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NYE:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution requiring the consent of Congress for the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESTRICTION OF USE OF ARMS BY ALIENS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled, "A bill to restrict the use of arms and other implements of war by aliens." I should like to read the bill as it is short and will take but a moment. It is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any alien residing within the United States, its Territories, or possessions, to bear, own, lease, conceal, buy, or sell any arms, ammunition, explosives, chemicals, military gas, or other implements of war.

SEC. 2. Any person who violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 and deported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1401) to restrict the use of arms and other implements of war by aliens, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROPOSED FEDERAL REAL ESTATE PAYMENTS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and in connection therewith ask that a short explanatory statement be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from Nevada will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1410) to provide a method for making payments to the several States with respect to certain lands and certain projects of the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN in connection with the bill is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. PAT M'CARRAN ON FEDERAL REAL ESTATE PAYMENTS ACT

I have today introduced a bill to be known as the Federal Real Estate Payments Act, which provides a method for making payments to the several States on certain lands and certain projects taken over by the Federal Government. This bill is a national-defense measure in order to permit local governing agencies to meet the added responsibility of national defense.

For many years Government officials in the various departments have been deeply concerned over the acquisition of private lands by the Federal Government, either through purchase, by donation, or by eminent domain. In most instances these private lands are taxable and are in fact being

carried on local tax rolls. Moreover, in most instances State and county governments, and political subdivisions thereof, have issued long-term bonds for municipal improvements and the like, with the expectation of receiving revenue from these taxable private lands, property rights, easements, etc. The Federal Government has long realized that when it steps into an area and acquires hitherto taxable properties, these are automatically stricken from the tax rolls, thereby endangering the financial stability of entire counties, and even States. Indeed, examples of county governments forced into bankruptcy, or compelled to refinance from top to bottom are becoming all too frequent.

The problem has, of course, been prevalent for quite some time. But today, with the Federal Government acquiring enormous properties in our rural areas to be used for training centers, for construction of defense plants, and in fact for expansion of all defense activities, the loss of revenue to local governments is a terrific blow. We are creating by purchase, and by the exercise of the sovereign's right of eminent domain, an almost insurmountable obstacle to sound local administration of finances.

In my opinion, Congress should take immediate action on the all-important issue of payments to States in lieu of taxes on properties acquired by the Government. In the Seventy-sixth Congress we amended the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to provide for payments to States in lieu of taxes where private property is taken over to facilitate the construction of T. V. A. projects. In that amendment we established a method for computing the amount due each State thereby affected, to be paid for the benefit of its citizens. That was a step in the right direction, but it did not solve, nor could it have been a solution to our problem.

I am very hopeful that the Congress will expedite consideration of the bill which I have introduced so that we may give assurance to our local governing agencies that this Government does not intend to force them into bankruptcy as a necessary and inescapable result of national defense.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4401) to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, Glenn Dale, Md., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HUEY PIERCE LONG

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and myself, I submit a concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Huey P. Long, placed in Statuary Hall by the State of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Huey P. Long, presented by the State of Louisiana to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent and illustrious citizens; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Louisiana.

INVESTIGATION OF EMPLOYMENT, WAGES, AND WORKING CONDITIONS OF "RED CAPS"

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I submit a resolution asking the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department to carry on certain investigations with regard to the "redcap" controversy with the railroads. I should like to say that a similar resolution was introduced in the last Congress. It has now been brought up to date, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of the Senator from Utah will be received and referred as requested by him.

The resolution (S. Res. 105) was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas prior to October 24, 1938, the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, a majority of redcaps employed by railroad or railroad terminal companies derived compensation for their services solely through tips or gratuities given them by the traveling public; and

Whereas at or about the effective date of said act the companies adopted a so-called accounting and guaranty arrangement whereunder, as a condition of continued employment, each redcap was required to report daily the amount of tips received by him from the traveling public, and the company guaranteed to pay the redcap any additional sum necessary to equal the minimum wage required by the act; and

Whereas numerous complaints were received from redcaps by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor, to the effect that they were required, in order to retain their jobs, to report, even though falsely, the daily receipt of tips in sums equal to or greater than the minimum wage prescribed in the act, when, in fact, they had received tips in sums substantially less than the minimum wage; and

Whereas upon investigation and a public hearing conducted by representatives of the Administrator it was found that the records kept by various companies were inaccurate in that they showed tips received by redcaps in sums equal to or greater than the minimum wage, when, in fact, many redcaps had actually received tips in sums substantially less than the minimum wage; and

Whereas after an investigation by representatives of the Administrator of complaints against two major terminal companies had disclosed evidence of flagrant violations of the minimum-wage and record-keeping provisions of the act the Administrator instituted and is maintaining civil actions under the act to enjoin similar violations in the future; and

Whereas more than 15 employee actions have been instituted under the act by redcaps against terminal companies alleging the illegality of the so-called accounting and guaranty arrangement and seeking recovery of sums alleged to have been withheld from them under that arrangement in violation of the minimum-wage requirements of the act; and

Whereas several of the terminal companies, after the institution of the above actions by the Administrator and the redcaps, publicly announced the adoption of a new plan whereunder, commencing on or about February 1, 1940, redcaps would be paid wages at the minimum rate prescribed under the act, but would be required to issue to the passenger a check for each bag or parcel carried and collect from the passenger and pay over to the terminal company a charge of 10 cents for each bag or parcel checked; and

Whereas this new plan inaugurated by those terminal companies and gradually adopted since then at most of the other railroad terminals through the country has resulted in (1) numerous complaints being made by the traveling public to the executive branch of the Government and the Administrator regarding the unfairness of the charge made by terminals and ascribing such unfairness to the operation of the act, and (2) numerous additional complaints by the redcaps that under the new plan many of them have been discharged, furloughed, or otherwise discriminated against because of failure to carry sufficient parcels and thereby sell sufficient checks to cover the cost to the companies of the minimum-wage payments; and

Whereas redcaps, passengers, representatives of labor organizations, distinterested civic leaders, editors, and others have urged that the Administrator take steps to ameliorate the conditions and practices of employment of redcaps by the companies; and

Whereas to this end an immediate inquiry into such conditions and practices is a matter of serious concern to the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor, or his designated representatives, is hereby directed to undertake immediately an inquiry into the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment of redcaps by railroad or terminal companies in view of the minimum-wage requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060), under his investigatory powers under said act, and to ascertain and report to the Senate—

(1) The extent to which such conditions and practices violate the letter or the spirit of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or other Federal statutes, if at all;

(2) The extent to which such conditions and practices are susceptible to regulation under the Fair Labor Standards Act in its present form; and

(3) What legislation, if any, should be enacted for the purpose of further regulating wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment of redcaps under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO ON FOOD FOR OPPRESSED PEOPLES

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address prepared by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado on the subject of furnishing food to the people of oppressed democracies, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR WESTERN FRONT—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. BULLITT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our Western Front," delivered by William C. Bullitt at Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., April 27, 1941, in behalf of United China Relief, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE QUESTION OF CONVOYS—LETTER TO HON. SOL BLOOM

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him under date of April 29, 1941, to Hon. SOL BLOOM, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and also a previous letter to Mr. BLOOM on the subject of convoys, which appear in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY GEORGE D. RILEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by George D. Riley, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN WOMEN AND HOME DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY COL. CHARLES H. RUTHERFORD

[Mr. MCFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "American Women Can Help Home Defense," delivered by Col. Charles H. Rutherford, civilian aid to the

Secretary of War for Arizona, at Phoenix, Ariz., on April 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEDIATION AS REMEDY FOR STRIKES—ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jay Franklin, entitled "Mediation Is Best Remedy for Strikes," which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND DEFENSE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Collective Bargaining and Defense," printed and distributed by the Washington League of Women Shoppers, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM REV. F. DORNBLASER IN BEHALF OF PEACE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Rev. F. Dornblaser, of Chicago, Ill., against involvement in war, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY E. G. B. RILEY ON HOW TO DEFEAT HITLER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How to Defeat Hitler," written by Mr. E. G. B. Riley, of Laconia, N. H., which appears in the Appendix.]

BLITZING THE PEOPLE—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blitzing the People," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEACE WITHIN—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Peace Within," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of Friday, April 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL OUTLOOK OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO—ARTICLE BY OSCAR DEPRIEST

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "From a Republican Viewpoint," by Mr. Oscar DePriest, former Representative in Congress from the First District of Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from him to Charles A. Lindbergh, a letter to him from K. Kurkjian, of Princeton, N. J., and an article published in the American Mercury of May 1941, entitled "Why Lindbergh Is Wrong," which appears in the Appendix.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CENTRAL LIBRARY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Washington Evening Star and one from the Washington Post regarding the proposed Central Library for the District of Columbia, which appear in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed.

CONVOYS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in the past week there have been numerous reports regarding the action which will be taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at tomorrow's meeting, when the anticonvoy resolution will be taken up. The report has persisted that there is a move on to pigeonhole the resolution and thereby prevent open discussion on the subject.

I cannot believe that these reports are true, in view of the statements of the distinguished chairman of the committee, in view of the tremendous popular interest as evidenced by the thousands of letters that have been pouring into the Congress on this issue, and in view of the urgency of the situation.

Only yesterday, in the column of John O'Donnell and Doris Fleeson in the Times-Herald, there was a report which has troubled me, and I now bring it to the attention of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. It reads as follows:

When the anticonvoy resolutions come before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Wednesday, the full power of the White House will be used to see that the resolutions are piously and quietly interred. At all costs, the resolutions will not be debated in the Senate—if the administration will prevails—even if forcible feeding by the political sawbones is required to make some of the committee members eat their words of convoy damnation during the debate on H. R. 1776.

The split in the Foreign Relations Committee is sharp, violent, and bitter. The sour lamentation from one side that the present program is "all war short of aid" meets the tart rejoinder that the arrival of the British battleship *George V* here with Halifax aboard was "the greatest shake-down cruise in history."

With this happy spirit of unity among the brothers, Committee Chairman GEORGE, of Georgia, is strictly on the spot.

On the day that the Georgian brought H. R. 1776 up to the Senate he held a press conference, in which he revealed that he had insisted that the original White House draft be changed so that the present neutrality-law ban on sending American craft, merchant or battle, into the war zone be maintained.

GEORGE declared that H. R. 1776, as written by the White House experts, gave the President the power "to authorize to export" arms and supplies to European belligerents. This was stricken out, GEORGE declared, at his insistence, before the bill was sent from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to Capitol Hill.

"If this phrase had been left in," declared GEORGE, "it would have included the use of American merchantmen, which would be entitled to convoy. I'm against convoys. I insisted at the White House that it be made clear that we were not undertaking to convoy shipments to Britain, and this was done."

It was only a few days later that the President backed up GEORGE with his own observation—

Which I have quoted here many times, and shall continue to quote until this convoy matter is settled, because an expert was speaking, the President of the United States, when he said, epigrammatically, tersely, eloquently, and truthfully:

Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war.

From one of the cracker-barrel philosophers whose views the President commended recently came a plea that there be less useless talk and more action. He wrote to his Representative, "We've already made a seven billion down payment on this war. How soon are we going to own it and have the right to run it?"

And a southerner complained sadly when the $7,000,000,000 bill was flashed on Congress: "It sure takes a lot of money to make loyal Democrats out of Chinese."

Mr. President, on April 2 I addressed the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on the floor of this body and asked if he did not feel that the committee should take such action that the joint resolution could be considered in the light of public discussion; and his reply was as follows:

I have no objection to debating it before the Senate and before the country, and I certainly think that all matters of importance—and I regard this as a matter of importance—should be subject to debate before the Senate.

It is because of this that I repeat that I cannot believe reports that the chairman of the committee or any members of the committee will take action to pigeonhole the bill and thereby prevent open public hearings in order that the people may have a voice on the issue, which affects them so vitally.

Mr. President, doubtless you have heard the humorous story which ends up with instructions telephoned by a gentleman about the dead body of a relative for whom he did not care:

Embalm, bury, cremate, and freeze; take no chances.

[Laughter.]

I hope there is no analogy between the story and the attitude of the Committee on Foreign Relations with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 62.

Mr. President, from all walks of life the rank and file of the American people have been pleading to us to bring this issue into the open for public hearings and for open debate on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, only a few days ago I received a letter, among thousands coming in every day from all parts of the country, from all classes, which is typical of one school of thought in this country. It was signed "Twenty Yale men"—the Senator from Ohio will please take notice [laughter]—and was written on the very fine stationery of the Yale Club, Vanderbilt Avenue and Forty-fourth Street, New York City. This is what the 20 Yale men had to say about the issue of convoys:

Why ask the rank and file to write letters about convoys? What do they know about it?

That is the philosophy of the so-called "intelligentsia" in this country: Why ask the rank and file? Why ask the common men, the home-makers, the fathers and mothers, about this matter which the President says means war? Oh, no; do not ask them. Ask the Yale alumni and the college presidents and the faculties throughout the Nation. Get their point of view, with one trend of mind, but ignore the masses of the country. Perhaps the great Administrator of the lease-lend bill, Hon. Harry Hopkins, was not far amiss when a few years ago he made that classic utterance which he would like to call back if he could, speaking about the administration of relief, "The American people are just too damn dumb to know what is going on." Mr. President, that classic utterance I cite to you today, and I hold a brief for the rank and file of the common people, if you please. I do not believe they are "too damn dumb" to know what is going

on. They know in the quiet of the home that the President was everlastingly right that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war," and they have a right to be heard, and we have a right and a privilege and a duty to represent them.

So I recall to the attention of the Senate the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that he believes that important matters should have full debate, and that he considers Senate Joint Resolution 62 an important matter. I say, report it to the Senate, whether with or without a favorable report; but get it before this forum of democracy, where the people interested, the rank and file, may be heard through their paid representatives on the floor of this body.

Now, about the 20 Yale men: This, Mr. President, is the type of mind that would rule Colonel Lindbergh off the air; the type of mind which, if it could, would prevent the rank and file of the American people from having a voice on issues which are a matter of life and death to them, and this is the type of philosophy expressed by Secretary Hopkins, which I repeat—

> The people are too damn dumb to know what it is all about.

Mr. President, I am almost through, but I wanted to bring this home before this body and the American people. In January Franklin Delano Roosevelt, your President and my President, said to a joint session of Congress meeting in the Hall of the House of Representatives, in a great speech—I considered it a great speech, a speech marked by oratory, made by the man who is my President, as well as yours—that his objectives were four freedoms: Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, "everywhere in the world." That is covering a lot of territory; but he said it. Yet, when Charles A. Lindbergh, American citizen extraordinary, in my judgment—when Charles A. Lindbergh, at a time when the Nation was not at war, dared to broadcast over the radio, in a public utterance, his views on the matter of war, and the danger of war, what happened? From 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, from the Executive Office, he is called a "Vallandigham" or a "copperhead." That is the stigma attached to Charles A. Lindbergh.

Is this a free land still? Oh, Mr. President, better that Franklin Delano Roosevelt should use his great office to make freedom of speech a reality in America and defend it here; better make democracy work here than have vain talk about freedom of speech everywhere in the world.

Mr. President, democracy is on trial today. We know that. Let us make it a reality in the halls of Congress and throughout the country. When any man—President, Senator, any rank-and-file citizen, Charles Tobey, Charles Lindbergh, Bill Smith, John Jones—cries out against anything, when he dares express his convictions, it is a sad day in America when aspersions are cast on him or when there is criticism of any man, high or low, who asks the right of free speech in America at any time, at any place. God save this Nation from so deteriorating. Instead of singing God Bless America, we had better sing God Save America when the fundamental right of free speech of any citizen, guaranteed under our Constitution, is challenged, and aspersions are cast on him and names are called, such as "copperhead" and "Vallandigham."

Mr. President, I rest my case.

PROPOSALS FOR BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Senate about a month or 6 weeks ago to investigate in order to find ways and means of setting up a system for an automatically balanced Federal Budget in times of peace have presented to the Senate two proposed constitutional amendments and a proposed bill as embodying three of the possible ways in which the objective might be accomplished, either by law or by constitutional amendment. There has likewise been filed a short report of explanation.

There is nothing difficult about this matter at all. There is nothing unattainable about it. It is nothing more than good, ordinary common sense that whatever type of Government we insist on having in this Nation we should pay for, and, of course, if we insist on a type of government for which we cannot pay, and keep on insisting on it year after year, sooner or later we will have no government at all.

The committee has had the advantage of consulting with several persons who are likewise interested in this subject, and we entertain the hope that in the very near future we may have open hearings upon the proposed bill and upon the two constitutional amendments which have been suggested.

Briefly, in order to show the pathway we are treading, let me point out that as one of the suggested ways in which an automatically balanced budget can be accomplished in times of peace the committee has presented a proposed law, and in that proposal it is pointed out, or decreed, that the average annual cost of the National Government for the period from July 1, 1930, to July 1, 1940, be definitely ascertained, and that this figure be known as the "annual normal Federal expense." In other words, the average yearly expense for the past 10 years would be taken as a base, and that would be called the "annual normal Federal expense."

Second. The amount of money which the Congress annually appropriates automatically determines the amount of taxes to be levied by the National Government in order to meet the appropriations.

Third. It will be necessary for Congress to adopt and have in being various schedules of taxation. Schedule A, for example, would raise sufficient money to provide for the "annual normal Federal expense." Schedules B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, and K would provide for additional expenditures over and above "annual normal Federal expense" in such years when Congress appropriated greater sums.

Fourth. Once the total of annual appropriations is known, the schedule automatically goes into effect which will raise sufficient money to take care of said appropriations.

Fifth. If because of a dull business year, or for any other reason, the schedule in effect does not raise sufficient money to provide for the year's appropriations, then the deficit thus created must be the first charge on the following year's revenue and be considered in adopting the automatic schedule of revenues for the following year.

Sixth. In the event that the schedule in effect raises more money than is necessary to take care of the year's total appropriations, the excess is automatically applied to the liquidation of the national debt.

Seventh. In years of great depression or extraordinary peacetime preparedness expenditures or any other abnormal governmental financial outlay, Congress can escape providing for such extra financial burden currently; it can provide for the payment of the extra burden over a period of not more than 20 years for the gradual liquidation of the deficit for any year. It may even provide that a hiatus of 2, 3, 4, or 5 years may run before taxes to liquidate the deficit created by the extra burden shall begin to be collected so as to liquidate it entirely in not more than 20 years from the date of its creation.

An illustration of some of the differences between the schedules might be comprehended as follows: Schedule A would provide for an income-tax exemption for married people, with no children, of $2,400; schedule B would provide for the same people an exemption of $2,300; schedule C would provide an exemption of $2,200; schedule D, $2,100; schedule E, $2,000; schedule F, $1,900; schedule G, $1,800, and so on.

In other words, in times of peace, whatever type of government the Congress desires, so far as expenses are concerned, the Congress automatically would be bound to raise enough money to pay for that type of government. That is the whole purpose.

In addition, we have proposed two constitutional amendments as alternative procedures to accomplish the same result. Briefly, the constitutional amendments, if either of them should be adopted, would provide that the national debt in times of peace shall never be greater than it was at the moment the constitutional amendment was adopted, and that Congress may not enlarge the national debt in times of peace, unless it provides for the liquidation of the increase in the national debt in times of peace over a period of 20 years. Thus, every generation would pay for the peace-time expenditures of that generation, for the peace-time mistakes of that generation, or for the peace-time wisdom of that generation, as the case may be. We then would not have the situation of any one or two or three or four administrations, whether Democratic or Republican, being able to buy popularity at the expense of future generations. It would be very easy for the administration of the Governor of any State, for example, to raise little or no taxes, and borrow against the future, when that would be permitted, but his administration could not be fairly judged

by its so-called accomplishments unless the liabilities which it passed over to future generations were likewise set up.

Mr. President, last year and the year before last, on frequent occasions, I attempted to show, as I will show briefly now, that in the long run it is not the extremely rich who can pay or will pay for the debt which we may be creating, but the very poor people and the middle-class people; indeed, if we were to take as revenue every cent that every person in America receives who has an income of $100,000 a year or more, either from earnings, or from speculation, or from investments, we would get only $1,000,000,000. We have been spending pretty close to eight or nine billion dollars a year. If we were to carry the illustration down further we would find that if we took all the income of those making $25,000 and over a year again we would fall far short of providing sufficient money to pay for our annual current expenditures.

Every Senator knows, as the country knows, that once the period we are now passing through is over, whether we get into the war or do not get into the war, and assuming that our sovereignty and independence last, there will be at some time in the future a tremendous transition from war preparation, from defense preparation, back to peaceful pursuits, which will occasion a great deal of unemployment and a great deal of strain, financial and otherwise, upon local, State, and National Governments. Just as England and France were unprepared for their military emergency, so we shall be unprepared for the economic emergency which is as sure to come as that night follows day, whenever the international emergency shall have somewhat diminished or subsided.

Mr. President, I do not want anyone to feel that I am particularly critical of the debt having been enlarged during the past 10 years, because it is only fair to say that it was much better in many of those years to borrow against the future than to try to go along on a current basis from year to year. What I am attempting to say now, without criticism of what has been done in the past, is that we cannot keep walking that road indefinitely, and if we do walk it we will distribute poverty in the country and abolish whatever possibilities of prosperity and social stability there may be in our Republic.

So these three possible remedies for the situation have been presented by the committee composed of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and myself. We welcome other suggestions. If any Senator has any bill or constitutional amendment which he would like to have us consider, or any program looking to the ultimate balancing of the budget in times of peace, we will be glad to give it our consideration, and to submit it to experts, and to make a report to the Senate.

This is our first report. It is not a finished product. The proposed constitutional amendments and the bill, no doubt, have many defects in them, but we are making progress, and we hope sometime in the near future to submit finished products to this body for its consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has not explained the second proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Both proposed amendments are alike in philosophy. The manner of operation is slightly different. I think the general explanation, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska, would cover both amendments. I am attempting here not to give the details but to show possibilities of how the objective can be achieved.

Mr. NORRIS. Are both amendments necessary, in the Senator's opinion, or would either one of them accomplish the purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. Either one of the amendments would accomplish the desired result. The bill, without either of the amendments, would accomplish the desired result, if it were adhered to. The trouble with the bill is that each Congress can undo the act of the preceding Congress.

The committee has attempted to present the matter from the standpoint of three possible solutions, to cover the field generally, and make the matter of selection something for the future.

Of course, neither our Government nor any other, may now be minded to take stock of the future. The day, the hour, the week, the month, indeed, the year, loom so important in our thoughts and in our comprehension of events that the future need not be bothered with. I believe the future will present just as many problems as those which now confront us if, indeed, it will not present more. I think it is the part of wisdom for this body to begin now, for the administration to begin now, for the country to begin now to prepare a cushion for the impact which is coming some time when the present international emergency subsides, even though the emergency may grow worse before it subsides. If we do not do so, we may find that in our desire to settle the problems of the moment we shall have failed to provide for the future, and in our pursuit of immediate objectives we may lose all we ultimately hope to gain. In other words, if the struggle abroad shall continue for a long time, it is perfectly possible that we may be victorious in the end, but it may be an empty victory, because the things for which we are fighting—the stability of our Government, democracy in America, and the American way of life—may be swept away by the cataclysmic aftermath which is as certain to come as night is to follow day.

So I hope Senators will read each of the suggested constitutional amendments, as well as the bill and the brief report which is attached thereto. I hope the country will read them, because I believe this is one of the most important matters the Congress has before it. Not to take some action on it would be not to anticipate the problem which almost certainly will be on our doorstep in the not far distant future.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 24, which was read, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 24

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee on the bill (H. R. 2788) entitled "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for 1942."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INTERSTATE MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 28, which was read, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 28

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 9,000 additional copies of House Report No. 369, current session, entitled "Report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens," which shall be for the use of said committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections I submit a report in the case of the West Virginia senatorial controversy and report a proposed resolution.

I will say to Senators that the report is not a very lengthy document. It undertakes to state in fairly clear fashion the controversy and the conclusions of the committee. The committee held very extensive hearings. The hearings have been printed; and if any Senator is not satisfied with the report I invite him to read the hearings. They will prove very instructive and entertaining if he can read them all. I suppose we shall be here a good many months yet, and I anticipate that there will be opportunity to read them.

I send to the desk the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections reporting and also the resolution reported by the committee. I ask to have the resolution read, and the report of the committee printed in the RECORD, because of the fact that there is great interest in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The report (No. 223) is as follows:

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which were referred the credentials of Clarence E. Martin and Joseph Rosier, each

of whom claims to be entitled to a seat in the United States Senate by virtue of a temporary appointment by the Governor of West Virginia, submits the following report:

"I

"The claim of Mr. Martin is based upon a series of three appointments by the Honorable Homer A. Holt, who was succeeded as Governor of West Virginia by the Honorable Matthew M. Neely on January 13, 1941. The purpose of each of these appointments was to fill a vacancy in the Senate seat of the Honorable Matthew M. Neely who was elected as Governor of West Virginia on November 5, 1940, while he was still holding the office of United States Senator, and whose term of office as Governor would begin, under the constitution of the State of West Virginia, on January 13, 1941. In connection with these appointments, important questions to be decided are the time at which the Senate vacancy occurred and the time at which the incoming Governor qualified under the West Virginia law to act as Governor, since the basic argument on behalf of Mr. Martin is that the Honorable Homer A. Holt continued as Governor for some period of time after the vacancy actually occurred.

"The claim of Mr. Rosier is based upon an appointment made by the Honorable Matthew M. Neely, as Governor of the State of West Virginia, on January 13, 1941, to fill the same Senate vacancy to which the three appointments were made by the Honorable Homer A. Holt. At the time this appointment was made the Honorable Matthew M. Neely was admittedly not only properly qualified to act as Governor of West Virginia but had also been duly inducted into that office.

"Extensive hearings with respect to these claims were held by the committee in January and February, and certain page references to the printed volume of the hearings are included in this report for the convenience of the Senate.

"II

"The basic authority to make temporary appointments to the United States Senate is found in the following provision of the seventeenth amendment to the Federal Constitution:

" 'When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.'

"The West Virginia statute, enacted pursuant to the seventeenth amendment, contains the following provision with respect to making such appointments:

" 'Any vacancy occurring in the office of * * * United States Senator * * * shall be filled by the Governor of the State by appointment' (West Virginia Code of 1937, sec. 211).

"There is also a West Virginia statute relating to the delivery by the Governor to his appointee of a certificate of appointment upon the latter's request. Under that statute, any such certificate is required to be 'substantially' in the form there set out, and in the statutory form a preliminary statement is included which reads in part as follows:

" 'Whereas, * * * who was duly chosen a Senator of the United States * * * having (died, resigned, been removed, or otherwise ceased to be a Senator, as the case may be)' (West Virginia Code of 1937, sec. 303).

"III

"On January 10, 1941, Senator Neely addressed a communication to Governor Holt, in which he signified his intention of resigning his seat in the Senate 'at precisely 12 o'clock midnight on Sunday, the 12th of January, 1941.' This resignation was acknowledged by Governor Holt as having been received at 1:30 p. m. on January 11, 1941 (hearings, p. 19).

"It is the view of the committee that it is for the person holding the office of Senator to decide when such office will be vacated and, although there have been many cases in which resignations have been submitted by Senators to take effect at a future date, no case has been found in which the time specified by any Senator for his resignation to take effect has been disregarded. Consequently, the committee is of opinion that the Senate vacancy in the present case was created at the time specified by Senator Neely in his resignation, and there was no evidence presented at the hearings before the committee to indicate that he intended to vacate his office as Senator at any other time.

"IV

"The first of Governor Holt's appointments was made on January 10, 1941, before he had received Senator Neely's resignation, and in the appointment it was stated that it was to be 'effective upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the Senate of the United States in the seat therein now or lately held by the said Hon. Matthew M. Neely.' The preliminary statement in this appointment referred to 'Matthew M. Neely * * * ceasing to be a Senator' (hearings, p. 1).

"The committee is of opinion that, as this appointment was admittedly anticipatory and was made before the then-Governor had received the Senator's resignation or had any knowledge as to when the Senate vacancy would exist, the appointment was not in harmony with the provisions of the seventeenth amendment or the West Virginia statutes relating to temporary appointments to the Senate and certificates of such appointments. The legislative history of the seventeenth amendment, and the construction apparently placed upon it by the West Virginia Legislature, would seem to indicate that 'when vacancies happen,' as used in that amendment, means 'at any time that vacancies take place.' Moreover, since the obvious purpose of the Senate vacancy provision in the seventeenth amendment is to maintain for each State its equal representation in the Senate until there is actually a vacancy in the office of a Senator from a particular State there is nothing upon which the local law, enacted pursuant to that amendment, can effectively operate.

"V

"The second Holt oppointment was made on January 11, 1941, after the Governor had been notified of Senator Neely's resignation. In this appointment it was stated that it was to be 'effective upon the taking effect of the resignation of the Honorable Matthew M. Neely as a United States Senator from West Virginia or upon any earlier occurrence of a vacancy in the seat in the Senate of the United States now or lately held by the said Hon. Matthew M. Neely.' The preliminary statement in the certificate issued by Governor Holt to Mr. Martin referred to 'the Honorable Matthew M. Neely * * * having resigned the office of Senator' (hearings, p. 2).

"Notwithstanding the reference in this appointment to 'any earlier occurrence of a vacancy, etc.,' a fair construction of the appointment would seem to be that it was prospective in character and that it was primarily intended to become operative as soon as Senator Neely's resignation took effect. As already indicated, the resignation, by its terms, was effective 'at precisely 12 o'clock midnight on Sunday, the 12th of January 1941.' Consequently, the earliest point of time at which such an appointment could become operative prospectively would be on January 13, 1941.

"No one can seriously contend that an outgoing Governor should be permitted to make a prospective appointment which would not take effect until after his term of office had expired. In the exceptional cases, such as the Horace Chilton case, where prospective appointments to the Senate have been recognized, it does not appear that any such appointment was made by a Governor whose term of office would not extend well beyond the time specified by the outgoing Senator for his resignation to take effect. In the view of the committee, the validity of the second Holt appointment therefore depends upon whether the Honorable Homer A. Holt held the office of Governor of West Virginia at any time on January 13, 1941. This depends in turn upon the time at which the incoming Governor completed his qualifications to act as Governor.

"On behalf of Mr. Martin it is urged in effect that the incoming Governor, Matthew M. Neely, did not complete his qualifications as such until he had vacated the office of United States Senator, had thereafter taken a qualifying oath of office as Governor, and a certificate of such oath had been filed with the Secretary of State of West Virginia. While it is true that the West Virginia law requires that certificates of the oath of all officers 'shall be filed and preserved in the office of the secretary of state,' and makes it the 'duty of every person who takes an oath of office to procure and file in the proper office the certified copies of his certificate of oath' (West Virginia Code of 1937, sec. 271), it is the view of the committee that these requirements do not constitute a part of the process of qualification. As no time is specified for such filing, it may be reasonably assumed that the incoming official would not be precluded from performing the duties of his new office merely because of some delay in obtaining and filing the required certificate of oath.

"The taking of the oath of office, and not the filing of the certificate, is apparently the important element to be considered in West Virginia in determining whether an incoming official is properly qualified to act. In this connection, section 272 of the West Virginia Code of 1937 provides in part as follows:

" 'No person elected or appointed to any office, civil or military, shall enter into the office, exercise any of the authority or discharge any of the duties pertaining thereto, or receive any compensation therefor, before taking the oath of office.'

"The basic authority for the above provision is found in article 4, section 5 of the Constitution of West Virginia, which reads as follows:

" 'SEC. 5. Every person elected or appointed to any office, before proceeding to exercise the authority, or discharge the duties thereof, shall make oath or affirmation that he will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of this State, and that he will faithfully discharge the duties of his said office to the best of his skill and judgment; and no other oath, declaration, or test shall be required as a qualification, unless herein otherwise provided.'

"Section 270 of the West Virginia Code of 1937 also provides in part:

" 'The oaths required by section 3 of this article shall be taken after the person shall have been elected or appointed to the office, and before the date of the beginning of the term, if a regular term.'

"There is also the following specific requirement in section 274 of the West Virginia Code of 1937 as to the qualification of executive officers:

" '*Provided*, That the State executive officers shall qualify on or before the first Monday after the second Wednesday of January next after their election.'

"In view of the foregoing provisions of the West Virginia law, the committee is of opinion that the incoming Governor, Matthew M.

Neely, was required to complete his qualifications as Governor either on or before January 13, 1941, and that the taking of a qualifying oath was the last step necessary in the process of qualification.

"It appears that an oath of office as Governor of West Virginia was taken by ex-Senator Neely on January 13, 'instantly after 12 o'clock midnight of January 12,' and that a certificate thereof was filed at 12:50 a. m. on January 13 in the office of the secretary of state of West Virginia (hearings, p. 5).

"It also appears that at 11:35 p. m., and again at 11:45 p. m., on January 12, Senator Neely took a qualifying oath for the office of Governor of West Virginia. Certificates of both of such oaths were filed in the office of the secretary of state of West Virginia on January 25, 1941 (hearings, p. 4).

"It is the view of the committee that the taking of such a qualifying oath on January 12 was specifically authorized by the provision of the West Virginia law last referred to, and served to complete the qualifications of the incoming Governor so that he was entitled to discharge the duties of the office of Governor from the first moment of January 13, 1941, when his term of office began.

"It is also the view of the committee that by taking such a qualifying oath on January 12 Senator Neely did not vacate his office of Senator, and it is obvious that the time fixed by the State constitution for the commencement of the term of office of Governor was not advanced by reason of the taking of the qualifying oath. It is equally clear that Senator Neely could not legally perform any of the functions of the Governor of West Virginia between the time he took either of such qualifying oaths on January 12 and the first moment of January 13, when the term of office of the new Governor began. Consequently, there was no violation of article 4, section 7, of the West Virginia Constitution, under which an executive officer is forbidden to 'hold any other office during the term of his service.'

"Having reached the above conclusions with respect to the qualifications of the incoming Governor, Matthew M. Neely, the committee necessarily concludes that the term of office of the Honorable Homer A. Holt as Governor of West Virginia expired at midnight on January 12. The committee also concludes that the second appointment of Mr. Martin, which could not become effective before January 13, was invalid, as it was intended to take effect prospectively, and at a time when the appointing authority was no longer in a position to make a temporary appointment to the Senate if there had then been an existing Senate vacancy.

"VI

"In view of the foregoing it is unnecessary to consider the third appointment of Mr. Martin except to say that it was invalid since it was made on January 13, 1941, after the term of office of the Honorable Homer A. Holt as Governor of West Virginia had expired.

"VII

"The final conclusion of the committee is that the appointment to the Senate of Joseph Rosier on January 13, 1941, which was made by Governor Neely after he had assumed the duties of the office of Governor of West Virginia, was a valid appointment.

"The committee therefore recommends that Joseph Rosier be seated as a United States Senator from the State of West Virginia to fill the vacancy created by the resignation from the Senate of the Honorable Matthew M. Neely."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is there to be a minority report?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. I have consulted with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who desires to make a minority report.

Mr. McNARY. If there is to be a minority report, the two reports ought to be printed together and submitted at the same time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the vote in the Committee on Privileges and Elections on the West Virginia case was very close—9 to 8. On behalf of the seven other Senators and myself who voted against the majority, I will say that we desire to file a minority report and ask that it be printed. We shall require a little time. I wish to confer with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who has just returned to the Chamber. The matter will not be held up. We shall ask the Senate to seat Mr. Martin, who is Governor Holt's appointee, the majority of the committee to the contrary notwithstanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the views of the minority, when submitted, will be printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no disposition to cut off the minority. Before presenting this report I consulted with the minority, and advised the minority that I was about to file the report, so that the minority could be guided accordingly. I assume that when the pamphlet form of the report is printed both reports will be incorporated in the same document; but I thought it would be well at this stage, if I could obtain unanimous consent, to have the majority report printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas and also the Senator from Kentucky if they have any views with respect to the time when this matter may be taken up. The reason I make that inquiry is that many Senators are interested in one way or another, and it seems to me there ought to be some understanding that it shall be taken up at some date in the future, so as to give Senators an opportunity to be present when it is to be considered and voted upon. Has the Senator any views on that matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that if the minority report were now ready, I should be willing to take the matter up within the next day or two. But I am sure Senators want a little time to read the report and some of the hearings. The Senator from Texas is agreeable to taking the matter up at any time the leadership sees fit.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be very glad to confer with the Senator on the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am willing to take the matter up the latter part of this week, next week, or at any other time. It is a matter relating to the privileges of the Senate, and it seems to me we ought to proceed with as much speed as possible consistent with proper consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is undoubtedly a privileged matter. The Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill has been on the calendar for some time. Its consideration has been delayed from time to time because of the illness of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I have conferred with Senators on the committee, particular the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and also with Senator MCKELLAR's brother, who is his secretary. I am authorized to say that, so far as they are concerned, it would be entirely agreeable to take up the bill at any time. I understand there was a tentative arrangement to take it up next Monday.

If the West Virginia contest should be taken up before that time and should not be concluded, of course, we should want to go on with it and dispose of it; but, in view of the fact that we are not doing much now and that we may have the calendar more or less loaded with legislation a little later, it is desirable that the matters which are pending be disposed of as soon as possible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. The committee has been discussing the West Virginia case since January. There were extensive hearings, and it is not possible, when 17 members of the committee have taken as much time as they have taken, that other Members of the Senate can familiarize themselves with the record within the next few days.

Many Senators have made arrangements to see the world's greatest sporting event—the Kentucky Derby. I think it is hardly possible that they would undertake to settle this case before the date of the Kentucky Derby, which will be run on Saturday afternoon, May 3. As I have said, many Senators are planning to attend the derby. Other Senators who are not present and do not expect to be present because of engagements for next week have indicated that they would not like to have the Senate consider the matter before week after next. On behalf of those Senators, I ask that it be definitely set for week after next.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Privileges and Elections does not propose to engage in any test of speed with the Kentucky Derby. [Laughter.] I am satisfied that in any test of that character we should come out at least third or fourth, or perhaps the last horse in the race. [Laughter.] So I do not want to insist on taking the matter up.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would depend upon whether the track were wet or dry. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to inconvenience any Senators, but I think we should proceed some time next week. I do not think it would be wise to postpone this case until week after next.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to refer to a rather casual statement of the able Senator from Kentucky to the effect that next Monday we might

consider the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill. I should like to know definitely whether or not that is to be the program.

Mr. BARKLEY. It will be unless the West Virginia contest should intervene. We might determine that matter. The question has been asked whether the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, in which there is a very controversial item, during the consideration of which most Senators desire to be present, will be taken up in the near future. After talking to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and others, I tentatively suggested that next Monday we would take up that bill. I do not know how much time its consideration will require. Perhaps it will take 2 days. We shall see.

I should like to follow that bill with the West Virginia matter. I should not like to see it go over until the week after next. There are some personal reasons that affect me only why I should like to see it taken up sooner; but I should like to accommodate myself, and I am sure the Senate does, to the wishes of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, that cannot very well be done, because nine Senators are on one side and eight Senators are on the other; but I have been asked to request that the West Virginia matter be put off until the week after next. Because of commitments in the nature of personal engagements made by various Senators, I am bound to make the request. Whether or not I can obtain an agreement on the subject, I have to make the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not making any personal request of mine in the interest of delay.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no personal reason to make the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senate has a right to delay legislation on an important constitutional matter in order that Senators may fulfill engagements away from Washington. Too much of that is going on already, and legislation is being delayed because Senators have other things to do. My view is that the Senate of the United States is where Senators ought to be when business is to be transacted, and I certainly shall not ask any delay on my own account.

There are a good many reasons why this contest should be disposed of as soon as possible. In the first place, the State of West Virginia now has only one Senator representing it in the Senate, and it is entitled to two. The committee has been very careful and painstaking in its consideration of this matter; and I think now, as a matter of right to that State, it ought to be disposed of without unnecessary delay. I will accommodate myself to the wishes of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the senior Senator from Kentucky that the committee, in the consideration of this matter, was quite indulgent regarding the absence from the city at various times of Senators who were members of the committee. The committee probably could, by disregarding that fact, have submitted its report to the Senate at an earlier date; but it was a sharp issue, and we felt that every member of the committee should have an opportunity to express his views and convictions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can we not have an understanding that the matter may be taken up on Thursday of next week, provided the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill is passed by that time?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is agreeable to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from South Carolina suggested that we have an understanding that consideration of the West Virginia contest follow the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, which will be taken up next Monday, and will certainly require, I should say, 2 days.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in that connection I should like to know, before passing that subject matter, whether we are definitely deciding now to take up on Monday the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I desire to know.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. The only reason why I suggested that the West Virginia contest follow the Post Office bill was that Members of the Senate should be notified that the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is to be taken up, and if that is done, presumably they will be here. When they are here there will be no better time to take up the very important contest involving the seat of a Senator. I believe the matter should be disposed of at the earliest possible date. I think such contests should always be disposed of early in the session.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are two or three important matters which may come up and should come up in the next week or so. In addition to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill and the West Virginia contest, there is a bill which is now pending before the Commerce Committee with reference to the purchase of certain ships in United States waters belonging to foreigners. A similar bill probably will pass the House next Tuesday or Wednesday and will come to the Senate, and I think it should be promptly disposed of. Of course we cannot do anything about it until the Senate committee reports.

Those three things are rather grouped together, and when they are out of the way it is entirely possible that we may have a lull in the Senate proceedings, so that Senators may, if they desire, pursue their personal matters without having to remain here. It would be most unfortunate to bring Senators back for consideration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, and then have a lull lasting a week or two, and then have to bring them back on the West Virginia matter, and then have another lull, and then have to bring them back again. Certainly there is no objection to Senators going home when there is nothing before the Senate for their consideration, and I think it would be an accommodation to most Senators if we could take up these three matters and dispose of them as early as possible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I did not make the request on my own account, because I intend to be here and, so far as I know, there is no reason for my not being here. If we could agree to take up the West Virginia matter next Thursday, and agree not to vote on it in the event of the absence of Senators who have expressed a wish to be here, and who, for reasons they cannot avoid, are detained, I should be glad, on behalf of the seven other Senators who voted with me, to undertake to make such an arrangement. I will say that if that is not done I shall be compelled to see that a vote is not had on the matter until they get back.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think there is any necessity for Senators making threats as to what they will do to prevent a vote.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is no threat.

Mr. BARKLEY. It sounded like one. I do not think it is necessary. I am not insisting that the Senate take up the West Virginia matter next Thursday, but I think its consideration should follow that of the Treasury and Post Office bill. It may not be taken up until Thursday; and I am willing to agree not to take it up until Thursday, even though we pass the Treasury and Post Office bill by next Tuesday. This is Tuesday, and if we designate Thursday of next week as the day for taking up the West Virginia contest it will give nearly 10 days' notice so that Senators who are absent may return. I do not know how long the contest will take. It may take 2 or 3 days; I do not know. Nobody knows.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I think it will take a considerable time, because several Senators have indicated that they desire to speak.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care how long it takes; I think we ought to take it up and dispose of it. Suppose we understand, then, that following the passage of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, provided that does not happen earlier than Thursday, we will take up the West Virginia contest, and everyone can understand that will be the program.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment: Provided what does not happen?

Mr. BARKLEY. I mean if we finish the consideration of the Treasury and Post Office bill before Thursday, we will not take up the West Virginia matter before Thursday.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well; that is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections by the Senator from Texas.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 106), as follows:

Resolved, That Joseph Rosier, appointed by the Governor of West Virginia on January 13, 1941, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation from the Senate of the Honorable Matthew M. Neely, is entitled to be admitted to a seat as a Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, it was Quentin Reynolds, who, after long months of reporting service in Europe, wrote in his book, The Wounded Don't Cry, this:

> We knew that Bullitt had talked to Petain and had told him that America would help in every way.

Mr. Reynolds speaks these days with the approval and with the applause of interventionists. In the same book, at another point, the author wrote:

> And there was the fairly well substantiated rumor to the effect that Bill Bullitt had told friends that America would be in the war within 8 days.

Ambassador Bullitt, of course, has denied that he ever gave any foreign nation cause to believe we might be counted on for any help in their wars. But in view of facts that came to light for the first time 18 years after the last war, I am at least wondering what time and history will demonstrate to have been the fact concerning the activities of our roaming Ambassador during these months, starting with those just preceding the declaration of war by England and France against Germany.

My curiosity on this score is sharpened by the many tales that drift back from points across the seas where our Ambassadors have made their calls. At the moment we cannot lose sight of the report by Demaree Bess in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post under the title "The Battle of the Balkans." In that article will be found these paragraphs:

> In Sofia I learned how the American mystery man, Col. "Wild Bill" Donovan, had joined forces with the British in an attempt to bolster up Bulgarian resistance. American newspapers have described Colonel Donovan as "the eyes and ears of Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox." In the Balkans, Colonel Donovan also gave Bulgarian diplomats the idea that he had authority as a spokesman. He told them, they later declared, that the United States was on the verge of entering the European war and would go on fighting Germany until Germany was defeated.
>
> Bulgarians interpreted Colonel Donovan's statement as something very much like an ultimatum. He was quoted as telling Bulgarian leaders that if they yielded to German demands and let their country be used as a German base, then they would automatically become the enemy of the United States Government, and would be regarded as our enemy not only during the war but after it ended.
>
> These were words as strong as any which German diplomats could have used.

Mr. President, we may now expect, of course, to hear denials by the "eyes and ears" of Secretary Knox of this report by Writer Bess, who is acknowledged to be a top American reporter in Europe. But it will still be interesting to know what history will do with this whole period of American involvement in Europe.

What both Bullitt and Donovan are alleged to have done will be conundrums perhaps for some years to come, conundrums like those presented almost daily right here in Washington.

At a time when our Government counts essential the drafting of young men of school age for military service while the same Government seems quite unconcerned about those forces that are slowing up production of war materials, it is interesting to observe some other inconsistencies that leave one wondering just whose emergency is the present one. Perhaps someone can make sense of it all.

THE FARMER AND FREEDOM FROM WANT

The war boom invited by easy defense spending is bringing joy and blindness to some communities—joy of prosperity and wide employment, and blindness to the day when those communities will observe ghostlike, idle new industrial plants with thousands of unemployed. But a third of our population—the third living on our farms, whose gross income last year was less than our first installment appropriation of $7,000,000,000 to aid a foreign cause—knows no return as a result of the war abroad or the defense program; no return except decreasing markets abroad and depressed farm prices at home.

The Senate has recently moved in a manner which would considerably improve the returns to the farmers this year and next by upping the appropriation for parity payments in the agricultural supply bill. The bill is now in conference, though there has been no conference called for at least 4 weeks. Now comes the evidence that the administration means to fight the increase for the farmer. "Farm Payment Rise Opposed by Roosevelt," say the headlines, and the newspapers report that the administration is bringing "pressure to prevent boosts in agricultural and other nondefense appropriations"; which only means that there is no defense for America in keeping the American farmers from the dire want that will prevail unless Congress gives larger help to them. It seems to be expected that though his cost of living and cost of production go up and up by reason of the defense program, the farmer can be a help and strength to America and democracy even though his export market vanishes and his share of the national income grows smaller and smaller. Perhaps it has been concluded that if someone must suffer for the adoption of a wartime economic base, it might better be the farmer; let the farmer want; he is patriotic; he took it on the chin the last time and is used to it.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Col. Charles Lindbergh offers a direct and clean-cut appeal for some consideration for America in this hour when we are being marched to war by an organized minority of interventionists. None undertakes to answer his argument. But columnists and the President proceed with an effort to tear him limb from limb as a rank copperhead for his brilliant exercise of his right as an American to freedom of speech and expression. Evidently those who give the greatest lip service to the cause of democracy are the last to want it practiced, even in peacetime.

FREEDOM FROM FEAR

Many months ago the President gave the press cause to suggest the possible presence of German submarines off our coast, with never any evidence whatsoever of their presence. But it built fear in the American heart.

Just the other day a clever suggestion was dropped, which found its way to the top of front-page columns throughout the land, to the effect that 40 percent of our aid to Britain was being sent to the bottom of the deep sea. To my knowledge only one source of public information went to the trouble of checking this "suggestion." Fulton Lewis, radio commentator, after his check, reported that evening to his radio audience as follows:

> Another Congressman, who refused to allow his name to be used, gave the news reporters a so-called confidential tip that he had information from an "unimpeachable source" that more than 40 percent of the material that we have sent, and are now sending, to Britain under the lend-lease program has been sent to the bottom on the way across.
>
> That story was distributed all over the Nation, and it occurred to me that you probably would like to have an authentic check on it. So I went to three different Government sources today, all of which are in possession of specific up-to-the-minute figures on exactly what is going across the Atlantic, and how much of it is being sunk.
>
> The Congressman may have thought that his source of information was unimpeachable, but two of them said that the losses have been negligible. The third one went a little further, and said that in the last few weeks the losses have been falling even lower than ever, and all three told me that the figure not only is exaggerated but it's entirely fantastic.
>
> I merely pass that along to you to keep the record straight. Whether the Congressman in question likes it or not, you're entitled to know the truth, and not to be propagandized.

Mr. Lewis reached but few by comparison with the many who were reached by the unimpeachable source reported through the press of the country. However unfounded was the suggestion, it built fear—fear that might win excuse for the war act of convoying supplies to Europe.

At about the same time, in the hour when the President was being rudely awakened to the discovery that the American people were not ready to countenance acts of war however much they wanted to aid Britain short of war, then came the President with his suggestion to the press that there might be—with emphasis on the "might be"—Nazis in Greenland. People who read this were not expected even to guess that if the Nazis were really in Greenland the President would know it and would be the first to say they were there, not just that they might be. To say it as it was said would at least frighten the people.

PRESIDENT MISUNDERSTOOD

I assume that our program of aid to Britain and the talk of the necessity of convoying lend-lease goods to England is a part of that policy laid down on January 6 of this year by the President when in his message to Congress he delivered the four freedoms to the world, "in our own time and generation—everywhere in the world." Clearly, I see it now. I misunderstood him then.

When he said "We look forward to a world founded upon freedom of speech

and expression—everywhere in the world, in our own time and generation," he meant this freedom for everyone but Copperhead Lindbergh.

When the President said, "We look forward to a world founded upon freedom from want—everywhere in the world * * * in our own time and generation," he obviously meant this freedom for everyone, everywhere, except the farmer in America.

When the President spoke in that message of "freedom from fear—anywhere in the world * * * in our own time and generation," clearly he meant this vital freedom for everyone excepting only Americans, who, seemingly, could not be expected to do their American duty without being frightened.

Somewhere, sometime, I may understand all of this; but I am a complete dunce, as many of my colleagues will probably want to insist, when it comes to squaring Presidential and administration words with each other in this emergency, which finds us at war with no one.

SOUND FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICY

The editor of the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune affords a little light for me in the editorial which I now read:

MOST FOLKS AGREE

If you were to outline a sound foreign and national-defense policy for the United States you probably would say something like this:

"We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conflict or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party; we will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.

"It is for peace that I have labored; and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life. * * *

"We look at the old world of Europe today. It is an ugly world, poisoned by hatred, and greed and fear. We can see what has been the inevitable consequence of that poison—it has been war.

"And we look at this country, built by generations of peaceable, friendly men and women, who had in their hearts faith—faith that the good life can be obtained by those who work for it.

"We know that we are determined to defend our country and with our neighbors to defend this hemisphere. We are strong in our defense.

"The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war. * * *

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

"They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. Yes; the purpose of our defense is defense. * * *

"In 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate the hazards which in the past had led to war. We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones. * * *

"I am fighting to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of our own United States."

Then the editor of the Tribune continues:

This is a fair statement of proper American aims and attitude. Furthermore, it is not an imaginary quotation.

Those words were spoken in various places in the eastern part of the United States, ranging from October 23, 1940, at Philadelphia, Pa., to November 1, 1940, at Brooklyn, N. Y. They did much to influence the thinking of the voters in the 1940 Presidential campaign.

Yes; you are right. These statements were made by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his campaign for a third term.

It is regarded as "unfriendly"—even treacherous—to quote them now in a different atmosphere. Efforts are being made to brand as disloyal anyone who has so long a memory, a memory which spans so short a range as 6 months.

Before the end of the next 3 months anyone who quotes these statements probably will be popularly regarded as disloyal. Such is the power of propaganda and such is the general disregard for ordinary moral standards in public affairs.

But millions of Americans will not forget them. No matter what the immediate future holds, millions of Americans will remember them—and what has happened since—as long as they live.

The Tribune editor might have added a definition of what is meant by "short of war" by quoting the President's words of September 1, 1939, when he said:

With the repeal of the arms embargo, this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and America ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict.

But, then, to bother with that would only require an additional definition of what was meant by "clearly and definitely."

Again, the editor might have added to his outline one going to the question of what is meant by the expressions "neutrality," "fool's gold," and "profits or peace," and quoted the Presidential Chautauqua speech of 1936—Just before election, Mr. President—when he spoke as follows:

The Congress * * * has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war * * * new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

* * * Effective maintenance of American neutrality depends * * * on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens.

* * * * * *

Let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

* * * * * *

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace."

And while we seek to put Europe on a footing of principle and respect once again by getting as near to the slaughter there as we can without killing anyone or letting any Americans be killed, we might remind ourselves of Thomas Jefferson's reminder that—

For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, the president of Stanford University, has a more modern way of expressing the same thought when he says:

If anyone believes the American people can go out and force other nations around to our way of thinking, he has a Hitler complex.

But what does it get us, Mr. President, after and if we were to do all this to satisfy ourselves as to the meaning? We are just where we are when we listen to Winston Churchill pounding up Hitler and asking us to have a hand in it today, and then read what the same Winston Churchill had to say back only a few months ago when he declared that if ever England was whipped in a war he hoped England could have a Hitler to show England the way out.

Perhaps, Mr. President, Mr. Willkie has the answer to it all when he says of his own kind of talk:

A bit of campaign oratory.

EXPLOSIONS, FIRES, AND OTHER ACTS OF POSSIBLE SABOTAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement I have prepared with a list of explosions, fires, and other acts of possible sabotage in this country during the past few months.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many things have been happening in this country which perhaps have escaped the attention of the majority of citizens.

I refer to the explosions, fires, and other acts which have been taking place over the past few months. Peculiarly enough, they have occurred in industrial plants engaged in defense work, in Navy yards, in our Government buildings here in Washington, and in our armories. Many of these acts may be attributed to sabotage.

With such things going on, and with communistic, Nazi, and Fascist influences bringing about a delay in our defense program and destruction of part of it—it is about time that we buckle up our belts and start to deal with these things with a firm hand.

We are engaged in a great effort to prepare ourselves for any eventuality. The people have recognized the threat to the present and the future security of this Nation and, through their Representatives in Congress, have accepted the task of placing our defense forces in order.

Billions of dollars are being appropriated for expanding the program of the Army and Navy of the United States. We are taking upon ourselves as a people the tremendous burden of eventually paying for this defense effort. We do so with the hope that by shouldering this burden and preparing ourselves we shall be relieved of the fear of entering a State of human bondage.

Americans possess a characteristic which in normal times is one of their greatest assets, but which in critical times, such as those through which we are passing, has a tendency to become a liability.

The characteristic of which I speak is the mutual trust which marks the personal and group relations of the people who comprise our population. Most Americans have such an abiding love for their country and such a firm belief in its infinity that it is impossible for them to conceive of any person or group of persons within its borders possessed of an urge to render its system of government impotent. Hence it is not difficult to understand the indifference with which they have regarded the appeals of those individuals and agencies conscious of the presence of persons who have pledged their allegiance to philosophies of government foreign to our own. Neither is it difficult to understand how persons exercising vicious influences upon our way of life have been able to effectively here espouse their respective causes.

People are indifferent either when they are not informed or when they are misinformed. It is the duty and the privilege of the many patriotic and informed Americans to hail the attention of their fellows to every existing danger to the perpetuation of our representative government. We who are aware of the truth that among us are many intent upon subversive activities and utilizing our guaranteed liberties to nurse their alien plans should accept the task of rousing all the people from their sleepy hollow and enlisting their energies in the fight against such influence. For it is also characteristic of the American people that once aroused to the need for action, their efforts are immediate and decisive.

I am convinced that we of this Nation can be as cunning in detecting the hostile activities of foreign agents and their allies as they can be in discovering our weaknesses and attempting to prosecute their program. I am convinced we can repel their acts without insulting or injuring those who have made their subscription to our democracy above reproach. I think we all agree that reason should set the pace of our attack upon the "fifth columnist"; that we should not allow our emotional reaction to his reprehensible movements to destroy the effectiveness of our counterconduct or embarrass loyal Americans. Yet in such an emergency as now exists our citizens are the essence of discretion and tolerance. We realize we have a difficult assignment and that in seeking to destroy a vicious influence it is not always possible and practical to make the treatment delicate. Prompted by such an understanding, the American people will refuse to accept as a violation of their inalienable rights temporary infringements incident to the struggle to make their future secure.

We who are loyal will not complain if our toes are stepped upon by those whose assignment it is to crush the plan by which they who are afflicted with the "isms" would destroy our entire physique. Americans would be unwise to refuse the blessing of such understanding.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation under J. Edgar Hoover is doing an excellent job, but they have a comparatively small force, and they are spread very thin throughout the country. They should have more appropriations and more men in order that this problem of sabotage and the subversive activities of large groups of people residing in this country may be unearthed, and proper action taken.

This is no time to twaddle—it is a time for action.

I hereby submit to the Senate a partial list of explosions, fires, and other acts which may have been caused by sabotage in this country during the last few months.

EXPLOSIONS

September 12, 1940: Hercules Powder Co., Kenville, N. J.

August 16, 1940: Atlas Powder Co., Joplin, Mo.

November 12, 1940: Trojan Powder Co., Allentown, Pa.

November 12, 1940: American Cyanamid & Chemical Co., Edinburg, Pa.

November 12, 1940: United Railway Signal Co., Woodbridge, N. J.

November 28, 1940: Du Pont Powder Co., Tacoma, Wash.

November 22, 1940: Lion Oil Refinery, El Dorado, Ark.

December 2, 1940: Columbia Powder Co., Tacoma, Wash.

December 10, 1940: Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J.

February 4, 1941: Wiedeman Machine Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

February 27, 1941: American Cyanamid & Chemical Co., Maynard, Mass. (first).

March 20, 1941: Hercules Powder Co., Kenville, N. J. (second explosion).

March 21, 1941: American Cyanamid & Chemical Co., Maynard, Mass. (second).

April 11, 1941: Hercules Powder Co., Belvedere, N. J.

April 11, 1941: Woodward Iron Co., Birmingham, Ala.

April 21, 1941: American Cyanamid & Chemical Co., Maynard, Mass. (third).

FIRES

November 16, 1940: Boston Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.

November 12, 1940: National Guard Armory, Atlanta, Ga.

November 17, 1940: Boston Navy Yard, Boston, Mass. (second fire).

November 17, 1940: Pennsylvania Chemical Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

November 26, 1940: Navy Department Building, Washington, D. C.

December 2, 1940: Two additional fires in Washington, D. C., Navy Yard, and at naval magazine, Bellevue, D. C.

December 9, 1940: Lowenthal Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

December 11, 1940: Norfolk Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va. (building destroyed).

December 14, 1940: Condenser Service Engineering Corporation, Hoboken, N. J.

January 14, 1941: Hercules Powder Co., Kenville, N. J. (third disaster in few months).

February 9, 1941: New Haven Quilt & Pad Co., New Haven, Conn. (big fire).

March 1, 1941: Fort Myer, Va., Army barracks destroyed.

March 13, 1941: Barnett Foundry & Machine Co., Irvington, N. J. (destroyed plant).

March 13, 1941: Bienville Warehouse Co., New Orleans, La. (drydock fired).

March 19, 1941: Boston Navy Yard, Boston, Mass. (fire in power and communications).

March 19, 1941: Curtiss-Wright airplane plant, Buffalo, N. Y.

April 11, 1941: Steamship *El Mundo*, New York Harbor.

April 28, 1941: Navy powder plant, Indian Head, Md.

OTHER ACTS

November 13, 1940: Seattle, Wash., emery dust in vital machinery of Steamship *President Grant* and Steamship *President Harrison*.

November 3, 1940: Giant cranes collapsed, San Francisco, building ships for Maritime Commission.

December 2, 1940: New York—liner *Yucatan*, valves were opened, and ship sunk at port. Was to sail for Puerto Rico with Government food supplies next day for new Government bases.

November 27, 1940: Catskill, Lehigh Portland Cement Co., 27 silos of cement for defense contracts collapsed.

December 6, 1940: Tacoma, Wash.—gas poisons many at shipbuilding company.

March 17, 1941: Daden, Pa.—Pennsylvania Railroad train carrying United States soldiers wrecked.

March 18, 1941: Ravenna, Ohio—derailment of train carrying 750 United States Government workers to new arsenal.

March 20, 1941: Pittsburgh, Pa.—earthslide buried railroad tracks.

April 1, 1941: Stewartsville, Va.—freight train carrying defense orders (explosion).

Above list furnished by Joseph Leib Research Bureau, Washington, D. C.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 482. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio;

S. 1254. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters;

H. R. 2082. An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3252. An act to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Martime Commission, and for other purposes.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4183, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading, "Quartermaster Corps—Cemeterial Expenses", on page 2, line 1, after

the word "employees", to insert "purchase of land."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Corps of Engineers—rivers and harbors," on page 6, line 22, after the words "by law", to strike out "$63,100,040" and insert "$68,268,640, of which $1,500,000 shall be available for improvement of Boston Harbor as recommended in House Document No. 362, Seventy-sixth Congress, $45,000 for improvement of the channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C., as recommended in House Document No. 313, Seventy-sixth Congress, and $60,000 for improvement of Silver Lake Harbor, N. C., as recommended in House Document No. 325, Seventy-sixth Congress, all as authorized by the National Defense River and Harbor Act approved October 17, 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control", on page 8, line 15, after the words "by law", to strike out "$71,129,000" and insert "$72,680,000."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not altogether conversant with the nature of the amendment just stated, or the reason why this action was taken by the Senate committee. I am advised that there is some disagreement among the Members of the Senate regarding the attitude of the committee, and that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], our eminent leader, desires to have the House language restored, in other words, desires that we reject the Senate committee amendment. I do not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to accept such a proposal. If not, I should want to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator from Kentucky is on his way to the Chamber, and will no doubt be here in a moment.

Mr. McNARY. If there is to be any controversy over the matter, I should want a quorum present anyway.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think it would be well to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Mo.	McCarran
Aiken	Connally	McFarland
Andrews	Danaher	McNary
Austin	Davis	Maloney
Bailey	Downey	Mead
Ball	Ellender	Murdock
Bankhead	George	Murray
Barbour	Gerry	Norris
Barkley	Gillette	Nye
Bilbo	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bone	Green	Overton
Brewster	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bridges	Gurney	Reed
Brooks	Hatch	Reynolds
Brown	Hayden	Russell
Bulow	Herring	Schwartz
Bunker	Hill	Shipstead
Burton	Holman	Smathers
Butler	Hughes	Smith
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Capper	La Follette	Taft
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Tobey
Truman	Vandenberg	White
Tunnell	Van Nuys	Willis
Tydings	Wallgren	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent in the performance of official duty as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors at the Naval Academy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, when the quorum was called we had reached the amendment on page 8.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee. I move to strike out the figures "$72,680,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$79,234,000." I will say just a word in explanation of the amendment I am offering.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of $70,000,000 for flood-control work under projects heretofore authorized by law. The House inserted a provision on page 8 providing that $7,683,035 should be immediately available "and exclusively for expenditure upon projects on account of which allotments heretofore have not been made." So under that language $7,683,035 would be taken out of the appropriation in the bill as it passed the House for the continuation of projects already under construction.

There are nine projects involved in the provision, a list of which I will give from the hearings. These projects are recommended by the War Department as the nine most urgent in the entire country for flood control and for national defense.

A list of the projects appears on page 81 of the hearings. The projects are the Almond Reservoir, N. Y.; Buffalo Bayou, Tex., at Houston; Louisville, Ky.; Newport, Ky.; Huntington, W. Va.; Wolf Creek Reservoir, on the Cumberland River; Wood River levee, in Illinois; Tacoma, Wash., project; Dorena Reservoir, in Oregon.

The House undertook to earmark $7,683,035 to begin these nine projects.

In the hearings before the committee it was testified by Brigadier General Robins, representing Major General Schley, Chief of Engineers, that these projects had all been approved by the War Department, and recommended as the nine most urgent in the United States, from the standpoint of flood control and national defense, but the engineers did not want the amount of money made available for beginning these projects to be taken out of the appropriation for the continuation of projects already under construction. In the hearings it will appear that General Robins suggested that instead of taking it out of the $71,000,000-plus contained in the bill, new money be provided for the beginning of these projects.

While there were nine projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers, the committee has included one, at Huntington, W. Va., which I think ought to be agreed to by the Senate, and it has added one project in Oklahoma, calling for $450,000, which is not included in the nine projects to which I have referred, and I will say to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma that I have no objection to the inclusion of that item for Oklahoma.

My amendment simply enables the War Department to begin the other eight of these nine projects which they urge, by the appropriation of new money for that purpose, instead of taking it out of the appropriation provided for existing projects which are now under construction.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. If I understand the Senator from Kentucky correctly, it is his purpose to have the Senate disagree with the proposed committee amendment, and to add——

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I will say to the Senator from Oregon that if my amendment is agreed to, adding this amount to the appropriation, which will provide new money for these projects, I will not have any objection to the Senate committee amendment striking out the House language, which takes the money out of the amount available for the projects already under construction. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma, as chairman of the subcommittee, and in charge of the bill, will accept my amendment.

I do not wish to go into detailed discussion of the items of the bill, but there are one or two with which I am familiar. For instance, we all recall the flood in the Ohio River Valley in 1937. As a result of that flood and other floods in the country, we passed the flood-control bill. Surveys were made in the Ohio River Valley, among them being one at Louisville, Ky. The Army engineers in cooperation with the city of Louisville made a detailed study for the purpose of providing against a recurrence of the damage which was inflicted upon that community by the flood of 1937. Under the arrangement the city of Louisville was to put up one and one-half million dollars to purchase rights-of-way and to do other preliminary work incident to the flood wall, plus $1,000,000 for sewage disposal made necessary by the construction of the wall, all of which involved a two-and-one-half-million-dollar bond issue. It was necessary to go before the legislature in order to get an enabling act, and the election could not be held until November 1940. All this was done under the encouragement and with the cooperation of the engineers of the War Department. The project had been agreed to, but a bond issue had to be authorized in order to raise the two and one-half million dollars that Louisville was to put up. The election

could not be held until last November. The election was held, and by the more than two-thirds vote required by the State constitution the people provided for the issue of bonds for the necessary two and a half million dollars. If it had not been for that requirement the flood wall at Louisville would already be under construction, and therefore would come under the appropriation. The same thing occurred at Newport, Ky. I speak of these projects because naturally I know more about them than I do about the other projects throughout the country.

In the city of Louisville and in the vicinity of Louisville $124,000,000 is at this time involved in defense enterprises. I shall not go into the details. Fort Knox is close by. Across the Ohio River in Indiana a $75,000,000 powder plant is being constructed by the Du Pont interests.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is now in operation, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is not quite finished. But if a flood should occur in the Ohio Valley similar to that which occurred in 1937, it would absolutely paralyze this $75,000,000 investment made by the Government of the United States. There are other defense enterprises in progress. All of them add up to $124,000,000.

In Newport the Andrews Steel Co. and the Newport Rolling Mills are now engaged almost exclusively in the production of defense articles under contract with the War Department. In the fall of 1937 those factories were closed from the middle of January to the middle of March—2 months. We all know what would happen if a similar thing should occur now. The people have, under the encouragement and with the cooperation of the War Department, through the engineers, voted to provide their share of the expenses, and that money is now available.

The same thing may be said of all nine of these projects. There is one in Texas, one in New York, one in Illinois, one in Washington, one in Oregon, and others in other States. The only objection the engineers had to the provision in the House bill was that it subtracted from the total amount they had available in this bill for the continuation of projects now under construction. All these projects had been recommended by the engineers. They are authorized by law.

I hope the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senate will accept my amendment, so work may be begun on these necessary, essential, indispensable projects which are intended and designed to accomplish and will accomplish the result of protecting immense investments by the Government of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to ascertain if I distinctly understand the Senator's proposal. As I understand, he concurs in the action taken by the committee in striking out the provision in the bill which requires that $7,000,000-plus must be used for new projects. The committee made that recommendation, I may say to the Senator, on the following statement made by the Assistant Chief of Engineers:

> The proviso now in the appropriation bill calling for the initiation of new projects will require the Department to make a blanket cut of 10 percent in the allotments which it proposed to make under the original Budget figure of $70,000,000. It is probable that this cut will prevent the Department from acquiring during the fiscal year 1942 lands in reservoir areas where dams will be completed during this and the next fiscal year. Furthermore, essential highway and railway locations for certain reservoir projects now nearing completion will have to be postponed until the fiscal year 1943, so that the reservoirs themselves cannot be operated until that fiscal year. With this reduction it will also be necessary to postpone the construction of essential pumping plants for local protection projects throughout the country with the result that these projects will not afford the protection for which they are designated until after the fiscal year 1942.

Then he said:

> The proviso now in the War Department civil appropriation bill calling for the initiation of new flood-control projects during fiscal year 1942 will not only affect the construction program of the Department, but it will also seriously curtail its design activities. It will unquestionably be necessary to reduce further the present design forces which have already been cut due to the limited appropriations for the present fiscal year. Since the work of this personnel is highly specialized and requires intensive training and technical knowledge, its loss will be a serious handicap in carrying out essential planning for new projects. Consequently the Department will be very much handicapped in placing such projects under construction when the present emergency is over and funds for such work become available in the future.

That will be the natural effect of allowing the House language to stand. General Robins, the Assistant Chief of Engineers, further said:

> The Department is of the opinion that if new flood-control projects are to be initiated during the fiscal year 1942 it is in the best interests of the United States, from the viewpoint of both economy and efficiency, to increase the Department's proposed appropriations for that fiscal year to take care of such new projects as Congress may desire to initiate rather than to curtail the funds which will be available for the continuation of its present construction program.

That is what the Senator from Kentucky proposes to do?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is exactly what I propose to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. In other words, the Senator would follow the recommendation made by Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely. I do not want to curtail the funds appropriated for flood-control works already under construction. From the $7,683,000 which is earmarked in the House bill I have subtracted the $1,129,000 that was earmarked for Huntington, W. Va., which leaves $6,554,000. That is the sum by which I attempt to increase the appropriation, so that the recommendations of the Army engineers may be carried out and they may begin the nine new projects without in any way impinging on the appropriation carried in the bill for the continuation of the projects already under construction.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement for the RECORD before we get away from this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I wish to clarify the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. I think he is in error in his tabulation. I think he means to increase the amount carried in the bill to the sum of $79,234,035.

Mr. BARKLEY. I left off the $35 because I did not think it was important so as to have a round sum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask the Senator from Kentucky if he has any objection to correcting the amount in his amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection, and I will modify my amendment so as to make the amount $79,234,035.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I wish to add my appeal to that of the able Democratic leader, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I think it would be a very grave mistake to conform to the action of the Senate committee.

I do not wish to cover the same ground covered by the Senator from Kentucky, but I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will favorably consider the amendment and place it in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show what has been done to date.

The Board of Army Engineers recommended to the Budget Bureau certain projects and certain sums. The Budget Bureau reduced the amount to an even $70,000,000. In the consideration of the bill the House decided to limit the appropriations practically to the Budget estimate. After it had made that decision it was decided to increase the number of projects, but still retain the same amount of money, so a provision was placed in the bill setting aside $7,683,035 of the $70,000,000, with which to start nine new projects, which would commit the Congress to a total expenditure in future years of approximately $55,000,000.

The Senate committee did not see fit to take during the next 12 months the $7,683,035 from the other projects the construction of which had been approved, and so the committee struck out the proviso on the theory that if the Congress should desire to start new projects, it had better make direct appropriations with which to start them.

As the matter now stands, if the Senate agrees to the committee amendment, no new projects will be started under the terms of this bill. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is agreed to, we shall go forward with the projects approved by the Budget Bureau, in the total sum of $70,000,000, and add to that sum approximately $7,000,000 with which to start nine new projects, which means committing the Congress and the Government to a total expenditure in the future of $55,000,000 over and above what the Congress is now committed to spend.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That sum would be spread over a period of years.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Depending upon the amount that may be economically expended each year, just as the appropriations for the projects already under construction have been spread.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The issue before the Senate is, Do we desire to authorize the starting of nine new projects costing $7,000,000 this year, and in the future, next year, the year after, and possibly the following year—because, as a rule, about 4 years are required to complete one of these projects—to spend $55,000,000 more? That is a decision which only the Senate can make. The House has agreed to start these projects by taking $7,000,000 from the allocations to the projects now under construction. The Senate committee did not want to follow that procedure. The Senate committee did not pass upon the question as to whether or not we should start nine new projects, representing a total cost over the years of $55,000,000 and a cost this year of approximately $7,000,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think the importance of flood-control projects should be underestimated by Senators. I was the Governor of my State in 1937, when we suffered perhaps the most disastrous flood in all the history of the country. Eight hundred thousand people were driven from their homes temporarily because of that flood; and the waters of the Ohio and its tributaries flooded all the territory from Catlettsburg to Hickman.

I hope the amendment of my colleague will be agreed to, for the reason that, in accordance with plans already made, the city of Louisville and the city of Newport have done everything they have been called upon to do, and it seems to me it would be a great mistake to permit to continue the prospect of a great loss to important defense industries. One of such industries is a powder plant, which is very important to the country. If a flood similar to the one of 1937 should occur in the Ohio River Valley, the defense industries would suffer great loss.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if my colleague will permit me and the Senator from Oklahoma will yield, I will say that the flood of 1937 caused a damage of more than $70,000,000 to the community of Louisville alone, and $400,000,000 in the Ohio Valley. If a similar flood should occur in the future it would cost the Government of the United States, because of the defense enterprises, more than the entire $55,000,000 which would be spent on all nine of these projects over the period of years required to complete their construction.

Mr. CHANDLER. In 1937 General Markham was Chief of Engineers. Together we followed the line of the flood and viewed the damage. The statement of my colleague is entirely correct. These projects may be called new projects, but they are projects which should have been undertaken long ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are projects which are already approved, and would now be under construction if it had not been for the constitutional and legal technicalities which the communities had to meet in order to raise their part of the appropriation to buy rights-of-way and make other preliminary expenditures so that the Government would not be charged with such expenditures.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know the facts with respect to projects in other States, but I do know that the Wolf Creek project is very important, particularly to Louisville and Newport, and also to all the people of the United States, because of the importance of defense industries at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may appear on the surface that Kentucky has more flood-control projects than any other State. That is perfectly natural because of the geographical situation. The Ohio River borders Kentucky River on the north all the way from West Virginia to Missouri. North of Kentucky are Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Flood-control projects are already under construction on the other side of the river, and if it appears that there are more such projects in the State of Kentucky than in other States, that situation grows out of the fact that Kentucky borders the Ohio River south of three other States of the Union. Therefore, in proportion to the mileage of the Ohio River as between Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, the number of projects is not out of proportion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] will accept the amendment offered by my colleague. If he does not feel that he can do so, I certainly hope the Senate will write such a provision into the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the only question involved is whether the $7,000,000 shall be taken out of the fund appropriated for projects already under construction or whether it shall be added to the total amount so that the projects in question may go forward with what may be called new money.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, since the committee took no action toward authorizing the construction of the new projects, but rather took adverse action, hearings were not held on the necessity for the construction of the nine new projects.

The senior Senator from Kentucky makes the statement that a new powder plant has been constructed at Charlestown, in southern Indiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. At a cost of $75,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. At a cost of $75,000,000. In addition, I will say that the Goodyear Rubber Co. is constructing and will operate for the Government, with Government money, a plant for the manufacture of rubber products. The Navy is now constructing a shell-loading plant. All these expenditures by the Government of the United States amount to $124,000,000 or $125,000,000. The question is whether we want to protect that investment by beginning at this time to construct a flood wall, heretofore decided upon, and with respect to which the people in the various communities have voted their share of the contribution under the encouragement and advice of the Government of the United States, through the Army engineers, who have recommended the program.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to state to the Senator from Kentucky, if the Senator from Oklahoma will permit, that I have no objection to Kentucky's having any number of such projects, so far as that is concerned; but was it not unwise to locate them at places which are liable to be flooded?

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection I will say to the Senator that it became the policy of the War Department and of the Government—and I think it is a wise policy—to try to decentralize war defense enterprises, by locating them at various places throughout the country. The National Defense Council, the War Department, and the Navy Department, had to consider in the beginning the necessity for such decentralization.

Mr. HUGHES. But Kentucky is a fairly large State. Did they need to pick out particular places which may be flooded?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator is not raising a geographical question. The matter is broader than that. The National Defense Council, the War Department, the Navy Department, the entire Government, early in the defense program decided that it would not be wise to concentrate defense enterprises in certain sections of the country. They gave out a statement, which was published in the newspapers, to the effect that they would decentralize war or defense enterprises and would put some of them in the Middle West. They have done so. In the process of decentralization, because of industrial activities, transportation facilities, and other equations, they located a few of the defense enterprises—only a few—in the Ohio Valley. Some of them have been located in Kentucky, some in Illinois, some in Ohio, some in Indiana.

Mr. HUGHES. What I have in mind, if the Senator will permit me to state it, is that, according to what has been stated here, the War Department, or whoever has the authority in locating these projects in the State of Kentucky, appears to have selected locations which are constantly in danger of flood and the damage which would come from flood. I am in sympathy with the legislation which has been enacted designed to prevent floods, and I voted for it; but where a city is so located that there is any danger of floods, I do not think the War Department should select that particular place as the site of an expensive plant which will be constantly in danger of being flooded, and I do not think that then the representatives of the War Department should come here and ask that because of

such flood danger we appropriate money to protect the plant.

I desire to say further that, as I recall, it has been stated during this session—I believe the Secretary of the Treasury so stated—that the policy of the Government would be not to engage in any new projects that could be avoided. There are in my State, for instance, a number of small drainage projects for the cleaning out of rivers, for example; but I cannot get any money for them, because I am told all the time that while the projects have been authorized, and while the Engineer Department has approved them, the policy this year and probably next year and during the time when we are engaging in the defense program is that money will not be available for such projects, and that we should stand by or should abide by the Budget.

In this bill, as I understand, it is proposed to exceed by about $8,000,000 what the House has provided, and to commit us to these nine projects which over the years will carry—I forget what the Senator from Oklahoma stated as the amount.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Fifty-five million dollars.

Mr. HUGHES. Fifty-five million dollars. It seems to me we are constantly getting away from what was understood, or what I understood, at least, at the beginning of the session, that we would not make such appropriations while we were in need of money for defense purposes; and, of course, we will need vast sums of money for them.

I think the Senate should follow the general trend of opinion of the country; that it should not appropriate money, which, of course, will have to be paid by more taxes, to carry on ordinary projects for which in other years we have been appropriating.

I cannot quite make up my mind that I am justified in voting for the amendment, and I do not know that I can make up my mind that I am justified in voting to commit ourselves to the nine new projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Delaware, for whom I have, as he knows, an affectionate regard, that whether the War Department and the Defense Council have acted wisely or unwisely in the location of these plants, they have been located. One of the largest plants involved in the whole defense set-up is a plant located by the Du Pont Co., from the Senator's own State, in Charlestown, Ind., in southern Indiana, across the river from Louisville.

Mr. HUGHES. They did not locate it, I presume; the War Department did.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; they sat in at the meeting held to decide on the location.

Mr. HUGHES. I think they usually have more shrewdness and judgment than that.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the location of plants, of course, the private corporation which is to build and operate the plant sits in with the Defense Council and the War Department in deciding on the location. That is true in every case. But regardless of all that, the plants have been located, and they have been located in pursuance of a program to decentralize defense industries and not to have them all in one place—to put them out in the Middle West, where they might be safe from bombing.

Mr. HUGHES. It seems to me we should stand by the program with which we started, or at least with which I understood we started. If we allow the War Department or any other defense set-up constantly to come back to Congress for more and more money because they have authorized a thing to be done, we shall be getting further and further away from the understanding we had, that during the time when we were appropriating vast sums of money for defense we would slow down on the appropriations for rivers and harbors and all that kind of thing.

It seems to me that we should do one of two things; we should either open the floodgates and let everyone come here and get money for carrying forward nondefense projects, or we should stand by what was understood, and not indulge in anything that is not absolutely necessary while we are voting vast sums of money for defense and while we are raising more and more taxes. I think we should have a fixed policy about such projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's views, but I desire to say that more than that is involved in this issue. In the first place, the Army engineers recommended certain projects as being urgent, and the nine projects here involved are on the urgent list of the War Department. They sent them to the Budget Bureau. The Budget Bureau recommended only $70,000,000 to the Congress, and there is a question whether we are to be bound hand and foot by a recommendation by the Budget Bureau simply because it happens to be the Budget Bureau's recommendation, for which I have, as a rule, a very great respect.

But the House itself has exceeded the recommendation of the Budget Bureau by nearly $2,000,000, and the bill reported by the Senate committee exceeds the Budget Bureau's recommendation by more than $2,000,000. The committee's report—and I am for it—includes one of the nine projects, in Huntington, W. Va., which I believe is essential. It has included a $450,000 project in Oklahoma, which was originally a reclamation project, but which has now become a flood-control or national-defense project.

I think we can depend upon it that the Army engineers will not recommend a project which is not worthy of consideration. If one of the nine projects which they have recommended is to be included in the bill, I do not think it can be urged as more important than the other eight. Neither the House nor the Senate committee has kept within the $70,000,000, which was the arbitrary ceiling fixed by the Budget Bureau; and, in the face of the urgent recommendation of the War Department, and the testimony of General Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, that these projects are urgent, but that they do not want to take the money for them out of appropriations available for projects already under construction, the question for the Senate to decide is whether as a matter of justice it should include this item. The Senate would be well within its rights in so doing.

It seems to me we should add this sum—it is not $7,000,000, it amounts only to six and a half million dollars, added to the seventy-two million-plus—in order that they may go ahead and build these projects for national defense and flood control. I believe the construction of one of them might save the Government more money than is involved in the entire appropriation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to yield as we go along, but I think some of these matters should be cleared up.

In the first place, there was no argument or testimony produced before the committee in support of any of these propositions save one, and that is the one for Huntington, W. Va. At that point they are building a river wall in three sections, commencing, of course, at the bottom of the river. They have completed section No. 1 and section No. 2 up to what might be called the little high-water mark, but not the real high-water mark. So, unless section No. 3 is completed, the two sections already completed afford but little protection against floods.

The testimony shows that at Huntington, W. Va., is located the only nickel-manufacturing plant in the United States and it was testified that right now nickel is a most important metal in connection with national defense.

So, because of the testimony given to the committee, the committee apparently was convinced that that item should be allowed. Had the same argument been made in behalf of the others, no doubt the committee would have taken a different view as to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that my colleague and I were guilty of negligence in not appearing before the Appropriations Committee on the other items. I had no intimation that the committee was going to make an amendment of this sort and strike out the provision of the House bill. If I had, I certainly would have appeared. I am not complaining, for it is not the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to notify Senators that an item in which they may be interested is under consideration; but I certainly would have appeared before the committee and stated what I have said here if I had had the slightest intimation that the committee intended to make any change in the language.

I wish to say that I think the amendment I have offered is a better solution of the problem than the language of the House bill, because it does grant six and a half million dollars of new money for these urgent projects. If I had known the committee were going to make any change in the House bill, I certainly would have appeared before them, and

advocated what I have urged on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like to make another statement, then I shall be glad to yield.

I am not impressed, and certainly not convinced, that this money is necessary to protect the powder plant in Charlestown, Ind. I am not advised; but I cannot believe now that the defense organization would have located a powder plant at a point where a flood would destroy the powder or make it wet. I am not an expert on powder, but I understand that wet powder is not of much benefit.

The Senator states that a rubber plant has been located in that rainy section which is subject to floods. I can understand why a rubber plant should be located at that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not contending that the plant at Charlestown, Ind., which is on the Ohio River, necessarily would itself be inundated by a flood, but that plant was located out in an open field in southern Indiana. They had no housing facilities; they have had to construct them, and to provide for them in part in the city of Louisville. A large percentage of the employees at the powder plant, and the rubber plant also, are drawn from the city of Louisville. If a flood should occur similar to that which occurred in 1937, which did $400,000,000 worth of damage in that valley, it would absolutely cut the powder plant and the rubber plant off not only from the supplies which must be carried to them, but the labor upon which they depend to carry on operations. So, the entire community there is involved in the question of protection against the occurrence of such a disaster as that which took place in 1937.

I may say that the same thing happened in Pittsburgh, Pa., where the steel industry is located, indeed, where it is concentrated. It might as well be argued that all the steel plants should be moved from Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio. The Monongahela River and the Allegheny River join at Pittsburgh to make the Ohio River; and Pittsburgh and Steubenville and Parkersburg, W. Va., and all the other industrial centers between Pittsburgh and Cairo, Ill., were damaged and inundated by the flood in 1937. So, if the logic of the situation requires that no plant be located where it might be damaged by flood, the same logic would require the removal of all the plants from Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and other places, even in Connecticut. Last year we appropriated money to protect from flood Hartford, Conn., on the Connecticut River, where the United Aircraft enterprise is located.

I am not seeking any geographical advantage. In the consideration of these measures, I never think of geography. I think only of where the need is, and I dare say that the RECORD may be searched in vain for any vote I have cast against protecting any community, certainly where a national-defense industry is located, by adequate appropriations, regardless of where it may be located.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. My friend from Oklahoma is very much interested in the Military Establishment and in the Army of the United States. We have in Kentucky, Fort Knox, which is a great military post and which is above flocdwater unless the flood should exceed all the records of the past. That post has been located there for a long time; it is not a recent designation. In Campbell County, Ky., there is Fort Thomas, which is near Newport, Ky. The Senator has visited those military establishments.

I wish to impress upon the Members of the Senate that this is no new project. It is a project which should have been completed long ago for the protection of the great city of Louisville, Ky. In 1937, when the flood came, the city was virtually promised that, as speedily as possible, the Government would work with the city and the State in trying to provide measures whereby such a flood would not occur again.

I wish to say, in case Members of the Senate think we have a country that floods for no reason at all, that the flood of 1937 was unusual and unprecedented. It was like the rains of California which come occasionally, and it was like the lack of sunshiny days at Miami Beach and other places. Every now and then such conditions occur; but we never before had such a flood as that of 1937, and, even if we had, it would not have affected Fort Knox or Fort Thomas. They are high up in the hills and rugged country of Kentucky. The du Pont Co.'s plant recently located at Charlestown is not in a flood area on its own account, but if such a flood as came in 1937 should occur, nobody could get to it or from it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield, with the permission of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. Notwithstanding the fact that Fort Knox is close to Louisville, and is on high ground above the floodwater, Fort Knox is required to get its supplies from the people of Louisville, and in the flood of 1937 the highway between Louisville and Fort Knox was completely inundated so that there was no communication. The same condition might prevail as to Fort Thomas, near Newport. These projects, these flood walls which the Government of the United States promised these communities, and because of which they bonded themselves, are intended to protect not only the city within its corporate limits, but to protect the valleys between the cities and the military posts, which, if shut off from their communications and their supplies, would suffer untold damage.

Mr. CHANDLER. In 1937, in order to get supplies from the Army post to the distressed people in that section, they had to go over the railroad tracks and railroad bridges in order to get out of that area at all. If it was a mistake to locate Fort Knox, and place 30,000 soldiers there, the mistake was made long ago. We spent millions of dollars there and placed practically all the gold the people of the world have in Fort Knox; and it is there now. Fort Thomas was established a long time ago. The problem is not a new one; it is of long standing. If the place involved were Oklahoma City or Wilmington, Del., and it had the prospect of being completely flooded, as the Ohio Valley was in 1937, and the flood could be guarded against by the expenditure of a very small amount of money, I would not vote to have it face the danger of a flood such as that of 1937.

I did not have anything to do with locating defense industries at Charlestown or the other places. I do not say it was wise or unwise; but the industries are there, and they are entitled to some protection, especially when we view also the fact that thousands of people who live in the area are entitled to protection from the floodwaters.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. I have been somewhat concerned over the statement of the Senator from Kentucky that the United States Government promised to do these things. Having followed the matter, I am totally unaware of the United States Government having bound itself to do them. The United States Government authorizes various projects. The authorizations are not promises of construction. They represent approval of the projects, but no promise is involved in the authorization. No promise is involved even in the appropriation; but certainly until the appropriation is made the Congress has not committed itself. It seems to me it is crowding the situation a little to say that these appropriations must be made because the United States promised to make them.

I happen to live in a community which has suffered from a flood far greater in proportion than that which afflicted Louisville some years ago—not in value, not in numbers, but in the proportion of the community. More than a third of the city in which I live was wiped out. Several hundred people were drowned; and that little community proceeded to construct its own flood works. It imposed upon itself an indebtedness representing a third of its assessed valuation in order to protect itself against flood. We had not learned at that time that all the obligation to protect everybody who settles in a flood area is upon the United States Government. We set about protecting ourselves, and our community footed the bills, and we are now suffering from the resulting tax load.

It seems to me that I have never heard more severe criticism of the defense organization of the country than that which has been suggested here when we are told that plants of a cost of $124,000,000 have been deliberately put into an area subject to flood. The decentralization is entirely proper. The Senator from Kentucky is right; there should be decentralization; but certainly the flood plain of the Ohio River is not the only place in which industry can be decen-

tralized. Kentucky is filled with high ground. I am inclined to think that those who located the plants investigated the danger of flood, and that it is somewhat less than the Senator imagines. I cannot conceive of the engineers under a defense project deliberately locating $124,000,000 or more of essential defense industries in an area imminently subject to flood, and we are told that these projects are the most pressing in the United States.

If the committee's provision stands, there is nothing in the bill to prevent the use of $72,000,000 for the construction of these particular projects. If they meet the condition which the two Senators from Kentucky announce, if they are the most emergent projects, if the Army engineers believe so, it is their duty to go in there and construct them. They are not limited to old projects. The Senate committee merely struck out the provision which compelled the construction of new projects, but they did not take from the Army engineers the power to construct new projects. Within this appropriation is full authority to do this work if it is of the emergent character which the Senators indicate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true, as I read the House report, that what the House did was to say, "We have allowed a certain amount to continue existing works," which is about sixty-five or sixty-six million dollars? Then the House committee said, as I understand, "You cannot use all of that $65,000,000 on the list of old projects that you have given us. You must take 10 percent of it, $6,500,000, and use it on new projects, and you must take that out of the old projects wherever you think it can best be taken out."

As I read the House report, that is the effect of the House committee's action.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. So, as a matter of fact, under the House provision—I see no reason why the House provision should not be restored—we would provide for these projects which are said to be necessary for national defense. I have no objection to the House provision, but I object to increasing the entire appropriation by $6,000,000 when neither the House nor the House committee nor the Senate committee has approved any such increase.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is correct as far as he goes. Of course, the point I was trying to make is that under the language of the bill as it would stand if the committee amendment were adopted there is nothing to prevent the Army engineers from constructing new projects. The amendment merely takes out the compulsion that new projects must be constructed. If the nine projects which have been mentioned, or some of them, are those most imminent, those which above all others demand construction, I cannot believe that the Army engineers will not recognize that fact and use the money accordingly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The argument of the Senator from Colorado that there is nothing in the law to prevent the Army engineers from using this money to start new projects is only technically true. The Senator from Colorado knows that the Army engineers will not use a dollar of it to start new projects, because the projects already under construction are those which the Army engineers in the beginning, following the enactment of the flood-control law, regarded as more important; and we might say for the sake of argument that those now under construction will be regarded by the Army engineers as more important than new projects, and therefore, unless directed by Congress, they will not take any money to start new projects from the appropriation made available for the continuation of existing projects already under construction. The nine projects which they have urgently recommended are the next important to those already under construction.

Mr. ADAMS. I misunderstood the Senator. I understood him to say that the nine projects were the most important projects in the whole country.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator now says they are the most important of those which have not been started.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. I did not mean to imply that the Army engineers regarded these nine projects as more important than those already started by their direction and on their recommendation; but I desire to make a further statement, if the Senator will permit me to do so. I do not want to take his time.

The Senator says there is no legal obligation on the part of the Government. There is not. Nobody contends that there is. There is no legal obligation.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator said the Government had promised to construct these projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did. I said that agents of the Government of the United States all up and down all these rivers, in cooperation with the local communities, worked out a flood-control program, made surveys, decided how much it would cost, and how much the local communities would be required to put up. Some of the communities were not required under the law to hold elections for the issue of bonds. They could put up their part of the money, and did so; and those projects are now under construction. Some of them, under constitutional limitations, were required to vote on the issue of bonds. I do say that when there is no legal obligation, we could stop in the middle of the construction of any dam or flood wall anywhere in the United States that is now in course of construction, and for which we have made appropriations. We would not violate any legal obligation to the people of those communities and those valleys if we should stop construction tomorrow.

But when the Congress of the United States enacts a flood-control act, and the engineers representing the Government make surveys, and confer with local communities, and decide where flood walls should be built, decide how much they would cost, decide among themselves how much the communities should contribute to the enterprises and, based upon that decision and that cooperation, the officials of the local communities go to the legislature and get the required authority to hold an election, and submit the matter to the people and the people vote by the required two-thirds, there is a moral equation which enters into the situation, as to whether the Government of the United States, after those steps have been taken, should then say to communities which have gone to the expense of issuing bonds, under the encouragement of the Government, "We cannot do anything for you now for the reason that other communities have gotten in ahead of you because they had the money available at the time and could go forward."

I do not contend there is any legal obligation, but I do say that Congress has the right to consider the steps taken by the Government after it had passed a law on the subject to meet the situation; and those steps have been made in these particular cases.

Mr. ADAMS. Would that be true in each of these nine cases?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not able to say whether in each case it was necessary to issue bonds, or whether that has been done. Probably in some of the cases the communities have not done so. Other Senators, who are familiar with the projects in their particular States, can give the Senator detailed information about that. I am speaking of those about which I know. But I do say that the Army engineers have made no distinction among these nine which they have urgently recommended as the next important step to be taken in connection with flood control and defense protection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Just one further word, if the Senator will indulge me.

I think Congress has authorized flood projects which involve the expenditure of from $600,000,000 to perhaps a billion dollars, if they shall be constructed. The question here is whether at this time, when tremendous expenditures are being demanded for defense purposes, we should undertake to commit the Government to an extra expenditure of $55,000,000, in addition to the very large expenditures now being undertaken. We are being told every day that we must make some reductions in our nondefense expenditures. The House endeavored to do that. I am very much impressed with the statement made by the Senator from Delaware, and I believe that the action of the committee was correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The table of projects on pages 83, 84, and 85 of the Senate committee hearings includes these nine projects within the $71,000,000, figures

for the other projects having been scaled down.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I am sure it does.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, it includes them only under the House language, which has been stricken out by the Senate committee. If the amendment shall be agreed to without any additional amendment, not one of these nine projects can be started.

Mr. TAFT. I am perfectly willing to restore the House language, so far as I am personally concerned, but I object to increasing the whole appropriation by $7,000,000. After the House passed the bill the Army engineers revised the amounts to be spent on existing projects, and cut them down in every case. For instance, the Cincinnati project is cut from $1,800,000, as it was in the original budget, to $1,615,000. They have cut roughly 10 percent from all existing projects in order to provide the money for the new projects. That policy is satisfactory, or should be.

Mr. BARKLEY. They only did so because of the language of the House amendment, which required that they take the $7,000,000 for beginning the new projects. But General Robins testified before the committee that the Army engineers objected to that because it would postpone the completion of projects already under construction, and would interfere with their program. They only cut them, because if this language is to remain in the bill, they have to cut them down, not because they want to do so or think it is wise.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator as to the value of the flood-control program in the Ohio Valley, but it will take about $250,000,000 to finish the Ohio Valley improvement and protect the Ohio River. There are large sections which cannot be protected at all by flood-control walls, and the railroads, particularly, cannot be protected. If any such flood occurs as the flood in 1937, at least two transcontinental roads will be stopped entirely for periods of 3 or 4 weeks. This flood control is infinitely more important to national defense than the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, so far as that is concerned. Yet it does not seem to me that we are justified in going ahead with that tremendous project, costing $250,000,000 or $300,000,000, and forcing it through on any ground of national defense. It will not be finished during any present war, so far as we can judge. I think it is all right to pick out particular projects, but if we do that, I see no reason why we should not cut down on a great many of the other projects which have no relation to defense, local projects, to the extent of 10 percent, which means it will delay final completion about a month. It seems to me that if action is to be taken to proceed with the defense projects in which the Senator from Kentucky is interested, it should be done by restoring the House language and rejecting the Senate committee amendment, and not by increasing the appropriations by $7,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio does not seem to realize that in establishing defense industries they must be located where there is transportation. The Government cannot go out into a desert and locate a factory, where a railroad has to be built to it. Undoubtedly the position of the War Department and of the Defense Council, and of the Navy Department, all of them operating together, is that there should be decentralization. So they located some of these plants at Cincinnati. Of course, as the Senator knows, I am not objecting to that. The Wright Aeronautical Co., I believe, has located near Cincinnati a plant for the construction of airplanes.

Mr. TAFT. But very carefully located it outside the flood district.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, but it draws its employees and its supplies from an area which in the flood of 1937 was overflowed. They have to locate the plants close to rail and water transportation. There is transportation on the river. Some of these plants have been located where they are because it is possible to float supplies down the river and unload them on the bank. I think they have not been located at particular points which are flooded, but we cannot divorce Fort Knox and Fort Thomas or any of the other plants from the communities, the centers of population, near which they are located, and from which they draw their labor supply and their material supplies.

Mr. TAFT. My point is that the railroads in all that area are going to be put out of business by any flood like that of 1937, until we spend $250,000,000 in building reservoirs on all the headwaters of the Ohio. So far as the indirect effect on defense is concerned, that is something we cannot take care of, so far as this war is concerned.

I say very well, let us put flood walls around any place where there are defense projects, such as the Louisville flood wall, in which the Senator is interested. But while doing that, why should we not cut down on projects which have no relation to defense, which are not going to make the Ohio Valley flood proof by the remotest conception of the imagination? Why should we not cut down on nondefense flood-control projects, while providing money for those which do have direct relation to defense?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe the Senator from Ohio was mistaken about the flood-control project at Louisville. We would have had that had there not been a war at all.

Mr. TAFT. I am for the flood-control project in Louisville. I am willing that the Government go ahead with that.

Mr. CHANDLER. But it was not initiated as a defense project, because the idea originated before anyone heard of the war. We need it a little more now, perhaps, because of the defense situation.

In 1937 the engineers said that if their recommendations were followed it would not be necessary for Louisville to suffer any more floods. After they made the plans the people of Louisville got together and agreed to cooperate, and voted their bond issue. Now the money is available, and I do not like to see it taken from them. The same thing is true as to Newport.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, I agree with him 100 percent. I only say that in this appropriation of $70,000,000 for other projects it is possible to find a great many which are not related to defense, and there is no need to increase the appropriation the House made from $70,000,000 to $79,000,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Ohio to the extent that I am willing to vote for the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Kentucky, and if that does not succeed, I am willing to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, for these projects are important, not because originally they were essential for the national-defense program, but for the saving of lives. Millions of dollars' worth of property and a great many lives were lost in the flood of 1937. If we ever have the same kind of rains we had that year we will have the same kind of flood again in the Ohio River Valley. But the engineers said then, and they say now, that if money is made available they will see to it that such a flood does not again occur.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] asked General Robins this question:

> Senator HAYDEN. It builds a flood wall that completely protects the city of Louisville?
>
> General ROBINS. Well, it gives it as high a degree of protection as is economically feasible.

That is not a statement that it is going to protect definitely against floods.

Mr. CHANDLER. He was not Chief of Engineers in 1937, and the Chief of Engineers in 1937 said that if the Congress made sufficient money available the engineers could construct a flood wall to prevent the recurrence of such a flood as occurred that year.

Mr. TAFT. I was reading the statement made by General Robins in his testimony before the committee this year.

Mr. CHANDLER. But General Robins was not the Chief of Engineers in 1937.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know anything about the merits or demerits of these defense projects, but I was in Louisville just after the flood had subsided in 1937, and I saw the damage done to property at Louisville and to adjacent property up and down the river. I think it is the duty of the Government of the United States, and of the local and State governments, to protect the valuable property in that locality. I am not so much in favor of these large appropriations, but since we have gotten into the habit of making

them I will say that I do not know where the money could be used to better purpose, for I do not know of any place where disaster was written in such large capital letters as in Louisville after the flood of 1937. I do not think we should quibble about spending money for such purposes as this, when we have invited the people of the localities to cooperate. I think it is our duty to see that every possible protection is given the valuable property which has been built up along the Ohio River.

I hope the committee will see fit to accept the proposal made by the Senator from Kentucky. We ought not to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. The floodwaters rose to such height and the destruction of property was so great that I would not have believed what was said about it if I had not seen it with my own eyes. I know the people there are unfortunate because they are located as they are. We spend money on the arid regions of the West, which God did not intend people to try to farm. They do not have any rain there in 4 or 5 years, and then they sit down and howl to be fed and clothed and housed, when God did not intend anything but gophers and prairie rats to live there. Here in a prosperous section, which has been built up, is a tremendously prosperous city, which was nearly ruined by one visitation of Providence. It is our duty to do what we can for those people.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I find there are two sides to all these issues. In the committee not long ago a proposal was made to appropriate a sum of money to straighten a certain river so that a number of ships which were almost completed could be gotten out to the ocean. The advocates of that amendment urged that it was necessary for national defense to get these ships to the ocean where they could be serviceable. They did not go into the matter in detail, and when we went into the matter more fully we found that in a certain State, on a river which was not very large, many years ago a man started to build small ships, and he made a success of his small-ship building. As time went on ships became larger, and this shipbuilder began to build larger ships. He had no difficulty, however, in getting the ships down to the sea.

Recently a contract was let, and he was the successful bidder, and he began to build ships of still larger size. The inference from the testimony presented before the committee, to begin with, was that unless we provided money for the purpose of removing some rocks and corners and straightening the river, those ships could not be gotten out to the sea. Then this shipbuilder came before the committee and said he could get them to the sea, but that if the appropriation were made and the river slightly straightened and some rocks taken out of it, he could get the ships out much more quickly. The first statement made to the committee gave it the impression that the work was absolutely necessary to be done. The item being small, however, and believing that it was necessary to remove the rocks so the shipbuilder could get the ships out more quickly, and also get them to his yards for repair purposes, we allowed it.

I remember another situation which I think perhaps did not come before the committee. In San Francisco there existed for a long time a very famous airport called Crissy Field. It was one of the important airports of America and perhaps of the world. It had served its generation well. When airships were small, that field served the purpose with success. When larger and faster ships were built, this little airfield was not sufficiently large to accommodate them. It could not be extended. It ran into a mountain on one side, into another mountain on the other side, and into the sea on the third side, and the fourth side, I think, was completely built up with residences. It was necessary to abandon that field because it could not be extended. The authorities went some 28 miles north of San Francisco and located an airport in a swamp. They built a levee around the swamp, and ditched it, and then pumped the water out of the swamp, and now they have at Hamilton Field what I presume is one of the finest airports in America. It is level and because of its large area it is extremely serviceable. In times of high water, of course, it is somewhat difficult for airplanes to come in or leave. But this airport has certain advantages by reason of its peculiar location. It is located in a swamp, and immediately surrounding it is a large tract of water which is very shallow, so shallow that no ships of any considerable size can come into the great expanse of water immediately adjacent to the airport. When planes come in, they can circle around for a considerable distance over the shallow water where large ships cannot go. That is a compensation for building an airport, one may say, in a swamp, which makes necessary the building of levees around it, and pumping out the water when the water is there.

Mr. President, the committee finds itself without information on these projects except the one at Huntington, W. Va. As I said in the beginning, the House amendment necessitates the taking for these nine projects of a certain amount of money from existing projects, which would slow down the existing projects during the next 12 months.

In the end, in either event, they will cost the Treasury approximately $55,000,000. The committee was not willing, as I believe, to take that responsibility without referring the matter to the Senate.

I saw in the Senate this afternoon a rather alarming newspaper headline as follows:

Jesse Jones warns of $90,000,000,000 debt.

Mr. President, personally I have no objection to these items. The House has approved them in a way by agreeing to start them by taking money from the $70,000,000 allocation. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky is agreed to it will add to the $70,000,000 enough money to start these projects within the next 12 months. Then when we meet next year we will have Budget estimates for sufficient sums for each of them to carry them forward for another 12 months. I think the Senate ought to know exactly what it is voting on. I am not at liberty, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, to accept his amendment, but I think when the issue is made plain, the Senate can do justice to the subject by voting. So far as I am concerned, I am ready for a vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I must take issue with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] when he says that the deserts of our western States—which, of course, include my great State of Arizona—are not fit for anything but rats. That is a term that is usually applied to Members of Congress [laughter], and I do not think it ought to be applied to my people.

Mr. SMITH. I thought Arizona was a decent place. I did not have reference to Arizona. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. I must say that Nature has so constituted the other places mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that they need protection. I for one am in favor of giving them that protection, and placing the water back in the river. In Arizona, when the time comes, we shall want assistance in taking water out of the river and putting it on the soil.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the consideration of my amendment, but in reply to what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] said about the committee not having any information, let me say that the committee certainly has the information furnished by the War Department, which has recommended all these projects. The only objection the War Department had to the House provision was that it took the $7,000,000 away from projects already under construction, in order to begin new projects. In General Robins' testimony he said that if the Congress were to add the amount we are asking, so that the Department could start the projects, not only would the Department be satisfied, but that it had recommended such a course, the only difference being that it did not want to take the money out of appropriations for projects already under construction.

I hope the Senate will agree to my amendment. The sum requested is modest compared to the need. Of course it would commit the Congress to the completion of the projects. No one expects projects to be started and then stopped. The same thing applies to all projects. It applies to every reclamation project in the country.

I wish to reiterate that I have never taken a provincial view in these matters. I have voted for every appropriation for reclamation and irrigation that has been recommended by responsible officers of the Government for the entire West and Middle West. Notwithstanding the fact that those lands are arid, there will come a time some day—and it is rapidly approaching—when every acre of land in the United States must support more people than it ever supported before. We must protect the people on the arid

lands. God made those lands. God made the rivers. It may have been a crime to locate a city on one of them; but history shows that the nations which have made the best use of their navigable rivers have been the most prosperous and happy nations in the world.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment which was suggested before the Senate Appropriations Committee and which was adopted by the committee is different from the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky which is now being considered by the Senate. The question presented to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate was whether, out of the comparatively small allocation of $71,000,000 or $72,000,000 for existing flood-control projects, $7,000,000 should be taken to be devoted to new projects on which no work had been begun. It was the view of the Appropriations Committee that that sum should not be taken from the appropriation for existing projects.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is not to take any sum whatsoever from the allocation for existing projects but simply to make a rather modest increase in the appropriation to take care of new projects. The increase suggested by the Senator from Kentucky is not in excess of 10 percent of the total appropriation for flood-control purposes.

Mr. President, I take the view that we should not freeze flood-control work where it now is. We should not confine, restrict, and limit appropriations to existing projects on which work has actually been begun, and do nothing whatsoever toward advancing projects which have been authorized by the Congress. I think we should continue to make progress in flood-control work. It may be that during the present emergency, in view of the vast sums which are being appropriated for national defense, we should be conservative in the appropriations which are made for new flood-control work, but there ought not to be an absolute freezing of appropriations to projects on which contracts have been let and work has been begun.

Take, for example, the Tennessee Valley Authority. That is an authorized project, but from year to year we increase the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority. We add new projects to it. So also for various rivers and streams of the United States we add something year by year because the flood-control program not only vitally affects the people of the United States but on it a vast amount of work is to be done in the future. We must continue to make progress. I should not like to see the Congress go on record as closing down on flood-control work in the future and freezing it where it now is. Therefore, Mr. President, I propose to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the Ohio Valley is not being denied assistance under the appropriation recommended. Of the $72,000,000 in the bill, $20,000,000 is for the Ohio River division. It is not a neglected area. If the committee action is sustained, a series of 15 or 20 projects in the Ohio River Valley will be taken care of under the appropriation which the Army engineers have recommended. The projects in the Ohio Valley involve a total Federal cost of $134,000,000. To complete them will require $51,000,000, in addition to the money which is now appropriated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator realizes, as we all do, that, next to the Mississippi Valley, the Ohio Valley is the greatest river valley in the United States. It is a great industrial center. The total cost of completing the projects now under construction in the Ohio Valley would be only one-third of the damage done by one flood in that valley. So, when we consider what Congress has attempted to do in that particular valley because of its importance in the center of the United States, I think we must consider the cost of the efforts to protect that valley as compared with the damage done by a single flood in 30 days.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator understands that I am not opposed to flood control.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. ADAMS. However, I am concerned with the vast indebtedness with which we are confronted, and the tremendous daily expenses we are incurring. It seems to me that when there is a question as to a nondefense appropriation at this time we ought to exercise restraint.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that; and that is why I have offered only the modest amendment which I have offered. If it were not for the defense situation I have no doubt Congress would already have appropriated more money than is involved in the bill to carry out the program it adopted in the Flood Control Act of 1938.

Furthermore, when we talk about the Ohio Valley we must recognize that it runs all the way from Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Mississippi River. It runs through a number of States; and it is not quite fair simply to call attention to the projects which may exist in one State. The Ohio River runs for almost a third the length of the United States from east to west, and around it and in its valley is the greatest industrial activity in any river valley in the United States.

Mr. ADAMS. It is a most fortunate valley.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, during the discussion of this matter stress has been laid on the so-called flood-control wall of Louisville, Ky. This matter has been discussed as though out of the six or seven million dollars sought to be added to the pending appropriation bill nothing else is involved except the cost of the Louisville flood control. As I understand, some six or seven other items are included, among which is a project in the State of Oregon which is a flood-control matter; one in the State of New York, which is for flood control; one in the State of Illinois, on Wood River, which is a flood-control project—perhaps a levee—one in Texas; and the Wolf Creek Dam on the line between Kentucky and Tennessee, all of which aggregate only $6,500,000, so far as the present appropriation is concerned, the total over a period of years being only about $52,000,000.

Since the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has charge of the bill, may I ask him if I an. not substantially correct?

So it is not altogether confined to flood-control projects along the Ohio, but there are other projects of equal importance, the total cost of which is only about $50,000,000 or $52,000,000, not to be paid this year, but to be strung out over a period of years.

Of course, if the amendment of the senior Senator from Kentucky, proposing to add approximately six and a half million dollars, is adopted, then we do commit ourselves at least morally to the completion of all these projects; but it is not a matter of appropriating $50,000,000 or $55,000,000 this year, but of simply committing ourselves to this program over a period of years. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, because I think that during the discussion it may have been lost sight of, that we are considering projects in about eight or nine other States in addition to the Kentucky flood-control projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Only three of the nine are in the Ohio Valley. The others are out over the entire country.

Mr. TAFT. In fact, I think only two of the nine are in the Ohio Valley.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Wolf Creek Reservoir any particular defense significance in itself? I notice that of the $6,500,000, $2,500,000 are to go to the Wolf Creek Reservoir. I wonder if that has any defense significance.

Mr. BARKLEY. That has been recommended by the Army engineers not only as having flood-control value but defense value, in this respect, that in that entire area there is no plant for the purpose of generating the electric power required by industries, and recently it was necessary to locate an industry for the production of aluminum at Muscle Shoals, Ala., simply because there was no power available anywhere else. The industry had to be located where the power was generated.

Not only the War Department and the engineers but the Federal Power Commission, in an informal report to the War Department, the National Resources Planning Board, and the Defense Council, have all been giving consideration to this matter, not only from the standpoint of flood control, which affects a vast area in the valley of the Cumberland River, but also with respect to the possible location, at a place safe from invasion or attack, of industries which might seek power that would be incidental to the construction of the dam referred to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the arguments of the distinguished Senator—the general argument that we would like to have the power—might be made in favor of 100 or 200 dams in the United States. In addition to the $2,500,000 in this $7,000,000, this project will cost at least $14,000,000 to complete, and its completion will require at least 4 years more. It has not the slightest relation to national defense in any way, any more than any public improvement in the United States or any improvement which increases the production of power in the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that there are 200 other dams which might be constructed with a view to developing power in connection with flood control, but none of those happens to be recommended by the engineers or the War Department. I do not think the engineers are sentimental about this matter. They have recommended the matter not only from the point of view of flood control but from the point of view of national defense; and if the Senator will read the hearings he will see that the item is allocated both to flood control and to national defense.

Mr. TAFT. It is just like the St. Lawrence seaway, which will not be finished for 4 years, and will not be finished before the war is over.

Mr. BARKLEY. The St. Lawrence seaway is not before this body for consideration. When it is, it will be passed on upon its merits. It has no relation to this matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago in the debate the Senator from Ohio read part of the testimony of General Robins before the committee. He did not read quite far enough, and I desire to read just two lines:

Senator HAYDEN. We were told of the serious damage—

That was at Louisville—

a year or two ago, and that will cure it?

That is the $4,500,000 project, of which $800,000 is made available by this appropriation.

General ROBINS. Yes.

I desire to repeat the statement I made a short while ago, that the engineers advised me in 1937 that if this money were made available, and if the job were done properly, it would prevent a recurrence of the terrible flood that did such terrific damage to the property and took so many lives of our people. Provision for that project is included in the amendment, and I urge the Members of the Senate to support the amendment offered by my colleague.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to say I am quite familiar with the Louisville project, but that project is taking $800,000 whereas the Wolf Creek Reservoir is taking $2,500,000 out of this $6,500,000 increase.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Ohio is aware of the fact that Louisville is making available $2,500,000 of its own.

Mr. TAFT. Well, the city of Cincinnati, which is my home, is making available $5,000,000, which more than matches the amount of money the Federal Government is putting up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], as modified, to the committee amendment on page 8, line 15.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, line 15, as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Consideration of the committee amendments has not yet been completed.

Mr. OVERTON. No; but the amendment is in reference to the amendment now under consideration; I am offering an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated so that we can understand what it is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$72,680,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$72,880,000."

On page 9, line 5, after the words "necessary expenses", it is proposed to insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That the sum of $200,000 of this appropriation shall be made available for an additional amount for removing accumulated snags and other debris and clearing channels in navigable streams and tributaries thereof in the State of Louisiana to be additional to the amount authorized for this type of work by section 1 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1414).

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment as amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky increases the appropriation contained on page 8, line 16.

The amendment I offer is intended to increase the appropriation as increased by the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, by an additional sum of $200,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the amendment is not in order at this time, unless the committee amendment is reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. The amendment is not in order because of the unanimous-consent agreement to dispose of the committee amendments before taking up individual amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. My amendment would increase by $200,000 the appropriation as agreed to by the Senate under the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think I can clarify the situation. Under existing law the Congress can appropriate $300,000 each year for the purpose of removing snags, stumps, and other obstructions in navigable streams. This bill carries the full $300,000 authorized by law. So, in order to make this amendment in order, the rule must be suspended. The Senator has protected himself in that regard by serving the proper notice to suspend the rule. The amendment, if adopted, would increase the $300,000 appropriation carried by the bill and authorized by law by the sum of $200,000, making the total amount for the removal of snags, stumps, and obstructions in navigable waters $500,000.

I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed with the regular committee amendments, and, upon the completion of committee amendments, that we may return to consider the motion made by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on the request of the Senator for unanimous consent, I trust that I shall be given an opportunity to return to the committee amendment, on page 7, line 5, and to ask for an opportunity to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted, so that I may present an amendment which I have in mind. My amendment is at the desk; it was being perfected when the Senate adopted the committee amendment. I believe it is germane to the pending bill, and that it should be given consideration by the Senate. So either now or when the committee amendments have been disposed of, I should like to ask unanimous consent to return to the committee amendment on page 7.

Mr. McNARY. That would be in order after the consideration and disposal of the committee amendments. Let us have the regular order.

Mr. MEAD. Does the Senator mean that at that time I would be privileged to ask that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered?

Mr. McNARY. Yes. After the committee amendments shall have been completed then the Senator may make his request.

Mr. MEAD. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that the committee amendment on page 8, as amended, has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two separate amendments, one striking out the figure on line 15 and inserting in lieu thereof a higher figure, which has been agreed to, and the one striking out the remainder of the sentence, which has not been agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, I ask that the question be put upon the committee amendment striking out the language on page 8, lines 16 to 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, beginning in line 16, proposing to strike out certain words.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. After adopting the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, would it not be necessary in order to carry out the intention of the Senate to retain in the Senate bill the language which is in the House bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As I understand, that language has now been stricken, but the Senator will have a right later on, as I understand, to offer his amendment and to move to suspend the rule to consider the amendment offering to increase the amount.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not referring to my amendment; I am referring now to the committee amendment striking out the language in lines 15 to 20. After adopting the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, then, it would logically follow that we should not agree to the committee amendment, because the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is to add that amount to the appropriation, so that the sum could be used for new work.

Mr. McNARY. That would follow logically, for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, which increases the sum by $6,800,000, has been written into the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That having been done, the House language in lines 16 to 20 should be stricken from the bill, because the money is provided to take care of the item covered by the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, and the Board of Army Engineers and administrators of this money would see to it that these projects were started exactly as was intended by the Senator's motion, which has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment on page 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, in the item for maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal on page 13, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$10,214,086" and insert "$10,474,086", and in line 16 to increase the total from "$14,884,086" to "$15,144,086."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 6, to increase the total appropriation for Panama Canal from $52,135,326 to $52,395,326.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the proviso on page 17, line 25, after the word "section", to insert "or any subdivision or provision hereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand the committee amendments have now been disposed of.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There was one amendment I was authorized to submit on behalf of the committee. I ask permission to offer it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the paragraph under the caption "Flood control, general", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That in aid of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project on the Caney River, Oklahoma and Kansas, authorized by the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1571), as amended, for the control of floods in the Verdigris River Valley, the Osage Tribal Council be, and it hereby is, authorized, upon payment of just compensation therefor, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to release and relinquish to the United States of America such right, interest, and control in and over the minerals reserved to the Osage Tribe by the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, as may be found by the Secretary of War to be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said Hulah Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided further*, That construction of said project may be undertaken when the amount of money to be paid to the Osage Tribe as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized has been agreed upon by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Osage Tribal Council: *Provided further*, That the amount agreed upon as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized shall be paid by the Secretary of War out of appropriations made for flood control, general, to the Secretary of the Interior for disbursement in the manner provided by section 4 of the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, for the disbursement of royalties received from the leasing of minerals owned by the Osage Tribe.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment occasions no appropriation. It is necessary for the following reasons:

The Board of Army Engineers has recommended the construction of a flood-control work on the Caney River in the Osage Indian Nation. The Osage Nation, in disposing of its property, sold the surface rights but retained the mineral rights; so that when the Board began to consider building this dam it found that, while it could get the property upon which to build the dam, the dam would be over the mineral rights still owned by the Osage Indians. The amendment would give the War Department and the Interior Department the right to negotiate as to the amount of damages to be sustained by the Osage Indians, and, of course, when the negotiation is completed, the Osage Indians will get the money which shall have been agreed upon. The amendment does not propose to increase the appropriation, and it is necessary because of the peculiar condition the Department found existing in the Osage Nation. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that that completes the committee amendments. Am I correct in that understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, at the end of line 23, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, however, That no part of these appropriations shall be used for the payment of any part of the salary or wages of any alien occupying any position covered by this section if such alien has United States civil-service status:

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, pursuant to a treaty between this Government and the Panamanian Government, and on the basis of the good-neighbor theory, we in 1941 made certain provisions for the employment of Panamanians on the Canal Zone. The language which was written into the Army and Navy appropriation bills pursuant to that action has, in our judgment, been misconstrued and misapplied by the Civil Service Commission.

I send to the desk a letter from Mr. L. A. Moyer, executive director and chief examiner of the United States Civil Service Commission, and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1941.

Mr. CHARLES F. WAHL,
President and Legislative Representative, the Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAHL: This is in reply to your letter of April 28 in which you ask certain questions concerning the status of citizens of the Republic of Panama in connection with employment in the Canal Zone. In your letter there is set forth the following proviso contained in civil functions appropriation bill, H. R. 4183, now pending in the Senate:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly after May 1, 1941, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama."

For the classes of employment covered by the appropriation bill language, citizens of the Republic of Panama would be permitted to take civil-service examinations and acquire eligibility on civil-service-employment lists. For the appointments in question, citizens of Panama and citizens of the United States will have comparable status. The proposed legislation, while permitting the employment of citizens of Panama, does not relieve such citizens from meeting the regular requirements for employment in civil-service positions. Competitive examination procedure would be required since there is no affirmative exception from civil-service requirements.

Your second query is as to the opportunity citizens of the Republic of Panama would, under the proposed legislation, have in non-civil-service positions. This Commission is, of course, without jurisdiction with respect to filling such positions. Appointments subject to the statutory authorizations would be for the discretion of the employing agency. For this reason we are not able to supply an answer to your second question.

Your third question has to do with section 1 Civil Service Rule V, stating, "No person shall be admitted to examination unless he is a citizen of or owes allegiance to the United States." The proviso in the pending bill quoted in your letter would necessarily constitute an exception to section 1 of rule V.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

L. A. MOYER,
Executive Director and Chief Examiner.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that the amendment I now submit is offered with the view that in conference the language will be so framed as to avoid the construction that has been put on the existing provision by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this matter was not presented to the committee, because at that time the issue had not been raised. Since the committee hearings were closed and since the bill has been reported to the Senate this issue has been raised, as I understand, wherein certain persons are classified under civil service. In order that the matter may be considered, as it relates to treaty obligations, I have no objection to accepting the amendment for conference purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate return to page 6. I have an amendment at the desk. I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment on that page was adopted be reconsidered, so that my amendment may be presented for consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration asked by the Senator from New York?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I probably shall not have any objection, but before consenting to the reconsideration I should like to know the nature of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$68,268,640" and insert "$69,268,640", and on page 6, line 24, after the word "Congress", it is proposed to insert "$1,000,000 for improvement of Oswego Harbor, N. Y., as recommended in House Document No. 96, Seventy-six Congress."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from New York will discuss his amendment. I do not know why we should include, generally, new projects; and I understand that this is one.

Mr. MEAD. Oh, no; this is an old project, recommended as a national-defense project, which was authorized in the legislation passed by the last Congress, and is the only one of the items in that bill that is not in this bill. So it is a project which we have passed upon, which is already authorized, and was recommended by the National Power Policy Commission as being necessary for national defense.

Mr. McNARY. Is it a river and harbor project?

Mr. MEAD. It provides for dredging a harbor in order to enable a power plant which has been constructed to serve its utilities. It is in connection with a privately owned power plant.

Mr. McNARY. Why was it omitted from the House bill?

Mr. MEAD. The House agreed to it in the authorization bill, but it was not included in the House appropriation bill. Why it was not included in that bill I do not know.

Mr. McNARY. Was it presented, and rejected by the committee?

Mr. MEAD. I presume it was presented to the House, but probably they did not have the Budget recommendation at that time.

Mr. McNARY. Is there a Budget recommendation for it now?

Mr. MEAD. No; there is no Budget recommendation for it or for at least three other projects that are in this bill. It is in the same category as the other three.

Mr. McNARY. I have not the bill in charge, but I shall be glad to have the Senator make his statement.

Mr. MEAD. To begin my statement, in the last Congress a river and harbor bill was vetoed by the President, at which time he explained that he would sign the bill if the items in the bill were in the interest of national defense. As a result of the President's veto the Congress prepared a bill, and the War Department and the Navy Department began an investigation of projects as to their national-defense nature; and so we passed a second bill which included only such items as were approved by the War Department, the Navy Department, or some other agency of the Government as being essential to the national defense. The second bill was approved by the President. The items in that bill I have before me; and they include Oswego Harbor at Oswego, N. Y., House Document No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress. That is the only one of those items in the second national-defense bill that is not included in this bill.

The argument that the item has not Budget support is met by the statement that at least three other projects authorized by the Congress as essentially necessary to national defense are in the present bill. In view of the fact that this project is strongly recommended by the National Power Policy Commission as essential to national defense, it occurs to me that it has more reason for being in this bill than have some of the items which are now in the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Senator name the three other projects to which he refers, and which he says are in the bill?

Mr. MEAD. It seems to me that they include Boston Harbor—if I am mistaken, the chairman of the committee can correct me—and the channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C., and Silver Lake Harbor, N. C. Those three projects which were in the approved authorization bill as essential to national defense and which are in this appropriation bill have not had a Budget recommendation. The item I have was in the authorization bill. It was listed in that bill, which resulted from the veto of the first bill; it was in that bill because it was recommended by an agency of Government as essential to national defense; and it is one of four items in that approved bill that has not budget figures accompanying it. Therefore, there is no real reason for its not being in the pending bill; but let me say to the Senate that the language of the National Power Policy Commission recommending it as essential to national defense will, in my judgment, commend it to any Senator who becomes familiar with the recommendation made by that agency.

I have here a letter to Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Department of War, Washington, D. C. The letter is signed by Leland Olds, vice chairman of the National Power Policy Commission. On that Commission are men like Mr. Lilienthal, of the T. V. A., and Mr. Ickes, of the Department of the Interior. After an investigation, and realizing that this is a privately owned and operated power project, even though some persons may feel that they are allegedly in favor of public power, nevertheless, this being a private power project, the National Power Policy Commission recommends this improvement as essential to national defense. This is what they say to the Board of Army Engineers:

NATIONAL POWER POLICY COMMITTEE,
Washington, May 29, 1940.

Brig. Gen. THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Board of Engineers
for Rivers and Harbors,
Department of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL ROBINS: Reference is made to your request over the telephone yesterday as to the need from a national-defense standpoint for the channel improvements proposed at Oswego Harbor, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 96, 76th Cong., 1st sess.).

Studies by the staff of the National Power Policy Committee show that the steam-electric station now being constructed by the Central New York Power Corporation at Oswego will be greatly needed for national-defense purposes to assist in supplying electric energy to the basic industries and war-material plants in the Buffalo-Rochester-Syracuse-Schenectady war-material area. In fact, without further expansion of generating capacity, this area is today short of the capacity required to carry the probable war load.

The Committee's staff also reports that the harbor improvements proposed in the Report on the Reexamination of Oswego Harbor, N. Y., prepared by the district engineer at Buffalo, May 19, 1938, are necessary to permit the most economical delivery of coal by lake carrier to the Oswego steam-electric station.

The proposed improvements in the Oswego Harbor should therefore be included among the rivers and harbors projects having a definite national-defense value.

Very truly yours,

LELAND OLDS,
Vice Chairman.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that if we are to be logical and reasonable, and act in keeping with orderely procedure, we should put this item back in the bill, for, as a stated a moment ago, after the President vetoed the rivers and harbors bill in the last Congress, and stated that he would sign a bill which was essentially

for national defense, the Senate and the House listed items which had been investigated by the agencies to which I have referred and placed them in an authorization bill, which was passed, and the only item that is omitted in the pending bill, so far as that defense authorization bill in the last Congress is concerned, is the item affecting Oswego Harbor.

The private power company is investing $750,000 of its own money in the improvement of this harbor. We are asking the Government to invest a million dollars in the improvement of the harbor. The annual saving resulting from this investment would approximate $270,000 annually. In other words, the cost would be liquidated in 4 years and reflected in lower power costs to the people of our State.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have included in the bill the remaining items which were approved by the last Congress, I hope that this item, which is essential to national defense, calling for the appropriation of a million dollars, will be accepted by the Senator having the bill in charge, so that it may be taken to conference and there considered by the House and Senate conferees.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this item was not presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It is not subject to a point of order, however, because it is authorized by existing law. The fact that the item is not budgeted does not make it subject to a point of order. I trust the Senate will never adopt a rule, written or otherwise, requiring a Budget estimate before the Senate can consider an amendment to an appropriation bill. While a Budget estimate is desirable, it is not controlling. A Budget estimate is only a recommendation of one of the bureaus of our Government. In one body of the Government it is a rule now, and is almost a law, that in order to get an item in an appropriation bill there must be a Budget estimate upon which to predicate the item. Of course, we cannot control the rules and the actions of other bodies; we can control the actions of this body.

So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the item save that it was not presented to the committee. It was presented to the committee of the House, and I presume the House committee rejected it because it was not budgeted.

If the item shall be approved, it will mean that the channel will be deepened from 16 to 21 feet. The channel is now 250 feet wide, and is in solid rock, which makes deepening expensive. I am not advised as to the necessity for the appropriation. I understand it was carried in the special defense bill which was passed less than a year ago. But because the item was not presented to the committee, as the Senator having the bill in charge I am unable to accept the amendment, and the Senate must pass upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment of the committee was agreed to?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have no objection to reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I have been discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MEAD. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 9, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following proviso on page 9, line 5, after the words "necessary expenses": *"Provided further,* That the sum of $200,000 of this appropriation shall be made available for an additional amount for removing accumulated snags and other debris and clearing channels in navigable streams and tributaries thereof in the State of Louisiana to be additional to the amount authorized for this type of work by section 1 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1414)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the amendment offered to carry out an existing law?

Mr. OVERTON. It is offered as an amendment to the appropriation bill. The existing law provides an allocation of $300,000 for the clearance of streams. This would be an addition of $200,000 to the authorization permitted by existing law.

The amendment is subject to a point of order if any Senator desires to raise the point against it. I gave notice of my intention to offer the amendment, however, and if the point of order is made against it, I shall ask that the rule be suspended in order that the amendment may be considered.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, while this matter is properly in the control of the Senator having the bill in charge, I may state, as a member of the committee, that this amendment, in part, at least, was considered by the subcommittee; it was presented and was rejected. I feel obligated to raise the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think the statement just made was hardly accurate. A Member of the House of Representatives did come before the committee and ask for cosideration of an item of $50,000 for his congressional district, located in northeast Louisiana. After the hearings were concluded the matter was discussed somewhat, and the Senator from Louisiana was present and discussed the possibility or probability of offering an amendment carrying $200,000, but such an amendment was not really offered and passed upon in the committee, as I remember.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct, and that is what I stated; that it was considered in part.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is absolutely correct in the statement he makes. However, on the testimony presented before the committee, I stated that in all probability I would offer the amendment on the floor. At that time I stated to the committee that the amendment was subject to a point of order, and under the rules of the Senate the Committee on Appropriations could not adopt the amendment because it would be legislation upon an appropriation bill. Therefore, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] will recall, I did not urge the Senate committee to adopt this amendment, as I intended to offer it upon the Senate floor. The amendment was submitted, however, to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and was not acted upon by the full committee, because it was subject to a point of order. Since the point of order has been raised, I shall ask that the question of the point of order be acted upon by the Senate, and that the Senate authorize the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. President, the testimony shows that last year there was a tremendous deluge in the State of Louisiana; there was a tremendous precipitation of rainwater, and that as a result logs, stumps, and debris were carried into many streams and bayous of the State of Louisiana, which are now clogged with such debris, so that after a heavy rainfall the surrounding croplands are overflowed. The Congress of the United States has authorized $300,000 to be allocated for stream clearance. General Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, testified before the committee that $200,000 at least in addition would be required to do the work in the State of Louisiana. Since it is a very urgent and emergent matter, I ask that the Senate overrule the point of order and consider the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I made the point of order with a view to sustaining the action of the Committee on Appropriations. A request was made before the committee for a $50,000 appropriation for this purpose, and inasmuch as the committee rejected the request for an appropriation of $50,000, I can hardly feel that it would be enthusiastic about an appropriation four times as large.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator is in error, and if I can refresh his memory I think he will agree with me. The matter never came up before the full committee at all. It came up before the subcommittee.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I stated to the subcommittee that it would be subject to a point of order. I stated to the subcommittee that I would not offer an amendment providing for $50,000, because $50,000 would be totally inadequate, and that the only amendment I would suggest

would be a $200,000 amendment, but that it would have to be offered upon the floor of the Senate, since the Senate would have to suspend the rule in case the point of order was raised because it was legislation upon an appropriation bill. If the Senator will recall further, no $50,000 amendment was offered at all. The $200,000 amendment was the only one suggested.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Louisiana is absolutely accurate, as he always is, with the single exception that we did have presented to us a request for an appropriation of $50,000, and that was not accepted by the committee. I do not recall whether the motion was made, but at least the matter was presented to the committee, and the committee did not see fit to put in $50,000, and it occurred to me, as a member of the committee, that for one at least I could not support an amendment providing four times that amount.

There is in the statute an authorization of $300,000. That amount of money is provided. Congress has indicated the amount. Of course it will not suffice to do the complete work. So far as I know, we have never had an appropriation for flood control or river protection which was complete and adequate. As one member of the committee, I felt that in view of the provision which had been made a large part of which would be spent in this very work and in this very State, the Senate ought not to suspend its rule for the purpose of making the proposed additional appropriation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in order that the record may be set straight I should like to read from page 97 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

Senator OVERTON. Possibly we can ask General Robins about it. This bill, as it comes from the House, carries $300,000?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

Senator OVERTON. The difficulty, I think, with which this committee will be confronted is whether this will be legislation on the appropriation.

I was the one who in all frankness and fairness raised the point before the committee.

The $300,000 allocation, as submitted by the Chief of Engineers, is predicated on a provision of the act approved in 1937, I think it was—August 28, 1937.

General ROBINS. Section 2 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 28, 1937, as amended.

Senator OVERTON. Section 2 provides that the Secretary of War is authorized to allot not to exceed $300,000 from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris and clearing channels in navigable streams and tributaries thereof when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of flood control; provided that not more than $25,000 shall be allotted for this purpose for any single tributary from the appropriations for any one fiscal year.

Congress has authorized $300,000 to be spent on navigable streams or tributaries thereof, on channel clearance throughout the United States. Whether we can add to the $300,000 without being confronted with the point of order that we are legislating in an appropriation bill is a question I think ought to be submitted to this committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, it will be noted that it was I who called the attention of the committee to the existing legislation and to the fact that the amendment suggested would be legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Representative MILLS of Louisiana said:

I appreciate the Senator's statement on the subject. Of course, a point of order can be made against this $50,000, but I trust that no point of order will be made.

Senator OVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt, from my familiarity with this area, that an appropriation is needed, and this work is very important. It is true that last year there was an excessive rainfall when a great deal of damage was inflicted on the crops and on property in that area. It is largely due to the fact, as I take it, that the drainage has been interrupted by levee construction on the main stem of the Mississippi River, and these tributary streams have become clogged with debris and with snags and other interruptions of drainage. There are also other bayous and other areas of Louisiana that also require channel clearance. In south Louisiana, there are a number of them which also suffered from excessive rainfall.

I should like very much to see an appropriation made, far in excess of $50,000, to undertake to meet this situation. The question with me is, however, whether we would not be legislating in an appropriation bill. We can do that, but I think you would have to authorize the chairman to present the amendment.

Following that I called General Robins to the stand, and he testified that $200,000 at least would be needed for this purpose.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit that I laid the whole subject matter before the subcommittee, and stated that it was legislation upon an appropriation bill, and stated that in case a point of order was raised, then the rule would have to be suspended here upon the floor of the Senate. When we came to mark up the bill I stated, as the Senator from Colorado will recall, that it was my intention in all probability to offer the amendment upon the floor of the Senate.

I therefore ask, Mr. President, that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended, and that the amendment be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended for the purpose of proposing an amendment.

The motion was rejected, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The bill H. R. 4183 was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if any discrepancy appears in the totals the clerks be authorized to correct the totals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. McALISTER

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Thomas F. McAllister, of Michigan, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, vice Hon. Herschel V. Arant, deceased.

As chairman of the subcommittee considering this nomination, and as required by rule 1 of the Judiciary Committee, I announce that Monday, May 5, at 3 p. m., has been set as the time for the hearings on this nomination, in the Judiciary Committee room, at which all interested parties will be heard.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say for the benefit of the Senate that I propose to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday. On Thursday I hope to have the calendar called for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection. We shall then probably adjourn until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (M. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. BAILEY), from the Committee on Commerce:

Several officers and employees for promotion in the Coast Guard and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several surgeons for promotion in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the

clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harrison Parkman to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY—UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William P. Seaver to be Assistant Administrator in charge of project development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lee Farnum Johnson to be Assistant Administrator in charge of project management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 29, 1941:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1946 (reappointment).

FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States, to be effective May 1, 1941, as follows:

From Foreign Service officer of class 2 to Foreign Service officer of class 1:
Erle R. Dickover, of California.
Paul Knabenshue, of Ohio.
Kenneth S. Patton, of Virginia.
Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri.
Walter Thurston, of Arizona.

From Foreign Service officer of class 3 to Foreign Service officer of class 2:
Raymond E. Cox, of New York.
George K. Donald, of Alabama.
Frederick P. Hibbard, of Texas.
Robert F. Kelley, of Massachusetts.
H. Earle Russell, of Michigan.
Clarence J. Spiker, of the District of Columbia.

From Foreign Service officer of class 4 to Foreign Service officer of class 3:
Parker W. Buhrman, of Virginia.
William E. DeCourcy, of Texas.
Edwin Carl Kemp, of Florida.
Lucien Memminger, of South Carolina.
Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio.
John Randolph, of New York.
Christian T. Steger, of Virginia.
Harold L. Williamson, of Illinois.

From Foreign Service officer of class 5 to Foreign Service officer of class 4:
George H. Butler, of Illinois.
Fayette J. Flexer, of Illinois.
Raleigh A. Gibson, of Illinois.
Julian F. Harrington, of Massachusetts.
Edmund B. Montgomery, of Illinois.
Austin R. Preston, of New York.
Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan.
Paul C. Squire, of Massachusetts.
George Tait, of Virginia.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer of class 5:
Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts.
John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts.
Walton C. Ferris, of Wisconsin.
W. Perry George, of Alabama.
Franklin C. Gowen, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Lord, of Massachusetts.
James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia.
Alan N. Steyne, of New York.
George P. Waller, of Alabama.
James R. Wilkinson, of Wisconsin.
Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.

From Foreign Service officer of class 7 to Foreign Service officer of class 6:
Ware Adams, of Georgia.
Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut.
William W. Corcoran, of Massachusetts.
Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma.
Elbridge Durbrow, of California.
Harvey Lee Milbourne, of West Virginia.
Harold B. Minor, of Kansas.
Harry E. Stevens, of California.
Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado.
Mason Turner, of Connecticut.
Carlos J. Warner, of Ohio.
Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey.
Eric C. Wendelin, of Massachusetts.

From Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7:
Theodore C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia.
John Davies, Jr., of Ohio.
C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky.
Richard S. Huestis, of New York.
Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio.
Harrison Lewis, of California.
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.
Robert G. McGregor, Jr., of New York.
Maurice Pasquet, of New York.
George W. Renchard, of Michigan.
Arthur L. Richards, of California.
Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.
Francis Bowden Stevens, of New York.
Laurence W. Taylor, of California.
Clare H. Timberlake, of Michigan.
Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota.

From Foreign Service officer, unclassified, to Foreign Service officer, of class 8:
William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey.
Glen W. Bruner, of Colorado.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
Easton T. Kelsey, of Michigan.
Donal F. McGonigal, of New York.
Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia.
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.
John C. Pool, of Delaware.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Arthur R. Williams, of Colorado.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Newton R. Shockley to be postmaster at Pell City, Ala., in place of N. R. Shockley. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Emmett I. Cox to be postmaster at Springville, Ala., in place of E. I. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

CALIFORNIA

Harrison P. Gower to be postmaster at Death Valley, Calif., in place of H. P. Gower. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1939.

Charles A. Beguhl to be postmaster at Goleta, Calif., in place of C. A. Beguhl. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

CONNECTICUT

Albert H. Buckingham to be postmaster at Roxbury, Conn., in place of A. H. Buckingham. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

FLORIDA

George W. Shuman to be postmaster at Dunnellon, Fla., in place of G. W. Shuman. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

William Edward Dewar to be postmaster at Largo, Fla., in place of W. E. Dewar. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

Lola D. Gall to be postmaster at Zephyrhills, Fla., in place of L. D. Gall. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1941.

GEORGIA

Ernest L. Stephenson to be postmaster at Covington, Ga., in place of J. L. Callaway, deceased.

Emmett Monroe Davis to be postmaster at Vidalia, Ga., in place of E. M. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

IDAHO

Harold A. Haymond to be postmaster at Genesee, Idaho, in place of H. A. Haymond. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Robert L. Anstine to be postmaster at Nezperce, Idaho, in place of R. L. Anstine. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

ILLINOIS

Audre A. Beggin to be postmaster at Apple River, Ill., in place of A. A. Beggin. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Daniel W. Waller to be postmaster at Durand, Ill., in place of D. W. Waller. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Pearle J. Bergland to be postmaster at Galva, Ill., in place of P. J. Bergland. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1940.

Joseph L. Langan to be postmaster at Odell, Ill., in place of J. L. Langan. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1940.

Bertha E. Sayre to be postmaster at Orion, Ill., in place of B. E. Sayre. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1940.

INDIANA

Levi B. Morehead to be postmaster at Atlanta, Ind., in place of L. B. Morehead. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Arthur W. Govert to be postmaster at Griffith, Ind., in place of A. W. Govert. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

Clarence A. Murphy to be postmaster at Linden, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Gordon O. Thurston to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ind., in place of G. O. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

IOWA

Rolla T. Allen to be postmaster at Barnes City, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Ellis E. Wiley to be postmaster at Diagonal, Iowa, in place of B. B. Dolecheck, resigned.

James A. Hollen to be postmaster at Eldon, Iowa, in place of A. J. Walter. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1940.

Emilie B. A. Krause to be postmaster at Ionia, Iowa, in place of E. B. A. Krause. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

Vira S. Fosmark to be postmaster at Rembrandt, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

KANSAS

Florence E. Westgate to be postmaster at Macksville, Kans., in place of F. E. Westgate.

Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

KENTUCKY

Nola B. Nicholson to be postmaster at Harlan, Ky., in place of N. B. Nicholson. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

Consuelo S. Bush to be postmaster at Shepherdsville, Ky., in place of C. S. Bush. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

MAINE

James Connellan to be postmaster at Rockland, Maine, in place of E. C. Moran, deceased.

MARYLAND

W. Louis Ryon to be postmaster at Waldorf, Md., in place of P. E. Huntt. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

MASSACHUSETTS

Michael J. Costello to be postmaster at Franklin, Mass., in place of M. J. Costello. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

William S. Arnold to be postmaster at Nantasket Beach, Mass., in place of W. F. Leonard, removed.

Edward E. Cooney to be postmaster at Northampton, Mass., in place of E. E. Cooney. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

MINNESOTA

John A. Peterson to be postmaster at Belview, Minn., in place of J. A. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1940.

Eino Kopponen to be postmaster at Mountain Iron, Minn., in place of R. S. Viitala, deceased.

Jeannette Schilling to be postmaster at Newport, Minn., in place of Jeannette Schilling. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

Alice F. Lane to be postmaster at Olivia, Minn., in place of A. F. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1940.

Cornelius W. Vahle to e postmaster at Tracy, Minn., in place of C. W. Vahle. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1940.

MISSISSIPPI

Nelms N. Northcross to be postmaster at Corinth, Miss., in place of N. N. Northcross. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

William Ellis May to be postmaster at Lake, Miss., in place of T. H. Vance, retired.

MISSOURI

Arvell F. Collins to be postmaster at Kirksville, Mo., in place of A. F. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

Raymond J. Hughes, Sr., to be postmaster at Beachwood, N. J., in place of R. J. Hughes, Sr. Incumbent's commission expired May 21, 1940.

John W. Guire to be postmaster at Long Branch, N. J., in place of J. W. Guire. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1941.

Leo Francis Nash to be postmaster at New Egypt, N. J., in place of L. F. Nash. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1941.

Helen I. Babnew to be postmaster at Woodbury Heights, N. J., in place of Marie Lucas, removed.

NEW YORK

Joseph Keenan to be postmaster at Babylon, N. Y., in place of Joseph Keenan. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

James J. Harrigan to be postmaster at Chappaqua, N. Y., in place of T. F. J. Hannan, deceased.

Andrew J. Hand to be postmaster at Endicott, N. Y., in place of A. J. Hand. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Lawrence W. Snell to be postmaster at La Fargeville, N. Y., in place of L. W. Snell. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Arthur Cosgrove to be postmaster at Lindenhurst, N. Y., in place of Arthur Cosgrove. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

John A. Kuchanske to be postmaster at North Syracuse, N. Y., in place of J. A. Kuchanske. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Jules L. Friedman to be postmaster at RonKonkoma, N. Y., in place of J. L. Friedman. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Marie Delaney to be postmaster at Rosendale, N. Y., in place of W. F. Delaney, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Hazel A. Sprinkle to be postmaster at Dobson, N. C., in place of H. A. Sprinkle. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Robert A. Whitaker to be postmaster at Enfield, N. C., in place of R. A. Whitaker. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

NORTH DAKOTA

Nathaniel O. Knutson to be postmaster at Rugby, N. Dak., in place of L. R. Huffman, removed.

OHIO

Charles B. Webb to be postmaster at Akron, Ohio, in place of R. C. Witwer, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

John E. Gwinn to be postmaster at Butler, Okla., in place of J. E. Gwinn. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Thomas A. Holland to be postmaster at Cushing, Okla., in place of T. A. Holland. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Willie F. Cowan to be postmaster at Jennings, Okla., in place of W. F. Cowan. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Rose B. Hayes to be postmaster at McLoud, Okla., in place of C. H. Hayes, transferred.

Lee Garner, Jr., to be postmaster at Red Oak, Okla., in place of Lee Garner, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

OREGON

Arthur R. McDonald to be postmaster at Elkton, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

PENNSYLVANIA

James F. McAleer to be postmaster at Folcroft, Pa., in place of J. F. McAleer. Incumbent's commission expired July 12, 1939.

PUERTO RICO

Maria de Mari Burset to be postmaster at Yabucoa, P. R., in place of Francisco Valdejuli, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Mattie H. Swallows to be postmaster at Algood, Tenn., in place of M. H. Swallows. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

TEXAS

Ruth V. Roome to be postmaster at Bandera, Tex., in place of R. V. Roome. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Lallie Griffith to be postmaster at Bedias, Tex., in place of Lallie Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Benjamin C. Bass to be postmaster at Chandler, Tex., in place of B. C. Bass. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Benjamin F. Weatherford to be postmaster at Elkhart, Tex., in place of B. F. Weatherford. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Elzy R. Knowles to be postmaster at Gilmer, Tex., in place of E. R. Knowles. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Levi C. Cowser to be postmaster at Goree, Tex., in place of S. G. Hampton, transferred.

Sallie Hamilton to be postmaster at Richards, Tex., in place of Sallie Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Walter E. Smith to be postmaster at Tahoka, Tex., in place of W. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

VIRGINIA

Thalia W. Williams to be postmaster at Brookneal, Va., in place of T. W. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

John Franklin Wolfenbarger to be postmaster at Clinchport, Va., in place of J. F. Wolfenbarger. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Harvey H. Russell to be postmaster at Marshall, Va., in place of H. H. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

John A. McConchie to be postmaster at Remington, Va., in place of J. A. McConchie. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Nan Elizabeth Crews to be postmaster at Saxe, Va., in place of N. E. Crews. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

WEST VIRGINIA

Jacob Seitz to be postmaster at Jane Lew, W. Va., in place of Jacob Seitz. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Howard Mahan to be postmaster at Oak Hill, W. Va., in place of Howard Mahan. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

WISCONSIN

John William Moore, Sr., to be postmaster at Dalton, Wis., in place of A. L. Foley, resigned.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS

Lt. Col. Arthur Emel Simonin, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Frank O'Driscoll Hunter, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. David Sidney Seaton, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Harold Huston George, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Walter Jay Reed, Air Corps.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. Edwin Sullivan, Air Corps.
Maj. John Raymond Drumm, Air Corps.
Maj. John Sherman Gullet, Air Corps.
Maj. John Raglan Glascock, Air Corps.
Maj. Ray L. Owens, Air Corps.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. Roy Dale Butler, Air Corps.
Capt. Berkeley Everett Nelson, Air Corps.
Capt. Archibald Johnston Hanna, Air Corps.
Capt. Richard August Grussendorf, Air Corps.
Capt. John Hiett Ives, Air Corps.

NOTE.—Dates of rank are omitted as the death or other unforeseen change in status of a senior officer might require a change in the dates of rank and necessitate the renomination of these officers.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. William Harold Roberts, Infantry, with rank from November 29, 1940.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Robert Wolcott Meals, Field Artillery (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 13, 1936.

First Lt. Thurman Wesley Morris, Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

First Lt. James Samuel Brierley, Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

TO CAVALRY

Capt. Howard Knowles Vail, Infantry (major, Army of the United States), with rank from August 1, 1935.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Lt. Col. Abraham Robert Ginsburgh, Judge Advocate General's Department, with rank from October 26, 1940.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Alfred Allen Maybach, Coast Artillery Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Richard Rawlins Waugh, Corps of Engineers (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.)

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from May 4, 1941

Maj. Mark Histand Doty, Field Artillery.
Maj. Charles Peter Prime, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).
Maj. Pete Turney Heffner, Jr., Infantry.
Maj. Otto Rudolph Stillinger, Cavalry.
Maj Murray Charles Wilson, Field Artillery
Maj Bruce Craighill Hill, Corps of Engineers.
Maj. Edwin Douglass McCoy, Quartermaster Corps.
Maj. Dewitt Talmage Mullett, Infantry.
Maj. Hugh Gibson Culton, Cavalry.
Maj. Paul Allen Reichle, Field Artillery.
Maj. Gerald Bradford Devore, Infantry.
Maj. Walter Bedell Smith, Infantry.
Maj. Osgood Cook McIntyre, Field Artillery.
Maj. James Emerson Bush, Field Artillery.
Maj. Morris Barnett DePass, Jr., Infantry.
Maj. Charles Ennis, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from May 11, 1941

Maj. Herbert Joseph McChrystal, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from May 12, 1941

Maj. Auby Casey Strickland, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from May 15, 1941

Maj. James Edward Dooley, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from May 19, 1941

Maj. John Max Lentz, Field Artillery.

To be major with rank from May 10, 1941

×Capt. Arthur Cecil Ramsey, Infantry (major, Army of the United States).

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.)

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

×Lt. Col. Harry Dumont Offutt, Medical Corps, with rank from May 17, 1941.
×Lt. Col. George Davies Chunn, Medical Corps, with rank from May 18, 1941.
×Lt. Col. Charles Mallen O'Connor, Medical Corps with rank from May 19, 1941.
×Lt. Col. Augustus Benjamin Jones, Medical Corps, with rank from May 20, 1941.
Lt. Col. Frank Henry Dixon, Medical Corps, with rank from May 24, 1941.
×Lt. Col. Robert DuRant Harden, Medical Corps, with rank from May 25, 1941.

To be majors

×Capt. Crawford Fountain Sams, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from May 2, 1941.

To be captains

First Lt. Alfred Pembroke Thom 3d, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Joseph Thomas Caples, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Julius John Snyder, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Adanto Arcangelo Secondo D'Amore, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Martin Andrew Compton, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Robert Beardsworth Lewis, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Eugene Maurice Martin, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Clifford D. Dangerfield, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Frank Gordon Stephens, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Forrest Edgar Hull, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1941.
First Lt. Jackson Franklin Morehead, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 19, 1941.
First Lt. John Henry Voegtly, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 19, 1941.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Donald William Forbes, Dental Corps, with rank from May 29, 1941.

To be captains

First Lt. Willard LaGrand Nielsen, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 4, 1941.
First Lt. William Paxton Fly, Jr., Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 16, 1941.
First Lt. Robert Bruce Shira, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 18, 1941.

CHAPLAINS

To be major

Chaplain (Captain) John William Westerman, United States Army (major, Army of the United States), with rank from May 1, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29, 1941:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Harrison Parkman to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department.

UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

William P. Seaver to be Assistant Administrator in charge of project development of the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency.

Lee Farnum Johnson to be Assistant Administrator in charge of project management of the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Nell C. Phillips, Eclectic.
Lucille C. Land, Gilbertown.
James Byron Hull, Lineville.

FLORIDA

Claude Dougar Boring, Arcadia.
Rowena E. McDaniel, Ocoee.

GEORGIA

Nancy A. W. Griffis, Screven.

ILLINOIS

Emanuel J. Shafranski, Lemont.
Mayme F. Brooke, Matteson.
Truman I. Myers, Naperville.

INDIANA

Sherard Theodore Henry, Lowell.

MAINE

Edward J. Doyle, Calais.

MASSACHUSETTS

Gerald J. Casey, Charles River.
Richard B. Murphy, Dennis Port.
James D. Cleary, Feeding Hills.
Thomas D. Cudihy, Marblehead.
Joseph Daniel Scully, Medfield.
Owen W. Gallagher, North Abington.

MINNESOTA

Leo L. Drey, Breckenridge.
Elmer D. Wannebo, Buffalo.
Catherine I. Ackerman, Eden Valley.
Paul J. Kelly, Fountain.
Carleton H. Leighty, Glenville.
Francis L. Brady, Lake Benton.
Vera M. Parks, Nisswa.
John C. Grimm, Perham.

MISSISSIPPI

Lottie W. Beazley, Raymond.

MISSOURI

Dale S. Vencill, Galt.
John Frank Hughes, Jr., Greenville.
Edna M. Gelsinger, Jerico Springs.
Isaac M. Horn, Memphis.
Genevieve M. Pratte, St. Marys.
Arthur Earl Thurman, Steelville.

NEW JERSEY

William H. D'Arcy, Cranford.
Edward von Kattengell, Red Bank.
Edmund H. Carpenter, Woodbury.

NEW MEXICO

Charles K. Johnson, Hobbs.

NEW YORK

John P. Hayes, Albany.
Martin Carey, Castile.
Eleanor Ann Coonan, Champlain.
Charles A. O'Brien, Fayetteville.
Francis Arthur Fagan, Herkimer.
Robert E. Lindsay, Mattituck.
Margaret T. Scott, Piermont.
August J. Portanova, Purchase.
James O. Bennett, Silver Creek.
Arthur D. Driscoll, Whitney Point.

NORTH CAROLINA

Rufus Jennings White, Conway.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary S. Tiedeman, Douglas.
Pauline A. Wetzel, St. Michael.

OKLAHOMA

Elmer J. Solomon, Kingfisher.
Mrytle Lee Autrey, Norman.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert C. Laird, Downingtown.
Walter S. Cressman, Gwynedd Valley.

PUERTO RICO

Rita M. Rodriguez, Guayanilla.
Leyla R. Ramirez, San German.

RHODE ISLAND

Thurman F. Eldridge, Bradford.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John C. Fowler, Gaffney.
Robert H. Billings, Lancaster.

TEXAS

Volney D. Phillips, Celina.
Nell M. Hall, Greggton.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 29, 1941:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH

Wayne Coy, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Investigation and Research for the period of the existence of the Board as provided in title III, part I, of the Transportation Act of 1940, approved September 18, 1940.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, be Thou our guide while life shall last. We praise Thee for Him who flooded His cross with a glory born in the regions of eternal light and whose mandates are destined to shake the thrones of darkness and tyranny. In the shades of human history, this sad world, with its upturned face, will yet catch a glimpse of His glory and a vision that will transfigure its suffering and sanctify its sorrow. Heavenly Father, may we thank Thee for sunlight and bird song, for the radiant dawn of this day falling upon the hilltops, for the great world athrob with light divine and everlasting. Let us rejoice that we have a part in its work, in its joys and in its sorrows; O awaken us to the beauty and the gladness of this day. We are grateful for Thy holy Gospel; in it is the power of God and the highway leading to a deepening peace. In it are written all the mercies of the living Christ, all the enduring hopes of humanity and all the joys of saints born and unborn. O may the day of peace soon come—not supine and languid, but peace based upon justice, upon liberty, upon knowledge, upon truth, then shall the latter day glory be seen and the new heavens and the new earth shall appear wherein dwelleth righteousness. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on relief of Polish citizens and the destitute in Siberia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE AT COLIMA, MEXICO

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution introduced by me, House Joint Resolution 172, appropriates the sum of $200,000 for the relief of victims of the earthquake at Colima, Mexico.

It has always been the policy of this Government to help our neighbors, and in these days when Western Hemisphere defense is uppermost in our minds, and when we feel that all our republics should act as a unit to resist the tide of aggression, it is doubly important for us to do everything in our power to help our stricken neighbors.

The people of the United States and the people of Mexico have carried toward each other the principles of neighborliness and good will at all times. We believe in the progress of our neighbor to the south, and Mexico believes in close cooperation with the United States. In the last decades Mexico had enlightened governments which carried out this good-neighbor policy to the satisfaction of both countries. Whatever differences there may be from time to time between us, our differences are caused not by any ill will but by the natural fact that human beings will occasionally differ, and whatever differences there are among us will always be adjusted without any resort to arms and without any aggression.

It has been the boast of our two countries that the people on both sides of the border are liberty loving, conscientious, hard working, and desirous in their own way to live in peace with the whole world. We will be drawing toward each other to a greater measure as time goes on. Europe is practically done for. The little European nations do not know how to get together to preserve their heritage of liberty, and as a result aggressors are having an easy time with them. We on this hemisphere will be forever watchful lest the forces of evil should want to overwhelm us as they did overwhelm the world on the other side of the Atlantic.

By appropriating a sum of money for the relief of victims of natural forces I feel that this country will have written its philosophy of neighborliness in a material way. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein editorials from the Pensacola Journal and the Tallahassee Democrat on Confederate Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GREENLAND AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the daily papers carried a most remarkable statement by the President of the United States, made on Friday to the press correspondents at the White House. The President said that the Nazis may have occupied part of Greenland, but that he was not sure whether they had or had not, and that he did not know. This filled me with consternation and amazement. The President is our Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. Who controls Greenland is of great military significance to this country. Indeed, recently we have evidenced this by establishing a protectorate over Greenland for the duration of the war. Most people are highly perturbed at this statement. I know I am. People feel that if the President does not know, then he should take very quick and immediate steps to obtain first-hand knowledge about a matter which is of such vital importance to the safety and future welfare of our Nation. Nevertheless, 3 days have elapsed since this statement was made, and to my knowledge no further facts of any kind on this subject have been released from the White House. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement which I made under date of April 17 before the Committee on Appropriations on the question of irrigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative program of the day, on Wednesday, April 30, following any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial by Mr. A. O. Moreaux, editor and publisher of the Rock County Herald, of Luverne, Minn., upon the question of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two letters I have written to the Attorney General in connection with two bills I have introduced on communism, fascism, and nazi-ism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

YEARLY WAGE RATE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I am today presenting a bill providing for an amendment to section (c) of the Walsh-Healey Act, which provides an inflexible 40-hour week and an 8-hour day. I call attention to the fact that in the wage-and-hour law there is provision for an annual wage agreement between employers and employees which provides for a guaranteed minimum of 2,000 hours, and when approved by the National Labor Relations Board permits such employees to work a maximum of 56 hours a week without paying overtime. As to those employers who have entered into such annual wage contracts and are now being called upon to enter into defense contracts, they find themselves up against the Walsh-Healey Act, which fixes an absolute ceiling of 40 hours a week and 8 hours per day, plus time and one-half for all overtime. I have discussed this matter with representatives of the unions and with the Labor Department, and there seems to be no objection to this bill. The proposed amendment simply provides that those employers who have entered approved annual wage agreements shall be exempted from the inflexible provisions of subsection c of section 1 of the Walsh-Healey Act, so as not to interfere with or destroy minimum annual wage agreements. I am convinced that such agreements should be encouraged. I sincerely trust that the Labor Committee will give this bill immediate consideration.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no objection and that the gentleman will discuss the state of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pain to inform the Members of the House that Mr. Jesse Jones warns the people of a $90,000,000,000 national debt. You should all be pained at that. When I picked up the Treasury statement of April 25 of Mr. Morgenthau I found that the receipts this month were over $86,000,000 more than they were this month a year ago, but the trouble is that the expenditures this month are more than the expenditures of the same month last year by $381,000,000. This is the usual New Deal procedure. More money and more spending all the time. Where are you going to get the money? The President and Secretary Morgenthau have said that we should cut $1,000,000,000 off our regular Government appropriations. That sounds good, but it will not happen. Why? Instead of that, we are increasing the regular Government appropriations. If you do not intend to get to the point where we will have a bankrupt Treasury then what are you doing, and how will we be able to carry on national defense? It behooves this Congress to do something, and the thing for you to do is to cut down our expenses, or you will wreck America. What is the use of getting an army of a million and a half men and a great navy if we are not going to be able to finance them? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

WAR

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, last fall the President of the United States promised the American people that he was going to keep them out of war. Last week he made the statement that if we delivered enough things to Great Britain with which to carry on the war that we could avoid active participation.

Last week, on the other side of the fence, he made the statement that this country was in greater peril than the people realized. Last week he announced an extension of naval patrols half way across the Atlantic. That step was another step toward actual war.

Is the President going to lead us into war through the back door, a little at a time? Has he the character or the courage to be absolutely and straightforwardly for peace or absolutely and straightforwardly for war? Is it not time for America to have honest straightforward leadership? [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of an article on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECURITY OF THE NATION

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, whatever may have been said by the President of the United States or anyone else at any time in the history of this country, certainly we should not allow it to stand between providing for the security of the Nation or not providing for it. The matter of providing for the security of the United States in a crisis such as we are now facing is something to be considered entirely and solely from the viewpoint of strategy and tactics, and I feel sure that the people of the United States, regardless of what may have been said prior to this time, will approve of any move being made to insure the safety of this Nation at this or any other time. If it is believed that convoying of supplies to Great Britain is felt to be necessary to insure the security of this Nation, I feel sure the American people will accept it in the spirit in which it will be called for. [Applause.]

THE DUTY TO DELIVER AID

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we all know that whether the Nation has peace or not is not something that can be determined by the Chief Executive or by the lawmaking body by some great gesture. We know that we are bound by the flow of circumstances, and we cannot live so that we can determine what the rest of the world shall do. When the time comes when we as a nation must do something, nothing that any lawmaker or any Executive can do will alter the fact that such is a duty if it becomes a duty, and so I am bound to ask the same question that we have previously asked. Since we have determined on all-out aid to Britain as the best way of defending this country against things that may come, and since we have voted $7,000,000,000 for that purpose, and if in the natural result of the program that we are confronted with, not of our choosing, but forced upon us, what we are providing is being sunk, and cannot be delivered by any other means, then does it not become our national duty to do that which will deliver what we have undertaken to do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein a petition, with the names, sent to me by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, one by the insertion of an editorial, and the other by the insertion of a radio address delivered in Detroit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from Col. Roscoe Turner on the subject of a unified air force.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert an article by Mr. Cudahy, who has been in Europe doing some observing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONVOYS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the question of convoys has been raised today, I would like to take this minute to make a brief statement.

The question of extending the neutrality patrol 500 miles, in my humble judgment, means absolutely nothing at all. It will have no effect one way or the other. We already have a patrol of 500 miles. We extend it now to 1,000 miles. No ship has been sunk within 1,500 miles of the United States. So this accomplishes nothing, and I do not believe it endangers the peace of America.

On the other hand, we have finally reached the real issue. All the other issues have been preliminary bouts. We have now reached the great event—shall we go into this war or shall we stay out? Every Member of the Congress knows that convoying means shooting and that shooting means war. I do not believe from the poll I have taken on the Republican side that there are six Members on the Republican side of the House who will vote for convoys, because they know that convoying means war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

GRANTING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF BILOXI, MISS.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3538) to amend the act entitled "An act granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes," approved April 28, 1906.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of this bill?

Mr. COLMER. This bill authorizes the transfer of certain lands that were previously granted to the city of Biloxi for cemetery purposes, to the War Department for the construction thereon, or a part thereof, of an aviation mechanical training school, for the training of aviation mechanics. It is a matter of the utmost urgency. In fact, the War Department is now withholding actual construction of the necessary buildings, and so forth, awaiting authorization of Congress for this lease.

Mr. RICH. Does the War Department wish to construct this aviation field, or is it something that the city of Biloxi wants?

Mr. COLMER. It has authorized the construction of this training school there, for the training of aviation mechanics, where some 16,000 aviation mechanics may be trained at one time. It involves no expenditure of funds whatsoever in this transfer.

Mr. RICH. But it is going to cost the Government a lot of money to maintain that school.

Mr. COLMER. Quite so. It is a part of the national-defense program.

Mr. RICH. Did the proper committee of the House, the Naval Affairs Committee or the Military Affairs Committee, approve of this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been considered by the Public Lands Committee, to which committee it was referred. That committee has unanimously reported the bill out and feels that it is a bill of importance that should be passed immediately.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Utah explain a little further, so that the House will understand?

Mr. MAY. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. When the gentleman mentioned that the War Department was to take over the property I raised no question about the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Public Lands, if that committee has passed on it. All I wanted to know is what the War Department proposes to use the property for?

Mr. COLMER. As I stated to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the War Department has authorized the establishment of an aviation training mechanical school.

Mr. MAY. Under legislation heretofore enacted?

Mr. COLMER. Under legislation heretofore enacted, it was found necessary, when they decided to locate this plant at Biloxi, Miss., to utilize a portion of the land that the Government had heretofore conveyed to the city of Biloxi for cemetery purposes.

Mr. MAY. Then it is only a question of permitting the property to be turned over?

Mr. COLMER. That is all.

Mr. MAY. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, so that the House will understand, the only purpose of this bill is to quiet title to the land. Under the terms of a grant from the Government to the city of Biloxi it was provided that if the land were used for any other purpose than that specified in the act, the land should revert to the Government. Under the plan that the city of Biloxi decides to use this land for—it is for national-defense purposes, which is not the same as provided in the act—therefore, without the passing of this bill, the land would automatically revert to the Government.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the matter, originally this land was granted to the city for cemetery purposes.

Mr. COLMER. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. And it can be used for cemetery purposes by the municipality?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If the municipality ever used it for any other purpose, it immediately reverts to the Government?

Mr. COLMER. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Now they want to temporarily lease it to the Government for national-defense purposes?

Mr. COLMER. The distinguished gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes," approved April 28, 1906, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That said lands are granted solely for park and cemetery purposes and shall revert to and become the property of the United States if used for any purpose whatever other than or foreign to those for which this donation is made: *Provided*, That the city of Biloxi is authorized to lease a portion of said lands to the War Department for use by the Army Air Corps Technical Schools and that such use shall not be deemed a use thereof for a purpose 'other than or foreign to those for which this donation is made.'"

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, May 6, after the disposition of legislative business for the day I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I made at the Williamstown spring conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 22, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, or of funds allotted to the Navy Department, shall be available after March 13, 1941, for any additional positions in the District of Columbia or elsewhere at rates of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, either on a per diem or per annum basis, except in pursuance of specific authorization herein or hereafter granted: *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, or of funds allotted to the Navy Department, shall be available for the employment of a greater number than eight thousand seven hundred and fifty civilian officers and employees in the Navy Department proper, at Washington, except in pursuance of specific appropriations as to numbers hereafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed, and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "acquisition and clearing of land for extension of Naval Academy grounds, $350,000;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "improvements at rifle range at La Jolla, $200,000, including $20,000 for target area and ranges;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "2"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. G. SCRUGHAM (except as to amendment No. 19),
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT THOMAS,
J. WILLIAM DITTER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
CARTER GLASS,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
DAVID I. WALSH,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Restores provisions proposed by the House (1) placing a $5,000 ceiling on salaries of new appointees in the absence of specific authorization, and (2) placing a ceiling on the number of civilian officers and employees in the Navy Department proper, at Washington, except in pursuance of specific appropriations as to numbers hereafter provided, but fixing such ceiling as to numbers at 8,750 instead of 7,500, as the House had proposed, and extending the provision to include allotted funds.

Nos. 2, 3, and 4: Appropriates $390,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $350,000 as proposed by the House, for the naval training station, Newport, R. I., and appropriates $449,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $425,000, as proposed by the House, for the naval training station, Norfolk, Va.

No. 5: Strikes out the clause inserted by the Senate in the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships", relative to travel expenses incident to maintenance and operation of various establishments.

Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9: Relating to the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportion of naval personnel": Makes a transfer between subappropriations as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision proposed by the House with respect to the procurement of domestically produced articles of food amended to conform with the provision inserted by the House in the fifth supplemental national defense appropriation bill (H. R. 4124), as amended and agreed to by the House and Senate.

No. 10: Eliminates the provision proposed by the House providing for the continued employment of the officer in charge of budgetary work in the Bureau of Ships in such assignment.

No. 11: Makes provision with respect to expenses attendant upon the movement of dependents of personnel, and of household effects of personnel, apply only to the fiscal year 1942, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 12 to 19, both inclusive, relating to Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: Provides for recreation building and accessories at naval station, Tutuila, Samoa (cost limit $70,000), as proposed by the Senate; provides for purchase of land adjoining submarine base, New London, Conn. (cost limit $51,000), as proposed by the Senate; provides for extending the Naval Academy grounds (cost limit $350,000), as proposed by the Senate, amended to provide for clearing, within the cost limit, the area acquired; provides for a post school building at the Marine Corps base, Quantico, Va. (cost limit $100,000), as proposed by the Senate; provides for the improvement of the rifle range at La Jolla, Calif., as proposed by the Senate, reducing the cost limit, however, from $220,000 to $200,000; provides for a theater and recreation hall at the Marine Corps base, San Diego, Calif. (cost limit $300,000), as proposed by the Senate; strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, provision for recreation facilities for officers at naval air station, Jacksonville, Fla. (cost limit $250,000), and strikes out provision for additional facilities at the flying field, Boulder City, Nev. (cost limit $500,000), as proposed by the Senate.

No. 20: Strikes out of the appropriation "Pay, Marine Corps", the limitation upon expenditures for flight pay, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 21: Inserts a new section, limiting the payment of any commission on any land-purchase contract to a maximum of 2 percent of the purchase price, the Senate having proposed 3 percent.

No. 22: Changes a section number.

J. G. SCRUGHAM (except as to amendment No. 19),
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT THOMAS,
J. WILLIAM DITTER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a complete report.

As agreed to by the conference committee, the bill carries a total of $3,415,521,750, which is $64,500 more than the bill carried when it left the House. All but $64,500 of the House reduction of $3,974,264 has been permitted to stand.

The Senate made provision for a number of public-works projects, estimated to cost $1,071,000, as agreed to. It did not add additional money on account of such projects. At the same time, the Senate eliminated two projects, which the House had approved, having a total cost limit of $750,000. The net result is additional contractual authority of $321,000.

The House provision with respect to the procurement of domestically produced articles of food has been modified to agree with the action of the Senate and House on the provision included in the Fifth National Defense Appropriation Act. In other words, it has been broadened to include clothing and has made compliance subject to the availability of domestic articles of satisfactory quality and at reasonable prices.

The Senate added to the bill a limitation on commissions payable on land-purchase contracts. The Senate fixed a maximum of 3 percent. The conference committee agreed upon a maximum of 2 percent.

I now will speak a moment on a House provision which the Senate eliminated. We have concurred in their action, against our unanimous judgment, in order to expedite the enactment of this bill.

I refer to the House provision for establishing an auxiliary flying field to the naval air station at San Diego, Calif., at Boulder City, Nev. Naval aviation facilities already exist at the Boulder City Airport. If used to relieve congestion at San Diego, some addition thereto would need to be made in quarters and improvement of the field.

The committee chose Boulder City because land acquisition is not involved. As stated, a navy hangar, large landing field, and other facilities already exist at this point. Probably there is no other area back from the coast but within an hour or two of flight where better flying weather prevails. The need for breaking up the congestion in certain coastal areas is generally recognized by all persons who are conversant with conditions.

Human lives and much valuable property are being sacrificed with great frequency in Navy and Army aviation. It borders on criminal negligence to permit the present congestion and possibility of recurrence of crashes to continue as an unavoidable part of aviation development. It is certainly not necessary to sacrifice all of these lives on account of the whims of bureaucracy.

I should like to read at this point from a letter written by the commandant of the naval air station at San Diego, dated March 8, 1941, to the Chief of the Bureau of Navy Aeronautics bearing upon this matter:

> Commander carrier division 1 is strongly in favor of providing facilities at Boulder City for one carrier group, which will permit extended training in the Boulder City area, with the resulting reduction in air traffic in the San Diego area. The commandant, eleventh naval district, as well as the commanding officer, naval air station, believe this to be most worth-while project and strongly recommend the approval by the Bureau of Aeronautics.
>
> Subsequent to the transfer of Clark County from the twelfth naval district to the eleventh naval district the question of using Boulder City Airport by aircraft at North Island has been under study. It is not believed that this proposed immediate extension of facilities at Boulder City will conflict with the long-range development of the site.

The Senate conferees resisted this item because it did not have the endorsement of the present Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics. It is our constitutional duty to provide and maintain a Navy, but I do not construe that to mean that the Congress must be dictated to by the Navy Department or by any bureaucratic chiefs, especially those in the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics. For this reason I intend to repeatedly present the issue to the House.

For the flying men themselves I have only the highest praise. It has been my privilege to accompany some of them on numerous flights over nearly all parts of this country, as well as to Alaskan and to Caribbean naval bases. They constitute a group of perhaps the finest military aviators in the entire world, and it is for their advancement and protection, as well as the improvement of the national defense, that I here express my views.

Certain provisions of this bill become effective immediately upon its approval. It is for this reason, and this reason alone, that we have not brought the aeronautics item back in disagreement, in order that the House might reassert itself. Those in the Navy Department opposing the proposition to relieve dangerous congestion have assumed a very grave responsibility.

As I previously stated, the chief differences of opinion between the House and Senate conferees arose over matters relating to aviation. After a lengthy investigation of the subject, frequent inspections of naval bases, and conversations with scores of pilots, I have come to the conclusion that our present system is certainly not developing aviation tactics for an offensive aerial war.

Naval airplanes in particular are evidently considered as an adjunct to the surface ships, and present training and tactics of naval aviators tend largely toward protection of the fleet. We are in entire agreement that both Navy and Army as now constituted should have the necessary airplanes to accomplish their missions, but daily it becomes more obvious that we are sadly lacking in the unified fighting air force such as is possessed by Germany.

The importance of air supremacy is generally realized in this country, but apparently not by some of the chiefs of aeronautics, who are still mentally fighting future war with the tactics and equipment of 1917 and 1918.

The future decisive area of combat will be in the air. This fact is becoming more ominously evident, as the record of events in the Old World is presented to our vision. A growing belief on my part that the United States must have a separate air force has now become a positive conviction. The vastly increasing range, speed, and striking power of aerial warships promises to sensationally further revolutionize present-day methods of combat.

Literally hundreds of millions of dollars are now being spent for structures and duplications of air facilities by the Army and Navy that may soon become obsolescent. This great economic waste could at least partially be avoided by a unified air command. The first indictment is against the policy of constructing and locating comparatively adjacent major Army and Navy air centers, usually costing millions of dollars each, under separate direction and command. This criticism does not apply to auxiliary or emergency landing fields nor to the splendid officers handling the actual operation and construction, who are doing a most excellent job. The criticism does apply to the aeronautic bureau chiefs who are responsible for the questionable policy. The second indictment is against the obstinacy of the same bureau chiefs in their blind copying of the English practice of having no bomb protection for airplane hangars, repair shops, and other facilities.

The lesson of the destruction of the Polish air force by the Germans at the beginning of the war seems to have gone entirely unheeded. In a fla' ntry protected air facilities may be ·racticable, but where there are adj: nt hills it seems inexcusable to deliberately build air or other bases invitingly located for destruction by enemy bombs when a moderate additional expense would provide safety. Interceptor and pursuit planes can be provided with folding wings, as in the Navy airplane carriers, to reduce the storage space required.

The present policy of concentrating highly essential military or industrial structures in very limited areas cannot be too strongly condemned, and may constitute an error of gravest consequences. It threatens to congeal our program for national defense into an obsolete and inefficient pattern, when just the reverse is desired. The only real remedy for the situation lies with the Congress. While the Chief Executive, in his capacity of Commander in Chief, has the power in times of emergency to consolidate air forces under one command, actually the details of any such changes are in the hands of the bureau chiefs in both branches of the service.

Authority is one of the hardest things for a capable human being to surrender, and it is characteristic of all Government bureaus that they vigorously resist changes affecting their jurisdiction. This may account for the fact that there is united opposition to a separate air force on part of nearly all admirals and generals in command and few, if any, of their subordinates care to take issue with their superior officers. Many years ago Gen. William Mitchell, the pioneer advocate of a separate air force, was most severely disciplined for his temerity in voicing his opinions in public. Today the reasons for unified air organization have increased tenfold, but the powers of the dead hands of entrenched bureaucracy have likewise multiplied and constitute a formidable opposition.

Everywhere the story of duplications of air authority is the same, from Hawaii to Puerto Rico, from Alaska to Virgin Islands, Jamaica, and Trinidad. One of the most serious faults noted, chargeable at least in part to the hydra-headed air authority, is lack of sufficient domestic water supply at the numerous aviation bases now being created. This is especially true in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands. In addition to the actual shortages in the present supplies, which are generally unprotected from sabotage or bombing attacks, certainly no adequate plans have been formulated for reserves of this vital necessity, except to commission a few scattered water barges, and to contract for drilling a few wells, with grave uncertainties as to quantity and quality.

The recent destruction of Yugoslavian towns, the triumphant rush of the German Armies through the Balkan countries and Greece, and the quick recapture of the strategic air fields at Benghazi were all due to German air superiority. These operations would not have been possible if the defending planes had not been almost entirely swept from the skies. The withdrawal operations at Dunkirk were accomplished primarily because the British managed to establish local superiority because of their higher speed land-based ships, with an operating radius of 150 miles. Had the scene of activity been 150 miles farther away, the evacuation would have been only a bloody shambles. Some day the United States forces may face a similar situation in any one of the many crowded cantonments. A few years ago ships in the North Atlantic were considered immune from air attack. Today heavy German planes are attacking naval convoys 500 miles west of Ireland, and soon all ship immunity will be eliminated. Two of their heavy bombers, given by name in the press, are ranging halfway across the Atlantic and sinking ships. We have

certainly not expedited our own aviation program for this type of plane.

The debacle in Greece has the significant note that the Allies were outnumbered 8 to 1 in air combats. The British and Greeks were simply air bombed out of their strong defensive position.

The old military strategy of mile-by-mile struggle for possession of forts and trenches as a primary objective in warfare is obviously obsolete.

The victors in the wars of today and tomorrow will be those who can best ignore and overreach armies and navies, and use their air superiority to strike directly at vital spots like water, food, and power sources, munitions plants, harbors, and airdromes. Then comes the victorious onslaught of the armored divisions, but air superiority is the first essential.

With all these in mind, now appears to be the time for the Congress to act vigorously in authorizing the creation of at least a separate and independent air force in the Navy and Army in order that mistaken loyalties to the older services and blind resistance to changes may no longer so seriously handicap the national defense. As a preliminary step, the Navy air force might be made an independent unit like the Marine Corps. Likewise, a separate service of supply seems desirable for aviation. Squadrons in training for an offensive aerial warfare should not be hamstrung by either a divided command or by inadequate replacement parts. To accomplish the best results a specialized aviation supply service should be created, and the high command should likewise be vested in specialists in aviation warfare, and not in prejudiced bureau chiefs who have to be qualified in all major naval subjects.

In addition to the previously made comments, I respectfully present the following suggestions for consideration of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and its distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

These items are offered after consultation with eminent authorities on the subject, and in their judgment I have the highest confidence. The outcome of the war may be determined by the secrecy with which new inventions can be developed and put into use.

First. Inventions of a military nature conceived by a United States citizen should be considered as subject to the law of eminent domain to be acquired at the option of the Government by an action somewhat similar to the condemnation proceedings under which land is acquired. Disclosure of such idea or invention except to designated officers of the Government would be forbidden by law under penalty.

Second. All inventions would be submitted to and examined by a special board of officers chosen for their scientific knowledge and experience, whose duty it would be to appraise the value of the invention or idea and recommend to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy the amount of compensation which should be made to the inventor.

Third. As any patent or other disclosure of an invention or idea of military importance would render it valueless to the Government, the acquisition of such an invention would naturally be conditional upon the absence of any such disclosure by the inventor.

Fourth. In order to discourage later disclosure of such invention after it has been acquired by the Government, the compensation awarded should be payable in installments over a term of years. Such payments to cease if at any time the Government obtained evidence that the invention had been disclosed to anyone without written permission of the Government.

Fifth. No discrimination in value would be made between a completely developed invention and a crude idea which the board considered capable of development into practical form.

Sixth. All development and manufacture of secret devices of inventions of value to the Government should be carried on by the Naval Research Laboratory, which should be sufficiently enlarged and equipped to carry on such work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have listened to the gentleman's statement with a great deal of interest. The gentleman appreciates that both the House Military Affairs Committee and Naval Affairs Committee have been instructed by the House to make a thorough investigation of the defense activities of both the Army and Navy. For such purpose we have set up separate committees. The Naval Affairs Committee has set up a separate aviation subcommittee to go into the very subject that the gentleman has mentioned in his conference report. I happen to be chairman of that subcommittee. I hope that the gentleman will come before us and sit with us so that we can get the benefit of his ideas, because he has given the matter a great deal of study.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Some time ago there was a rather startling newspaper item to the effect that the United States would have Canada build vessels in Canada, that we would pay for them, then they would be brought over here and we would transfer them under the lend-lease bill to Great Britain. Are the provisions of this appropriation bill sufficiently strong to protect the American people against that sort of outrageous procedure if somebody in authority should decide to do that?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Such a suggestion was not considered in connection with this bill, and there was no provision made therefor.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman not think it is about time that Congress when it appropriates money put some strings on the appropriation so that it will prevent such a startling procedure as I have outlined and which the Secretary of the Navy is quoted as having said met with his approval?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. In general, provision has been made to govern expenditures along lines of authorized procedure.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman states there has been such provision?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the gentleman feels that one of the most objectionable things now as far as naval aviation activities are concerned is that it is not a separate unit, it is still under the control of the Navy Department, and as such cannot function as well as if it were a separate unit such as the Marine Corps and could function as such, of course, subject to correlation with the naval authorities.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Generally speaking, we have no objection to an air force as an adjunct of the Navy and the Army to the extent necessary for them to perform their mission; but we are of the opinion there should be created an air force designed specifically and primarily for the purpose of aerial offensive in warfare. We regard the recent debacles in Europe as due primarily to lack of proper aerial offensive organization on the part of the Allies.

Mr. PITTENGER. How much is involved in this appropriation bill?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. About three and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is the chairman of the committee familiar with reports in past weeks and months to the effect there will be a decentralization program and that boats will be built for the Navy Department in midwestern cities, particularly at Duluth, Minn., and at other places on Lake Superior?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The gentleman from Minnesota made a very able presentation of such question on a previous occasion. That is the only information on the subject which I have in mind.

Mr. PITTENGER. Has the committee any information whether or not the Navy Department is going to keep faith and really decentralize or is it going to spend all of this appropriation on expanding already existing navy yards?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The money will be spent for the purposes for which it is appropriated, which are given in the bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does not the gentleman think it is time that our appropriation committees put some strings on the expenditure of this money so that it will be spent in a way that the welfare of the American people and national defense will be promoted instead of having it on a lopsided basis in connection with an expansion program that will take skilled workmen from the Midwest, from the gentleman's State, to the eastern centers, and leave those midwestern and Western sections almost in a hopeless economic condition to face a hopeless situation?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The committee has already placed such limitations as it deemed practical and necessary at this time.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. In self-defense, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I resent the suggestion which appears to me to be critical, coming from

my very well-beloved friend from Minnesota, that this obligation rests on the shoulders of the Appropriations Committee. I want to remind him that in the largest degree and to the fullest extent the Appropriations Committee must abide by, first, authorizations as the House passes them, and, secondly, by the determinations of the departments, as they are a part of the executive branch of our Government. So it would be futile for the Appropriations Committee to tie strings onto a very vitally important defense measure simply for the purpose of what some people might call logrolling.

Mr. PITTENGER. I had no intention of being critical of the highly esteemed gentleman from Pennsylvania, who speaks for the Appropriations Committee. I do not want him to set up a straw man, then knock it down again, because the members of the Appropriations Committee are the most able Members of the House; neither do I want the implication to remain that I believe in logrolling. I do not.

I know that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania is too high-minded to submit to any such tactics, but I believe this little colloquy illustrates what I have long felt, namely, that the tail wags the dog. The departments come down here and get all the money they want and spend it the way they want to spend it. I do not know a better place to start on a program of seeing that the departments do the right thing than right here in Congress, with appropriate safeguards on appropriation bills.

I am not criticizing anybody. I am stating facts. My distinguished colleague from Nevada has been most courteous in permitting me time to make these inquiries.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. My distinguished friend from Minnesota knows only too well that I would not impute to him the slightest suggestion of logrolling. I know he is motivated at all times by an interest that does not permit stooping to sordid practices of that character, and that he is always mindful of the national need as he approaches these items. I join with him wholeheartedly in the observation he makes that somehow or other we ought to get hold of the executive branch of the Government and keep it in line with the will and the wish of the people as it is represented here in the House. I commend the gentleman for the splendid contribution he has brought to the discussion of the day. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORN AND WHEAT QUOTAS AND LOANS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 187.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 187

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 149, a joint resolution relating to marketing quotas and loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without amendments.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Hall, Leonard, W.	Powers
Bradley, Mich.	Harris, Va.	Rabaut
Buckler, Minn.	Holmes	Ramspeck
Buckley, N. Y.	Hook	Robinson, Utah
Burch	Jenks, N. H.	Romjue
Burdick	Jennings	Sacks
Burgin	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Satterfield
Byrne	Jones	Scanlon
Celler	Kilburn	Schaefer, Ill.
Clark	Kirwan	Scott
Cluett	Kopplemann	Shafer, Mich.
Cole, N. Y.	McArdle	Shannon
Costello	McGranery	Sheridan
Crowther	McKeough	Simpson
Dies	McMillan	Smith, Pa.
Domengeaux	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Eberharter	Martin, Mass.	Stearns, N. H.
Edmiston	Mitchell	Sutphin
Flannery	Mundt	Sweeney
Fogarty	Nelson	Taylor
Folger	O'Day	Wadsworth
Geyer, Calif.	Osmers	Welch
Gifford	Plumley	White
Grant, Ind.		Wolfenden, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. Cox, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Matthew F. McGuire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address that I delivered at Anderson, Ind., recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. TENEROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CORN AND WHEAT QUOTAS AND LOANS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] to be in turn yielded by him as he sees fit.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] to make a brief announcement.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this gesture of friendship and courtesy on the part of the gentleman in control of the time, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge EUGENE COX. I have asked for this time merely to make an announcement.

In the patio of the Administration Building of the Department of Agriculture, the marble building facing the Mall, there is displayed, today and tomorrow only, an exhibit of new uses of cotton which the research laboratories of the Marketing Division of the Surplus Marketing Aministration have perfected. There are on display fireproof cotton shingles, fireproof cotton outer walls, fireproof cotton wallpaper, and fireproof insulation made of cotton. There is a cotton house, complete. We are all desperately busy, but I feel sure that many of the Members and our guests in the gallery will find this one of the most interesting exhibits they have ever seen if they can drop by for a few minutes. It is open to the public, and, of course, free of any admission charge.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the gentleman will include also the fireproof cotton blankets. I understand the Red Cross has purchased 10,000 of them, which I think will be of great benefit.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman. There are also cotton mattresses, cotton paving for irrigation ditches, roads, and airport runways.

This exhibition is well worth seeing and is most creditable intrinsically. But when we think of the years of top-flight thought and painstaking work back of each one of these proven products, too much credit can hardly be given to Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Surplus Marketing Administration; J. B. Wyckoff, Chief of the Marketing Division; E. H. Omohundro, senior agricultural economist; and the great Department in which they so ably serve.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY].

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who is handling this rule, has allotted me time at the beginning of the discussion of this all-important measure. I assure you I shall not take up your time discussing the sad plight of the farmer at the present

time, because that is generally known to all of us. Neither will I take up your time discussing the status of the farmer with reference to our war policy or the provisions of the lease-lend bill, and other conditions that we all know exist, whereby the farmer is one group that is certainly making greater sacrifices than almost any other group and is getting less in return, and I say that without fear of contradiction. During the duration of this war, and also after it is over, the American farmers will be the group that needs the most help and will get the least help.

The farmer is not before you today making any demand. He has to work for beneficial farm legislation through us, as his friend and representative. He is before you through you and me as the representatives of agriculture, and all other friends of agriculture, requesting that he be given some additional farm relief legislation. Our Committee on Agriculture is now holding hearings, and has been for quite some time, on the general farm program. I do not know if and when a general farm bill will be brought out of our committee. No one knows whether it will be, if reported, a cost-of-production bill, a price-fixing bill, a certificate plan, a processing plan, a parity loan program, or just what it will be; but we do know we are working at the job. We do know that we are doing the best we can under the existing circumstances. It is recognized by all to be a complicated and complex problem, with many different plans and angles.

Today you have an opportunity, as we see it, really to do something constructive for the farmer, although I must admit it is not of a permanent nature. It is in the nature of an emergency. I wish we could now get a high-loan program that would work and be permanent.

How does this House Joint Resolution No. 149 get before the House? Briefly, the Senate, in March of this year, passed a resolution whereby quotas were to be voted by referendum on wheat and corn. This resolution was introduced in the House, and, of course, it was sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. You and I, and everybody else, know it is a very complicated job to administer any farm program, and, furthermore, this resolution is not only to simplify administration, but it is an effort to have prices for farm commodities raised to the producers of farm commodities. As we all know, the quotas have never been voted by the farmers on wheat and corn, and the present program has been under the Soil Conservation Act.

The farmers producing cotton and tobacco have voted quotas, but the farmers producing wheat and corn have not, because they have not been asked to because the sacrifices and the benefits have not had the relationship that the Secretary of Agriculture felt was necessary to call for a referendum; but, Mr. Speaker, we know that today surpluses are being piled up in all agricultural commodities. We know that our export trade is gone. We know that while we are planting 62,000,000 acres of wheat, we have about 700,000,000 bushels of wheat carry-over. From past experience and from statistics, we know there is no way to consume domestically more than about 685,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. We also know that if these surpluses continue to pile up, the prices will have to be pushed down. That means the farmer not only pays the bill but will be left holding the bag.

We further know that the only way to hold up prices on agricultural commodities is to put a base or a foundation under them, and the method being used now is the loan method. This is putting a floor under the major agricultural commodities. The higher the loan, the stronger the floor.

When this resolution came from the Senate to the House Committee on Agriculture, we knew the gigantic task that was ahead of us, but we reasoned that the farmers wanted quotas for the corn farmer and the wheat farmer, and in order to have quotas and to make the program effective you have got to raise the penalty for the noncomplier. You know the penalty for noncompliance on wheat has been only 15 cents a bushel. We thought that penalty would be sufficient when the act of 1938 was enacted, but we now know that 15 cents a bushel, as a penalty for a noncooperator, is not sufficient, because he goes on and does not comply, pays his penalty, and puts his commodity on the market and floods the market at a time when the prices are pounded down. So in our effort not only to help the wheat and corn farmer, knowing the penalty to be effective would have to be raised, the House Committee on Agriculture said that if we increased the penalty we should increase the mandatory loan provision as it now exists. There is a loan provision in the present Agricultural Adjustment Act which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to loan on the five basic agricultural commodities anywhere from 52 percent to 75 percent of parity.

The selling price of rice and tobacco and corn has been around 75 percent of parity, but wheat and cotton have not, and there has been authorized a loan of only 56 percent of parity on these two commodities. That is the highest loan that the Secretary of Agriculture has authorized on wheat and cotton. Fifty-six percent of parity, Mr. Speaker, does not put the farmer in the picture where he deserves to be. So our Committee on Agriculture, in the joint resolution that we now have before you, said that we would provide 75 percent mandatory loans to be loaned by the Commodity Credit Corporation on these four major agricultural commodities, and we did not include rice for the reason that rice is already above 75 percent of parity. However, I think you all realize that the Committee on Agriculture always tries to be broad-minded and fair; and if there is any serious reason why rice should be included here, I do not believe we have any serious objections to including rice, but we are endeavoring to do something by way of a mandatory loan at this particular time for the commodities that are below 75 percent of parity.

Generally, these are the provisions of this House Joint Resolution No. 149. It differs vastly from the measure the Senate passed. As I have said, we put a 75-percent mandatory loan on these commodities and provided certain penalties. We do not provide a penalty of 30 cents for corn or 40 cents for wheat, as was asked originally, but we say that when a commodity receives a 75-percent-of-parity loan the penalty shall be 50 percent of the loan. You understand, of course, that a 75-percent loan on wheat would be approximately 85 cents a bushel. The penalty, which is 50 percent of the loan, would be about 42½ cents for the noncomplier.

I want to be perfectly frank with the House and present this proposition as clearly as I can within the limited time at my disposal. I do not know of any organized group that is against the provisions of this bill as our House Committee on Agriculture has brought it to you. There may be some individuals who may be against it; and if there are, I imagine the reason would be that they feel the penalty on the noncompliers is too severe. I could discuss this matter at length, Mr. Speaker, but when you have a noncompliance with a program, that is what breaks the program down. If a person thinks that 50 percent of the parity loan is too great a penalty for the noncomplier, I beg of you to reason the matter in this way. We cannot legislate, although we endeavor always to take care of minorities, for the very few; that is, those who do not comply. We have got to legislate in a general way and have in mind those who do comply, and the 50-percent penalty will enable the noncomplier even to store his wheat or his other commodities and secure a loan that certainly will not work any hardship on the noncomplier. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman desire any more time?

Mr. DOXEY. It is very kind of the gentleman to suggest it, and I would like to yield to some gentlemen for a few questions, though I do not want to impose on anyone. I know other Members want time, and our time on this resolution is very limited.

Mr. COX. I yield the gentleman 4 minutes more.

Mr. DOXEY. I thank the gentleman, and I shall be glad now to answer any questions that I may be able to.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. Yes; gladly to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am very much interested in the statement my friend and colleague has made about the penalty to be imposed on the noncompliers. I am very strong for this resolution, and I want to see it pass, but it happens that some of us represent certain sections of the country where a lot of new lands are being put into cultivation, because of certain situations. In other words, in the section of Missouri that I have the honor to represent, formerly a great timber country, large swamp areas were drained at great cost, and heavy drainage assessments and installments were placed against these lands. The owners had to clear the land in order to hold it. As a consequence, many farm homes

have been established, and these men are developing and farming the land in order to get into the farm program, and as yet many have not had sufficient time to get into and comply with the program. To place a 50-percent penalty against this land will virtually drive these farmers into bankruptcy; and while we are trying to help agriculture in general, I insist that something ought to be done to protect these lands and the people who are establishing homes on them. The same situation applies with reference to the irrigated sections where new homes are being established.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is taking up considerable of my time, and I would be very glad to answer any question that he may ask, but I do not want the gentleman to take up all of the time allotted to me. I know how keenly my friend feels about this.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think a discussion of this problem is worth the time.

Mr. DOXEY. I know, and I have a situation such as the gentleman has. I have the answer that I would like to give to you.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman think we ought to do something to help the people in these drainage areas, where heavy drainage installments are placed against these lands that are being cleared? They have to clear the land in order to hold it, and like the farmers in the irrigated sections, where they have to pay heavy installments for water benefits as well as large sums of money to place these lands in cultivation, I think something should be done for them instead of confiscating their homes. They are in a different situation from the farmer who does not have to bear these additional burdens. We should reduce the penalty as to these new-land farmers until they have had time to establish a base and comply with the program.

Mr. DOXEY. I thoroughly appreciate the gentleman's position and the effort that he has made on behalf of these people. I appreciate the fight that he made in the committee, but the gentleman knows as well as I do that a number of us have that same situation. We tried to remedy the situation but how to remedy it I am frank to say I do not know, without doing something that will materially hurt the program. Those in charge of administering it—and they know more about it than we—would say that it would place the program out of balance. The gentleman suggests that those people be exempted. We have been pretty liberal in our exemptions with these farmers. The corn farmer has been exempted 15 acres and the wheat farmer 15 acres in this bill, and we exempt the man who has the usual allotment under the soil conservation, because those people have been independent all of their lives and do not know anything else but farming; but as to the people who have cleared the land in order to get into the program, because that is the only thing they feel they can get a livelihood out of, I can do no more than to say to them that on that rich soil raise all you can and put it into storage and get a loan of 60 or 75 percent of parity, and in that way they will get more money out of it than any other thing that they can raise on the land. I certainly can appreciate my colleague's position, and I know how hard he has worked to remedy this situation.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What the gentleman says is true about wheat and corn, but it happens that in the section I represent—one of the greatest cotton-producing sections of the Nation—we grow cotton principally, and there is little left for the new cotton farmer but to pay the penalty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. Yes; gladly.

Mr. LEAVY. I want the gentleman to clarify the situation in reference to corn in commercial areas and in noncommercial areas. Corn now is loaned up to 75 percent in what is called commercial corn growing areas. What changes are made here?

Mr. DOXEY. There are about 600 counties in the commercial corn area, and there are counties in every agriculture State that are not in the commercial corn area. Of course, when we wrote this bill, to be frank, we felt that the referendum would be submitted to the corn farmers and quotas assigned, but since the bill has been reported I cannot speak with authority; however, there is some doubt as to whether we will have any referendum this year on corn other than the program under the soil conservation plan. The corn farmers are now given about a 75-percent loan. We want at least a 75-percent loan on wheat and cotton and I hope you vote with us. I believe you will.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, some of us have been busy with committee hearings or other matters the past few days and have had little opportunity to study this bill. I have read the report, however, and have looked through the bill rather hurriedly. Certain questions come to mind to which I would like to direct attention.

In the first place, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] just said, it is very probable there will not be corn quotas this year. So the primary effect of this bill, so far as the marketing quota provision is concerned, relates to wheat. A great deal of wheat has already been planted. Consequently the effect of this bill upon the wheat grower is to affect a situation that has already been created. It is retroactive. The farmer who has planted his wheat planted it on the supposition that if he was not a cooperator, and if he was planting more than he might have if he signed up for the benefit program, he should be subject to a penalty of only 15 cents on the wheat that he might market in excess of the normal production quota. This bill proposes to say to that farmer who has planted in excess of what he would plant if he were qualifying for the benefit payments, "For the excess marketing quota you will have a penalty of 50 percent of the marketing price." In other words, if wheat should go to a dollar, the penalty that this man faces is not 15 cents but 50 cents. That is a condition he did not know when he planted his wheat.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I wonder if the gentleman is not somewhat mistaken. It is 50 percent of the loan; not 50 percent of the market value.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have that correction, for, of course, that means the penalty is not quite as severe as I feared. And I understand the bill increases the loan provision to 75 percent of parity, so that the penalty on wheat would possibly be about 42 cents, if my figuring is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would be one-half of 75 percent of parity. That being 84 cents, it would be about 42 cents a bushel.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As has been stated by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], the intention is to heavily increase the penalty of the noncooperator in these production programs.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman think it is necessary to increase the penalty if you are going to increase the loan?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the loan increase for the noncooperator is only on 60 percent of parity, whereas it is 75 percent of parity for the cooperator.

In addition to the penalty provisions, it must be remembered that primarily the emphasis in the 1938 Farm Act was on the positive side of providing benefit payments for cooperators. This bill seeks to increase the penalty on the noncooperator.

Now then, the thing which has particularly disturbed me is this sentence in the final paragraph, of the report of the committee on the bill:

> The resolution in effect provides for the determination of a farm-marketing excess on corn and wheat, and puts the marketing penalty on this excess of the commodity, regardless of whether it is actually marketed, thereby making unnecessary the determination of the actual production and the actual marketings of the commodity on the farm.

That would seem to penalize the producer, whether he seeks to sell his wheat or not. When the 1938 Farm Act was passed we were given to understand that if a noncooperator wanted to raise more wheat than he might have if he were signing up for the benefit program, he could do so, but he would either have to use that wheat on the farm or he would have to suffer a 15-cent-a-bushel penalty when he sold it. I have been told by some members of the committee that this sentence in the report is not a true or

correct statement of what the bill does. If there is some member of the committee who would like to explain that, I will yield to him at this time for that purpose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The law passed in 1938 provided that in the event of marketing quotas a farmer could not market in excess of his quota, nor could he feed the excess upon his farm to livestock or poultry that was to go into market; but he could feed that excess to poultry used on his own table, or to a milk cow that provided milk for his own family or to the pig that he kills for food for himself and his family; also for his work horses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Now in the light of this sentence on penalties in the committee report, what is the prospect for the farmer who has not signed up?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from South Dakota 2 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The prospect is that he has got to turn his excess over to the Secretary of Agriculture; that is, the farmer who produces in excess must turn his excess over to the Secretary of Agriculture or he must store it and not use it in any manner whatsoever.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If he must store it, what is he going to do with it?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The time will then come when the storage will be released and the farmer will get that wheat that goes into storage.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That may be 1950.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa what provision in the bill provides that this wheat will be released from storage so that he can market it?

Mr. GILCHRIST. As I have told the gentleman, the language in the report, regardless of whether it is actually marketed or not, is erroneous.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But I yielded to the gentleman to explain what he is going to do with this stored wheat. It will deteriorate, of course, in time, under the storage conditions that prevail on the average wheat farm.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I think the chairman can refer to the section of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can explain that to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In the event he has produced in excess of his market quota this year, he will have to store the wheat and will not be able to sell it until it can come within his marketing quota for the next or a later year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can the gentleman from Nebraska inform me in what part of the bill that provision is found, that he is going to have a chance to sell the wheat before the wheat has deteriorated?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I think it is well to understand that practically all of this is in existing law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Except it greatly increases the penalty on wheat he cannot market.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It increases the penalties but does not change the existing law materially. The existing law provides that in the event marketing quotas are voted, wheat that is carried in excess of the market quota—the farmer can store it and sell it next year within his marketing quota. In order to do that he may have to reduce his acreage. The important part of this bill is the mandatory loan provision that will raise the price of wheat 20 cents per bushel on this year's crop.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN A. HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, ever since 1935 the 60,000 dairy farmers in upstate New York have been suffering from what might be termed 7 years of Biblical famine.

In 1935 and 1936 devastating floods rushed from the Susequehanna and Chenango and a number of other large tributaries, sweeping every single thing before them, destroying lands, washing away fertile soil, and executing tremendous damage upon the entire countryside. Not satisfied with that, the forces of Nature seemed to be conniving and plotting, for the following year there was visited upon the same section one of the most destructive droughts the entire Nation has ever known. I need not point out to you the widespread suffering, the lack of subsistence feedings, the absolute dearth of hay and fodders that existed. In the years 1938, 1939, and 1940 there was no possibility of obtaining any such thing as hay or fodder at a reasonable price. That presented a problem which was without question one of the most serious the dairy farmers have had to face in the past 25 years. You know and I know that it takes a great deal of time and a lot of industry to build up a good dairy herd; that it takes a period of years in the raising of those animals not only from the time of a possible drought or famine, or tremendous price rise, but many years before that, and it also incurs the outlay of every available bit of cash a farmer can possibly raise.

In addition to that, to take advantage of the situation the 60,000 dairymen of up-State New York found themselves in, there came into various districts where the drought was especially severe a number of exploiters and connivers, who immediately raised the price of hay and fodders a tremendous amount and forced many farmers absolutely to go out of the dairy business. Those who were able to survive were compelled to borrow money at a price way above anything they had ever had to pay before; and so it is that these 7 years of famine have been to the dairy farmers of up-State New York devastating to the *n*th degree.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It seems to me the tragedy of the gentleman is that the dairy industry, which is by far the largest and most valuable branch of agriculture, has never shared one dime in this agricultural program. The dairy farmers, the poultry raisers, and the fruit growers have been left completely out in the cold.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. SHORT. How in the world would this really help any dairy farmer, poultry raiser, or fruit grower?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There is no possibility of this helping our particular section, and I appreciate the point the gentleman has made.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Has not the gentleman been in Congress long enough to know that dairy farmers do not belong to agriculture at all?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right, notwithstanding they do have to exist on subsistence feeding and other items raised by farmers.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I mean from the treatment they get here one would not know they belonged to agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There is no question about that fact. The gentleman is absolutely correct in stating it.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman point out how the Committee on Agriculture can aid the fruit growers more than it has?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry, but my time has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, in one way I am a little embarrassed today to stand up here and oppose this bill. People have come to me and asked me why I should be interested in it, it does not affect my district. Of course, my answer to that is that pretty nearly all the things we have been doing for the past 8 years have not affected my district. When we are elected to office we should think of the whole United States and not of our own particular district.

To start with, I want to be fair. May I say that as far as the dairy industry is concerned, the fact it has not been a basic commodity is due to the industry itself. There is no one to blame for that except themselves. We had hearings in Wisconsin and also in Minnesota. Over in Wisconsin we let the fluid-milk boys run the show. They said we did not want anything to do with it and that we did not want to be regimented, but I notice they came down here to Washington and got a very acceptable milk-marketing agreement for themselves. Anything I

shall say today will not have any personal, political, or sectionalism atmosphere. For the welfare of ourselves, I shall try to enumerate the reasons that everyone should be very careful before they vote for this bill.

First, I am opposed to this bill because we are doing something that I am not so sure is for the best interest of the farmers of this country. We are freezing or we are going to freeze certain people in the production of wheat. I wonder how many people here today want to freeze the big corporation farmers who are raising wheat and who already have had millions of dollars from the Treasury of the United States? Who wants big operators like Campbell on a 50,000- or 100,000-acre basis. I just wonder how many want to do that in fairness to the average farmer in the United States. This is the third year I have spent trying to fathom some of these new wrinkles in the farm program and the more I study it the more I find we pass legislation for the top and the bottom, but the great bulk of the people in between are the ones who do not get the benefit of the program, and I am willing to defend that statement any time, any place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get this one thing across, and I am not going below the Mason and Dixon's line. There is nothing personal, political, or sectional about it. There is one congressional district that has had more money than have any one of 20 States, and a lot of those 20 States believe they are pretty good agricultural States. All we are doing by this bill is making the matter worse. We are going farther down the road for things we should not be for.

Here is my No. 2 reason—this is surely a part of the bill that I want every Member to take home with him, because we are going to get into lots of difficulties. I do not want to get into any argument about the Smoot-Hawley tariff or reciprocal trade treaties, but listen to this: We will say that the parity price of corn is $1 a bushel. According to this bill we can lend 75 cents. One-half of 75 cents is 37½ cents. Is that right? Read the bill over. Any man who is in the program is going to pay 37½ cents every time he sells a bushel of corn. Our foreign farmer brother may ship in all he wants to at 25 cents a bushel. Who wants to legislate a tariff 50 percent higher on our domestic producer than we do on our foreign producer?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I believe the gentleman made a mistake in his statement, and I know he does not want to do that. He mentioned that every farmer who sold a bushel of corn would have to pay 37½ cents a bushel. In the first instance, the penalty rate is 50 percent of the loan rate.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The loan rate is three-quarters of parity, which in this case would be 31 cents.

Mr. MURRAY. If corn is $1 a bushel, he could borrow 75 cents?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It would not make any difference.

Mr. MURRAY. If parity is $1 a bushel, how much could he borrow?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Corn is not $1 a bushel.

Mr. MURRAY. We are not legislating just for today. I am asking if the parity price of corn is $1 a bushel?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman would be correct.

Mr. MURRAY. If parity on wheat is $1.60 a bushel, three-quarters would be $1.20, and a half of that would be 60 cents. The tariff on wheat coming in from some other country today is only 42 cents. Is there a man here today who wants to go to his farmers and tell them, "I just did a good thing for you. I voted a bigger domestic tariff on you than we require of the foreigner who wants to bring his products into this country."

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. No marketing quota will be put into effect this year on corn and, further, this penalty will not apply to noncommercial areas as far as corn is concerned.

Mr. DOXEY. This is to cover those who do not comply. A great majority are complying; therefore the tariff, as you term it, only affects the man who is outside the program and will not comply and who is trying to break it down.

Mr. MURRAY. As long as I have yielded, may I answer the question by asking my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi, with all his interest in cotton, to please tell the Members of the House what you are going to do with the Bankhead cotton bill, which raises the price of cotton up to 14½ cents? They will lend 14½ cents per pound. Cotton today is only 7½ cents in Brazil. I would like to know how you are going to keep cotton from Brazil from rolling right into this country?

Mr. DOXEY. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. DOXEY. I will be glad to answer it. If we can get 100-percent parity, we are not worrying about the Brazilian cotton, even though there is no tariff on it, because the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies of the Government have ample authority to protect our market, and we have faith in them. We want to get our house in order and let the Brazilian situation take care of itself. That is our position exactly.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a good answer; but it does not stop the cotton from coming in here.

Mr. DOXEY. Section 22 will take care of that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question I raised on the bill was not raised because I do not want to work out a solution that will be fair to the farmers. I voted for the 1938 Farm Act, but I did it at the time with the assurance to the wheat farmer, who could not come in because he felt that his system of production and his crop hazard and the investment he had did not permit him to come in, that if he wanted to market he would not be subject to a penalty of more than 15 cents. There are a great many wheat farmers today whose quotas have been cut to the point where they cannot sign up any more, because they cannot under the hazards support their farm and carry on with the investment they have and pay their interest to the Federal land bank and sign up.

Mr. MURRAY. I may say to my colleague that I want to get back to this cotton situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We have to treat them fairly.

Mr. MURRAY. I call the attention of the people today to the fact that this is just one small group of agriculture that is reaching its hands just that much more into the pot of gold. We talk about parity, parity, parity. The cotton crop has had from 45 to 50 percent of parity all these years. This last year it got $96,000,000 out of over $203,000,000, or 47 percent of it. If we are going to have class legislation continually for the few at the top and the few at the bottom, we are going to end up just about the same as agriculture is going all over the United States today.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If a person once accepts the philosophy of granting parity loans of 100 percent or parity loans of 75 percent to the cooperator, does he not necessarily have to accept the philosophy that a penalty must be imposed? Let me change my question around. Is there any way, any practical way, any sane way, any fair way to promote a program of parity loans or less-than-parity loans without at the same time imposing a penalty on the noncooperator?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I do not believe there is. I believe the farm people of this country are not entitled to and do not ask for any more than any other class of people. I believe that if they voluntarily go into a program they are entitled to 100 percent of parity, because they are going to die just as surely with 75 percent parity as they would with 25 or 50 percent of parity. It is just going to take a little longer to kill them. They are entitled to 100 percent parity. If the Bankhead bill comes over here including all of agriculture, not just a few selected crops, which means only about a third of our economy, I certainly would be glad to vote for it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can contribute anything to the discussion, but there appears to be a little misunderstanding developed about what the bill does. I am not in the wheat area and I am not in the commercial corn area. My attitude on the committee has always been that the wheat members and the corn members should get together and discuss their problems and confer with the Department, and I try to go along and cooperate with them.

This bill came to us before the announcement by the Department of Agriculture that there would be no corn-marketing quotas this year. It was stated then that corn and wheat quotas would be necessary on account of their enormous surpluses. You understand, I presume, that on July 1 there will be approximately 400,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat. You also probably understand that Canada now has a surplus sufficient to supply Great Britain for 2 years if Canada does not grow another seed of wheat. So the Department took the position that the time had come when they should submit to the corn and wheat farmers the question of whether they wanted to further increase the surplus or wanted to invoke marketing quotas. Many of the members of the committee had no concern in it except to be helpful and cooperative.

There is now in the present act machinery for marketing quotas, but, as has been mentioned, it provides a very small penalty, 15 cents per bushel, on wheat. Wheat has been going up a little. It is hoped that the loan rate will be increased. I know you gentlemen will recognize that if the price goes up or if the loan rate goes up, a small penalty will not prevent any producer from continuing to grow all the wheat he wants to.

There are but two things in this bill. The bill came to us originally with the simple provision to increase the penalties on the excess production of wheat and corn. I believe one penalty was 30 cents and the other one was 50 cents. Some of the members of the committee immediately objected and said, "We cannot go to our people and say, 'We have fixed you up now; we have just increased your penalties. We have not increased your price, we have not helped the price, we have not increased the loan, we have just fixed you up by plastering a higher penalty on you.'" I felt that that was a reasonable objection.

The suggestion was made in the committee, "Penalties and loans should have a comparative basis; that is, if you are going to have a low loan, then a low penalty will be sufficient to protect it. If you are going to have a high loan, you should have a high penalty. Otherwise, a man could take advantage of the loan, pay a small penalty, and make a profit producing wheat and corn outside of the program."

So the formula in this bill was agreed upon, and after wheat and corn agreed to it, then cotton agreed to it, and the penalty on the overproduction of cotton, wheat, or corn was to be 50 percent of the loan. If you loan 75 percent of parity the penalty will be 37½ percent, and if you loan 50 percent of parity it will be 25 percent. If you will stop and think a minute, I am sure you will agree that those two things must go up or down together.

Now, heretofore or this year, corn has been receiving a loan of 75 percent of parity. The cotton and wheat farmers have received a loan of only 56 percent of parity. There is a very earnest effort in our committee to try, as best we can, to keep the commodities on the same basis and have them go along together. The criticism has been made here that our committee has done nothing for dairying. I want to say to you, just as sincerely as I can, the only reason our committee has not reported a bill for dairying is because the dairy producers refuse to get together. We sit there on the committee and one group comes in with a proposal and another comes in with an entirely different proposal. I am just as anxious as any man in the Congress——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Let me complete this statement.

I am anxious to provide exactly the same rights, the same benefits, and the same protection for dairying as I am for any other commodity produced in this Nation, and if the dairy producers will get together among themselves, or a respectable majority of them, and submit recommendations to our committee, I believe I can speak for the committee and say that proper legislation will be presented to the House.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], who does not happen to belong to my party, had a bill before the committee all last year.

Mr. PACE. And I am very sympathetic toward it.

Mr. MURRAY. And he could not even get it voted on in the committee. We spend more time talking about these things than anything else. We could have voted on that measure 25 times while we were talking about it.

Mr. PACE. But there is very little support from the entire dairy industry for that bill. Personally, I am sympathetic toward it and supported it in committee.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes. The gentleman has promised to come before our committee soon, and I look forward to his appearance.

Mr. HULL. As a matter of fact, when the hearings were held last year, there was not a soul who appeared in opposition to the bill, and any opposition that did appear, which I do not know anything about, came quietly from some source of which I have no knowledge whatsoever, and you have not a thing in all your hearings against that bill.

Mr. PACE. Let me say to the gentleman that I understand there will be a general meeting of the dairy interests of the Nation next Friday, and I think if the gentleman can produce a recommendation from the dairy producers at that meeting it will contribute materially in the expedition of the consideration of that bill.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield right there, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he is proposing to hold anything of that sort against the committee that is now operating in the Seventy-seventh Congress?

Mr. HULL. Perhaps not.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is referring to the committee of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and I will say to the gentleman now that at any time he wants to come before our committee on this bill we will be delighted to have him appear and we will give him every consideration.

Mr. PACE. Now, I want to say one other thing. One of the gentlemen said that this bill would "freeze" the big producers of wheat. I understand one of the problems now is that big operators, which have a very low cost of production, have contributed most to this enormous surplus, and I will say to the gentleman that my understanding is that the wheat producers have come in and asked for this legislation in order to prevent those big operators from further expanding and further contributing to the surplus.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has always been very much interested in the problems of the renters or the sharecroppers, and I am wondering how the gentleman feels about the problem this will present to the farm renter who rented his farm last year and planted his wheat either last fall or this spring, with the prospect of a 15-cent penalty if he overplanted, and the problem he faces now where he cannot hope to be able to pay the rent for his farm and his other expenses.

Mr. PACE. I regret that my time does not permit me to answer that question.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PACE. I may say to the gentleman that there is a problem there, but as I understand it, their wheat is planted nearly the year round, because you have a winter wheat and a spring wheat, and I do not believe at any period when Congress is in session you could select a time that would not run into the problem of some producer somewhere in the United States having already planted his wheat. The gentleman, of course, is more familiar with that situation than I am.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would the gentleman think of an amendment exempting the marketing of wheat already planted?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman understands that none of the quotas will be effective unless two-thirds of his producers approve it and it is a question of whether you shall serve the greater number or whether you shall submit to the wishes of the lesser number. We shall offer an amendment to the bill which will protect many of those to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thought one of the gravest concerns of government was to protect the weak or the minority. The strong always have ways of protecting themselves. Your sharecropper or your farm renter is the man who faces the most serious problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute for the purpose of asking a question. The gentleman has said that it has been determined that corn quotas will not be applied this year.

Mr. PACE. Yes. That is by official announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HALLECK. That has caused a lot of confusion in the Corn Belt.

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand the 1938 Farm Act, it provided for the determination of the question as to whether or not there should be quotas by a certain formula that had to do with the carry-over, the proposed production, and the estimated consumption, and whenever the production and the carry-over exceeded a given amount in respect to the expected consumption, the quotas were to be applied. Is this declaration in line with that formula in the bill or not in line with it?

Mr. PACE. I refer the gentleman to section 371 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which states that any time the Secretary concludes quotas would be either an increase in export demand or in a time of emergency, he may suspend the marketing quotas. I am sure that the Secretary is acting under the authority of that act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, during the past 8 years hundreds of thousands and tens of millions of dollars have been dished out of the Federal Treasury by this patronizing, paternalistic administration to the farmers of our country, particularly to those who grow cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and tobacco, and in spite of these unparalleled expenditures the American farmer still finds himself in an awful plight. The laws of nature are still absolute and inexorable, stronger than the laws passed by the Congress of the United States, and this House should begin to realize that it cannot abrogate the natural law of supply and demand. Originally the A. A. A. bill bore some degree of honesty, because its avowed purpose was to limit production and to make the farmer carry out orders issued from a centralized bureaucracy. We pursued that policy, plowing under cotton, knocking innocent pigs in the head, burning wheat, until the Supreme Court of the United States declared the act invalid and unconstitutional, and then we found a certain group of men bringing the same old corpse into this Chamber dressed up in new togs, called an act to conserve the soil. I am happy that I stood in this Chamber and at that time said to the membership of this House:

> Tear the mask from this camouflaged measure, get beneath the subterfuge back of the sophisticated argument, and you will find that this Soil Conservation Act is nothing more than a crop-control act, an act to regulate and regiment the American farmer.

Its purpose was to limit production, but because of intensive methods of farming adopted, production increased, although acreage was reduced.

It seems to me that we have had a confession on the floor of the House this afternoon that this is what the A. A. A. is, and that this present resolution will further rob the few remaining independent farmers of the little liberty they have left. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] was honest enough to say that we have at the present time a penalty of only 15 cents a bushel on wheat for those farmers who refuse to cooperate or to comply with the program; and that now we bring in a resolution increasing that penalty from 15 cents a bushel to 50 percent of the value of the loan to those who cooperate. I am for the increased loans, but I am against the increased penalties. The evil of one counterbalances the benefit of the other. When you passed the Soil Conservation Act you denied there was anything compulsory about it, but many of us pointed out at the time that because of these economic rewards offered for compliance and because of certain penalties imposed on those who refused to comply, in essence it was mandatory and altogether compulsory. It seems to me that we are just going one step further toward complete, absolute regimentation of the American farmer and are destroying the last vestige of liberty of the most independent group left in America. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman from Indiana has any more time that he desires to use?

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] indicated to me that he would be back shortly and wanted to consume 3 minutes. He is not in the Chamber at the present moment.

Mr. COX. There is just one more speaker on this side.

Mr. Speaker, that the plight of the farmer as a whole is bad, I presume practically everybody agrees. Certainly all Members coming from agricultural sections would agree. It is disappointing to me that Members representing the dairying sections of the country should indicate opposition to this bill. That they should be disappointed that there is nothing in the bill that relieves the situation with reference to the dairy people, I can understand; but it is difficult for me to get their viewpoint and to understand just how it is that they find it within their hearts to oppose a measure that promises some relief to at least a part of the group to which they belong.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It may be true that under this particular measure the dairy farmers are not benefited, but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that they are protected now by a tariff; that they participate in the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated for surplus commodities and that they participate in the soil-conservation benefits.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this measure was reported unanimously by the great Committee on Agriculture of this House. Since that action there has apparently been a division, as we find indicated in the debate thus far.

The purpose of the measure is to somewhat narrow the disparity in the income of the farm worker and the industrial worker.

Some weeks ago my colleague, Mr. PACE, analyzed a statement issued by the Department of Agriculture which showed that as of October 1940, if the wage income of the farmer had increased in line with that of the industrial worker, cotton, instead of bringing 9.3 cents a pound at that time would have been bringing 28 cents. Wheat, instead of bringing 68 cents, would have been bringing in $2.02. Corn, instead of bringing 59 cents, would have been bringing $1.47. Rice, instead of bringing 63 cents, would have been bringing $1.86. Butterfat, instead of bringing 28.8 cents, would have been bringing 60 cents.

Since that time, instead of there being a narrowing of this difference of income, there has been a steady widening of it.

Now, this bill does not solve the whole problem. It is merely an undertaking, and I think a modest undertaking, on the part of the committee to do what can be done at this time without throwing the whole program out of joint. While it does not take care of all of the growers, it takes care of those whose situation seems worst, from this comparative statement from which I have quoted.

Representatives of the Committee on Agriculture have here on the floor in this debate repeatedly promised the dairy people that when they get together and come before their committee with a proposal to relieve their situation, bad as it is, that they will be before a friendly tribunal and with the prospect of cooperation to the extent of proposing to this House legislation which will in part take care of their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I trust there is no opposition to the rule and I therefore move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 149, relating to marketing quotas and loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 149, with Mr. BEAM in the chair.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the House joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state to you at the outset that this bill is more or less an emergency bill. The loans are only in effect for 1 year. The purpose of the bill is to give the wheat farmers of this country the right and privilege to vote for marketing quotas. It was generally

understood that the Department expected to call on corn farmers to vote on marketing quotas on corn, but because of a situation that has arisen recently, I understand they are not now planning to vote quotas on corn. If quotas are voted on wheat, then the penalty will be increased to 50 percent of the loan. The loan under this bill on wheat, cotton, corn, and tobacco is to be 75 percent of parity. I understand that the loan on corn at this time is 75 percent of parity.

This bill, if passed under this emergency situation, will give to the wheat farmers of this country about 17 cents a bushel over what they are receiving at this time. It will give the cotton farmers about 2 cents a pound over the present loan, which is about 9.6 cents.

Now, parity on wheat at this time, so the Secretary of Agriculture has told us, is $1.13⅞. This would give to farmers who are now receiving 55 and 60 cents for wheat about 85 cents per bushel. It would insure to cotton farmers a price of 11½ or 12 cents a pound for this year's crop.

This bill does not apply to any wheat farmer or any cotton farmer who produced cotton or wheat in 1940; only in 1941.

Outside of the dairy people who apparently oppose this bill, and I cannot understand why they oppose the bill in that this Government has given to the dairy interests millions of dollars under section 22 by the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, the only opposition to the bill comes from selfish groups. I regret that Members representing dairy districts oppose the bill. I believe there is not a Member on the floor of this House from any section of the country that produces any type of crop but who knows I am interested in agriculture from a national standpoint and not from a sectional standpoint or the standpoint of any particular commodity. I stand ready to do just what I told the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] a few moments ago, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to give any bill for any commodity prompt consideration. I want to say to you that I am just as anxious to give dairy products, poultry products, fruit, and every product parity as I am cotton or these other products.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for the very fair hearing he has given every bill that has come before his committee this year, but I want to point out to him that last year in the very midst of a tremendous drought in the particular section of the country I represent I asked for a hearing repeatedly on a bill I had introduced that was endorsed by a number of farm organizations throughout the country which provided for transportation of hay, bringing down the price to a reasonable point that could be met by the farmers in my district, but it was not given a hearing. An adverse report on the bill was made by the Department of Agriculture. I tried repeatedly to get a hearing but failed. I feel sure that if the gentleman had granted the hearing the committee would have sided with me as against the Department of Agriculture's report.

Mr. FULMER. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, and I can assure him I shall be delighted to cooperate with him in every instance.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that Members who represent some agricultural sections of this country, or some agricultural commodity that perhaps is not covered under this bill, will stand up here and join with selfish groups that are absolutely destroying agriculture today. Who opposes this bill? The cotton textile manufacturers and the bread-baking industries of the country. They say: Why, if you pass that bill or any other bill that will help the farmers, unless you take the money out of the Treasury of the United States you are going to ruin my business.

Let me quote from a paper that comes out from New York, representing these textile manufacturers:

> Staple goods 64 by 60 print cloth today is selling at 7½ cents, last month 6 cents, and a year ago 5 cents.

You will see that present prices represent a 50-percent increase, yet the farmer's cotton is selling at or just a little above the loan price.

The City National Bank in New York issues monthly a statement. The last statement was issued on April 15, and in this they named some two thousand-odd large corporations, setting forth the percentage of profit for 1940 over 1939. I quote only two or three of them. Listen to this: "Agricultural implements, 67.2 percent; cotton goods, 77.4 percent," and iron and steel 98.8 percent. If, however, you get from the Department of Agriculture the price of cotton goods today and do some figuring for yourself, you would find that the farmer should be receiving for his cotton at this time 19¾ cents per pound. However, he is receiving just about the loan price.

I was interested this morning when I read a letter from a farmer out in Montana sending me his statement of production, storage, sale price, and so forth. This farmer put into storage 4,455 bushels of wheat. He received a loan thereon at the rate of 55.95—not quite 60 cents per bushel. If you will take out freight, storage, interest, and a check for $22 he had to pay to get the loan, when his wheat was sold at a price of about 75 cents, he came out in debt $16.66. That same farmer this year under this bill, if passed, with the same amount of wheat, would receive a difference of about $750, and all other farmers of that section, or any other wheat section, would receive that rate of increase, yet today we have some Members on the floor of the House who would stand up and assist these selfish groups who are robbing these people of fair prices to kill a bill that would definitely for this year give the farmers an increase of millions of dollars for their cotton and wheat.

We frequently hear it said that the farmer today is getting some of the benefits out of the national-defense program the same as other groups. I deny that statement. On the other hand, they are losing because they are not getting increased prices for what they sell but instead are having to pay increased prices on everything they buy.

Quite a lot has been said about the farmer who is not cooperating. I understand about 10 percent of the wheat farmers are not cooperating for one reason or another. Under this bill the farmer who stayed out and who is trying to destroy the program can come in. He can put his excess wheat in storage, sell his other wheat, or put it in storage; next year he can get his quota and take care of his excess wheat.

Are you going to defeat a bill that means millions to the farmers of this country, who have tried to cooperate in the hope of bringing to agriculture that type of prosperity they are entitled to in line with other groups? Are you going to try to legislate in the interest of a small minority that would destroy those farmers who are trying to cooperate?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that I believe the American farmer has just about as good a friend in him as he has ever had in any Representative in Congress. I know the gentleman is trying to do the fair and the honest thing by the farmer which has been denied him in the past. I appreciate that there are benefits contained in this bill for the farmer, and I think the very instance the gentleman has quoted from a farmer in Montana is typical generally in my section. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, however, that we raise a lot of fall wheat in that country, as well as in all the northwestern section of the United States, and likewise a lot of spring wheat. These farmers have planted their fall wheat, and, of course, it will be harvested in 1941.

Mr. FULMER. Permit me to answer the gentleman. I know exactly what he is asking me because he talked to me about it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman let me conclude the statement?

Mr. FULMER. My time is going to be up pretty soon.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will try to get the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FULMER. We only have a limited time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that our farmers are going to harvest that crop planted last fall and this spring. That has already been planted. Now, if we penalize them 35 cents a bushel, or thereabouts, does not the gentleman think that is really unfair to the people who have already planted their crops?

Mr. FULMER. Not at all, for two reasons. They can come in and store that wheat and receive the same benefit that the man who has been cooperating receives, by taking care of his excess wheat in the 1942 program. And if you are going to kill this bill because of one man or 10 percent of the farmers who are not cooperating, then you are going to

deprive thousands of farmers of millions of dollars that they would receive.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not want to kill the bill. I think the bill has some merits.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, our committee is now holding hearings on major bills pending before the committee. I believe every member of the committee is interested in doing for agriculture what this Congress has done for various other groups, and they have passed some of these bills without a record vote. I believe I can speak for the members of our committee, that is, we propose to put on the steps of Congress a bill that will actually give to farmers that which it has given to other groups, that is, a 100 percent parity bill. I hope that no Member will take the position that because it does not affect the commodity grown in his district, or because it might penalize 1 out of 40 they will defeat the bill but that you will help those of us who are interested in helping farmers pass this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to take issue with certain Members here, and groups who are sincere in their desire to help agriculture as I am. But agriculture is a big industry in the United States, and it has many ramifications and diversifications. Some of us represent the dairy sections in the northern States and, naturally, we are concerned with the welfare of the dairy farmers.

This bill is not designed particularly to aid agriculture, with the exception of the oan provisions, which increases the existing loan rate and makes it obligatory at 75 percent of parity. The main provisions of the bill are to increase the penalties, providing farmers do not comply with the marketing quotas fixed by the Department of Agriculture.

This is not an emergency measure. The bill becomes permanent law and a part of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and will continue in operation until repealed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there anything in the bill which limits the operation of it to 1 year?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; except the original A. A. A. Act provides that a vote shall be taken for the calendar marketing year. When the bill came from the Department of Agriculture to our committee, the department requested a 2-year referendum vote. That is, one vote on the marketing quota would stand for 2 years. But the committee turned that down, and the bill as now written only provides for 1 year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand, the penalty provision is permanent law. But is it not true that the 75 percent of parity under the terms of the bill, page 16, would apply to the 1941 crop only?

Mr. ANGUST H. ANDRESEN. The 75-percent loan rate will only apply when the marketing quota is in operation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is important and the gentleman may be in error.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago, in the fall of 1937, you will recall that the House had before it the Agricultural Adjustment Act. I opposed the bill at that time on account of the compulsory features of the act. The proponents of the bill said at that time there was no compulsion in the bill, that is was voluntary, that the farmers did not have to comply if they did not wish to do so. Now we have come to the compulsory control features of the bill. The bureau and the Department of Agriculture, as well as those who advocate this, all admit that compulsion must become effective and they are, therefore, in the case of wheat as they have already done in the case of cotton and tobacco, submitting a referendum to the farmers to have them determine whether or not marketing quotas and penalties shall go into operation.

This bill simply increases the penalties. Of course, the answer will be that the farmers do not have to vote for the marketing quotas. If two-thirds of them vote in favor of the marketing quotas and one-third or less than one-third vote against it, those who are opposed to marketing quotas will be bound by the vote of the two-thirds, and the penalties will go into operation whether they like it or not.

The penalties in this bill are increased. Let us see if the farmers will vote for marketing quotas on wheat. How can they help but do it? The Department offers to pay the wheat farmers 18 cents a bushel parity and soil-conservation payments. In addition, they say, "We will give you a 75 percent of parity loan on wheat," which will make a Government loan of approximately 84½ cents a bushel. If the farmers fail to vote in favor of marketing quotas and compulsion, they receive no loan whatever and they get no parity payments. Therefore the farmer is really up against a difficult proposition where he cannot help himself but vote in favor of the benefits that he is receiving in order to maintain some stability for his farm during this critical time.

Mr. Evans, the head of the A. A. A., has traveled from one end of this country to the other in the wheat sections and has told the farmers, "If you do not vote in favor of marketing quotas, the price of wheat will go down to 25 or 30 cents a bushel." He has said the same thing about corn.

I recognize the critical situation due to the large surpluses of wheat and corn in this country, and that something must be done to put a floor under the economic structure of agriculture. This bill would do that. However, the philosophy of continuing this type of program simply means the piling up of huge surpluses in this country, which eventually is going to break of its own weight, break the Treasury with it, and break all the farmers of the United States.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Has not Evans told the truth in those statements?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question but that Evans has told the truth.

Some of the gentlemen in this room blamed the Farm Board when it bought a few hundred million bushels of wheat. Do you know that we have over $600,000,000 of Government money tied up in loan and owned cotton? Do you know that we have around 500,000,000 bushels of corn, and they say they have to get 65 cents a bushel for that corn in storage out through the country and 69 cents a bushel in Chicago?

I want to help the farmers, but the time is coming when we must get down to earth and get a sound program for the farmers in the United States. If we do not get to the position where we pass such a program, agriculture and the entire country will go to wrack and ruin. We have had repeated promises for the last 8 years that we would get together here in Congress and in our committee and enact some sound legislation to take the place of this emergency legislation which is on the statute books. For the first time in our committee, under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], we are having general hearings, with a promise that we will sit down and draft a Nation-wide farm program that will be effective and that will bring the farmers parity income, to which they are justly entitled in our complicated economic structure. [Applause.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. During the entire hearings before our committee, has a single new idea been expressed by any witness who has appeared there in an effort to solve the farm problem?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is one of the distinguished leaders in the House and I have a high regard for him. I believe the members of the Committee on Agriculture are as well posted as anybody who has knowledge of agricultural problems.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have repeatedly proposed, as the gentleman knows, that we should lock our door in the committee room and as American representatives sit down around the table and work out the problem, which we know can be done, without political influence and connivance from an administration that does one thing to help the farmers on one hand and another thing to ruin the farmers on the other hand.

Mr. COOLEY. There is nothing in this bill——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; that is what I said in the beginning, but I am just pointing out this whole philosophy that we have before us of regimenting the farmers and penalizing them. We are just piling trouble upon their tired backs today that will make it worse for them when the day of reckoning comes. That day is not very far distant, because when this war is over, unless we mend our ways here and our policies in this country, America and the farmers and the laboring man and industry will be used as the dumping ground for farm products and goods produced by peon and convict labor in other parts of the world and they will try to take the best market we have away from us. It is our job to correct this problem.

I hope when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule I may have an opportunity to talk on an amendment or two which I propose to offer to the bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have some modesty, being a new Member of this body and also a new member of the Committee on Agriculture, in attempting to convey some of my opinions to the House in connection with this all-important measure.

I may say, at the very outset of the few minutes I have, that personally I am under no obligation to defend the Department of Agriculture. I make this statement because of some things I shall say a little later. The distinguished former Secretary, now Vice President of the United States, made three speeches in Oklahoma during the recent campaign and confined them to my district. Nearly everyone else in the Department of Agriculture was down there telling the people in my district what a calamity it would be to the farmers of that district if I were elected a Member of this House. So I say this to my Republican brothers, that you may certainly know that I am under no obligation whatever to defend the Department of Agriculture.

However, this is an important measure to the people of Oklahoma and to the wheat farmers generally in the United States. I go along 100 percent with the philosophy of my good friend from Missouri that the farmers certainly should not be regimented, and I do not know that I would have voted any differently than did he if I had been in the House when the 1938 act came before the Congress. But we have that act already on the statute books, and we are going into this harvest with a carry-over of something like 400,000,000 bushels of wheat. And my State is third in the production of wheat, 60 percent of which is grown in my district. This bill affects nothing now save and except wheat. As I understand, they are not going to ask for marketing quotas on corn. Here is what it provides, and here is all it does provide: It gives the farmers the right to say by their own vote whether they want these marketing quotas. This House is not saying to the farmers of this country that you have got to take these marketing quotas. All we do by this bill is to give the farmers of this country a chance to vote on whether we have these marketing quotas or not, and it takes two-thirds of that vote to determine the marketing quotas.

Now, I may confess that it does seem somewhat unfair to change the penalty or change the rules of the game, so to speak, in the middle of the game, but after all, the farmers themselves, all over the United States, will pass upon this question themselves. All we are doing is giving them a chance to say whether two-thirds of the farmers who raise wheat in this country and are affected by marketing quotas, want to increase the penalties—and, incidentally, under the provisions of the bill they will benefit under the increased loan values.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I have only 5 minutes, but I yield to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the referendum vote is submitted to the farmers the Department of Agriculture tells them, "If you do not vote you will get no loan and you will get no corn parity payments."

Mr. RIZLEY. I think that is probably true, and, as I said, I yield to no man in my position against any program of regimentation, but I may say further that I think of all the people now who need some protection in the face of this war is the farmer, and that is the reason I made the remarks I did on the floor of this House yesterday. When I called the attention of this membership to the statement of the Chief Executive of this Government, through Mr. Morgenthau, to the effect that we have now got to start a much-belated program of economy by reducing the Budget on nondefense essentials, and we are going to start on the American farmer. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I believe we should analyze the issue before the House. In the first place, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 has provided the law pertaining to marketing quotas. Under that law, if two-thirds of the farmers do not vote for marketing quotas in the case of a referendum, there will be no marketing quotas; but the law also provides that there will be no loans. That is a mandatory provision. Let us not forget what the law is at the present time, because the bill before us today in general simply increases the penalties under the marketing-quota section and makes mandatory loans for 75 percent of parity. The demand for this increase in penalties came from the Department of Agriculture and from the farm organizations. The most important section of the bill, in my opinion, is that providing for loans on the basis of 75 percent of the parity price. This provision was inserted in the bill by our Committee on Agriculture.

I want to make clear my position on this bill. It should be recognized that a number of compromises had to be made in this measure before our committee. It is not like I would want to have it, but it is much better than no law. It should be analyzed in that light. The bill that is before us is very essential insofar as the wheat farmers are concerned.

The loan section that has been put into this bill provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall loan 75 percent of the parity price on cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco. Corn farmers are getting 75 percent of parity loans now, and tobacco is above that. So cotton and wheat are the only commodities that will benefit from this loan section. I offered the amendment to the bill in committee providing for 75-percent loans on wheat. I refused to vote higher penalties unless higher loans were provided. The committee saw fit to accept my amendment and added corn, cotton, and tobacco.

This loan of 75 percent of parity has already been made available to corn producers under the discretionary power contained in the A. A. A. It has not been available to wheat producers. Wheat producers have been getting only 56 percent of parity on loans. The loan rate is the only thing that maintains the price of wheat today. Can we be fair to the wheat producers of this country by setting a price, and that is what it is, of only 56 percent of parity? It should be remembered that 25 percent of the population of this country is engaged in agriculture and that they receive only 8.1 percent of the national income. Unless we provide something that is going to be equitable and fair to these producers, we cannot have prosperity in the country. We cannot restore national prosperity unless we can prevent economic collapse in these sections of the country now producing wheat, cotton, and certain other agricultural products that have been suffering so much. This is what we are up against. We will have a carry-over of about 400,000,000 bushels of wheat as of July 1 this year. This is approximately 100,000,000 more than last year's carry-over and is the highest on record. We are anticipating a 500,000,000-bushel carry-over next year. Why is this carry-over being built up to unprecedented proportions? Simply because our export markets are gone. This is an emergency situation. Our export markets are gone, so legislation of some kind must be enacted that will provide some means of reducing this surplus and at the same time give the wheat farmer a chance to escape bankruptcy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The wheat farmers are fighting for their existence. They cannot continue to pay increasingly higher prices for their farm machinery and sell their product for 56 percent of parity. The outlook for wheat is not very favorable because of the acreage reduction that is necessary to eliminate the price-depressing surplus which has been brought about by the loss of foreign markets. During the last 10

years our wheat exports have averaged less than 10 percent of our production. Formerly we exported around 30 percent of our wheat. This bill, if enacted, will provide a reasonable loan of 75 percent of parity, which means about 84 cents a bushel on wheat. This will be about 20 cents a bushel above the existing loan rate. It will provide a means of eliminating the price-depressing surplus without forcing the farmer into bankruptcy. The millers can and should pay this price without complaint since there is only about 1 cent's worth of wheat now in a loaf of bread. The ultimate consumer certainly will not be adversely affected. However, it will mean about $150,000,000 a year to the wheat growers. This will not come from the Federal Treasury but from the buyers of wheat.

If the merits of this bill are carefully compared with the demerits, I am sure the bill will receive the support of the Members of Congress. Compromises have been necessary in this as in all legislation. The Senate has already passed a companion measure to this bill which had no mandatory loan provision in it. I am hopeful that the Senate conferees will accept the House provisions when this bill passes and goes to conference. [Applause.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to inflict myself on the House again, but I rise to tell the chairman of this committee that he does not need to put me in bed with any of the big shots in New York, with any of the banks up there. The only reason that I am opposed to this bill is because I do not believe in it and I am not too sure that it is a good thing to stand up here and oppose it, but I do not care enough about politics to sit here day after day and see unfair legislation passed in the name of agriculture as we have had to see legislation passed here now for the third year.

If anyone wants to go out and freeze Mr. Campbell or any other big 50,000 or 100,000-acre wheat farm in America, any man who has that much base acreage, that is all right with me. I would say the people who vote for this bill will be with the big operators. I am trying to do something for the family-size farmer. If it is for the welfare of the family-size farm, I will vote for it, regardless of who brings it in.

We have heard so many things about what you have done for the dairy farmer. I did not want to go into that. I am not opposed to this bill because you have not done anything for the dairy farmer. I am not opposed to it because of the things you have done to him. I will call your attention to the peanut business. Here we have a peanut tariff which shows that the tariff has been gradually raised up to 7 cents a pound on shelled peanuts. With all this talk we have heard about the bad Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, have you ever heard anyone talk about reducing the tariff rates on peanuts? It is 7 cents. It is two and one-third times what it costs to produce a pound of peanuts. Peanuts do not have to worry about any importation. You have got two and one-third times what it costs to produce a pound of peanuts, in the shape of a tariff. A tariff on cheese would have to be 60 cents per pound if it compared to the tariff on peanuts. In addition to that, the other day we passed a peanut bill. We put on a domestic tariff of 3 cents a pound. Now, that is the kind of attention we are giving the peanut industry, a 7-cent foreign tariff and a 3 cent per pound domestic tariff.

As far as cheese is concerned—I did not want to bring that up—but I will say to my good chairman I would like to have you undo the bad things you have done to the dairy industry before you do them any good. Please do not tell me it is because you went out and used some funds to buy butter for 25 and 26 cents a pound, about half or two-thirds what it cost to produce it, and then give it to the customers of the farmers to sit down and eat, that you are doing the dairy business of this country any good; 92-score butter in Chicago for the last 8 years under the New Deal has averaged 27 cents a pound. That is the kind of economy the New Deal has given the dairy farmer—38 percent less than what it was in the 8 years before that. Comparable figures could be given for cheese.

If I or anyone else sat here year after year and saw this group and that group keep taking money out of the United States Treasury for some little crop, I do not care to do so. So I say to you today the only reason I am opposed to this measure is because I know the principle of this legislation is wrong.

I am not opposed to 75 percent of parity. I would be glad to make it 100 percent, but when you continually come in and get funds like we have seen happen here, getting over $300,000,000 for a crop that is worth only $595,000,000, then I say it is time someone called the attention of the people of this country to the fact of how the money is going down a rat hole under the leadership of the New Deal. I do not blame the people in the Department of Agriculture. They are carrying out legislation that we pass. If we pass this kind of legislation, we cannot come back next year and blame them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that he is in favor of the loan features of this bill?

Mr. MURRAY. I am in favor of full parity for every agricultural product that is produced by any class of farmers in the United States. I am opposed to sectional, selfish methods of getting money out of the United States Treasury continually.

I am opposed to this bill for two very good reasons. First, this bill freezes the wheat acreage on farms of the big operators who are already in business and have been getting huge sums out of the Treasury. Why freeze this acreage except to the average- or family-sized farmer?

We do some rather peculiar agriculture legislating under the New Deal.

First. We appropriate money to the Dies committee to investigate communistic activities, and we then turn around and appropriate money to start communal enterprises.

Second. We appropriate money to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make millions of dollars of loans to big corporations, then drop down and loan money to people without any farms and furnish them 100 percent of the money to buy farms for them.

Third. We buy 12,000 farms at $5,700 each for people who never owned or operated a farm and furnish the money at 3-percent interest, and then turn around and drive 91,195 farmers off their farms because they cannot pay an average mortgage loan of less than $3,000 with $112 annual interest, which has been 4 and 5 percent and now 3½ percent. We drive these average farmers off from their farms and out of their homes and away from an opportunity to make a living; we then build 90,436 housing units for big-city cousins that cost $4,354 apiece and ask the taxpayers of the country to pay $193 of the rent per unit per year for 60 years, which amounts to $28,000,000 per year, or $1,680,000,000 for the 60-year period.

Fourth. While we drive 91,195 average citizens out of their homes, we buy 12,000 more unfortunate farm brethren farms that cost twice as much as the homes and farms of the average citizens we drive off. We federally finance 10,000 to 20,000 homes for the more fortunate of our brethren at the same time we are driving the average person from his home, and this is called humanitarianism when they use these public funds to carry out this unjust program, but I do not know what they call it when they drive average citizens down the road to the W. P. A. and relief rolls.

Fifth. We appropriate millions in the name of agriculture that goes to the big operators and the big mechanized farms, then we also appropriate other millions in the name of low-income groups although a large percentage of it never gets to him, and the large group of regular, average farmers are kept over the barrel trying to compete with the big mechanized corporation operators and are asked to furnish the funds for the low-income projects now in operation.

Sixth. It has been said that $10,000 to $100,000 per year people do the leading and the common people do the bleeding. This is truly correct because we have made a great group of average citizens carry undue burden. We legislate for the top and the bottom and leave the great average citizen to carry the load.

The second reason why I am opposed to this bill is because no Member of this House has a moral, just, or valid reason for voting a domestic tariff on the domestic producers that excels the tariff imposed on the foreign producers.

For example, if the parity price of corn is $1 per bushel. Under this bill the domestic producer will have to pay a tariff or penalty of 75 cents divided by 2, or 37½ cents, per bushel if he raises corn over his quota, and if he is not in the program he will pay the same. If foreign corn is imported the tariff is only 25 cents per bushel. Do I need to waste any more words on this unfair legislation?

If the parity price of wheat is $1.60 per bushel, the domestic producer has to pay 50 percent of 75 percent of $1.60, which is $1.20 divided by 2 or 60 cents per bushel domestic penalty, or tariff, while the foreign farmer has to pay only 42 cents per bushel tariff to enter our market. Is this not enough explanation?

It has always surprised me to find that our southern low-tariff friends do not have tariff on imported cotton, but they do have a domestic tariff of 3 cents per pound on their domestic production. As long as Brazilian cotton sells for 1½ cents per pound below our price we may not need to worry, but what will be the situation if cotton gets to be 16 cents per pound, or parity?

Peanuts are different. They have a 7-cent tariff on foreign importations so our southern friends apparently like this part of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. This tariff is 2⅓ times the cost of producing the peanuts. The domestic peanut producer, by recent legislation, has the protection of an additional 3 cents per pound domestic tariff if he is in the program for his allotted acreage. Of course, if he is outside the program, or plants in excess of the program, the domestic producer will have to pay his 3 cents per pound domestic tariff. This should be conclusive evidence to any fair-minded man whether he live above or below the Mason and Dixon's line, that you cannot have an effective and fair domestic control program without a corresponding effective control on importations. If these domestic tariffs sound better classified as penalties, all well and good, but they are tariffs just the same.

We are missing our agricultural objective if we are trying to give the farmer his share of the national money. The longer we put off legislation that gives all family-sized farms or average farmers parity, the longer it will be before we have a program of common sense and common justice.

Do you realize that one wheat-growing congressional district has had more agricultural subsidies than the farms in the following States:

Payments under Agricultural Adjustment program, 1933–40, inclusive

Arizona	$14,840,706
Connecticut	4,757,988
Delaware	2,979,036
Florida	14,039,451
Maine	6,234,623
Maryland	11,541,637
Massachusetts	3,707,676
Nevada	895,925
New Hampshire	1,207,979
New Jersey	4,285,493
New Mexico	19,833,570
New York	18,586,762
Oregon	26,526,621
Pennsylvania	23,006,813
Rhode Island	193,590
Utah	10,853,591
Vermont	2,970,346
Virginia	26,110,196
Washington	39,776,310
West Virginia	6,491,400
Wyoming	13,218,174

Do you want to be a party to freezing this kind of an unfair situation?

In conclusion, let me state that there is no reason to be satisfied with the 75-percent parity, because in the long run, if the farmer does not get full parity he will be starved to death in his attempt to feed the rest of the Nation.

Let this legislation rest in peace until the Congress is ready to legislate for the great bulk of average farmers who live on family-sized farms. If we do otherwise, we will continue the road we are following that promotes big mechanized farm units at the top and the sustenance homestead type of agriculture at the bottom, with the average family-sized farms gradually eliminated from the picture.

Mr. COOLEY. But what particular section of this bill is the gentleman opposed to?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sorry, but my time has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take this occasion to say that at the proper time I will offer an amendment, on pages 1 and 2, which has to do with the following subject: The penalty for overproduction, I believe, in this bill is fixed as high as 50 percent. If a farmer sells wheat over his acreage, he is fined 50 percent of what the loan base is. In my section there are many small farmers that really cannot make a living on the amount of allotments they have. The amendment which I will offer simply provides to change the definition on page 1 to read as follows:

which is not fed to livestock on the farm.

Just give him a chance to feed that overproduction if he has any to livestock on the farm. If that is done, the same as the corn provision for ensilage, that will give that farmer a chance to use that extra grain without being penalized.

It seems to me that in this period in the history of our country, when we are preparing for war, we will not make any mistake in giving these farmers a chance to raise some livestock.

If this amendment is accepted, we will have to amend line 15, on page 2, after the word "silage", by striking out the period, inserting a comma, and adding "when fed to livestock on the farm."

That is the matter that I will bring to your attention under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman emphasizes the fact that an exemption is already made for corn used for silage.

Mr. BURDICK. I referred to that in the bill itself. Ensilage is excluded. Give us a chance now to feed this extra wheat to livestock, to produce likestock, and do not penalize us under the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, rather than the technicalities of the bill, which will be discussed at various times, I should like to discuss a few fundamentals. When that Utopian, sound, self-operating, ideal, farm program becomes a law or effective I want to point out to my friends, and no one will dispute, there will be ample provision in it for some sort of limited production in harmony with the old theory of supply and demand. That is in this bill. I want to say further in reference to the word "regimentation" that I have never since I heard that word at any time ever been afraid of it as long as it has been coupled with the word "referendum." I do not believe our unwilling conscripts in the Army would be very much scared about their service if they could meet and on a two-thirds majority go home on the next train. They would not call that very much regimentation. And that has gone along all the way throughout this farm program that is left to God Almighty's great common people and everybody regardless of what he may be doing. It is a fundamental principle in America that the majority rules. It is another fundamental principle that there is wisdom in a multitude of counsel. These are the theories by which the farm program has been based, and that is why, after they use them and vote 90 or 95 percent for a program, it is carried out; and who are we to deny to any class or group, be it organized labor, capitalists, or farmers, that demands the right to meet and vote themselves upon their own question, to deny to them that right?

I said to one gentleman who appeared before our committee: "If it were true that the wheat-growing industry was limited to 50 or 100 men you would not be here today bothering Congress about any legislation, would you?" He said, "Certainly not." I said, "No; you would be at some resort holding a convention and by a majority rule in that convention you would decide on a program of how much wheat you were going to produce for the domestic market and how much you were going to produce to sell at a less price in the world market, and you would never bother Congress." That is just exactly what every other phase of industry does, and the devil, and Congress, and high water will never be able in spite of all your antitrust legislation to keep them from doing that one thing.

Did you ever buy a pair of shoes for 25 percent of parity because there was overproduction? You never did, and you never will. I take off my hat to the superb economic judgment and wisdom of the man who makes shoes, because he has sense enough and power enough within a little group without any legislation from Congress to regulate that shoe market.

All of us will admit that all the giants of industry of the country supplying about 85 percent of the needs of humanity are today thus controlled except the farmer who for the wide diversity of opinion and the various types, nationalities, and localities, and States must proceed blindly. He cannot hold a convention with his fellows at the resort like the hundred producers; he must come to Congress to do the things he cannot do for himself. One Member before the committee referred to the night

riders of Kentucky in the tobacco situation and other similar situations in the West on similar matters. That reference only calls to our attention the leading minds among farm people have felt the need of the authority to control their business like the capitalists of industry control theirs, and to get out of mire and misery of despondency. A system that caused them to raise more and actually get less.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Time is fixed by the rule. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, a man once invented the sewing machine. His name was Elias Howe. If I were not raised in the Methodist Church I could say, "To hell with Elias Howe because he did not make a perfect machine," but I will not say that. I will say: "Maledictions upon Elias Howe for that his sewing machine was found not to be just exactly perfect at the start." So it is with legislation. All legislation is the result of compromise and experience and knowledge as we go forth. Especially is this true regarding legislation for the greatest industry in the world.

We know how this legislation started, we know that farmers were not getting what they ought to get. It was only recently that I drove through the Southland, Tennessee, Arkansas, Georgia, and all around through there, and I saw farmers living in want and squalor, white folks as well as colored folks. They are entitled to a better life. We farmers in Iowa have also been in submergence. They started foreclosures and one out of every seven farmers in my county had foreclosure suits and many were kicked off their farms. Sixty miles west of my home foreclosure case riots broke out and they dragged a judge off the bench because he was about to sign a foreclosure decree. I do not defend that, it is too bad, but I say the duty falls on us to correct that situation, and we ought to do it.

This Congress helps with everything else. I will not take your time to show how in almost every industry except farming we have provided payments of some kind or artificial help of some kind. We did it in the tariffs. We did it in the fair trade bill. Banks get a certain amount of protection. Railways, the coal mines, gold and silver miners, the air lines, the ships, and the newspapers get assistance, and I could go on and name 25 or 30 more industries that get artificial help. But no, you must not do this for the farmer.

My friends on this side of the aisle who oppose this measure say, "Yes, we want to help you, but we do not want to do it at this particular moment or in this particular way." They do not tell you in what way they are willing to provide. They all love the farmer, especially on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Then they seem to forget him. Why do you not help the farmer the rest of the time?

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about regimentation. I represent a corn community. There is no regimentation, as was claimed by the eloquent gentleman from Missouri. Every corn man in the State of Iowa and in the United States has the right to do just exactly as he pleases. He has the option to go into the program or stay out of it, and this bill does not take hold of him and tell him how much he shall plant or how much he shall not plant. He has the right to plant whatever he wants. But the bill does say that "if you go ahead and join with your neighbors in order to reduce the supply and prevent immense surpluses, and therefore raise the price, then we will give you parity payments, we will give you loans, and we will give you other advantages. Take your choice." Many of them in my community and all over the country are taking their choice. They say, "We will go ahead. We will raise all the corn we want to." My nearest neighbor has done that. He lives on a farm about a mile away from a place in which I used to be interested. He goes ahead and does as he pleases and raises corn to his heart's content, and he has no trouble.

We farmers are demanding that platform pledges be kept and that the promises be kept—that the farmers be given some parity and be placed on something like a level with other industries. Our friends of the opposition tell us that while they do not have any bill now, still we must not do this now, or in this way. That has always been true. I have a basket of telegrams and letters from the corn farmers of my district and community asking that parity payments be made. May I say to the folks of this country that they cannot afford not to pay parity to farmers.

The only way to bring prosperity back to our whole country is to see to it that the farmers have money to spend. For every dollar they spend, it has been shown by reliable statistics that $7 will go into industry, manufacture, or trade. You cannot afford not to pay parity to the farmers, because you are losing and will lose billions of dollars every year by not giving equality to agriculture.

The law of supply and demand has been referred to, and even God Almighty has been spoken of. We are all for Him, and for the law of supply and demand. When the surplus is big, then, indeed, the price is low. That is the law of supply and demand that my friends talk about. The bill that we have before us today is one that will insure 75 percent of parity to the growers of these commodities. Since the bill was reported on April 2, a new edict has been handed out, or a statement has been issued by the Secretary of Agriculture by which it now appears that corn will not be subject to a marketing quota this year; consequently this bill will have to be amended in one particular, to which I will call your attention when we reach it, in order that corn may be protected.

Mr. McINTYRE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. McINTYRE. The gentleman has stated he comes from a corn district. I come from a livestock district. It occurs to me that the exception in here with respect to silage is liable to ruin the livestock business.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The exception in the bill with reference to silage has no import or no power whatever, because corn is not under a marketing quota at all and will not be. That provision was made since April 2, when the bill was reported out. If you will read the provisions, you will see it relates to marketing quotas, so that it has nothing to do with corn as it stands now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that at this late date, after 8 years, we should hear criticism of the A. A. A. I live on my farm when I am in Oregon, the only home I have. I remember very distinctly that, in the fall of 1932 and in the spring of 1933, from my ranch went great big fat cows, weighing 1,200 pounds, that did not bring $20 apiece. I shipped big hogs, and they did not bring $5 apiece. Thousands of bushels of wheat went for 25 cents. Butterfat brought 13 cents. The farming country was "broke" from end to end. Pitchfork brigades threatened violence. There was despair and turmoil.

I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture when the original Triple A Act was drawn. That was the one thing that brought us out of that Dismal Swamp. [Applause.] There is no question about that. For 2 years we received the benefits of the old Triple A Act, and when the Supreme Court found it was unconstitutional—three eminent judges upholding it—we switched to something else. We did something for the farmers. I hope my friends from Minnesota and Missouri will just remember those dark days away back there when they criticize farm legislation.

What does this bill mean? It raises about 20 cents the floor under the price of wheat, which has to face a quota vote. We now have 400,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat. The surplus will be 500,000,000 bushels next year if allowed to continue without quota. The farmers raising wheat wish to vote to cut down the quantity produced. That is sensible. It takes a 2-to-1 vote to carry the quota.

Under this bill we are going to give them what? Seventy-five percent of parity as a loan; that is all. Corn has been getting a 75-percent loan under the act. Cotton will get it. The loan value is the fixed lowest price.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States has never lost a dollar in connection with a loan on wheat, because it is a commodity we must use. We may have to take over this year a hundred

million bushels of wheat under loans already made, but it is selling now for almost 10 cents more than was loaned on it. The charges can all be paid and the Government will not lose a dollar. The Government will get interest on every loan it has made on wheat.

What else is provided? Somebody stated here it would hurt the cattle business. There is an amendment, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, which provides that if a man has a little over his quota on corn he can put it in his silage. Yes; that helps the small man, and that was the object of it. It further provides that 15 acres, notwithstanding bushelage, shall be exempt.

We must legislate more in these coming years for the small producer.

This bill is very important to the Northwest. We raise out there 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, one-half of which must be used outside the Pacific Northwest. It cannot be consumed in that section. Some goes to the Philippines, some to China. It is very necessary that the Pacific Northwest country vote a quota on wheat in order to reduce its surplus.

I am sincerely hoping that those who have been somewhat critical of the joint resolution will see fit to vote for it when it comes to a final vote. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the bill and the report of the committee that the report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, subparagraph (11) of section 1, on page 7, reads as follows:

> The provisions of this resolution are amendatory of and supplementary to the act, and all provisions of law applicable in respect of marketing quotas and loans under such act as so amended and supplemented shall be applicable, but nothing in this resolution shall be construed to amend or repeal section 301 (b) (6), 323 (b) (except as provided in paragraph (7)), or 335 (d) of the act.

The Ramseyer rule is as follows:

> Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—
>
> (1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and
>
> (2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

This joint resolution provides, on page 2, subparagraph (2), line 19, that the rate of the penalty shall be 50 percent of the basic rate of the loan on the commodity for cooperators for such marketing year under section 302 of the act and this resolution.

The act is referred to on page 1, line 3, as—

> The provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1939, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act).

On page 4, line 15, there is a specific amendment adding the word "wheat" to section 326 (c) of the act.

A further amendment appears beginning in line 19, and reads as follows:

> The marketing penalty on corn or wheat shall not be applicable to any farm which, under the terms of the then current agricultural conservation program formulated under sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is classified as a nonallotment farm if the acreage of the commodity harvested on such nonallotment farm is not in excess of 15 acres or the acreage allotment for the farm, whichever is larger.

In line 16, on page 5, appears another amendment defining section 323 (b) of the act.

It is perfectly apparent that this act is an amendment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It is apparent that the provisions of the Ramseyer rule, which I quote, being paragraph 2 (a) of rule XIII of the House, have not been complied with in the report. There is absolutely no statement showing the changes and the effect of the amendments for the information of the House. This is not a general statement of amendment. Those rulings relating to general statements have no application whatever to this particular situation. It is a clear violation of the rule, and it is not in order at this time to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. FULMER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order of the gentleman from New York comes too late. The point of order should have been made in the House instead of in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman will be glad to hear the gentleman from South Carolina on the point of order.

Mr. FULMER. I do not care to say anything further on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEAM). The gentleman from New York has made a point of order that the report on the joint resolution does not comply with the Ramseyer rule. The gentleman referred first to subparagraph 11 on page 7 of the joint resolution, which reads as follows:

> The provisions of this resolution are amendatory of and supplementary to the act, and all provisions of law applicable in respect of marketing quotas and loans under such act as so amended and supplemented shall be applicable, but nothing in this resolution shall be construed to amend or repeal section 301 (b) (6), 323 (b) (except as provided in par. (7)), or 335 (d) of the act.

The gentleman from New York has pointed out various other paragraphs of the joint resolution to substantiate his statement that there has been no compliance with the Ramseyer rule.

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 8, page 51, section 2243, reads as follows:

> The point of order that a report fails to comply with the requirement that proposed changes in law be indicated typographically is properly made when the bill is called up in the House and it comes too late after the House has resolved into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill.

Again, the Chair points out that on February 10, 1937, the Chairman [Mr. LANHAM], while proceeding in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, substantiating the language the Chair has just read, held, in effect, that:

> A point of order that a committee report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule comes too late after the House has resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill and debate thereon has begun. Points of order against the consideration of bills on the ground that the reports accompanying said bills do not conform to the Ramseyer rule come too late after the House has resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole and consideration has begun.

In view of the circumstances of the case and under the precedents and rules of the House, the Chair is of the opinion that the point of order which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has stated comes too late. The point of order should have been made in the House and for these reasons the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act)—

(1) The farm-marketing quota under the act for any crop of wheat shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to wheat on the farm, less the normal production or the actual production, whichever is the smaller, of that acreage planted to wheat on the farm which is in excess of the farm acreage allotment for wheat. The farm-marketing quota under the act for any crop of corn shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to corn on the farm which is not harvested as silage, less the normal production or the actual production, whichever is the smaller, of that acreage planted to corn on the farm which is not harvested as silage and which is in excess of the farm acreage allotment for corn.

The normal production, or the actual production, whichever is the smaller, of such excess acreage is hereinafter called the "farm-marketing excess" of corn or wheat, as the case may be. For the purposes of this resolution, "actual production" of any number of acres of corn or wheat on a farm means the actual average yield of corn or wheat, as the case may be, for the farm times such number of acres, but shall not include corn harvested as silage.

(2) During any marketing year for which quotas are in effect, the producer shall be subject to a penalty on the farm marketing excess of corn and wheat. The rate of the penalty shall be 50 percent of the basic rate of the loan on the commodity for cooperators for such marketing year under section 302 of the act and this resolution.

(3) The farm marketing excess for corn and wheat shall be regarded as available for marketing, and the penalty and the storage amount or amounts to be delivered to the

Secretary of the commodity shall be computed upon the normal production of the excess acreage. Where, upon the application of the producer for an adjustment of penalty or of storage, it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the actual production of the excess acreage is less than the normal production thereof, the difference between the amount of the penalty or storage as computed upon the basis of normal production and as computed upon the basis of actual production shall be returned to or allowed the producer. The Secretary shall issue regulations under which the farm marketing excess of the commodity for the farm may be stored or delivered to him. Upon failure to store or deliver to the Secretary the farm marketing excess within such time as may be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the penalty computed as aforesaid shall be paid by the producer. Any corn or wheat delivered to the Secretary hereunder shall become the property of the United States and shall be disposed of by the Secretary for relief purposes in the United States or in foreign countries or in such other manner as he shall determine will divert it from the normal channels of trade and commerce.

(4) Until the producers on any farm store, deliver to the Secretary, or pay the penalty on, the farm marketing excess of any crop of corn or wheat, the entire crop of corn or wheat, as the case may be, produced on the farm shall be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for the amount of the penalty.

(5) The penalty upon corn or wheat stored shall be paid by the producer at the time, and to the extent, of any depletion in the amount of the commodity so stored, except depletion resulting from some cause beyond the control of the producer.

(6) Whenever the planted acreage of the then current crop of corn or wheat on any farm is less than the farm acreage allotment for such commodity, the total amount of the commodity from any previous crops required to be stored in order to postpone or avoid payment of penalty shall be reduced by that amount which is equal to the normal production of the number of acres by which the farm acreage allotment exceeds the planted acreage. The provisions of section 326 (c) of the act shall be applicable also to wheat.

(7) A farm marketing quota on corn or wheat shall not be applicable to any farm on which the acreage planted to the commodity is not in excess of 15 acres. The marketing penalty on corn or wheat shall not be applicable to any farm which, under the terms of the then current agricultural conservation program formulated under sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is classified as a nonallotment farm if the acreage of the commodity harvested on such nonallotment farm is not in excess of 15 acres or the acreage allotment for the farm, whichever is larger. If the acreage of the commodity harvested on any such nonallotment farm is in excess of 15 acres and in excess of such acreage allotment, the normal production or the actual production, whichever is the smaller, of the acreage harvested in excess of 15 acres or such acreage allotment, whichever is larger, shall be taken as the farm marketing excess and shall be subject to penalty: *Provided*, That there shall be no penalty on wheat harvested on any such nonallotment farm from which no wheat is sold if the acreage of wheat harvested on such farm does not exceed such acreage per family living thereon as may be used for home consumption without reducing the payment with respect to the farm under the then current agricultural conservation program. For the purposes of this paragraph and section 323 (b) of the act, acreage of corn harvested as silage shall not be considered acreage planted to corn, or acreage of corn harvested.

(8) Until the farm-marketing excess of corn or wheat, as the case may be, is stored or delivered to the Secretary or the penalty thereon is paid, each bushel of the commodity produced on the farm which is sold by the producer to any person within the United States shall be subject to the penalty as specified in paragraph (2) of this resolution. Such penalty shall be paid by the buyer, who may deduct an amount equivalent to the penalty from the price paid to the producer.

(9) The marketing penalty for cotton produced in the calendar year in which any marketing year begins (if beginning with or after the 1941–42 marketing year) shall be at a rate equal to 50 percent of the basic rate of the loan for cooperators for such marketing year under section 302 of the act and this resolution.

(10) The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to make available upon the 1941 crop of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, or tobacco, for which marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year 1941 are in effect, loans as follows:

(a) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 75 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

(b) To cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn, at the rate of 75 percent of the rate specified in (a) above;

(c) To noncooperators (except noncooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified in (a) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

(11) The provisions of this resolution are amendatory of and supplementary to the act, and all provisions of law applicable in respect of marketing quotas and loans under such act as so amended and supplemented shall be applicable, but nothing in this resolution shall be construed to amend or repeal section 301 (b) (6), 323 (b) (except as provided in paragraph (7)), or 335 (d) of the act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, is the bill being read and considered by paragraphs or by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is being read by sections, and the Chair will recognize gentlemen at the conclusion of the reading of the section.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer at page 2 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to recognize the gentleman from Montana at the appropriate time. The bill is composed of one section, and at the conclusion of the reading of the section the Chair will recognize Members.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each numbered paragraph be considered as a separate section and that amendments, as well as debate, be in order at the conclusion of the reading of each paragraph.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time, I am bound to object to that request. I would like to have the gentleman agree that we consider the bill as having been read and then proceed immediately to the consideration of amendments.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that this may be done.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me submit to the gentleman that there are many amendments to be offered and, with a limitation on offering amendments during the reading of the joint resolution, Members will be precluded from talking for any amount of time whatsoever on the bill except to discuss one amendment to strike out the last word at the end of the bill.

Mr. DOXEY. For very obvious reasons, when we are reading the bill by sections we cannot consider paragraphs as sections, and I have got to object to that request. The gentleman can object to my request if he wants to, but I think my suggestion would expedite consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that the Committee proceed for the consideration of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. TABER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 5, line 15, before the period insert: "*Provided, further*, That for the marketing year beginning in 1941, there shall be no marketing penalty on wheat with respect to any such nonallotment farm if the acreage of wheat harvested on the farm is not in excess of the usual acreage determined for the farm under the 1941 agricultural conservation program and the county committee determines, in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary, that there will not be marketed an amount of wheat in excess of the 1941 farm-marketing quota."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to take care of a situation in a great many States where farmers have not been planting wheat for commercial purposes, but have been planting wheat for their own consumption. This will apply in all of the States where farmers have been planting wheat acreage under the soil-conservation program. About 2 years ago they said to me that I could plant 10 acres on my farm, and I have a pretty large farm, but I did not plant any wheat. Under the 1940 act, under the 1940 conservation program, they said to farmers in my State and many other Southern States that they could plant 15 acres to the farm or 3 acres to each family on a farm or their average acreage planted in 1938 and 1939. If a party had five families on a farm he could plant 15 acres, but the farmer who had been planting wheat for consumption on the farm for his tenants and himself, could plant in 1941 the usual

acreage planted or the average of 1938 and 1939. Now, this has all been agreed to and is under the rules and regulations gotten out by the Department. For instance, here is a farmer whose average for 1938 and 1939 would, perhaps, be 20 acres, and under those circumstances if we did not pass the amendment he would be called upon to plow up, say, 3 acres or 5 acres or pay the penalty.

This amendment has been worked out by the Department so as to keep faith with these farmers who are complying with the soil-conservation program, the cotton and wheat programs.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. I think it should be very definitely understood that this amendment simply applies to 1 year, and that there should be no attempt to renew it in another year. I am in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment because it does give some men who went into the program in good faith an opportunity to stay in the program this year without suffering a penalty, which they could not have anticipated, but I think we ought to give warning now that that will not happen in another year.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman absolutely, and if there is a wheat farmer in my country today who has planted wheat as a noncooperator and has an acreage above what he is is entitled to plant he will be penalized under this, and should be. I can assure the gentleman that so far as I am concerned there will not be any attempt on the part of those of us who represent that class of farmers referred to to give them any advantage after this year. In fact, it is no advantage, but is carrying out a program that has been agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think I brought this Arends bill to the attention of the chairman the other day. This is confined to an area where they do not have the quota and, of course, none of this wheat is produced for commercial purposes, but for consumption on the farm.

Mr. FULMER. Yes. Referring to the letter the gentleman has in his hand, that farmer has 12 tenants, and that would give him 36 acres, and in the period 1938–39 he planted 44.4 acres. And under this amendment this farmer would be exempt and should be.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman think that the amendment will take care of the situation to which I directed attention earlier, where a farmer has already planted his acreage and cannot change that acreage now? Will that protect the man under the 1941 Marketing Act?

Mr. FULMER. I take it the gentleman is referring to a farmer not cooperating and of course it would not apply in my section nor in the gentleman's State, but under the bill we are now about to pass that noncooperator can come in and store his wheat and get a loan and still have his quota as if he had been in under the program, and next year come in and comply and utilize that which he has stored, but if he persists in staying out, then he would be penalized on the amount of the excess.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am opposed to this amendment because it does not provide for the noncooperators. The gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], said the noncooperator is provided for to the extent of what he has produced and stored and if he produces over his quota this year, that can be put in storage, but if he puts it in storage, under the provisions of this act, next year he will have a reduction in his quota to the extent of the amount of his storage, so the penalty is the same. That means that the farmer who borrows money and has his wheat planted, yet he will have to carry the interest over from this year and reduce his acreage and income next year, carrying that interest rate, and his expectation is reduced just the same as if that bill were retroactive. I do not think this amendment honestly answers the question of making this bill retroactive on the farmer who has already planted his wheat.

Personally I am opposed very much to the general principle of the bill. It is less than 2 years since we stood in the well of this House and agreed on a general farm bill, upon the ground that it was voluntary, and time after time the advocates of this bill stood here and said, "If you don't want to come in under the farm bill you don't have to, we are just giving you a chance to get the benefit, if you want to do it voluntarily," and yet today you bring in a bill that raises the penalty for noncooperation from 15 cents per bushel to 50 percent. If a bushel of wheat sells for $1.25 the penalty next year to stay out will be 62½ cents.

You bring in a bill that abolishes any voluntary action on the part of the farmer; abolishes any democracy in the farm program. You bring in a bill that makes the farm program definitely and finally compulsory. I am bitterly opposed to that bill on the principle that it makes forever and ever the farmer who has already had his acreage, and his children and his children's children and his grandchildren forever and ever serfs and slaves to a fixed program that he has no voice in, and he has only the whip of compulsion over his back forever. I sincerely hope that this committee will defeat this amendment because it does not answer the fact that this bill is retroactive. I sincerely hope that the American Congress will not today enact a bill that will put the scourge of compulsion on the back of the farmer forever. As far as I am concerned, I will be no party to it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 7, after line 10, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. That notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, that after June 1, 1941, corn harvested as silage for feed on the farm shall not be included as part of the corn acreage allotment."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the population of the United States 40 years ago was 75,000,000 people. Today our population has increased 57,000,000 or up to over 132,000,000, yet this year the acreage of corn is the lowest in 40 years. We just wonder what is happening to the corn and the huge surpluses and the lack of consumption in this country.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield? They used to eat corn bread then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I think some people do still eat corn bread. I hope so.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me discuss my amendment for a moment and then I will yield.

In a commercial corn area which takes in approximately 600 counties, mostly located in the Middle West in the Corn Belt, and certain counties which have now been added to the commercial corn area, in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware, because of the increased corn production, we find that the corn acreage has been reduced in the last 3 years from 52,000,000 acres to 37,000,000 acres, a reduction of between 14 and 15 million acres. That particular area, prior to 3 years ago, had better than 50 percent of the acreage of corn in the United States, and produced about two-thirds of the entire production of the country. Now we find that outside of the commercial corn area they have approximately 60 percent of the acreage, and the production is close to a 50–50 basis.

I live in a dairy section. Most of the States in the North are engaged extensively in the dairy business, particularly on the small farms, where we try to have an efficient farm unit. We have a certain number of dairy cattle; some poultry, and some hogs, and we try to produce enough feed on those farms to take care of our livestock. We sell little if any corn in the form of field corn. We market our crops through the products of livestock and poultry.

When our area was put into the commercial corn territory, immediately a corn-curtailment program was put into operation. Many farmers who had been in the habit of producing 40 acres of corn on a 100-acre farm were cut down to 25 acres, and some of them even less. It was found that most of those farmers were unable to produce the necessary feed to take care of their livestock. They were

then forced to sell some of their livestock or go out and buy feed in the open market with which to give proper sustenance to their dairy herds.

In my particular section we do not sell any corn as corn. We use the corn in the form of silage, and we feed it to the dairy cattle. At the present time, under the acreage program—and we want to comply as much as we can with the program—most of our farmers are unable to plant enough corn to fill their silos and stay in the A. A. A. program. All my amendment seeks to do is to permit our farmers to plant corn for silage purposes, to be fed on the farm to their dairy cattle, without coming under the control and penalty provisions of the bill. It is true that silage has been exempted from the penalty marketing quota provisions of the bill, but there will be no marketing quotas on corn this year, due to the edict which the Secretary issued on April 3, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] stated. There will be loans without marketing quotas, and I understand the gentleman from Iowa will offer an amendment to make 75 percent of parity loans on corn, notwithstanding the fact that no quotas have been voted. I am for that amendment.

I believe that in fairness to at least 3,000,000 farmers engaged in the dairy business in the Northern States they should be permitted to raise enough corn to feed their livestock without being compelled to go out in the open market to buy the corn, as is now proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

On April 3 Mr. Wickard, the Secretary of Agriculture, issued a statement to the effect that he intended to fix the price of pork at $9, the price of butter at 31 cents, the price of eggs at 21 cents a dozen, and poultry 16 cents a pound, these prices at Chicago. He urged the farmers to produce more of these commodities to take care of the additional demands of consumption in the United States, Great Britain, and other nations resisting aggression. The farmers want to produce this additional supply that is needed in this country, but I say to you that the dairy farmers and those engaged in the production of poultry products should be permitted to produce the feed on their own farms without restriction.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman stresses the fact that the farmer should be permitted to feed this silage outside of the quota allotment. How can the gentleman justify that yet support a penalty of 50 percent of parity for any amount of wheat that is fed in excess of the quota?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The amendment that was just adopted was the first exemption that was adopted and permitted farmers to plant and use more than 15 acres of wheat on a farm. Some of the Members who were here 3 or 4 years ago when we had the original A. A. A. up for consideration know that I offered a similar amendment which was rejected by a very narrow vote, but we had promises from the Secretary of Agriculture at that time that he would adjust the situation so our farmers could produce enough corn for silage to take care of their livestock herds and dairy cattle.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. There is one thing that almost everybody engaged in other lines of farming seem to forget and that is that the dairy farmer is the one man who does not call upon the Government for soil-conservation money. He is the one man who builds up the soil because of the character of the farming he is carrying on.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And I may add that corn used as silage is eventually the best soil-conserving material we have. I have received letter after letter; I have talked with hundreds of farmers in my own district and elsewhere and received letters from other States where they are engaged in dairy production asking us to pass some legislation so that the people can raise enough corn to fill their silos to feed their livestock instead of forcing them to buy it on the open market.

Mr. O'HARA. Has the gentleman received any letters in opposition to the exemption the gentleman asks in this amendment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have not received a single letter opposing it, but I may say to the gentleman in all fairness that certain individual farmers primarily interested in large commercial production, and in selling their surplus to their fellow farmers are opposed to it, but the average farmer cannot afford to pay 65 cents for it locally or 69 cents in Chicago a bushel when they can get only 31 cents a pound for their butterfat on the Chicago market.

Mr. O'HARA. This would force them to buy feed on the open market.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I said, we cannot afford to buy this stored corn that the Secretary tells us is to be sold at 65 cents out of storage and 69 cents in Chicago, with the Government fixing a price of 31 cents a pound for butter in Chicago, which means about 28 cents at home. We cannot afford to go out and buy that corn. We should, therefore, be permitted to produce enough corn without any control to fill our silos.

I hope you will approve this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason to grant to dairy interests unlimited right to raise silage any more than there is to grant the corn area an unlimited right to raise corn. As I said before, the law of supply and demand will operate, and when these folks who are in the dairy area raise their ensilage they are simply broadening the supply of corn.

Under the amendment the dairy people will get all the credits that the corn farmer gets who raises hogs; he will get loans; he will get parity; he will get conservation payments on that part of his allotted corn area of his farm, and then under this amendment he would be able on the rest of his farm to raise silage. That would disrupt and break the whole program, for that silage can be used for the purpose of feeding calves or cattle; and when you mention cattle you think of hogs, for hogs and cattle go together. It will simply so ruin this program that there will be no control of corn acreage at all. Silage is the thing the dairy farmer wants. The gentleman from Minnesota says they do not raise enough so they must go out and buy feed. That is exactly what they have to do in the hog or cattle country. They have to buy corn for feed, for they cannot raise any great amount of hogs without buying corn; and the same with reference to fattening cattle.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I cannot yield. I have not the time.

The facts are, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment, if agreed to, so far as corn is concerned, wipes out the bill. The bill might just as well be put into the garbage can right now if there be no limitation upon the amount of corn which can be raised by way of silage, in addition to the corn which goes into any quota which may be established by the Secretary.

If you want to have unlimited raising of silage, then let us have unlimited raising of cotton, wheat, and all other commodities. The dairy people have been treated in some respects very well, and, as has been stated heretofore, any bill that comes before the committee having to do with dairying will be looked upon favorably. I have voted for every kind of benefit to the farmer since I have been in Congress except the time they had the bill brought up here about potatoes which was afterward declared unconstitutional. The first thing the Congress did when it returned was to repeal the bill, and the sponsors of the bill were most anxious themselves to repeal it.

Mr. BOLLES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOLLES. Will the gentleman state how dairying has been treated so well?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Certain dairying interests have been given marketing agreements in various cities. I do not think dairying has been given all that it ought to have had.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I have here a statement made by the Department of Agriculture in February, this year, which states, and I quote as follows:

Milk production continued through January at a record-breaking level for the season. The number of cows has been increas-

ing in nearly all States. The cows are being fed better than in any recent year, and the weather during January continued mild in contrast to the unusually severe conditions during the same month last year. The reported production per cow, which on January 1 was the highest on record for the date, showed slightly more than the usual increase during the month. On February 1 it was still above previous records for that season in all groups of States except the South Atlantic and South Central, and even in those areas it was higher than in other years since the depression. In Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, and Kansas reports on production per cow were outstandingly high, mostly about 7 percent above previous records. For the country as a whole the February 1 production per cow reported by crop correspondents averaged 13.46 pounds this year, compared with 12.65 pounds last year, and a 1930–39 average of 12.29 pounds.

I could go on and show that under the present marketing agreements the dairy interests have been helped. We want to go ahead with them, but we do not want to destroy the corn program throughout the United States which this amendment will certainly do, because it releases corn everywhere in the United States for the purpose of feeding animals on the farm. The amendment under the present philosophy of the bill ought to be voted down.

We use silage in many way, for fattening cattle, for instance, and especially for feeding calves and in the fattening of calves. This will be in direct opposition to benefits to the farm areas which are themselves cutting down their acreage. They are paying the price. They are making sacrifices. They must make sacrifices in order to comply. But under this amendment there is no price paid by the dairy farmers and no sacrifice whatever. They want to get the same treatment that the corn farmers and the wheat farmers are getting without helping along in the program to prevent surpluses and raise prices. They want to have their cake and eat it, too. This will not be fair to the other farmers in this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. Chairman, somehow I have always wished I could tap some fount of omniscience in dealing with farm questions, knowing how delicate and how controversial they are. I might recite in point the case of the little boy who approached his mother and asked, "What makes the Tower of Pisa lean?" She said, "I do not know, but if I did, I would take some."

I would take some omniscience if I knew where it could be had to solve this problem. It does not require any omniscience to perceive how skillfully this amendment, however, would just raise hell with the Corn Belt, if you will pardon the inelegance of that term. Most everything explains itself if you will just read it carefully. It requires no erudite explanation on my part to fathom this amendment. Let me read the pertinent portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN]:

After June 1, 1941, corn harvested as silage for feed on the farm shall not be included as a part of the corn acreage allotment.

Suppose my name is Joe Doak. I operate a farm of 200 acres. I have a hundred acres of corn allotment, but I seed down 200 acres of corn. I am going to produce 100 acres of silage corn. What am I going to do with it? Why, feed it to dairy cattle, possibly to fatten livestock. But I am also going to harvest in the form of cereal corn the other 100 acres. What am I going to do with the corn from those 100 acres? Feed it or sell it, and so aid in destroying the program for Corn Belt farmers.

Well, out in the Corn Belt we do not get any allowances of that kind. We take the whole program as such, but if you pass this amendment, Joe Doak, with 200 acres, 100 acres of silage corn and 100 acres of ear corn, can do what? Fatten hogs, yes; and ruin the corn program in the Middle West, or sell his corn in the industrial market and aid in reducing the price. Thus the dairy farmer would receive a double benefit, whereas the Midwest hog farmer would be penalized.

I have not always been for the whole program, but I do not believe in any kind of submarining or torpedoing of this program by such a proposal. I think it is necessary right now for the boys from the Farm Belt to stand up and convoy this bill to port without the Andresen amendment, or you are going to be sunk. You might just as well put that down in the book.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have always recognized the gentleman as a scholar and as a great farmer from Peoria. He referred to a man with 200 acres of land. Does he think that a man residing out in his district with that size farm would put the whole 200 acres into corn?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there anything in here to show that he will not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; but does the gentleman think he would?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the joker in it. The gentleman confesses the joker. It requires no further argument on my part.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I gave the gentleman credit for his having a lot of intelligence, but when he says that his intelligence sinks into insignificance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is only trading upon a presumption. May I say to you when you put this in, the corn program in Iowa, in Illinois, and in other States will be partially sunk.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman wants to put his corn into whisky, while the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] wants to put his into milk and butterfat.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a practice of estimating corn by the gallon.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOLLES. With respect to the 100 acres of corn in Illinois which you are going to plant for silage purposes, the average Illinois farm in the Corn Belt does not have any silo, does it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have plenty of silos down there, but I may say to my friend from Wisconsin that what I object to is that out in the dairy centers you are going to use this amendment to raise hell with the corn farmer in the Corn Belt. The chairman of the committee knows that that is true. So I suggest to the Members that they rise up as one man and smite this amendment hip and thigh, because you know what is going to happen to the corn and hog farmer.

Mr. BOLLES. We do not raise any commercial corn in Wisconsin.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And the gentlemen in the Corn Belt want to raise hell with the dairy farmer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have not gone into the dairy business down there, as is so perfectly evident, and as the gentleman knows.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOLLES. We import 412 carloads of feed from the State of Illinois. I want the gentleman to show me where this amendment will stop that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us vote this amendment down with great gusto. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to disagree with my able friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, on this matter, but I do want to take a few moments to point out something that has not been brought out yet in the course of this debate as far as this amendment is concerned.

It has been very ably pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Illinois what the effect of this amendment might be in the Corn Belt, but no one has yet pointed out what the effect of this amendment might be in the Dairy Belt when you get outside of the commercial corn area.

As you all know, we have in this country a commercial corn area and a noncommercial area. Those who are in the commercial corn area and who are in the program operate under a quota and they receive certain benefits that are not received by those outside of that area. They are entitled to parity payments if they come under the program. They are entitled to the benefit of corn loans. Those who are outside of the commercial area are not so restricted in their production, in that they can produce up to their soil-conservation acreage in corn, but on the other hand they do not receive corn loans and hey do not receive parity payments.

If you adopt this amendment you will permit dairymen in the commercial corn area to have their cake and eat it, too, and you will put to a disadvantage every dairyman outside the commercial corn area, because he will still be in the same position in which he has been. He will

not get parity payments, he cannot increase his acreage above what it has been before, and he will not get the benefit of corn loans.

We have gentlemen here from Wisconsin, just across the State line from the gentleman from Minnesota. Most of their counties are not in the commercial corn area. If we adopt this amendment, certainly they will be put to a great disadvantage compared with the farmers in the district of the gentleman from Minnesota, because not only will they retain all of the benefits they have now, but this resolution will take off the restrictions and permit those producers to produce all the silage they want on top of their corn allotment.

Most of the dairy sections of this country are outside of the commercial corn area. If we adopt this amendment, we will undoubtedly increase the production of dairy products. We want to increase it some, but if we do this we are going to take the lid off. We do not know what the effect may be on the price of dairy products. The only thing that will save those prices will be the agreement of the Department of Agriculture putting a certain price per pound on butter fat, and that price is considerably below parity, as we all know. We will not only be increasing the production to a point which I believe may very detrimentally affect prices, but we will be putting every dairyman outside of the commercial corn area at a very distinct disadvantage as compared to the dairymen in the commercial corn area.

I appreciate the problem of the gentleman from Minnesota. This amendment would be a fine thing for his district or for any other district similarly situated, but there are not very many districts of that kind. It is a peculiar problem. I sympathize fully with the problem in those districts, but if you adopt this amendment you may help a little in those districts but you will be doing a great deal of harm to all the other dairy sections of the country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman agree with Secretary Wickard and the Administration that there is a need for the production of additional dairy products in this country to help England and other countries?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I stated a moment ago that we should increase our dairy production, but I believe that if we take the lid off entirely, as this amendment would do, we would increase it to a degree much greater than is likely to be necessary. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture deserves the thanks of the House for bringing this measure to our attention at this time. The Committee on Appropriations reported an agricultural appropriation bill for 1942 and we passed it and it has gone to the other body. That bill is now in conference. The result of that conference will largely depend upon the action of the House on the bill before the Committee this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, the primary purpose of the bill under consideration is to provide for increased loans on wheat, cotton, tobacco, and corn. In the very nature of the case there can be no increased loans on these or other commodities unless the penalty is increased, and therefore the penalty for violations is properly increased under this bill. The concrete question is whether or not the program is to be conserved by providing the additional loans that will increase the incomes of cotton farmers, of wheat farmers, of corn growers, or whether or not this program is to be jeopardized in the interest of those who are opposed to the program. Whatever may be said about the program of the administration, the Members on the left of the aisle and their party have all advocated parities and they have advocated soil conservation and they have advocated loans. These are the programs we are undertaking to protect in the legislation now under consideration.

I want a reasonable income for all agricultural groups. I believe the gentlemen from dairy sections are pursuing a short-sighted policy in opposing this legislation. I am for the dairy group. Congress has legislated for the dairy group. They have a monopoly of the American market today. They have a protective tariff of 14 cents a pound, and they have the benefit of loans, if they so desire, as I am advised by the Department of Agriculture; and I read the exact language furnished me by the Department of Agriculture with respect to dairy loans on March 4, 1941, the very thing that is provided in the bill under consideration:

> The loan programs on butter have been in effect during the last three marketing seasons. They are handled through the Dairy Products Marketing Association.

Our friends from the dairy sections have marketing agreements, and under those agreements they get from 71 to more than 75 percent of parity. They have the benefit of the American market as a result of a protective tariff. They have the benefit of a recent pegged price for their butter, and they have the benefit of soil conservation.

I come from a cotton district. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is from a dairy district. Under the program in 1939 the State of Mississippi received—and I give you the figures from the Agricultural Adjustment Association—soil-conservation payments aggregating $19,844,218, while Minnesota received $21,441,577. So I might go on. Texas received the largest amount in the United States, because they have cotton, wheat, corn, and other products. The largest conservation payments are paid not to a cotton State, but the next to the largest payments are paid to Iowa, which received $40,512,800; Kansas received $23,163,405. So I say to you that we cannot solve the problem in one bill. And, in my judgment, I say to my good friends from the dairy sections, receiving, as they do, under our present program, $12,367,413—having, as they do, under a protective tariff, the best market in all the world, and receiving millions of dollars in the purchase of butter and other agricultural products to provide for the needs of the poor in this country under the surplus commodity program—they should cooperate in the effort to make this program successful and in the effort to increase, as this committee has undertaken to do, the income of the farmer by providing for increased loans; and those loans cannot be increased, in reason or in common sense, unless we provide increased penalties. That is exactly what this bill does. And, Mr. Chairman, it does occur to me that the friends of agriculture, although we may not be able to relieve and treat all interests in this bill, should stand by this bill and vote unanimously for its passage.

This bill provides for increasing the incomes of corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and cotton growers. Other legislation provides for the increase of incomes of other farmers. The Representatives from the dairying areas are entitled to increased incomes. They cannot expect other agricultural interests to support legislation in their behalf unless they are willing to cooperate and support legislation for the benefit of other groups. I trust that all friends of agriculture and all who are interested in increasing the incomes of all agricultural groups will vote for the passage of the pending bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, let it be understood that I am not here to oppose this legislation, but I do support and am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

I think we ought to be a little more practical about this matter. I believe there are comparatively few of us who have had practical experience in dealing with this problem. Mr. Chairman, all in the world this amendment does is to provide that corn raised for ensilage for feed on the farm shall not be included as a part of the corn-acreage allotment. I don't think there are very many of the Members here who realize what is meant by ensilage. Ensilage, after all, is green feed. It is not sold commercially. It is not even transported from the farm. It does not compete with corn on the domestic or foreign market, as such.

If you are going to maintain that ensilage should be included in the quota, and I am talking practically now, then

you ought to include alfalfa, clover, soybeans, and dozens of other kinds of green feed, that are used for the same purpose as ensilage.

As I understand the situation, it is intended under this measure to cut down the amount of corn that is sold commercially. It does not compete with corn, as such. You are going pretty far afield when you give it such construction. Furthermore, ensilage is not fed by the dairymen, alone. It is fed by the hundreds of tons, in the Middle West, to calves, steers, and to sheep.

Mr. Chairman, just because some of us want to amend this measure and make it a little more practical and workable, is no reason why we should be charged with weakening it. I, for one do not want to do that. I do think it could be improved. In adopting this amendment, you are not injuring the measure or the program for the average farmer.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Member from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman has made an excellent argument in behalf of an amendment which the committee has already adopted, and which is in the bill at the present time. Corn planted for ensilage is exempted from the marketing quota. The amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota applies to the acreage allotment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly, that is only fair, and furthermore it should not be included in the acreage allotment. It should not be included any more than clover, alfalfa, soybeans, kafircorn and many other kinds of feed that are not sold commercially but are used as feed. The practical thing is to leave it out. No real argument, as I view it, has been presented to show why ensilage should be so included.

I can see why some of the big operators who raise corn in huge amounts and market all of their grain commercially will benefit by opposing this amendment, because the more corn taken out of the market, and out of acreage, the more acreage there will be for the big operator. I say again, why not look at this problem in a practical manner.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I am glad to yield for a question from my distinguished colleague and ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman represents a district a large part of which is in the noncommercial area.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have in our district commercial and noncommercial areas. The gentleman who is now on his feet comes from a great wheat-producing area. But that does not make a bit of difference. What we want to do today is to do the right thing, the practical thing, and not try to injure the one in order to help the other a little. Why legislate for a certain group because he may be in a commercial or noncommercial-corn area, or noncorn area, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman think if we adopt this amendment we ought to also amend the law so as to provide that no producer in the noncommercial-corn area shall receive parity payments, so that they will all be on an equal status.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course not. The gentleman is entirely beside the question. I cannot think he would want to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the farmer who operates the average-sized farm and tries to raise a diversity of crops, and who, if given a chance, would like to utilize at least a part of his crop on the farm. I am interested in the man who operates what may be known as the family-sized farm. After all, he is the one who really needs the most help and encouragement.

Before I close, let me say that I am in favor of the farmer receiving a reasonable price for his products on the basis of the price he is required to pay for the things he buys. He is not getting it. Not by a long shot, and almost everybody knows it.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the members of the Committee to vote down this amendment. I realize what it will do to the noncommercial areas. As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] said a few moments ago, outside of the commercial area, the corn acreage is controlled largely by the conservation program. If you permit a farmer in this area to plant his regular corn acreage, and then plant acreage for ensilage, he can go into producing dairy cattle, hogs, and beef cattle if he wants to. I hope, gentlemen, you will vote the amendment down, and let us pass a bill which will do that which the committee intended, when we reported the bill out, give an extra additional amount of money to the farmers of this country.

Mr. BARNES. If we adopt the amendment, it will force the corn-producing areas to go into the dairy business out of necessity.

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment which I have at the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, to the amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Strike out the period and add: "nor shall wheat harvested as hay for feed on the farm be included as a part of the wheat acreage allotment."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment that I have offered to the amendment clearly indicates what will happen when we start amending the bill in this way. If it is fair to exempt corn harvested for silage, in determining the acreage allotment, then it is fair to exempt wheat harvested as hay in counting the allotment.

Now, you pass on the amendments as they appeal to you.

I want to say a final word with respect to the bill before us. I raised a question in the consideration of the bill which I thought was an important question. That is the retroactive feature of the bill in its increase of penalties on the man who already has his wheat planted. I tried to get members of the committee to agree to an amendment which I thought would remove the inequity, but I have been unable to do so. In spite of that I intend to vote for the bill on final passage. I make this statement because some may have thought from the question I raised that I thought the bill should be defeated. I do not.

The point emphasized by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] clearly makes a case for the bill. That is, the increase of loan values. This may be a makeshift as farm measures go, but it does not call for a direct appropriation from the Treasury, and it should help to sustain the price of these farm products in the present era. That is important enough to justify the passage of the bill. I hope you will vote for the bill on final passage, regardless of our success or failure in trying to correct some of the undesirable features in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What percentage of the wheat growers are noncooperative?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know what it is now. There is a tendency this year to have a smaller percentage of cooperation because of the feeling that prices may skyrocket. Regardless of estimates on supplies, the farmers remember the wartime prices on wheat 22 years ago.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not about 10 percent?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it may be more nearly 13, but it is in that neighborhood.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And should we not try to protect the 90 percent who want to cooperate rather than to protect the 10 percent who want to sabotage the program?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, I want to keep faith with both groups, so I want to protect that 10 percent as much as I can. They made their choice and planted on the basis of the law as it has been. I do not like to increase the penalty on them after their wheat is in the ground. I recognize, however, there is an attempt to compensate them by making their excess wheat eligible for a loan under loan provisions of this bill so that they can carry their storage until a year comes when they can sell it without a marketing penalty.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's amendment is not necessary, because you can cut hay or anything you want to, if it is hay.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not necessarily. I have seen some wheat that was intended to be harvested for grain wither in the hot sun, and then it was cut for hay.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. You can do that and get paid for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Some of the farmers have found difficulty in establishing that, and if it is written into the bill it would be much easier. But I am not arguing for the gentleman's amendment or for my amendment to the amendment. Do with these amendments as they appeal to you. I hope, however, that the loan features of the bill will be sustained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were ayes 32 and noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: On page 2, line 11, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: "*Provided*, That the penalty established by this act shall not apply to wheat harvested in 1941."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to remove from the bill the retroactive feature already discussed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

In our section of the country we plant a great deal of fall wheat. Our spring wheat is already planted. This bill penalizes those who have planted their wheat last fall and this spring by compelling them to pay a penalty of 50 percent of the loan value of the wheat. Now, that is not fair to those who have already planted their crops and who want a loan—or to those who do not want loans but desire to keep their wheat and later sell it.

I want to make some general observations with reference to this subject.

Mr. Morgenthau the other day made the statement that all expenses outside of the defense program must be cut down, and the first group he drove at was the American farmer. In other words, we are going to cut down the expense of government, but we are going to take it out of the hide of the only group of people that is not benefiting by reason of the defense program and the only unorganized, unprotected group by either union or monopoly. Every day you pick up your paper you see unprecedented profits made by the big corporations of this country. They are making more money than they did in the balmy days of '29. We are indebted to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for putting into the RECORD on March 31 a table showing what wheat today would be selling for if the wheat grower received the same price for his wheat as industry and the industrial worker received for his wages. The table shows that he would be receiving $2.02 a bushel instead of somewhere around 85 or 90 cents a bushel.

The American farmer is not getting a square deal. He is not profiting by the defense program. He is out in the open. He must take the other fellow's price for everything that he raises to sell, and he must pay the other fellow's price for everything he is called upon to buy. He has nothing to say about either. Everything he buys has gone up from 50 percent to 150 percent, and yet the price that he receives for what he raises remains at about the figure it has been heretofore, with his taxes mounting constantly. Now, why penalize those people who have already planted their crops by compelling them to pay 50 percent of the loan value for not complying with the quota system?

I ask you to take from this bill its retroactive feature. As a matter of fact, laws that are retroactive should never be passed, for they make the innocent suffer, something we should not do. When those people planted their crops last fall and early this spring they assumed and were justified in the assumption that the fine they would be required to pay for not complying would be 15 cents, not 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill. It will help some. I say to the chairman and the members of the Committee that I am going to vote for this bill, I am for it. At the same time I should like to see the bill made better and give a square deal to the man who relied upon the law as it was at the time he planted his crops, a square deal just the same as you would want to give anybody else. And speaking about parity, Mr. Chairman, why in God's name should not the farmer get parity instead of 75 percent of parity? Why should we not be as much interested in seeing him get parity as we are in seeing industry and labor get parity? Prices have been fixed on coal and many other commodities. Labor unions have fixed the price of their labor, and rightly so, industry through monopoly fixes their profits and prices; why should not something be done for the farmer to place him somewhere near other groups?

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to support this amendment.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana. It certainly was not intended to penalize the farmer whose prosperity and livelihood are in large measure dependent on a wheat crop planted perhaps last fall or winter under the conditions mentioned by the gentleman from Montana.

My colleague has made an able presentation of the case for the farmers of his district. This situation applies also to many farmers in Nevada, and I ask your fair consideration and support of this amendment. I do not wish to take any more of the time of the House, but I assure you of my interest. An injustice will be done if the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I think all will agree we have been liberal in the matter of debate under the 5-minute rule. It is now 12 minutes of 5. I wonder if we could not reach an agreement as to time for further debate of amendments? Can the Chair ascertain how many Members desire to be heard on any further amendments to this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counts eight gentlemen standing.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the bill close in 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There are six amendments pending at the desk at the present time.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to offer, which I believe the committee might agree to.

Mr. DOXEY. That might be, but I think we should limit debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped time could be fixed by agreement, but that having failed I now move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the bill close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oregon rise?

Mr. PIERCE. In opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk straight to my friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], and the gentleman from Nevada, with whom I had pleasant associations when I was Governor of Oregon. I want to say to them when they talk about injustice to the noncooperator, in the matter of the 1941 wheat crop, they are talking about a condition this amendment is intended to improve. Owing to the loan feature, the price of wheat has been raised from 56 to 75 percent of parity, an increase of practically 20 cents a bushel to both cooperators and noncooperators.

The gentleman states that the man in Montana who has overplanted would have been penalized 15 cents a bushel and that we have added practically 20 cents a bushel penalty by the provision we have put in this bill. We have taken care of him by raising his loan value. Suppose he had to pay a 41-cent penalty? Considering the other advantageous provision we have made for him, what does it amount to? We have taken care of his loss. Do not disrupt the program by this amendment. You are not doing justice to the whole country. The people in his State are 90 percent cooperators. I cannot blame the Congressman from Montana for trying to get everything possible for his people. I think he can do them full justice without insisting upon changes for a few who got all the advantages of this big program, which has trebled the price of their wheat, although they have not

cooperated. We are not legislating for them, we are trying to legislate for those people who made the agreement and are willing to continue under it. The noncooperator is outside the program, but he can come in and be a cooperator right now and get the advantage. He should have it, and he should go along.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. Chairman, all of this debate is very interesting to the ordinary layman. We hear a lot about the plight of the farmer, and I have heard this for the last 10 years. We hear all about the condition of the farmers. My good friend the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] has offered an amendment which seeks to help the wheat farmers of his particular section of the country because of the fact those farmers have planted this wheat early in 1941 and late in 1940. I feel the gentleman is right and justified in his position. Yet the farmers of my particular district are complaining today. Why? Because of Government regulation and the unfairness of Government regulation and the Department of Agriculture. You ask, What am I driving at? Just this, and it comes from an ordinary layman, too.

The farmers out in the Corn Belts all over the country are guaranteed 58 cents on corn. The fellow in the East gets it, the fellow in the West gets it, and the fellow in the North gets it, yet the same Government that is guaranteeing 58 cents to the corn farmer, this same Department of Agriculture bureau, says to the Middle West farmer, "You can have $1.71 a hundred pounds for your milk," and comes right over into Maryland and Virginia and for the same grade, the same type of milk, coming from the same identical kind of cows, it says in this particular section, "You can have $3.30 a hundred." This is the same Government.

The question I ask is, Where is this equality we hear so much about? Where is this protection to the farmer? When and where is he going to get it? We have farm bureaus throughout the United States. We have farmers' protective unions, farmers this, and farmers that, but there is not a one of them that is worth a pinch of salt when the farmer is really in dire distress.

We hear about organization. We hear that the men in the plants are getting the money, that the big industrialists are getting theirs, and so forth. Why? Because of the fact they are organized, because of the fact they have a concrete organization, one that they believe in, and the organization believes in them. Until the farmers organize, until the farmers unite in a program that the farmers want, then and then only is the farmer going to get a square deal on the things he produces.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. It seems unfair to write a bill that penalizes the farmer for the wheat he planted in good faith last fall.

It is difficult for us to look into the future, but one thing I believe we all know, and that is that there is going to be great hunger in all the nations as a result of the chaos that exists.

Wheat is a product that can be stored. Therefore, I believe, in the interests of children, the retroactive features of this bill as proposed in this amendment should be stricken out.

This bill does not in any way correct the basic economic situation of the farmer but it does try to alleviate immediately some of the existing difficulties with which he has to contend.

I am also interested in another problem that will come up soon and that is the problem of irrigation.

Montana has become water conscious. Its people realize that if it is to maintain its agriculture and support its increasing population every drop of water that can be conserved in the State must be put to beneficial use principally through irrigation.

During the decade from 1920 to 1930 there was a decrease in the State's population, but in the succeeding 10 years the number of inhabitants increased more than 4 percent. And this increase was in spite of a heavy out-migration of farm and other families from the eastern section and industrial centers.

The counties where irrigation dominates the agriculture showed substantial increases in population while those which are forced to rely on dry farming continued to register losses. Newcomers to the State from the drought-stricken areas to the eastward more than offset the departing throngs who went elsewhere and, doubtless, created problems for the areas to which they fled.

The turn-overs in population due to drought or other conditions are not conducive to the maintenance of a stabilized economy and happy homes in any State. This condition has contributed in no small measure to the heavy relief expenditures the Federal Government has made in the last 7 years in Montana, totaling more than $113,000,000.

Had even half of this amount been expended for construction of irrigation projects in Montana, more than 500,000 acres of land could have been brought into cultivation for the support of 100,000 persons on self-sustaining farms and in towns that are created or expand in the wake of irrigation developments.

In connection with the Federal reclamation program, under which the Bitter Root project in my district has been rehabilitated and the little Frenchtown project constructed, I am especially interested in advancing small projects, which mean so much to established communities. The water conservation and utilization program is especially designed to advance projects of the type I have in mind, and the $3,500,000 appropriation proposed for these projects should be increased to at least $5,000,000.

With a small amount of reimbursable funds appropriated directly from the Treasury, relief labor and Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees can be used to rehabilitate agricultural areas from which people will be forced to move unless succored. The so-called Missoula Valley project near my home city, we believe, can qualify under this program and the work will be a distinct contribution to the stabilization of the community.

The Federal reclamation program as a whole commends itself to the people of Montana and should appeal to the country at large. If the results are to be put on a dollar-and-cents basis, there is one fact that can be cited. In the 38 years since enactment of the reclamation law of 1902, the lands these projects have watered have produced crops valued at more than 2½ billion dollars. This amount, which has been turned into channels of national wealth, is about 10 times the cost of the completed projects in which these lands are located.

When it is considered that the reclamation projects through the 50,000 farm homes established have given security to a million persons on the farms and in the cities and towns in the vicinity, there is concrete evidence of the value of the national reclamation policy.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against this bill which will if it passes make the farm program compulsory for all farmers.

Congress and the bureaucracy which grew out of the A. A. A. program and the administration or its spokesmen have persistently in no uncertain terms assured the farmers they would never make this program compulsory. Now all pretense is thrown to the winds and henceforth all farmers will be compelled to join the program or be penalized for not so doing.

Even the farmers who were not in the program and who planted wheat last fall will be, under this bill, forced to pay as a penalty 30 cents or more per bushel for all wheat they raise over and above the quotas fixed by some bureaucrat here in Washington who probably in his entire life never planted a grain of wheat. Could anything possibly be more unfair than this?

I understand the Agriculture Department intends to exempt corn from the program for this year, but it will be in the hands of that Department to do whatever it pleases.

I do not believe the majority of the farmers of the United States, if they had an opportunity, would vote for this compulsory feature in the farm program. I believe most farmers still feel that they are more capable of managing their own farms than the politicians in Washington.

Ever since I have been in Congress I have been warning the farmers and people of my district of the danger of the farm program ultimately becoming compulsory. Now it is here, if this bill passes. From now on it may be expected the bureaucrats will pull the rope tighter and tighter around the farmers' necks. This bill now tells them how much they can plant. Soon they will be told what they can plant, when they can plant it, and how much they can keep of what they produce.

This is just another long step toward making agricultural slaves out of the American farmers.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Did you ever see a farmer compelled to go into this program?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The farmers will be compelled, under this bill, to go into it or they will have to accept a penalty.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: Page 1, line 11, after the word "wheat", strike out the period, add a comma, and insert: "and which is not fed to livestock on the farm."

Page 2, line 15, after the word "silage" strike out the period, add a comma, and insert: "nor wheat fed to livestock on the farm."

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to give you something to operate on. You can go right ahead and do the same as usual, kill this amendment, if you want to, but let me call attention to the fact that there are a great many farmers in Montana and in North Dakota who have quotas of 28 to 30 acres of land. There is no one living that I know of who is smart enough to raise a family on 28 to 30 acres of wheat land in Montana or North Dakota.

These men withdrew last year and went their own way, but under the terms of this resolution they have to come back in there and farm that 28 or 30 acres, and if they do not, they have to pay a penalty if they raise any wheat.

The only thing you are doing in this bill is increasing relief. The average relief charge in my part of the country is $749 per family. If you want to drive a bargain of this kind and not let the farmer have a chance to feed his extra wheat on the farm, you can give him that $749 which you have been giving him for the last 6 years. This is a question of bookkeeping. Give him a chance to help himself or the Government will have to help him, that is all.

All this amendment does is, in case the small farmer has too much acreage to fit his small quota, to permit the farmer to feed his surplus wheat to livestock on the farm and not be penalized; that is all you are voting for. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under authority granted I present herewith a clear statement of the situation now before this House on the pending bill taken from a publication called the Co-optimist:

[From the Co-optimist, a publication of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association]

It is far from the usual thing for the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association to make public the correspondence which it sends out or which reaches it. This, however, is to be the exception that proves the rule. Because it has to do with a trouble that is proving far too general and also because it touches vividly on the injustices too often done the small, low-income farmer by the existing acreage quota system, you are permitted to play kibitzer and look over the shoulder of our general manager, Mr. Thatcher, to whom the letter was addresed and who answered it.

The letter came from D. W. Chapman, field representative of the F. U. G. T. A., at Peerless, Mont. Mr. Chapman points to the injustice done to the small farmer by the acreage restrictions of the A. A. A. and encloses a letter from a member of the Farmers Union at Peerless, Mont., which sets forth instances of the injustice that is being done. This writer insists that if the penalty for overacreage from 15 cents to 50 cents a bushel is enacted into law, it will be an outright purge of the small farmer in that section of Montana at least. In that region of Daniels County there are 35 farmers. At least 5 of these have 18, 20, 28, and 30 acres allotted to wheat. It is, with reason, insisted that not one of those five can make a living or support a family on such a restricted acreage. One case may be used for an example of what the situation is:

"One of these farmers has a wife and seven children to support and when the A. A. A. first started, he was loyal and signed up. Having farmed with horses he had considerable acreage to feed crops. In two years' time his wheat acreage was down to 28 acres and his allotment check was about $28. Knowing he could not support his family on that acreage the A. A. A. officials advised him to quit the A. A. A. He has not participated since. This year, however, he will either have to participate and farm 28 acres of wheat, or take a 15- or 50-cent penalty if the quota passes." Naturally, most of the farmers in that area are against the quota and will so vote at the coming referendum.

What were Mr. Thatcher's reactions to such a situation? He has made his big fight for the small, low-income farmer, and when he finds any of them getting the short end of the stick, as in this case—he got busy, as this letter of his will show:

"Mr. D. W. CHAPMAN,
"Field Representative, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, Peerless, Mont.

"DEAR DON: Your letter of the 13th instant simply conveys the information of a common problem that is gradually growing worse all over the country. You and I know well that a farmer can't make a living on even 70 acres of land as a wheat grower. He is going to have to have something besides that.

"I have done everything I know to do to help these people; I have done everything but commit murder. A letter in the Montana Farmer, or in the Farmers Union News, or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD doesn't mean a lot, I am sorry to say. What it takes is about a half dozen Senators who know what it is all about and who will go in before a committee and battle their hearts out to protect these people with insufficient plant to make a living, and then go on the floor of the Senate and fight their lives out for them there. That's where the battle is tough; that's where all the battles are won and lost on these legislative programs.

"In desperation, after I got your letter and some resolutions along the same line, I called Secretary Wickard over long distance and asked him just what is to happen to these people. 'If they have less output than will assure a living subsistence, then what are they going to do?' I said to the Secretary: 'These people haven't livestock, and some of them live in areas where there isn't water enough to attempt to have livestock. But where they have water and no livestock, we ought to arrange to let them feed their wheat to make more hogs, and cattle, and poultry.' He said, 'I think so, too.'

"I am going down to Washington next week, to talk to him about it.

"I hope you believe that I have battled my heart out for this thing. Thanks for writing me.

"Sincerely yours,
"M. W. THATCHER,
"General Manager."

This quota allotment, when used without discrimination, becomes the bed of Procrustes. He was a Greek brigand who took prisoners whom he strapped to a bed. Those who were too long for it had their heads chopped off; those who were too short for it were stretched to fit. It was a stature quota, to make all men equal, but was rather tough on those who could not measure up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURDICK), there were—ayes 40, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GILCHRIST moves to amend the joint resolution by striking therefrom the language found in lines 12, 13, and 14, on page 6 of the resolution, to wit: "for which marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year 1941 are in effect," and inserting in lieu thereof language as follows, to wit: "for which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in 1941."

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I understand the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. FULMER. I may say to the gentleman that the amendment is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. GILCHRIST. And the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is kind enough to say he thinks it is a good amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that in order to help the commercial farmers of the country I will agree to the amendment. I believe they should have it. We want to help them.

Mr. GILCHRIST. That is all there is to it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 6, line 12, after "wheat" insert "rice".

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, may I state that a number of the Representatives from the districts where they plant rice, including my good friend, Judge Naris, of Arkansas, came to be about this amendment. At this time rice is selling at a very good price, but they are somewhat uneasy about what the price of rice might be in the future. The only reason rice is not carried in the bill in the first place is that we felt that the price of rice was all right and could be left out. However, putting rice in this joint resolution would not do any harm and would put the rice people in such a position that if the price should go down they would be able to get a loan and

would be placed on an equal basis with cotton and wheat farmers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the penalty for marketing rice outside of the quota?

Mr. FULMER. It would be 50 percent of the amount that would be loaned on rice.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, Mr. Chairman, with all deference that would not be so under the terms of this bill. That may be so under another law. That is the reason I am asking the question, because there is no provision for embracing rice in the penalty provisions of this resolution unless you offer an amendment to include it. My question is, What is the penalty under existing law, independent of this joint resolution?

Mr. FULMER. Maybe some of the Members representing districts where they grow rice could answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. NORRELL. That is under the existing law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know, but what is the penalty?

Mr. NORRELL. I cannot say.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then I would say to the gentleman that unless he is very sure there is a penalty of 50 percent the word "rice" should be inserted not only in the loan provision but in the penalty provision of this joint resolution; otherwise, there would be discrimination.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then the words "and rice" would be inserted after the word "cotton" in line 4 on page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may give the gentleman from Mississippi the information he is seeking?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The present penalty on rice is one-fourth of 1 cent a pound.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is certainly very much less than 50 percent. As I understand the amendment, the words "and rice" are now inserted after the word "cotton" in line 4 on page 6.

Mr. FULMER. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield further, under the penalty provisions of the pending resolution, which are in paragraph (2) on page 2, provision is made for corn and wheat. Then on page 6, in paragraph (9), there is a penalty for cotton. The resolution provides for loans for cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco. There is no penalty provision in the resolution for tobacco. I understand the penalties on the sales of tobacco under existing law are largely in excess of 50 percent of the loan value, and for that reason they are omitted in this joint resolution.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I therefore shall not offer the amendment I have proposed, which is to insert the words "or tobacco" in line 4 on page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: On page 5, line 20, strike out all of subsection 8 and renumber subsections 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, as I observe this debate this afternoon it seems to me it resolves itself into just one thing. For the last several years the farmers of the United States have had a loop around their necks and the Department of Agriculture has been gradually pulling it up. Instead of 15 percent, we now propose to increase that to 50 percent and that seems to be the only thing I can see in this proposition here this afternoon.

The amendment I have offered here strikes out subsection 8, and I just want to read it to you so you will get the full force and effect of it:

Until the farm marketing excess of corn or wheat, as the case may be, is stored or delivered to the Secretary or the penalty thereon is paid, each bushel of the commodity produced on the farm which is sold by the producer to any person within the United States shall be subject to the penalty as specified in paragraph (2) of this resolution. Such penalty shall be paid by the buyer, who may deduct an amount equivalent to the penalty from the price paid to the producer.

All the personal property in this country is free to be dealt in, and the only thing I ever heard of to restrict that is to put a mortgage on it, and if you put a chattel mortgage on it, the mortgage is filed and there is notice to everybody that there is a lien against that property and it cannot be sold without the party accepting the penalty. Under this provision here, there is no protection for any individual. If somebody came along and wanted to sell you a wagon load of corn, it would be necessary for you to find out from the Government whether they had any lien on it or not or else take the man's word who is selling it to you. I think this part, subsection 8 of the resolution, ought to be stricken out. It ought to be left up to the Department of Agriculture to protect itself when they first make this loan to the individual and not take in the whole United States, because otherwise there may be innocent individuals who would be called upon to pay these penalties themselves. Of course, if they knew there was a penalty they could check it, but if they do not know that they take that chance.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Of course, under the gentleman's interpretation if the producer could sell it regardless of penalty there would not be any way for the Government to enforce this provision, and this is identical with the provisions with respect to other commodities.

Mr. JOHNS. Why should you penalize the man who buys it? He has not had anything to do with the program at all. Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. PACE. With respect to all the commodities, it is recognized that there is a lien on a noncooperator for the amount of the tax on the excess production, and I know that in the case of cotton all warehousemen are notified as to any liens, and the discussion in the committee was to the effect that this would not eliminate the need of filing notice of a lien by the Government.

Mr. JOHNS. What about the individual who has nothing to do with this program at all and does not care anything about it and has not cooperated in any way with it? He may want to buy some feed or some corn, and if he has to run around all over the neighborhood or wire the Department of Agriculture or somebody else to find out whether there is a lien against this corn or not, he is being penalized to that extent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The farmer who is trying to buy corn, who does not have enough to feed his dairy cattle, can buy it from the Department of Agriculture at 69 cents at Chicago and pay the freight to his farm in Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNS. He might be able to do that, but he ought to be able to buy it at home and not have somebody out to see him the next day to collect a penalty.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Can the gentleman think of a better way to enforce this provision of the law than the provision which he desires to strike out?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes; I think the Department of Agriculture should file the lien or give notice of the lien to the people in every community who have not joined in this program the same as everyone else who is required to give notice of a lien on personal property.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Why select corn and wheat and not do the same thing with respect to the other agricultural products?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the rice growers I rise to express our appreciation and thanks to the distinguished chairman and great Agricultural Committee for adopting my amendment providing loans under certain circumstances to rice growers. I might say with reference to the processes of supply and demand about which so much has been said today, that this is one item in the agricultural bill where those processes have functioned. Today we are getting parity prices and we hope this favorable condition may continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. BEAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 149, and, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 123, noes 15.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio (during the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

So the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 60, relating to the corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, strike out everything after the enacting clause, and insert the provisions of the House Joint Resolution 149 just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings under which House Joint Resolution 149 was agreed to will be vacated and the joint resolution laid on the table.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill today be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in revising my remarks today, that I may quote from the Farmers' Union Grain Bulletin on matters pertaining to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including a letter from Amos Pinchot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill discussed today and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday unanimous consent was granted and a special order issued granting my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] the right to address the House for 1 hour today. It is now 5:20 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent that that permission be carried over until Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech by the Right Honorable Winston Churchill on the naval bases of Eire.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short article from the Indiana Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] may extend his remarks in the RECORD two times, and on each occasion he may include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address by Col. J. E. Meyer, on Aviation, delivered at St. Petersburg, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LANDIS was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article from the Times-Herald on our naval building.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I had reserved under special order today may be deferred until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The Speaker laid before the House the following resignation:

APRIL 29, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Respectfully,

A. J. ELLIOTT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that those who have preceded me with special orders have seen fit to defer those matters, I ask unanimous consent that the special order accorded me this afternoon may be continued over until a later date when I may make a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for 1 week, on account of important business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the conclusion of the legislative pro-

gram for the day and the other special orders, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2082. An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3252. An act to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 482. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio; and

S. 1254. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will continue hearings on the following days:

1. Wednesday, April 30: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Mississippi and Great Lakes region.

2. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

3. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

4. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

5. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

6. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

7. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

8. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

9. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

10. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

11. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4499, a bill to authorize the heads of the various departments and agencies of the United States to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when it is in the interest of the national defense, to authorize the President to give priority to deliveries under such contracts, and for other purposes, on Thursday, May 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 4.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, May 7, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4215 (Mr. ALLEN), to exclude certain aliens.

Consideration of House Resolution 94 (L. M. FORD) and private bills, Thursday, May 8, 1941.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m. Wednesday, May 7, 1941. Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 4314.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

475. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting reports of negotiated contracts entered into by the Navy Department during the quarter ended March 31, 1941, in accordance with provisions of section 2 (a) of Public Act No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

476. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a supplemental report of contracts entered into for buildings, facilities, etc., in accordance with the provisions of section 8 (b) of Public Act No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended by section 9 of Public Act No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, for the quarter ended March 31, 1941; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

477. A letter from the national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting a set of the proceedings of the Forty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Los Angeles, Calif. (H. Doc. No. 189); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

478. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Recreation Committee, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

479. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay claims which have been settled by them amounting to $1,450 (H. Doc. No. 188); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

480. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for St. Elizabeths Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. Part II, minority views on H. R. 4139. A bill to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1817. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2675. A bill to permit mining within the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3929. A bill to extend the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4205. A bill to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 178. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4534. A bill to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An

act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," in order to extend the power to establish priorities and allocate material; without amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 4132. A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4489. A bill to permit the courts of the United States and State courts to issue copies of naturalization certificates to all persons over 21 years of age who can show they are entitled to citizenship in the United States of America by the naturalization of their parent or husband that was issued out of the court; without amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 29. Concurrent resolution acknowledging the felicitations of the Congress of Costa Rica; without amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4224. A bill relating to the manning of certain vessels of 500 gross tons and less; without amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4225. A bill relating to the manning of certain sail vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4031. A bill to provide increased pay for certain military personnel while engaged on parachute duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4293. A bill to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment" (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 30), as amended June 2, 1939 (Public, No. 109, 76th Cong.), so as to provide compensation for donors of blood for persons entitled to treatment at Government expense whether or not the donors are in the Government service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4449. A bill to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students; without amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Committee on Military Affairs. House Joint Resolution 55. Joint resolution to repeal section 3716 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4443. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 242. An act to repeal certain provisions of the act of February 25, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes", and the act of July 3, 1930, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1930, and June 30, 1931, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 287. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 840. An act to create the grade of aviation cadet in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and to prescribe the pay and allowances therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMASON: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3316. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a revokable license to Guy A. Thompson, trustee, Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., and successors in interest, to maintain certain railroad trackage and station facilities on Jefferson Barracks Military Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4573 (by request). A bill to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEAVY:

H. R. 4574. A bill to amend the act of June 11, 1940, Public, No. 590, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, providing for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4575. A bill to promote the economic welfare of the countries of North and South America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4576. A bill providing for the approval of certain State plans under the Social Security Act which provide for the disclosure of information required by the State constitution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4577. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a fuel depot at Middle and Orchard Points, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 4578. A bill to authorize certain corrections in the tribal membership roll of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 4579. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 4580. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Thirty-second Division Veteran Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4581. A bill to create an Indeterminate Sentence and Parole Board, provide for uniformity of term of sentence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4582 (by request). A bill to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4583. A bill to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to provide for the participation of the United States in the Florida Centennial and Pan-American Exposition to be held in the State of Florida during the year 1945; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 189. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4534; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 21, relating to conversion of fruit surpluses into alcohol; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their joint resolution (H. 1009) concerning the postage franking privilege to the military and naval camps; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 2, concerning general-welfare bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4584. A bill for the relief of Ladislas Frank; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAY:

H. R. 4585. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lydia Louise Enslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4586. A bill granting a pension to Rebecca Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Ray C. MacMillen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4588. A bill to appoint Emmett S. Harden a captain and retire him at that grade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 4589. A bill for the relief of Clara Louise Dickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

904. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, urging the enactment of suitable legislation to extend in a reasonable manner to the boys in the military and naval camps throughout the country the postage franking privilege; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

905. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Chapter of the America First Committee, signed by 1,000 persons, urging Congress to oppose any further move to involve the United States in a foreign war, and particularly oppose further transfers of American naval craft to foreign powers or any system whatsoever of naval convoys for shipments of American goods to any belligerent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

906. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of W. M. Jones, post commander, and O. W. Inman, post adjutant, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Navarro Post, No. 3366, Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bills 2290 and 2299; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

907. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the New Jersey Library Association, urging enactment of Senate bill 337 and House bill 4103, providing that the postage rate on books shall be 1½ cents per pound; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

908. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Junior National Chiropractic Association, Indianapolis, Ind., urging support of House bill 1052; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

909. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, relating to conversion of fruit surpluses into alcohol; to the Committee on Agriculture.

910. Also, memorial of the State of California, favoring consideration of resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress to provide for the dredging of Bodega Bay and to reestablish harbor facilities thereat; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

911. Also, memorial of the State of California, favoring consideration of resolution relative to the improvement of the harbor at Crescent City, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

912. By Mr. SWEENEY: Resolution of the Cleveland Industrial Union Council, opposing the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Labor; and resolution adopted by the Ninety-fourth General Assembly of Ohio, relative to supplying food to the small democracies of Europe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

913. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition bearing the names of approximately 100 citizens of Newton, Sussex County, N. J., petitioning the Congress to enact a law making it illegal to sell or give to our soldiers any beverages containing alcohol, this law to apply within military areas and within a zone extending several miles in all directions from our military areas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

914. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Park City Ladies Auxiliary, Park City, Utah, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson bill (H. R. 4139); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

915. Also, petition of the International Union United Automobile Workers of America, Local 198, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson bill (H. R. 4139); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

916. Also, petition of the Alton Building and Construction Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, Alton, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

917. Also, petition of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the American way of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

918. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Local 13, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4139, the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Paul Moeller, pastor of the St. Paul Lutheran Church, of Alpena, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and gracious God, we come before Thee humbly asking Thy gracious benediction for the tasks of this day. Turn us to Thee whenever we are tempted to forget and wander off in ways of our own choosing.

In these days of staggering events endow the leaders of America with calmness amidst the turmoil of a crumbling world, with clear vision to see the essential tasks confronting a committed nation, with strength to do and courage to stand for the right, with unswerving integrity and faithfulness in days of treachery and broken promises, with a real sense of responsibility to the people back home, with loyalty to the traditions of a free people and with an appreciation of the surpassing value of human life.

We ask these gifts that the present peace and future freedom of America be our portion and that of our children. In Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed without amendment to concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill H. R. 2788, independent offices appropriation bill for 1942; and

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the select committee appointed to investigate interstate migration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Huey P. Long placed in Statuary Hall by the State of Louisiana.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4183. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A LOST CIVILIZATION IN ARIZONA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is a truism that life on this planet is one continual struggle and that the major part of all efforts are directed toward defense. Defense is a word on all lips today, and it is a thought in all minds and hearts, but the defense usually thought of now is military defense against a possible ruthless foe. I want to remind you that Nature herself can be as ruthless as any of her creatures, including man. Great nations and human societies have been unable to defend themselves against the ruthlessness of Nature. The valley in which I live sustained a vast population 3,000 years ago. Those prehistoric men dug 150 miles of canals in the valley around about Phoenix and built up a remarkable civilization and society, but they perished from the earth in that valley and in the adjoining valleys because, as the archeologists tell us, the river beds scoured out and sank and these prehistoric farmers were unable to get water into the intakes of their intricate system of canals; therefore they perished.

Engineers tell me that the Colorado River at Parker, Ariz., is scouring out its bed below Headgate Rock Dam and that the river is sinking so that the earlier canals and irrigation works at Parker will soon be unable to take water onto the thousands of acres which have for years been watered for Indians and white men. In the consideration of the Interior appropriation bill I earnestly request Members to note carefully the statements of engineers and act accordingly, so that our present-day population may have adequate defense against that action of the river such as formerly destroyed the ancient civilization in the Southwest. I may wish to elaborate this matter at the session tomorrow. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the Reverend Fulton J. Sheen at the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner, held in New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

CONVOYS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, 1941, I introduced in this Chamber House Joint Resolution 162, for the purpose of prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries.

Not long thereafter it was intimated orally and in print that, while our Government might not attempt to convoy, it might attempt to escort. Accordingly I dispatched the following letter of inquiry to the Secretary of the Navy:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1941.

The Honorable FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I shall appreciate it if you will furnish me the accepted and approved definitions employed by the Commander in Chief of the Navy of the United States for the following terms: (1) to convoy; (2) to escort.

Thanking you for this service, I am,
Sincerely,

HENRY O. TALLE, M. C.

To this inquiry I received the following reply:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1941.

The Honorable HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TALLE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 18th to the Honorable Frank Knox, which has been referred to this office for reply.

The expression "to convoy" is a misnomer inasfar as naval usage is concerned. The word "convoy" means a number of ships escorted by combatant vessels. The combatant vessels of a convoy are the escorts.

Very truly yours,
H. W. GORDON, Jr.,
Lieutenant, United States Navy,
Public Relations Branch.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers report that our naval forces are engaged in patrol duty in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The reports state these forces go very far away. They are not even barred from the so-called war zones.

Convoying, escorting, patrolling—translated into action, what do these words mean? Remember, the patrolman is the United States Navy—our ships, our guns, our men. The consequences of what may happen are horrible to contemplate. Can nations any more than men take fire into their breasts and not be burned? [Applause.]

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 190

Resolved, That ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREENLAND

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, Greenland lies almost entirely in the Western Hemisphere. The policy of the United States, as set forth in a resolution adopted by the Seventy-sixth Congress and by various Executive pronouncements opposes any transfer of territory in this hemisphere to any new European power. The occupation by the Nazi Government of any of that part of Greenland which lies in this hemisphere would clearly violate our stated national policy, even were we to overlook occupation of that part that lies in the other hemisphere. It would also be a threat to our national security in this day of speed, speed, and more speed. It is now 4 days since the President stated that the Nazis may now be occupying Greenland. Even if he did not know the facts last Friday, he should know them by now and should have fully advised the people of this Nation. So far as I have been able to discover, no statement has been made by the President on this situation. If we are to continue to have an intelligent and enlightened public opinion to back our national policies, facts such as these must be ascertained and must be made known at once. [Applause.]

AMERICA DOES NOT WANT WAR

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, America does not want war. Perhaps the significance of that remark has been lost in its repeated utterances by many a voice, in the Congress and out. But that does not detract from its truth. And, as America does not want war, America therefore realizes that supplying our Navy to convoy war materials will bring about what the President himself has stated: "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." Let us not deliberately pave our way into the war now raging in Europe because a small number of persons with authority in Government and industry are doing their utmost to bring this about.

What I desire, what every American desires, is peace for America, and we can only maintain that peace by prohibiting the use of convoys. However, we must be realists. We are committed to a program of all aid to Britain short of war, and I sincerely believe we should afford some measure of protection for our efforts to aid Britain, and I believe it can be done without the use of our Navy to convoy war materials, which would in all likelihood be the fatal step toward actual entry into the war. I, therefore, am introducing a bill to the effect that the President shall transfer to Britain, under the terms of the lease-lend program which was recently enacted into law, at least 50 or more destroyers. These, when transferred to England, shall be used by that nation to convoy the cargoes of war materials we are sending her, with the destroyers manned by British crews and carrying the British flag.

I feel sure this would insure the security of the American people who have been propagandized to the point where they believe convoys are a necessity. Instead we would be far more secure on the road to peace if we gave England sufficient destroyers, than to have our entire Navy in the war.

Let me remind you—the lives, the property, the lifeblood of America's people, are at stake; for, I repeat, "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." Let us, rather than take this last step into war choose the sane pathway and loan these destroyers to Britain, have them manned by British crews under the British flag, to act as convoys for our shipments of war materials.

Favorable action on my measure will bring this about. I thank you. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extent my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of war propaganda and Charles A. Lindbergh, and to include an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]?

There was no objection.

GREAT BRITAIN SHOULD CONVOY ITS OWN MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to an advertisement appearing in the Washington Post this morning, showing pictures of some battleships and captioned "Thanks to the Royal Navy," and the announcement that a local merchant

has received the greatest consignment of English-made clothes in the history of his establishment, indicating that the Royal Navy is convoying commerce from Europe to these shores. These advertisements are appearing in many newspapers along the eastern seaboard and in Canada. It is part of a new campaign to "Buy something British."

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this convoy question, which is a serious one—and I firmly believe the American public do not want to use our boats to convoy war munitions through the combat zones—I respectfully submit if the British Navy can convoy commerce to these shores and put out the sign, "Business as usual," it ought to be compelled to utilize that navy to protect its own shipments to England instead of demanding the use of our Navy for such purposes. Convoys mean war, make no mistake about that. Whether it is patroling or convoying, it is war; and when one of our ships is torpedoed we are going to have another "Remember the Maine" incident. The hysteria will be on, and we cannot be stopped from going into the blood business. If the American people speak up and protest to the President now before it is too late, we may be able to save the lives of thousands of American boys and save our form of government.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY PROJECT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PITTENGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the Hydro-electric Power Commission of Ontario which shows that the power plants operate there the year around. I ask that my remarks be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, appearing in the Chicago Daily Times on Friday, April 25, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in this morning's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook on the tricking of Dean Landis by Secretary of Labor Perkins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to a paragraph in the Washington Post Wednesday, April 23, by Hedda Hopper:

> Well, Melvyn Douglas is making headlines again. Understand he signed his name to the petition protesting the deportation of one Harry Bridges.

This Melvyn Douglas, formerly known as Melvyn Hesselberg, is the same Melvyn Douglas, or Melvyn Hesselberg, who did not accept an honorary military commission in California on account of the public uproar against his communistic activities and association. After knowing his political background, one would expect nothing else from such a man as this Melvyn Douglas, or, as he was otherwise known, Melvyn Hesselberg. I hope that everyone who ever sees him on the screen will always remember that he is a great defender of Harry Bridges.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Orson Welles, the man who put on the invasion from Mars, also signed up.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. It is just too bad we cannot send Orson Welles back to Mars. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEOGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Brooklyn Daily Eagle of April 28, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. T. J. Farrell, of 70 Prospect Park West, Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to House Resolution 17, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative MCCORMACK, and covering the career of Gen. William E. Mitchell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on the Garand rifle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California has made another unjust attack. If Melvyn Douglas has signed the paper the gentleman says he signed, I sincerely regret that he did it. But I can say this about Melvyn Douglas: He is one of the most basically patriotic people and one of the hardest workers for America's basic institutions and the preservation of democracy that there is in this country today. The reason he

did not accept the military commission that was offered him was because he had the good sense to know that he was not qualified for it. No man could be attacked as viciously as Douglas has been by the Communist press and be justly accused of communistic activities, as the gentleman from California has done to Mr. Douglas. But I wanted this 1 minute to say this: I was home a short time ago, and I had a chance to talk to a lot of our people at home in California. I found practically no complaint on the part of those people about the things they were to be asked to do, the sacrifices they might be asked to make for their country, or the taxes they might be asked to pay; but I found one thing they were deeply concerned about—especially the young people. They asked me this question: "Are people in Washington, are people in Congress, are the leaders of this Nation going to have the intelligence and the courage to see to it that when this period is over we are not to be left with a great depression and new insecurity?" And I believe nothing that could be done would mean more to our national morale today than for us to begin now to outline and put into effect a program that will end unemployment in peacetime, end poverty in the midst of plenty, and assure us a home market for all we can produce. The thing that every person needs above all else is hope. Not only do I urge, therefore, that we devote our attention to the question of how we are going to prevent an economic collapse from coming when this period of defense spending is at an end but I beg specifically that the Labor Committee grant a hearing on my resolution which will create a commission to begin at once the development of a plan for the adjustment of our economic problems after this defense period is over. Let us wait no longer. Let us begin to perform this duty of the Congress, which is, I sincerely believe, of just about equal importance with the military defense program itself. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Mr. Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange, delivered at Washington on April 19, entitled "Why Farmers Oppose Daylight Saving Time."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on pensions and national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein testimony submitted by me before the Federal Hospitalization Board regarding a veterans' hospital facility at Easton, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and others who are so active and sincere in their efforts to help even the workmen who work in the factories to earn their daily bread and continue with our all-out aid program and help factories speed up arms production. I applaud this, but I deplore the inconsistency of many of those gentlemen when they are unwilling, after this all-out aid is manufactured and made available, unwilling to buckle down and do what all men have to do sometimes, and that is to take stern and firm measures to make it effective. We cannot sustain our Nation and be mollycoddles. What is the use of having all-out aid unless we get it to where it will deliver the goods and do business. England cannot use a gun she cannot get her hands on nor fight in an airplane lying on sea bottom. I wonder if we may believe that there may be some slight tincture of politics in this position? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 5, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD twice and in each instance to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order today, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader if he can tell us what is to be the program for the coming week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very pleased to give such information as I can. Of course, Monday is Consent Calendar day and the calendar will be called. After that it is the intention to bring up the rule on the Bland bill relating to the requisitioning of vessels where there was sabotage attempted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That bill calls for 3 hours of general debate, and an hour on the rule. I presume it would not be finished on that day.

Mr. McCORMACK. I doubt it, and in that event it would go over until Tuesday. Then there is a Private Calendar to be taken care of on Tuesday. After disposition of the Bland bill, the priorities bill out of the Naval Affairs Committee will be considered. I cannot state in what order, but if the rule comes out on the Lanham bill, the authorization of $150,000,000 in connection with emergency hospitals and schools, and so forth, that bill will be taken up next week; also a small deficiency appropriation bill which I understand will be ready next week and probably the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is a place provided for the so-called Vinson bill which was reported out this morning by the Rules Committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. These bills that I have referred to are very important, and I cannot see where the Vinson bill could be brought up next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech made by our outstanding colleague the constructive gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. After this, the Speaker will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, we had several interesting remarks made yesterday on the agricultural situation, but there is one part in particular that I draw to the attention of the House at this time, and that is a problem which is going eventually, if it is allowed to grow and fester, to mean the end of independent farming in America. I refer to the shortage of farm labor, and the situation in particular in up-State New York. It is a fact that many of the farmers this year in my particular locality will be forced to give up their small family farms unless this problem is corrected. I, for one, believe it is a task which must

be considered by the Congress and by the National Defense Commission so that the problem may be solved. I ask that consideration be given to an effort to remedy this lack of farm labor on the farms in America. [Applause.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4590, Rept. No. 476) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4590, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1942. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that debate close when the House adjourns today, the time to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the ranking minority member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I made the statement that I reserved the points of order. I do not know whether the Speaker understood it or not.

The SPEAKER. The RECORD will show that.

Mr. RICH. The other is agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that the gentleman from Oklahoma said that we would go on with debate and determine later whether it would end.

The SPEAKER. Oh, the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma was that debate close today.

Mr. RICH. My understanding of the agreement between myself and the gentleman was as I state.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the request again. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill run throughout the day, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and one-half by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The agreement was that we would have debate just run throughout the day, and then at the end of the day determine whether we would close debate or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I did not so understand. It was my understanding that we might close debate today and read the first paragraph.

Mr. RICH. I am hopeful, too, but if I have any greater number of requests than I have now, I want to take care of them. I have requests now for 3 hours and 40 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That being true, I hope the gentleman will use about 2 hours first, because I do not have a single request at this time on this side.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I renew my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I have not had a chance to go into this bill in detail, as it was just reported this morning, but I find that one item has been cut out which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, amounting to $500,000, for the construction of transmission lines, and so forth, to convey power from Fort Peck to places of use.

I understood that this item was taken out of the bill due to the recommendation of the Commissioner of Reclamation. I wish to put into the RECORD this statement upon the same, given to me by the Department:

About August 15, 1940, correspondence from the Corps of Engineers indicated that Fort Peck power would be available early in 1942. On this assumption, the Commissioner of Reclamation prepared estimates for an appropriation of $500,000 for constructing transmission lines leading away from Fort Peck Dam. The Commissioner appeared before the Budget and secured the approval of the Budget for this appropriation. Some time later and before the committee hearings on the Interior appropriation bill, the Bureau of Reclamation phoned to the Army engineers' office to ascertain if the schedule outlined in August 1940 was being adhered to. The verbal reply at that time was to the effect that on account of difficulties in securing materials the installation would no be completed as scheduled; that power would not be available until late in 1943. Having this knowledge of changed conditions, the Commissioner of Reclamation appeared before the Appropriations Committee and advised the committee, when this item was reached, of the circumstances regarding the Fort Peck installations, and stated that it would be satisfactory if the appropriation of $500,000 was eliminated for the fiscal year 1942. This verbal information was later confirmed by correspondence between the Bureau and the Army engineers, which is to the effect that Fort Peck power will not be available until late in 1943, and this, for all practical purposes so far as irrigation pumping is concerned, means it will not be available until the summer of 1944. The installation under way at Fort Peck consists of a 35,000-kilowatt unit and one 15,000-kilowatt unit, making a total of 50,000 kilowatts. One of the principal difficulties that the Army engineers are having is the inability to secure penstock pipes leading from the dam to the power plant. It is understood that material used for these pipes is being required by the Army and Navy for armor-plate work on ships and tanks.

However, I want to say in behalf of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and in behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], that regardless of politics they are motivated by the highest desire to serve to the utmost of their capacity the best interests of this country as they see it. Each one of them is to be congratulated upon their sincerity and honest purpose. I do not criticize them at all. I do feel, however, that particularly in relation to appropriations for the Indians—a people who are inarticulate, excepting through the Congress—that they should be more liberal. It is an easy thing to have these people of a great and ancient tribe love their country if only treated justly. One cannot read the history of our Government's dealings with the Indians without becoming incensed at the injustice that has been heaped upon these people at various times.

Now, along this line there is an item to which I want to make specific reference. A year ago the Senate wrote into the Interior Department appropriation bill the right for the Indian Bureau to contract for land and to enter into contracts for the purchase of land for landless Indians. The Bureau of the Budget declined to recommend that this power be given to the Indian Bureau this year, and the committee did not put it in the bill, and it leaves those Indians without any means of support or sustenance for the future.

I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having to do with this bill and asked that that power be written into the bill, giving the right to purchase land for landless Indians. Governor Pierce, of Oregon, also made a powerful argument before that subcommittee for this authority to be written into the bill. But somehow it seems it is the general trend of things in the Government to try to cut down expenses on everything excepting the national defense. The first people hit are the farmers who are unorganized and who are unprotected and, of course, in minority. The are hit first. Then next are the poor, defenseless Indians who are the wards of the Federal Government. When we took them over we said we would take care of them. We took everything they had of any value, and today, when a white man finds out that an Indian has something of value, he finds a way of taking it from him. All of the good lands that the Indians had in years gone by the white man or the Government is now in possession of and owns. The Indian now has nothing

but what you might call marginal land upon which scarcely anything grows.

In my State we have 500 Indian families making a population of in the neighborhood of 3,000, who, for one reason or another, have no valid claim to enrollment in recognized tribes, and who are landless and resourceless. They are real Indians—the Indian Office, from its investigations, estimates the great majority are halfbloods or more. A few, perhaps, are descendants of former Canadian Indians who drifted across the border. Many apparently are Chippewas who have migrated from the Lakes States area. A scattered few were at one time given allotments on the public domain. The land was of such poor character they could never make a living from it and were forced to move.

Today they live on the edges of towns and cities in the State, crowded into miserable hovels, living in abject and pathetic poverty. Their deplorable condition reflects upon the people of the State and upon the Federal Government. Local welfare agencies are taxed beyond their limits to ameliorate their condition.

These Indians are eligible for enrollment under section 19 of the Indian Reorganization Act. If the Indian Office had adequate funds the task would be relatively simple. It could accept applications for enrollment, buy land for them, provide agricultural assistance, and otherwise enable them to rehabilitate themselves. Indian Service appropriations, however, are already spread out so thin that it is not able to do an adequate job with the members of recognized tribes. No purpose would be served, therefore, in enrolling an additional 3,000 Indians.

In general, it is considered that the purchase of adequate lands for an economic base for these people is the first essential in any program of rehabilitation. At least 50 to 60 percent of them would respond to an agriculture and livestock program.

To provide the necessary land will require a million dollars. In addition, another million will be required for loans and grants for cattle purchases, machinery, homes, and farm buildings. Essential public services such as schools, health facilities, agricultural help will require an annual appropriation of $40,000.

These are the ultimate cost of rehabilitating some 250 of these families.

If these expenditures be spread over a 5-year period and permit the resettlement of approximately 50 families a year, there should be annual appropriations of $250,000 for land purchases, $200,000 reimbursable for loans, and $12,500 for essential services.

Yet we refused to provide anything for them. The Bureau of Indian Affairs a year ago under authority provided in the appropriation bill by the Senate and concurred in by the House, was given the right to contract for land for these people, but it was not done. Today even that authority is taken away. So for another year at least these poor people have got to roam the country and live as tramps. As a matter of fact, before our Committee on Indian Affairs a year ago evidence was brought out to the effect that some of these Indians were living on dog meat. Now, that is going on in these United States. We have money to appropriate, if you please, for the distressed women, children, and men throughout the world but we have no money to take care of our own needy and distressed people, nor to take care of the aged white people who are unable to look after themselves because of one thing and another over which they have no control; such help to our own of course would not make headlines. We have no money to take care of the people, namely, the Indians, whose property we took, and forced on them, if you please, the legal relationship of guardian and ward.

I am not going to offer any amendment to restore that authority to this bill because I know it would be voted down, whether the committee would oppose it first on the ground that it being legislation on an appropriation bill, was subject to a point of order; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] this morning notified the Chair that he reserved all points of order against the bill and, of course, such an amendment would be subject to a point of order; so I am not going to offer it, but I am going to try to induce our Senators who are concerned with Indians in the Western States to write that authority in the bill in the Senate, and I hope it will be concurred in by the House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Are there not several problems in the Indian question? I have been a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. In the first place I find we do not know what we legislate about; and, secondly, we do not know what is actually going on in the field where these Indians live. I have suggested at numerous meetings that the committee ought to be given the power to make a study of the whole question.

A third point is, how much money have the Indians to their credit which we refuse to give them back even to buy clothing and food? Has the gentleman any figures on that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman asks a question the answer to which would take a bookkeeper 30 days to find out, but his suggestion that an investigation be made is a mighty good one.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that, but it is important, nevertheless.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the Indians have anything of value and they are authorized to sell it, the money is put in the United States Treasury, and they cannot even touch it without the authority of Congress, and then we see these Congressmen with their hatchets out here for the Indians not only chopping up the bills, but the Indians as well. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1942 I think I can truthfully say that every item has been scanned carefully by the members of this committee. We started the hearings on March 20, and, with the exception of a few days during the Easter holidays, we worked every day, including Saturdays.

Thirty agencies of government are taken care of in this bill. Year after year additional agencies have been added to the Interior Department appropriation bill. Last year was no exception to the rule. Two or three rather important agencies were added during the last fiscal year. Let me say at the outset that our hearings this year have been attended more universally by members of the committee, minority members as well as majority, than any of the hearings with which I am familiar. We divided the work of the committee this year as we have in the past. We called on individual members to handle the different agencies of the Department, and I frankly confess they did an excellent job. I feel that I should say for the RECORD that the minority members and the majority worked in greater harmony this year than ever before. We had our differences, of course, and certain items in this bill will be criticized—and possibly they should be—but for the most part every item in this bill was approved by the minority members as well as the majority. Our distinguished chairman of the committee, the venerable gentleman from Colorado, ED TAYLOR, was unable to be present at most of the hearings, but he was present in marking up the bill and rendered very valuable service to the committee. Other members aside from myself are the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]; and the minority members are the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and a new member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The first thing the Members of the House want to know, I believe, is how this bill compares with previous Interior Department bills and how does the bill compare with the Budget estimate? What are the increases and what are the decreases? And did you bring the bill in above the Budget estimate or below the Budget estimate? Here are the figures briefly. I will just hit the high spots, and when I finish I shall be pleased to answer any questions if I can do so.

The amount provided in the bill for Interior Department activities for the fiscal year 1942 is $177,019,078. The total Budget estimate of the committee, consisting of $150,087,238 in the regular Budget, and $33,257,110 plus in the supplemental estimates, amounts to $183,344,348.

The bill as recommended to you by the committee is in excess of the 1941 appropriation by $21,469,245. Probably you are asking the question why is there such a considerable increase over last year's bill. I will explain that as I go along. Since I stated there is an increase over the 1941 appropriation, it might be well to explain in a few words the reasons for these increases.

The first and most important increase is caused by the need to accelerate construction of the Bonneville power project to meet the national-defense demand for power in that area. The increase over last year on the Bonneville project alone is something over $11,000,000. This is, of course, for the purpose of stepping up the completion of that project for the additional power which is greatly needed. As Members know, there are some national-defense plants being constructed out there, particularly an aluminum plant which, as I understand it, will be one of the largest aluminum plants in the world.

Then, too, there have been stepped up one or two reclamation projects in order that their power development facilities can be used for national-defense purposes. This accounts for an increase of a little over $5,000,000 over the 1941 appropriation. The remainder of the increase is due to the estimate of $4,000,000 over the current appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Blue Ridge Natchez Trace Parkway, this increase being necessary to meet the $6,000,000 contract authorization in the 1941 Interior Act.

COMPARISON BETWEEN BILL AND BUDGET ESTIMATES

We feel that we have made a particularly good showing in reducing the bill below the Budget estimate by $6,325,000. I may say before I leave the subject of reclamation that certain Members of this House have in the past referred to the Interior Department subcommittee as that committee that is packed for reclamation projects, the committee that wants to expend every dollar possible on reclamation projects; but the fact of the matter is that of these 30 agencies and of the $6,325,000 cut below the Budget estimate which the committee was able to make, 65 percent is in the Reclamation Service. I might add that this bill is 3.4 percent below the Budget estimate and is by far the best record made in connection with any annual appropriation bill brought to this House thus far.

Here is something I probably ought to say off the record. There were a number of Congressmen and others who appeared before the committee. Of the over 20 Congressmen who appeared before the committee, I think all but 1 asked for an increased appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, had the committee given all the Members who appeared before the committee favorable consideration, instead of this bill being $6,325,000 below the Budget estimate it would be exactly $41,379,664 above the Budget estimate. So you can understand the tremendous pressure that has been brought on this committee for additional funds to be expended.

Let me say that in nearly every instance the projects presented by the Members of Congress and some of their friends were meritorious projects. I think this is especially true with reference to reclamation projects in the West. We had the Governor of a great State come before our committee and plead for a project on a river that has done damage to the extent of millions of dollars throughout that area, but the committee did not feel justified without a Budget estimate, and without the recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation, to accede to his request. That is one of many projects presented to the committee.

If you have never visited the West, you can understand when you get out there that water is the very blood stream of that entire country. I believe that most of those reclamation projects presented to us, $41,000,000 above the Budget estimate, are not only meritorious but would make this country a richer place in which to live. Let me remind you that these reclamation projects pay back to the Government the cost of construction work. At this time about 99 percent, as I recall, of all reclamation projects in the United States are paid up, and some of them are paid ahead of time. So much for the Reclamation Service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to supplement what the gentleman has stated by pointing out that in our State alone more than 20 percent of the State's population is dependent upon Federal projects outside of the cities and counties they support. Were it not for Federal assistance in our irrigation and reclamation projects in the West we just simply could not survive. There is no man in the House who is a better friend of all the West than is the distinguished gentleman now addressing the Committee. He is always on the job for his own State and the entire West. It is such Members of Congress as he that are making the West. [Applause.] If it had not been for Federal assistance given to us out West we would have had to abandon the western country because water is our lifeblood.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his very kind and generous observation. May I say that the committee was very much impressed with the need of one or two other reclamation projects in the gentleman's own State, and I hope that next year there will be a Budget estimate for one or two of these reclamation projects.

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION FOR PURCHASE OF LAND FOR INDIANS

I would like to say a word in reply to the very impressive speech the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] made with reference to the desirability of granting contractual obligations to spend $325,000, I believe, for the purchase of land for needy Indians. I know the situation is very serious in the gentleman's State. I know there is need for that. There are several reasons why the committee did not feel it should put the authorization in this bill. In the first place, we had no Budget estimate. The main reason, however, is that the committee had previous notice that if it were put into the bill a point of order would be raised against it, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I feel confident of the gentleman's sympathy for the landless Indians. He has shown his friendship for them on many occasions. We not only have them in Montana, but we have them in the gentleman's State, in Oregon, in the Dakotas, and in several other States. As I said this morning, I think it is a crying shame for the United States Government to let the needy of every nation in the world put their hands into the United States Treasury and then deny a subsistence or living to people upon whom we have forced the relationship of guardian and ward—namely, the American Indians, the first people, as far as the record shows, ever to occupy what is now the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his statement, and candor compels me to say I agree wholeheartedly with the statement the gentleman has made, and that rather than have $1,700,000 in a relief bill every year for Indians it would be far better to help those Indians help themselves.

BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

Next I will take up the Bituminous Coal Division. The fact is I did not vote for the original bill providing for the establishment of a commission and the fixing of rates. I was one of those doubting Thomases who thought it just could not succeed. But I am glad to state today that the Bituminous Coal Commission has succeeded far beyond our expectations. I want to remind you that not a dollar of these appropriations expended for the Coal Division comes out of the Treasury of the United States. That does not mean it does not come from the people. The point I am trying to make is that the Coal Division has brought into the Treasury more than $4,500,000 during the past year. Under the old set-up, with a seven-man Commission, the members were fighting among themselves; they could not agree on policy; it was top-heavy from every standpoint; but even though the business of the Coal Division has more than doubled in the past year, they are running at considerably less expense than they did under the old top-heavy, seven-man Commission.

The committee, after hearing the evidence, reduced the appropriation for the Bituminous Coal Commission $221,000 below the Budget estimate. That is not below what they had last year. It is above the amount they had last year. However, let me call your attention to the fact that the business of the Bituminous Coal Division has increased more than 100 percent in the last 12 months.

Further, at this time there are 858 cases in arrears in compliance violations alone. Each one of these cases must be tried, and they are being tried as fast as the Division can try them. In spite of that, we have recommended a cut of $221,000 below the Budget estimate, for this reason: The minimum prices have been fixed by this agency for some time and these

prices are established and now in operation. The committee believes that a considerable portion of the funds previously spent on the establishment of the minimum prices should now be diverted to use in connection with the compliance work, which has become a very important part of the work of the agency.

We feel that the new coal set-up under Director Gray is doing an excellent job. As I stated a moment ago, it is working harmoniously. The reduction we have made is in no way a reflection on his administration. On the other hand, we commend him wholeheartedly for his very splendid work.

SOIL- AND MOISTURE-CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

The next item I shall discuss is what is known as soil- and moisture-conservation operations. This is a new item, a new activity in the Interior Department bill. This does not mean that we are establishing a new activity. It does mean that the soil- and moisture-conservation activity has been transferred from the Department of Agriculture under Reorganization Act No. 4. We have recommended a reduction of $125,000 in the estimate of $2,250,000 for this activity. These cuts are applied to the personnel in the higher brackets, a complete list of them being set forth in the report on the bill.

This organization will confine its work to duties to the public lands under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. Frankly, the committee felt that that is where it belongs, and that Reorganization Act No. 4 will permit this work to be done better and more economically than it has heretofore been done under the Department of Agriculture.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The next item is the General Land Office. We disallowed four junior land examiners, including their travel expenses, which amounted to $15,440. These were to be $2,000 jobs. The committee felt these jobs would be filled by inexperienced boys recently out of college, and that the work could be done better and without additional cost by the personnel they already have in the Department, particularly the personnel in the Soil and Moisture Conservation Division, the Grazing Service, and the Geological Survey. This personnel would survey and make plans for the most beneficial use of the public lands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is not the work of the Geological Survey in determining and investigating on the ground our mineral resources one of the most important activities we have?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is true. I think it is a very important department of the Government.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

We next discuss briefly the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The evidence presented before our committee showed that the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs have increased considerably during the past fiscal year.

It has been brought to our attention rather forcefully in recent years that the general public and Members of Congress have a very limited knowledge of the Indians of this country and of the activities of the Indian Service. For this reason I desire to make a brief statement concerning the more important phases of the duties and responsibilities of this branch of the Interior Department.

The Secretary of the Interior, through the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, is charged by the Congress with the responsibility for looking after the welfare of approximately 395,000 Indians and natives of Alaska. Prior to 1934 the Federal Government acquired from the Indians by treaties and otherwise large areas of land and set aside for their use comparatively small reservations. Under the so-called General Allotment Act of 1887 many of these reservations were allotted to the individual members of the tribes with the result that in excess of 50 percent of the Indian estate passed into non-Indian ownership. This loss of land holdings reduced many of the tribes to a condition of extreme poverty, from which they have not and cannot recover until a land base adequate at least for subsistence needs has been supplied by the Federal Government.

One of the most important of these is an educational program ranging from the primary grades through the high-school level, plus certain specialized courses above the high-school grade, such as the 2-year commercial course offered at the Haskell Institute in Kansas. The educational program for the Indian youths is designed to provide the type of training that will enable the student to exploit the resources he has at hand and to utilize these resources for the improvement of his own economic status. This program recognizes the fact that not all of the students will wish to return to their home communities and consequently provision is made for specialized training in the various skilled trades. Many Indian youths are taking their places in industrial establishments throughout the country. It is estimated that the total number of Indians of school age is 88,230. Of that number 74,531 were enrolled in various types of schools during the 1939–40 term. The appropriation for educational activities for the fiscal year 1941 is approximately $10,000,000. This sum includes funds for the operation of 20 nonreservation boarding schools, 34 reservation boarding schools, and 351 day schools of varying sizes, which are located in the continental United States and Alaska.

We were pleasantly surprised to learn that the population of Indians has increased decidedly in recent years. The problems of law enforcement are increasing not only in the continental United States but also in Alaska. The problems of health are increasing. The problems of agriculture among the Indians and the problems of stock raising are increasing. Yet, despite all of this, your committee has cut the appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Appropriations for this Bureau reached a high some 3 years ago, when the appropriation was a little over $36,000,000. In 1941 the appropriation was reduced to $33,225,000. For the fiscal year of 1942 the appropriation is again decreased to $31,839,488.

We have recommended a cut in the Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates, a very substantial reduction, I may say, of $634,000. I shall mention some of the outstanding cuts.

Expenses for tribal organization under the Wheeler-Howard Act are cut $14,540. The committee feels that the work of organization should be completed within a few years and has advised the Bureau of Indian Affairs that this item will be cut substantially each year hereafter.

There is a cut of $260,000 below the Budget for Indian irrigation items. This will slow up work on the Colorado River Indian project in Arizona, but the committee felt that the work need not all be completed within the next fiscal year and for that reason felt justified in reducing the Budget estimate for that very worthy project.

MEDICAL RELIEF FOR INDIANS

You will note there is an increase of $151,000 for health work among the Indians. You may recall that this committee increased the Budget estimate for health work among the Indians last year, and this year the committee has increased it again in the amount of $151,000. The committee may be called upon to increase it again next year.

The evidence is that the health conditions of the Indians, while improving, especially in the United States, are still rather alarming. Tuberculosis, as you know, is very prevalent among the Indians. The evidence before the committee was to the effect that we have tuberculosis somewhat under control, at least it is on the decline in the United States, but it was pointed out that tuberculosis among the Indians of Alaska is now approximately 13 times as prevalent as tuberculosis among the Indians of continental United States.

A complete field hospital and medical service is also maintained for the benefit of the Indians. There is at the present time a total of 98 hospitals and sanatoria in operation in the United States and Alaska. A total of 197 physicians and 696 nurses are employed to carry on this work, in addition to numerous minor employees. During the fiscal year 1940, 65,042 patients were hospitalized and 398,270 field treatments were given by the medical staff. In addition, 627,166 dispensary cases were treated. Total appropriations for health activities for the fiscal year 1941 are $5,728,210.

Progress is being made with respect to the education and medical assistance for the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska, but much remains to be done. This bill carries no funds for new construction of schools and hospitals, but the need for such construction was forcefully presented in the testimony of witnesses appearing before the committee.

It was asserted, as will be shown by the hearings, that 5,000 of the natives of Alaska are entirely without school facili-

ties and that in a number of places the existing school buildings, all of frame construction, are old and barely usable and practically beyond repair.

However, it is with respect to the health of the natives of Alaska that there is the greatest cause for concern. Investigations made by the health authorities show that the prevalence of tuberculosis among the natives of Alaska is over 10 times the rate for the United States as a whole. The committee has received abundant evidence to the effect that the only practicable means whereby this terrible scourge can be checked, and those not infected can be saved, is by the segregation of the sick, and that segregation can be best accomplished in hospitals. The testimony given before the committee on this bill shows only 50 beds in the Indian hospitals of Alaska assigned to tubercular natives, while there is need for the accommodation of several hundred so diseased. This condition with respect to tuberculosis is deserving of most careful consideration.

The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND], appeared before the committee and made an impressive statement on conditions in Alaska. He emphasized the distressing situation with respect to tuberculosis among the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska and the need of prompt measures of relief through the construction and operation of hospitals for those so afflicted, as well as the need for school houses, both as replacements and to take care of native children now entirely without school facilities. The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] particularly insisted that in the past, and indeed up until the present moment, the Indians and other native races of Alaska—all of whom are classed as Indians—have been in some respects discriminated against in their fair requirements for education and health aids as compared to the Indians who reside in the several States, and he invited attention especially to the supporting data contained in a letter addressed to him by the grand president of the Alaska Native Brotherhood, which may be found in the hearings. The committee, of course, desires to see fair treatment accorded to all Indians.

The need for additional hospital facilities in at least five States of the Union and an urgent need for additional hospital facilities, especially in Alaska, is admitted by all in position to know the facts. We know this is needed tremendously, and the committee did increase the appropriation to the amount I have suggested, and my own feeling is that it should have been increased materially for health service especially, I will say to my friend the Delegate from Alaska, in that great, far-flung area to the north.

There is an increase for employees in the Indian hospitals in the United States, and that has been made necessary because of the 44-hour week for employees in Indian hospitals. As Members know, the Bureau of the Budget made a rather careful survey of this situation recently, and they found employees, especially nurses, working as high as 72 hours and some even more hours than that. So the recommendation was made, and urgently insisted upon by the Bureau of the Budget, that employees of all Indian hospitals and other Government hospitals be put on a 40- or 44-hour week.

I mentioned a moment ago the need for additional appropriations for medical relief in Alaska over the 1941 appropriation, and yet the committee only increased the appropriation by $27,320 for medical relief in Alaska. The testimony as to conditions in Alaska brought forth the fact that the situation is becoming more serious. The increases we have recommended will provide for a few additional employees in Alaska and will permit the operation of one new hospital on a full-year basis.

AGRICULTURE AND STOCK RAISING AMONG INDIANS

In an attempt to enable those Indians interested in agricultural activities to obtain the greatest benefits possible from their land an agricultural extension service is maintained. During the calendar year 1939, the last year for which complete figures are available, a total of $5,860,000 was received by Indians from the sale of livestock and agricultural products. The value of all livestock owned by Indians is estimated at $19,000,000. Approximately 16,500 Indians own beef cattle. For the maintenance of this important phase of the work of the Service $670,220 was appropriated for the fiscal year 1941.

INDIAN IRRIGATION

Numerous irrigation projects are maintained to serve Indian lands. These projects range in size from a few acres to projects containing thousands of acres. The largest single project is the Colorado River project in Arizona, which is under construction at the present time and is estimated to cost approximately $14,000,000. When fully completed, irrigation facilities will be provided for approximately 100,000 acres of land. During the calendar year 1939, 174,000 acres of irrigated land were farmed by Indians. For the operation and maintenance of all irrigation systems on Indian lands a total of $1,387,550 was provided for the fiscal year 1941, and, in addition thereto, $2,572,300 were made available for the construction of new or the extension of existing facilities.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF INDIANS

The next item is for relief and rehabilitation of Indians, and I will say again that in my judgment the committee cut this item very severely. Heretofore this item has been carried in the general relief bill. It will not be carried in the relief bill in the future, and is being provided for in this measure. Heretofore the Indians have been allocated $1,700,000 of the general relief fund, and I think it is only fair to say that no one has charged that the Indians got more than their share of general relief. The Budget cut this item for 1942 to $1,300,000, and the committee took out its pruning knife and cut another $300,000 off of this item. We have recommended in the bill $1,000,000 and transferred another $100,000 to the road-building program, which makes an actual cut of only $200,000 as applied to Indian relief. The majority of the members felt that the increase on account of defense and other employment justified a decrease in this particular item.

CONSTRUCTION ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Now, as to construction of dormitories and repairs at Indian schools and hospitals——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The committee made a cut of $113,000 for new construction in the Indian Service. I might say here that there was not in the Budget a single dollar for construction in my own State of Oklahoma, although we have more than one-third of the Indians of the United States, and the testimony was that the need is very urgent.

We found it desirable to make several small increases in some of the construction projects, but the total cut in construction items was $113,000.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Now, as to the Bureau of Reclamation, which I discussed briefly a moment ago, we have recommended a total of nearly $79,000,000, but there is an increase of only $5,741,000 over the 1941 appropriation. As I stated before, more Members of Congress came before our committee and asked for additional appropriations for reclamation items than for all the other items in the bill, but in spite of the pressure we were subjected to, the bill is reduced $4,200,000 below the Budget estimate for the Reclamation Service.

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM

The program of reclamation construction we are considering has a vital influence on the destinies of more than 15,000,000 people living in the arid West. It is the fiscal instrument of a policy which year after year has been demonstrating its value and contributing to the national welfare in constantly greater measure.

The widespread support given to this policy, so obviously in the public interest in building a more secure economy in the western third of the country is not surprising. But I wish more Members of Congress could be impressed with the importance of all-out support of this vital program.

As a resident of the State of Oklahoma, I am an unbiased observer, who can view Federal reclamation without favor or prejudice. Oklahoma has not had one reclamation project in operation, and only one is under construction—the Altus-Lugart project, a combination flood-control and irrigation undertaking on the North Fork of the Red River, the district now ably represented by my good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

I assure you, however, that Oklahoma is water-conscious. Her people are fully aware of the value of conservation. There is very good reason, indeed.

Oklahoma is a part of that area of the Great Plains where more than 5,000,000 people have suffered almost continual drought for the past 10 years.

The wrecked hopes and blighted lives of many of these people resulting from this drought are not mere fancy. They are revealed in cold figures—the United States census. I refer to the census reports for the 1930–40 decade. For the first time since her admittance to statehood, Oklahoma showed a drop in population. Forty-eight of Oklahoma's seventy-seven counties—more than half of them—had decreases.

Nor was Oklahoma alone in this loss. From the Canadian border to the Rio Grande, more than 500 of 699 counties of the Great Plains reported a loss of more than three-quarters of a million people.

Where did these people go? Again I turn to the census reports. Out of 309 counties in the Mountain and Pacific States, 277 showed a net gain in population totaling 1,941,000 persons.

The situation may not have been so serious had the far Western States been prepared to receive and settle on irrigated land the 175,000 farm migrant families from the Great Plains and other areas. But, unfortunately for these family groups, for the West, and for the country, only a bare handful of the many thousands had a fair chance of becoming self-sustaining. There was not enough irrigated land to go around.

The result has been a constant drain for relief on the Federal, State, and local treasuries. When I am asked why the Nation should concern itself with the migrant problem, it is not with any pleasure or satisfaction that I point to the figures from the United States Treasury.

In 7 years, from 1933 to 1940, the Work Projects Administration and its predecessors expended more than two and one-half billion dollars in the 17 States affected directly and indirectly by the drought. When the Great Plains farmers were dislodged from their farms and homes they turned to the Government for relief. When they went West in search of a new start in life they found themselves forced to accept relief. The land and the opportunity they sought were not to be found.

Two and one-half billion dollars is a sizable sum. I do not suggest that all or even a major portion of this money could or should have been spent on irrigation projects under the Federal reclamation program. But I do insist that this country has had a striking lesson from the niggardly manner in which it has in the past met the need for the conservation and utilization of the precious water resources of the arid West.

OKLAHOMA NEEDS IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

My friend, Don McBride, chief engineer of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, has made studies which indicate to him there are from 660,000 to 4,000,000 acres of land in Oklahoma that can be irrigated if floodwater now running to waste can be conserved. He estimates the maximum area when reclaimed will support half a million people.

In the 30 years before this forward-looking administration, less than $225,000,000 had been appropriated for reclamation. In the 8 years that have elapsed since the President entered the White House, nearly three times that amount has been provided for the program. I insist we can make more real headway; secure more results in the way of employment and settlement; and achieve more permanent benefits by expediting the construction of reclamation projects.

I have been especially interested in the new type of projects that are specially adapted to the Great Plains drought regions. These projects provide employment for W. P. A. labor and C. C. C. enrollees. They rehabilitate and revitalize agricultural areas that are on the downgrade. They make sick sectors economically healthy once more.

The funds appropriated directly from the Treasury for these projects are reimbursable. The contributed labor would otherwise more than likely be employed on less permanent work. The repayable expenditures average around $5,000 or $6,000 per farmstead. This is about the average amount of Federal funds expended per relief family in the drought States from 1933 to 1940.

PROGRAM SELF-LIQUIDATING

Let me again emphasize that this program is self-liquidating, and that the Government's outlay is to be returned to the Treasury. It may be informative to note that of the Government's investment in irrigation projects where repayment has begun, water users have already repaid more than $65,000,000, or one-third of the investment in projects in operation.

Without going into further details of the beneficial results of reclamation construction, I shall summarize briefly a few of the achievements of this policy:

Fifty-three thousand irrigated farms carved from the desert provide a livelihood for a million persons on those farms and in the 258 towns and cities dependent on them.

More than 20,000 other farms, inadequately irrigated by private systems, have been rescued from retrogression to the desert.

More than 3,000,000 persons get over half their power needs from Boulder Dam and other projects.

Reclamation-project areas alone provide an annual home market for a quarter of a billion dollars in manufactured and agricultural products of the East, Midwest, and South. And, finally, power for national-defense industries is provided in the Pacific Northwest, the Pacific Southwest, and other areas.

With a reasonable acceleration of the program, we can visualize Federal reclamation within a few years serving 9,000,000 persons in the West through irrigation, power, and municipal water supplies. It will bring into existence productive farms which will support 150,000 families on irrigated land and in nearby cities and towns. It will stabilize irrigation water supplies for established communities with a population of more than one and one-half million. In the Great Plains, from which farm families are continuing to flee, many agricultural areas will be rehabilitated and their people safely anchored against the storm.

I insist the achievements of these objectives justify and demand approval by the House of every item for the Bureau of Reclamation in this bill.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The largest item under this head is, of course, the Central Valley project, in California, with which all of you, I am sure, are familiar. We have heretofore provided $73,200,000 for this project, and the bill contains $34,750,000 to continue work on that project.

While the committee was considering the bill it received a supplemental estimate of $13,750,000 for Central Valley alone, which contained $4,000,000 for the construction of a steam plant on the project.

There was considerable conflict of testimony with reference to the possibility of including this item in the bill. It was presented as a national-defense measure, and there was some evidence to show that it is justified as a national-defense measure. Yet it was a definite departure from the reclamation program, and the committee had some doubt as to the necessity for it and felt that if it were essentially a national-defense measure it ought to come in in a national-defense measure, and that our committee ought not to be called upon to put this in an Interior Department appropriation bill. It is the first time the committee had been called upon to consider the construction of a steam plant in connection with a reclamation project, which is constructed primarily for reclamation and flood control. Therefore the committee did not include this item for a $4,000,000 steam plant in the bill. It is significant that both the president and the secretary of the National Reclamation Association advised the committee to stop, look, and listen before it included the steam plant in the bill.

BULLSHEAD PROJECT, ARIZONA-NEVADA

The bill carries $5,000,000 for a new project in Colorado, on the Colorado River, 67 miles below Boulder Dam. The project will regulate the waters from Boulder Dam and will be of great value in connection with the national-defense program. The estimate presented to our committee was to the effect that this entire area will soon be faced with a shortage of power, and the power to be developed at the dam, to be known as Bullshead Dam, will be transmitted to Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma, Ariz. The estimated cost of the project will be $41,200,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For what industrial or other purposes will that power be used after being transmitted to Yuma, Phoenix, and those other towns?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It will be used for several industrial organizations, some of which are now under construction and some of which are finished, and all of which are crying for additional power at this time. There is a very serious shortage in that area, and it is at least partly for national defense that this dam is being constructed.

GRAND COULEE DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The bill carries a Budget estimate of $8,000,000 for the Grand Coulee Dam, a project in Washington, which the committee felt was modest, considering the enormity of the Grand Coulee. A total of $142,000,000 has heretofore been appropriated for this project alone. The development of power in connection with this project has become of importance to national defense, and plans for this purpose call for the installation of 108,000-kilowatt generators—one in October 1941, one in February 1942, and one in June 1942. The Reclamation Bureau advised the committee that plans must be made for additional generators much earlier than was originally contemplated. Some of the largest industrial plants in the United States are now in construction in that area, and it is feared that they will not have sufficient power when finished.

VALLEY GRAVITY CANAL PROJECT, TEXAS

The bill contains a new project on the Rio Grande in south Texas, the Valley Gravity canal, on the Texas side of the Rio Grande. It has an approved Budget estimate of $2,500,000. The estimated cost is $65,145,000. This project will protect and establish the right of American interests in this area to an adequate supply of water. After hearing the testimony of numerous witnesses, two of whom were members of the International Boundary Commission, including some engineers, the committee regarded this project as one of the most urgent and most essential projects in the bill.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Geological Survey was cut considerably. The total cut was $1,030,500, due mainly to the elimination of money for mapping strategic areas. The committee questioned the necessity for this work. If necessary, it should be in a defense bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield myself 10 minutes additional. We have allowed an increase of $15,000 in the estimate for an investigation of mineral sources in Alaska. This is to investigate the matter of tin in this area. Members know this is the only area in the United States that has any possibilities, much less any probabilties, of producing tin in the United States and for the United States.

This Bureau is also carrying on investigations into other strategic materials of value to national defense.

BUREAU OF MINES

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended a substantial increase for the research and development of helium and certain minerals of value to national defense, and we have approved those items, the most important of which are as follows: Chromium, magnesium, and nickel studies, $160,000—increased $60,000 by the committee; helium-plant investigation and expansion, $350.000. This is primarily for adding an additional unit to the plant that we already have at or near Amarillo, Tex.

Investigation of domestic mineral supply, the committee allowed $425,000.

Manganese-beneficiation plants and research, $930,000.

The committee believes that the Director of the Bureau of Mines and his staff are performing very efficient and essentially valuable service in connection with the development of these materials which are so necessary in connection with our entire national-defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service is one of the finest organizations in the Federal Government; has a magnficent record—a record of accomplishing much on small appropriations, of getting the maximum benefits for the people for every dollar spent. To curtail seriously the appropriations asked in this bill would materially set back the cause of conservation in the United States.

Nineteen forty-one marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service. On August 25, 1916, President Wilson signed the organic act, under conditions similar to those we face today. The world was in a turmoil. Several years of brutal warfare had devastated much that was significant of Old World grandeur and greatness. The United States was doing everything in its power to escape, if possible, the cataclysmic struggle overseas. In spite of all that—perhaps because the events in Europe gave added emphasis to the importance of preserving that which as a nation we held most dear—the Government took time to enact legislation assuring preservation of its great scenic assets, of the historic shrines that marked crucial phases in our history or that commemorated the high courage of our people.

And the following April—that fateful April of 1917—funds to organize the National Park Service were carried in the Interior Department Deficiency Act of April 17, 1917.

Certainly if we could spare time and money in 1917 to start a new activity, in 1941 it would be folly, by negation, by failure to provide the minimum funds, to undo or nullify the outstanding achievements in Federal park administration during the past quarter of a century.

Necessarily that initial appropriation of 1917 was small, barely sufficient to provide a skeleton organization. But the small staff provided was deeply imbued with the spirit of service and had unbounded enthusiasm. For a score or more of years appropriations continued inadequate, and only overtime and boundless enthusiasm and the most economical use of funds made possible the achievements that marked the early progress of the National Park Service. During those years the Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget when established, learned to respect the integrity of those connected with this Federal bureau. Members of the appropriations committees, at first skeptical, discovered by personal investigation that Service officials planned their official budgets with the same care they used in handling their personal finances; that they amply justified their requests for funds.

Several years of fair appropriations followed, then again came Nation-wide curtailments, and the National Park Service, along with other nonemergency agencies, suffered. It took on a tremendous load in 1933, when under Government reorganization it took over the administration of many new areas with reduced appropriations. Nevertheless it responded gladly to the call to put men to work, and cooperated wholeheartedly in the Civilian Conservation Corps and other emergency programs. That meant a reenactment of the struggles of 1917 and the following years—an undermanned staff never counting hours or waste of energy in its desire to meet the existing situation.

During the depression emergency the National Park Service became well and favorably known throughout the States. Taking advantage of the opportunities provided through the Civilian Conservation Corps and other emergency activities, it rendered, and is still rendering, outstanding aid to the various States in providing much-needed recreational facilities in State and other local parks. The Congress has recognized the conspicuous benefits inherent in such cooperation by enacting, in 1936, "An act to authorize a study of the park, parkway, and recreational-area programs in the United States and for other purposes."

In connection with these newer activities, I wish to express the committee's appreciation for the fine achievements of Director Arno B. Cammerer, who last year requested that he be relieved of the directorship of the National Park Service for reasons of health, and I deeply regret to announce his untimely death today. Mr. Cammerer became Director in 1933, when the reorganization brought a vast number of new duties to the Service, and served with distinction during the 7 years that marked the greatest expansion of our country's park facilities. In the passing of this great, good man who has been lost to the Service, the Nation has also lost a splendid high-minded and unselfish citizen.

Mr. Newton B. Drury, the present Director of the National Park Service, is a nationally recognized authority on park affairs and is well known in the field of conservation. The impression he made upon the committee members during the hearing on the Interior Department appropriations bill was distinctly favorable.

A tribute also should be paid to Associate Director A. E. Demaray for his excellent presentation of the National Park Service estimates. Mr. Demaray's knowledge of the National Park System in all its ramifications has always been of great assistance to the committee.

The Federal parks provide the type of well-balanced recreation that is so essential in maintaining national morale at a high level, during a period when serious emotional strain must find an outlet or result in explosion. A large number of the areas under the supervision of the

National Park Service are readily accessible to expanding industrial communities engaged in defense industries, and to military cantonments. During the period of selective-service training, the collection of fees from members of the military and naval forces visiting the Federal park areas has been waived. The enhanced pride and knowledge of the best that the country has to offer which will result from such visitation will, I firmly believe, be of tremendously more value to the country than would the collection of such fees. After all, those defend best who are firmly convinced that what they are defending is priceless.

While I am convinced that the greatest value of the National Park System is in its morale building and stimulation of patriotism, I recognize that there is also a practical material benefit to the Nation that should not be overlooked in considering appropriations for the various units of the system.

Following through in our efforts to keep the financing of the national parks on a sound basis, the committee in the pending Interior Department appropriation bill is recommending an appropriation of funds for The Alaska Railroad to acquire and operate the lodges, camps, and transportation facilities for the accommodation of visitors now provided by a private corporation in Mount McKinley National Park. I believe that it would be in the interest of the public, both traveling and taxpaying, to have the facilities for public accommodations in all the national-park areas owned and controlled by the Government.

May I also remind you of the attendance in the parks—the increase in attendance at all national parks within the last 20 years. At this time there are 26 national parks in the United States. We have 4 national historical parks, 82 national monuments, 11 national military parks, 7 national battlefield sites, 6 national historic sites, 12 national cemeteries, and 9 miscellaneous memorials.

May I call attention to the fact that in 1940 there were 16,681,695 people visited the parks of the United States. You would be surprised to know what they pay in cash to get into those parks. Several of the larger parks brought into the Federal Treasury over $300,000 each in fees. But I said there had been an increase in the number of visitors. Back in 1920 there were less than a million people who visited all the parks of the United States. Eight years ago there were 3,481,490 people who visited all the parks in the United States, a sizable increase. Then from 1933 to 1940 the amount increased until, as I stated, more than 16,000,000 people visited those parks last year.

The revenues received from all the parks last year amounted to almost $2,000,000. To be exact, the revenue brought in from fees paid by those 16,000,000 people was $1 928,000.

We are recommending in the bill $14,466,000, which is less than the Budget estimate by $27,105.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I want to commend the gentleman for making a very fine statement, and commend the committee for doing an excellent job; but I especially want to commend the committee for taking out of this appropriaion for the National Park Service the $75,000 that was provided originally for the Travel Bureau. That was excellent action on the part of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman; and I will say again that there was some doubt in the minds of some Members about the feasibility of and necessity for this particular item for the Travel Bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we felt that a major part of this information could be gotten from the A. A. A., hotels, and other private bureaus and agencies. We are now providing for the administration, protection, and operation of Mammoth Cave Park in Kentucky for the first time. I call your attention to this in particular: We have approved a Budget estimate of $80,500 for this park, but the actual revenues received from this park alone last year was $134,000. So it appears that the Federal Government is going to make a profit of more than $50,000 on the Mammoth Cave Park alone, a pretty good investment.

The bill contains the Budget estimate of $230,000 to provide for the operation and maintenance of demonstration areas. There are 53 of these recreational demonstration areas. Up until this year this work was carried on from relief funds. Some of these areas are the most beautiful in the United States. Relief funds are no longer available, so it has been placed in the lap of the Park Service, and the committee has allowed funds to continue it.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he gets away from the parks?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I notice on page 114 a provision that the sum expended for the Vanderbilt Mansion historic site shall not exceed the total of the admission charges. Does the gentleman know what the admission charges on that were? Did they cover last year's expenditure on that site?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not recall at the moment.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I may say that the receipts fell substantially short of the expenditures.

Mr. KEAN. Then this year they will have to cut expenditures way down if they operate this park or monument, unless more money is appropriated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That, as I recall, is correct.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

We come now to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Under Reorganization Plan No. III, the Bureau of Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries were consolidated into the Fish and Wildlife Service. Wildlife in the United States is in a much better condition with reference to human requirements than at any time since the beginning of the century. For a Service charged with the responsibility of national wildlife administration, this satisfactory report is self-sufficient evidence that the agency is contributing to the national welfare. At a time when nearly all undertakings are being judged in terms of defense, it should be pointed out that the United States is better able to undertake an intensive national-defense program because of the success thus far achieved in restoring and conserving its wildlife and, further, that a continuing wise administration of this natural resource will strengthen a nation's defense against both foreign and domestic dangers.

The present administration has shown a continued interest in all matters dealing with conservation of our natural resources, and the fish and wildlife program has benefited because of this attitude. The steady, consistent growth of a more balanced national program gives evidence of the influence of this attitude. Within the past month, when conservationists became alarmed that the national-defense efforts of the Government might seriously interfere with the welfare of fish and wildlife, the President requested the Secretary of the Interior to appoint a liaison officer to work with the Army, Navy, and the Office of Procurement Management to see that the rearmament program causes a minimum damage to this natural resource. This move was taken not to in any way hamper the rearmament program but rather to check on possible damages as a result of bombing ranges and increased pollution of streams and to insure that the Government's past investment in restoring wildlife would not be jeopardized.

The work of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska falls naturally under two broad classifications: (a) Regulation and conservation of the salmon and other fisheries, and (b) management of the Alaska fur-seal herd and the furnishing of necessaries of life, including schooling and medical attention, to the 450 native residents of the Pribilof Islands.

The fisheries constitute Alaska's greatest natural resource, and yield products of an average annual manufactured value of $40,000,000, give seasonal employment to upward of 30,000 persons, and represent an investment of about $60,000,000. Canned salmon accounts for about 90 percent of this fishery wealth, with halibut, herring, cod, shrimp, clams, crabs, and minor items making up the remainder.

The fisheries of Alaska are upon a sound and enduring basis, and the trend of productivity is upward, even though there may be occasional seasonal recessions. The future of the fisheries of Alaska is bright.

The Pribilof Islands fur-seal herd contains about three-fourths of the fur-seals of the world. Under Government management this herd has increased from about 125,000 in 1911 to about 2,200,000 at the present time. The gross value of the skins sold in the past year has been well over a million dollars. The

fur-seal herd represents the world's outstanding achievement in the conservation of a wild-animal resource.

Other features of the work include protection of sea otters, walruses, and sea lions in the coastal waters of Alaska. Marked progress has been achieved in restoring the almost completely annihilated and highly valuable sea-otter resource in the Aleutian Islands region.

The results of a study of the retail marketing of fish in about 50 cities east of the Mississippi River are now being compiled and analyzed, and will furnish the basis for the more orderly marketing of fish in this populous area.

Fishery biologists of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the past few months have developed a practicable method of increasing the earnings of the haddock fishermen in New England by $4,000,000 without additional investments in the fishing fleet or its cost of operation. If the recommendations of these fishery biologists for proper management are carried out, the gross yield of food fishes will earn thirteen and a half million dollars more than at present. All of these increases would be without danger to continued maximum production and without danger of depleting the supply.

The continuous program of biological fishery investigations of the Service is a necessary and powerful factor in conserving existing stocks and rehabilitating overfished and depleted species. The present yield of the commercial fisheries of four and a quarter billion pounds must be maintained and can be enhanced by scientific research.

The same type of studies with the same objectives that are maintaining national strength through the wise use of our great commercial food-fishery resources are likewise being applied to the protection and development of our inland fish supplies which satisfy the recreational needs of upward of 12,000,000 anglers.

During the fiscal year 1940 the total production of fish and eggs from the Federal hatcheries amounted to 7,402,181,000.

Over 22,000,000 fish—trout and bass—went into Forest Service areas alone. A larger number was assigned to other Federal areas, including national parks, Indian reservations, reclamation reservoirs, and so forth, and it was evident that these allotments fell short of the requirements. There was a marked increase in the demand for stocking farm ponds constructed under the auspices of the Soil Conservation Service.

The Fish and Wildlife Service in administering wildlife has not only encouraged desirable birds and mammals but for many years has also taken the leadership in an intelligent restraint of the numbers of such species as do damage. Carnivorous animals that prey on livestock, rodents that destroy crops or food supplies, carry disease, and by their burrows damage irrigation and other embankments, and birds that prove destructive in orchards and grainfields are being controlled more effectively than ever before as a result of the operations and demonstrations of the Service. These activities will take on new significance during a national emergency in which food supplies become of critical importance, and they can be intensified to any needed degree.

Under the leadership of the Fish and Wildlife Service great strides have been made during the past 3 years in coordinating the conservation efforts of the State game departments and the Federal Government. Congress has appropriated $5,000,000 from the more than $9,500,000 collected as tax on arms and ammunition and set aside for wildlife purposes. The States contribute $1 for each $3 of Federal money to buy and develop lands for wildlife and to carry on studies to see how they can improve their management practices. Forty-six of the forty-eight States have already assented to the act, and almost 500 different projects are in operation.

Thousands of acres of lands have been acquired and dedicated to wildlife use. The State game departments are now financially able to employ trained men to conduct studies and surveys and help plan long-time programs which will be of continuing benefit. Already 275 trained technicians have been hired by the States—a long stride forward in good administration.

There has been a great lack of technicians in the field of wildlife management, but this gap is rapidly being closed. The 10 cooperative research stations, financed by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the State game departments, the State universities, and the Wildlife Institute, are turning out graduate students at the rate of 10 to 15 a year. Since 1936, when the stations were started, 100 students have been graduated, and all of them are now employed in the field of wildlife management. The employment of trained men in both the Federal and State agencies will continue to raise the standards of management as time goes on.

The special committees in both branches of Congress, realizing the inadequacy of the enforcement system, and also that new national conservation legislation had brought increased responsibilities, gave their support to increases of the appropriations made for use in law-enforcement work.

With the additional funds thus provided the Biological Survey was able to reorganize the work and to increase the personnel materially. The State conservation departments were encouraged to cooperate in widespread campaigns to reduce violations.

Game taken by poachers constitutes an unnatural loss, and as such it can be prevented or reduced to comparatively inconsequential proportions. It is only necessary to provide an enforcement agency sufficiently trained and numerous enough to cope with the outlawry.

Careful estimate shows that 120,000,000 acres of former waterfowl habitat have been taken from use by agriculture, manufacturing, and other industries. It has been figured that about 7,500,000 acres of marshland, properly distributed throughout the continental United States, will take care not only of the existing population of migratory waterfowl but of a considerably increased population, and thus insure the return of a breeding stock to the northeast nesting grounds sufficient to maintain the population.

About 4,000,000 acres of this land have been acquired by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and 178 waterfowl refuges have been established. There are now 267 refuges for the protection of all native forms of wildlife with a total area of nearly 14,000,000 acres. In 1934 the continental population of waterfowl numbered only about 30,000,000 birds. As a result of the expanding refuge system and other effective restoration activities by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the population has increased to an estimated 70,000,000 birds.

In connection with this service we have made a reduction of $235,500 in the Budget estimate. We have recommended a cut of $500,000 in the estimate of $3,000,000 under the item for Federal aid to wildlife restoration. This item has been expanded by leaps and bounds in recent years. The amount we have recommended is $1,500,000 more than the 1939 appropriation and $1,000,000 more than the 1940 appropriation. We felt that a more rapid expansion was unwise at this time. In connection with this service we have made several increases in order to provide for the development of sufficient fish-culture stations in the United States.

We have also allowed an airplane for law-enforcement work in the Territory of Alaska. The evidence before the committee showed this to be very advisable, that it would be a splendid investment. As a matter of fact, an airplane is about the only means that can be used to make any serious headway in catching lawbreakers in that rugged, mountainous country.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

National defense in Alaska

The Territory of Alaska, vast in area and possessed of really substantial natural resources, has largely grown in interest and importance to the rest of the Nation in recent years. The population of the Territory increased 22.3 percent during the decade ending in 1939. International conditions have forced recognition of the highly important strategic position of Alaska with respect to national defense. At its far northwestern extremity the main body of Alaska extends to a point within 54 miles of the main body of Asia. Of the two small islands lying in the very throat of Bering Strait, less than 3 miles apart, and called the Diomedes, one belongs to the United States and the other to Soviet Russia. Moreover, as will be readily seen from an inspection of a world globe, a considerable part of the coast of Alaska lies on or near the Great Circle Route, the shortest route between the United States on the one side of the Pacific Ocean and Siberia and the Japanese Empire on the other side.

Value of Alaska to the United States

It should be borne in mind that the money which we have spent and are spending in Alaska for military works and installations in that Territory are for the benefit of the Nation as a whole and not solely for the protection of the residents of Alaska.

But the wealth which we have taken out of Alaska up to date and the incomparably greater wealth which still remains in the Territory would fully justify substantial expenditures for the defense of Alaska alone. Since Alaska was taken over by the United States in the year 1867, the Territory has produced more than $600,000,000 worth of gold, more than $200,000,000 worth of copper, more than $130,000,000 in furs, exclusive of fur seals and sea-otter pelts, and more than $1,000,000,000 in fisheries products, especially the rich and nutritious salmon. The forest resources of Alaska, although not now utilized, are capable of producing at least $50,000,000 worth of pulp and pulp products each year in perpetuity. The coal beds in Alaska are so immense that no attempt has been made to estimate their extent except to say that there are billions of tons of coal in the Territory. Probably the greatest natural wealth of Alaska lies in its agricultural and grazing lands, some 40,000,000 acres in extent, capable of producing enough food to supply millions of people. The reindeer ranges of the northern and northwestern portions of Alaska could supply enough meat to feed those people. The value of the commerce between the United States and Alaska exceeds $100,000,000 each year.

Alaska is indeed a priceless asset in and of and by itself, over and above its inestimable value as a defense outpost for the Nation when it is properly fortified.

The recent defense program has resulted in a tremendous expansion of our activities in Alaska.

Highway to Alaska needed

For a number of years past, the desirability of the construction of a highway to connect the existing road systems of the United States and Canada with the Richardson Highway in Alaska has been urged upon this committee. The total length of the highway necessary to be constructed in order to make road connection between the United States and Alaska through Canada is approximately 1,200 miles, and it is estimated that such a usable, all-weather road, which could be readily kept open the year around, may be built for not more than $25,000,000. Formerly, the arguments presented to the committee in support of such road were based on economic grounds, namely, the opening up of the large farming and mineral-bearing areas of Alaska to prospective settlers. Recently, the national-defense aspects of such a highway have been emphasized in the need of having an overland route by which the military establishments in Alaska can be supplied against the possible event that the surface of the Pacific Ocean should fall into the control of potential enemies. It has been repeatedly urged that the construction of such a road, which, it is said, can be completed in two summer and one winter seasons, would be the best guaranty of our national safety so far as that safety depends directly or indirectly upon the possession of Alaska.

Without being an alarmist and without creating enemies by the use of the imagination, it seems beyond dispute that such a highway to connect with our Territory of Alaska would materially promote our aims in national defense and might even conceivably make it possible for us in the future to avoid the anguished reproach of "too little and too late."

The Alaska Railroad

The Alaska Railroad is of vital importance to national defense inasmuch as it is the supply line between the Pacific Ocean tidewater terminus and military posts located at Anchorage and Fairbanks.

The fifth supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, reported by the deficiency committee, which passed both House and Senate some days ago and which has been approved by the President, carries in a lump-sum appropriation for military construction the amount of $5,300,000 for relocation of the southern end of The Alaska Railroad so as to remove the seaboard terminus of that railroad from the city of Seward, the present terminus, to a point near the head of Passage Canal—sometimes called Portage Bay, an inlet of Prince William Sound. Such a change involves the building of 14 miles of new railroad to connect with the proposed new terminus on Passage Canal. It also involves the abandonment of the southern 66 miles of the railroad and of the railroad-terminal facilities at Seward. The junction point of the proposed new line of the railroad from Passage Canal and the present line is at a point 66 miles north of Seward and for convenience may be called Mile 66. By this operation the total length of the railroad would be shortened by 52 miles.

The building of the new line and new terminus was urged by the Secretary of War and by the high command of the Army as being necessary for national defense. It was pointed out that the present line of the railroad between Seward and Mile 66 is subject to sudden and damaging floods, and that, moreover, the line embraces a number of high trestles and bridges constructed of wood many years ago, readily subject to sabotage by fire or explosives, and costly to maintain. The general manager of the Alaska Railroad has estimated that the new line of road to Passage Canal can be built in "from 18 to 20 months."

Whether or not this new construction can be completed and be in operation in 18 months is a subject as to which this committee possesses no special knowledge, but even if only 18 months are required to complete the job it would seem that some adequate provision should be made for the assured maintenance of the existing line of the railroad between Seward and Mile 66 during that period. It is possible that the greatest danger of sabotage or accidental destruction of the timber structures on the present line will occur within the next 18 months, before the new line can be completed and put into use.

Since the Government is committed to these projects of national defense in Alaska, it would seem the part of wisdom to take whatever steps are necessary to guarantee the safety and maintenance of the existing transportation facilities of The Alaska Railroad while the new terminus and new railroad mileage are under construction.

Indeed, it might also be wise not to dismantle the existing line into Seward after the new road into Passage Canal is built, but to have both available so that in the event of the interruption of one the other could take care of the necessary traffic.

The report of the committee on this bill invites the attention of the executive agencies of the Government to the plight of the people of Seward in the event that the new terminus and connecting line are built and the present railroad between Seward and Mile 66 is dismantled and abandoned. In such a contingency, that plight will be a tragic one, and it is hoped that some suitable relief measures may be suggested by the proper agency or department of the Government.

Seward, the present seaboard terminus of the railroad, and Anchorage, the site of a large Army air base and military post now under construction, are 114 miles apart by the line of the railroad, and Anchorage is almost due north of Seward. Seward is also the terminus of a highway which extends northerly and northwesterly from Seward a distance of about 75 miles, and which has several short branches, built largely to serve in the development of mineral deposits in that region. This highway at one point, called Sunrise, situated on the south shore of Turnagain Arm, is only 36 miles from Anchorage.

The suggestion has been made that in the event of the abandonment of the Seward end of the railroad after the new line of the railroad is completed and in use it would be highly advisable to extend the highway from Sunrise to Anchorage, thus giving highway connection between Seward and Anchorage, and in part compensating for the loss of connection by the railroad. It is represented that such a road will be necessary for economic reasons to give an outlet for the large agricultural area lying on the west side of Kenai Peninsula, west and southwest of Seward. It has been further urged that the construction of such a highway would have definite national-defense value, because in the event of interruption of traffic over the railroad, military and other supplies and equipment could then be moved by highway from Seward to Anchorage.

Two Army air bases, three Navy air bases, two submarine bases, and a number of airfields for military use are now under construction in Alaska, and a Coast Guard station has been authorized. An examination of the several appropriation bills enacted during the last 3 years shows that the total of funds heretofore appropriated or allocated for national-defense projects and installations in Alaska exceeds $95,000,000. A part of the work contemplated and appropriated for has been completed, but much more remains to be done. Some thousands of troops of various types, principally intended for the defense of the air bases and other works constructed and to be constructed, are now in Alaska, and thousands of additional

troops undoubtedly will be sent to Alaska within the next several months.

The Territory of Alaska was denied $50,000 in the estimates for new road construction for the simple reason that the committee was not given definite information as to where it was proposed to construct this road.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Virgin Islands got one increase. The Governor there is faced with tremendous problems, one of which is law enforcement. We have allowed him one administrative assistant, and we felt this would assist him materially in his work in the Virgin Islands.

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

The last item in the bill is what is known as the Antarctic Expedition. Admiral Byrd appeared before our committee, and as I am sure all of you who know him personally will agree, the Admiral is a very affable and genial gentleman with a splendid record as an officer and a gentleman. I am sure he has the respect of all the members of the committee. Members of the commitee, however, do not now, nor have they ever, looked with favor on the so-called Antarctic Expedition. We spent a total of nearly $1,000,000 on this expedition to the South Pole. Our Interior Department subcommittee did not put in the bill last year a dollar to continue the Antarctic Expedition and made very, very plain that we expected those two ships and the people on that expedition to be brought home, but they are still in the process of bringing them home. We thought we had allowed enough in the deficiency bill to bring them home, but it appears that the $19,610 is needed to wind up that job, and the committee wrote in its report that this is for the purpose of demobilizing and liquidating the Antarctic Expedition.

In closing let me say that certain items in the bill will, of course, be criticized, and that is perfectly all right; but we feel that the committee has done a reasonably good job.

The genial and affable ranking minority Member from Pennsylvania will offer his criticisms. I hope you will listen to them. But I sincerely hope that he will be definite in his criticisms and point out item by item where any saving could have been made and not talk in glittering generalities.

Let me remind you again that we brought this bill in $6,325,000 below the Budget estimates. Let me remind you, also, that the increases in the bill above last year's appropriation are primarily for or in connection with the national-defense program; and as I stated at the outset while we were having these hearings there came across our desk $33,000,000 of additional supplemental appropriations mostly for defense items and the committee could not do more, we felt, in justice to national defense, than to allow a majority of these Budget requests. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed my association during the hearings with the members of the subcommittee, because I like them personally. In fact, I like all Members of the House of Representatives. But I do not like all of the things that the Members of the House of Representatives do as a body, nor do I like all the things that the administration is now doing, or the things that they have done in the main. We are here to try to do the best we can in our own individual way and, if we can as individuals see things properly and clearly, it seems to me that we will probably do some things very much differently from the way we now do them in a collective way.

I am going to quote, first, from the statement made by Secretary Ickes, who has charge of the Department of the Interior as its Secretary. He was the last witness who appeared before our committee during the hearings. Secretary Ickes stated:

> The total amount of our estimates for the Interior bill for 1942, including amendments to the regular Budget estimates which just recently have been submitted by the President, is $179,687,238. This is an increase of $35,140,025 over the amount of the appropriations available for the current year. Of the total requested, $119,486,950 are for construction items carried in the general public works chapter of the 1942 Budget, an increase of $35,066,900 over the 1941 appropriations for similar items. For general operating functions, exclusive of construction, these estimates total $60,288,000, or $73,125 more than the corresponding appropriations for 1941.

Since the above statement was made by the Secretary we have added for the Bituminous Coal Commission $3,029,000.

The reason I read the statement of the Secretary is this: We have written up the bill since that statement was made and, if you will turn to the report, you will find that our report shows that we are $21,469,245.61 above the Budget of last year. We did not cut it sufficiently. You have all noticed in the newspapers of last week that the President of the United States stated we must cut $1,000,000,000 off the regular appropriations for the Government. When Secretary Morgenthau testified before the Ways and Means Committee the other day in connection with increased taxes he said it is going to be necessary to cut $1,000,000,000 off the regular appropriation bills. Jesse Jones stated before the Chamber of Commerce recently that it will be necessary to cut down a billion dollars from the regular appropriations. But here comes the Secretary of the Interior and he states that he is going to have $35,000,000 more this year than he had last year. Does the President of the United States and Secretary Morgenthau get any cooperation from the Department of the Interior? I would like to know that.

I have been reciting for 8 long years and giving you daily a résumé of what the Treasury Department is doing. Never in the history of this Nation have we been such squanderers of public funds as this administration. Never in the history of this Nation have we had men in public office who were more desirous of trying to get money out of the air or money out of the future generations than the present administration. The thing that amazes me is how this administration and the Members of Congress think the future generations are going to stand up under the heritage that this administration is going to leave them. How in the world will they be able to conduct the affairs of government if they have to pay for the ruthless expenditures that this administration is heaping upon them?

We take the attitude today that everything is for defense and that we should cut down regular appropriations. But you are not going to cut down regular appropriations, because this administration and this House of Representatives and the Senate are not going to do it. They just cannot do it; they just do not know how to do it; they just will not do it. That is my expectation of what this Congress will do. The President will not do it, and he does not insist that the Congress do it; he has the power, but he will not do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. For a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said they cannot do it, then he finished up by saying they will not do it. Does not the gentleman mean they will not do it?

Mr. RICH. This administration cannot do it because they do not have business ability enough to do it. That is what I mean.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does not take very much ability to quit spending money.

Mr. RICH. It does here. They have educated everybody in the United States to come to the Government and ask for anything that they may need, and the people expect this Government to give it to them without their doing anything to get it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is what I mean: If they cannot do it, of course we cannot criticize them for not doing it.

Mr. RICH. Well, we never should have had this administration in the first place, because it is not capable. That is the point I make. It never should have come into existence. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means they are so loose with public funds they cannot help it?

Mr. RICH. They were born that way. That is the reason the Chief Executive's father left everything in trust.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Is it not on account of lack of courage?

Mr. RICH. It is lack of courage, lack of ability. I would say it is about 50–50.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman would admit, however, that it is the consensus opinion or majority opinion of the voting public of the United States of America that they should be there? The gentleman will concede that?

Mr. RICH. May I say that your administration has brought the American people to the point where they believe it just comes out of a great treasury, and all they have to do is ask and it will be given to them without working to get it. That is the greatest damage this administration has done to the American

people. It causes us to be weak-kneed men and women. They have caused us to lose faith in our own ability to do things, and with the way you people have been dishing it out, the people think there is no end to it. The people are going to get a great reaction when they find out this country is bankrupt. Everybody will receive the greatest shock that this Nation has ever known. And the way we are going it will not be long until we are bankrupt. Jesse Jones yesterday said we would soon have a $90,000,000,000 debt. That is terrible, I must say.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Were the majority of the American people of that opinion in 1933?

Mr. RICH. No. I say you have had the people of this country camouflaged. You are camouflaging them right now in the same way as, I say, the President of the United States is when he says he is going to cut down the regular appropriations by a billion dollars. You will not do it. You will find out I am right and the President is wrong. Before this session ends you will find that the President of the United States and this Congress will have appropriated for the regular functions of the Government just as much as was appropriated last year.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does the gentleman mean that Mr. Hoover camouflaged the people in 1933?

Mr. RICH. No; Mr. Hoover is an honest man; he always told the truth. You know it, and all the people know it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. This is a time when I have the bull by the horns. I shall yield myself as much time as I choose, and I am not going to yield for a minute.

Secretary Ickes bragged about the fact that since he has been Secretary of the Interior he has increased the number of employees in that Department in the District by 28 percent, but he has increased the number of employees in the Interior Department in the field by 226 percent.

You recall that when the President of the United States took office he said, "I will consolidate bureaus, eliminate departments, and cut down the operating expenses of the Government by 25 percent," yet the Secretary of the Interior seems to get a great deal of satisfaction out of the great increase in his Department.

The Secretary of the Interior has said:

> Through the press, the radio, and through our educational media we have spread the conception of public responsibility for our great natural heritage.

In that respect, there is nobody who is trying to spend more money for propaganda for his own Department than Secretary Ickes. The money that is being spent for his radio programs and for the propaganda that is going on in that Department could be eliminated, we could cut it all out, and the country would be better off if we did.

The amount we are spending in this appropriation is $177,019,078. When the Senate gets through with it it will be much larger. We take in in receipts about $37,000,000 from all phases of this Department. I asked the Secretary the very question I ask you, "Where are you going to get the money to carry on for that Department?" I asked him if it was not possible for him to secure larger revenues from the people who benefit by what they receive from the Department. He said that he supposed he could; but that because the Department of Agriculture gave away so much, or permitted too many gratuities to be given to the people, he did not believe his Department should charge the people for services rendered unless the Department of Agriculture did the same thing. I asked him, "Where are you going to get the money to operate the Department?" He said, "That is up to Congress."

"That is up to Congress." That is the statement that is made by every head of a department that comes before our committee. They realize they could put a better business administration in their departments, but they are not going to do it, because they are jealous of some other departments. When it comes to getting money, they think they will come to the Congress and get it. I say they are justified in that belief because the Congress generally gives them about what they ask for. I condemn such action by this Congress. It is a terrible situation so far as a business administration in the various departments of the Government is concerned. I bring this point out for the reason that I know it is necessary that the Congress take steps to correct this evil.

When the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior appeared before the committee he made the statement that they were going to do away, he thought, with the fees they are now charging. When the Secretary appeared before the committee, after I had criticized him so vehemently, saying it was wrong to do away with the fees, the Secretary said he had no idea of releasing the fees now charged and would try to collect the $37,000,000 again this year. I congratulate him because he differs with the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Burlew, in that respect. However, I am very friendly with Mr. Burlew but I do not share his views in this respect.

May I say that I do not have the heart to fight this Interior Department appropriation bill this year as I did last year, and I will tell you why. Three or four weeks ago we gave $7,000,000,000 to the President of the United States to give away in arms and ammunition to kill people, and then appropriated $4,000,000,000 ourselves, making a total of $11,000,000,0000 in 2 days, after very few hours of debate. That would be enough to run the Interior Department for over 60 years at the rate it is now going. I am more for spending money to help the American people than I am for going to Europe to try to destroy life and get ourselves into such a hole, possibly, that we will wreck this Nation of ours if we go to war over there. I am opposed to it. That is the reason I cannot go after this bill with hammer and tongs and cause you to stay here for a week, fighting this bill.

However, I say this from the standpoint of a businessman and a Member of Congress, I honestly believe I could take this appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and place such charges upon the services the people of this country receive from the Department that I could cut the amount of this appropriation by $30,000,000 to $40,000,000, and make the Interior Department self-sustaining. I honestly believe that could be done. Certainly it ought to be worth a trial.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. May I commend the gentleman for his fine statement? The gentleman will be amazed to hear that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors this morning authorized appropriations of $484,000,000, $384,000,000 in excess of what was suggested even by the administration people. There were included such projects as the Florida ship canal. The only thing that was not included was Passamaquoddy, and I cannot for the life of me understand why they did not include that.

Mr. RICH. Did you say I would be surprised? I am not surprised at anything this administration does. I am not surprised, because with them, the sky is the limit, and bankruptcy will be the eventual result. So you are not surprising me, and I can say this in all good faith, because I do not expect anything else from them.

When they passed that Florida ship-canal project they ought to have been ashamed of themselves, and they ought to be ashamed of themselves to think of going ahead and proposing the St. Lawrence waterway at a time like this.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. And they voted the Florida ship canal item in the face of a statement by Judge MANSFIELD, the chairman of the committee, that no owners of boats had requested it and that, in fact, there were only two boats that could possibly use the Florida ship canal at this time.

Mr. RICH. It is a terrible travesty on justice to the American people to think of the many things that Congress does that are not sensible or sound and will eventually lead only to the downfall of the American Republic unless the American people wake up, and the only way you are going to wake them up is when you bring in a tax bill here for $3,500,000,000. It ought to be $6,000,000,000, and that tax bill should have been enacted 8 years ago, because this administration has received the greatest revenues that any administration ever received, but their expenditures exceed their revenues by such fabulous sums that it is simply terrible to think about it. The great indebtedness that this administration will leave the country is a deplorable thing—a travesty to the oncoming generations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes more.

Let me now call your attention to the fact that we have in this country about 360,000 Indians. The object in the creation of the Indian Bureau was to try to get the Indians to become self-sustaining, and by appropriating funds for a few years for use along educational lines to make them competent to handle their own affairs so that they would not be a charge on the American public. But, instead of this, each year we increase the amount of money for the Indian Bureau, and we are making such increases in appropriations that, instead of the Indians becoming self-sustaining, they are coming each year to rely more and more on the Federal Government to give them aid and assistance.

I believe that the cost of the Indians now is running anywhere from $295 to $315 a head. This is what it is costing the Federal Government for their upkeep and maintenance.

One thing we have been doing under the administration of the Indian Bureau is to build such fine buildings as schools for these Indians that when they come out of these schools they naturally expect that they will have surroundings similar to what they had when under the supervision of the Government. We are teaching them to expect too much, and they are not going to take it so well when they have to go back to their reservations because they are disappointed and discouraged. So today we are causing them to feel that they ought to be maintained by the Government. I think the Indian Bureau should be operated in a very different way from what it has been in the past.

I shall now take up the question of the Virgin Islands. We have the Virgin Islands rum plant and a sugar industry which the Government has been operating. As you know, this plant has been operated with a $30 capitalization after the Government spent $3,500,000 trying to build it up. This year they lost over $38,000 on a $30 capitalization. I have always objected to this rum plant that you are all stockholders in because I do not believe in the American public being in the rum business, and I do not believe in the Government being in business of any kind. The Secretary sent the members of the subcommittee some of the Government rum again this year, and the clerk of the committee called me up and said, "Since you do not use it, I do not suppose you will want your rum," and I said, "Yes; send me that rum over to my office, because I do not want the other members of the committee to get it, and I do not want anybody else to get it because I am afraid it might injure them." So I have the rum now in my office, and I shall probably retain it for future use. [Laughter.]

Then I asked the Secretary about the rum plant they have down in Puerto Rico. He said that the Government does not own a rum plant in Puerto Rico, that the Government is not in business in Puerto Rico, that it is a private enterprise. I want to show how we are camouflaging the American people as to what we are doing in Puerto Rico. There is a corporation there with a capital stock of 374 shares at $5 a share, making $1,870. That is a sugar plant, and they also have a butyl alcohol plant. The Government loaned this corporation, having $1,870 of capital stock, the sum of $933,002. Does anybody think that anyone but the Government would loan a private corporation of $1,870 capital stock a million dollars? No banker or private corporation would do that; and yet the Government did.

There is another corporation there with 386 shares of stock at $5 a share, amounting to a capital-stock issue of $1,930. That is a private corporation, but look at what the Government has done. They have loaned that corporation $2,499,931.27. Would any banker do that? Would anybody but the Government loan that money to that corporation? They did not send me a list of the stockholders, but I have a statement back there on the table, and they say that it is a private corporation. That is just camouflaging the American people, because the Government owns these corporations, and in one corporation they have this butyl alcohol plant, another rum plant in Puerto Rico which you people in the galleries and all the people of America are stockholders in.

We also have a fruit growers' cooperative association there. The Government has loaned that corporation $116,403. They had a deficit this year of $28,000, and finally they gave it up and said to the Government, "You take the whole thing." So after they had operated and went into bankruptcy and accumulated a lot of debts they turned it over to the Government and the Government took it. They also have other plants on these islands. The point I make is that we are putting the Government in business and the Government loses and the taxpayers lose.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman tell me whom he means by the Government? Who lends this money—Jesse Jones or the R. F. C.?

Mr. RICH. It is the Department of the Interior. They have the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Finance Association, and they have made these loans to these corporations that they claim are private corporations, and Mr. Ickes is the guiding star.

Mr. KEAN. And we appropriate the money for that?

Mr. RICH. Certainly, somebody did, or they would not have the money. They get it from this administration.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact that back in the Republican administration Charlie Dawes, the Republican Vice President, was loaned some $90,000,000? I wonder whether that was wrong or not?

Mr. RICH. Let me say this: I am not here to protect Republicans or Democrats, or to heap trouble on anybody, but I say when you and you and you do not do the thing that is best for America, and do the things that they have been doing in the last few years, which are going to run this country into bankruptcy and ruin financially, then you are responsible for making such loans, for doing business that should not be done.

Now we have the reclamation projects. Much of the money that has been loaned for reclamation goes out to separate individual projects, and they are supposed to pay that back into the revolving fund, and when they get it into the revolving fund they loan it out again. It should revert to the Treasury of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I will take 5 minutes more. I could go on here for quite a long time on this bill and show you hundreds of places where we could cut down these appropriations, and it ought to be done if we are going to carry out the statement that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury and Mr. Jesse Jones said, but it will not be done, because I tried to cut off an appropriation for the Bituminous Coal Commission this morning, and they said because the Bituminous Coal Commission was coming out of the operators and the taxpayers they would not cut it down. So I have no faith in having this bill reduced.

Can you blame me for not trying to take a lot more time to show you these things? I do not have any idea you will cut anything from this appropriation. I leave it to you to do your duty. With less than 50 Members on the floor of the House when we make these great appropriations, and with less than 50 Members on the floor during the consideration of most of the appropriations, you do not give the time to those bills that they deserve. You do not give them proper recognition. You are only leading the country to disaster.

I will give you some more information on this bill when we come to read the bill with respect to certain items concerning which I propose to offer amendments to cut down some of the appropriations. I hope that other members of the committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], the gentleman from Nevada, Governor SCRUGHAM, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and myself included, with all the other Members of Congress, will get into their hearts a desire to try to save this Nation from bankruptcy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], a member of the committee.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible in 10 minutes or in 10 hours to attempt either a defense of a measure of this kind or a justification of it. This committee began hearings on the 20th of March. We continued through until about the 25th of April before we wrote up the bill. There are nine members on this committee. As has been indicated, the sessions were from morning until evening. Yet I must confess there is a tremendous lot in this bill that I know

very little about. It is humanly impossible for the most intelligent and the most industrious Member of this Congress to understand, except in a superficial manner, any of these great appropriation measures. Of course, we can criticize or we can shoot in the dark in the matter of reductions or additions and just trust to luck. In the final analysis, a subcommittee on appropriations which writes a bill and brings it into the House must depend in large measure upon what the Budget has done upon the case as the agent of the executive department of the Government presents it. He is a very partial witness and he tries to put forward his best foot always.

Those are all things we took into consideration. You will note, in spite of the fact that members of this subcommittee in large part come from the western half of the United States, where the items in the bill are matters of great concern, since the money in large measure will be spent there in the first instance, yet, we report here a bill in this year of unprecedented appropriations that is 3.62 percent under the Budget. That is the greatest cut below the Budget estimates of any bill that has come before this House during the Seventy-seventh Congress. [Applause.]

It is not right to say that you should just cut here, there, or the other place, because that would not be consistent with our work as legislators.

I want to pay a well-deserved tribute to the clerk of our committee, William Duvall, who did so much in helping us prepare this bill in an orderly manner and in helping us make the record as it is, a record of 2,000 pages.

I want to likewise pay a well-deserved compliment to James Scanlon, who does the editorial work for every subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. If you will examine these hearings, examine the index, examine the subtitles, the subheads, and arrangement of the material, you will find it is done by men who have a real understanding of the work they do, and to Jim Scanlon must go the greatest credit for the hearings on every bill.

There are 15 major activities in this bill, and they divide themselves into 30 submajor activities, all in the Interior Department. These subactivities, in turn, divide themselves into literally hundreds of items. Of necessity, we could only give a little time to any of them. I am appreciative, as I know every Member on the majority side of the House is, of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] of the attitude that he takes; not that it is one of carelessness, but the position he takes is that he does not have the heart to fight this appropriation this year because, by comparison, it is a very minor appropriation when viewed in the light of some appropriation bills that we have passed and some that we will pass. I do not say that I subscribe to that doctrine, because I feel that every item we have in here is fully justified.

I know it is a sort of a threadbare argument to say national defense is the cause of some increases, but I am going to run the risk of repeating this assertion and then attempt to prove it to you: I feel there are many things in this appropriation bill for the Interior Department that directly and unqualifiedly tie themselves in to our national-defense program. The increase over last year is made necessary not only in its entirety, but in sums even exceeding the increase, by reason of national defense. For instance, the Bonneville project is out in my region. It is not in my district, but it is in the Northwest on the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington, near the mouth of that great river. There we have a great flood control, navigation, and power project. The increases were some ten or eleven million dollars this year, and there was a little question even in the minds of those of us who are its best champions as to whether that could tie itself to national defense. We asked the clerk of our committee to contact the head of the Office of Production Management, Mr. Knudsen.

We asked him to send a representative to our committee to give us impartial information as to whether or not such increases were justified and needed as a part of national defense. The response came in the form of a letter from Mr. J. D. Biggers, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1941.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: The growing need for an abundant and available supply of electric energy for use by defense industries impels me to address you in the interest of the request of the Bonneville Power Administration now pending before your committee for its appropriation for fiscal year 1942. The amount requested aggregates $23,847,600 and is required for facilities for transmitting electric power from the generating plants of the administration to the points where the power is to be used. The plants of defense industries in the Pacific Northwest are increasing constantly, and the demand for more and larger blocks of electric power is likewise growing.

The request of the Bonneville Power Administration of the Interior Department contains particular items which might be construed as of primary civil rather than emergency need, but the great preponderance of the total is needed for transmitting power for defense purposes.

Knowing of your interest and that of your colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in all aspects of the defense of the country, I feel that you will want to give favorable consideration to the request of the Bonneville Administration.

Very truly yours,

J. D. BIGGERS,
Director of Production Division.

I do not know what better proof any Member of this House would want in support of an appropriation if he had heretofore voted for national-defense appropriations, because this statement from the man perhaps best qualified to advise us, clearly is proof of need.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. On the point the gentleman from Washington is discussing, there appears in House Document 133, a communication from the Director of the Budget, Harold D. Smith, relating to the item of $10,900,000 emergency appropriation increasing the appropriation over the preceding year in which he says:

This rapid demand for power in the area to be served by the Bonneville and Grand Coulee power plants makes necessary the installation of additional generating facilities. Provision has been made for the installation of all units at Bonneville and three units at Grand Coulee. To meet the growing demands the Bureau of Reclamation contemplates contracting for three additional units at Grand Coulee in the near future. Funds for these additional units, of 108,000 kilowatt capacity each and estimated to cost about $9,000,000, will not be required before late in the fiscal year 1942 or early in the succeeding year.

The foregoing estimate of appropriation is required to meet contingencies which have arisen since the submission of the Budget for 1941, and its approval is recommended.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman is correct. In addition to what I have just mentioned in support of that appropriation, we have the Bureau of the Budget, we have the Federal Power Commission, and we have this unusual situation out there, we have the Aluminum Co. of America, we have the Reynolds Metal Co. of America, and half a dozen other corporations that are just simply on their knees begging for this electric power.

We all recognize that we have a bottleneck now in our whole airplane production because of a shortage of light metals. Let me make this statement to you in that connection, that this is not money thrown away. The receipts from Bonneville and Coulee power in the first year of partial production, that is, next year, are going to exceed $6,000,000—in just 1 year—with Bonneville about 60 percent in production and Coulee less than 17 percent in production.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am fully appreciative of the gentleman's great interest in Grand Coulee and in Bonneville. I should like to inquire whether or not this increase in this appropriation bill is to be used principally for the building of transmission lines? You are producing the current. You have got to get that current to the consumer. Is not that true?

Mr. LEAVY. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. KEEFE. As soon as you have these transmission lines built you will be able to take a large portion of the potential output of both these generating plants. Is not that true?

Mr. LEAVY. That is the history of the development of both these projects. Three years ago it was asked, What will you do with this output?" It has already resulted in tremendous rate reductions to the average consumer, and there has been a tremendous upsurge in consumption.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope the gentleman will make that point clear, because so many people of the country are of the opinion that the development of Grand Coulee and Bonneville will result in a huge expenditure of money and the installation

of generating plants that will produce a tremendous amount of electrical energy where there is nc market for that energy. The fact is just the reverse, is it not?

Mr. LEAVY. It certainly is, and if I had the time I could readily make it clear to everybody. The average city of 125,000 people in America requires about 50,000 kilowatts of electricity. The Aluminum Co. of America now is buying 165,000 kilowatts, or almost 3½ times the amount of electrical energy required by the average city of 125,000 population. The Reynolds Metal Co. is going to use more electricity thai. a city of 150,000 would use. So much for the industrial use.

Our farmers have not their homes electrified to a very much greater extent than have the people in the Middle West, but when you give them electricity at 5 mills a kilowatt-hour—and that is the rate fixed for Grand Coulee-Bonneville power to the Rural Electrification Administration—instead of 15 mills, or 3 times as much, and you are going to increase consumption tremendously. The truth of the matter is that if the President, as a part of the New Deal, had not had the foresight 7 or 8 years ago to begin these great undertakings, to wit, Grande Coulee and Bonneville, we could not possibly carry on even in the manner in which we are now doing in our present national-defense program.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, supplementing what he has already stated, that about 3 years ago, due to unprecedented low water in the Missouri River, caused by lack of snow in the mountains, that it was necessary to import power as far as eastern Montana from the gentleman's State of Washington in order that the smelter in Great Falls could be operated. As I understand it, we now have almost the same situation in the mountains. We have a dearth of snow, and it will probably be necessary to import power again from the gentleman's State into Idaho, into western Montana, and perhaps into eastern Montana.

While I am on the subject, I want to compliment the gentleman, because I know it is due him. The country as a whole, and particularly the entire western part of the United States, and particularly his own State, is exceedingly fortunate in having the gentleman as a Member of Congress and his serving upon the important committee of which he is such a valued member. He has rendered untold beneficial services to all of the Northwest.

If it were not for his untiring and unselfish work, together with the work of his colleagues serving on the Appropriations Committee—and I refer to such Members as the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]—I do not know what we out in the western part of the country would have done. I may also refer to my friend from the State of Pennsylvania, who has contributed his share also, or as much as he can, when we consider the fact he is always looking for where we are going to get the money. Complimentary reference may be made to all of the other Members.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I call the gentleman's attention also to the fact that while money is loaned on these projects, I think approximately 95 percent has been repaid as the payments fall due. It is about the best security the Government has at this time.

May I also ask the gentleman to explain one item? He heard my statement this morning with reference to taking out of the bill the item of $500,000 that was to be used for the purpose of building transmission lines to convey power from Fort Peck over to various places of use; that is, to lift the water to places of use in western North Dakota and eastern Montana. I would like to have the gentleman explain why that was taken out, if he will.

Mr. LEAVY. May I say, first, I appreciate the gentleman's compliment. If I have ever knowingly, in the 5 years I have been a member of this committee, urged or presented a cause which I did not honestly believe had merit, I cannot recall it. I would not do that. Our good friends in the East and in the South are sometimes unmindful of the fact that Uncle Sam owns a great part of the western half of the United States. He is the landlord there; he is the boss in that region: and it is his property that the Interior bill secures funds, with which we manage the estate of Uncle Sam, directly owned by him.

Now, reclamation has a real value, just as the construction of these giant dams has. The repayments on Federal reclamation projects are 98 percent current. This is surely a wonderful record. It is true the Government gets no interest on the money it puts into the construction of a reclamation project, but it is paid back over 40 years in 40 annual installments. Homes are made for millions of people who otherwise would become drifters and wanderers. The fact that there is a need for this is evidenced by the last census. The population increase in the western half of the United States where reclamation is practiced was 14.7 percent, while the population increase in the United States as a whole was around 7 percent—just about twice as much in the western part of the United States as the figure for the whole Nation. I will not have time to go into the matter fully, but these added people are entitled to a chance to establish themselves and become independent.

Answering the gentleman's question as to why the item of $500,000 was taken out of the bill after the Budget had approved it, I can almost pay the gentleman a compliment by stating his able and his persuasive presentation of this item to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the Bureau of the Budget and everybody in influence resulted in this item winning premature approval. Last fall the item of $500,000 was put in on the theory that the Army engineers would have installed the generator facilities at Fort Peck, but by reason of the tremendous step-up in the national-defense program, those facilities have not been built, so the line will not be necessary within the next year. It is a necessary item, but perhaps premature in having it in there at this time. However, I credit the gentleman's industry and activity in that respect.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that one of the specific reasons, according to the testimony before the committee, was it would not be effective or could not be effective until 1944.

Mr. LEAVY. That is exactly what I attempted to say.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman agrees with the statement I made heretofore as to why the item was taken out?

Mr. LEAVY. I do.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken considerably more time than I should have. I would like to have answered my genial friend from Pennsylvania on the question of the Government in business. In one breath he says the Government should charge fees for services that are strictly governmental, referring to the Park Service, and make a profit out of it. In the next breath he says he would not have the Government in business at all. I challenge the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other Member of this House on either side, and I care not how profound an economist he may be, to pick out of this bill functions in any considerable degree that are not governmental. It is the Government's business to be in charge of the parks, the public lands, the Geological Survey, the Reclamation Service, and all of these other 15 activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington for yielding to me at this point. The flags over every one of our national parks should be flying at half mast today in token of mourning for a man who has done more for the advancement of our National Park Service than any other. It is with deep regret that I inform the House at this time of the untimely death of Mr. Arno B. Cammerer, former Director of our National Park Service, at the age of 57 years. He was born in my State of Nebraska and he was my personal friend.

I notice in the legislation before us that this Committee so recognized the great work of Arno Cammerer that they provided funds to make him an Associate Director of the Park Service. His host of friends will appreciate this recognition by Congress. He was Director of that Service up to a year ago, and because of ill health he was forced to leave that directorship. Since then he has

been acting in an advisory capacity. He ignored his ill health and continued his work for the Government, which he has served for over 30 consecutive years. Arno Cammerer dedicated his life to the land and the people of our country. He had many opportunities for the more glamorous phases of life, but he frequently demonstrated his determination to give his life to provide opportunity for health, recreation, education, and enjoyment of the people of America.

So this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I join with thousands of other friends of Arno Cammerer to pay a tribute to his memory and in this way placing in the permanent RECORD of Congress our appreciation of the great service rendered by this man who gave so many years of his life to the service of his country and to the service of mankind.

Mr. LEAVY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska for paying the well-deserved and beautiful tribute to a great and good man and an exceptional public servant, who has passed, so untimely, to his final reward. I pay tribute to him as being one of the greatest men in that particular field with whom it has ever been my pleasure to come in contact. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] such time as he may desire.

BONNEVILLE POWER IN PEACE AND WAR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to urge the approval of the allocations in this bill for the Bonneville project. They are items to provide necessary transmission facilities in order to make complete use of Bonneville power in the present emergency.

We are finding in the present emergency, as we found in the World War No. 1, one of our most essential needs is electrical energy for power purposes. Fortunately we have several large power-producing projects now operating throughout the United States that we did not have in the last World War. In my district is Bonneville, on the Columbia River, and nearby Grand Coulee, both utilizing the great capacity of this, the second largest river in the United States, for power production. Neither of these plants is yet completed, but Bonneville is nearing completion and Grand Coulee has now gone into production. Later in my remarks I will tabulate the total installed capacity of these plants and the dates the power will be available. One of the strategic uses of this power is for the production of aluminum. Bonneville power is now being used for that purpose. There are many other deposits of critical and strategic minerals in the Northwest area, as well as in Alaska, which may be reduced, processed, and utilized by means of this power. The appropriations before you today are for the purpose of providing transmission facilities to make available the power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee not only for use in the national defense but also to bring the power to the markets of the Northwest for use during normal times.

Oregon and the other States in the Pacific Northwest have a number of charted deposits of strategic and critical materials. I have worked on the idea that the Nation and my region could be materially benefited by coupling together these resources and the great amounts of low-cost hydro power native to that region. It is true that these northwestern deposits are of lower grade than those occurring in the older sections of the country and occur in more complex structures. However, this ceases to be a handicap when modern electrochemical and electrothermal processes are used. To utilize such processes electricity costing, delivered, less than 3 mills per kilowatt-hour must be available. The Columbia River is one of the few spots in the country where such energy can be had; it is practically the only place where it can be secured in large quantities.

On May 8, 1940, I addressed the House on this critical defense subject and presented some compilations and conclusions. This subject matter was presented 8 days before the President first addressed Congress on the European situation. This survey pointed out some very definite conclusions that need to be considered. A reading of that presentation will show the metal situation we face today was obvious from the factual analysis of the metal and defense statistics.

Let us take aluminum for example. This is the base material for any air program. No nation can produce airships in quantity and quality without adequate supplies of aluminum or substitute light metals. Aluminum is an electrolytic metal. Last year our production of this metal represented about 425,000 kilowatts of equivalent electric capacity. The best information available indicates that the Axis Powers have in their territories over 2.5 times this equivalent electric capacity as a base for their air program. Gentlemen, every available Columbia River hydro power kilowatt must quickly be put to work before we can begin to approach their realized light-metal standard. Remember also that the unsatisfactory solution of this situation resulted in inadequate air forces for France, and thus contributed to that nation's downfall. I could spend a great deal of time on this subject and also point out the necessity for developing our western lucites, alunites, and other clays to replace our imported bauxites, but will pass along to cover briefly the nickel situation. A new field lies ahead in the reduction of ordinary clays to secure aluminum. Again, this will call for electric processes.

I also covered this nickel situation in the speech of May 8, 1940. Nickel is needed for armor plate. Over 90 percent of this material, vitally needed for our naval program, comes from one foreign source. Think what this means, when we have natural armor plate material untouched in Alaska. These Alaskan deposits are located adjacent to tidewater. All that is needed to secure an independent source for such a vital material is to barge this natural material down and dump it into possible Bonneville or Coulee electric furnaces.

Mr. Chairman, this presents briefly one of the major reasons I am urging particular attention to the Bonneville items. A careful reading of history will show that major nations have only maintained their position by maintaining their metal independence.

In addition, we must consider at this time possible post-war conditions. If we are to hold our own nationally, we must be able to meet the coming post-war commercial invasion. All these modern processes of peace and war depend on abundant low-cost electric energy. The Detroit automotive industry would not have been possible without the electric metals produced from low-cost Niagara power. I cite this as an example of the results accomplished by coupling low-cost energy to latent raw materials.

ADDED CAPACITY

Previously Bonneville's opponents have urged that no market existed for Bonneville power. Actual contract results within the past year has now evaporated such an argument. We today see load demands in excess of installed plant and transmission capacity.

For the past few years we have pointed out the Bonneville results that could be accomplished from demonstrated natural load-growth surveys. I early urged the completion of Bonneville and presented factual estimates to demonstrate the soundness of such a suggestion. Time has demonstrated the correctness of these estimates and the vision of your committee in making allowances for transmission construction as soon as the authorizing act had been passed. To market power we must be able to deliver. Electricity cannot be stored, packaged, or transported like other commodities. The record plainly shows that the Administrator is now finding it difficult to supply sufficient power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee to meet the defense loads and local requirements. It is always well to remember that no worth-while private capacity has been installed in this region since 1929. A substantial part of the demands on Bonneville arises from inadequate private regional installed capacity.

LOAD CONDITIONS

On page 2675 of the RECORD of March 27 last, I pointed out facts on the increased load conditions in the Bonneville area. I would like to briefly summarize this information for the benefit of this committee.

An analysis of official Bonneville records brings out that the Administrator has executed prime-power contracts up to the middle of March totaling 278,452 kilowatts. Of this contracted amount, 6 industrial consumers are taking or will take 226,500 kilowatts. Twenty-three contracts have been executed with public agencies, totaling 20,452 kilowatts. In addition 2 contracts have been executed with private power companies, totaling 31,500 kilowatts.

The RECORD shows also that 13 different defense mineral industries are negotiating with the Bonneville Administrator for an additional load which will range from 150,000 kilowatts initially to about 285,000 kilowatts ultimately.

In addition to these defense loads the Bonneville circuits will need to supply an additional 75,000 kilowatts of capacity this fall to meet the deficiency of public and private systems during the 1941 peak

season. The normal load increase in the area will approach 75,000 kilowatts per year. This means that 5 years hence the normal regional load growth will be about 375,000 kilowatts, or 83 percent of the total installed dependable capacity of Bonneville.

It has been testified by experts from the War Department and the Reclamation Service that approximately 3 years must elapse between time of authorization and the time of completion of generation capacity. The modern high-voltage transmission line takes approximately one-half of this time to complete; therefore the scheduled completion dates of generators and transmission lines must be in step and should be in advance of the load. This capacity schedule is one that needs to be considered at all times.

The recent testimony before the Senate Deficiency Committee brings out that since February 1, 1941, the Office of Production Management has requested Bonneville to make available 80,000 kilowatts of additional capacity for the production of aluminum. This request is in addition to the 165,000 kilowatts of power now under contract to the Aluminum Co. of America. This Bonneville capacity of 245,000 kilowatts will produce some 245,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. This represents about 59 percent of the total aluminum produced in the United States during 1940 and some 30 percent of the total light metals needed for our defense program. From a statistical analysis it is obvious that more Bonneville-Coulee power must be used to the limit if we are to meet the set defense objectives. Delivery of this additional power is scheduled to begin in June 1941, and I trust that your committee will make immediately available the funds needed to complete these defense connections.

The same testimony brings out that the Columbia Steel Castings Co. is negotiating a contract for 7,500 kilowatts. Their product will consist of steel castings used for the construction of ships. The Pacific Carbide Co. now has a contract for 2,000 kilowatts used in the manufacture of the essential defense material—calcium carbide. This company is now negotiating for an additional 2,000 kilowatts for early delivery.

The Bremerton Navy Yard has also requested 20,000 kilowatts for early delivery. At the time of the Senate testimony the indicated delivery date for such navy-yard power was June 1942. I understand that the Navy now desires to push ahead this delivery date by 6 months.

A steel company has indicated that it would be prepared to initiate operation by August 1941 providing 15,000 kilowatts would be available.

The Electro-Metallurgical Co. is negotiating for 7,500 to 37,500 kilowatts for 1941 delivery.

The Tongue Point Naval Station at Astoria and the War Department airport at Pendleton will require approximately 2,000 kilowatts by June of this year.

Shipbuilding and other marine construction will require close to 10,000 kilowatts.

Municipalities and R. E. A.'s will require an estimated 10,000 additional kilowatts; and, as I have pointed out, the private utilities will need 75,000 kilowatts to meet their power-load conditions in the fall of 1941.

To meet these demands the following generating capacity will be available:

	Bonneville	Grand Coulee	Total installed capacity
			Kilowatts
January 1941	1-4		194,400
August 1941	5		248,400
Do		1	356,400
December 1941	6		410,400
Do		2	518,400
April 1942		3	626,400

We are also confronted with the need of providing service to, first, the Army airport at Pendleton by May 1, 1941; second, the naval air base at Tongue Point; third, several Rural Electrification Administration projects; fourth, Bremerton Navy Yard; fifth, public-utility districts in urged need of additional power; and, sixth, a number of industrial prospects which will require power before the end of the calendar year 1941. Every effort is being made to meet these emergency situations through the reallocation of funds by loans from projects now under construction, most of which must be replaced before the end of the fiscal year.

The critical situation faced by the Administration to meet its contract commitments, brought about principally by national-defense requirements, will probably necessitate pooling of power resources of the region and obtaining available power from the existing public utilities.

The Bonneville-Coulee power administrator reports installation of generators at both Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have been advanced to meet the needs of the national-defense program. The fifth generator at Bonneville Dam has been advanced by the Army engineers from January 1, 1942, to August 1941. Reclamation engineers at Grand Coulee Dam are also speeding up installation of the first major generating unit from October 1, 1941, to August 1, 1941.

By July 1, 1942, three of the world's largest hydroelectric generators will be installed at Grand Coulee Dam and will be interconnected with Bonneville Dam and other public and private power systems throughout the Northwest. A total of 650,000 kilowatts of Columbia River power will be available by that time.

This large block of energy will be ready in time to take care of national-defense contracts, Administrator Raver said. He also pointed out that the rights of public agencies to Columbia River power are fully protected under the terms of the contracts, and that ample power will be available for the electrical needs of the region, which are growing at an unprecedented rate.

Imperative need for the increased output of aluminum alloys for defense requirements recently was emphasized by the Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management with the announcement that the curtailment might be necessary in the use of the metal for domestic and household purposes. The official statement of the defense organization declared:

> Industrial users of aluminum in the nondefense field are being urged to give immediate attention to the use of substitutes, including plastics, because of the impact of a defense program which may make it impossible for them to furnish the general public with the usual supply of aluminum implements.

Production of aluminum on a large scale in the Pacific Northwest had its inception in December 1939 when the Aluminum Co. entered into a 20-year contract with the Bonneville Power Administration for delivery of 32,500 kilowatts of power. It established its first aluminum-reduction plant west of the Mississippi River at Vancouver, Wash., and began production of aluminum on September 1 of last year. Since that time production has been maintained at the rate of 60,000,000 pounds a year, Administrator Raver reports.

RATE SAVINGS

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned the defense-metal situation because of the immediate necessities of this problem, but no statement could be complete without reference to the requirements of the Bonneville Act covering public benefits from this project. The sales program of the administrator has carried out the mandate. The direct and indirect results of this policy are reflected in the customer rate savings accruing in Oregon and Washington, totaling over $8,000,000 from 1935 to date. Eighty-three percent of this saving comes from rate reductions of the private power companies and 17 percent from reductions by public plants. In 1940 these combined savings totaled $3,591,000, and in each succeeding year this increased amount will be cumulative. This is another example of how the wise development of this vast power resource is erecting a sounder economic future for the region.

ESTIMATES

Mr. Chairman, we have here two budget estimates for Bonneville. The first was the one sent up with the regular January budget. This regular estimate totals $12,958,000. The second or supplemental estimate totals $10,900,000, and out of this amount $1,000,000 has been appropriated in the first deficiency bill, H. R. 3836, thus leaving a balance of $9,900,000 for consideration.

I find in analyzing the items going to make up these two estimates that 64 percent of the regular estimate directly benefits Oregon and the Portland-Vancouver or lower Columbia area.

About 60 percent of the supplemental estimate directly or indirectly benefits this same area. I call your particular attention to the transmission lines actually contemplated for erection in Oregon. The justification shows these items.

The following break-down shows the items making up the regular supply bill and the supplemental estimate for the

Bonneville Power Administration, together with the estimated amount directly or indirectly affecting Oregon and explanatory notes concerning each item:

Regular supply bill

Item	Total net amount	Estimated amount directly and indirectly affecting Oregon
Grand Coulee, Covington line	$1,730,000	[1] $432,000
Bonneville, Vancouver No. 3 line	1,219,000	[2] 1,219,000
Substations, 230,000 kilovolts	4,022,900	[3] 3,956,000
115,000-volt lines	253,000	[4] 253,000
Substation additions, 115,000 volts	848,000	[5] 848,000
Feeder lines	1,500,000	[6] 750,000
Advanced surveys	200,000	[7] 100,000
Construction, tools, equipment	300,000	[7] 150,000
Operation, maintenance, marketing	885,600	[7] 750,000
Coulee lines	2,000,000	
Total	12,958,500	8,458,000

[1] Current to firm up Bonneville plant capacity will go over this line during flood and low flows in Columbia. Approximate indirect benefit to Oregon, 25 percent.
[2] Supplies current to Portland area.
[3] Includes North Bonneville and Vancouver substations supplying the Portland area. Indirect benefits to Oregon are 25 percent of the Covington substation, 50 percent of Midway substation. All of south Bonneville substation will supply Oregon.
[4] Oregon City transmission lines.
[5] Oregon City and St. Johns, Oreg.
[6] Funds out of this item will be used to build a transmission line to La Grande, Oreg., where a public utility district has been recently voted. Negotiations are now in progress between the Union County district and the private power company, and the indications are that in the near future this district will acquire this property on a fair basis. This construction is necessary to serve the growing needs of this eastern Oregon section.
[7] Estimated direct benefits to Oregon.

Of the $12,958,000 included in the supply bill, $8,458,000, or 64.3 percent of the total, directly or indirectly benefits Oregon. The location of all of the included items may not be in Oregon, but Oregon secures the benefit. For example, Bonneville-Vancouver line No. 3 is located on the Washington side of the river because of physical and topographical conditions, but the line carries current which will serve industries in the Portland-Vancouver area and thereby directly affects Portland.

Supplemental estimate

Item	Total net amount	Estimated amount directly or indirectly affecting Oregon
Bonneville-Coulee line No. 2	$3,785,000	[1] $1,895,000
Transmission system, 115,000 volts—Bonneville-Vancouver lines Nos. 5 and 6	1,615,000	[2] 1,615,000
Feeder lines	4,000,000	[3] 2,261,000
Advanced surveys	300,000	[4] 150,000
Construction tools and inventories	700,000	[4] 300,000

[1] Bonneville-Coulee Line No. 2 will bring 1 unit of Coulee power into the Portland-Vancouver area to meet a growing demand. Approximately one-half of this expenditure will benefit the Portland-Vancouver area.
[2] This line, although located on the Washington side of the river, serves the Portland-Vancouver area.
[3] There is approximately $81,000 in this item to serve farmers in Lane County, Oreg., and to provide investigations and surveys to reach farmers in the Eugene-Drain, The Dalles, Hood River, Woodburn, and Union County, Oreg., areas. $580,000 is included to cover a 57,000 volt feeder from the St. Johns, Oreg., substation to serve prospective defense industries intending to locate in the Portland area. $1,500,000 in this item is to cover substations and service lines to take on prospective defense industries requiring over 200,000 kilowatts, now under negotiation involving the production of ferro-alloys, iron, steel, calcium carbide, electrodes, chrome steel, mercury, magnesium, and zinc.
[4] Estimated amount to be spent directly benefiting Oregon.

Supplemental estimate—Continued

Item	Total net amount	Estimated amount directly or indirectly affecting Oregon
Permanent buildings	$250,000	[4] $125,000
Operation and maintenance	250,000	[5] 250,000
Total supplemental estimate	10,900,000	6,596,000
Less amount appropriated, H. R. 3836, by Senate	1,000,000	
Balance	9,900,000	6,596,000

[4] Estimated amount to be spent directly benefiting Oregon.
[5] To provide for power purchase to tide over a critical period in late 1941, before the remaining ready Bonneville units can be brought into production. Most of this purchased power will come from the Seattle Storage Hydros.

NOTE.—60½ percent of this supplemental estimate directly or indirectly benefits Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the Congress has in the past exercised exceptional vision in providing funds to create outlets for Bonneville energy. Without this vision our national air program would have been retarded at least 18 months or 2 years. Bonneville area is not the only beneficiary. Increased defense pay rolls in California, Oregon, and Washington reflect the increased light-metal production in this area. Bonneville capacity would not have been available for ingot aluminum production without transmission and marketing facilities. Your vision, together with that of a few of us who have urged these appropriations, has increased the Nation's airplane production by at least 30 percent. This vision needs to be fully known and I want to thank you for the careful consideration you have given to such pleas in the past.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is an able and brilliant Member of this House. He is patriotic. He is strongly for national defense.

For the information of the House, may I say that several months ago an outstanding advocate of national defense, a learned man in this line, appeared before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and outlined in detail what, in his opinion, should be the national-defense set-up for the Caribbean Sea, the Panama Canal, and Florida. It is quite significant that air bases and other national-defense establishments have now been placed throughout the Caribbean area on American soil and on soil acquired by our country under lease. There is only one remaining link in that national-defense plan as outlined to make it full and effective. That link is the Florida Canal. This is not my own statement; it is the statement of those who are learned in national defense. Therefore, I would appreciate it if careful study should be given this angle when this subject comes before the House.

Of course, the transportation benefits of the Canal have been found to be adequate to justify it thoroughly from every point of view. There will be a saving of more than $10,000,000 a year in transportation costs. This project is recommended by the Army engineers, it has been approved by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I trust that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and all other Members of the House who are interested in full and complete national defense of the Caribbean area and the Panama Canal, together with the facilitation of economic transportation, will lend this measure full and complete support when the opportunity presents itself.

It is time to develop our internal projects and affairs, as well as to vote billions for foreign aid. [Applause.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am aware, the estimates sent up by the Bureau of the Budget for Alaska have not been reduced in the bill reported here today, except in two instances. One of them is a relatively minor one, which I did not even know was in the Budget estimate. That was an estimate of $1,250 for an automobile for the Governor of Alaska. The other item disallowed is of substantial importance to the people of the Territory, because it is the item of $50,000 for new road construction in the Territory of Alaska, and the only item of that nature carried in the bill. The road appropriation carried in the bill, Mr. Chairman, is for $634,500 for the maintenance only of highways in Alaska. There is not a dollar for new construction.

Prior to the time that the public-works funds were appropriated, the Congress from year to year did make some years larger, and some years smaller, appropriations for the construction of new highways in Alaska, but with the advent of the Public Works Administration, that plan was discontinued, and only the item for maintenance was carried in the bills of this nature, and we were required to get money for new construction from the Public Works Administration.

That was not so easy, but nevertheless substantial sums of funds from this source were expended in Alaska.

Now, it is said in the report on the bill that the $50,000 was denied because of some testimony to the effect that it was not specifically decided where the money ought to be expended. The testimony of Mr. Gordon, representative of the Interior Department, upon the subject appears on page 942 of the hearings, and in that testimony it is shown that originally the money was asked for and was justified before the Budget, for an extension of what is called the Bunker Hill-Kougarok Road in northwestern Alaska. After the justification before the Bureau of the Budget and the estimate of the Budget came to Congress, strong representations were made to the Interior Department that roads were insistently and immediately demanded in connection with the Army and Navy bases now being built in Alaska, outside of the Army and Navy reservations. I happen to know that the commanding general in Alaska insisted that those roads be built. As a consequence, when Mr. Gordon appeared before the committee he was compelled to say that, although this money was origi-

nally designed for the Bunker Hill-Kougarok Road—a road that has been desired and required and asked for for many, many years—it might be necessary to use the money in connection with supplying facilities to the national-defense posts in Alaska.

I submit that there is not any justification, with full knowledge of the subject, for denying this appropriation. In fact, it ought to be 10, 20, or 30 times as great.

The distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], has adverted to the fact that the National Government is a great proprietor, a great landowner of land in the Western States. That is even more the case in Alaska. I had a calculation made several years ago, I think it was in 1938, and by excluding unpatented mining claims, title to which still resided in the Government, it was found that the National Government at that time owned more than 99.8 percent of all of the 589,000 square miles of land and water embraced in the Territory of Alaska. The Government is our great proprietor there. So it is safe to say that even taking into consideration the unpatented mining claims, of which many exist in Alaska, the Government still owns, without any vestige of adverse title or without any vestige of title residing elsewhere, more than 98 percent of all public land in Alaska. That is the reason why the Territory is obliged to apply to Congress for such assistance as may be contained in a bill of this kind, although I believe the largest item by far is for the Indians of Alaska and for the Eskimos, who are classed as Indians. In that respect, Alaska is not in any different category than are any of the States which have Indian population. So the money spent for the support and medical relief and education of Indians in Alaska ought not be specifically charged against the Territory, because the same expenditure would be made if those citizens of the United States should reside in one of the States rather than in Alaska.

I have often said, and I repeat, that if the National Government should see fit to give to the Government of Alaska all the public land, we would not have to come to Congress asking for help, except for such sums as would be spent in all of the States, just as they are spent in Alaska, for the carriage of the mails, and for national defense, and for similar national purposes. Of course, that will never be done. The public lands of Alaska are too valuable to the Nation to ever take a chance of giving that title to the Government of the Territory.

Therefore we are obliged to come here and ask for such things as aid in the construction of roads.

I am the more regretful that this sum of $50,000, which is no vast amount, everyone will admit, has been cut out of this bill, because roads are the principal means of transportation, roads are the things that we need, for our economy in Alaska, above everything else. Give us roads and we can take care of ourselves. Give us a highway to Alaska and give us an internal system of roads in Alaska, and Alaska is on its own. We have enough natural wealth in Alaska, but at the present time it is not available to the people of the United States because there is no means of land communication between the States and Alaska. So I say it is too bad that this amount is cut out, although I suppose $50,000 would not build more than 10 or 15 or 20 miles of road around the Army bases which are now in the Territory. I hope it will be restored in the Senate, and if it is so restored, then I shall come to this House and ask the members of the conference committee to agree to it. It should be agreed to.

It cannot be repeated too often that in Alaska roads are our first economic need. Without roads we can accomplish little. With roads we can achieve the full measure of our possibilities. It is of no avail to have millions of acres of first-class farming land in Alaska—which we have—unless the settlers on such lands can be supplied with roads. I have in mind especially an area nearly 100 miles long and from 10 to 20 miles wide lying on the shores of Cook Inlet, on the west side of Kenai Peninsula, where the soil is fertile, the climate mild, with ample rainfall, suitable in every respect for agriculture, and yet it is of little present use to us because settlers in that area are virtually locked up in a prison because there is no road leading into the region or through it or across it to connect the potential farms with each other, and with the settlements and cities in that part of Alaska in which sale could be found for the produce of the farms.

The Department of Agriculture reports that there are 750,000 acres and upward of excellent agricultural land in the Forty Mile country, but it is safe to say that not 100 acres of it are under cultivation because of lack of roads. At the present time this excellent land might just as well be in Africa or South America, so far as Alaska is concerned. A road to connect the Forty Mile with Fairbanks would make it all available for settlement and cultivation.

It is not alone in the potential farming areas of Alaska that roads are needed, but also to supply the mineral lands of Alaska so that they may be adequately developed and operated, and thus add to the wealth of the Nation. Two men, Alaskans, Carl Whitham and Asa Baldwin, sturdy pioneers, journeyed to Washington last year to appear before the Subcommittee on Appropriations considering the Interior bill to point out the pressing need of converting into a highway the now-abandoned railroad between Chitina and McCarthy, Alaska, and the construction of a bridge to span the Chitina River near McCarthy. The whole job could probably be done for $300,000. Such a road would adequately take the place of the railroad by which the McCarthy mineral-bearing area, including the Nizina gold-producing country, was formerly supplied. There is immediate need for construction of the road and bridge mentioned. This is only one example. Many others could be cited.

May I repeat that roads are the outstanding and prime and immediate economic need for the development of Alaska, a complete road system extending from the now-existing roads in the Dominion of Canada into Alaska, there to connect with such roads as we now have in the Territory, and the extension of the Territorial roads into a completely integrated highway system to furnish access to the principal mineral and agricultural regions of the Territory.

With such a system of roads connecting the United States with Alaska and extending to those parts of Alaska which contain the greatest natural resources of soil and minerals, there would be, I am confident, a constant procession of our sturdy citizens from the States to Alaska similar in type to the great migration which settled the land beyond the Alleghenies, and then the Great Plains, and finally the Pacific coast.

Suggestion has been made by some well-intentioned people, most of them without any comprehensive knowledge of the subject, that Alaska should be settled by admission thereto of nonquota aliens. Under all of the schemes presented, the nonquota aliens would somehow be gotten through the States without their escaping and would be landed on the coast of Alaska. It is vaguely suggested that perhaps, and only perhaps, philanthropists will finance these settlers or that they may be financed in some fashion by the United States Government. The one feature of these plans that is most objectionable to me is that which would require the nonquota aliens to remain in Alaska and to forbid their entering any of the States under criminal penalties unless and until at some equally indefinite and vague date in the future they may become citizens of the United States. The carrying out of such a program would most effectually establish a sort of a glorified concentration camp in Alaska and would erect an almost impassable barrier between Alaska and the 48 States.

Not only is such a plan highly objectionable to all of the people of Alaska, including myself, but it is totally unnecessary for the settlement of Alaska or the development of its latent resources. If a road is built to connect Alaska with the United States, and if in addition a complete system of highways is built in Alaska so that there is highway connection between the United States and those parts of Alaska which are best fitted for agriculture and for mining and for industry, the Territory will be populated just as fast as the people can be absorbed into the Territorial economy. These settlers would not be subject to the disadvantages of being nonquota aliens, confined to Alaska as to a quasi prison camp, but would be of our own citizenry or else aliens lawfully admitted to this country under the immigration laws and free to travel therein wherever they desired.

It is a tragedy that during the last 10 years at least $1,000,000 per year have not been spent for new construction of roads within the Territory, and it is an equally great tragedy that the highway to Alaska is not now completed.

At this point may I make further comment about the proposed international highway to Alaska? Many people do not know that there is a good road already in existence as far north as Hazelton, in

British Columbia, approximately 883 miles north of Seattle, Wash. But beyond Hazelton there is little road in existence except for short stretches near Atlin, in British Columbia, and between Whitehorse and Kluane Lake, in Yukon Territory, Canada. To connect Hazelton with our principal existing road in Alaska, which is called the Richardson Highway, would require the building of between 1,000 and 1,200 miles of new road, dependent upon the route taken. In my judgment, and in the judgment of engineers who have made a study of the project, this new road could be built for $25,000,000 or possibly less, including the construction of the necessary bridges. That amount of money would give us a 24-foot-wide road surfaced with gravel or crushed rock, traversable in all weathers and in all seasons.

Some people, including a few high in official life, are still blindly asserting that such a road could be used only about 5 months of the year, and that it would not be possible to keep it open during the winter season. Nothing could be further from the truth. As a matter of fact, the snowfall of the region in which such a road would lie is comparatively light, the same as is the case with the low interior valleys of Alaska.

It is possible that such a road would not approach Hazelton, but in its northerly course would depart from Prince George, British Columbia, instead; but in any event the point is that at moderate cost it is possible and practicable to construct a highway, open for traffic the year around, which would connect Alaska with the United States.

While the economic advantages to the citizens who reside in the several States and those who reside in Alaska, resulting from the construction of such a highway, would be enormous, the building of the highway is even more insistently demanded by considerations of national defense. Two Army air bases and three Navy air bases are now under construction in Alaska. The Army air bases are located near Fairbanks, Alaska, and near Anchorage, Alaska, respectively, both on The Alaska Railroad. Some thousands of troops will be stationed near these bases for their protection. At the present time the only way of supplying all of the defense establishments in Alaska is by sea. That mode of supply is safe enough as long as we control the surface of the eastern and northeastern parts of the Pacific Ocean. But it should be evident to anyone at this time that the day may come, and perhaps soon, when our fleet will be required to go to the Atlantic and the control of the surface of the Pacific may then conceivably fall into hostile hands. Without a highway to connect the United States with Alaska, under such conditions, the supply of our military establishments and of the civilian population of Alaska would be indeed difficult and hazardous. The construction of the highway to Alaska would be definite insurance against the evils that might otherwise come upon us in such a contingency. To delay or refuse to build the highway is to rely upon good fortune instead of making adequate provision for our defense. France tried that.

Some days ago a bill was passed providing $5,300,000 for change of terminus of The Alaska Railroad from Seward to a point on Passage Canal. Such a change would involve the construction of approximately 14 miles of new railroad to connect with the existing railroad at a point 66 miles north of Seward. The general manager of the Alaska Railroad, testifying in support of this project, said that the present existing railroad between Seward and the junction point with the proposed railroad should be abandoned and the track torn up. This change, if carried into effect in the manner described, will absolutely ruin many of the residents of Seward who settled there and aided in building the city, relying in good faith upon the assurance that Seward was the terminus of the railroad and would continue so to be.

Mr. Chairman, I still believe that a mistake has been made in adopting the project. Nevertheless, it has been adopted. However, a part of the baleful effects of the proposed change of terminus upon the citizens of Seward can be obviated and the national defense can be more surely promoted by rehabilitating the present railroad line between Seward and the proposed junction point and then keeping that line in existence and usable. In this way there will be some traffic out of Seward, and in the event of any obstruction of the line between Passage Canal and the junction point the railroad into Seward will be available for all types of use, including the supply of the Army posts at Anchorage and Fairbanks.

It is to be noted that the committee has recommended an increase of $15,000 above the Budget estimate for the work of the United States Geological Survey in Alaska for the purpose of making further investigations with respect to occurrences of tin in the Territory. This additional appropriation is highly commendable and yet it is my duty to say that the additional $15,000 is only a very small fraction of the amount which should be appropriated for such purpose. Alaska is the one part of the Nation in which there is at least a fair prospect for finding and developing tin ore in sufficient quantities to supply a considerable part of our national needs. The tin ore, which is called cassiterite, is found at intervals in a considerable belt running through Alaska approximately east and west from Bering Strait at the one end to Livengood at the other. The only commercial production of tin in Alaska is at a place called Tin City, on the shores of Bering Sea, near Bearing Strait. At this place placer tin ore has been mined for some years, and the present production is about 50 tons of tin per year. The ore is found in small nodules mixed with the gravels of the river valleys and is separated from the gravels by sluicing, as in ordinary gold placer operations. Some ore has been found in place. Similar occurrences in much smaller quantities of nodules of cassiterite ores have been found in a number of streams between Tin City and a point east of Hot Springs, approaching Livengood, a distance of more than 500 miles. The additional $15,000 recommended by the committee will permit the examination of a very small area by a handful of men only.

Considering the vital need of tin for our national use, the fact that we need about 70,000 tons of new tin each year, and that it is all imported except for the extremely small quantity produced in Alaska, I suggest that instead of appropriating $15,000 for the purpose of exploring the tin deposits of Alaska the amount appropriated should be at least $2,000,000, as proposed in a bill which I introduced on January 3, 1941, House bill 96.

Before concluding my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to invite the attention of the House to the pressing need for aid to the natives of Alaska—Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts—who are afflicted with tuberculosis. Among the natives of Alaska this plague is a frightful one. As the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] has said, the incidence of this dread disease among the natives of Alaska is approximately 13 times as great as among the nonnatives. It is more than 10 times as great as among the people of the United States generally. So far as we can tell, conditions in this respect are not getting any better, but rather are becoming worse, because those who are ill with tuberculosis live with the members of the family not so diseased and so, in the end, it is frequently the case that many members of the family acquire the disease and finally die of it. There is really only one way to terminate this scourge, and that is by segregation of the sick in hospitals. At the present time only 32 beds in the Indian hospitals of Alaska are assigned to tubercular native patients. When the hospitals now building are completed there will be a total of about 50 beds for that purpose. What is needed immediately is a hospital or hospitals which will take care of several hundred natives so afflicted. The cost of such a hospital or hospitals would amount to a considerable sum, but I nevertheless urge construction without delay. It is of little avail to do many other things which we are now doing and yet permit our own citizens to suffer such a terrible disease without offering any relief or any hope for the future. Budget or no Budget, the necessary amount should be appropriated now. Time is of the essence.

As compared with the Indians in the United States, the Alaska natives have been, in a sense, discriminated against in that they have been treated less well in some regards than the Indians in the States have been treated. I say this with the full realization and with profound gratitude for the notable advances made for education and medical relief and care of the natives of Alaska during the last 8 years. We have enjoyed a sympathetic administration of Indian affairs, and have had the support of Congress for many measures of assistance and aid and relief.

I am not unmindful of what has been done, the granting to the Tlinket and Haida Indians of Alaska the right to bring suit in the Court of Claims to recover compensation for the property and property rights of which they have been

deprived, the granting of citizenship to some of the Indians of Metlakatla, the increased provision made for education and for medical relief, although a considerable number of the natives of Alaska are still without any educational facilities whatsoever, the benefits enjoyed by the natives under the C. C. C. program, and the advantages gained under the extension to Alaska of certain provisions of the Indian Reorganization Act. And yet in spite of all this, the scourge of tuberculosis remains, and that challenge to our humanity should be met by the construction of whatever hospitals may be needed to take care of those so afflicted.

The president of the Alaska Native Brotherhood, Mr. Roy Peratrovich, of Klawock, has invited attention to the discrimination against the natives of Alaska as compared with the Indians residing in the States in a letter which appears on pages 417 and 418 of the hearings. The facts stated in that letter cannot be truthfully denied. It reveals a discrimination against our people for which there is no justification. I am glad that the committee has given the subject careful attention. Mr. Peratrovich, by high personal character and unusual ability, coupled with a profound devotion to the welfare of his people, is deserving of every confidence. It is earnestly to be hoped that the revelation which he has made of existing conditions will bring about prompt reform. The committee, in the report on the bill, page 10, has given evidence of its concern for the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska, a concern which may well be shared by all of the officials of our Government.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I pay grateful tribute to the members of the committee for the careful and sympathetic consideration which they gave to all matters coming before them concerning the Territory which I represent, as well as for their personal courtesy to me. [Applause.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House, and particularly of the committee we set up for the purpose of inquiring into un-American activities, to a series of articles that appear in a New York newspaper over the signatures of two responsible newspapermen. These newspapermen, George Reedy and Kenneth Crawford, have made very serious charges against one William Rhodes Davis.

It seems to me to be unfortunate that the House should be compelled—and I feel certain we shall be—to make an investigation into these charges, because a resolution was adopted in the Senate some months ago calling for an investigation of the activities of this man, but up to this time the Senate has not seen fit to take any steps whatsoever, despite the fact that this matter is of great importance and the defense of our country may be imperiled through the activities of a man or group of men who are serving the very people we are arming ourselves against. These leading columnists start a series of articles with the fact admitted to them by Mr. Davis himself that he was paid $440,000 by the Nazis in 1940, the first full year of the war. It seems to me that if the committee we set up to investigate subversive activities is really interested in determining whether or not un-American activities are being engaged in by people in high positions they ought immediately to subpena to appear before that committee this man Davis and find out why he received $440,000 from the Nazi government and what he did in return for this tremendous fee, and also these newspapermen, so that they may be compelled to disclose the source of the information on which their serious charges are based. I sincerely trust a sufficient amount of pressure will be brought upon the members of our committee to force them immediately to bring Mr. Davis and Messrs. Reedy and Crawford before their committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, it is quite apparent there does not appear to be any very serious controversy over the pending bill, and because of this fact I am timorous enough to ask for a few moments this afternoon in which to discuss a matter which I believe is of some importance to the country and should be of some importance to Members of Congress. You will recall that in 1936 the Congress passed the Walsh-Healey Act in subsection (c) of which they established an absolutely inflexible rule which was to be applied to all employers furnishing material under contract to the United States Government involving $10,000 or more, by which the hours of labor were specifically limited to 40 per week, and 8 per day. The Walsh-Healey Act became the law of the land and has been quite generally accepted as such by industry throughout the country.

In 1938 the Congress saw fit to pass the wage-hour law, as a result of which there now appears to be a very distinct conflict between the provisions of subsection (c) of the Walsh-Healey Act and certain provisions of the wage-hour law. I want, specifically, to direct your attention to the fact that the Congress, in response to what I conceived to be a very proper objective and motive, wrote into the wage-hour law, in section 7 thereof, a provision which would permit an employer to enter into a contract with his employees arrived at as a result of collective bargaining, what is known as a guaranteed minimum-wage agreement. I am one of those who believe that that is or should be the ultimate objective of all organized labor, namely, ultimately to achieve a position where labor can be guaranteed a minimum annual wage. Encouragement to this point of view was specifically written into the wage-hour law. Section 7 of the wage-hour law contains a provision for the entering into of such contract as a result of collective-bargaining arrangements between employers and employees; and when such a contract has been approved by the National Labor Relations Board it establishes a status of relationship pursuant to that contract between such an employer and his or its employees. A specific section provides in the guaranty for an annual minimum wage, that the employer guarantees a minimum of 2,000 hours per year. The advantage accruing to the employer who enters into such a contract is that he is permitted under the terms of the law and such contract to work his employees not to exceed 56 hours per week without paying time and a half for overtime.

I happen to have in my district some forward-looking employers who have entered into contracts with employees arrived at as a result of collective bargaining, which contracts have been approved by the National Labor Relations Board, which guarantee to those employees a minimum of at least 2,000 hours of employment a year. This gives the employees a sense of security based upon a guaranteed minimum annual wage rather than a wage specified on an hourly basis, and this employer in consideration of guaranteeing such a minimum is, as I have already stated, permitted to take care of the peak loads in its business by working employees not to exceed 56 hours a week and not to exceed a maximum of 2,000 hours in a year without paying time and a half for overtime.

Let me now point out the conflict that arises between the wage-hour law and the Walsh-Healey Act. This concern I am now referring to has had the most amicable relations with its employees. The employees belong to a C. I. O. union and are heartily in favor of the minimum annual wage guaranty contract. There has never been any trouble or dispute between this employer and his employees. Both sides agree that it is a good contract. They want to keep it in force, they want to see it extended to other plants, and other employees are likewise interested in this type of employer-employee relationship. This particular plant is now called upon by the United States Government to accept a contract with the Ordnance Department for the manufacture of some supplies needed by the Army. Immediately upon the acceptance of such a contract they are bound by the inflexible provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act, which will require them to work their men not in excess of 40 hours a week and not to exceed 8 hours per day. Under the provisions of their collective-bargaining agreement they may work them up to 56 hours a week without paying time and a half for overtime. If they work them over 40 hours a week on a Government contract, under the Walsh-Healey Act they must pay time and a half for overtime. It should not require the skill of a seer to be able to see and understand that if this employer accepts a Government contract under these circumstances he is going to have to throw his entire employer-employee relationship into the wastebasket.

The employees operating under the guaranteed minimum wage agreements want to work for the Government, and they are unable to understand why, when they have entered into a collective bargaining agreement with their employer guaranteeing an annual minimum wage, they should not be able to do their work

under that agreement without reference to subsection (c) of the Walsh-Healey Act.

In response to the demand which has come as the result of some discussions I have had on this subject with representatives of labor and with representatives of the Labor Department, I have prepared and submitted to the Congress yesterday a simple little bill which provides an amendment to subsection (c) of the Walsh-Healey Act and provides that subsection (c) fixing a 40-hour week and an inflexible day shall not apply to those employers who have entered into a guaranteed minimum annual wage agreement arrived at as the result of collective bargaining and approved by the National Labor Relations Board under the provisions of subsection 7 of the Wages and Hours Act.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, who is one of the coauthors of the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. HEALEY. I have not heard of the gentleman's amendment before; I have not had a chance to examine it, but it sounds reasonable to me. I thought perhaps the gentleman's people who are affected in this way might be able to obtain some relief under the present provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act which provides that in certain instances the Secretary may grant exceptions.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I have had considerable correspondence with the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins. I presented that very issue to her, but she is of the opinion that under the present interpretation of the Walsh-Healey Act it is not possible to accomplish the purpose I have suggested here this afternoon under the power that is reposed in her in the present provisions of the law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I realize the difficulty in getting any bill that affects legislation on the statute books with relation to labor out of a committee, but I have suggested to members of the Committee on Labor, as well as to the chairman of that committee, that here at least is one thing that Congress ought to do. It is in the interest of promoting national defense, it is in the interest of promoting fair and decent relationship between employers and employees, and it is for the purpose of correcting a very obvious situation that has arisen in the enactment of the wage-hour law since the original passage of the Walsh-Healey Act in 1936. This little amendment should be written into the law without delay in order that employers who have seen fit to guarantee to their employees a minimum annual wage contract will not be penalized, but, on the other hand, may be encouraged to adopt that sort of employer-employee relationship.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Labor took the position she was without authority to permit the agreement to be carried out that the gentleman has just described?

Mr. KEEFE. I would not say that she is without authority to permit the agreement to be carried out, but I do say that her position is she is without authority to suspend the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. WALTER. It so happens that I assisted in the drafting of the Walsh-Healey Act. It was clearly the intention of the drafters and the Committee on the Judiciary that when the occasion arose for an exception to be made that the Secretary of Labor should have ample authority to make such an exception.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I shall ask leave at the proper time to extend my remarks and I shall endeavor to incorporate in those remarks the correspondence I have had with the Secretary of Labor upon this specific matter.

Regardless of whether she has the power or not, I think the gentlemen will concede, as have the representatives of labor who have appeared before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I happen to be a member, and with whom I have discussed this matter, that this should be done. I found no one but who agrees that this should be done and should be done at once to correct a thing that is very obviously wrong. I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is greatly interested in this matter, that he give his influence and support to see that this correction is made.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, first of all I wish to compliment this very distinguished committee for submitting the pending bill. I believe in economy and am always interested in upholding the recommendations of the committee, especially where great savings are shown as in the pending bill. I have a matter, however, that I was unable properly to present to the committee, and for this reason I plan to offer an amendment to cover what I have in mind.

Most of you gentlemen know something about Hot Springs National Park. The Government owns property in Hot Springs, the city owns property, and property is owned by private individuals. Hot Springs National Park necessarily comes, so far as its maintenance is concerned, within the provisions of this bill. We are the oldest national park in the country. We are nearer self-sustaining than any national park in the United States. I think we have the greatest health resort in the world. That is evidenced by the fact that the Government has established at Hot Springs, Ark., one of the great Army and Navy hospitals, to which some of you have gone, and I hope you have been benefited.

The point I am getting at now is this: Some of the Government-owned property, for instance, the Army and Navy hospital, the free bathhouse, and other Government-owned property, is right in the center of the city of Hot Springs. The street on which the Army and Navy hospital is located was repaired about 10 years ago and is now about worn out. It is dangerous for ambulances and other vehicles to use this street. Since Camp Robinson was located at Little Rock, there is excessive travel over this street, and it is in very great need of repair.

In order that you may know exactly what I am trying to do, I show you a map of the town of Hot Springs, Ark. All this property here is owned by the Government. This is the Army and Navy Hospital. Here is the Government free bathhouse. This is the street that is worn out. I am advised that all of the private-property owners and the city of Hot Springs want to improve this street. Therefore we are asking that the Government supply its part of the money that is necessary for the improvement of the street. The Government's part would not be in excess of $7,000. The adjacent property owners are required to put up the same amount of money per foot space as we are asking that the Government pay.

Mr. Chairman, it is very necessary, as I see it, in order for ambulances to come into and get off the grounds of the Army and Navy Hospital, that this street be improved. This is the one thing that we are asking in addition to what our splendid committee has already recommended. We are very grateful for what the committee has done for us in the past. If it were not absolutely essential, we would not be asking for this special consideration at this time. I shall offer an amendment taking care of this matter at the proper time tomorrow, and I hope the committee may see fit to accept it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Who originally built that street?

Mr. NORRELL. The street was constructed way back yonder as a joint activity. About 10 years ago it was repaired on the same basis we are asking that it now be repaired, according to my information.

Mr. STEFAN. When it was originally built and when it was repaired the Government participated in the cost?

Mr. NORRELL. My information is that the Government has always participated in the cost. We are not asking for anything new or unusual at this time. In other words, if you own property on one side of a street and I own it on the other, we would each pay half of the cost of the improvement of the street. That is what we are asking the Government do in this instance. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of any appropriation bill I yield to no one on the issue of economy or in my concern over the fiscal affairs of this country. Someone has said that it does not take a good banker to say

no to every application for a loan; neither does it take a good banker to say yes to every application for a loan. There are some things that are worth considering and there are some that perhaps he should turn down. The same applies to appropriations.

I believe one of the most worth-while appropriations this Government makes is the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. One of these days we are going to have an end to all our defense activity. We hope that time is not so far off, and that we do not have to go through too great an ordeal before that time comes. Yet there is a time coming when all of the industrial activity that has been tied up primarily with national defense is going to stop. The Army and the Navy are going to be demobilized. There are going to be a great many people who are going to have to find a place to live and to work in this country of ours.

We hear it lamented a great deal that there are no more frontiers. May I remind this Congress that the Bureau of Reclamation is creating new frontiers, and doing it all the time. It is providing a place where individuals can build new homes and where they can work out their destiny as private citizens. I believe all this investment we are making in reclamation projects is wisely providing for the future of this country.

I am particularly interested in the item for the Bureau of Reclamation pertaining to the Case-Wheeler projects. This is a small item of only $3,500,000. It is spread out and spent in a great many States. This legislation grows out of the investigation made a number of years ago throughout the so-called drought area. If you will consult the statistics available on relief expenditures, you will find that throughout the so-called drought or Dust Bowl areas in Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, the Dakotas, eastern Colorado, and eastern Wyoming and Montana, the relief expenditures have been very, very heavy. This appropriation is the one means of stopping these relief appropriations. It will enable the people to help themselves.

As I say, this $3,500,000 is spread out and spent on a number of small projects. Through this money and the regular W. P. A. load, and in some instances some help from the Civilian Conservation Corps, these projects are built.

Here is a very interesting fact in connection with reclamation and relief. The fact is that in irrigated areas there are fewer people on relief. I mentioned something about the distress in the so-called drought areas. I know about that. The State of Nebraska has lost a greater percentage of its people than all other States of the United States except one. Half of those people moved out of my district. It is a matter of obtaining some supplemental water in order that they may hold the homes and the farms on which they have struggled for more than half a century.

While this shift in population has come about, and while in many places the loss has been very heavy, when we turn to those portions of our State where irrigation has already been developed, we find that instead of an outward migration the population has increased a great deal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Nebraska 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I have in mind one particular Nebraska county that the benefits of irrigation were brought to shortly after the turn of the century. This county, rather than suffering a loss of population like the rest of my State, has increased in population about 14 percent. Their problem during all these periods of drought and depression have been much different.

It would perhaps be a waste of time for me to suggest to this Congress that the people of this irrigated county have bought more typewriters, furniture, automobiles, radios, and countless other things that the industrial centers of America make and sell than the other counties in the drought area. From the standpoint of saving of relief money alone, the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation are some of the wisest appropriations that this Government makes. The Bureau is conducted, I believe, by a very competent staff. The head of the Bureau of Reclamation is a former Nebraskan, the able and distinguished Mr. John Page. I think if I were going to mention any criticism against the Bureau of Reclamation it would be that perhaps they are too slow in executing the plans that are before them; that they are not building these projects as fast as they could; and that they are not spending the money we do give them quite as rapidly as they ought to. Some of the Bureau's engineers dilly-dally along too much, and fail to push the program as they should. If they do not speed up soon, this work should be turned over to the Department of Agriculture. I feel that this appropriation of $3,500,000 is very small, and I am sorry that the Bureau of the Budget did not see fit to raise it. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we will find that this appropriation is one of the most beneficial that we make for any purpose. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—ONCE AGAIN

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, for years I have been urging a thoroughgoing investigation of radio broadcasting and its regulation by the Federal Communications Commission. Members of the House will recall that a few years ago the passage of such a resolution by the House was blocked at the last moment by the active intervention of the White House. The investigation has not been made as yet. It is bound to be made eventually, in my judgment.

To soften the demand for investigation, a subcommittee consisting of three members of the Federal Communications Commission, two of whom are still members of the Commission, was appointed by the Commission. Their duty in effect was to investigate themselves to see whether or not the Commission had been guilty of fostering or permitting a monopoly in radio broadcasting contrary to the express provisions of the Federal Communications Act and to the detriment of the public. The subcommittee consumed almost 2 years in their so-called investigation, sometimes referred to as the "monotony" investigation. They finally submitted a report to the full Commission on or about June 2, 1940.

I quote the following paragraph from the conclusions of the subcommittee:

> The inescapable conclusion is that National and Columbia, directed by a few men, hold a powerful influence over the public domain of the air and measurably control radio communication to the people of the United States. If freedom of communication is one of the precious possessions of the American people, such a condition is thought by the committee to be in the public interest and presents inherent dangers to the welfare of a country where democratic processes prevail.

The House, through its Appropriations Committee, has been repeatedly assured that the report of the full Commission would be forthcoming shortly. In this connection, I quote from the independent offices hearings on appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission on January 8, 1941:

> Mr. FLY. Now the entire matter is before the Commission for disposition. That will result in a report by the full Commission, with the rules and regulations, if any, which may be adopted by the Commission, and perhaps with recommendations to the Congress. I just do not know, of course, what the Commission will do, but it is ready for the definitive action.
>
> Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When may we expect this action?
>
> Mr. FLY. I should think within the coming month would be a safe answer.

February, March, and April have come and gone and still the Congress has no report or recommendations in respect to an investigation undertaken almost 3 years ago.

What is the reason for this interminable delay? I do not know. It may be further evidence of incompetence or inefficiency. I call attention, however, in this connection, to the following paragraph from Variety under date of March 26, 1941:

> On the general subject of antimonopoly—
>
> The statement reads—
>
> President Roosevelt is rumored to have told Chairman Fly recently (Fly has had two White House appointments in a short time) that he wants to discuss and ponder the proposals for stringent regulations of public practices and stringent means of bringing about greater competition in broadcasting. He is represented as believing it would be unwise to take any steps at this time which would lead to a fight and hurt relations between the industry and the administration, especially in view of the desire for unity to insure complete cooperation in carrying out the national-defense program. Accordingly trade watchers believe the monopoly report will be put back in the closet for some time.

If this assertion is well founded, it would appear that the White House, having opposed congressional investigation, now opposes presentation to Congress of the findings and recommendations based

on 3 years of investigation by the members of the Federal Communications Commission itself.

I note with interest also, Mr. Chairman, that no tax of any kind on the holders of Federal broadcasting licenses is included in the list of tax proposals submitted to Congress by the administration, despite the fact that radio broadcasters are competitors with the theaters and other amusements which are disseminators of entertainment and substantially taxed, and despite the fact that the testimony of the Federal Communications Commission—page 679, 1942 independent offices appropriation hearings—shows a combined gross income for broadcasting stations for 1939 of $123,881,864. Those who realized this return did not pay the Federal Government 1 cent for the licenses through which it was earned.

In reference to this matter the article in Variety, already referred to, makes the following statement:

Battle of words over whether radio should be forced to pay some special sort of privilege tax and ought to be curbed to protect the press has grown more furious with the National Association of Broadcasters taking up the challenge of the International Allied Printing Trades Association.

As of possible interest, I include at this point a letter dated August 21, 1940, addressed to Mr. M. H. White, managing editor, Winona Republican Herald, Winona, Minn., by John B. Haggerty, president of the association:

INTERNATIONAL ALLIED PRINTING TRADES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1941.

Mr. M. H. WHITE,
Managing Editor, Winona Republican-Herald, Winona, Minn.

DEAR MR. WHITE: We are in receipt of your letter of April 2 and appreciate the informative thoughts therein contained.

You say "Our newspaper employees are better paid than are our radio employees." That is true the country over. You employ more persons on your newspaper than in your radio station, as does a publisher who writes he "employs 500 persons directly whereas the radio station employs not over 30 persons."

You say, "It seems to me that any move to specifically tax one form of advertising is unfair and short-sighted, to say the least." We thank you for this opportunity of correcting a false impression implanted in the minds of some publishers by persons who wish to befog the issue.

We have never advocated a tax on advertising. Radio advertising is secured through the dissemination of commercially sponsored entertainment and used by the purveyors of sponsored entertainment as a means of diverting advertising from the printed page to radio broadcasting. We do advocate a tax on the disseminators of sponsored entertainment comparable to that tax now collected, in nickels and dimes, from the public who have a choice of the form of entertainment they desire when they patronize a theater or other forms of amusement. The recipients of sponsored entertainment—radio in the homes—must accept such entertainment as the radio broadcasts. (Surely not the quality of entertainment the American public are entitled to.)

The tax we have suggested is wholly in line with the tax which we have every reason to believe will continue to be levied on other disseminators of entertainment such as motion-picture theaters, etc.

No one will contend that radio broadcasters, who pay no franchise tax to the Government, who pay little, if any, taxes to the communities wherein their radio stations are located, and in most instances pay only a meager tax, in some remote locality, wherein is located the transmitter of such broadcasters, should be alone privileged to retain exorbitant profits untaxed.

Surely, an industry which, its own reports show, is earning collectively from 60 percent net to as high as 132 percent net, on what it declares is the present value of its property, cannot expect much longer to escape paying its share to maintain and provide for national-defense needs.

The following data, reported officially to the Federal Communications Commission for the year 1939, is illustrative of radio-broadcasting profits. These figures are those reported by the 33 full-time, clear-channel, 50,000-watt stations. These stations are located in the larger centers, and in most cases they individually service areas covered by as many as 100 newspapers. The average value of such stations, $212,577; the average net income, $284,000, or 132 percent; they employed, full time, an average of 84 persons who were paid an average of $55.64 weekly. (This includes salaries and wages paid to managers, executives, artists, writers, musicians, electrical operators, announcers, and all other workers.)

Average gross monthly income was $68,321; average monthly costs for salaries and wages of executives and employees, $20,362; average monthly costs for talent and other operating expenses, $15,164; average monthly costs for power, $1,573; or a total for these principal expenditures of $37,099, leaving more than $31,000 monthly for profits, etc.

This income is secured through the willingness of owners of radio sets to listen to commercially sponsored entertainment disseminated by the purveyors of radio advertising and is in direct competition with the motion-picture theaters and other disseminators of entertainment or amusements.

It is well to bear in mind also that one of the networks is yearly paying cash dividends of more than 200 percent on the cash invested by shareholders.

Ability to pay ought to be the basis for all taxes.

We are taking the liberty of sending copy of this letter to others interested.

Thanking you for your comment and trusting that we may be favored with your support.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN B. HAGGERTY,
President.

One word more, Mr. Chairman. In his testimony before the subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission on January 8, 1941, Chairman Fly admitted the Commission's responsibility for the character and integrity of an applicant in granting a license. He stated specifically:

If the record of any licensee is bad, if there is evidence of general irresponsibility or fraud, or anything of that sort, we do not entrust licenses to him.

In this connection, and as further evidence of the manner of operating by the Commission, I include at this point a letter of transmittal and copies of minority and majority opinions in the recent decision of the Commission, vacating previous orders of the Commission revoking licenses of six Texas licensees. The revocation had been based squarely on proof of false and fraudulent statements and representations and transfer of control in violation of the terms of licenses held and of the Federal Communications Act. It will be noted that Mr. James G. Ulmer, described as "the primary and moving figure in all of these cases," continues in managerial capacity. It will be further noted that Commissioner Payne declined to join the Commission in what he describes as a "back flip," stating that, in his opinion—

The Commission has given a favorable signal to all and sundry who are plotting to obtain radio licenses by indirection and fraud.

OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER
GEORGE HENRY PAYNE,
April 3, 1941.

To Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH.

Remarks: Commissioner Payne asked me to send you copies of the Commission's decisions and orders in the Texas cases, and a copy of his dissenting opinion.

These were just issued today and were not available at the time we sent you the papers you asked for last Saturday.

RUTH KOPPIALKY,
Assistant Secretary to Commissioner Payne.

COMMISSIONER PAYNE CRITICIZES FELLOW COMMISSIONERS FOR RESCINDING REVOCATION ORDERS IN TEXAS RADIO CASES—DECLARES COMMISSIONERS DISREGARDED EVIDENCE AT HEARINGS HELD BY HIM IN TEXAS

[Before the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C. In re revocation of licenses of the following stations: State Capitol Broadcasting Association, Inc., Austin, Tex., station KTBC, docket 5835; John Calvin Welch, William M. Keller, and Bonner Frizzell, doing business as Palestine Broadcasting Association, Palestine, Tex., station KNET, docket 5836; Red Lands Broadcasting Association, Ben T. Wilson, president, Lufkin, Tex., station KRBA, docket 5837; Sam Houston Broadcasting Association, Huntsville, Tex., station KSAM, docket 5838; East Texas Broadcasting Co., Tyler, Tex., station KGKB, docket 5840; Eagle Broadcasting Co., Inc., Brownsville, Tex., station KGFI, docket 5854]

DISSENTING OPINION OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE HENRY PAYNE

I cannot agree with the action recently taken by the Commission vacating the revocation orders in the six so-called Texas cases.

It is regrettable that the Federal Communications Commission has, after whitewashing the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., exonerated these six radio station owners, whose licenses were revoked over a year ago. This action of the Commission is particularly regrettable, as only a few days ago, under similar circumstances, the Commission unanimously refused to renew the license of John H. Stenger, Jr., for station WBAX, although Stenger, in my opinion, was far less culpable than these six Texas licensees.

I fear that the precedent set by the Commission in its decision of September 4, 1940, in the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. cases (from which I also dissented), has risen like a ghost to plague the Commission, as I predicted it would. For, once the law is relaxed or softened in favor of the mighty, it is hard to enforce it rigidly against the less mighty.

Consider the steps taken by the Commission in these Texas cases.

On February 7, 1940, the Commission revoked the licenses of stations KTBC, KNET, KRBA, and KSAM; on February 13, 1940, that of KGKB; and on March 22, 1940, that of KGFI. The revocation orders had the unanimous vote of the Commission.

On May 17, 1940, the Commission issued proposed findings of fact and conclusions, affirming its revocation orders in the cases of stations KTBC, KNET, and KRBA. On June 20, 1940, the Commission took similar action

in the case of station KSAM, on July 9, 1940, in the case of station KGKB, and on September 9, 1940, in the case of station KGFI.

After exhaustive hearings had been held on these cases in Texas and the record was complete, the Commission affirmed the revocation orders—unanimously and after due deliberation.

Let us examine briefly the charges of the Commission against these broadcast license holders.

The two important charges in all the cases, except in that of KGKB (East Texas Broadcasting Co., Tyler, Tex.) and KGFI (Eagle Broadcasting Co., Inc., Brownsville, Tex.), are similar and are in effect as follows:

(1) That the original construction permits and station licenses were issued by the Commission upon false and fraudulent statements and representations, and because of the failure of the applicants to make full disclosure concerning the financing of station construction and operation, the ownership, management, and control thereof, in violation of the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the rules and regulations of the Commission; and that, had the actual facts in connection therewith been presented and made known, the Commission would have been justified in refusing to grant the applications.

(2) That the licenses granted to the station license holders, in and by the terms of their licenses, have been transferred, assigned, or otherwise disposed of by the licensees of record without the consent in writing of this Commission, in violation of the provisions of the licenses and of the provisions of section 319 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

In the KGFI case the charges listed in paragraph (2) were the ones principally urged.

In my opinion, there was only one question for the Commission to decide, namely: Had the charges of paragraph (1) or of paragraph (2), or both, been sustained at the hearings?

Evidently the Commission was of the opinion that such charges had been sustained; otherwise, it could not have issued proposed findings affirming the revocation orders.

What, then, has happened since the issuance of the proposed findings to change the mind of the Commission?

Oral arguments were held at various times subsequent to the issuance of these proposed findings. That was the only important event of record in the history of these cases occurring between the issuance of the proposed findings and the present decisions of the Commission.

I have scrutinized the transcripts of these oral arguments as well as the exceptions and petitions filed by the respondents, and I fail to find any new evidence of such a character as to impair the validity of the action taken by the Commission in revoking the licenses.

The Commission in its final decisions does not show which of the charges the Government has failed to prove or which the respondents have disproved. Either, in my opinion, would be a hard task, for every one of the charges is supported by an abundance of evidence in the record.

In fact, in these decisions it is admitted that solid foundation exists for affirming the revocation orders.

In the KGKB case (East Texas Broadcasting Co., Tyler, Tex.) the charges, in effect, were as follows:

(1) That control of the licensee corporation was transferred to James G. Ulmer and his wife by means of stock sales in violation of the act.

(2) That the corporation assigned the rights granted to it by its license to James G. Ulmer, and that he had exercised such rights without having secured the consent of the Commission in writing.

These charges, too, have been established by an abundance of evidence.

In this case, too, the Commission had voted unanimously to sustain its own revocation order. Nothing said or done subsequently has changed an iota of the merits of the case.

The reasoning in the Commission's decision in the Tyler case (KGKB) is strange and bewildering. The Commission holds, figuratively speaking, that having let five horses escape it might as well let this one go, too.

I wish to call the attention of the Commission to its own decision of March 31, 1941, denying the application of John H. Stenger, Jr., for renewal of the license of station WBAX at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

In my opinion, the evidence in the Stenger case is far less convincing or damaging than the evidence in these six Texas cases.

The Commission seems to be much worried about leaving certain areas in Texas without broadcast service if these revocation orders were affirmed.

This, in my opinion, is an unnecessary worry. It has been my experience that new stations spring up quickly without coaxing and without the need of sending out engraved invitations.

I wish I could join the Commission in the back flip it has done in these cases, for I should like to see the decisions unanimous. But I do not see how I possibly can. I presided at the hearings, I heard all the testimony of the respondents and of the Government witnesses, and my convictions cannot be altered except by the introduction of convincing evidence contradicting the record. But I fear such evidence does not exist.

In my opinion, the Commission has given a favorable signal to all and sundry who are plotting to obtain radio licenses by indirection and fraud.

I therefore dissent from the Commission's action in vacating the revocation orders in these cases.

GEORGE HENRY PAYNE,
Commissioner.

APRIL 3, 1941.

[Before the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C. In re East Texas Broadcasting Co. (KGKB), Tyler, Tex. Revocation of license B–110. Docket No. 5840]

DECISION AND ORDER

By the Commission (Commissioners Case and Payne dissenting):

Proposed findings of fact and conclusions having been released, exceptions thereto filed, and oral argument had in the above-entitled proceeding, the matter is now before us for final decision. As in the other so-called Texas cases,[1] we are convinced on the record herein presented that solid foundation exists for affirming the revocation order entered in the instant proceeding, but, again, considerations of public interest lead us, reluctantly, to a different ultimate conclusion than that reached in our proposed findings of fact and conclusions. To recapitulate, in our proposed conclusions in the instant matter, we said:

"1. On some date unknown to this Commission during the year 1936 or 1937, there was sold to one James G. Ulmer a majority of the 1,000 shares of outstanding capital or voting stock in the East Texas Broadcasting Co., and there was finally sold a total of 736 shares to the same individual. Of these shares, 480 were later reissued at various dates, on the books of the corporation, in the name of James G. Ulmer, and 256 shares were reissued in the name of his wife, Minnie B. Ulmer. The 256 shares recorded in the name of Minnie B. Ulmer were falsely reported to the Commission from time to time as being voted personally by her, whereas they were in fact at all times voted by James G. Ulmer by means of his wife's proxy. In fact, a majority of the 1,000 shares of stock in the East Texas Broadcasting Co. was voted and controlled by Ulmer during the years 1938 and 1939. The sale of this stock to Ulmer and the subsequent exercise by him of the voting rights therein constituted in truth and in fact a transfer of the legal or voting control of the East Texas Broadcasting Co. and gave him the actual control thereof. As such transfer of control was made without the consent in writing of this Commission, as required by section 310 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the said transfer was illegal and in violation of the provisions of the statute.

"2. Under a contract entered into on May 20, 1932, between the East Texas Broadcasting Co., licensee of station KGKB, Tyler, Tex., and one James G. Ulmer, the former delegated to the said Ulmer the operation and management of station KGKB. Under certain provisions of this contract, on February 7, 1935, the said East Texas Broadcasting Co., through formal action of its board of directors, leased the facilities of station KGKB to the said James G. Ulmer for a period of 3 years, ending February 5, 1938, and has from time to time since the latter date, by subsequent actions of its board of directors, extended this lease. Each of such extensions constituted, in effect, a new lease. By virtue of the above contract and leases, the said East Texas Broadcasting Co. voluntarily transferred the rights theretofore granted to it by the terms of the license issued by this Commission for the operation of station KGKB and did also transfer the management, control, and operation of station KGKB to the said Ulmer, without having first applied for and secured the consent of this Commission in writing for such transfer or assignment in violation of the provisions of section 310 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

"3. By virtue of the above contract and leases, the said James G. Ulmer has, since February 7, 1935, or some date prior thereto, acquired the management, control, and operation of station KGKB and has exercised the authority and rights granted to the East Texas Broadcasting Co. by the terms of the license theretofore issued to said company for the operation of station KGKB, in violation of the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended."

On October 2, 1940, subsequent to the oral argument hereon, the East Texas Broadcasting Co. filed with the Commission minutes of the Board of Directors which read in part as follows:

"James G. Ulmer, secretary and general manager of the company, moved that his contract with the East Texas Broadcasting Co., which was filed with the Commission May 20, 1932, and which is now being disputed by the Commission, be forfeited and canceled and that it be of no further force and effect. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sledge and voted unanimously so that the contract became immediately of no further force and effect whatsoever.

"A motion was made by James G. Ulmer that every detail of the management and operation of the East Texas Broadcasting Co. be placed back into the hands of the company. This motion was unanimously carried and immediately all management, operation, and control of every kind and nature of Radio Station KGKB was placed back into the hands of the East Texas Broadcasting Co. on this date.

"A motion was made, duly seconded, and unanimously carried that the bank account

---

[1] See decision and order of the Commission in Docket Nos. 5837, 5838, 5835, 5836, and 5854, released simultaneously herewith.

of the East Texas Broadcasting Co. be carried in the name of the East Texas Broadcasting Co. and that all checks be signed by the secretary and countersigned by the president until further notice.

"At this meeting James G. Ulmer advised the board of directors that Mrs. Ulmer had sold $6,000 worth, or 240 shares, of her stock, so that his stock and Mrs. Ulmer's stock combined would no longer constitute a majority of the stock of the organization and that all dispute relative to stock ownership would therefore be at an end.

"A motion was made and carried by a unanimous vote that James G. Ulmer would continue to manage radio station KGKB on a salary of $400 per month from month to month under the direction of the board of directors."

The licensee has also filed returns under oath showing the distribution of its stock to be such that the combined holdings of James G. Ulmer and his wife are less than 50 percent. Thus the licensee, belatedly, it is true, has endeavored to purge itself of the unlawful aspects of past operation of station KGKB.

In our decision and order *In re Red Lands Broadcasting Association (KRBA et al), supra*,[1] we quoted from and applied certain observations set forth *In re Navarro Broadcasting Association, Docket No. 5839,* — F. C. C. —, decided September 5, 1940. Bearing these remarks in mind, it will be noted that here also no question is raised that the program service of station KGKB, in and of itself, is not in the public interest. Furthermore, station KGKB serves as the sole radio broadcast medium for community expression in Tyler, Tex.[2]

In re Red Lands Broadcasting Association, et al, supra, we ordered that stations KRBA, KSAM, KTBC, KNET, and KGFI be issued temporary licenses for a period of 90 days during which time the licensees of said stations shall submit evidence satisfactory to this Commission that James G. Ulmer has completely and absolutely relinquished any right, title, or interest to said stations and in their conduct and operation, and will not be associated or connected with them in the future. In this case, in view of the action of the licensee's board of directors heretofore referred to in eliminating the unauthorized transfer of control, we will permit the licensee to continue operation of the station. By this it is not to be construed that Dr. Ulmer's past activities in connection with the station are in any way approved by this Commission. To the contrary, we unequivocally condemn these activities and the complete disregard of the duties of radio-broadcast licensees shown by the other principal participants in this proceeding. The Commission does believe, however, in view of the action taken regarding the licenses of the stations mentioned above, and by reason of other considerations mentioned herein, that the licensee East Texas Broadcasting Co. may now be entrusted with an authorization to continue the operation of station KGKB.

In tolerating the action of the respondent herein it must be understood that should future improper conduct on the part of the licensee of station KGKB be proven, the facts developed and the improper conduct proven in these proceedings cannot be disregarded.

Accordingly it is ordered this 2d day of April 1941 that the Commission order revoking the license of station KGKB be, and it is hereby, vacated.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
T. J. SLOWIE, *Secretary*.

[1] See decision and order of the Commission in Docket Nos. 5837, 5838, 5835, 5836, and 5834, released simultaneously herewith.

[2] According to the 1940 United States Census, Tyler, Tex., has a population of 28,279.

[Before the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C. In re Red Lands Broadcasting Association (KRBA) (Ben T. Wilson, president), Lufkin, Tex. B–104, Docket No. 5837; Sam Houston Broadcasting Association (KSAM) (H. G. Webster, president), Huntsville, Tex. B–108, Docket No. 5838; State Capitol Broadcasting Association, Inc. (KTBC), Austin, Tex. B–102, Docket No. 5835; John Calvin Welch, William M. Keller, and Bonner Frizzell, d/b as Palestine Broadcasting Association (KNET), Palestine, Tex. B–103, Docket No. 5836; Eagle Broadcasting Co., Inc. (KGFI), Brownsville, Tex. Revocation of licenses. B–122, Docket No. 5854]

DECISION AND ORDER

By the Commission (Commissioner Payne dissenting):

Proposed findings of fact and conclusions of the Commission having been released on the above-entitled proceedings, exceptions thereto filed, and oral argument had, these matters are now before us for final decision. Upon consideration of said oral arguments, the proposed findings of fact, and conclusions, the exceptions thereto, and the testimony individual to each docket, we are of the opinion that ample foundation has been provided for sustaining the revocation orders entered herein. Other considerations, however, impel us to a disposition of the matters differing from that indicated in our proposed findings of fact and conclusions heretofore promulgated.[3]

The primary and moving figure in all of these cases was Dr. James G. Ulmer.[4] His actions, coupled with the lack of understanding displayed by the other principal participants in the proceedings with respect to the duties of radio-broadcast licensees particularly concerning the requirements of the Communications Act of 1934 and the rules and regulations of the Commission, combine to present a clouded and dubious history for each of the stations involved. But we think in this regard that the various licensees in the light of the several hearings will accord in the future more respect and, consequently, a stricter adherence to such duties and requirements.

We said, In re Revocation of License of Navarro Broadcasting Association, docket No. 5839, — F. C. C. —, decided September 5, 1940:

"In determining whether to revoke the license of a radio broadcast station for false representations to the Commission and other violations of the Communications Act the Commission is faced with competing considerations. The Commission's primary duty is to the listening public, and in dealing with a licensee the Commission must be guided by this primary duty. On the other hand, if the Commission is to carry out its function of granting and denying applications for licenses, it must obtain true and accurate information from those who seek to operate radio stations and must take disciplinary action against those who make false representations to the Commission. But discipline should not be inexorably applied when station licensees demonstrate to the Commission, as these respondents have now done, that they are ready to act in good faith."[5]

Applying these observations to the instant proceedings, it is noteworthy that in none of these cases has any charge been made that the program service of these stations in and of itself is not in the public interest. It is also to be observed that, except in these special instances, the evidence establishes that the various local parties involved are responsible citizens in good public standing and repute. Moreover, we are faced with the circumstance that in none of the areas wherein these stations are located, excluding Austin, Tex., is there any other station to serve as a medium for community expression excepting said stations. It may be noted, however, that Austin has a population approximately four times greater than Brownsville, the largest of the remaining cities here involved, and has but one station in addition to KTBC—namely, KNOW, which operates with power of 250 watts.[6]

The Commission now feels that the licensees may be entrusted with authorizations to continue the operation of these stations. Said authorizations will, however, be issued on a temporary 90-day basis, and prior to the expiration date thereof the licensees shall submit evidence satisfactory to this Commission that James G. Ulmer has completely and absolutely relinquished any right, title, or interest in or to stations KRBA, KSAM, KTBC, KNET, and KGFI, their conduct, and operation, and will not be associated or connected with them in the future.

The Commission leaves the records in these cases with the admonition that in any future proceeding involving these licensees the facts developed in the instant proceedings will be considered in connection therewith.

Accordingly it is ordered, this 2d day of April 1941, that the Commission's orders revoking the licenses of stations KRBA, KSAM, KTBC, KNET, and KGFI be, and they are hereby, vacated.

It is further ordered that said stations be issued a temporary license for a period of 90 days from the date hereof, during which time the licensees thereof shall submit evidence satisfactory to this Commission that James G. Ulmer has completely and absolutely relinquished any right, title, or interest in or to said stations, their conduct, and operation, and will not be associated or connected with them in the future.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
T. J. SLOWIE, *Secretary*.

[3] By its orders entered February 7 and March 22, 1940, the Commission revoked the licenses of Stations KRBA, KSAM, KTBC, KNET, and KGFI. In the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of the Commission thereafter released in connection with the proceedings resulting from these revocation orders it was concluded that all of such orders should be affirmed.

[4] See proposed findings of fact and conclusions of the Commission in dockets Nos. 5837, 5838, 5835, 5836, and 5854.

[5] The respondents referred to are J. C. West and Frederick Slauson, Corsicana, Tex., doing business as the Navarro Broadcasting Association, licensee of station KAND.

[6] According to the 1940 United States census, the population figures for these communities are: Austin, 87,930; Lufkin, 9,567; Palestine, 12,144; Huntsville, 5,108; and Brownsville, 22,083.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, it is a little late in the evening to take the time of the House on any important issue. I feel, however, that the issue I am going to discuss now should be debated fully in the House. I regret very much that other Members of the Congress have not seen fit today to ask for time to speak on the same subject. I am sure they would have obtained it from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to discuss the most important issue with which this country is confronted. I believe all other issues that have been discussed here today and during the last

week amount to nothing at all compared with the question of war or peace—of whether we shall convoy or not convoy, whether we shall be involved in war or whether we shall stay out. Everything else sinks, by comparison, into insignificance—just wasted words. If we are involved in this war—and certainly if convoying is done we will be involved—then this country faces ruin and bankruptcy, blood and tears, and the end of American liberties and American democracy and freedom.

There are some people who seem to think in their own minds that this war that is going on in Europe is somewhat the same as the last one 20 years ago in which we participated. There is no basis whatever for comparison. In the last war we had 20 allies. We had the British Fleet, the French Fleet, the Japanese Fleet, and the Italian Fleet, and some others, to protect our soldiers when they were sent overseas.

We had a number of allied armies in the front line, and all we had to do was to send our soldiers there and take over the front line with them. This war is entirely different. I doubt very much whether we can land any troops under present conditions, but if we are involved in this war it will mean that at least 10,000,000 Americans will be needed to serve in our armed forces, and the war may last from 5 to 20 years. American children yet unborn may be serving in that war in China, Africa, and Europe. And the end means bankruptcy and ruin, and probably after that communism.

Yet the Congress is now absolutely silent on this paramount issue that affects American peace and security and the future destiny of the one great free nation in the world.

In the Senate today the Foreign Relations Committee refused by a vote of 13 to 10 to report out the no-convoy resolution providing that there shall be no convoying without the consent of the Congress. That committee even refused to permit the matter to be debated in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman appreciate the fact that the group of nations that gains preponderance in airplanes and bombs will soon shut off the petroleum supply and other things to the other combatants, and the war will be ended?

Mr. FISH. I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman appreciate the fact that the group of nations that obtains preponderance of airplanes and bombs and war munitions will soon shut off the supply of petroleum to the other combatants, and soon end the war?

Mr. FISH. I cannot foretell what is going to happen in the war. I do not propose to try. I do not know what nation will win the war. I know where my sympathy lies, but that does not change the situation. My ancestors came to America 300 years ago, and they as well as the forefathers of every other Member of Congress—whether he or his forebears came here in recent years or 300 years ago—all came here for the same purpose and that was to get away from the wars of the Old World, the civil wars and the eternal wars of Europe. And now the interventionists want to get us back into those eternal wars and destroy everything that has been built up in this country in the last 150 years and join again in the European blood feuds. Our liberties, our free institutions, would all go out of the window and there would be a black-out of free government itself, and the creation of a dictatorship in 24 hours after we became involved in any of these European wars.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If America gets started in this war, and we have to take the offensive and send our men either to Europe or Asia, it means almost ruination for the American people, does it not?

Mr. FISH. It means that we will be holding the bag and doing all the fighting. The only possible allies we have today, right now, are England and China. They have all that they can do to survive. They will not be real allies—we will be the allies. They will not be helping us, but we will be helping them, if we can, and I submit to the Members of this House that the day we get into the war we will have lost, no matter whether we are victorious in 5 or 10 or 15 years in battle. We will have lost the day that we get in, because we will lose everything we cherish in America.

Mr. RICH. And it is not the function of America to undertake to rule the world, but it is our business to stay home.

Mr. FISH. It never has been our business to police the world. It has been the unwritten law of this country, and it has been our foreign policy, not to intervene in these Old World quarrels and to remain at peace and defend this continent against all comers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It seems to me that the greatest menace to American democracy lies in the failure of the leaders of the Nation to tell the truth to the American people. We do not know whether or not the United States is actually convoying ships. We have not been told anything with regard to what our ships are doing. Secrecy, duplicity, and deception are the attitude of our war lords toward the American people.

Nobody has yet told the Nation what this patrol in war zones means. Certainly the elected representatives of the people should be fully informed as to the exact nature of the activities of this so-called patrol system in war zones which the President has announced. Is it convoy by another name?

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. I had intended to ask the very same question and then to answer my own question. Naturally I prefer to have my colleague from New York ask it; and it is a most pertinent one, because the Congress, as he says, has no information whatever. I say that as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have absolutely no information in regard to this so-called neutrality patrol except what we read in the newspapers, and we read in the newspapers that the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Stark, went before the United States Chamber of Commerce, not before the Congress of the United States, and told them, to our utter surprise, that we have a neutrality patrol 2,000 miles from our shores. Then he added that he wished he could make it 3,000 miles.

Now, let us see what the President of the United States had to say. Repeatedly he said to the American people during the last Presidential campaign:

> We will not participate in foreign wars. We will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands, outside the Americas, except in case of attack.

That, I will say to my friend from New York, was delivered at a meeting sponsored by the teamsters union on September 20, 1940. Mark these words:

> We will not send our naval force to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas.

Now they send a naval force 2,000 miles, but not in defense of America, for no nation has attacked us, but for the purpose of aggression; to jeopardize our security, possibly to deliberately involve us in war. When they call that patrol a neutrality patrol it is a fraud on the American people and the height of hypocrisy. It is a sham and a fake to call a patrol a neutrality patrol 2,000 miles from your shores and operating in a war zone. What I complain about is that the Congress of the United States is derelict in its duty in neglecting to tell the people what is happening, when the President neglects to properly inform the people or the Congress regarding the Government's actions and policies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. As a matter of fact, is not the so-called neutrality patrol in a war zone a perversion of the very intention of the law that authorizes the setting up of these neutrality patrols?

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman. I think the country is being endangered. Whether it is a deliberate plan on the part of these interventionists in the Cabinet, at the demand of a war-minded minority that represents only 15 percent of the American people, who want to commit some overt act to arouse the passion of the American people and involve us in war, I do not know. They say our ships are sent out to defend American commerce. We have no commerce there. We do not have a ship there. But actually they are being sent 2,000 miles from our shores to parade up and down on dress parade, hoping that some German submarine will take a shot at them.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I have thought, and so expressed myself on two or three occasions in public, that the President has this power under the Constitution to

convoy and patrol, and that nowhere in the law does he have the power by statute. I am wondering if the gentleman from New York would give me his opinion as to whether or not that position is correct, as far as he sees it?

Mr. FISH. I think it is a very debatable question whether the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has the power to convoy ships into war zones, because that in itself, as is obvious to everybody, is an act of war. Congress alone has the power to declare war; not the President of the United States. If he assumes that power which is not authorized by any bill—certainly not by the lease-lend bill—I would remind those who talk so loosely about the lease-lend bill that there was an amendment put on the bill in the Senate, the Clark amendment, ratified by the House later, which says that all these goods we produce should change ownership, which actually means there should not be any convoying. But I do not deny that the President might assume those powers and might, as Commander in Chief, send out a convoy. But I do not think that he has any legal right to do so, because he knows and we know that is an act of war. Even the Secretary of the Navy, perhaps the archinterventionist in America, said before the Foreign Affairs Committee that convoying was an act of war. Certainly the President has no constitutional power to declare war, and if he uses convoys that is an act of war. It is one and inseparable. We must get that into the minds of the American people very clearly; that for the President to assume the power to order convoys he is in effect usurping the power of Congress to declare war.

I have here a letter addressed to my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. PHEIFFER], a copy of which was sent to me, in which the writer states: "I favor convoys, but I am against war." That is impossible. If you are for convoys, you are for war. They are one and inseparable, and this must be made clear to the American people. There is no way to avoid war if we use convoys.

We are not a neutral nation. We do not claim to be neutral any longer. We have not been neutral for a year and a half. We are in a nonbelligerent status—friendly to the British and unfriendly to the Germans. At any time during the last year and a half Dictator Hitler could legally have declared war on us for unneutral acts that we have taken against him, and that is truer since we passed the lease-lend bill. But that is the last thing he is thinking about. The last thing Hitler or Mussolini would want to do is to declare war on us. If we use convoys, however, our ships will be sunk, and after half a dozen American ships have been sunk we will declare war on those responsible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I feel so strongly on this question that I think it should be debated fully on the floor of the House. The ones I blame are those of us—and it represents all but half a dozen of the Republicans and a great many Democrats—who are not discussing this issue at the present time. It is our duty to do it, and it is the duty of those on the other side who are in favor of convoys to get up here and give their reasons for being in favor of convoys. A few weeks ago it was not possible to get a Democratic Senator or Democratic Member of the House to uphold convoys over the radio. They do not want to come out in the open on convoys, because convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war, and they are afraid to advocate convoys. It is therefore the duty of those of us who are against convoys to bring up this debate and ask those who would propose convoys to support their position and to give their reasons. Let us have a full debate in this great deliberative body.

Mr. NORRELL. I agree with the gentleman from New York that convoying would undoubtedly mean war.

Mr. FISH. That is what I want the public to know. The decks have been cleared of these other issues which are little by comparison—they are not little, they were very important—but the proponents of the lend-lease bill, and the arms-embargo repeal, said those measures were peace measures, they were means to keep us out of war. That is what the proponents of those proposals said. Now the decks have been cleared. We ought to have a crystal-clear issue on whether we are going to enter the war or to stay out. I do not impugn the motives, the patriotism, or the Americanism of the 15 percent that want to get us into this war. They have as much right to get up here and express their views on the floor of the House as have the 85 percent who want to stay out of war; but the 15 percent should give their views. The issue ought to be debated.

I feel so strongly on this question because I believe it means the end of free America if we are involved in this war. I am almost ashamed of the 85 percent of the Members of this House—there must be something like that—who are against convoys, because they do not day after day rise on the floor of the House and express their views and make it clear that convoying means war and war means ruin and disaster for America.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It seems to me the difficulty lies not so much in trying to obtain a discussion of the convoy issue, the difficulty lies in the fact that the issue has been confused by the dishonest use of the term "patrol" which in reality constitutes convoying, but Congress has not been told just what patrol means.

Mr. FISH. I will say to the gentleman, and it may seem strange for me to say this because I am critical very often of the President, perhaps rather consistently, that while I feel that the President of the United States has done more than any single man to lead us up to the brink of war, that he is more responsible for creating this hysteria for the last 2 years, talking about airplane attacks out in Denver, Omaha, and so on, than any one man in America, I nevertheless believe the President of the United States is the one man in the administration today, the one man in authority in the administration, who refuses to take the leap over the precipice into war. I believe the President of the United States is having tremendous pressure brought upon him by his own interventionist Cabinet which he appointed, including two former Republicans—and there are no greater interventionists in America than those two—as well as by powerful groups of people in the city of New York, and by interventionist newspapers, war-making columnists and others representing the 15 percent for war who are exerting the most terrific pressure upon the President to push him into war. But I do not believe the President has made up his mind to repudiate his word to the American people, to repudiate the Democratic platform upon which he was elected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I believe that if there is any hesitancy on the part of the President it is not because of the President's willingness to hesitate but it is due to the great resistance on the part of the masses of the American people to going into this war, and if we are plunged further into this war it will be done against the will of the American people. This war is an unpopular war. The American people want no part of it, and the President knows it.

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman. I am sorry I did not finish my thought on that line. The gentleman is exactly right.

I believe the President of the United States is watching public opinion and public sentiment every single day and every minute of the day. He is watching the result of these protest meetings against war: No convoys! No war! He is in touch with the situation and knows that 85 percent of the people want to stay out of war and are against convoys. In addition to that I believe the President of the United States elected on a third-term ticket, the first third-term President we have ever had, elected by the American people, not only feels his responsibility to public sentiment but he is thinking of the future of his own position historically in America. If he should take this country into war in defiance and in repudiation of his promises and pledges, he would go down in history as the greatest repudiator in our history, as having betrayed the American people and as having forced them into a war against their will by some deliberate overt act. It would destroy the President historically, his popularity, and his position in history.

At the present time the President, in my opinion, has not surrendered to these interventionists. He has not yet repudiated his word, and I want to believe him because he is still my President, and I believe that he does not intend to repudiate his word. At the same time I would like the Congress to debate this question of war or peace, and particularly the ques-

tion of convoys or no convoys. I would like to see a joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress that there shall be no convoying without the consent of the Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to take issue with him in regard to the conduct of this whole war program. Time and events have demonstrated since May 16, 1940, that every step sold to the American people as an overt step for peace has been in reality a covert step for war, and, as for the President of the United States himself, I charge that this whole war program has been put over on the American people by fraud and deception from its very inception, and it is being continued by fraud and deception. The American people are beginning to recognize the fraud and deception, now that the curtain is lifting.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I believe that there is a gigantic conspiracy in America right now, and it is now at its height, to get us into the war. This comes not only from Americans but from abroad. I am of British origin. My sympathies are with the British, but I know that in the last war the British spent $200,000,000 to get us into the first World War. They admitted that by parliamentary report, and I would not blame them at all for spending $200,000,000 to get us into the present war. They would be unwise and very foolish if they did not do that, from the British point of view, but we would be a lot of suckers if we followed them again into a war that will destroy America.

That is why I agree with the gentleman. There is a campaign going on now to involve us in this war, and unless you and I and the rest of us stand on our feet and present the facts to the American people, the American men and women, the plain people of America who want to stay out of war, this conspiracy may succeed. It has not succeeded yet. We are not in this war. No blood has been spilled, no ship has been sunk, and no American has been killed. We are not in this war, and we are not going into the war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the question of the California Central Valley water project, which has been the basis for a new hope to the people of our State ever since it was first conceived. It is a manifold project which includes a number of different benefits that will accrue.

In the first place, by means of controlling the flow of the Sacramento River so as to maintain that flow in times when there would otherwise be low water, it will prevent the destruction of some of our most fertile lands in the Delta area around San Francisco by the encroachment of salt water.

In the second place, it is a flood-control project to help eliminate the disastrous floods in the Sacramento Valley.

Most important of all, it is an irrigation project, aiming to transfer some of the surplus water from the Sacramento Valley in the northern part of the State to the southern part of the State to be used in the San Joaquin Valley, thus permitting all the waters in the upper San Joaquin to be used in the upper San Joaquin Basin.

In California, water is life; therefore this project is life for us in the future. It happens that in connection with this project it is altogether feasible, and certainly desirable, that power shall be generated in connection with dams to be built. This Shasta Dam and other similar structures of smaller nature are going to generate somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,190,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. The purpose of this power generation is clearly threefold. In the first place, the purpose is to have available a sufficient amount of power to take care of national-defense needs.

The Federal Power Commission has estimated that within a short time, perhaps 3 or 4 years, the northern part of the State of California will be short 907,000 kilowatts of generating capacity. At the present time the northern part of the State is borrowing from southern California essential power to operate the defense plants; and southern California is going to need that power itself, and more, too, in a very short time. In other words, there is an absolute necessity for an increase of power to be generated in our section.

The second purpose of the generation of power is to reduce the cost of electricity to the consumers of the State of California.

The third purpose is to help pay for the project. This is a project being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, which means that the entire cost of the project must be repaid to the Federal Treasury out of revenues from it. Those revenues come from two sources. First, payments by the water users for the water they get to irrigate their farms; and, second, from the power revenues. That is to say, the less the power revenues are the more water users will have to pay, which will result in a higher cost to the farmers for the water they use.

It happens that the committee has cut out $4,000,000 which was asked by the Budget for the construction of a stand-by steam plant which, if constructed, would firm up the power from the Shasta Dam so that 89 percent of the 2,190,000,000 kilowatt-hours which will be generated would be firm power. Only firm power, obviously, can be contracted for by municipalities and consumers of that sort. If it is secondary power, and to the extent it is secondary power, there is only one place you can sell it, and that is to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which has a complete monopoly of the electric-utilities business in the northern part of the State of California. It becomes obvious therefore why the P. G. & E. should oppose the steam plant. In other words, without the construction of the stand-by steam plant, to a great extent this project and the electric power users of the State are put at the mercy of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. This company came in and opposed the construction of this steam plant at the very same time it was itself asking for permission to construct two new dams on the Feather River for the generation of power.

With this steam plant, I was informed by the Bureau of Reclamation only a little while ago, according to the Bureau's preliminary estimate, an additional $80,000,000 of revenue from power will be available in the 40-year repayment period; in other words, if this steam plant is not constructed, if you do not put in that steam plant to firm up this power, it means that the water users of the State of California—the farmers that use that water and have to use it—are going to have to pay $80,000,000 more for water than they would have to pay if you had a balanced power development in connection with this project.

For these reasons I regret very sincerely what the committee has done about this matter, and I hope this item will be restored before this bill becomes law. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost, there is national defense. Every American is interested in the defense of this country. We are determined that it shall be the best defense that any country has ever seen. If need be, we are ready to divert all our normal energies to the building of a gigantic defense machine. I am for that. Not because I like militarism, not because I believe in a vast armament program as a means of checking the terrible depression in which we found ourselves, but because world events seem to require it.

But I am definitely opposed to the use of our national-defense program as a catch-all for every kind of expenditure known to man. In the last few weeks our national parks, our fish and wildlife, our grazing surfaces have been classified as defense agencies. St. Elizabeths Hospital, for over a generation a hospital for the mentally sick, has been officially made a defense agency within the last week. If someone wants to get a little pork-barrel legislation, the approved Washington etiquette tells him to label it "national defense." I say that this is a fraud upon the American public.

Let me make myself clear on this point. I do not for a moment suggest that the entire national-defense program is subject to this criticism, but in the last month the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ENGEL, has issued two reports on the construction of American training camps, revealing excessive expenditures of more than $10,000,000. The gentleman from Michigan, Representative ENGEL, made personal inspections of these camps and discovered that in instance after instance your money was being squandered. In one case there was not even a plan listing the total number of buildings to be erected at the camp, while construction was actually under way. In another a railroad line

was pushed through 15 miles of rock. In a third, a camp was built upon a sharp grade, which required the expenditure of thousands of dollars unnecessarily.

Altogether the present Congress, in not more than 100 days, has voted appropriations totaling $16,091,543,000. No national legislature in the history of mankind has ever spent so much money in so little time. But what is even more amazing is the fact that very few people in Washington seem to be concerned about how this money is to be raised. So far the largest sum mentioned in the way of revenue for the coming year amounts to about two-thirds of the total estimated expenditure.

Just what is the American people's reaction to these appropriations and the absolute indifference of the administration to meeting our obligations? Why hasn't the Federal Government insisted upon a reduction of normal departmental expenditures? The President and his official spokesmen have asked the people of the United States to prepare for sacrifices, but the fact is that our Government has refused to make the slightest sacrifice of its own. The Federal Government is still spending tremendous sums on routine office functions without so much as demanding a penny off for national sacrifice. [Applause.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this Congress will soon be called upon to decide whether or not the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway will become a reality. From the time that the earliest explorers traveled through the chain of lakes and rivers that empty the waters of the Great Lakes into the sea—lakes and rivers that made a natural highway straight into the heart of our great continent—men have looked toward the time when the land obstacles and rapids would be cleared away and permit the commerce of the West to go uninterrupted to the sea.

Real pressure for the waterway did not become felt until the Middle West became well settled. By 1890 Chicago had attained a population of over a million people. Grain and cattle were raised in abundance and the manufacturing centers of Detroit, Toledo, and Cleveland roared into action until by the turn of the century the "age of steel" was in the ascendancy. By 1900 the meat-packing industry was expanding in Chicago. In 1903 Henry Ford started to manufacture automobiles. Shipping on the Great Lakes was fast becoming a major industry. Concurrently with all of these, the railroad-car shops of Cleveland were expanded greatly in order to supply the rolling stock to transport the products of this increased industrialization.

Parallel to this industrial and agricultural expansion of the Middle West came the demand for cheaper transportation. For a time this demand for cheaper transportation took its expression in an attempt to lower and equalize railroad freight rates. In this struggle of the Plains for cheaper rates the Grange took an active part. Soon, however, it became apparent that there was a level below which it was impossible to lower the freight rates of railroad transportation.

OTHER WATER ROUTES DEVELOPED

Water transportation then came in for its share of attention. The Mississippi River was dredged and made more navigable. In 1914 the Panama Canal was opened to commerce. Both of these developments, while they were paid for out of the common funds of the Nation, placed the Middle West at a disadvantage. New York was made closer to San Francisco from the standpoint of freight cost, while the rise in railroad freight rates had just the opposite effect on goods moving from Chicago to California.

During this time the movement for a water route utilizing the existing Great Lakes system was taking form. First agitation for the construction of a navigable waterway upon the St. Lawrence River originated in Canada, and we find pamphlets and essays on its advisability appearing as early as 1832. When the area of the Great Lakes Basin had been transformed from a sparsely settled area to a fast developing industrial and commercial area, the people there joined their demand for a waterway with that of the Canadians. As a result of the joint interest and demand for such a waterway, an organization was formed, called the International Deep Waterways Association, which held its first meeting in 1895. Following this meeting sufficient interest was created so that the President of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada appointed deep-waterways commissions. In 1897 the United States Deep Waterways Commission reported that there were two possible routes for such a waterway, the St. Lawrence and the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk Canals, either of which were feasible.

In 1902 the Governments of the United States and Canada appointed a joint commission on the waterway, which functioned in various forms until 1914, at which time there was a cessation of activity in this regard because of the war. After the war all of the factors that had been favorable to the project had been increased.

NEED FOR CHEAP POWER IN QUANTITY

Coincident with the industrialization of the Middle West was the great need for cheap industrial power. The Great Lakes seaway aroused the interest of the manufacturers on that score, since it is the greatest single source of electricity in North America. Many leases were granted by New York State to private persons and corporations that were interested in developing the power of the St. Lawrence River. Notable among these was the Long Sault Co., which is a subsidiary of the Aluminum Corporation of America. So valuable do private interests consider the power rights alone that one corporation, the Hugh L. Cooper & Co., offered to invest $1,300,000,000 in developing the power sites and to make the Government a gift of the cost of navigation that was joint with power development.

The Federal Government and the State of New York have consistently, however, attempted to keep this great natural source of power for the people, following the policy expressed by Charles Evans Hughes in 1907, when he was Governor of New York, when he said:

> The water power should not be surrendered to private interests, but should be preserved and held for the benefit of the people.

In the period of the twenties the movement for the waterway was kept alive, and finally in 1932 the Governments of Canada and the United States signed a treaty. This treaty, while it received more than a majority of the votes in the Senate, failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds for ratification.

Once again this proposal is going to be before the Congress, and once again the hopes of the people of the Lakes area hang in the balance. Again Congress has the opportunity to authorize a great project that will enhance the economic well-being of the entire Nation.

NEED FOR WATERWAY INCREASING

The reasons for adopting this plan are even more impelling today than they were in 1934, when more than a majority of the Senators of the United States voted for the project. Today the extra electric power is needed for our defense effort. The secluded haven of the Great Lakes is needed for building ships to replace the ships that are daily being sent to the bottom of the ocean in the present war.

While other countries are spending billions of dollars to obtain a few miles of seacoast, 3,000 miles of seacoast can be made available to the people of the United States by completing this project. A survey of the people and interests that are opposing the building of this waterway, together with their arguments, discloses that the only influences that are alined in opposition are selfish interests that do not have the whole interest of our country at heart.

I have previously answered the attacks of these interests but choose now to answer an argument that has been advanced since my last address on this subject on April 3. Recently there have been arguments advanced attacking the provisions of the agreement that provides for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway on the basis that it would jeopardize the navigability of the Mississippi River. May I say for the record that I do not in any way intend that the development or maintenance of any present or future waterway should be impaired by this project. I favor developing to the fullest the natural avenues of commerce that exist in this country, believing that it is only through an expansion of our trade both here and with other lands that we can eventually realize the greatest benefits of civilization, and raise to the highest levels our standard of living.

WILL NOT JEOPARDIZE THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

It is the contention of those fearing for the Mississippi River system that the clause in the agreement that provides for arbitration in cases of diversion will make it possible for Canada to imperil the navigability of the Mississippi River by re-

fusing to permit diversion of sufficient water to operate the system.

The amount of water diversion necessary to operate the Mississippi River at greatest efficiency and without danger of floods is from 1,000 to 1,500 cubic feet per second. This amount was judicially determined by Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes. Prior to his appointment as Chief Justice, Charles Evans Hughes was named as master in chancery to hear the testimony and to report to the Supreme Court relative to diversion of the waters of the Great Lakes. He reported to the Supreme Court of the United States that 1,000 to 1,500 cubic feet per second was the amount necessary to operate the system to maintain the navigability of the Mississippi River, and that any amount over this would make floods likely in the Mississippi River.

There is enough water being diverted now to operate the Mississippi River system. The agreement for the Great Lakes seaway does not open to arbitration present diversions of water, but only amounts greater than permitted on January 1, 1940. If there is any danger of such a provision imperiling the use of this great and valuable water route—the Mississippi—I say now is the time that we should write into this agreement an amount to be diverted for this purpose, or a provision that will for all time guarantee the availability of sufficient water for that system, provided, of course, that it shall not detract from the already recognized interest of the several States bordering on the Great Lakes.

May I reiterate that since there is now enough water being diverted to supply the needs of the Mississippi to the Gulf waterway and the agreement does not open to arbitration any existing diversion I fail to see how it could in any way imperil the future use of the Mississippi for navigation.

WOULD CREATE NEW WEALTH

The completion of the seaway would create new wealth in the Middle West, and in so doing would benefit the whole country. Dynamic Detroit would turn its energies to building ships, storing goods, processing raw materials, and the hundred and one functions that take place in a seaport. The dangerous movement of industry toward the center of economic control, Wall Street, would be reversed. More than any other section of the country wealth created in Michigan and the Central States permeates the whole Nation. Do you recall the return of prosperity in 1935 and 1936? It was Detroit that led the Nation. The rush back to normal business brought the whole country with it.

The same is true today with Detroit leading the Nation as the arms producer: men of all States are drawn there. In our need for ships today what would we not give for additional boat-building facilities. There are those who today say that even if we start to build the waterway it will not be done in time to do any good. I say to you that those same persons were saying the same thing when Congress voted 3 years ago to expand the Navy. Such an attitude would preclude ever doing anything that would take more than a few months to complete and is advanced not as a valid argument but only to delay even further the ultimate realization of the waterway.

We are now in a period of work for everyone because of the great defense effort. The industrial genius of Detroit can continue this prosperity long after the defense program is over. There will be a need of ships to be built over and above the capacity of existing facilities. Creation of the new shipyards would not in any sense detract from the existing ones as ships to replace the millions of tons that are now beneath the waves will require the combined use of all the yards and ways available.

The completion of this project will for the years to come be a great boon directly to the millions of people who live in the great central area of the continent, and indirectly to those other millions of the United States who will have this great waterway as a trade route tapping the richest farming and commercial section of the country. It will culminate more than a century of hopes and plans of the people of this section, and will not damage the interests of any other segment of our population. It is essential for defense, but even more for the peacetime well-being of our Nation.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I understand there are no further requests for time on the minority side, and I therefore ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6, on page 1.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4590, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1942, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include a letter signed by Mr. John B. Haggerty, president of the International Allied Printing Trades Association; also a letter of transmittal and minority and majority opinions in connection with the recent decision in the so-called Texas cases by the Federal Communications Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent for two other extensions of my own remarks, including in one a brief editorial from the Miami Herald, and in the other a resolution recently adopted by the Kentucky State Bar Association on the regulation of administrative agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] be permitted to extend his remarks in two particulars, by the inclusion of two editorials, one from the New York Sun, and one from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Lewis Merrill, president of the Office and Professional Workers of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a letter from Lewis Allen Berne, international president of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE STRIKE AT THE FORD MOTOR CO.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the legislative business has been disposed of, I be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the matter to which I wish to call the attention of the House today is in connection with the Ford strike. I heard a statement made on the floor of the House sometime ago that the damage caused in the Ford plant on April 1 and subsequent days up until the 4th was caused by loyal employees of the Ford Co. I quote from the testimony of Mr. Edgar F. Wait, superintendent of the tire plant:

Edgar F. Wait, superintendent of the tire plant, gives testimony which shows that the slow-down of April 1 and the destruction of property was caused by a member of the C. I. O. employed at Ford's.

He was asked to describe what happened on the afternoon of April 1, 1941 (105) and, after testifying that early in the afternoon there were a lot of small incidents that practically shut production down he said that about 4 o'clock in the afternoon there was a definite slow-down through the entire tire plant.

He testified that normally a builder will make about 15 tires an hour. "On the bead

job, will make several hundred beads an hour, and we found there was a definite slow-down, and they told me that they had been instructed they were to get 5 beads an hour, roughly, instead of 180, or 1 or 2 tires an hour.

"Q. Who told you this?

"A. Union men in the shop.

"The men I talked to had C. I. O. buttons on" (106).

On redirect examination, he testified that the Ford employee who told him of the instructions for the slow-down was Roy J. Doyle.

This witness further testified:

"One of the electricians had gone to the calender line that supplies material for the fabric building the tire where they are processed, and they had asked them to slow down twice. * * * In the creel room, there are about 1,500 cords come out on separate spools and they are brought together to make fabric 60 inches wide. Out of the 1,500 cords, somebody cut, I will estimate, six or seven hundred of them" (107).

That happened about 4:30 or 4:35 and "our situation was that we simply couldn't operate."

Upon examination by the court, the witness said (108), referring to the instructions for the slow-down:

"The COURT. Did they state who had given them the instructions?

"Answer. They said they had instructions from the union."

There had been (109) "a gradual slow-down in the plant for a period of 2 weeks. We took a number of men back. They said they had been put out for union activities. That is what the union claimed and the week they were in, our production dropped 15 to 16 percent. Before this, there had been a definite slow-down, even though we put union men back to work."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GERRYMANDERING

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House at this time in view of the fact that a proposal has been made by a legislative committee of the Massachusetts Legislature to gerrymander the State of Massachusetts so as to insure the election of only 2 Democrats out of a total delegation of 14 Representatives in Congress. The gerrymander, a nefarious practice of political legerdemain, has been used more flagrantly in this particular case than ever before in the history of the use of that pernicious political system, designed to defeat the will of the people in their free choice of representatives in government. The history of gerrymandering is very interesting, and I ask the Members to listen to it for a few minutes. I think the gentlemen will be quite interested in how this practice first originated; and, by the way, it originated in Massachusetts back in 1811.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of what the gentleman said, I wonder if the practice is as unfair as he suggests and if the Massachusetts Legislature followed the Labor Board in setting up election districts, for example, in which they included the labor union at Crystal City, Mo.

Mr. HEALEY. Oh, I can anticipate what the gentleman is going to say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think they are off the same piece of cloth?

Mr. HEALEY. And I can answer it by saying that there is no analogy between the two. I do not yield further.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, let me finish the sentence I started.

Mr. HEALEY. I do not yield to the gentleman any further.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I may be permitted to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. HEALEY. I yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that immediately following the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] he be permitted to address the House for 3 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

"GERRYMANGLING" MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, with the forbearance of the membership of this House, I wish to turn back in the annals of political bossism in America to the year 1812; the place, Massachusetts. It will be recalled that during that remote year an ill-famed mythological monster, the gerrymander, first reared its unglamorous head on the American scene.

I am prompted to take this action by the realization that, with congressional reapportionment at hand, there are others, particularly in Massachusetts, who are delving into those annals and have turned wooing eyes toward that creature of fearful mien and malodorous repute. I am particularly inspired to do so by the fear that, in my State, with the traditional impetuosity of hasty love, Republican suitors for the favors of this fabulous creature may be entirely too engrossed in its fabled dowry to note, with unjaundiced eye, its physical imperfections.

For the chronicles of this legendary monstrosity raise some suspicion that somewhere in the remote genealogy of the gerrymander appeared the genus mephitis—commonly known as the striped polecat. Some slight credibility is given to the impeachment by the fact that in the excitement of attacking its opponents with hideous noises and frightful grimaces, the beast so far forgot itself as to unleash upon its creators such an horrendous stench as to cause them politically to wither and die forthwith.

There are now certain Republicans in Massachusetts who have bailed the creature out of cold storage and are intent on streamlining and glamorizing it for a return engagement on the American scene. Born gerrymander in 1812, it is to make its second debut as "glamourmander" in 1941. Under these circumstances, were I to remain silent in my knowledge of its past iniquities, I should be guilty of contributing to the masquerade. For that reason I presume upon the patience of this House to outline briefly what is known of the case history of this rapacious sesquicentenarian.

Although the authorship of the term "gerrymander" and the paternity of the original caricature are obscured in doubt and conflict, the time and circumstances surrounding the coining of the word—one which has long since found its way into the accepted usage of our language—are matters of certainty.

It arose in 1812 out of the bold attempt of the Jeffersonian Republican Party—also known as the Democratic Party—to perpetuate itself in office by arbitrarily cutting up the State of Massachusetts into senatorial districts which would insure the election of a Jeffersonian Republican majority in the Senate.

In 1811, the Massachusetts State election resulted in a complete victory for the Jeffersonian Republican Party over the Federalists, Elbridge Gerry being elected to the governorship and a majority being elected to both house and senate. Hon. Joseph Story, of Salem, was chosen as speaker of the house but later resigned his office to accept appointment as Justice of the United States Supreme Court and was succeeded by Eleazer W. Ripley. Hon. Samuel Dana, of Middlesex County, was chosen as president of the senate.

In January 1812 the Senate and House passed a measure appointing a committee—

> To consider the subject of a new law to alter the districts now established for the choice of counsellors and senators and to determine what alterations may be necessary therein.

Without delay, and presumably with a calculating eye on the "rotten boroughs" of England, the committee went to work on what was to earn undying fame as the "gerrymander." The bill was passed by slim majorities in both houses of the legislature and Governor Gerry signed it, thereby acquiring unenviable distinction and a namesake.

For authorship of the term and creator of the original caricature we can only resort to conflicting accounts. The following account was printed in the New England Historical and Genealogical Register in 1873:

> The true history of the "gerrymander" is as follows * * *: "The map of the county of Essex, designating the boundary of the senatorial districts, was drawn by Nathan Hale, who with Henry Sedgwick were editors of the Weekly Messenger. It was printed in that paper March 6, 1812. The extraordinary division of the county, and adding Chelsea from the county of Suffolk, in order to secure a Democratic majority in the senate, was such a piece of political management as to produce a general outcry. The map was copied into some of the other newspapers, and at a dinner party at the house of Mr. Thorndike, an eminent merchant of that day in Boston, it was exhibited by Mr. Cogswell, afterward librarian of the Astor Library. The form of the district was a subject of remark, and it was said that it resembled some horrible animal and only wanted wings to make a frightful political dragon. Mr. Tisdale took his pencil and sketched the wings, and there was a discussion about the name, some suggesting that of salamander. Mr. Alsop proposed that of "gerrymander," which was adopted.

At variance with this is the following report of James S. Loring in his Hundred

Boston Orators, published in 1852. After citing the fact that Judge Story was reputed to have originated the plan, it states:

It is highly probable, however, that the Honorable Samuel Dana, who was president of the senate in that session, was the originator of this measure, which was caricatured in the Boston Gazette of March 1812 by an engraving, executed by E. Tisdale, a miniature painter, representing the new order of districting in the form of an unsightly skeleton, and was first exhibited in the Centinel office. Washington Allston, calling there with James Ogilvie, a lecturer on oratory, and noticing the figure, remarked to Russell, the editor, "What an odd-looking creature is this. It looks like a salamander." On which Ogilvie, quick as light, replies, "Why, let it be named 'gerrymander' for the Governor." We relate this on the authority of Dr. Joseph Palmer, who had the statement from Benjamin Russell.

Still another account is given by Joseph T. Buckingham, in his Specimens of Newspaper Literature in 1850:

In 1811, when Mr. Gerry was Governor of the Commonwealth, the legislature made a new division of the districts for the election of Representatives to Congress (?). Both branches then had a Democratic majority. For the purpose of securing a Democratic Representative an absurd and singular arrangement of towns in the county of Essex was made to compose a district. Russell took a map of the county and designated by a particular coloring the towns thus selected. He then hung the map on the wall of his editorial closet. One day Gilbert Stuart, the celebrated painter, looked at the map and said the towns, which Russell had thus distinguished, formed a picture resembling some monstrous animal. He took a pencil, and with a few touches added what might be supposed to represent claws. "There," said Stuart, "that will do for a salamander." Russell, who was busy with his pen, looked up at the hideous figure and exclaimed, "Salamander! Call it Gerrymander." The word became a proverb, and for many years was in popular usage among the Federalists as a term of reproach to the legislature which had distinguished itself by this act of political turpitude. An engraving of the gerrymander was made and hawked about the State.

The gerrymander did not immediately disappoint the expectations of its fond parents. In 1812 the election of Senators under the gerrymander law resulted in 29 Jeffersonian Republicans and only 11 Federalist Senators being elected, despite the fact that the total number of votes cast for Federalist candidates outnumbered those cast for Jeffersonian Republican candidates, 51,766 Federalist votes being cast to 50,164 for the Jeffersonian Republicans.

However, and hereby hangs the moral, in the State election of April 5, 1813, the Federal Party triumphed completely over their opponents, Governor Gerry being defeated for reelection, and even the gerrymander district casting a majority of votes for the Federalist candidates.

In the Salem Gazette the following day the following obituary appeared:

We announce in our paper of today, we confess with no great regret, the death of that far-famed and ill-begotten monster the gerrymander. This delicate monster has been pining ever since last November, when he terribly strained himself in attempting to swallow one of his parents. But, regardless of the consequences of that wicked and injudicious attempt, he yesterday made another most desperate effort to swallow three of his nearest relations, and immediately expired in the most agonizing struggles—a loud warning to all his relations in this and the neighboring States.

As epilogue it should be told that, although Elbridge Gerry was later elected to the Vice Presidency of the United States, he failed to receive the electoral vote of his own State, despite his otherwise truly great and illustrious career in the service of the State and Nation.

And now, Mr. Speaker, may I depart from the historical and allegorical to discuss the tentative plan for congressional redistricting which has been proposed by the Republican majority of the Massachusetts legislative committee on congressional redistricting?

Bluntly and without refinements, the plan is to so carve up the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as to change the present ratio of the Massachusetts congressional representation from the present 9 Republicans and 6 Democrats to 12 Republicans and 2 Democrats, 1 Congressman being lost to Massachusetts as a result of the reapportionment law.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that this bold attempt to virtually legislate out of existence the Democratic Party in Massachusetts is being made in the face of the following facts:

Since 1928 the State of Massachusetts has voted decisive majorities to the Democratic candidate for President in each of four national elections without interruption. During the same period the people of Massachusetts have accorded majorities to the Democratic candidates for Governor at 5 State elections and to the Republican candidates at only two, one of which was by the narrow margin of less than 5,000 votes.

Against this factual background, the proposed Republican plan stands out as one of the most cold-blooded attempts at extirpation of political opposition ever attempted on the American scene.

In having compared that ill-famed creature of Governor Gerry's administration to the monstrous proposals advanced today in Massachusetts, I am guilty of a calumny for which I tender my humble apologies—to the gerrymander. Beside the cynical butchery of the map of Massachusetts that is today contemplated, the manipulations of that long-past administration shrink to the stature of childish pranks.

To call this device gerrymandering would be to ennoble it by the comparison. It is not gerrymandering, it is "gerrymangling." It does not end with tortured and unnatural grouping of communities, but proceeds to carve and mangle large cities in order that the pieces may be thrown into districts with which they share no natural community of interests and for the purpose of frustrating the will of the majority. Somerville, Lynn, and Lawrence, all cities of well over 100,000 people and coincidentally Democratic in political complexion, are to be dismembered and partitioned ruthlessly in order to deprive them of an effective voice in the selection of their National Representatives.

The key piece in this political jigsaw puzzle, the vortex around which the whole plan gyrates, the prize "gerrymangle" of them all, is to be a district fated to serve as the private domain of the dynasty of Senator Angier L. Goodwin. Centered in what are believed to be the special preserves of Senator Goodwin, the proposed district stretches north and south, with a slice of dismembered Somerville dangling on one end and a piece of partitioned Lawrence on the other. It is the fond, although I believe misguided, hope of the progenitors of the plan to entrench themselves in this district as their citadel of boss rule. The original gerrymander contemplated the advantage of a political party. This "gerrymangle" envisions only the personal aggrandizement of an individual.

Grand strategy of the projected coup d'etat is to expatriate incumbent Democratic Congressmen from their districts, despoil them of their constituencies, figuratively snatch their seats from under them. In pursuance of this design, a district has been jigsawed around to confine within its borders no less than three incumbent Democratic Congressmen—a bald and unblushing act of political quarantine. Nowhere is the intent to frustrate the will of the majority more transparent than in this phase of the plan. It is obvious that those who aspire to profit from this maiming and mangling of the Commonwealth have no faith in their ability to do so in an open and democratic manner on the issues before the people in fair, compact, and natural districts. Rather do they attempt to do so by chicanery and stratagem by attempting to build walls of exclusion to shut out effective opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is needless for me to dwell at length on districts whose compactness and contiguity are strained almost to the point of fiction or upon the great inequalities in population between proposed districts. Those are well-known devices of political bossism.

But in sum and substance the proposed plan for redistricting in Massachusetts adds up to the most high-handed attempt to entrench boss rule and destroy the two-party system ever projected in any State of this Union.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that I do not charge the Republican State administration with responsibility for this proposed outrage to traditional American principles of fairness and American democratic institutions. The paternity of the "gerrymangle" is unknown. All we know is that it was submitted by the Republican majority on the redistricting committee as a tentative plan. We do not know where it came from but we do hope that it will go back there.

I feel confident that the fair-mindedness and Americanism of Governor Saltonstall would never permit him to approve such a proposal. I am equally confident that the great bulk of fair-minded Republican legislators in the Massachusetts Legislature would refuse to sanction such a travesty on the democratic system of government. I am sure, too, that all must realize that the adoption and approval of such a scheme could

only result in eventual disaster to those who participated. The great mass of Massachusetts citizens — Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—would effectuate their indignation by sweeping out of office any administration that tolerated such an assault on the two-party system.

Mr. Speaker, during the short span it has been with us, the "gerrymangle" has displayed the same malodorous propensities that distinguished its predecessor. It is to be hoped that it may be induced peaceably to depart before it precipitates like catastrophic consequences. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Mr. J. M. Dille, secretary-manager of Northern Colorado Conservancy District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, following the regular business of the House and any special orders that may have been entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GERRYMANDERING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], speaking figuratively, shed many tears over the situation of the people in Massachusetts. He thought they were being deprived of some of their rights; but as far as I know the gentleman from Massachusetts has not done any weeping over the situation of some employees who want to bargain collectively, but who cannot do so because of the peculiar rulings of the N. L. R. B. I refer to the case of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. against National Labor Relations Board, decided April 28, from which it appears on page 2 that six plants of the plate-glass division, located in five different States, Ford City, Pa., Creighton, Pa., Mount Vernon, Ohio, Clarksburg, W. Va., Henryetta, Okla., and Crystal City, Mo., were all joined by the Labor Board in one election district. So that according to the Supreme Court decision, 1,600 employees down at Crystal City cannot bargain through representatives of their own choosing, but are forced to do their bargaining through representatives chosen by employees in other cities and other States.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you so graciously yielded to me, I believe I will.

Mr. HEALEY. I want to say to the gentleman in answer to his first statement that I had not done any weeping about the opportunity of employees to bargain collectively——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I mean these.

Mr. HEALEY. That I have consistently voted for measures and supported measures that would assure the employees of America the right to bargain collectively, while to the best of my knowledge the gentleman has fought such measures as vigorously as he possibly could, and has taken every occasion he possibly could on the floor to defeat the purpose he mentions, the right of employees to bargain collectively.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The only trouble with the gentleman's statement is that he is not accurate as to my position, and the Supreme Court does not agree with him as to the effect of the National Labor Relations Act. In the longshoremen's case—308 United States 401—which is cited in this decision, decided on April 28, the Supreme Court held that the A. F. of L. members on the west coast could not bargain through representatives of their own choosing; and the result of this decision—Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. against National Labor Relations Board, United States Supreme Court, April 28, 1941—is that the 1,600 employees of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. cannot bargain through representatives of their own choosing.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now.

The only trouble with the gentleman's position is that while he voted for the Wagner law, which, in effect, denies the right of collective bargaining, I have sought to amend the Wagner law, section 9-a-b, I believe it is, so that the employees of a particular unit of a plant in a given city could select their representatives for collective bargaining and not be compelled to bargain as these employees are in Crystal City through representatives selected by men in other cities.

It is just a difference of opinion about what the law is and what it means. As it happens, the Supreme Court has construed the law as I have indicated and the express provisions of section 7 are destroyed by the Court's construction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is much hysteria throughout the Nation today on the subject of strikes in industry. This hysteria is seen most clearly in the press, in inspired editorials, and among certain groups of this Congress. The picture is drawn that organized labor is deliberately indulging in an orgy of strikes directed against our national-defense effort, designed to impede our armament program. You have only to pick up any great daily newspaper to see that a concerted campaign is under way to paint labor as the principal bar to the completion of our national armament plan.

The picture is drawn to labor's disadvantage. The impression is deliberately given that organized labor is out to take advantage of the defense program to advance its own ends, at no matter what cost to the Nation or to our security. This picture is drawn a hundred times daily, not only in the press and in speeches, but also in the flood of bills aimed at organized labor that have recently been introduced.

Every strike, even the smallest, and even those involving a few dozen or a few score of workers, is played up beyond any previous standards of news or political value. Newspapers that previously did not bother to report news of interest to the labor movement and to the workers are putting strike stories on the first page, dealing with them at great length in editorials. Certain groups in Congress who previously were not interested in the affairs of the labor movement—unless it was to vote against legislation designed to reinforce labor's right to organize and bargain collectively—are suddenly blossoming out as experts on labor matters, with bills in their pockets designed to take care of all our problems in labor relations. The problem of labor relations is on everyone's lips and in everyone's mind. Everyone has his own pet solution, which he is willing and eager to offer to the Nation and to see enacted into Federal or State law. Almost all of these proposals, offered in Congress and promoted in the daily press, are aimed at curbing strikes, aimed at reducing the amount of time lost through industrial disputes.

We can agree that strikes are undesirable. We can agree—and organized labor is the first to assent to this—that labor relations can be peaceful, that there is no need for costly struggles between labor and management. No group is more anxious than organized labor to avoid strikes. No group is more anxious to put labor relations on a peaceful, orderly basis than organized labor and its responsible leaders. Strikes are serious matters to the workers involved. They imply loss of wages, loss of working time, grave risks of injury, and even death, to the men who are forced to take to the picket line. Strikes are not embarked upon lightly. They are always the last resort of working men and women who have been convinced that no other way of settling their grievances is available to them. No union undertakes to strike until all possible avenues of settlement have been closed. Far from promoting strikes out of a desire to do mischief, responsible industrial unions take every possible step to avoid them. Union contracts signed by representatives of the workers and of management contain elaborate machinery for settling disputes without recourse to strikes. Responsible unions—including both unions in the A. F. of L. and in the C. I. O.—negotiate for weeks

and even months before they take to the picket line. A recent example is that of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which negotiated over a period of 11 months for the renewal of its contract, during which period no strike took place or was contemplated. Another example is the steel workers' union, which opened negotiations with the major sections of the steel industry for the renewal of its contract many weeks before the renewal was achieved.

Perhaps this basic truth of the labor situation would be clearer if the newspapers and certain forces in this country had not taken so much pains to confuse the issue involved. We hear a constant barrage of criticism and vituperation directed against the labor movement because strikes do take place, because workers do stop work in the interest of achieving their demands for higher wages and better living and working standards. We hear almost nothing about the real cause of strikes. Almost nothing is said—or, if it is said, only on the back pages of the papers—about the real reasons why workers go on strike. What are some of these causes, some of the reasons why workers are impelled to undertake the hard way of settling a dispute with their employers?

Strikes have two main origins—the refusal of employers to grant needed wage increases and the refusal of employers to bargain collectively with the democratically elected representatives of their employees.

Let us look at the first of these two main causes before we proceed to the question of collective bargaining and the right of workers to withhold their labor power in an organized manner. For this purpose let us look at some figures the United States Government has collected on wages and living costs and contrast them with figures the corporations have announced publicly revealing the profits they have made.

According to a recent Government study undertaken in California—I refer to figures announced by the Heller committee—it takes an annual income of $2,200 to keep an American family of 5, 3 children and 2 adults, on a decent living standard. This income, broken down to its simplest budgetary items, provides the following standard of living: 34 cents a day for food for each member of the family, 11 cents per meal; 1 overcoat every 6 years for the head of the family; 1 suit every 2 years. For the mother, 1 warm coat and 1 good dress every 3 years; $34 a month for housing, which obviously means substandard housing, especially in these days of rapidly rising rents; for such essentials as medical care, $1.50 a week; for recreation, culture, and the like, $5 a year; for church and charity, exactly 35 cents a week; for luxuries, nothing; for savings, nothing; for sudden emergencies such as every family faces, nothing.

In other words, $2,200 a year is hardly an exalted standard of living. A family of five would do well to get by on minimum standards with such an income. Yet how many people in the United States enjoy such an income? According to a report of the Social Security Board, only 8 people out of 100 have an income of $2,200 a year. Only 23 out of 100 have as much as $1,400 a year. Less than 29 of 100 have as much as $1,200 a year. And one-third of all the people in the United States have less than $400 a year to live on and to raise a family on.

Now, let us look at the contrast between these earnings of workers and the profits of the big corporations. Again using official reports, we find that 6 corporations had net profits in 1940 of $776,000,000. These corporations employed 904,000 workers. They made, therefore, an average profit of $860 on each worker employed during 1940 over and above the wages the worker was paid. These profit figures, as I said, are net; they are reported after every possible deduction is subtracted from the gross profit.

Let us look for a moment, also, at how these profits have increased over 1939. One aircraft concern reports an increase of 3,000 percent. Another reports a 1,370-percent increase—the Vultee Corporation—where you may recall a 2-week strike in which the workers asked for an increase over their average earnings of 50 cents an hour. A steel company reports increase of 148 percent. Another—Tom Girdler's Republic Steel—reports a 98-percent boost in profits. A shipbuilding firm had an increase of 211 percent, a coal company one of 5,700 percent, and so on. These profit figures are for 1940. They will be much higher in 1941, now that our defense program has got into its stride. And wages, except where organized labor is able to enforce its demands, have stood still. Where these demands have been won by organized labor wages have gone up—but not by 3,000 percent, or even 100 percent, but by $1 a day or by 10 cents an hour, or by 10 percent of total earnings.

These figures of wages and profits provide one basic reason why workers organize into unions and why, when their just and reasonable demands for wage increases are refused, they go on strike. Another reason equally basic is the frequent refusal of profit-swollen corporations to bargain collectively with the representatives chosen by the workers in democratic elections.

As we all know, the law of the United States requires employers to bargain collectively in good faith, requires them to recognize unions when chosen by a majority of their workers, requires them to refrain from intimidation and other interference with collective bargaining. And, as we also know, many corporations, including some of those most blessed with profitable defense orders and contracts, refuse flatly to bargain collectively as the law requires. We know that some of these corporations have consistently defied the National Labor Relations Act ever since it was written, and have so far gone unpunished or even unrebuked.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act is the law of the land. It was passed by an overwhelming majority of Congress in response to the demand of the people of this Nation for a law to protect the basic right to organize and to bargain collectively for better living and working conditions. That law has not been amended, despite vigorous efforts of certain elements in this country that have been waging a campaign against the rights it puts into Federal law. Yet that act, passed by Congress and regarded by all workers as the Magna Carta of industrial democracy, is consistently and successfully flouted by many of the wealthiest and most profitable corporations in the Nation. Is it any wonder that organized labor occasionally takes to the picket lines after it has exhausted every other means of settling its disputes with managements, after it has seen its just and reasonable demands for needed wage increases ignored, after it has seen the laws of the United States defied by the rich and powerful?

I will not burden you with statistics on the number of strikes or the amount of man-days lost in recent months. Government witnesses have testified at length before congressional committees, proving that there have been many fewer strikes in recent months than there were in a similar war period in 1917 and 1918. It has been shown that organized labor today is conducting its relations with management with a minimum of strikes or stoppages. It has been shown repeatedly, and attested by high Government officials, that labor is making its full contribution to the defense program. This testimony and these figures are available to all who care to heed them.

Yet today, in spite of these facts, in spite of these basic truths that are available to all, we have an atmosphere of hysteria against organized labor, an atmosphere that I regret to note has swept Congress to the point of seriously considering passage of bills that would destroy labor's right to organize, would destroy labor's right to bargain collectively, would destroy labor's right to strike. Chief among these repressive proposals is the Vinson bill, H. R. 4139, reported out of the House Naval Affairs Committee after 2 days of hearings and recommended to this House for passage.

This bill would impose a so-called cooling-off period on labor before it could take strike action following a strike vote. During that period the dispute would be submitted to compulsory arbitration.

It would forbid unions and employers to sign a union-shop contract except in shops where such a contract already exists—in other words, it would freeze wages and working conditions at present levels, particularly in plants that were not organized prior to passage of the bill. It would freeze the open shop, make union shops in unorganized industries illegal.

It would permit employers to discharge workers under suspicion of being subversive, with no proof of the charges required and no penalty against the employers if the charges or suspicions were later shown to be wrong.

It would curtail and make impossible the most normal routine union activities in organizing workers by allowing anti-labor enforcement agencies to describe such activities as coercive, and thus illegal.

Let us examine this cooling-off proposal in some detail. On the face of it, it is made to sound logical and reasonable, to sound like a sane and sensible

proposal to delay and prevent strikes. Actually it is nothing of the kind. To begin with, the idea of cooling off is designed to put the onus for all strikes on the workers. It is designed to make strikes appear the work of hot-headed, irresponsible union leaders who need some sort of cold douche to bring them back to their senses. But strikes are not caused by the irresponsible acts of individual union leaders. They are caused by long-standing grievances that accumulate over a long period of time, grievances that are not settled by other means. The proposed cooling-off period would not remove these grievances. On the contrary, the status quo that caused the strike vote would not be touched by cooling off. The grievances would remain unsettled, still rankling in the minds of the workers. And the workers will interpret cooling off, no matter in what phrases it is disguised, as an attack on the fundamental American right to strike.

They will see on the one side the corporations piling up huge profits, refusing to agree to just and reasonable demands of wage increases, and on the other side their own unions deprived of their last resort in enforcing those demands—the right to strike. Without this right the unions would have no real bargaining power. They could not hope to go to the employers as equals. They could only go as supplicants, hoping that the employers will grant their demands, with no possibility of using their economic strength to make these demands felt. American workers do not take kindly to the idea of going to their employers, or anywhere else for that matter, as supplicants. They regard themselves, as all Americans do, as free men, with the right to take concerted action for the redress of grievances. This right is basic to all the rights that the American people have possessed since our Nation became free. Without this right, the basic fabric of our democracy is threatened. And with that threat comes a threat not only to the rights of the American people but also to the living and working standards they have built up over years of organized effort.

The clause in the Vinson bill outlawing the union shop in unorganized industries is another blow at the vital rights of the organized labor movement. We hear much talk of the supposed evils of the closed or union shop. It is painted as a monstrous device of selfish union leaders to ensure their own power. Actually the union shop is a very simple device by which labor unions seek to guarantee their own existence and the existence of the improved conditions they win from employers. It does not exclude workers from employment in industry. It merely sees to it that good working conditions won over a period of struggle shall not be sacrificed or evaded by employment of nonunion members. It is a safeguard against attempts to weaken or destroy the union through displacement of its members by nonunion workers. It is also a guaranty that all workers who benefit by union-won conditions shall take their share of responsibility for maintaining those improvements. It is a normal, businesslike way to proceed. Employers are organized. They belong to their own trade associations and they deal with each other on the basis of signed contracts guaranteeing certain conditions. For a union to accept anything less when it can secure the union shop would be treason to the interests of its workers. The union shop has worked admirably in scores of basic industries. It is prevalent in all organized industry, recognized by responsible union leaders and employers alike as necessary to good, stable labor relations. To make the union shop illegal would be to set back the clock of labor relations a generation or more. It would reduce labor to the old days of involuntary servitude, where employment under any conditions as set by the master must be accepted. It would be a denial again of all that American democracy has meant to American workers.

All the sections of the Vinson bill are dangerous invasions of civil rights and of the basic freedoms that Americans have won for themselves. One of the most glaring of these invasions is concealed in the section allowing employers to discharge men on the mere suspicion of being "subversive." To begin with, no definition of the word "subversive" is given in the bill. It can include anything the employer may not happen to like. The experience of organized labor has shown that this term, so loosely applied, can be used against union leaders and union members in the industry. Labor has seen this happen time and time again. It has seen union leaders and members who are vigilant in protecting the working standards of themselves and their fellow workers stigmatized as subversive, discriminated against, frequently fired, cut off from the chance of earning a living. Organized labor is, therefore, right in viewing the loose use of this term "subversive" with deep suspicion. It is right not only from its own experience but from the basic fact that American labor is loyal, is patriotic, is devoted to the defense of democracy.

After all, who has a greater stake in democracy than the American worker? Who has more to lose if democracy is lost? Without the guaranties that democracy provides, American labor would live in a condition of servitude, would see all its gains swept away, would see its hard-won standards dissipated overnight. The tactics of smearing militant, progressive trade-unions and their leaders are as old as the industrial system of production. It has been used against every union in our history, sometimes with very damaging effect. It has invariably been used against those whose efforts in behalf of themselves and their families and their fellow workers have been irritating or troublesome to the employer. To give this smear tactics the force of Federal law, as this bill does, would be to underwrite the whole shabby history of persecution and discrimination in American history. It would be to underwrite all the evils exposed by the Senate Committee on Civil Liberties, the evils of industrial espionage and industrial blackmail used so extensively to combat unionism in the past.

A final word on the misuse of the word "coercive" in describing union orzanizing methods. The Vinson bill states, in effect, that unions must not use "coercive methods" in recruiting new members. No definition of the word is given. It is left entirely in the hands of the agencies or individuals enforcing the law. Here, again, organized labor has learned from experience to look with deep suspicion on the loose use of a word or a phrase that can be interpreted in any one of a dozen ways against the normal activities of unions. The Wagner Labor Relations Act was written to prevent such interference with normal and legitimate union activities. It was designed to free labor from such shackles as had been imposed on it in the past. This section of the bill would place these shackles on labor again, would wipe out the gains in industrial democracy that have been made under this most important piece of social legislation. Such a use of the word "coercive" was sought by those who would have amended the Wagner Act over the past few years. Labor and progressive people everywhere fought to preserve the act from such interpretations and amendments. They will not fail to resist this new attack on fundamental rights.

Indeed, the entire organized-labor movement in this country has already shown its unanimous resistance to the Vinson bill. President Green, of the A. F. of L., has described it in a speech to one of the A. F. of L.'s affiliated unions as "an about-face to take liberties away from Americans" and an effort to regiment American labor. A. F. of L. Secretary-Treasurer George Meany described it before the House Rules Committee only last week as "a punitive measure" that would destroy the rights of American workers. "The A. F. of L.," he said, "is absolutely opposed to compulsory labor," which this bill would mean.

C. I. O. President Philip Murray emphatically warned the affiliates of his organization that the bill "will seriously endanger the future existence of our unions." He further warned in a letter to House Naval Affairs Committee Chairman VINSON that:

> The contents of this bill and the procedure which has been adopted by your committee in connection therewith merit the most forthright condemnation and opposition of organized labor.

As I pointed out earlier, this bill was rushed through the House Naval Affairs Committee with blitzkrieg speed. Only 2 days were given over to hearings on a measure affecting the daily lives of millions of men and women and the whole welfare of the Nation. Only two witnesses were heard.

This bill is a dangerous measure. It is dangerous not only to the millions of workers who will be covered by it but to the entire fabric of democracy in our country. President Roosevelt has pointed out that our defense program demands a happy, contented people whose devotion to democracy is made real by concrete benefits that flow from democracy. This bill, if passed, will undermine that foundation. It will produce discontent, dissatisfaction, and a strong

questioning of the motives of Congress in voting a huge defense program on the one hand and in voting to rob our own people of democracy on the other. It cannot be defended on any ground of reason or common sense. It is not needed. Its passage will set back our progress toward industrial democracy a score of years and more.

I would be the first one to ask for punishment of saboteurs who try to obstruct our defense program—no matter whether they would be found in the camp of employers or employees. I would be the first one to demand severe penalties for people who use their positions in our defense industries to disrupt work upon orders from foreign agitators. However, I do not see any necessity for antilabor legislation which would unjustly punish our whole working population and take away the protection to which they are entitled. If we want to keep industrial peace, we will have to extend our Government's protection equally to employer and employee and see to it that the foes of democracy do not use this emergency to attain their own ends by creating confusion and disunion among our people. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PACE, for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for 4 days, on account of important business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2082. An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3252. An act to make emergency provision for certain activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will continue hearings on the following days:

1. Thursday, May 1: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the upper Ohio River and tributaries.

2. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

3. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

4. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

5. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

6. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

7. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

8. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

9. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

10. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs at 10:30 a. m., Thursday, May 1, 1941, for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 172, to appropriate the sum of $200,000 for the victims of the earthquake at Colima, Mexico; and House Joint Resolution 174, for the relief of the distressed and suffering peoples in the earthquake zone of Mexico.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4499, a bill to authorize the heads of the various departments and agencies of the United States to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding when it is in the interest of the national defense, to authorize the President to give priority to deliveries under such contracts, and for other purposes, on Thursday, May 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 4.

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346 House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, May 7, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4215 (Mr. ALLEN), to exclude certain aliens.

Consideration of House Resolution 94 (LELAND M. FORD) and private bills, Thursday, May 8, 1941.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 7, 1941. Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 4314.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Wednesday, May 14, 1941, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 3361, to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish-restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for extension of the powers conferred by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, and the powers specified in paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III of the act approved May 12, 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

482. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to $484,600 (H. Doc. No. 190); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

483. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made under the authority of the act of March 5, 1940 (Public, No. 426, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

484. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the acts for promoting the circulation of reading matter among the blind; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4590. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 147. Joint resolution for the relief of the Indians in California; with amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 446. A bill for the relief of the estate of Opal June Lindsay, Luck A. Lindsay, Thelma Louise Lindsay, and Laura Kathleen Lindsay; with amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3831. A bill for the relief of George S. Wolbert, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship &

Engine Building Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 103. An act for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 216. An act for the relief of A. B. Codrington; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 248. An act for the relief of John G. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 309. An act for the relief of Dr. Morris B. Toubman; without amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. S. 436. An act for the relief of Maximo Abrego; without amendment (Rept. No. 484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. S. 514. An act for the relief of R. Stern; without amendment (Rept. No. 485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 788. An act for the relief of Noland Blass; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 991. An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty; with amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4591. A bill to provide for the discovery, introduction, breeding, and testing of agricultural crops for utilization in industry and manufacturing, and for replacement of surplus agricultural crops through cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture and the several State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4592. A bill to provide free postage for members of the military or naval forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 4593. A bill to further promote the defense of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4594. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4595. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr IZAC:

H. R. 4596. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California park system," approved June 29, 1936; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROGERS OF OKLAHOMA:

H. R. 4597. A bill to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians under tribal agreement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SACKS:

H. R. 4598. A bill to permit the insurance under title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, of mortgages on properties the construction of which was begun prior to January 1, 1937, on the same basis as properties the construction of which was begun after such date; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4599. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for St. Elizabeths Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4600. A bill providing for the approval of certain State plans under the Social Security Act which provide for the disclosure of information required by the State constitution, and the statutes enacted thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACIORA:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to determine what factors or conditions are responsible for existing discrimination against workers, on the basis of age and physical requirements, in obtaining and retaining employment in private industry and in public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 191. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1608; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 4601. A bill for the relief of Sarah Zimmerman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Forest Dewford Harris; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4603. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, Medals of Honor to Bertrand W. Keating and to John O'Kane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 4604. A bill for the relief of Doris Mongol Rai; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 4605. A bill for the relief of William A. Roberts, father of David Ernest Roberts, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

919. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of various citizens of Janesville, Wis., opposing the use of convoys to Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

920. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Yonkers, N. Y., memorializing Congress to oppose any change in the existing law for the preservation of the cane sugar refining industry in the State of New York that would add additional burden on the American consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

921. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Massachusetts Brewers Association of Boston, opposing the increase of malt beverage taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

922 By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, urging the Congress to pass House bill 3570; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

923. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting Congress to enact suitable legislation to extend in a reasonable manner to the boys in the military and naval camps throughout the country the postage franking privilege; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

924. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 3570, making funds available to aid cities and towns in the State of Rhode Island in solving the acute problem of building new homes for civilian workers engaged in defense projects; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

925. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress with relation to the McNary bill, now pending before the Congress of the United States, and providing for the payment of annuities to blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

926. By Mr. HOOK: Petition of the Townsend Club members and citizens of Elo, Houghton County, Mich., requesting that the Townsend bill be reported favorably; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

927. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and vicinity, endorsing House bill 4212, to regulate conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

928. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Ridgewood, N. Y., unanimously opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and urging Congress to oppose the ratification of the agreement with the Government of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

929. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Resolution proposed by Pleasant Valley Grange and adopted by Pomona Grange, Wayne County, Pa., favoring Federal legislation to make unlawful strikes and labor disturbances in industries engaged in national-defense contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

930. By Mr. SWEENEY: Resolution of the United Automobile Workers Association, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Local 32, and of the United Mine Workers of America, Local 12148, opposing the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Labor.

931. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the Hamtramck Rotary Club, Hamtramck, Mich., endorsing the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project, and urging that the Congress enact necessary legislation to complete the project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

932. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the Retired Personnel Association of El Paso, Tex., offering their services to the United States Government in carrying out the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

933. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Yonkers, Yonkers, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the beet-sugar industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

934. Also, petition of the United Automobile Workers of America, Local No. 664, North Tarrytown, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4139, known as the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

935. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, Local No. 379, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor

and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

936. Also, petition of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to education; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Maker and Defender, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, and with whom is the ordering of our creaturely existence: We beseech Thee to bless our country with Thy patient teaching, that it may be cleansed from the stain of every lingering corruption, to the gradual evolving of a truer and purer social order, and the training of the hearts of all our citizens in Thy faith, fear, and love, the fear of naught but consenting to iniquity and the love that desires and seeks the good of all.

Give us greater skill in the art of self-discipline, so essential in these troublous times. Grant us light to see and grace to follow the paths wherein we should walk, for, though vaguely perplexed, we are anxious above all else to do our duty unto our God, our country, and our fellow men.

Finally, we ask for the bestowal of that spirit, at once tender and strong, which makes all things ours and makes us of some benediction to others, even the spirit of Him who lived abundantly and lived withal to heal and bless, Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 29, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on April 29, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 1059. An act to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), as to the requirement of mandatory performance and payment bonds in connection with supply contracts.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3538) to amend the act entitled "An act granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes," approved April 28, 1906, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY THROUGH CENTRAL AMERICAN REPUBLICS (H. DOC. NO. 197)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American republics in Central America in the survey and construction of the proposed inter-American highway within the borders of those republics.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 1, 1941.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

READING MATTER FOR THE BLIND

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the acts for promoting the circulation of reading matter among the blind (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report for the quarter ended March 31, 1941, on contracts entered into for buildings, facilities, etc., in accordance with law (with an accompanying report); and

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of negotiated contracts entered into by the Navy Department during the quarter ended March 31, 1941, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (a) of Public Act No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

RECLAMATION REPORT ON THE BULLSHEAD DAM PROJECT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Reclamation report on the Bullshead Dam project on the Colorado River where that stream forms the boundary between Arizona and Nevada (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS FOR ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for St. Elizabeths Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the City Council of Gardner, Mass., approved by the mayor, favoring amendment of existing law providing a 30-day lay-off period after 18 months of employment under the W. P. A.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by 45 Rotary Clubs of the one hundred thirty-ninth district assembled in the State of Louisiana, protesting against delay in the national-defense program caused by strikes and shut-down of plants which have contracts for airplanes and for the Army and Navy, and requesting that the Federal Government deal most severely with those responsible for such strikes in defense industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions of the Building and Construction Trades Council, of Alton, Ill., and Painters Local, No. 487, both of the American Federation of Labor, of Sacramento, Calif., pledging that there will be no stoppage of work because of jurisdictional disputes between any of the building and construction trades on any building or construction project essential to the speedy and successful completion of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of Painters Local No. 487, American Federation of Labor, of Sacramento, Calif., stating that, under employers who are recognized as being fair to organized labor, when any or all of the building- and construction-trades organizations are unable to supply a full force of building-trades men to man defense projects, every organization affiliated with such labor organizations agrees that a union employer shall be privileged to employ others than members of the building and construction trades affiliated with such labor unions until such time as the labor organizations so affiliated can replace nonunion men with members of their organizations, or until such nonunion men are requested to become members of the respective unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Yonkers, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation which would reduce the quantity of tropical raw sugar now imported into the United States for refining and distribution; to the Committee on Finance.

House Resolution No. 149, agreed to by the House of Assembly of the State of California, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to prevent profiteering in foods and other necessities of life during continuance of the national-defense emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions unanimously adopted by the Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa, assembled at Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation providing universal military service for all young men in America between the ages of 20 and 22; repeal of the Neutrality Act; the designation of an area within the territorial limits of the United States where the youth of all nations may receive appropriate military training, etc.; the establishment of an American Council of Nationalities for defense of democracy; reversion to the principles of international law in force prior to enactment of the existing Neutrality Act; and amendment of the nationality laws so as to insure that no loss of American citizenship will ensue to any person desiring to enlist for the duration in any

army now fighting the enemies of democracy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 21

"Relating to conversion of fruit surpluses into alcohol

"Whereas it is expected that at the termination of the coming fruit and vegetable season even greater surpluses of fruits and vegetables will exist than at present due to the loss of the overseas market; and

"Whereas in the San Joaquin Valley and throughout California there are thousands of tons of dried fruit and vegetables for which no use appears to be immediately or at all available; and

"Whereas a use has been discovered for surplus fruit and vegetables in more than 25 foreign countries, where it is a regular practice to augment their fuel supplies from agricultural surpluses: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the establishment of plants near the places where such surpluses of fruit and vegetables exist to provide a practical form of farm relief by the conversion of all such surpluses into alcohol for use in the national defense as an auxiliary fuel; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker of the assembly be hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and to each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Commerce.

"Assembly Joint Resolution 44

"Relative to Sacramento River north from Chico Landing

"Whereas during the past 30 years the Sacramento River from the Chico Landing north has received no attention or care whatever from Federal or State agencies, although it is navigable to Red Bluff; and

"Whereas gold-mining operations and bank and soil erosion have resulted in the creation of snags, sand bars, and banks in the Sacramento River; and

"Whereas these snags, sand bars, and banks have deflected the river's current and caused new channels to form with accompanying erosion to valuable farm lands adjacent to the river; and

"Whereas thousands of acres of valuable farm land, assessed as high as $100 per acre, have been swept away by the Sacramento River and destroyed, and additional thousands of acres of valuable farm land are threatened with destruction; and

"Whereas county and State roads, bridges, and other properties have been damaged and destroyed by channel changes, thereby becoming useless for State and county purposes and for purposes of national defense; and

"Whereas dirt swept down the Sacramento River has been deposited in the lower Sacramento River channel, with consequent creation of deltas raising the bed of the channel and causing great and devastating floods in the flat valley lands south of the Chico Landing and all along the Sacramento River as far south as the city of Sacramento; and

"Whereas unless immediate steps are taken to relieve the situation herein described, untold loss of life and property will inevitably occur: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to render such immediate aid as may be necessary to correct the conditions and avoid the calamity herein described; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the chairmen of the flood-control committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Chief of the United States Army Engineers, Department of War, United States Army, Washington, D. C., to the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., to the Reclamation Board of the State of California, and to the United States Army Engineers, Department of War, district of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 45

"Relative to flood and seepage conditions along the Sacramento River and its tributaries in northern California

"Whereas land adjoining the Sacramento River, approximately 70 miles in length and 4 miles in width, representing some 280 square miles, has been seriously affected by seepage as a consequence of a rise in the flood plane since the inception of the present flood-control plan; and

"Whereas orchards consisting of large acreages of prune, walnut, and other trees having tap roots, have been and will continue to be destroyed by such seepage; and

"Whereas hundreds of acres of alfalfa and other perennial crops have been drowned and totally destroyed; and

"Whereas thousands of acres of early-sown grain land have been drowned and many acres of seeded grain cannot be planted until so late in the season that satisfactory crops cannot be obtained; and

"Whereas in seasons of normal and above-normal rainfall, seepage water has remained on land until so late in the year that even summer-planted crops such as grain sorghums, beans, and peas cannot be grown; and

"Whereas many acres of late spring-planted crops such as rice and sugar beets cannot be planted; and

"Whereas acre upon acre of formerly rich river land is becoming impregnated with alkali, thus destroying its productivity and value; and

"Whereas the winter season of 1940–41 wrought untold damage to orchards, lands, and crops from Stony Creek in Glenn County to Knights Landing, in Yolo County; and

"Whereas this damage has affected lands on both the east and west banks of the Sacramento River in the counties of Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, and Yolo; and

"Whereas the invasion of seepage waters has greatly impaired sanitary sewer systems and rendered useless septic tanks within the rural areas; and

"Whereas in seven out of eight cemeteries in the affected localities interments have been impossible for the past several months; and

"Whereas the lands affected by the present deplorable seepage conditions are in the main the most productive and highly assessed farming lands in their respective counties; and

"Whereas the cost of attempted farming operations on these lands has greatly increased because of seepage; and

"Whereas the county tax rolls will of necessity be greatly reduced within the affected seepage areas, thereby placing an increased tax burden upon lands not so affected; and

"Whereas Federal land bank loans and liens on affected lands are seriously jeopardized and impaired; and

"Whereas unless immediate and prompt assistance toward relieving the situation is granted, crops will be lost, lands will become worthless, and bankruptcy will follow: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to render such immediate aid as may be necessary to correct the conditions and avoid the calamity herein described; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the chairmen of the flood-control committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Chief of the United States Army Engineers, Department of War, United States Army, Washington, D. C., to the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., to the Reclamation Board of the State of California, and to the United States Army Engineers, Department of War, District of California."

A memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Memorial 6

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida in legislative session assembled, do most respectfully memorialize and petition the President and Congress assembled, as follows:

"Whereas the St. Augustine historical program has been organized and undertaken under the leadership and sponsorship of the city of St. Augustine, the State of Florida, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the American Philosophical Society, the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and other distinguished national organizations and individuals for the purpose of studying, preserving, and developing the rich materials relating to the Spanish colonization of St. Augustine and the region of which it was the historical capital; and

"Whereas the State of Florida, by reason of its discovery by Ponce de Leon and later colonization by Spain became the cradle of American civilization and is today the crossroad of all the Americas; and

"Whereas the St. Augustine historical program recognizes the significant contribution of Spain to the processes of American civilization, and provides as its primary purpose for the creation in St. Augustine and in the region associated with it, through the development of important historic sites and buildings, of a national shrine commemorating this important period in the history of the United States; and

"Whereas there is to be established in St. Augustine, Fla., as a part of the general plan of the St. Augustine historical program a permanent inter-American cultural center to commemorate the founding of St. Augustine; and

"Whereas the cultural relationships between the United States and the other American republics are of paramount importance; and

"Whereas the inter-American cultural center and the St. Augustine historical program will afford an opportunity for the advancement of these relationships; and

"Whereas such a cultural center in relationship to other elements of the general plan of the St. Augustine historical program

is worthy and deserving of the support and encouragement of the United States; and

"Whereas the State of Florida has already gone on record as approving and sponsoring the St. Augustine historical program, and to that end has appropriated $50,000 for the carrying on of said program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That your memorialists do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, in order to accomplish the foregoing purposes, to authorize by suitable legislative enactment the proper agency or agencies of the Federal Government to establish at St. Augustine, Fla., an inter-American cultural center to be maintained permanently thereafter, to commemorate the founding of St. Augustine, and particularly for the advancement of the cultural relationship between the United States and the other American republics; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor, April 24, 1941."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution to request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to the effect that any bonds or other obligations of the municipalities of Puerto Rico hereafter issued for the purpose of retiring bonds or obligations formerly outstanding, shall not be included when their borrowing capacity is computed under section 3 of the organic act, approved March 2, 1917, as amended, until 6 months after their issue

"Whereas on August 3, 1935, the Congress of the United States enacted legislation to give the people of Puerto Rico an opportunity to consolidate its public debt by obtaining new loans with which to cancel existing loans, on better conditions and at a lower rate of interest; and

"Whereas the municipalities of Puerto Rico could likewise consolidate their debts by obtaining new loans at a lower rate of interest and with better and more convenient conditions for payment; and

"Whereas such thing could not be done without special legislation of the Congress of the United States because the borrowing capacity of the greater part, if not all, of the municipalities of Puerto is exhausted; and

"Whereas the said consolidation of the municipal debt would mean savings in interest for the municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring)*—

"First. To request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to the effect that any bonds or other obligations of the municipalities of Puerto Rico hereafter issued for the purpose of retiring bonds or obligations formerly outstanding, shall not be included when their borrowing capacity is computed under section 3 of the organic act, approved March 2, 1917, as amended, until 6 months after their issue.

"Second. That a copy of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Governor of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the United States."

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 882

"Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the McNary bill—to provide for the payment of annuities to blind persons—now pending before the Congress of the United States

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress a bill which is intended to provide pensions for the blind, namely, S. 869, the McNary bill, to provide for the payment of annuities to blind persons, which, if enacted, will assure a sorely afflicted people of security in old age: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this general assembly respectfully requests the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give wholehearted support to said measure by working indefatigably for its passage; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"House Joint Resolution 1009

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact suitable legislation to extend in a reasonable manner to the boys in the military and naval camps throughout the country the postage-franking privilege

"Whereas it is the universal desire to provide insofar as possible for the comfort, convenience, and welfare of the boys inducted into selected service for the defense of this Nation; and

"Whereas in order to knit more closely together the human relationship, it is well to encourage correspondence from the boys to the members of their families, especially their parents: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact suitable legislation to extend in a reasonable manner to the boys in the military and naval camps throughout the country the postage-franking privilege; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly-certified copies of this resolution to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress, and to the Postmaster General of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.)

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

"Senate Resolution 256

"Resolution urging Congress to pass H. R. 3570

"Whereas the demands of national defense have required the building of new homes for enlisted personnel of the forces of the Nation and for civilian defense workers at Quonset Point, in the town of North Kingstown; and

"Whereas similar demands have resulted in defense housing projects in the city of Newport and in the town of Middletown; and

"Whereas as a result of this national-defense activity new demands are being made for public services, including school facilities; and

"Whereas these abnormal demands cannot be met by the normal facilities of said towns and city: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to urge upon Congress the passage of House Resolution 3570, making funds available to aid said towns and city in solving the acute problems presented by the defense emergency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island."

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Joint Resolution 32

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for free transportation and mailing of publications to military camps

"Whereas many draftees and other military men in camps are far from home and seldom see a newspaper from their local communities or a publication which they were formerly accustomed to read; and

"Whereas if free mailing privileges were extended to periodicals, newspapers, and publications sent to military camps, our men under arms would receive reading material which they would greatly appreciate: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the free transportation or mailing of periodicals, newspapers, and publications sent to military camps and other places where men under arms are concentrated; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the board of governors of the Maryland Citizens Committee for Democracy, Baltimore, Md., favoring a policy of making promptly effective aid to Great Britain and her allies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Marion, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

OLD OREGON TRAIL—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. NORRIS. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Nebraska in regard to the old Oregon Trail. I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Library and printed in the RECORD under the rule.

The resolution is as follows:

Legislative Resolution 20

OLD OREGON TRAIL

Whereas the year 1943 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of civil government in the West, and the blazing of

the old Oregon Trail from Independence, Mo., to the Willamette Valley in the old Oregon Country, by that historic covered wagon train which won an empire for the United States; and

Whereas the migration of 1843 and those which followed made imperishable history for America; and

Whereas all of the States through which the old Oregon Trail passed are rich in the history and traditions of that heroic period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska in fifty-fifth regular session assembled:

1. That the State of Nebraska joins with the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, and Missouri, and with the Congress of the United States in properly observing the year 1943, to the end that the heroic deeds of the intrepid pioneers who blazed the trail to the Pacific coast may not be forgotten, and that the name of the old Oregon Trail may be enshrined forever in the heart of America.

2. That this resolution be spread at large upon the journal of this legislature; and that the clerk of this legislature is hereby ordered and directed forthwith to forward a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Nebraska in Congress, to the Governor of the State of Oregon, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon.

Introduced and adopted April 25, 1941.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Superior, Wis., on April 14, 1941, expressing its views as to the necessity of immediate action for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

I also ask unanimous consent to have a similar resolution from the Superior Federation of Labor, Superior, Wis., inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution introduced by Mayor Ostby expressing the attitude of the common council as to the necessity of immediate action for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas the existence of another World War has demonstrated more significantly than ever the immediate necessity for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway as a defense measure; and

Whereas said project would be of immeasureable value and benefit to the citizens of Superior and millions of others residing throughout the Middle West; and

Whereas hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal funds are to be expended for defense measures, and it appears to the Common Council of the City of Superior that the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway from the city of Superior to the Atlantic Ocean is one of the most important and valuable means of preparing for the national defense as well as for the general welfare of our citizens in peacetime: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Common Council of the City of Superior that the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take every possible immediate action necessary to accomplish the commencement of the construction of said project, and to proceed to complete the same within the shortest period of time possible; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to all the Members of the House of Representatives from Wisconsin, and to the Members of the United States Senate from the State of Wisconsin.

Passed and adopted this 14th day of April 1941.

Approved this 15th day of April 1941.

BRYN OSTBY, *Mayor.*

Attest: R. E. MCKEAGUE, *City Clerk.*

SUPERIOR FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Superior, Wis.

Whereas the project commonly known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway has been advocated for a great many years; and

Whereas the completion of such a project is of tremendous importance in the light of our national-defense program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Superior Federation of Labor, of Superior, Wis., the Central Labor Organization of Superior, representing 41 labor unions, hereby goes on record as wholeheartedly favoring and urging the immediate commencement and the completion of, as soon as possible, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Wisconsin.

Dated this 2d day of April 1941.

CLARENCE C. REHL,
President.

CHARLES FELL,
Secretary, Legislative Committee.

RESOLUTION OF NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

Mr. WILEY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in March 1941, which was forwarded to me by the Honorable Silas Evans, president of Ripon College.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accord with the statement of President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 14, 1940, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools believes that, in addition to scientists, engineers, and other specialists essential to national defense, "we must have well-educated citizens who have sound judgment in dealing with the difficult problems of today."

It is necessary, also, to consider the needs of tomorrow and make suitable provision for the "national health, safety, or interest." Secondary and higher education, whether in the humanities, political science, economics, or other subjects, contributes to leadership and helps both directly and indirectly in making a people competent to exercise the rights and duties of intelligent citizenship. Thus it is not less important in the perpetuation of democracy than technical knowledge is now in the defense of democracy. The normal processes of education, therefore, should be interrupted only when and to the extent that the national welfare in all its aspects is thereby significantly served.

If the present provision regarding deferment is not extended, many thousands of youth will be withdrawn every year from educational institutions at such inopportune times and under such conditions as to discourage them from ever resuming their studies. Many other students, of whom only a small number would be likely to qualify for service, would decide, in view of the prospective call to which they soon would be liable, not to enter or return to high school, college, or university. Experience shows that a very high proportion of those who postpone their formal education for even a year will never continue it, and the Nation will suffer a permanent loss of informed and competent citizenship.

It is, therefore, the judgment of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, assembled in Chicago, Ill., March 24–29, 1941, that the best interests of total national defense for the present and the future require that the policy provided in the present Selective Training and Service Act of permitting college and university students to defer the call for military training and service until July 1, 1941, be extended, so that during the continuance of peacetime conscription students regularly enrolled in recognized secondary schools, colleges, and universities may complete the academic year in which they become subject to call. Since this would mean only brief deferment, not exemption, it could do no harm to the training program.

The association believes also that in the national interest high-school and college students, now made unduly tense and restless by the conditions themselves and by certain kinds of publicity, should be counseled and encouraged by parents, teachers, and governmental officials—as was done by the President in his statement referred to above—to continue calmly and purposefully with their education until they may be called for training.

MEMORIALS AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, favoring the immediate passage of the general-welfare bill now pending before Congress and known as House bill 1410.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The resolution is as follows:

House Joint Memorial 2

Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, petitioning the immediate passage of the General Welfare Act now pending before Congress and known and designated as House Resolution 1410

Whereas security for the aged is a national rather than a State or local problem; and

Whereas although the National Government has attempted to provide for the needy aged under a general-welfare act; and

Whereas said act, as now administered, is wholly inadequate to accomplish the purposes for which is was intended; and

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Congress a general-welfare act, introduced by Congressman W. H. LARRABEE, of Indiana, which would more fairly and adequately accomplish such purpose and provide a minimum Federal pension of $30 per month to every needy person over 60 years of age: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Florida and the Senate of the State of Florida do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States of America to immediately enact said general-welfare bill, known as House Resolution 1410; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State of Florida, be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and that copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House and Senate of the United States Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal in both the State senate and house of representatives, and that sufficient copies be furnished to the press.

Approved by the Governor April 22, 1941.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I also present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida urging the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant the application of Eastern Air Lines, Inc., for a certificate to engage in temporary transportation between and through Tallahassee, Ocala, and Orlando, Fla.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolution is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Resolution urging the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States to grant the application of Eastern Air Lines, Inc., for a certificate to engage in temporary air transportation between and through Tallahassee, Ocala, and Orlando, Fla.

Whereas it has come to the attention of the legislature that Eastern Air Lines, Inc., has made application to the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States Government for authority of said air line to immediately commence the operation of two round-trip schedules per day in, between, and through Tallahassee, Ocala, and Orlando, Fla., in such a way as to provide continuous and direct air transportation all the way between Miami, West Palm Beach, Vero Beach, Orlando, Ocala, Tallahassee, and points beyond; and

Whereas direct air transportation of persons, property, and mail over the proposed route will greatly facilitate the travel and business of those in central and south Florida who find it both necessary and desirous to travel to and from Tallahassee, the capital of the State, on official business with a minimum of time away from their respective homes and places of business, especially at this time when the State legislature is in session; and

Whereas the proposed extension will render to the members of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which convened on April 8, 1941, for a 60-day session and who will be traveling to and from the State capitol at Tallahassee in connection with their constitutional duties during said legislative session a greatly needed and desired direct passenger and air-mail service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)—

SECTION 1. That the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States Government be, and it is hereby, respectfully petitioned, urged, and requested to promptly grant the pending application of Eastern Air Lines, Inc., for authority to immediately commence the operation of two round-trip schedules per day in, between, and through Tallahassee, Ocala, and Orlando, Fla., in such a way as to provide continuous and direct air transportation all the way between Miami, West Palm Beach, Vero Beach, Orlando, Ocala, Tallahassee, and points beyond and return.

SEC. 2. That upon the adoption of this resolution by both the house of representatives and the senate, the secretary of the senate shall immediately transmit certified copies thereof to the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States, the Post Office Department of the United States, United States Senators CHARLES O. ANDREWS and CLAUDE PEPPER and United States Congressmen from Florida LEX GREEN, PAT CANNON, JOE HENDRICKS, HARDIN PETERSON, and ROBERT SIKES.

Mr. ANDREWS. I also present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Florida memorializing Congress to consider locating munitions plants in that State, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

House Memorial 3

Memorializing Congress to consider locating munitions plants in the State of Florida

Whereas the Federal Government, during the past 7 months, started 784 defense production plants at a cost of $2,000,000,000, and is now looking for 100 munitions plants sites to cost $1,500,000,000 more, in addition to which there will be many complementary locations to choose; and

Whereas we believe Florida offers as nearly ideal locations for the establishment of munitions plants and complementary locations as can be found in the country, the climate in winter being nearly ideal and heat in summer never extreme; furthermore our forests are such in all parts of the State as to make it very easy to screen locations from an enemy; and

Whereas it is nothing but fair that the extreme southeastern section of the United States get its share of defense-production plants, when insofar as Florida is concerned there are none: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Senate of the State of Florida in the Legislature assembled (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Florida Representatives in the United States Congress, namely, United States Senators CHARLES O. ANDREWS and CLAUDE PEPPER, and Representatives J. HARDIN PETERSON, R. A. GREEN, BOB SIKES, JOE HENDRICKS, and PAT CANNON be, and they are hereby, requested to use their best energies and hardest possible efforts to secure the location of as many munitions and other defense-production plants in Florida as is possible. We earnestly request that every argument be exhausted in securing those very desirable plants bound to affect the economic benefit of all the citizens of the entire State; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of Florida be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida to each of the Senators and Representatives of Florida in the Congress of the United States of America.

Approved by the Governor, April 24, 1941.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Rules:

S. Res. 96. Resolution making rule XVI applicable to amendments to relief and work-relief bills (submitted by Mr. ADAMS on April 22, 1941); without amendment (Rept. No. 239).

By Mr. LANGER from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 3362. A bill to amend the act of May 24, 1940 (Public, No. 520, 76th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 240).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 269. A bill to amend section 5278 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 241).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 3514. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain tribal land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value; without amendment (Rept. No. 242).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 3987. A bill to provide relief for, and to promote the interests of, the landowners on the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 243).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokees; without amendment (Rept. No. 244);

S. 1120. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 245); and

H. R. 4064. A bill for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; with an amendment (Rept. No. 246).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 234. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers of the Army to enter into agreements with local governments adjacent to the District of Columbia for the use of water for purposes of fire fighting only; without amendment (Rept. No. 247).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado; from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1371. A bill to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students; with amendment (Rept. No. 248).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 215. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938; with amendments (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. BUNKER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 13. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nevada; without amendment (Rept. No. 249).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 819. A bill for the relief of Littlefield-Wyman Nurseries; without amendment (Rept. No. 250);

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Foot's Transfer & Storage Co., Ltd.; without amendment (Rept. No. 251);

H. R. 1267. A bill for the relief of Russell H. Gauslin; without amendment (Rept. No. 252); and

H. R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Adam M. Garmon; without amendment (Rept. No. 253).

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 3404. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain property; without amendment (Rept. No. 254).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1089. A bill to extend the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in

the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 255).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1422. A bill to constitute an Army Chaplains' Corps with a brigadier general as chief; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1423. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of insane persons belonging to the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1424. A bill for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULOW:

S. 1425. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Gebhart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1426. A bill for the relief of Otis Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 1427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Della Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of Walter M. Anderson;

S. 1429. A bill for the relief of William Corder; and

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1431. A bill to provide for the purchase of the old post-office building at Eugene, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1432. A bill to establish a system of automatic salary increases within the Federal service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1433. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1434. A bill to require parity prices to be paid for agricultural commodities for the use of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1435. A bill to prohibit child labor and provide minimum wages as a condition for agricultural benefit payments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1436. A bill to facilitate the maintenance of communication between members of the armed forces on active duty and their families by providing for the free transmission in the mails of letters and post cards written by such members; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1437. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1438. A bill to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1439 (by request). A bill for the relief of the Duwamish Tribe of Indians and all bands of said tribe in the State of Washington; and

S. 1440 (by request). A bill for the relief of the Snoqualmie Tribe of Indians and all bands of said tribe in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to sex disqualification removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND CORPORATIONS—JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. BYRD. I introduce a joint resolution to provide for reports to the Secretary of the Treasury in regard to the financial condition of certain agencies and corporations of the Government, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 73) to provide for reports to the Secretary of the Treasury showing the financial condition of certain agencies and corporations of the Government was read twice by its title and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to require, as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, a complete financial statement from each of the following agencies and corporations: Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Commodity Credit Corporation; Export-Import Bank of Washington; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Tennessee Valley Authority; Public Works Administration; United States Maritime Commission; Rural Electrification Administration; Home Owners' Loan Corporation; Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; Federal savings and loan associations; Federal home loan banks; Federal Housing Administration; United States Housing Authority; Farm Credit Administration; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; Federal intermediate credit banks; banks for cooperatives; production credit corporations; regional agricultural credit corporations; Disaster Loan Corporation; Electric Home and Farm Authority; Farm Security Administration; Federal National Mortgage Association; Inland Waterways Corporation; Panama Railroad Co.; Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration; RFC Mortgage Co.; and Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

SEC. 2. The said financial statement of each of the foregoing agencies and corporations shall include—

(1) A statement of its assets (including outstanding loans) and liabilities for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

(2) A statement in reasonable detail of the accounting principles used in the preparation of the statement submitted under paragraph (1).

(3) A statement of its revenues and expenditures for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, classified to reflect profit or loss and to segregate operating costs, together with a statement as to the part of such expenditures paid out of the Treasury and the part paid out of the income of the agency or corporation.

(4) A brief description of the nature and kind of its principal assets (including outstanding loans) as contained in the statement submitted under paragraph (1), including the date and manner of acquisition, the value when acquired, expenses incurred thereon, and the appraised value as of the end of the fiscal year for which such statement is made, and a brief description of the liabilities reported in such statement showing whether the same be indebtedness on open account or represented by bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness.

(5) A statement setting forth, from its organization through the end of the fiscal year for which such statement is made—

(a) The aggregate principal amount of loans, if any, made;

(b) The aggregate principal amount of any such loans outstanding at the end of such fiscal year; classified as to original loans, renewals, or extensions, uncollected accrued interest, or other assessments;

(c) The aggregate principal amount of repayments made with respect to such loans;

(d) The aggregate principal amount and the number of its loans which were in default at the end of such fiscal year, classified to show principal or interest and the probable value thereof, with a statement as to the method of evaluation;

(e) The aggregate principal amount and the number of its loans or other assets which have been written off, in whole or in part, including assets which have been appraised at less-than-cost value; and

(f) The aggregate principal amount of loans the property securing which, as a result of a default, was acquired by it or sold, at foreclosure or otherwise; the aggregate appraised value as of the date the loans were made of all such property; expenses incurred and capitalized in connection with the custody and disposition of such property; and the amount realized on property sold or disposed of otherwise.

(6) A statement setting forth the authority of law pursuant to which its liabilities have been or may be incurred and the limit or limits, if any, upon its power to incur obligations. Such statement shall contain a report on the character and amount of any notes, bonds, debentures, or other such obligations issued by it and its capital stock and other participating interests or rights, the extent to which and the authority of law under whch the United States, or any corporate or other agency or instrumentality thereof, is or may become liable as guarantor or otherwise with respect to any of its liabilities, now existing or which may be incurred, or with respect to any securities issued or which may be issued by it, and include list of its creditors and of the owners or holders of its securities (including its capital stock and other participating interests or rights) so far as reasonably ascertainable.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized to require such additional data from such agencies and corporations to be included in such financial statements as he may deem necessary or desirable in the public interest. Such financial statements shall, upon request, be made available to any Member of Congress or any committee thereof.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3538) to amend the act entitled "An act granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes," approved April 28, 1906, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was

referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 26, after line 12, add the following:

"Fence construction on the international boundary: For construction of fence along the international boundary as authorized by the act of August 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 660), $50,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of lands or easements for sites for boundary fences except for procurement of abstracts or certificates of title, payment of recording fees, and examination of titles."

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation" and the subheading "General Fund, Construction", after the words "Bullshead project, Arizona-Nevada, $5,000,000, for the purposes and substantially in accordance with the report thereon heretofore submitted under section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and subject to the terms of the Colorado River Compact", strike out the semicolon, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That 7½ percent of the gross proceeds derived each year from the sale of electric energy generated at such project shall be paid promptly after the end of such year to the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of taxes and as a part of the costs of operation of such project, such payments to be equally divided between such States."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4590, the Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

DEFENSE SAVINGS BONDS AND STAMPS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix the addresses delivered on April 30, 1941, by the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Postmaster General on the subject of Defense Savings Bonds and Stamps, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL PICTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The National Picture," delivered by him before the Appleton, Wis., Chamber of Commerce, on April 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

GRUMBLING IN THE DEFENSE CRISIS—STATEMENT BY MAYOR KELLY, OF CHICAGO

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago, on the subject of grumbling in the defense crisis.]

ADDRESS BY H. R. BAUKHAGE BEFORE DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION CONVENTION

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Can Democracy Be Defended," delivered by H. R. Baukhage to the Fiftieth Continental Congress of American Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, on April 19, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRIPLE A PROGRAM

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper clippings from the Elgin (Nebr.) Review, also a letter from a Nebraska farmer relative to the triple A program, which appear in the Appendix.]

ALLEGED DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST COLORED PEOPLE BY CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Edgar M. Gott, of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, and also a statement by C. D. Jolly and T. R. Dunlap, of the industry and labor committee of the San Diego branch of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, relative to alleged discrimination by the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation against the employment of colored people, which appear in the Appendix.]

STEPS TOWARD WAR—EDITORIAL FROM ARGUS CHAMPION, OF NEWPORT, N. H.

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Watch Our Step," published in the Argus Champion, of Newport, N. H., which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH WAR AIMS—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article under the heading "Lord Halifax reveals British war aims," published in the Christian Century of April 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE ON THE WAR IN OUR LAP

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 30, 1941, entitled "The War in Our Lap," which appears in the Appendix.]

STRATEGIC EVACUATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE CORNELL DAILY SUN

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Cornell Daily Sun entitled "Strategic Evacuation," and also a letter appearing in the same newspaper, which appear in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRNES submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3981) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 22 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, or of funds allotted to the Navy Department, shall be available after March 13, 1941, for any additional positions in the District of Columbia or elsewhere at rates of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, either on a per diem or per annum basis, except in pursuance of specific authorization herein or hereafter granted: *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, or of funds allotted to the Navy Department, shall be available for the employment of a greater number than eight thousand seven hundred and fifty civilian officers and employees in the Navy Department proper, at Washington, except in pursuance of specific appropriations as to numbers hereafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed, and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto"; and the to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "acquisition and clearing of land for extension of Naval Academy grounds, $350,000;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "improvements at rifle range at La Jolla, $200,000, including $20,000 for target area and ranges;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "2"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
CARTER GLASS,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
DAVID I. WALSH,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
J. G. SCRUGHAM (except as to amendment No. 19),
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT THOMAS,
J. WILLIAM DITTER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BYRNES. I move the adoption of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CONVOY QUESTION

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the United States promised the countries now battling to save the world from a despotic program which would destroy every vestige of popular government that we would extend all aid short of war.

We are not carrying out that promise.

What shall it serve to speed up our industries to mass production of ships, tanks, airplanes, and other military supplies in order to furnish them to those who stand with us against despotism if the supply ships are destroyed before they can deliver their priceless cargoes?

We know, or we ought to know by this time, that if Great Britain goes down in this struggle we shall be left practically alone to meet the most powerful war machine ever devised.

We have, consciously or unconsciously, based our policies on the circumstance that the British Fleet would take care of us on the Atlantic side against foreign aggression. It was because of the existence of this great naval power that we, with a two-ocean front, were content with a one-ocean Navy. As a result of this we find ourselves today deprived to a large extent of this protection to our eastern seaboard, while we are faced with a precarious situation in the Pacific. We are feverishly endeavoring to do what we should have done long ago to make ourselves invulnerable, regardless of what tempests of destruction may rage abroad.

Certain elements in this country, knowingly or unwittingly, are aiding the enemies of democracy by opposing every step in our logical program, on the outmoded theory that the oceans themselves afford us protection from foreign assault. I agree with them to this extent: Actual invasion of the United States—that is, continental United States—is an improbability at present. However, unless we entirely close our eyes to the course of events in Europe, we know that the procedure of the Hitler-led Axis is to preface every assault by weakening its intended prey by more or less indirect means—by "fifth column" activities, by economic pressures, and by declarations of pacific intent which are only a mask for more hostile purposes.

We have seen 14 independent, peace-loving governments destroyed, and 14 peace-loving nations reduced to slavery in the face of definite declarations that Hitler had no territorial ambitions in Europe. We heard this solemn declaration before he took over Austria and after he had wiped out Poland. We heard it when he took the Sudeten section of Czechoslovakia. He told the world that Holland and Belgium had nothing to fear from Germany almost up to the day when his legions swept through the Low Countries and on to France.

The lesson of all this for America is that we must take a long-range view of the possible course of events. We must envision, should England go down and the British Fleet be destroyed or imprisoned in the Mediterranean, what the prospects would be for this hemisphere. I am no military strategist, but I think nearly everyone will agree that the conquest of Great Britain would only be a prelude to the southern advance of Japan.

If Japan were unhampered, and Singapore and the Dutch East Indies and whatever else Nippon might feel able to swallow should come under her dominion, then we would be confronted on the Pacific with the equivalent of an Asiatic Germany. Can any American contemplate with equanimity a power-glutted Japan stopping short on her side of the Pacific Ocean? What of the Philippines? What of Midway and Guam, and perhaps Hawaii, and possibly Alaska?

Even if we accept the thesis of the isolationists and appeasers in our midst that Japan would be content with her Asiatic and oceanic objectives, how much trade could we expect with the Orient if Japan should dominate over there and control the trade routes? Let us take the same long-range view of possibilities on the other side of the world. With the British Isles out of the way, we may be sure that the hun hordes would take actual possession of whatever they wanted on the west African coast. The port of Dakar, in what is theoretically French territory, would become a Germanic base. If Hitler deemed it worth while, the Portuguese Azores would be taken over—and these prospective hostile bases are a good deal closer to South America, south of the eastern bulge of Brazil, than are we. In much of this South American country the Germans are the dominating foreign element. How much trade below Panama would be left to the United States if this grim picture should become a reality?

Yes; I know that bringing in the question of trade sounds sordid; but, in the last analysis, it is on trade that national wealth and power are based. Cut off our commerce, and our great country, while possibly remaining safe from military invasion, must dwindle and deteriorate.

Mr. President, we are joined with the rest of America, North and South, in a program of hemispheric defense. Even without the Pan-American agreement, we are pledged to the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine. How much attention do you suppose Hitler would pay to the Monroe Doctrine if he could successfully challenge it? Is it not taking too much for granted to assume that he would not assert control over the colonies of the countries he conquers? Is it likely that he would abstain from attempting to impose his system on some or several South American States, even though he risked a war in which he would have to engage at a point to which he is closer than we are?

The question that now confronts this country is, What can we do, what should we do, to avert the dire future which I have tried to point out?

The answer is that we must not permit Britain to fall, for the fall of Britain is the requisite prelude to the disastrous sequence. So we must see to it that the cargoes on which, in all probability, the fate of England depends will reach her. We must protect our cargo ships, at least within the limits of this hemisphere.

Some of those who take a contrary view of our foreign policy say this would be convoying the ships. All right; I am not afraid of that word. We ought to convoy our ships. I realize that the President has said that convoying means shooting, and shooting is close to war. In most things I bow to the wisdom of our great President; but I feel, and I hope he feels, that whatever risks are involved in convoying our ships at least to the mid-Atlantic are justified in the face of the peril that confronts us.

During our history we fought at least one major war for the preservation of our principle—the freedom of the seas. The war right of blockade must be recognized, of course; but there cannot be any such thing as an ocean-wide blockade. It rests with no nation to make the whole world a war zone or to assume that it can sink without warning the vessels of neutral lands thousands of miles away from either the territorial waters of the blockader or the shores of the blockaded. We would admit ourselves to be a weak nation if we permitted attacks on our ships in western waters, and I do not think that any great number of my countrymen would consent to such a confession.

The isolationists say if our battlecraft interfered when a Nazi submarine or bomber torpedoed the cargo ships, that would constitute an act of war and would justify Germany or Japan in so considering it.

We have no intent, no desire, to declare war, but we cannot prevent any aggressor nation from declaring war on us.

Certainly if Germany were looking for an excuse to declare war she would not have waited this long. I doubt very much if convoying our ships would be any more provocative than the steps we have already taken—and taken wisely—as part of our defense movement.

It would be no more an act of war, for example, than permitting anti-Axis warships to come into our ports and use our facilities to repair battle damages in our shipyards. I doubt if convoying is more of an act of war than our seizing German and Italian steamers to prevent their crews from sabotaging them in our harbors.

Both of these incidents, and many more, are authorized by laws passed by Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I will yield after I have finished my speech, when the Senator can have all the time he desires. He has had all the time the last few days.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator can make a statement about the time I have taken and then say that he declines to yield. That is enough to say, that he declines to yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. All right; I decline to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well. I am glad the Senator is corrected.

Mr. GUFFEY. In doing the things I have mentioned, we do them in the de-

fense of America. It seems to me a strange straining of technicalities to assume that we have not the same legal right to protect our ships on the high seas.

If our Navy went on convoy duty, it would be performing no act of aggression on the Nazi sea raiders. If there were any shooting, they would have to start it, and whatever action we took would be an action in defense. The mere presence of an American warship with the merchant vessels would be notice to the Nazi sea wolves that reprisal would be immediate for any attack, and the safe transport of most of our shipments would probably be accomplished without firing a shot.

It seems to be the general assumption that a hostile exchange at sea is necessarily followed by war. History bears out no such inevitability. Far back in our history Napoleon extended his anti-British blockade to include our vessels, and, if I recall my history correctly, there was gunfire during the years that we combated that French theory. But no war resulted. Just a few years ago Japanese aircraft sank our patrol ship in Chinese waters. The Japs said it was by mistake, and the *Panay* returned the fire as best it could. No war resulted.

Why must it be assumed that if we fired on a submarine or a bomber which was assailing an American merchant vessel war must follow?

In 1913 there was a lot of shooting in and around Vera Cruz, but we had no war with Mexico. Japan and Russia have been sniping each other's forces on the border for years, without even a diplomatic rupture. Any of these incidents might have brought war, but did not. So why must we take it for granted that a brush over the defense of American shipping means that we should be any more involved in the Hitler war than we are today?

In any event, are we so careless of our national dignity, so doubtful of our strength and capacity, that we are forever to be bluffed by Hitler, whose engagements elsewhere are more likely to forbid his inviting the vast powers of the United States to make common cause with his enemies than to bring us actively and totally into the fray?

Or are we to continue indefinitely being deterred from our declared purpose of supplying Britain with the materials requisite for her defense, which I insist is equally our defense, by the menace of another power across the Pacific, which is only awaiting the conquest of Great Britain to proceed with an Asiatic version of Hitler's international brigandage?

Mr. President, we promised aid in every way short of war. We did not promise—we could not promise—that no nations would make war on us. We know that Hitler would "take us on" tomorrow if he thought it was to his advantage to do so.

He would no more scruple to bomb New York than he did to bomb Belgrade—if he thought he could get away with it. Indeed, he has been industriously doing practically the same things that brought us into war with Germany in 1917. He gambles on the circumstance that we have a peace-loving President, and are a peace-loving people, and, therefore, are not willing to enter the world conflict. So he, not less than ourselves, has done everything short of war in his disregard of our national rights. He maintains his agents within our territorial boundaries to stir up whatever trouble lies within their capabilities. He had his ship captains sabotage his ships in our harbors, in defiance of American law. He brings Japan within the Axis to hold our Navy in the Pacific, while he destroys ships of every nationality, without warning, and encourages an Asiatic menace against us. Why should we be mealymouthed in our course toward a power which has declared itself committed to destroy democracy the world over?

I know that some of those most vehement in their fulminations against even a mild naval patrol, let alone the question of an actual convoy system, insist that the conquest of Great Britain would not involve the perils I have outlined.

If, because the invasion of continental United States is improbable, there exists no danger, why are we building a two-ocean navy, enlisting an army of millions, bending all our energies to manufacture appliances and munitions of war?

What are we preparing for if we are not preparing a defense that will deter the international raiders from pushing us too far, when and if they have accomplished their present aims? We know that if Britain prevails, our troubles are over; so what could be more intelligent internationally than to insure that Britain will not go down? We know that the longer the struggle against Hitler domination continues, the more time is left to us to get ready, whatever the outcome of the war.

It is not for love of Britain that this country is trying to rush her the means of making a successful defense. It is not through admiration of the British Empire that we are bending our effort to give her the ships and planes and guns she needs. Our interest is as selfish as that of any endangered nation which found itself in like circumstances. But we do know that for more than a century we have found the British good neighbors. So long as Britain dominates the oceans we feel secure, which is the reverse of how we would feel if the Axis succeeded her as a far-flung power.

Therefore, we extend to Britain, while glorying in the heroism displayed by her warriors and civilians such aid as we can give. It certainly does not make sense to put that aid into ships which are to be sunk en route.

We stipulated every means "short of war." Should we modify that to read "every means short of efficient aid"?

Whom are we serving by withholding the protection of the war cargoes? The question answers itself.

There is no use deceiving ourselves with the idea that Herr Hitler will feel kindly toward and treat considerately the United States if he wins the battle of Britain. Does not every American know that if he ever gains the power to do so he will punish us for what we have done, rather than reward us for what we did not do?

So, I urge earnestly that we do our part in insuring the delivery of the vital cargoes to where they are most needed. If the Axis Powers should resent such action with open hostilities, which does not seem to me to be a reasonable hypothesis, how would we be any worse off than if we did not escort—convoy, if you like—the munitions and whatever else we chose to send to carry out our promise, and thus serve our own security?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania agreed to yield to me when he had finished his address. I now ask him to answer some questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator from Pennsylvania has yielded the floor, and the Senator from New Hampshire can take all the time he wants, so far as the Senator from Pennsylvania is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection. If that request is agreed to, I shall seek the presence of a quorum before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of bills on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to entering into an agreement to proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar; indeed I shall support it, but in the meantime the able Senator from New Hampshire desires to be recognized for a few moments before we proceed to the consideration of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator from New Hampshire does not want to speak for more than 5 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to make a very brief statement.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire proceeds, will he yield to me long enough so I may read a short letter addressed to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NYE. The letter is addressed to me by Thomas R. Meredith, box 535, Chester, Pa. It is dated April 28, 1941, and is as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR NYE: Might it not be well to raise the question in the Senate as to whether all other citizens inclining more toward Colonel Lindbergh's views than toward the President's are not desired in the Service?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am addressing my remarks now for about 3 minutes particularly to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who has just finished his remarks.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I am the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania sits on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. TOBEY. I accept the correction, and I thank the junior Senator from Pennsylvania very much.

Mr. President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the President of the United States, made a statement within a week that it was absurd to talk about convoys. I am

glad that the administration Senator from Pennsylvania, in contradiction, recognizes that the convoy question is not absurd but a very important question for him who speaks in defense of this land.

I now ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question. He can answer or not as he chooses. The Senator from Pennsylvania said that convoys would not necessarily mean war, but the man whom he represents on the floor of the Senate—his Chief and my Chief—contradicts the Senator from Pennsylvania, for that man said eloquently, tersely, and epigrammatically a week ago:

> Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war.

But the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] said:

> Convoys do not necessarily mean war.

Now I propound to the Senator this question: If we convoy munitions to the ports of the British Isles, in the Senator's opinion, would Germany be justified in firing on our armed convoys?

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. TOBEY. Very gladly. If the United States were to use its naval vessels to convoy munitions to the ports of the British Isles, in the opinion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, would Germany be justified in firing on our armed convoys?

Mr. GUFFEY. I will answer the Senator from Vermont—I should say, the Senator from New Hampshire—in my own time and in my own way.

Mr. TOBEY. Pardon me. The Senator to whom the Senator from Pennsylvania is speaking does not represent Vermont. He still represents New Hampshire. Please understand that. [Laughter.] It may be the remark was intended to be jocular, and I accept it as such.

Mr. President, in this period of confusion, justified apprehension, and crisis-producing maneuvering, I measure my words when I say it is a risky time for our leading statesmen to give false assurances to the American people. False assurances build up hope, but when the character of those assurances comes to light it breaks down the faith of the people. Without that faith we cannot be a united nation.

On April 2 an assurance to this body and to the people was made on an issue which is a matter of life and death to the people on an issue which is so pregnant with direful consequences to the people that they have flooded the Congress with thousands upon thousands of letters, on an issue which the President himself says "means war" if put into effect. On that day the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee rose to his feet, and speaking with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 62, the anticonvoy resolution, said:

> There will be no disposition on the part of the chairman of the committee not to give a full and fair and frank hearing upon the resolution.

This promise reassured me and reassured the mass of the rank and file of the American people. In letters to many who had written to me I repeated that assurance of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Yesterday, at a meeting behind closed doors, the Foreign Relations Committee voted on a clear-cut motion to hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 62. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee voted against holding hearings.

I now turn toward 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and say, "Mr. Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, Mr. President, Mr. Chief Executive, to whom we, the chosen representatives of the people have surrendered many of the powers vested in us by the people, keep your hands off of the Congress of the United States." Resort to word-twisting to confuse the people on the issue of war or peace, resort to pressure methods on Members of Congress of the United States, and resort to under-cover maneuverings has no place in the United States of America. That kind of procedure undermines the faith of the American people in their democracy at a time when the people have a will to make democracy work on the home front.

Yesterday the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations took several votes on Senate Joint Resolution 62 to prohibit the use of our naval ships to convoy goods to belligerents. The votes on all the motions indicated a determination on the part of the proconvoy group to keep the resolution from being considered by the Senate, voted upon by the Senate, and even to prevent open public hearings in order that the people might have an opportunity to be heard on a matter which means life and death to them.

First, the committee members voted against hearings by a vote of 13 to 9; then there was a motion to report the resolution favorably, which was defeated 13 to 10; then there was a motion to report the resolution without recommendation, that it might come back here without recommendation and receive full, free, and fair debate on the Senate floor, and it was defeated 13 to 10. Then there was a motion to report the resolution adversely, and, to use the words of Mr. Ripley, "believe it or not," even this was defeated and by a vote of 14 to 9. Thus the committee said, in effect, "We are opposed to the resolution to prohibit convoys; we will not allow the people to have public hearings, even though thousands upon thousands of people have written urging hearings; and, so far as it lies within our power, we will not permit the resolution to be considered and voted upon by the 96 Senators who represent the people in the United States Senate."

Why are they afraid to have this matter see the light of day? Are they afraid to have the Senate be on record in this issue of life and death to the people? Are they afraid that a majority of the Senators may be directly responsive to the pleas of their constituents and vote in favor of the convoy ban?

Mr. President, the people of the United States were saddened by the failure of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to back up his assurances for public hearings with a vote in favor of a motion to hold public hearings. The people of the United States are puzzled by the action of the committee to prevent the issue from being voted upon in the Senate.

But, Mr. President, the people will have an opportunity to follow debate in the United States Senate on this issue, and they will have an opportunity to know which of their representatives in the Senate are willing to disregard their will as overwhelmingly expressed in their letters to the Senators.

I serve notice at this time that when the President's ship-seizure bill comes on the floor of the Senate for action I will introduce my anticonvoy resolution as an amendment to it, which will present the issue for free debate on the floor, and which will call for a roll-call vote solely on the issue of whether the Members of this body will act to prohibit convoys or not to prohibit convoys.

And so now I again turn toward 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and say, "Mr. Chief Executive, here is one plan which no amount of White House pressure can thwart, whether that pressure is applied directly or indirectly, and whether the maneuverings are in the open or under cover." Make no mistake about it: There will be consideration by the Senate on this resolution, and there will be a roll-call vote on the resolution.

In closing, let me say these words with conviction: The time has come for the Congress of the United States to obey the injunction seen at every railroad crossing in the country in the form of a sign in large letters, reading, "Stop, look, and listen." It ill behooves the Congress of the United States, the chosen and paid representatives of the people, to turn a deaf ear to free, full, and frank consideration of the vital, far-reaching matter of the use of convoys, so pregnant with tremendous, drastic, and dire possibilities for the people of the country. That proposition has been eloquently and truly stated by the President himself, who said:

> Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks certain documents bearing on the question of convoys.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE MEN FOR DEFENSE FIRST,
New York, N. Y., April 30, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: As you may know, this committee was organized on the basic proposition that convoys mean war, and therefore, come within the sole discretion of Congress.

You may be interested in the enclosed form letter of which we sent out 10,000. It is safe to say that every name on this list and hundreds of other members who are not there listed, support your bill and demand that it be brought to the floor of the Senate for debate. We would be glad to have you put this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you wish.

No acknowledgment is necessary.

With best wishes and support.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD A. MOORE,
Chairman.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: Step by step America has approached the brink of total war. The next step will be the last—convoys mean war. We write to urge you to exercise now your right and duty to speak up on the vital question of peace or war. If you fail, the decision will go by default.

We are a committee of college men and women, ready to defend our country, who are united in the belief that American democracy can be preserved only by—

(1) Building an impregnable national defense; and

(2) Staying out of war in Europe.

We favor continued aid to Britain, provided only that it remains short of war. We oppose only those steps which are not short of war but war itself. We, therefore, stand opposed to the use of American warships as convoys—a measure which means war, as suggested by the President himself.

The lend-lease law specifically states that convoys are not authorized. It was proposed and passed as a measure to keep us out of war.

Despite this declared policy of H. R. 1776, and in the face of the 83 percent of the Nation who stand opposed to war, the pro-war minority now urges open hostilities through the use of our Navy to convoy. To forestall the thwarting of the people's will, Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, has introduced a bill forbidding the use of our ships as convoys without the consent of Congress. The bill thus insures that the war-making power, which the Constitution gives to Congress alone, shall remain in the hands of the people's representatives.

We urge your immediate support of this measure. We ask you to join with our committee in its efforts to perserve democracy at home by staying out of war abroad.

Since our work depends entirely on voluntary contributions of time and money, anything you can give will help. But in any event we want your active support. Urge the President to keep us out of Europe's war; send a letter to your Congressman; write your newspaper; tell your friends; fill out the coupon below.

COLLEGE MEN FOR DEFENSE FIRST.

ESSEX SANATORIUM,
Middleton, Mass.

Hon. C. W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Accept my sincere congratulations for the aggressive militant manner you opposed convoys by United States Navy in your clash with Colonel Breckinbridge on Saturday evening, April 11, 1941.

As I lay in a sanatorium, suffering from the effects of being gassed in World War No. 1, I cannot too strongly oppose the sending of other young able-bodied American boys into the hell they sent the so-called flower of American manhood a generation ago.

I wish I could have been near enough to you to shake your hand after you piped down that so-called southern gentleman who could only come back by name calling and boasting that he served in that last scrap. I'll bet he was down in a dugout, as he was a colonel. Thanks again for your New England spirit.

GEORGE F. MAHONEY.

P. S.—I'd like someone to ask Colonel Breckinbridge how many of those killed in the last war were colonels?

NEW YORK, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. TOBEY: It is most important that your anticonvoy bill be given a public hearing. We who are taxed too heavily to meet fat salaries demand that the public be permitted to hear what is going on in Washington.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. P. L. BABCOCK.

APRIL 26, 1941.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As one western New Hampshire man, congratulations for your firm and defiant stand on the question of convoys. In the capacity of State officer in the department of agriculture I have the opportunity to talk with many types of people, including some of the service boys and professional people.

The feeling is uniformly—positive, no convoying—stay out of this deal! A defensive war brought to our shores would prompt the support of every citizen regardless of cost, but not this duplication of 1917.

England's war aims should be openly declared now and all aid withdrawn unless she is willing to accept a reasonable program for a negotiated peace.

Any literature which you are able to send will be appreciated and used toward the realization of the above end.

Sincerely yours,

P. S. MATHEWS,
Private, 1918.

PERU, IND., *April 12, 1941.*

Hon CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I just listen to your talk and can say that I am behind you 100 percent. I have voted for Mr. Roosevelt three times, the last one to my sorrow, and if lies and broken promises constitute Americanism, deal me out now.

I will have to change my mind if I ever go to the polls again; this Democratism and Republicanism—I am canceling the both of them; and if there ever was a time when people is losing faith in their Government it is now.

We fought in the World War to save democracy; what in the world are we going to save this time; and do we have to go to war every 20 years to save this thing that is called democracy, or is it the almighty dollar?

Fight to the last ditch, and if there is anything that I can do within my power I am at your service.

Wishing you the best of luck.

J. H. KEITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 19, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: As a mother and an American citizen, am writing to let you know I am wholeheartedly in sympathy with your resolution and what you are trying to accomplish.

I wish you success.

Respectfully,

ISABEL A. HARMON.

CHICAGO, *April 20, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your efforts to keep us out of war. We hate war. I think a great majority of the people of this country favor your bill, and I hope you can get it to the Senate floor.

Yours truly,

ALAN C. ROGERS.

NORWOOD, OHIO, *April 21, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR May I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the wonderful work you are doing with your anticonvoy resolution. As a Member of the common people of the Middle West, I assure you we don't want any part of this European war.

The American people have made up their minds that this is not our war, we are not in it, and we are not going to get into it. The American people are not being fooled. It has been too short a time since the last war, when we "saved the world for democracy" without even a "thank you."

The one and only way to protect America, and the one and only way the citizens of America are willing to protect it, is right here within the Western Hemisphere. Attached you will find a list of quotations which I have used in writing to a great many of my friends against the interventionists' policies. They might call the contemporary isolationists Nazis and Communists, but they can't call these men that.

There must be no convoys and no war, and we want the issue debated democratically.

Yours for peace,

MILES D. BURNETT.

LITTLE-KNOWN SAYINGS OF WELL-KNOWN PEOPLE

"Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, and caprice?"—George Washington.

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concern."—George Washington.

"For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to the principles of morality, and respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character."—Thomas Jefferson.

"We have no commission from God to police the world."—Benjamin Harrison.

"Why not face the basic military and economic fact that it is not within our power or means to create military or naval establishments of sufficient strength to police the world, but that it is within our power and means to prevent others from transporting wars to this hemisphere?"—From the Report of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, May 15, 1940.

"We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say 'no' to those who selfishly would let us go to war."—Franklin D. Roosevelt, August 14, 1936.

"I am inclined to think that Europe will never make peace within herself until we leave her to her own work."—Lord Lothian.

"We of Europe shall solve our own problems; it is our own affair; we alone understand it. And let me add this: Every public man from Europe, especially every professional politician, who approaches the people of the United States, begging them to interfere in our affairs, is a liar, and knows that he is a liar."—Hilaire Belloc, noted English author.

"America has abstained from interference in the concerns of others, even when the conflict has been for principles to which she clings as the last vital drop that visits the heart. * * * She well knows that, by once enlisting under banners other than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication in all wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy, and ambition, which assume the color and usurp the standard of freedom."—John Quincy Adams.

ELIZABETH, N. J., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Actuated by your inspirational and courageous effort to keep the United States out of a foreign war I take this opportunity of applauding your Senate

resolution expressly prohibiting convoys by United States naval vessels.

It is apparent that sheer sophistry is being employed by many leaders in the administration to minimize or disregard completely the cogent phrase "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." Reiteration of this observation, together with an appreciation of the futility of intervention in a foreign war, will, I am confident, lead the Congress to expressly prohibit convoys by legislation.

Very sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) HENRIETTA JAMES.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,
RAYMOND J. KENNEY CHAPTER NO. 112,
Williamsport, Pa., April 21, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in full accord with your bill to prohibit the use of United States Navy and its personnel to convoy merchant vessels with materials to any of the belligerent nations.

I am now stating my opinions and not the opinions of any members of this chapter of the Order of the Purple Heart, although I am also a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In the beginning of this World War No. 2, I firmly believed that the United States, having learned its lesson from World War No. 1 would remain always neutral from any foreign propaganda, and at the same time build a Navy second to none, fortify those of our outlying possessions, an air fleet capable of giving us protection, and an Army capable of repelling any foreign invaders; however, I find we are not building for our defense, but for the defense of the Empire of Great Britain. Since when has it ever became a necessity for the American people to state that our first line of defense is the defense of England, or the defense of China, Greece, or any other foreign nation, and it is my idea that nobody in America has a right to advocate the use of American soldiers outside the United States; nobody has the right to advocate sending American soldiers abroad; nobody has the right to advocate the participation of America in any war abroad; nobody has the right to advocate our taking any part in it unless he, she, or they are prepared to put up their son and make a blood contribution. To these people who go around shouting about international cooperation and interference abroad and helping everybody out; unless these people have sons to put up, and spill some of their precious blood. they ought to keep their mouths quiet.

This organization, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Department of Pennsylvania, went on record in open convention last June 14–15, at Hazelton, Pa., against loans and aid to England—that was in 1940—and since that time all-out aid has been advocated, and we are at this present time taking from the armed forces and the Navy forces that equipment which is so vital for our own defense, besides passing a lease-lend bill for the aid of the Empire of England.

Both other veteran organizations at all times, namely, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have advocated "keep America out of foreign wars—a navy second to none, an army such that no foreign nation will dare to attack or attempt to invade any possession or part of the United States."

In closing, I again wish to extend to you my respect for the earnest work that you and others are doing to keep America out of this foreign war. Let's stay out of it, and there are only two things worth fighting for, in my opinion, for the American people to consider, and they are, defense of your home and the Bill of Rights.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE R. ROOK.

P. S.—You can use this for any need you care to.

EAST ORANGE, N. J., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We are all so busy writing to our own Senators to oppose the plan to convoy supplies to Great Britain by the United States, that we fail to express our gratitude to you and others who have withstood the siege thus far.

I had the pleasure of hearing you on the radio a few nights ago and I want you to know I am grateful. Numbers of people are but fail to tell you. With God's help we will win and prevent war. I wrote as vigorously as I knew how to my Representative and Senators to use all their strength in support of Tobey resolution 62.

Dear Senator TOBEY, I would love to equip you with all sorts of help to prevent the opposition from putting us into the war. I am convinced if we publicly and privately ask God to show us how to do this He will.

I hope I will not offend you by presuming to enclose a little prayer which has everything in it we need for victory and peace.

With prayers for your safety and well being, I am,

Gratefully yours,

Mrs. ALONZO J. GREEN.

PRAYER OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

Grant me grace, O merciful God,
To desire all that is pleasing to Thee,
To examine it prudently,
To acknowledge it truthfully, and
To accomplish it perfectly, for the praise and glory of Thy name. Amen.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *April 21, 1941.*

DEAR MR. TOBEY: I thoroughly agree with you in your effort against convoying ships to Great Britain. Feel sure if we do that it will mean war for United States, and we should stay out of it by all means. The last war didn't help us, and I surely appreciate you trying to keep us out of this one.

Faithfully yours,

Mrs. L. F. CALKINS.

LAWRENCE, MASS., *April 20, 1941.*

Hon. CHAS. W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you for your splendid radio address on Wednesday, April 16, 1941, against the use of United States convoys. You deserve a lot of credit for your courageous fight to keep America out of this European war. The general feeling amongst my friends is to build up a strong defense of America, and be prepared to fight only when this country is threatened by attack.

Yours sincerely,

HENRY T. ROONEY.

McDONNELL'S MARKET,
Roslindale, Mass., April 21, 1941.

Hon. Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, have heard your fine radio appeals in regards to your bill before the Congress to oppose the convoying of American ships. We, therefore, are contacting our Representatives and urging them to support your anticonvoy legislation.

We are fully aware of the seriousness of the whole international situation, but we must preserve peace in our own country or all will be lost.

Keep up your efforts for America first. We are with you, and trust you will not be discouraged by so much opposition from internationally minded men in our Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

McDONNELL'S MARKET,
HERBERT C. McDONNELL,
SELINA McDONNELL,
ADA E. McDONNELL,
CECILIA McDONNELL,
MARGARET RICKARBY,
EILEEN RICKARBY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 10, 1941.*

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

MR. PRESIDENT: As this is a free country, and as I am a free American citizen, I am taking the free American liberty of asking you for an answer to be made at once in one of your very interesting fireside talks to the American people who have honored you with a third-term election to the Presidency. My question is:

Are you going to keep your pledge to keep America out of war, or, was that pledge like the same pledge that Wendell Willkie made when he was trying to defeat you—only campaign oratory?

Your constituency are entitled to a straight, unequivocal answer from you, without evasion or subterfuge.

The populace of America are much disturbed over the fact that most of the knowing ones in Washington are of the opinion that we are on the brink of war in the European-Asiatic-Germanic melee that is now going on—a war in which America has no cause to participate. An answer to this question will relieve the populace—who are nearly unanimous in the opinion that we should keep out—of very great anxiety and unrest and fear.

You, Mr. President, should be a stanch friend of the American people—this, over and above friendship and good neighborliness to any and all other peoples in foreign lands.

It is not a hard question to answer provided you have made no commitment to King George and Lord Halifax and Mr. Chamberlain that binds you to make America their ally in this war.

What is your answer?

Mr. President, in your public pronouncements before last November's election, you averred that the aid you wished America to give England was to be "short of war." Now that the election is over, you have announced, in your recent Jackson Day address, the aid is to be with all our resources "and all our power." Do you mean by "all our power" that, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, you propose sending our soldiers and our sailors overseas again?

If that is what you mean, the inference is plain that you are a better friend to England than you are to your own country and that you have no regard for your pre-election pledge to the mothers of America that none of their sons would be sent to engage in another foreign war.

Yours, with very great respect,

JAMES E. BATTENFIELD.

One hundred percent against American convoys and against paying for England's war.

WINTHROP, MASS, *April 18, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just written my views on the convoy question to Senators LODGE and WALSH, and as you are leading the fight against this fatal step I want you to know how we feel on the subject in question.

Mrs. Dutch and I have listened to the various discussions with an open mind. What you have said has caused us to reach a definite conclusion. As we see it, Great Britain is asking us to help her police her entire Empire. We believe that if she were to withdraw her battleships and planes from the Mediterranean and the Far East and use them to fight off German submarines and airplanes she would have plenty of battleships to convoy merchant vessels from this country to the British Isles and possibly enough strength to even invade Germany. The talk about the Suez Canal being Britain's life line is entirely fallacious. Were a safe lane established from the United States to the Brtish Isles she would have a life line of all the supplies she needs of foodstuffs and other materials necessary for her existence.

If England would devote her entire war activities toward conquering Germany and Germany alone instead of trying to maintain domination all over the world, she might then ask us to help her accomplish the job of annihilating Hitler and the Huns, for if Hitler is beaten the war would be over. We should not shed one single drop of American blood to help England unless she is willing to devote her entire attention to conquering Germany and Germany alone. I have not heard anyone express this thought.

England had no right to promise Poland help when she knew she could not help her. She has blundered all the way through, promising help she was not in a position to deliver. Her promise of aid to Greece looks as though it was going to end as those made to Norway and the Low Countries.

Mrs. Dutch, although a native of England, agrees with me heartily. We should stop aiding Britain unless she stops trying to police the world.

I hope our viewpoints may be helpful to you in the great battle you are waging to keep American boys out of this entirely foreign war. More power to you, Senator; we pray for your success.

Sincerely yours,

LEON P. DUTCH.

RIDLEY PARK, PA., *April 20, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: May I compliment you on your efforts to keep this country out of the European war. I am unalterably opposed to convoys of ships or the sending of our Navy into the war zones. Why we should feel obliged to get into this war is beyond me. I served overseas in the last war, and can see no justification for us to again become involved in a similar undertaking. I hope you will be successful in your attempts to prevent our entrance into this war.

Yours truly,

CHARLES P. SHAW.

ELIZABETH, N. J., *April 21, 1941.*

The Honorable CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Sincerest thanks for your anticonvoy resolution.

The preservation of our strength bodily and in all other ways seems to us the foremost patriotic duty. If we do it, we shall be victorious.

If we do it before disaster befalls the Nation, we will owe it to men like you.

Forward, then, with our blessings!!

Respectfully yours,

HELEN YOUNG, M. D.

DARLINGTON, PA., *April 18, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to congratulate you on your effort to prevent the use of convoys by the armed naval forces of the United States. Such action would mean war. No boys to Europe to fight England's battles this time. Eighty-three percent of the people are determined to stay out of any foreign war.

Yours very truly,

B. C. SAWYER, M. D.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *1941.*

Honorable Senator TOBEY.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to take this means to commend the courageous stand you are making to keep our boys at home.

I am the mother of two boys and I am determined that they will not be sent in to foreign lands to fight. May God bless you and give you the fortitude to carry on.

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. MICHAEL MCANDREA.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 18, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: California, by an overwhelming majority, favors your bill to prohibit the use of so-called convoys, meaning, as it does, that shedding of American blood which England so desires as the means of having us win their war for them as we did that of 1914–18.

It also favors the measure for a referendum vote before any declaration of war can be passed, and all other measures which will stop this mad parade of steps into imperialistic war.

The writer hereof is a Georgia Democrat who, except where the candidacy of that great statesman, Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, was involved, has always voted the Democratic ticket or else not voted at all.

But he (this writer) feels that the present crisis transcends party allegiance or party loyalty, and so he wonders if some scheme could not be devised whereby our good President Roosevelt could be relieved of some of the tremendous burden he is carrying.

For instance, could Congress not persuade him to concentrate exclusively on domestic matters and turn over the entire control of foreign affairs and policy to someone with, shall we say, a better background for meeting the international issues? Such a man, for instance, as Herbert Hoover.

It could be done, could it not, sir, by a power of attorney irrevocable "until such time as the said Herbert Hoover has revived our policy of friendliness with foreign nations, reestablished the Monroe Doctrine, reaffirmed the nonmeddling policies of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe; and, in general, got us out of the mess into which we have been catapulted"?

If it could be done, what a blessing to America's next 10 generations.

Yours respectfully,

A. H. FREDERICK.

SALEM, OREG., *April 17, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We heard your radio address and are very hopeful that we can keep this country out of war by adopting your resolution, and have written our Senators and Representative to support you in your noble effort.

Wishing you much success and hoping that you will have the strength to carry on your good work

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. NICK CASPAR AND FAMILY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 17, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As one of the 83 percent who are opposed to our involvement in foreign wars, I wish to register my disapproval of the convoying of ships, because I believe that is the surest way to get the United States into war.

I think our President is gradually trying to involve us and that the people should take some steps to prevent this. Surely we have some rights left. If there is to be any democracy anywhere, it should be preserved here in America.

The people who do the fighting should have a right to decide whether or not we go to war. There is so much pressure being put on the Senators from the Executive that they no longer represent the will of the majority.

I have no objection to aiding the democracies, providing they reimburse us in some way and that we do not convoy. Our help may only prolong the war, but I do think we should feed the hungry of all who need it, if this is possible at all.

The enclosed clippings express my views in part. Not long ago we were told that Hitler would attack us; now, according to David Lawrence, Hitler doesn't want war with the United States, so we may safely run the blockade. It all smells like propaganda to me.

I have the honor to remain

Yours very sincerely,

GAIL HARE ALLEN.

ALLSTON, MASS., *April 20, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am hoping and praying you have all the success in the world. You sure are a wonderful man, and it's going to be a hard fight, because the majority are all warmongers. I just had a soldier visiting me, and he said he wished some of the "big shots" had to serve a few months; and all the refugees coming over and getting jobs right away, and our boys plugging for $21 a month. They sure are pulling some fast ones in Washington. I know the mothers in Boston are truly grateful to you. May God bless you and give you the courage to fight for our sakes.

I am

Yours sincerely,

SABINA COX.

CHICAGO, *April 20, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I wish to express our thanks to you for your stand on convoys. May you be successful. It is very comforting to the people back home to know that there are a few real patriotic Americans in Washington who are deeply concerned about our country and are doing their utmost to keep us out of war.

We are writing Senator GEORGE and his committee to help us.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. F. L. ADAIR.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Philadelphia, April 21, 1941.

Senator C. W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am unanimously instructed by the board of the Pennsylvania branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, to express to you the deep indebtedness of all of our members, who believe that the United States should remain at peace, for your introduction of Senate Resolution 62, prohibiting convoys.

In the opinion of this organization, the passage of your resolution would bring to our country the most urgent and effective defense—defense against war itself.

We assure you of the wholehearted support of the Women's International League.

We should appreciate it very much if you would inform us if there is any action which might be of service in securing the success of your measure.

With most sincere thanks.

SOPHIA H. DULLES,
Cochairman, Legislation.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 19, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to urge you to do all in your power to bring the question of convoys to a full discussion on the floor of the Senate. If we are to decide to have convoys, let the Senate vote so; but let it be done democratically after an honest debate. Let me repeat, do all possible to bring about an honest discussion on this vital matter.

Sincerely yours,

S. E. JANIS.

ALLENTOWN, PA., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I heard your recent broadcasts pertaining to the bill proposed by you to prevent naval convoying of ships to the belligerent countries, and I wish to state that I am in full agreement with your objective. In this instance I agree with the President when he said, "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." I cannot accept the thesis of the interventionists that this is our war and I am utterly opposed to our entry into the war as an active belligerent.

We entered the last World War to make the world safe for democracy and, it seems to me, that time has proven our efforts and sacrifices were in vain. In my humble judgment the Allies made poor use of victory and peace, and also the prevailing isms in the world today are the direct fruits of the last war. In my opinion the fundamental causes of war are, misrule, greed, and commercialism, plus human misery, hatred, and a dynamic leader.

I enclose an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, April 27, The Crisis in the Atlantic, which is an excellent article in favor of our entry into the war. It appears that the editor is better informed than the Members of Congress and, I think, this is a bold assumption.

I also enclose a clipping referring to Colonel Lindbergh's address before a rally in Chicago sponsored by the America First Committee. I have every respect for his opinion and I do not doubt the sincerity of his convictions, and I predict that history will record that his judgment was correct. He is a real American and I admire his fearlessness for following the dictate of his conscience.

I read in the paper yesterday, see clipping enclosed, of the formation of a new national organization known as the Fight For Freedom Committee, headed by the Right Reverend Henry W. Hobson. It seems to be somewhat of a tragedy that so many of our citizens appear to be more interested in the welfare of foreign countries than they are in the United States of America.

My sympathies are entirely with England and her Allies and I desire them to win the war. I am opposed to dictators of every species. I favor giving England and her Allies all reasonable aid short of war, but I am opposed to giving away those implements of war which are needed for our own defense. It seems to me that America's first obligation is to make her strong and able to defend herself if and when attacked. In short, I am for America first and always. Our aim must be full protection for America, otherwise we may lose our democratic form of government while we are endeavoring to defend it abroad.

It appears that many of our citizens are being stung by a variety of hyper-fertile international bug. Permit me to suggest that you request the Bureau of Entomology to make a careful investigation and to take the necessary steps to protect the Nation from the ravishes of the bugs. I further suggest that in case the bug is of a new order that it be named in honor of either Dorothy Thompson or H. V. Kaltenborn, whom I regard as the two most foremost students of internationalism.

You are doing a great service to the Nation and you deserve the praise and thanks of all genuine Americans. America needs more men of your kind who are unafraid to speak boldly in its defense. I strongly urge you to do all in your power to keep America out of this war, because I do not see the justice of having our youth again sacrificed upon foreign soil.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. KOPP.

SUNDAY, APRIL 20.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your vigorous and thoughtful radio speech of last Wednesday evening was a great pleasure to me.

This question of convoys must be stopped immediately, as must the subterfuge with which the administration is rapidly getting this country into the war.

I will consider every Congressman who votes for convoys by our ships as voting for our complete entry into the European war.

It has been gratifying lately to see that some of the local editors are beginning to realize that the administration is saying one thing and doing another.

Please continue your fight against our involvement in Europe's war, and also introduce a bill against trade with Japan.

Very truly yours,

F. H. JENNINGS.

THE FISHER C. BAILY CO.,
Reno, Nev., April 18, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
The Dodge, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: This is simply to record that all the members of the associations mentioned below so far as we have been able to consult them, are strongly in favor of your resolution against convoys, and that they will do everything possible to support you. We are today writing the President, as per copy enclosed, and we are also writing our two Senators and our Representative. We feel sure our good Senator PAT MCCARRAN can be depended upon to vote for your resolution, as well as for Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, which we presume you are also supporting.

Hoping you will let us know regarding anything that we can do to help you, and hoping you will be successful in passing said resolution, we remain, with highest admiration and regards.

Yours very truly,

FISHER C. BAILY,
President, Peace League of Nevada and Chairman, Peace Conference of Reno and Sparks.

APRIL 18, 1941.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: Undoubtedly you are watching results in the Balkans, North Africa, the battle of the Atlantic, and the blitzkrieg on London, etc.

We hope you have also read Colonel Lindbergh's letter to the people in Collier's and his speech of last night regarding prospects for the British Empire.

It does not seem to us that the way to defend America is to try to defend some other country 3,000 miles away and its widespread empire, mostly even farther away.

If the Tobey resolution and the Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 for a referendum on the war matter are passed, you would have a good "out"—if by any chance you have made representations of aid to any foreign country.

Can you see any possibility of successfully invading Europe and capturing Berlin; at this time, instead of having them with us, we no longer have the assistance of France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, Serbia, and other Balkan nations. I fear our entrance into war could only end in 5 to 20 or more years of warfare with an army of 20,000,000 or more, with casualties of 5,000,000 or more, a debt of two hundred billions or more, and even with all this, the success of our efforts might be doubtful. All would end in such world-wide destruction that the people would rise and throw out their rulers in most countries of the world, including possibly the United States.

Hoping that you will keep your campaign pledges and do everything possible to prevent this fatal result—for humanity and the people of our country, I remain,

Yours very truly,

——— ———,
President, Peace League of Nevada and Chairman, Peace Conference of Reno and Sparks.

LAPLATA, N. MEX., *April 17, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I heard your broadcast on convoying the English ships by our Navy. I know all of the people in my voting precinct and all of them said that the reason they voted for President Roosevelt was because he promised to keep the United States boys out of foreign wars; he said he would say it over and over that he wouldn't send the boys out of the United States. I think we have got enough to do by staying out of the convoying of ships to England. I voted for Roosevelt three times. The third time was all on his promise to keep the boys out of Europe's wars. If you look it up you will see that the men that advocate convoys or sending the boys to Europe to fight have got no boys in the draft age. I and 50 of my neighbors are strictly against convoying or sending the boys out of the United States to fight, and want all of you Senators and Congressmen to do all you can to prevent it; let them come here and all of us, old and young, will fight them alike. I appreciate your nerve and stay with them. I wouldn't think that Mr. Roosevelt would promise the people what he did about keeping the United States out of war, then turn around after he was elected and try to convoy to England so we can get into it too and send our boys over to be killed. I hope you Senators will not let it pass, let us stay at home, for I don't think that war is ours.

TOM DOSHER.

SANTA ANA, CALIF.

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am rewriting a letter to you which I sent to Mr. Roosevelt. The following is the letter:

"Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
"*Washington, D. C.*

"DEAR SIR: I am ardressing you as one American citizen to another, and in doing so I am asking you to stand by what you said in the preelection days, that our young men would not have to go to war if you were elected. And now I am asking you to keep your faith with the American people.

"Mrs. Roosevelt talked peace in the preelection days. Where has it gone?

"The statement that things have changed since election is not the answer. Peace never changes.

"No convoys, that's a subtle way to get America into an undeclared war. Declared or undeclared war is still what General Sherman said, 'Hell.' Pilate sentenced the innocent Jesus to an undeclared death, then washed his hands in a basin of water as a bluff that he didn't have anything to do with it.

"War is a crime against our innocent young men, and all the water in the two oceans won't wash our hands clean."

(The end of the letter except that I asked for a reply.)

Thank you, Senator TOBEY, for giving me the inspiration in your broadcast to write the letter.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) MARTHA EDWARDS.

CONCORDIA MOTOR CO.,
Concordia, Kans., April 20, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I heard your address over the radio against convoying supplies to Britain.

Keep up the fight; we should not get involved in this war.

I am also in favor of a war-referendum bill. Those who want war either are too old to fight or have no boys that they would give.

* * * * *

Joseph Kennedy spoke the truth when he said "Win, lose, or draw, if we get into this war, it will be the end of civilization and the whole world will be bankrupt."

Let those who vote to go to war be the first to go across. Keep up the fight, we are with you.

Respectfully,

MRS. R. R. BEARDMORE.

ELECTRIC VALVE MANUFACTURING CO. INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 21, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Attached please find an article in the New York World-Telegram under date of April 19.

The writer is of the opinion that you are doing a very worthwhile piece of work in Washington. Keep it up, as over 90 percent of the citizens of the United States are in back of you. We are just plain Americans and while most of us would like to see a stalemate in Europe, we would not care to have our country enter the war, as it would be a very expensive process and would burden us down with taxation. We are big and powerful enough to take care of ourselves. Let Europe keep on fighting as they have been doing for over 2,000 years, but let America take care of America only.

Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter that was sent by me today to Hon. F. D. Roosevelt.

I hope that you and the other Senators will use all the influence possible to keep the administration in Washington from forcing the United States into an unwanted and unpopular war.

With best wishes for your success, I am

Respectfully yours,
ELECTRIC VALVE MFG. CO., INC.,
W. J. CORCORAN,
President.

ELECTRIC VALVE MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 21, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Now that the question of convoying ships to England is coming up I wish to state that this is an absolute and positive step toward our entry into the European war.

If you will carefully canvass the country you will easily ascertain that at least 90 percent of the citizens are against taking part in this unfortunate and unpopular war. After all we are real Americans and believe with Washington, Jefferson, Madison, etc., in staying out of these European wars that have occurred in times past and will again occur in the future.

Will you kindly endeavor to bring up in the Senate Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY'S resolution to prohibit convoying and use your influence to have this resolution adopted and thereby greatly oblige over 90 percent of the citizens of the United States?

Respectfully yours,
ELECTRIC VALVE MFG. CO., INC.,
——— ———, *President.*

RIDGEWOOD, N. J., *April 21, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to compliment you on the stand you are taking regarding convoys. Every thinking American knows that we are being slowly, but surely, being put into this war. For the past year both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie said we would do everything short of war. It looks to me now as if we will be doing everything short of winning the war. How in the world any sane person thinks we can blast Germany out of the entire European country is beyond reason. Everyone would like to see England win, but she lost this war before she even started. She was about as badly prepared as we are at the present moment. What we should be doing now is working to make peace and not making every effort to enter the war.

Hoping you and your colleagues will keep up your fight, I am,

Sincerely,

FREDERICK A. LANDIS.

ST. ALBANS, N. Y., *April 15, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: A few days ago I heard your arguments against convoying ships to England; also the tremendous facts of how this country has been getting gradual doses of opium from the President and his administration, to soothe the thinking process of the people, so that when the President declares war no one will ask how and why.

May I congratulate you upon your American stand and may Divine Providence guide you in your wholehearted fight to think of America's home troubles and not to waste effort over a foreign land.

It is lamentable that so many of your Congressmen think so little of America and so terribly much of England to the extent that they would willingly see this country in actual war for her sake; to see the sorrow of parents for their sons; the want and privations of the people; the depressions that will bring so much misery and unhappiness to all. How could these Senators be true and honest Americans? They are not Americans but rather traitors. They are the "fifth columnists." It is they that should be ferreted out and put on trial.

Yours is a deep consolation, Senator, in knowing that millions of true Americans are behind you and your effort to keep America safe from, and out of, war—and know, too, that many are the prayers for your success from all denominations.

Respectfully yours,

ANTHONY KOZUMPLIK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 16, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I started this letter to you immediately after your broadcast but didn't get it off.

I just want to say that we think you are doing America a magnificent service in your grand fight against convoys, and I hope with all my heart that you can force your resolution out of committee.

There are many encouraging signs, and I believe if we all stand together we can come through this mess a whole, sane, and wide-awake Nation.

We are with you.

Sincerely yours,

BESSIE SIMON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 15, 1941.*

The Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am just in receipt of yours of 14th inst., enclosing copy of your resolution, for which I thank you.

The only way we can avoid another A. E. F. is for the 4,000,000 conscripts, who were kept out of the last war until the votes were counted and whose sons are being conscripted for this one, to take a firm stand against sending their sons to the slaughter fields of Europe, and all the rest of us unite solidly behind them, and neither will the President dare ask or the Congress dare vote a declaration of war.

The final move has just been started. At this moment the papers on the stands say in large letters, "Stimson Says Train Our Soldiers to Fight on Foreign Soil." This was undoubtedly inspired by his Chief, who is preparing to duck out of Washington, as he always does, until the first blasts blow over. Then will come a pitiful wail from some high official in England, and Mr. Roosevelt will rush back from Warm Springs and probably ask for a declaration of war. There we must all show the red blood of our forefathers if we want to save our Nation from destruction.

I maintain that if England cannot defeat Hitler it would be futile for us to try to send enough men over there to drive the Germans out of all of Europe, Asia, and Africa and that we had better conserve our strength and resources and prepare to defend ourselves on this continent if we ever have to do it.

Very respectfully yours,

J. W. HOUGH.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you as a mother of two sons, and to let you know I am very much opposed to having American ships convoyed with American boys.

I feel I am expressing also the opinions of thousands of mothers everywhere.

Trusting and praying that this will never be done.

I am, sincerely,

MRS. J. E. PRITCHARD.

AURORA, ILL.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *April 15, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Having heard a portion of the broadcast Saturday evening when you appeared on the Peoples Platform, I wish to express my hearty approval of your presentation of the subject which was being discussed.

I feel that everything you said relative to the administration's attitude of repudiating all pledges concerning keeping us out of war was very clearly and accurately stated. I feel that you are right in assuming that the great majority of people in this country are still desirous of keeping out of the war and building a strong, influential democracy here at home.

These views are from one who was not only in the last war but served overseas.

Very truly yours,

W. F. GUARD.

FRED J. CRISP, INC.,
Akron, Ohio, April 15, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SENATOR: I heard your debate with Col. Breckenridge Saturday evening over the radio and it seemed to be the general topic of conversation at the country club and two other places at which I happened to call. From the general expression, there was no dissension against your opinion.

United States should be proud of men of your caliber who have the courage to speak the truth and stand for what they think is right. The truth, of course, always hurts and your statement about our being suckers in the last war is something the general public should know if they don't. They even ignored and refused to pay their just obligation, or, in other words, they fed us a nice big bowl of hot soup and now they want to feed us another, only bigger and hotter.

I naturally subscribe to helping England in every way as I dislike to have Europe dominated by Hitler. I am an American, born of English parents, but I could not subscribe to our going into the last war and I have not changed my opinion about this. This seems to be the general expression of over 90 percent

of the people I have talked to in the past 6 months.

May God give you health and strength to fight on.

Very truly yours,

FRED J. CRISP.

PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: They couldn't answer you on Saturday for you spoke the truth. Last election night I drove up to Hyde Park to cheer the President, for I had voted for him again, believing him and his mouthpiece Joseph Kennedy. Don't let him betray that confidence. This time he has a mandate—to keep us out of Britain's war. To send convoys is to send American boys into the paths of torpedoes. We, the people, say no convoys.

Keep up the fight—we'll pray and talk for you everywhere we go. Ninety-six million of us want peace. All help short of war is O. K., but not a smidgen more. Don't let Anglophiles and others with their fish to fry get us into it. I have five sons.

ISABELLA BEACH.
(Mrs. Harry A.)

APRIL 12, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR: We listened in on the People's Platform Saturday night and we sure are glad to hear that we have a Senator that feels as the working people do toward war.

We are working people and we surely do talk war and I'm sure you said just about what we feel.

The working people do not want war, that's certain.

Congratulations on your speech.

(Signed) Mr. and Mrs. LEO MARISSEAU.
HAVERHILL, MASS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 12, 1941.*

Hon. SENATOR TOBEY.

DEAR SIR: I want to add my mite of encouragement to you in your efforts to save we Americans from the disaster of another foreign war. The bulk of the American people are behind you in your efforts.

Here is a suggestion. The next time someone makes the statement that we have been hiding behind the British Navy for 100 years ask them if the British Navy protected the Government of the United States during the Civil War. Unless my history is cockeyed the British Navy did all it could to hamstring the blockade of the Southern States. If the British Navy was protecting us for the past 100 years where was it when the French expedition set Maximilian upon the throne of Mexico?

May you and those who are making the fight with you be successful in saving the American people from the folly of another foreign war.

Sincerely,

ALBERT HUENEFELD.
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 15, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please keep up your fight to forbid armed convoy for foreign destination, which surely means war.

I am a World War veteran, and I know this is not our war. We want no part in it, either in Europe or Asia, and we should not be compelled to go over there every 20 years or so to settle their quarrels. We had no business over there the last time and much less now. God forbid our entry into it. Preserve our own country, keep out of war and bankruptcy.

Most respectfully yours,

GEORGE W. BASHER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 14, 1941.*

Senator C. W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: Your radio speech and also the round-table discussion was indeed good.

The lady was absolutely correct when she stated (in your round-table talk) that from the amount of men who are unable to pass the draft test was proof we have business here at home to do.

Yes; I have advocated for some time also that if our Government heads would try to solve the many problems here at home they would not find time then to meddle in Europe's everlasting wars.

Our President promised the people of America that if we would elect him for a third term he then would keep us out of war.

From the way this whole mess looks to me now, Mr. F. D. R. is letting the American people down more and more each day.

There are some at the head of our Government who should go back to their father's farms or harness shops driving mules instead of trying to force and drive the American people into bloody wars.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. R. JACKS.

MOTHERS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Detroit, Mich.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a regular meeting of the Mothers of the United States of America, which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 14, 1941:

"Whereas we, the Mothers of the United States of America, are organized for the purpose of keeping this country out of foreign wars; and

"Whereas President Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself has repeatedly said that the act of convoying ships means war; and

"Whereas it is his duty to fulfill his solemn promise made to the people, i. e., 'Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars'; and

"Whereas, notwithstanding his duty, his promise, and his admissions that such step means war, he is said to be arranging to convoy ships, to commit the final act leading to war, under the guise of 'neutrality patrol': Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, We, the Mothers of the United States of America, most seriously protest against such breach of promise and breaking of faith by the misuse of power. We hereby urgently demand that the constitutional power of our representatives be used to prevent such acts of war, and thereby save the United States of America from becoming involved in a repetition of the senseless tragedy of 1917, i. e., a foreign war which is not our war; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be duly certified and sent to the President and to each Member of both Houses of the Congress of the United States of America."

We request that you support the Tobey resolution prohibiting the use of convoys.

[From the Detroit Times of February 23, 1941]

EMPIRE BUSINESS "AS USUAL"—ENGLISH SEND LUXURIES TO CANADA BY CONVOY—AMERICA SENDS BUNDLES FOR BRITAIN WHILE BUNDLES FROM BRITAIN FLOW BACK ACROSS ATLANTIC

(By Walter Kiernan)

MONTREAL, February 22.—Bundles for Britain flow from more than 700 cities in the United States across the Atlantic today, while bundles from Britain flow in a never-ending stream back across the Atlantic to Canada.

Ships that carry socks and sweaters as a free-will offering from people of the United States to Britain are passing ships that carry socks and sweaters from British manufacturers to the retailers of Canada.

This is one of the most paradoxical situations in any comparison of the United States at peace and Canada at war.

CLICKING NEEDLES

While women in the United States click their needles turning out sweaters and sox to be packed up and shipped off to England by the Bundles for Britain organization, Canadian stores feature sox and sweaters which are the product of British looms, apparently still turning out and delivering the goods despite Hitler and threatened invasion.

Last year Bundles for Britain, Inc., with a staff of 650,000 volunteer workers in the United States, received and spent $1,654,085 for aid to Britain in the form of goods or cash.

There is no Bundles for Britain in Canada. Here the population is asked to "buy British" rather than to donate anything and the range of products offered for sale is amazing considering that they come from a country at war.

METAL PILED HIGH

In the United States, at peace, citizens are urged to save their old automobile registration plates and turn them in for scrap metal. Canada, at war, receives from Britain, at war, 5-pound tins of toffee. One Montreal store window is piled high with the metal containers.

Simpson's, one of Montreal's big department stores, displays heavy boxes stamped "Britain delivers the goods" in its windows. In some boxes are hundreds of sweaters of all colors and sizes, neatly wrapped and packaged.

Britain is delivering luxuries as well as staple merchandise.

A huge packing case in Eaton's window is stamped "Convoyed by the British Navy."

DAINTY FIGURINES

It is filled with service plates and dainty figurines from Britain's famous china makers. Five-and-ten-cent stores feature British lacework with a good-sized table scarf available for 63 cents.

Tip Top Tailors, a tailoring chain, has brought in approximately $4,000,000 worth of suiting materials, indicating that British looms are functioning smoothly. In the first 16 months of the war, only about one-seventh of the material ordered was lost at sea, indicating that the British convoy is also working smoothly.

Furniture turned out in Britain's famous William Birch plant at High Wycombe and Frederick Tibbenham plant at Ipswich continues to arrive in Canada, and the Eaton Co. notes:

"Even the threat of raids, the crash of bursting bombs can neither hurry nor delay the painstaking carving and creating of beautiful furniture."

To citizens of the United States who think of all-out war in terms of complete abandonment of luxuries, and of war transportation in terms of troop movements, the manufacture and shipping under convoy of furniture, Wedgewood plates, and toffee seems strange, but Canadians think it not unusual.

[From the Detroit News of March 31, 1941]

ANTICONVOY MOVE IS MADE IN SENATE

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY (Republican, New Hampshire) introduced a joint resolution today to prohibit convoying of merchant vessels by United States warships.

He said his resolution would give the Nation "an opportunity to see whether the administration and the Members of the Senate mean business when they say they are opposed to our entering the war."

TOBEY, who voted against the British-aid bill, said that his resolution would enable President Roosevelt and the Senate to "translate their public statements into specific legislation to keep the country from taking a step into war."

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *April 22, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

I am opposed to our country's entering the war and I know that the use of American naval vessels as convoys will be the last step we take. War is inevitable if we use convoys.

Please, for your country's sake, don't give up or waver a bit. I am behind you and I know a majority of the American people are.

I have written letters to newspapers opposing convoys, and if you have any information on this subject you can send me, I will use it at once.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. KEENAN.

APRIL 21, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please keep up your valiant fight against those who want to drag this country into the European holocaust. Let us stick to the Monroe Doctrine, as did our forefathers, and keep out of Europe. It is none of our business.

Yours very truly,

JAMES J. DUGAN,
Veteran of Foreign War.
JEAN DUGAN,
War working during last war.
We know.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 16, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on a mighty fine speech. We appreciate the great fight you and a few of your colleagues are making in the Senate on behalf of the great majority of Americans. We will never forget the real men in Congress fighting for the preservation of democracy here at home.

FREDERICK W. HORNER COLLEGE MEN
FOR DEFENSE FIRST.

WEST ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *April 16, 1941.*

United States Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand and fine explanation of convoy situation. Keep up good work. Friends, neighbors expressed similar sentiments to those contained your able speech.

DAVID A. ROHN.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *April 12, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United State Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am thoroughly in accord with your resolution against the use of our ships as convoys, and I can speak for everyone I have talked with. I have met but two persons who believed in sending men abroad. All others were opposed.

Very truly yours,

NORA M. O'BRIEN.

MUNHALL, PA., *April 19, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR TOBEY: I am just one of the many millions of Americans who, like yourself, believe that the use of American convoys can lead but to one end which is war. Please continue the good fight which you are putting up against this warlike measure which has been brought up before the Senate. I have written other Senators to help defeat the measure and am doing my best to get my friends and neighbors to do so, too.

Convoying ships is perhaps one of the surest ways we can find of getting into the war. It is quite inconceivable that Germany would not sink these ships. In order to do so, she must use gunfire, and, as you say, gunfire means war. Many of my friends express the opinion that sinking American ships will not swing the public's opinion in favor of war. If I remember correctly, it was this very thing that started us on the road to war.

I would not like to see the United States in another war, for I have had the experience of going through one. I would not like to see my son, who is of military age, to get tangled up in the bloody mess going on in Europe. I'm sure that if you keep the good work up, many citizens will realize what your objective is and will rally around.

Thank you again for the good work which you are doing, and I hope that you may soon have a loyal following in the Senate, large enough to defeat the measure.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN RIPPER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 23, 1941.*

DEAR SIR: As far as the convoy question is concerned, everyone I have spoken to is convinced that the United States' sanctioning convoys will lead us irrevocably into the bloody conflict abroad.

We don't want our boys to be concerned with the deadly but useless struggle going on between the various countries.

By all means quash the convoy system.

EVELYN DALY.

YONKERS, N. Y., *April 22, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We are all against convoys and want to stay out of war. We elected President Roosevelt on the promise he would keep us out of war, and I hope he does not betray our trust. May God bless you for your good work.

Very truly yours,

MRS. CATHERINE FERGUSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I want to congratulate you on your one-man struggle against the underhand tactics of the administration. The American people are practically unanimous in their desire to stay out of the European war and in their opposition to the use of American convoys. The man on the street is deeply indebted to you for your bold and forceful expression against clandestine efforts to drive us into war. Take added courage in the fact that the American people are behind you en masse.

There will be national unity and fresh morale in the Nation only when the administration ceases its warmongering, concentrates its defense activities for the sole purpose of defending the Western Hemisphere, and puts its house in order—that is, endeavors to eliminate poverty.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT MOORE,
A Young Man of Fighting Age.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 19, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY of New Hampshire.

SIR: Many of us here in Illinois are grateful to you for your anticonvoy bill. I heard an audience of more than 8,000 people last night cheer when your name was mentioned. Please accept my thanks for your stand.

MRS. MINA S. ROGERS.

THE STRATFORD NEWS,
Stratford Center, Conn., April 19, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a word to let you know that there are many people in this section who applaud your stand on the convoy question.

Your telegram to the President, as reported in the New York Times of Friday, certainly spoke the feelings of many people with whom I come in contact. I believe they are the sentiments of a majority in this country. But for once in our national history the majority has been maneuvered into such a bog of mental confusion that it doesn't know how to get what it wants.

Yours sincerely,

ALFRED S. O'BRIEN,
Editor, the Stratford News.

KEARNY, N. J.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the April meeting of the union of which I am a member, I personally polled 80 members on the questions: One. Shall we go to war. Two. Shall we convoy ships to belligerent nations; and the result was this: On No. 1, 11 yes, 69 no; on No. 2, 15 yes, 65 no.

Senator, I believe that if this was done in every union the results would be approximately the same, that is, that the rank and file are opposed to war and all so-called steps short of war.

Keep battling. I am sure that the majority of the people are with you in your fight to keep this Nation of ours out of this war.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS D. KELLY.

NEW BRAUNFELS, TEX., *April 19, 1941.*

Senator CHAS. W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you on your fight to keep the United States from convoying ships.

I served with the A. E. F. in France in 1918 and know what war is. Keep up your good fight and help us to stay out of war.

Thank you and good luck.

Yours very truly,

FRANK KNEUPPER.

TACOMA, WASH., *April 12, 1941.*

Hon. C. W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Words alone cannot express my deepest appreciation of your valiant stand in behalf of America, our youth, and the welfare of our Nation. Undoubtedly, the great majority of loyal and true Americans who heard you speak during the debate upon the People's Platform will thank God that we still have Americans such as you in our Congress.

Statesmen such as you, sir, have not fought in vain; patriots such as you conceived our Nation; the spirit of the founders and the fathers of our glorious country dwells within you. Some day we shall awake from the present trance in which our noble country was placed by servants of the king and the committee of "Aiding the Allies by Robbing America."

I, too, still suffer from the wounds of battle—I, too, am a slave of the war that was to end all wars. My very soul cries out against a repetition of '17-18—not because of untold suffering and wounds, but because America has nothing to show for our victories; no gain whatever for America or the world in general. We defeated the armies of the Kaiser but brought Hitler into being. We may defeat Hitler, but we shall establish Stalin as the ruler of Europe, including England. Just as Christ died upon the cross, so died the sons of America upon the barbed-wire entanglements, hanging limply, arms asunder, just like Christ in his ordeal. Will America send its sons to Europe again? May God not let this come to pass.

Foreign slackers and cowards who fled their countries instead of fighting are now demanding that we reestablish them in their business or regain their lost enterprises in Europe by waging a never-ending war—by saving foreign empires, kings, and dictators. Americans who fought and bled for America upon the battlefields in Europe are now branded by them as masked appeasers, "fifth

columnists," Nazis, etc. These foreign devils tell us to go to war and sacrifice our glorious country, our sons, our wealth, our liberty and freedom, in order that they may continue to live in splendor.

Wealth, greed, and power will crumble into dust, but Americans such as you, sir, will become our immortal great—will live upon the pages of American history. The catch-phrases and slogans as used by the war-mongers and servants of the king today are naught but the tools of dictators. Barnum was right in his day, but Barnum is dead. Enclosed please find my poem, Requiem.

Very respectfully,

J. H. ZEGENDER.

(Served with One Hundred and Forty-fifth Infantry, A. E. F.; wounded September 26, 1918.)

REQUIEM!

(By J. H. Zegender)

America, thou noble Nation,
Conceived of suffering, blood and toil—
Endowed with liberty and freedom,
Upon thy ever sacred soil.
The gains of hundred years and fifty,
So richly blest by hand of God,
Have finally now been all surrendered
To lie beneath the foreign sod!

George Washington's heroic army,
So valiant once at Valley Forge—
Gave us the burning torch of freedom
And the defeat of Old King George.
Again a drama now unfolding,
Just after hundred-fifty years—
When Congress freely abdicated
In favor of the British peers!

Perhaps we all will owe allegiance
To His Majesty, the British King—
And bend our knees as loyal subjects
To every royal hireling.
How long until our cherished laddies
Will sail across the foaming sea—
To fight the battles of the ages
And save His British Majesty?

LITTLETON, N. H., *April 17, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Congratulations on your speech of Wednesday night, on the radio, against convoying. God bless and sustain you in your efforts. I am absolutely against convoying.

REV. F. P. FRYE.

Written from New Hampshire Methodist annual conference, at Nashua, N. H.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 23, 1941.*

United States Senator TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your splendid telegram to the President of these United States was read to us tonight from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We stand back of you 100 percent, and are most grateful for your brave efforts to prevent our boys from being sent into this war. Keep up the good work.

UNITED MOTHERS OF AMERICA.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: May a New Deal Democrat congratulate you on your fight to bring the convoy question out in the open. Continue the good work.

ROBERT N. GILMORE, Jr.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

GARY, IND., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate your courageous opposition to convoys. Your radio broadcast last week was certainly to the point. Convoys mean war.

My business brings me into contact with hundreds of people each week, mostly in their homes, and I want to assure you that the overwhelming opinion is decidedly against convoys and war.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES RYAN.

WORLD WAR MOTHERS OF
NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Winchester, Mass., April 16, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The New England Chapter, World War Mothers of New England, Inc., in convention assembled at Hotel Brunswick, Boston, April 9, 1941, went on record to say that the World War Mothers of New England are united against our United States Government sending convoys to Europe, and that we are with you wholeheartedly on your campaign against convoys.

We also went on record against sending any of our American boys to fight on foreign soil. A letter has been sent to each of our Senators from Massachusetts and other New England States.

We gave our sons in 1917 to save democracy, and now most of us have grandsons in camps, either through draft or enlistment. Must we always fight England's battles?

Gratefully yours,

MARY E. GILBODY,
Chairman, Legislation.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 19, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The attached represents the viewpoint of one American citizen who is concerned with the current influences trying to force us into the use of convoys by naval vessels before I believe the citizens of this country are ready for it.

By willingness to risk war in aiding Britain, I believe many Americans mean, if it is forced upon us in granting aid in equipment but not that we should force American boys into the war in this direct act.

GRACE J. AVERILL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 11, 1941.*

To Committee to Defend America by Aiding Allies:

I gave toward this fund previously because (1) I believed England needed funds to defend herself rather than funds in form of food or relief as restricted by other organizations, and also because (2) I believed all Americans should give of their resources rather than send our boys as has been done before.

I am in sympathy with the lend-lease bill as implementing this idea of joint support in resources, but your publicity has destroyed all confidence in your honesty of statement, because as soon as we passed the lease-lend bill your organization immediately came out for naval convoys although at the time the bill was being discussed, the question of convoys was "soft pedaled."

All of this supports the feeling many Americans have that we are being subjected to a careful build-up of propaganda to take us step-by-step into war, going as rapidly as American public opinion can be swung. Confidence in our democratic processes is impaired when we sense such a prejudiced influence. We begin to feel that we can't believe anything as being a sincere statement of facts or of purpose when such statements apparently are made only at the psychological time to achieve a deliberate effect.

I am opposed to involving the lives of any American men against their own free will in this European conflict and especially men in our own military services. I am in favor of going the limit in taxing income and resources and in taking over businesses where it will speed our help in furnishing equipment and I am in favor of some compulsion in settling of strikes, but that is as far as I am willing to go. We should all tighten up our belts together.

At this time I am not receptive to the idea that we should send our men to Europe either for convoys or as an invading army on the basis that it will prevent Hitler from invading the Americas later. If we establish this principle, we are committing ourselves to fight in all wars in the future as a protector of the whole world. I am willing to give England all the boats we can and strain our utmost resources to replace them. I am willing to cooperate with South American countries on total hemisphere defense but I am not willing for the United States of America to assume responsibility for compelling American men to fight in Europe or in convoys to Europe. Loyal Americans of European parentage who fled the continuance warfare and social and national conflicts of Europe should not be forced to give their lives fighting in such a conflict. If our furnishing of resources does not stop Hitler then we should all suffer together in any economic results, or in loss of economic power. If we continue to build defense facilities to the maximum I cannot sincerely believe there is danger of military occupancy of this country.

GRACE J. AVERILL.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., *April 17, 1941.*

Hon. Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: After listening to your stirring radio speech last night on the convoy question, I want you to know that I have just written to Senators WAGNER and MEAD demanding that they support you in the magnificent fight you are making against this last and final effort to plunge us into this war. I also wrote to President Roosevelt, letting him know my views. I have watched your career in the Senate, and may God bless you, Senator, is all that I can say. I, with members of my family and friends, would like nothing better than to some day have the opportunity of voting for you for President of the United States.

Yours very sincerely,

JOSEPH REIDY,
A. E. F. Veteran.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 17, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I only wish I could grasp your hand to congratulate you on your fine speech over the radio Wednesday night.

Thank God we have some true Americans like you in our United States Senate.

I am now writing also to my two Senators from New York, MEAD and WAGNER, urging them to vote for your resolution against convoying.

May God give you health and strength to carry on your glorious fight.

My son is now in the United States Army, and I want to tell you that he is dearer to me than anything in this world.

Hoping to hear from you soon again, and hoping your resolution passes overwhelmingly, I remain,

Respectfully,

THEODORE HILGEMAN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 16, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Permit me to congratulate you for your fearlessness in daring to bring to the attention of the American people the moral aspect of the convoy-and-war issue now confronting them. It is encouraging to know that in the midst of all the hypocritical appeals for a spiritual awakening there is at least one Senator who has the fortitude to bring the name of Jesus Christ into the picture.

When the debate begins on the 30th of this month, I look forward to your unyielding spirit to put that sacred name also into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Your reference to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, during your radio address tonight reminded me of the significant fact, that it was on Good Friday of 1917 that the Senate of the United States were voting to put our Nation into the throes of the first World War.

I have every confidence that our participation in the current orgy can be prevented if your colleagues are awakened to the awful truth that the Prince of Peace is appealing to them to keep America sane and free. I can never understand why Christian gentlemen seem to lose all semblance of moral responsibility as soon as they don the robes of their official positions. America can well be proud of you and rightly grateful, that in this age of world-wide insanity, there are men like you in the Senate, who are dauntless in their determination to follow the advice of the Father of our Country—to keep aloof from entanglements with foreign nations.

There are few in this country of ours who would be unwilling to offer their lives in defense of it, whether the necessity arose from a fear either of invasion or of insurrection, but at the same time there are few who are willing to offer their lives to protect the interests of another nation by fighting a foreign war. I, for one, am not willing to do so. Thus, I urge you, Senator TOBEY, to keep up the crusade for the welfare of America first, and take comfort in the admonition of the Christian truth, that you will find a real reward for having fought a good fight, for having kept the faith. God bless you.

Most respectfully yours,

JOHN F. CASSIDY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 16, 1941.*

Hon. JAMES MEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MEAD: As one of your constituents who has never failed to let you know where he stood on critical issues before the Senate of the United States, I write you at this time to put myself on record against the use of convoys by the Government of the United States. Perhaps, you will read no further, but if you do, you may find an argument in support of my stated opposition, that will be of interest to you as a Christian gentleman if not as a Senator from the State of New York.

Whether or not our country shall participate in the tricontinental war is a subject that surpasses the realm of politics and government, it is a subject that hinges more on the matter of conscience and of morals. If you are going to be honest with yourself and with the millions of citizens whom you represent, you will not overlook the mental reservation that the people of the United States are committed to a policy of peace and noninterference in the affairs of Europe, Asia, and Africa. You know as well as I that this war is none of our business, and if you should assist the power politicians in their effort to make it our war, you will be untrue not only to yourself and to the people, but also to the God, by Whose Providence you were elected to the high office you now hold.

While you represent citizens of all creeds, you must not lose sight of the fact that you have an obligation as a Christian to harmonize your official activities with the moral law that was handed down to man long before the first government was ever instituted. That law forbids any but a just war, and you cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, call this present conflict a just war. Nor can you justify the taking of any one step that might precipitate our engagement in it.

On the 30th of the current month, you will have an opportunity to voice the sentiment of real Americans and particularly of Christians who are sick of this widespread campaign to chastize Hitler for the excesses reported to have been committed against non-Christians resident within the territory of the Third Reich. That opportunity is related to Senate Joint Resolution No. 62, introduced by Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, prohibiting the use of convoys by the Government of the United States. I am against convoys because they are the last step before open participation by our Nation in this war. I trust you will have the courage to vote for the resolution, remembering that Almighty God is greater than President Roosevelt, and will hold you to an accounting long after the President will have passed to his eternal reward. Think it over, Senator MEAD. It is more important to your eternity than it is to mine.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN H. CASSIDY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 16, 1941.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: At this critical period in the life of our Republic, it is most unfortunate that you have been stricken with an attack on your health. I am not unmindful of the probability, that it has been occasioned by the arduous tasks in which you have engaged as a Senator from our great State of New York. In thanksgiving for the many noble efforts you have made on behalf of the people, the least we can do is to pray for your speedy recovery.

I am confident that in this crisis you will be spared to carry on your crusade for the good of the humanity and particularly for the welfare of the citizens of the United States. All that they desire in this war-torn world is to live in peace with their fellowmen. It is within your power to help them find that peace by striving to keep America out of war.

On the 30th of this month of April, you will be called upon to vote on Senate Joint Resolution No. 62, prohibiting the use of American convoys, which the President has declared will mean war. As one of your constituents, I am opposed to war and to any step that might lead to war. Thus, it is my ardent hope, that you will be well enough to attend the session of the Senate when the issue of convoys is presented to it, and that you will have the fortitude to vote against their being used by the Government of the United States.

Your vote on that day or whatever day the vote will actually be taken may be your last official act, if the Creator who made you and who so recently has given you a warning of the hereafter by allowing your health to be shattered, should choose to take you home again, beyond the veil of politics and service to your country. Politicians may fool some of the people about the necessity of stopping Hitler, but they have not fooled you and they have not fooled the God of Peace. If you should vote as the politicians want you to vote, careless of the will of the sovereign people, you will have yet to reckon with God, who presides over the destiny of nations, and who will hold you to a more strict accounting than any party or any power in the world.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. CASSIDY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 16, 1941.*

Hon. ANDREW L. SOMERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SOMERS: For a considerable period of time, whenever the Congress were called upon to vote on some momentous issue before them, I never failed to let you know my position as a constituent; and while I readily concede the great demands upon your time, I cannot help but regret that I have never received a reply to my letters. More so, however, do I regret the fact that you seem to have disregarded what I know to be the will of the sovereign people. You have gone down the line with the administration, apparently careless of the views of your constituents on the things that affected them even more than they affected you.

Now is the time to redeem yourself. We are confronted as a Nation with the great issue of peace or war. We, the people, want peace. The administration seems to want war. But it will be we, the people, who will have to fight the war, not the administration. Is it not high time that you took official recognition of this important fact?

I appeal to you, Mr. Congressman, to look at the picture from an angle other than politics. Look at it from the standpoint of a citizen of this free Republic and also as a creature of God. Long after you will have passed the pale of such things as politics and duty to the party, you will still be reckoning with the greater force that existed before government was even conceived and will continue to exist after the last government will have vanished from the face of the earth. Think of eternity, and you will act for peace. Remember the words of Christ: "He who lives by the sword will die by the sword."

I am not attempting to confuse the issue with sentimentalism. I am trying to be practical. Very soon you will be called on to vote on Senate Joint Resolution No. 62, to prohibit the use of American convoys, which the President has admitted means shooting and which he has stretched to mean war. As one of your constituents I call upon you in the name of Christ, the Prince of Peace and the King of Kings, to vote against convoys and thereby vote for peace. It is yours to choose between the warmongers and the people, between Satan and Christ. I pray God to give you the courage to forget politics and to vote for the will of the sovereign people.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. CASSIDY.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just listened to your splendid radio address.

Convoys mean war, and war means sending our sons to die in foreign fields; this is not our war, we do not want war, we do not want union now.

Thank you for your work, and I am a Gold Star Mother from November 11, 1918, and may this never happen again.

CLEOPATRA MATTICE.

AUTO TRANSPORT CORPORATION,
OMAHA, NEBR., *April 17, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We listened to your speech last night and thought it was very fine in every way. We are behind you 100 percent and are writing our Congressmen today. We thank God that there are sincere and fearless men like you and the rest of the opposition group in this country. The small group of Congressmen opposing war are our only hope.

We are for America and American boys first, and so are countless numbers of people we know. The swivel-chair patriots should rush right over to Europe and fight if they are so anxious. We wonder what is stopping them. Why aren't we allowed a referendum on the war question? What if someone should take a notion to organize our draftees, represent them, and demand rights for them? Everyone has rights except the boys that will have to do the fighting.

Thanking you for your superb efforts to keep this country out of war, we remain,

Yours very truly,

MRS. L. L. WADE.
LEROY L. WADE.

OVIATT'S,
Los Angeles, April 16, 1941.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It seemed to me that some word of explanation might be apropos in connection with the attached petition which the employees of this firm released to you and the Congress, in its original form, yesterday.

Our executive group, along with employee representatives, came to my office a day or so ago asking if they might, under our company firm name, petition you as they have. I heartily agreed with their action, which has involved the name of this company.

I, too, am of the firm belief that you were not only sincere, but right, on October 23, 1940, when you solemnly promised not to take this country to war unless attacked by a foreign foe.

Twenty-five years of travel and business relationship with every country in Europe convinces me that this European mess is not our war, and I personally see no reason for buying an interest in it; for, if we do, we will not only lose our liberties and bankrupt the Nation, but what is more important, we will most assuredly lose millions of precious lives, and, I ask you, for what?

The path to war is a false path to freedom.

Most earnestly,

OVIATT'S.
JAMES OVIATT, *President.*

PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(With copies to the Cabinet and to all Members of Congress)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last fall, when you were campaigning for reelection, you stated in Philadelphia on October 23, 1940:

"To every man, woman, and child in the Nation I say this: Your President and your Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves, not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves, not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'"

We, the undersigned, desire you to know that we are heartily in accord with your very definite promise and commitment made at that time and most earnestly petition you not to allow our Navy to convoy, patrol, or in any way assist in delivering war materials, supplies, etc., to any nation now at war. Our reason for making this request is because we are against foreign wars and are against any deliberate action on the part of our Government that would allow our naval forces to be attacked.

We assure you, Mr. President, that over 80 percent of the American people, as shown by a recent Gallup poll, are today heartily in accord with your pledge of October 23, 1940, not to intervene in foreign disputes, but to follow the principles of the great Americans of the past who pioneered this Nation's foreign policy, thereby avoiding all entanglements by America in Europe's endless wars.

Signatures:

Paul Rangue, Nathalie Sode, James Oviatt, Paul D. Bucklin, Vernon Oviatt, Antonio Falasca, Frank J. Recupero H. N. Dombrowerter, John Kish, Peter Sutz, Stanley Pazny, Sam Secard, Sol Hollander, Frances Croce, Cora Kozlowski, Mrs. G. Russell, Mrs. Pluma B. Ray, Pietro Ricciarde, Rocco De Pietro, Louis Lianda, Stanley Latku, Jennie Mastro, Rose Barone, Elizabeth E. Strand, Margaret B. Whyte, Anne Paulson, Juan Campa, John Uhrin, Margaret Vogt, Rose Kocuper, Frank Pucunas, Ferdinand S. Gilli, Paul Roth, Robt. R. Hawkensen, George S. Ray, Jesus Avelor, Karl H. Anderson, Theo. Benditt, Sylvia Jones, Lewis A. Oviatt, George L. Tracey, Ferrell Burton, Sr., E. Merton Campbell, Max S. Rittenberg, P. D. Sinst, A. N. Menard, Betty Webster, Arthur J. Nelson, Jr., Ralph L. Green, Robert L. Young, Dorothy K. Bauer, Kay Russon, Ross Christensen, Maxine Clear Upham, Leslie H. Sawyer, Franklin D. Richardson, Henry E. Clark, Bessie M. Oviatt, E. R. Davis, Mary Volpe, Carmen Gutierrez, Palagia Czech, Walter B. Alkaj, Darkis Horasion, Jose Moreno, Ysabel Zwiga, John Leos, Martin Ruiz, Isaias Lesn, C. C. Cotterell, Edmund Lowe, John Keenan, Frank M. Little, Sidney H. Cotterell, Wm. O. Brutung, Geo. Hermann, Dorothy F. Martin, Otto Mannisto, Ivar Karjala, Paul Dekamy, Bela Tremler, Silas Tippins, Alexander Rudentis, W. H. Kiger, V. T. Keefee, J. H. Marion, C. N. Maurats, Ralph Odegard, Libby D'Orazio, K. R. McLawrin, Lois Campbell, C. L. Tanner, Robert S. Burns, C. Fred Clarks, Frank W. Smith, Stella E. Tunell, Fredericka B. Hussey, Bernice S. Deane, Edna M. Burns, Marion Winters, Ethel McLaurin, Berna Pringle, P. L. Frienier, Martha Lieb, John Keenan, Sidney L. Liberman, Louis L. Sagados, Jennie Berardino, Rebecca Ulloa, James Brown, Pasquale Palange, Chas. Chintney, Magdortoon Magkune, Rosa Galesana, Amelia Garcia, Anna Nastace, Martha Nastace, Lawrence Alesky, Joan Gordizky, Julio Leos, Lucy Leos, Carmen Buono, Yvonne Kinsey, Irene W. Tanner, Genevieve Townsend, Ann M. Zehean, Paul C. Hauck, Wm. N. Northridge, Miriam C. Jensen, Fred Graf, Wesley C. Green.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 17, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you do all you can to prevent the convoying of supplies to England by our Navy?

I am a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution now holding a convention in Washington and will remind you that the United States is not a colony of Great Britain. Many of our ancestors settled that question many years ago.

Please insist upon your views; all of my friends are with you.

Truly yours,

JOSEPHINE MAST.

P. S.—I am a retired teacher. Some of the boys I taught died in the last war.

J. M.

WEBSTER GROVES, MO., *April 16, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: For us to enter the war would be to gamble the life of America on a bet that England will win.

Each day's developments make that outcome less likely, unless victory is to be achieved by wishful thinking.

If the use of convoys is permitted, or if any other action provocative of war is taken, America will have been maneuvered into a position where the probabilities are that, without a friend left among the ruling powers of the world, she will have to fight alone an enemy 3,000 miles away, or order her forces to turn around and run home as fast as possible. What of American soldiers marooned on foreign soil? Would their fate be different from that of English and French soldiers in German prison camps?

What will America do to those who maneuver her into a position of this sort? Will their previous popularity have any bearing on the public action? There is not the slightest doubt about the answers.

They will be relegated promptly to the limbo of political oblivion by the great mass of the American people who are opposed to our involvement, and will remain that way even though the war boys shout themselves hoarse.

The continuance of America's existence does not depend on the continuance of any other nation's existence.

If we will build and keep at home our own defenses, we will be poison for any nation foolish enough to attack us.

The only way we can be defeated is to be denuded of our own defenses and made anemic, financially and in a military sense, by entering into wars of other nations.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD C. STUART.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 24, 1941.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Although I am not one of your constituents, I am writing to express my admiration and appreciation of your stand on keeping this country from further involvement in the Anglo-German war, as expressed in your radio talks. This country needs more articulate expression of the general feeling that no matter how bad the Nazis may be, we can best protect ourselves against them by building up our own defenses and correcting our own economic ills, rather than running all over the world (or the Atlantic Ocean) fighting England's wars.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. BUCK.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 24, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I earnestly urge the holding of immediate public hearings on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution. We are convinced that America should not go to war, and convoys mean war.

Respectfully,

LILLIAN H. BYRNE.
(Mrs. E. Parker Byrne.)

AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE,
Cincinnati, April 23, 1941.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: On behalf of 4,500 members of the America First Chapter in this city, I ask that a hearing be held on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution. Also on behalf of the aforementioned members our slogan is, "No convoys—no war."

I am sending copies of this letter to the President, Senator TOBEY, and Senator BURTON.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARK MITCHELL,
Secretary.

EVANSTON, ILL., *April 23, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have been following with great interest your fight to have fulfilled pledges given to the country by Congress (and reportedly by our President) that the lend-lease bill would be a peace bill, not a war bill. Many mothers whom I know are convinced that convoys would be an act of war. If we foolishly permitted ships to be convoyed, next our fine, young boys would be

on European battlefields (if not drowned in the Atlantic en route). Is there any reason to suppose that our ships would not be sunk in the Atlantic Ocean as the British ships have been? Is there any reason to suppose that our boys would not be slaughtered and defeated on European battlefields as allied boys have been?

We have a right to expect you to keep our boys in American possessions.

Sincerely,

GRACE S. GAULT (Mrs. P. F.).

GREENFIELD, MASS, *April 22, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily endorse your resolution aimed at the sending of convoys across the way and believe that to do this is an open invitation to active participation in a war which is not of our making or concern.

For the Keene (N. H.) Sentinel I am preparing a statement of my views on this subject and hope that it reaches your attention.

If at some time in the near future you are to be in this vicinity and would require assistance in arranging a meeting in Greenfield which through facilities of radio station WHAI would enable coverage in southern Vermont and New Hampshire and also is within reasonable distance I would be glad to do this in the interests of America first.

Respectfully yours,

RAYMOND L. BICKFORD.

Formerly with headquarters, second division, A. E. F.

UNDERWOOD & UNDERWOOD,
New York, April 24, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good fight against convoys. The large majority of Americans are against war, and convoys are an act of war.

We want no American armed forces sent into war zones under any pretext.

Our most serious and vital need is to build up our own defenses at once. We must stop stripping our Navy or air force for any foreign government.

We should only ship abroad armament that we do not need ourselves.

America must become powerful enough to fear no one, to keep out of foreign wars that are not our own, and to never expect any other country to fight our wars.

Very truly yours,

E. ROY UNDERWOOD.

APRIL 24, 1941.

THE EDITOR, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR EDITOR: Your editorial, "Resolution of the American People," appearing in your Wednesday, April 23, issue is without doubt one of the most dastardly pieces of work so far perpetrated upon the American people. Such usurpation is obnoxious beyond comprehension. You know very well that the majority of the American people absolutely do not want vested in the President ample power to convoy. In work of this type you are taking liberties which brand you as dishonest. This is no time for such perfidy.

Not only is it your editorial policy to drive the mothers' sons of America to the altar of mass murder, but also do your columnists support the idea. Particularly, let me direct your attention to one columnist who fails utterly to respect the Father of our Country—Miss Dorothy Thompson. Not so long ago she was shouting from the housetops that Hitler was bluffing, while Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, a true American patriot, declared to the world that Hitler was not bluffing. Time has proven that Dorothy Thompson was just releasing claptrap to the world, while Col. Charles A. Lindbergh actually knew what he was talking about. Is Dorothy Thompson's judgment any better now than it was then? I bring this point out to prove that editorial policy in this country and crackpot columnists are leaving nothing undone in their efforts to deliver the mothers' sons of America up to mass murder, while they sit back in their luxuriously furnished air-conditioned offices reaping a harvest in a monetary sense.

If I were of the mind that you and so many of our columnists in this country are I certainly would be honorable enough to pack my bag and hurry to the battle line over there, instead of foisting propaganda upon an innocent people. I certainly would not be traiterous enough to hide behind the skirts of the Constitution of the United States of America, sitting in luxury, and advocate the slaughter of those who are unfortunate enough to declare themselves against being led to such slaughter.

You and your ilk dishonor the name of the Father of our Country, his ideals, and his deeds. You and your ilk dishonor American patriots so great as George Washington, Nathan Hale, and others who believed in America first, last, and all the time. You and your ilk join the side of Benedict Arnold. You and your ilk cause the pages of history to cry out, "Reverse me. Benedict Arnold was right; George Washington, Nathan Hale, Paul Revere, and others who fought for the same ideals were traitors." You and your ilk dishonor the patriotism of those who gave to this generation the greatest Nation on earth.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt stands pledged to the American people to keep the American people out of war. "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas, except in case of attack." "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." The American people hold President Roosevelt to these pledges. During the debate on the lend-lease bill the convoy question was brought up. The assurance to the American people was that there would be no convoy. It was during this debate that the question arose as to the unlimited power being handed over to the President and was answered in terms that, should he abuse the power, Congress still had the power of impeachment. Should President Franklin D. Roosevelt move to repudiate these pledges to the American people, I call upon my Representative and two Senators in Congress to move for his impeachment so as to justify the American people's belief in pledges made by their President.

If I were of the mind that you and your ilk are, I would, because of my dishonoring the names, the deeds, and the ideals of great men who gave to the world this great Nation, embark from the shores of a country with which I could not at least be honest.

Yours very truly,

ARNOLD W. CRAFT.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 25, 1941.*

Senator CHAS. W. TOBEY:

Our St. Vincent Orphan Association, established in 1850, and comprising some 4,000 active members, and 100 percent American citizens, have passed a resolution and wish to enter a most vigorous protest against our sending convoys with shipments to England, or a thousand miles, or any distance that might precipitate us into this European war. Present unfortunate happenings to innocent people and our previous experience should guide our judgment now. Let's fight for uncompromising American peace and protect our own Nation.

JOSEPH G. HILKE,
President.
FRANK L. ROGLES,
Chairman.

SONOMA, CALIF., *April 21, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR: I was born in America 63 years ago. I heard your broadcast last evening. I'm for my Nation 100 percent. I surely am not in favor of convoying to Europe, but I am in favor of defense for United States first of all.

I think our leaders should make their vows true to the people of America.

My support.

Yours sincerely,

W. A. METCALF.

LONG'S, *Erie, Pa.*

Senator CHAS. W. TOBEY,
New Hampshire.

DEAR SIR: Please vote against sending our boys overseas and against sending convoy ships. Do not let them drag us into this European mess.

Yours very truly,

W. R. LONG.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Woburn, Mass., April 23, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We who remember you well and happily from the temple days are proud of the stand which you have maintained on foreign policy. While the administration has been backing a reluctant country into war over a bridge of untruth and violated promises it has been heartening to hear your forthright talks over the radio. The people of this Nation owe you their thanks. I want to express mine.

I hope Congress can recover enough of its abdicated powers to prevent convoys and the sending of our men abroad.

I do not believe Britain can win in Europe. If she loses and the invasion of this continent which our war party professes to fear becomes an actuality, how shall Congress explain the giving away of our defenses? If a defeated empire gives up her navy, planes, and tanks won't it be just fine for us to have to defend ourselves against our own equipment which will have fallen into German hands.

The people of this country do not want war.

Kindest regards to yourself and your family.

Cordially,

ROBERT N. GREY.

GENEVA, N. Y., *April 23, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: In a letter from my son, now at Fort Bragg, N. C., was the suggestion that surely Senator TOBEY should have a friendly and thankful word of appreciation for his courageous opposition to convoys.

That gratitude is herewith expressed, Senator TOBEY. You were also absolutely right on the so-called lend-lease bill, you and 30 other men who seem to realize that an oath to consider the welfare of the country and people you represent is a sacred and solemn thing.

With from 82 percent to 87 percent of the people, varying a trifle according to sections, opposed to another European massacre for their sons, it is passing strange to see, on the part of so many Senators, a stubborn refusal to act in accordance with that expression of sentiment.

With very best wishes from this family, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

BERTHA M. PEEL.
(Mrs. Joseph L. Peel.)

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 24, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: This is an expression of my appreciation and support of your anti-convoy resolution and the hope that when it

is reported to the Senate you will fight it through to a successful issue. It is increasingly clear that in this matter of keeping out of European entanglements the Senate is our last and perhaps our only safeguard.

Most sincerely yours,

B. WARREN BROWN.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 24, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am bitterly opposed to this country participating in the present European war to save the British Empire. This is not our war. I fought in France in the World War—to save democracy—and I know what war is. I am ready to defend this country, in which I was born, if it is attacked, but I am not willing to defend special interests on European soil. Why don't all those who are yelling we must save the British Empire join the Canadian forces?

No convoys—no war.

Very respectfully,

A. J. COLE.

AMERICAN PEACE MOBILIZATION,
New York, N. Y., April 17, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I am sending to Senator GEORGE requesting that a representative of the American Peace Mobilization be heard at the forthcoming Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on your resolution to forbid the use of United States naval vessels for the protection of convoys bound for a belligerent nation.

Your resolution has the full support of the large organization which I have the honor to represent. We shall appreciate any effort which it is possible for you to make to insure the fullest possible expression of the views of our organization at the committee hearings.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK V. FIELD,
Executive Secretary.

APRIL 17, 1941.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations
Committee, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I am writing to request that a representative of the American Peace Mobilization be permitted to express our views at the forthcoming hearings to be held by your committee on Senator TOBEY's resolution prohibiting the use of United States naval vessels for protecting convoys bound for belligerent nations.

On April 5 and 6, at the American People's Meeting, which was held under our auspices, over 5,000 delegates from 385 cities and towns and 40 States in this country unanimously passed a resolution against the use of convoys. These delegates, representing many million Americans organized in trade-unions, churches, community groups, and in organizations of farmers, youth, and Negroes, hold the view that convoys will inevitably and speedily lead to full United States participation in the European war. They are strongly opposed to our entrance into the war and consequently to the use of convoys.

The American Peace Mobilization is the largest antiwar organization in this country and has branches in virtually every important community in the United States. The importance of our organization and the importance of the issue which is now to be debated before your committee justifies us in requesting that our point of view be given full and complete expression before your committee.

I shall appreciate hearing from you at what time you wish to have an officer of the American Peace Mobilization present himself at the hearings of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK V. FIELD,
Executive Secretary.

BEVERLY, MASS., *April 2, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I feel that you have correctly judged the desires of the American people when you state that they are anxious to avoid war, especially a war which seems to the average American not to be his own. I personally am convinced that we must give England all possible material aid in order to assist her to win, but I do feel that we should not draw our forces into the conflict.

During the last war I felt that it was my duty to enlist in the United States Army in order to "save the world for democracy," and was sent to Europe, where I served with a combat division until the end of the war, and after that period was in the Army of Occupation in Germany. I cannot, as an ex-service man, feel that we should ask young American manhood to again undertake a task which proved to be practically without benefit to the American people. It is difficult for the average American with whom I have talked to understand why the administration seems so clearly determined to follow the trend of 1914, and I find an increasing number of people who are becoming alarmed at our near approach to the conflict.

The Associated Press reported your bill to ban convoys. I think this shows very clearly your desire to avoid any complications which would lead us directly to war. If it is determined that we should give ships to the British Government, I feel these should be manned by their own sailors. It would be far better for us to pay the huge debt now involved than to spend the lives of our young men. I make this statement with a full knowledge of what a modern war involves, and I sometimes wonder if those individuals who are so anxious to see us enter the war would be willing to volunteer themselves.

Very truly yours,

ELLIS M. PURINTON.

APRIL 17, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your speech against convoys was splendid. Your resolution has the blessing of more Americans than you know. America wants peace. Its efforts now are misguided. It has given England its aid, but let us retain our life, our country.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS T. LANSSEN.

BOULDER, COLO., *April 16, 1941.*

Mr. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Please do not allow American convoys to be used in any shape or form, as we do not want war, so help you God.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. F. JEAGER.

NEW YORK, *April 18, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY, Esq.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to offer my sincerest congratulations on your proposed ban on convoys and also your statements recently in a radio debate, and hope the convoy issue can be voted on and convoys blocked as we all know it is war, and for what? I fail to see where the loss of some foreign markets would be cause to go to war—and indeed, if we build a better mousetrap I don't see that even loss of trade would be a reality. As for competing against so-called slave labor, I seem to recall some very cheap foreign-made articles on sale here for years, which gradually brought down the price of American-made articles—electric bulbs for instance. And what has happened to the solemn promises about no army outside the Western Hemisphere—already our Secretary of War is mentioning "other places." To my mind the American voter is being made the laughing stock of the world if the present trend of edging us into war against our wishes continues.

Sincerely,

S. J. KANE.

Copy to Hon. B. H. WHEELER.
Copy to Hon. R. F. WAGNER.

APRIL 24, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Thank God for your wonderful broadcast a few days ago. I have joined "America first," for not one boy of ours must shed his blood again for any foreign land—it would not be just or fair. We did it one, we must not go back for more. The fear of our people of the Government is most amazing. (Enclosed article is true.) I see it on every hand. I myself am a daughter of the American Revolution; a charter member of Minute Women, charter member and State officer of Red Cross, and a State regent for "restoration of George Washington's birthplace." My grandfather was a lieutenant colonel on Gov. DeWitt Clinton's staff (1820); my father a picked sharpshooter of a famous New York regiment, the Ellsworth Avengers; my son of 18 a World War volunteer, served for the full duration, is living but may not last 2 years—my only boy. We are all natives of New York State, and back of that Old Lynne, Conn., 1632. My Revolutionary ancestor was a minuteman under General Washington. I have three bars—my D. A. R. pin—have lived in all parts of this Nation, nearly, am "East and West" (the twain does meet sometimes). I have found but two women who are for convoy. They were British, but living in this country. My right arm is lame from writing to United States Senators who are for active participation in this world fight. I have lived in Germany also, for the education of my children, and know the cruel Hun heart.

Give all we have to spare for those in anguish across the sea, but not one drop of American blood again. It will be revolution here, Senator Tobey. I speak whereof I know.

Very sincerely,

(Pen name) E. HUNTINGTON.

P. S.—I have not one drop of German blood, nor any of my ancestors. We are all English and Scottish.

WASHINGTON PEACE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1941.

The Washington Peace Mobilization urges immediate passage of the resolution, to prevent convoys, of Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY. The American people have never wavered in their demands that the United States remain at peace. The sending of convoys into the war zones is the last step leading to full participation in the war now raging in Europe.

There is grave danger that the wishes of the people for peace will be ignored by a war minded administration and those who profit from war, without Congress even debating the question. Only Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, can declare war. It is, therefore, of vital importance to the very existence of our democracy that hearings on the question of convoys be held at once and that this issue of war or peace be voted on by and discussed by the people of this country and their democratically elected representatives.

Because the question of war or peace is of paramount importance to every citizen, the Washington Peace Mobilization, representing thousands of Americans, insists that the full right to be heard be given the people's organ-

ization before the Congress acts on an issue of such grave importance to our Nation.

NEUTRAL MOTHERS OF AMERICA,
Flint, Mich.

The following is a copy of a resolution that was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Neutral Mothers of America which was held in Flint, Mich., April 8, 1941.

"Whereas we, the Neutral Mothers of America, are organized to oppose the sacrifice of the sons of America in this or any other foreign war; and

"Whereas President Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself has repeatedly said that the act of convoying ships means war; and

"Whereas it is his duty and his solemn promise to keep us out of foreign wars, and

"Whereas notwithstanding his duty, his promise, and his admissions that such step means war, he is said to be arranging to convoy ships: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, We, the Neutral Mothers of America, most seriously protest against such breach of promise and breaking of faith by the misuse of power and we hereby urgently demand that the constitutional power of our Representatives be used to prevent such acts of war and thereby save the sons of America from being sacrificed in this foreign war; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be duly certified and sent to the President and to each Member of both Houses of Congress of the United States of America."

KATHERINE M. SUTTER,
Secretary.

SONOMA, CALIF., *April 20, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR: I was very much impressed with your broadcast last evening. I am an ex-service man, and you can rest assured that not only do I agree with you on this anticonvoy bill but 90 percent of the American people I contact daily—and that is quite a number—are in full agreement with your real American cause. We shall back you 100 percent for not selling us down the river.

Your ardent supporters,
ARTHUR METCALF AND FAMILY.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *April 22, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Out here on the west coast, where there are tens of thousands from New England States—in fact, every State in the United States—you might talk to 50 men and women; 49 out of 50 stand for your bill to keep the American flag, ships, and our boys out of the war zones. The warmongers in Washington ought to get out and mix with the great mass of the common people.

H. B. WHITE.

NEW YORK, *April 25, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Here is the whole thing in a nutshell: Convoys, dead boys.

Go to town with it. Yell it at "Stained" GLASS. You will have millions of true Americans echoing you.

Thanks for your true Americanism. My great-great-grandfather, Robt. Harper, was in Second and Third Congresses.

Cordially,
CORNELL GREENING.

OGUNQUIT, MAINE, *April 24, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I join those citizens who desire a public hearing on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution.

As a citizen who has with mortification watched every step that our country has taken toward entry into the foreign war, I urge that this anticonvoy resolution be passed, so that we may at least avoid further advance into the war.

Very truly yours,
(Miss) LAURA SPEYERS.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *April 22, 1941.*

United States Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We heartily appreciated your splendid radio address of last Sunday and wish to thank you for the determined stand you are taking against the convoying of ships by our Navy. We have each written letters to our Senators and Congressmen from California urging that they support the Tobey amendment.

We feel that nothing that we may have to face in the future could possibly be as disastrous as involvement in England's war. We feel confident that our manpower and resources are adequate to protect our own country and that it would be madness to waste our strength fighting for the British Empire all over the world, which we would no doubt be expected to do if we allow ourselves to become involved.

Yours respectfully,
CAROLYN R. THOMSON,
MABEL A. THOMSON,
JOHN THOMSON.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *April 23, 1941.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am writing to request a hearing on your bill opposing convoys and have also written to the President. I shall be glad to do anything to further the passage of this bill.

Very gratefully,
F. V. FOWLER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 24, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be congratulated on your brave efforts to protect this country from involvement in an unwise foreign adventure which can risk much and gain nothing for this Nation.

Please be assured that your anticonvoy resolution has stirred general support from all people except that small group which is more interested in Europe than in America, and these interventionists are afraid of you and your resolution.

Please force your proposal to a vote so that we may know for the record which men in Congress are abetting these foreign interests.

God speed your efforts.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. MCGOVERN.
(Mrs.) IRENE M. MCGOVERN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 21, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the risk of being a traitor, a dupe, or a liar, I am glad to see you willing to secure certain information for the public relative to convoying our ships to Britain. Machiavelli must turn in his grave to see how this present administration is putting him to shame. We must use every means at our disposal to drive the warmongers out in the open and make them fight like men.

Mr. Roosevelt opened the week end telling the American people they were slow to recognize what is happening in Europe. Is he trying to keep us from seeing what is happening in this country? After almost 3 years of the war he himself is not able to render effective aid to the small democracies, even after he pushes some of them into a hopeless war. A friend of mine who has a brother in the air-training program at Pensacola tells me that they are using eight men to a training plane this year where they used only four last year. Are we sending all our training planes to other countries and thereby neglecting our own defenses? If all this wild bellicose talk from Washington should get us into war we may find ourselves as unprepared as France was.

While there is no objection on the part of the American people to give all-out aid to England, we cannot see why our good intentions should be turned against us by our President and made to appear that we want war as well. Convoying ships will mean just that.

I want to thank you for the courageous fight you are making to keep us out of Europe's war. More power to you and your colleagues in the Senate.

Sincerely,
JOHN HIRSCHLER.

(Copy to WAGNER.)

LANSING, MICH.

Hon. CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY:

Thanks a million for your support and efforts to keep us at peace.

Only those too old to fight, or safe themselves, are trying to push us into this war. Their speeches are very nauseating to us.

If ever we boys needed a friend it is now, and you are proving to be that friend.

Thanks again for your help.

Very truly yours,
WM. L. AUSTIN, Jr.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, *April 25, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: A great many of us here at Swarthmore are convinced that to convoy foreign ships through combat zones is to declare ourselves belligerent. It would be the last in a series of steps directed toward entrance of the war. (The "short of war" phrase seems to have been the sugar coating on the bitter pill, and it is all worn off.)

I cannot be sympathetic with the interventionist position; I do not want the United States to go to war. For these reasons I find myself in strong support of your resolution. In order that the American people understand that the use of convoys is simply a means for easing us into the war the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee should be made public. Eighty-three percent of the people, in answer to the Gallup poll, declared themselves to be against direct involvement; they should be fully aware of the meaning of convoys.

The Government, as the representative of the people, must make the people's intense wish their first consideration. The hypothetical "honor of the country" is not at stake.

Yours sincerely,
BARBARA BOWMAN.

DURO PRODUCTS,
BENTON HARBOR, MICH., *April 23, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: While we are from Michigan, we appreciate your fight in the Senate on the pledges given by both parties, also the President, against war.

We are proud of our Senator VANDENBERG and can trust his judgment.

Senator BROWN has been so tied up to the administration that he has not always voted as the people back home wanted. We are told that he has had so many letters from people that are against convoys and war that he sees he will have to do better. In a letter recently he said that he will vote for your bill, should it be brought up.

Yours truly,
IRVEN SPENCER.

MILFORD, CONN., *April 24, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Recently I listened to your radio address, Anti-Convoy Resolution, which will come up before Congress.

I am in hearty accord with all you said in your broadcast, and I have written to the following to vote for the passage of your bill:

Senator JOHN A. DANAHER, of Connecticut.
Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, of Connecticut.
Representative SOL BLOOM, of New York.
Representative JAMES A. SHANLEY, of Connecticut.

As I said in my letter to each one, that I thank God that America can boast of another daring, patriotic Senator.

I am a native-born American citizen, Senator TOBEY, and my beloved America and her people come first, last, and always in my heart.

My father fought in the Civil War to preserve this Union, and I am concerned about the future of our America and her institutions.

It is about time that we began straightening out our own domestic affairs instead of trying to police and clean up the rest of the world. No American convoys for me, and no American sailors or soldiers to be sent to European soil.

God bless you in your efforts in behalf of the American people.

Cordially yours,

(Miss) AUGUSTA WILL.

ROSLINDALE, MASS., *April 24, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We listened to both your broadcasts, Wednesday and Saturday, April 12 and 16, and enjoyed them very much, indeed. We thought Mr. Breckinridge a terrible warmonger, and too insulting. We are glad you're against convoys and hope many more good Senators will fight against them. It seems Mr. Roosevelt is trying hard to send them, as the American people do not want war, and he knows it. Seems to me everything England wants they get, and here in America are people who need help but do not get it, as everything is for Great Britain, and we should do all we can for America only as there is too much propaganda here.

The Senators who vote against convoys should have the best of luck.

Hoping you will broadcast again.

Yours truly,

Mrs. GEORGE RAUH.

PHILADELPHIA HARDWARE &
MALLEABLE IRON WORKS,
PHILADELPHIA.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am one of your strong supporters and a good friend. Be careful about the convoy proposition. You stated many times you wanted to keep this country out of war, convoy may lead us into war. Many people have this same opinion. Lend them ships to be manned by British sailors but not to be convoyed by American seamen.

I do not like to see you criticized by both Democrats and Republicans.

With kind regards, I remain

Very truly yours,

PHILADELPHIA HARDWARE &
MALLEABLE IRON WORKS, INC.,
WILLIAM J. DEVLIN, *President.*

(Sent to all United States Senators.)

NEW YORK CITY, *April 21, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I wish to compliment you on your fine stand on this serious situation into which our Government seems to be involving us. You gave a fine talk on the convoying of United States ships and I thoroughly agree with your viewpoint. I only wish we had many more Senators like yourself, who would have the interest of this country at heart rather than a misguided "loyalty" to others.

There is no good reason for us to enter this European war and our last experience should have taught us enough. All this controversy shouldn't have been necessary if our President and most of our present leaders had been faithful to their campaign promise to keep us out of any European war. But evidently that promise was soon forgotten.

It is my opinion that if we do go into this war, we would only get what we would be going over there to defeat—dictatorship. However, I do believe that we should prepare for emergency. If we are fully prepared there will be no emergency.

Respectfully,

JOHN J. DOHERTY.

VETERANS OF THE ABRAHAM
LINCOLN BRIGADE,
New York, N. Y., April 25, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: In spite of every Presidential assurance that our country will be kept out of war, one measure after another is adopted by Congress inexorably dragging us into it.

If ever the security of our country and the lives and property of our citizens has been threatened it is in the latest movement to supply naval protection to convoys bound for belligerent countries.

Obviously these convoys will be attacked. Just as clearly we shall then have to wage war to protect them.

The Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade determinedly oppose every such war-making measure. We are convinced of the vital importance of the passage of the Tobey resolution and urge that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommend its adoption by the Senate.

We further urge your committee to grant the opportunity to spokesmen for the American Peace Mobilization for testifying on the Tobey resolution. This organization represents millions of American citizens and has a clear-cut program for peace.

Yours truly,

IRVING GOFF,
National Executive Secretary.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 25, 1941.*

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing this letter to urge you that open public hearings be heard by your committee in order that the people may send representatives to be heard in support of Senator TOBEY'S resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft from transporting, delivering, or convoying any type of materials to belligerent countries.

I trust that my request will have your serious consideration, as I am convinced that the vast majority of the American people are opposed to our doing any convoying.

Yours very truly,

FRANK A. HARDEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The women of our organizations, the Silver Star Mothers of America and the Daughters of the Constitution, are supporting your great fight against convoys. The President owes the citizens an honest statement of his intention. God bless you.

Yours peacefully for not a man to Europe,

MARIA LIVINGSTON MILLS,
Chairman, Pan American Committee.

HAMBURG, N. Y., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY.

MY DEAR SIR: After listening to your broadcast of April 16 I went to bed and slept for the first time in nights. You have by your determination to keep our country from taking the final plunge that would involve us in war given me a new hope of which I had almost despaired.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY A. O'DONNELL.

NOTE.—For your information, John C. Butler (Republican) was elected to House of Representatives yesterday, April 22, to fill vacancy in New York Forty-second Congressional District, defeating his Democratic opponent Mrs. Hattie Schwert, widow of the late Congressman Pius L. Schwert.

JIM MEAD left his post at Washington and came home to campaign for Mrs. Schwert. This is Senator MEAD'S own district. Mr. Butler is opposed to convoys, while JIM MEAD'S rubber-stamp plea is "Uphold the President."

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 23, 1941]

FORTY-SECOND DISTRICT GOES REPUBLICAN

In the election of JOHN C. BUTLER the Forty-second Congressional District returns at long last to the Republican column. The grip of Senator JAMES M. MEAD on it is broken. Although affiliations in the bailiwick showed Republicans in the majority up to 1940, Mr. MEAD had represented it for 20 years. When the opportunity came to him to enter the Senate, the Democratic organization let him select the party candidate for the Forty-second District, and he fixed on the late Pius L. Schwert, a popular figure in his own right. Mr. Schwert's election was taken as evidence that the district still was loyal to Mr. MEAD. For the special election caused by the death of Mr. Schwert the Senator dictated nomination of the Representative's widow, Mrs. Hattie E. Schwert, an altogether estimable person. Mr. MEAD did all the campaigning, and the outcome must be accepted as a sharp reverse for him.

Mr. BUTLER conducted a vigorous and intelligent campaign, ably backed by the Republican organization. At the outset his chances were regarded as slim because of the intensity of Mr. MEAD'S efforts. The Senator told the people of the district that the eyes of the President were on them; he urged them with all his eloquence to give the administration a vote of confidence to bolster it in the national emergency. On that score, then, the outcome is the more impressive. It indicates an independent spirit among the voters of the Forty-second District. The people there clearly want a Representative who is not under orders, who feels free to vote on the momentous issues ahead as his own conscience dictates. Now that the grip of Mr. MEAD on the district is broken, there is reasonable expectation that it will continue in the Republican column.

HAMBURG, N. Y., *April 23, 1941.*

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
Hon. ROBERT WAGNER,
Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER.

MY DEAR SIRS: To convoy vessels would mean shooting, shooting would mean war, and war would mean sending our boys abroad to die for something that they or ourselves had nothing to do with, and from whence there would not, there could not, be any return. It would be a one-way trip. Our boys would not know for what purpose or to what end they would be fighting.

Our forefathers left Europe, for there was no peace or liberty in Europe. They came to America. They fought and died that we might have peace and liberty here in America.

Are we to abandon the Constitution established by the Founding Fathers? Are we, the people, willing to permit Congress, who

has been elected by the people, to abdicate in favor of the President? No. We, the parents of those American boys, are not willing that those boys be sent abroad to fight and die in foreign wars.

I am not a member of any organization movement. I am just a father who has one son in the United States Army, another son in the United States Navy, and another son awaiting the induction call. These boys will give all they have for America.

Sirs, I beg of you, as I pray to Almighty God, do not permit the youth of America, that love America, to be sent abroad to be slaughtered for a lost cause in Europe.

Do not, I beg of you, sirs, permit convoys. May Almighty God fortify you with wisdom and may the Prince of Peace be good to us all.

Yours,

ANTHONY A. O'DONNELL.

Cosigners:

George J. Muir, Mrs. George Muir, Mrs. Harry B. Errington, Patricia M. O'Donnell, Margaret C. Hopkins, John Knaak, Mina Knaak, May U. Hipp, Francis W. Twohey, Mary A. O'Donnell, Ruth M. Knaak, Anna Tillner, Albert Tillner, Raymond Truxes, Noreen R. Twohey, Margaret Truxes, George W. Hipp.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 25, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in a position to hear the views of prominent American citizens, and the feeling is strong that your anticonvoy bill will pass.

Copies of my letters to Senator GEORGE and the President are herewith enclosed.

Sincerely,

WM. T. CORLETT.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 25, 1941.*

Senator GEORGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Many American well-wishers sincerely hope that the Tobey anticonvoy bill will pass. If not, it means war, which we do not want. One experience within a quarter of a century of our participation in a European war, with which we had no concern—as in the present war—should be enough. So think many American citizens, to which I subscribe.

We trust the convoy bill will not pass.

Sincerely,

WM. T. CORLETT.

APRIL 25, 1941.

The Honorable FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Members of your Cabinet may think this is our war, but many with whom I come in contact think that we have nothing to do with England's wars unless they conflict with our well-being, as they have during our history.

I, with many American citizens, hope you will not send convoys to the war zones of Europe. It means our entering the European war, which we do not want to do. Some twenty-odd years ago your predecessor, Woodrow Wilson, entered a like war and died of a broken heart. I hope you do not repeat this now by sending convoys to Europe.

Sincerely,

WM. T. CORLETT.

HOBOKEN, N. J., *April 24, 1941.*

Hon. Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Upon receipt of your card, I have just written to Senator GEORGE and to President Roosevelt.

My letter to Senator GEORGE was as follows:

"Every individual American life is too sacred to be sacrificed in the interest of any foreign power or to save our foreign trade. May I trust that you will oppose every snare which the advocates of war are planning for our country's involvment.

"May I trust that you will support the Tobey anticonvoy resolution and urge immediate public hearings on this resolution."

Hoping that you will have the gratification of seeing your resolution enacted into law, and that the present crisis may be overcome without plunging us into the inferno, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

CHRISTIANE WALTER.

P. S.—I shall write to more Senators, particularly to such who are of the opposite opinion.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE,
Swarthmore, Pa., April 25, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your anticonvoy resolution is an indication that you clearly realize that the convoying of ships is a step leading directly to our full involvement in the European war. Eighty-three percent of the people, in a recent Gallup poll, replied that they definitely opposed direct entrance into the war; but not all of these people realize that their support of the use of convoys may mean just this. I urge, therefore, that you do all in your power to see that public committee hearings on your resolution are held immediately, that all the issues may be clearly put before the people of this last remaining free democracy. Before people in this country declare themselves for or against our convoying ships, they should realize that it is simply a means of easing us quietly into the conflict.

Know that many here at Swarthmore, even many who supported the lend-lease bill, are opposed to using American ships for convoying through the war zones. Like-minded persons throughout the country would give wide support to your resolution if hearings were made public.

Sincerely yours,

JEANNE CURTIS.

DORCHESTER, MASS., *April 24, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one American citizen, I am using this means to let you know that there are people who do not want to get into the European conflagration, and view convoys as a definite step in that direction. That is why I favor very strongly your resolution on convoys. I hope you will use the present opportunity to press for public hearings on this resolution.

Respectfully yours,

IRVING PHILLIPS.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Reading, Pa.

Senator C. W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TOBEY: As a member of an organization that wishes to avoid war, we are very much in favor of your resolution against the convoy. We urge you to make every effort to have public hearings on the bill as soon as possible. We are urging others to write to the committee.

We sincerely hope this bill will be passed.

Very truly yours,

LOUELLA MULLIN,
Business and Industrial Secretary.

MILLVILLE, N. J., *April 25, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It is useless to write to Representatives of my own State, so I am writing to you to give you encouragement in your fight against convoys.

I think it is now time to think of America first, and build up our defenses here, and not somewhere else in a foreign country. I urge you to continue your fight to the last breath against going down the road any further to war. I am in contact daily with many people, and I can tell you now that the masses of Americans are against getting involved in this foreign conflict, contrary to the fact that certain people are claiming that the people of the United States are demanding convoys. This is not so—the majority are against it.

Once more may I urge you never to give up the fight against involvement.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MAINES.

(Copy to Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.)

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *April 25, 1941.*

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Foreign
Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: At a recent rally, the Bridgeport Council of the American Peace Mobilization passed unanimously a motion to support the Tobey no-convoy resolution.

Great alarm was expressed, especially by the mothers present, that American naval vessels would be used as convoys for vessels carrying war materials to belligerent nations.

One mother testified that her son had joined the Navy (he is only 18) in response to the call for young men to train as mechanics. But no sooner was he in than, instead of going into training in the shops, he and many other boys like him were rushed to Virginia to form the crew of a destroyer now being prepared for convoy service. This unhappy youth wrote his mother that the only trained men in the whole crew that will man this destroyer are the officers. The others are all boys from 18 to 21. The mothers of these boys rightly feel that their sons will be sent to almost certain death in order to save trained Navy men for less risky service.

The patriotism of these mothers and their sons is not in question. We are bound to be loyal to our country and its people, not to politicians who, by deceit and trickery, are taking the Nation into a disastrous foreign adventure.

We, almost a hundred citizens of Bridgeport, representing thousands of trade unionists, churches, and youth organizations, hope that your committee will report favorably on the Tobey resolution.

Respectfully yours,

(MRS.) RUTH E. KENNELL,
Executive Secretary, Bridgeport
Council, A. P. M.

AKRON, OHIO, *April 25, 1941.*

To the Honorable Senator TOBEY,
United States Senator,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading a great deal about the bill you introduced before Congress against convoying ships to Europe, and I am heartily in your favor, and sincerely hope you get same passed.

Won't you please continue trying to keep America out of war. I don't believe we should be involved in another European war after keeping out of Europe's troubles since the last war.

Yours with kindest regards,

W. R. COX, D. D. S.
W. M. JOHNSTON, M. D.

JOHNSON & FAULKNER, INC.,
New York, April 25, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I extend to you my heartiest congratulations on your fight for the anticonvoy legislation.

More power to you!

Sincerely,

DAVID S. HEMINGWAY.

DENVER, COLO., *April 22, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The following is a copy of the letter I sent to the Senators and Representatives from Colorado:

"As one of the 83 percent of the American people, I am writing to you to protest against convoys, for convoys mean war, and I am against the United States taking an active part in this European conflict. I think it would be well for the Government of the United States to listen to the voice of the American people protesting against active participation in this war instead of the warmongers in the United States and to all the British propaganda flooding this country.

"I would think that the United States would have learned a severe enough lesson in the World War to stay out of the present conflict. Look at the money we spent; but, of course, that is a mere drop in the bucket compared with the debt of billions we are incurring today. Then when the war ended the debtor nations soon repudiated the payment of their debts to the United States and called us Shylocks. Of course, Finland stands as the one foreign nation with honor as she always met her obligation and even wanted to in her time of stress during her fight with Russia. The money we spent in the World War is nothing in comparison with the American boys who gave their all and never came back from foreign countries. And look at the hospitals filled with invalids, some far worse off than those who made the supreme sacrifice, living, suffering examples of the awfulness of war.

"And yet some in the United States dare talk of convoys, not thinking nor heeding the terrible sacrifice it will inflict upon the flower of American youth. Those that consider convoys probably are too old to be actual participants when the holocaust breaks, and who, if they have sons, have, no doubt, seen to it that they are in safe jobs not subject to dangerous active duty.

"I can speak from actual experience, for my husband saw active service in the World War; was over there a year, is a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion. We were married 8½ months (I was no "war bride") when he sailed with the Six Hundred and Third Engineers. He was in the Meuse-Argonne drive, and I did not know for a month after the armistice was signed whether he was dead or alive—and then his first letter came saying he was safe. God was good to us, and brought him back safe and sound.

"Now we have two sons, one 19 and one who will be 17 this summer. I did not give birth to those two boys to ever have them fight on foreign soil. War is hell, and I am not willing that our sons be sent to fight for England or any other foreign country on the face of the globe.

"How do the Representatives in the Government dare not listen to the voice of the people who had an active part in the World War, to the voice of the Legionnaires, and even more to the voice of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who actually know more about the horrors of foreign wars than the stool pigeons in this country?

"Another issue that soon may be considered, to which I wish to protest, is the lowering of the age for conscription. If it is lowered to 18, it will destroy many a fine boy's college education. For, if he has to stay out of school for a year, granting that it is only 1 year, and no active service—a thing I cannot conceive possible unless the Government listens to the dictates of the American people—how many youths will go back to study? Then, too, the average boy of 18 is not versed in the ways of the world and many a youth will have his life ruined morally—for where there are army camps there is bound to be a bad moral influence. I know the condition of some camps where we were stationed before my husband sailed—Camp Lee, Va., was one. Instead of lowering the age limit, if necessary, raise it, as there are plenty of old bachelors who could go. That would not ruin the education of the American youth and put our young boys into moral temptations before they are old enough to stand firmly on their own feet.

"Thank God we still have a Government in this country of the people and for the people, and let us pray to God that we may keep it, and that the Government will listen to the majority of the people and live up to their election pledges to keep us out of this war."

I am for you 100 percent, and may God grant that you win in your fight against convoys, and so against war.

Yours very truly,
HELEN B. HUBBARD.
(Mrs. Ralph B. Hubbard.)

TAFT, TEX., *April 11, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I read in the papers that the subject of convoying shipments of materials to Britain is being much discussed in Washington. Permit me, as a Texas cotton farmer, to urge you to take a firm stand against convoying. Our Nation must make great sacrifices to help Britain save herself, but we must not become an active participant in the European struggle. Therefore, let us not expose our own ships and men to the German naval and air forces.

Sincerely yours,
FRED B. JONES.

(Copy for Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.)
NEW ORLEANS, LA., *April 25, 1941.*

Hon. WALTER GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I want to join with all true Americans in urging the holding of immediate public hearings on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution.

Convoys mean war—no convoys, no war. The Tobey resolution must be passed.

American young men must not be sacrificed by fighting somebody else's war. We do not desire our boys to die on foreign soil and be plowed under in foreign lands. Nor do we desire hundreds of thousands of our young men returned to us maimed and crippled for life, hopeless physical wrecks.

What we desire is that America build a strong navy and the greatest airplane fleet in the world to protect this continent, but keep out of other nations' business.

My forefathers fought in the Revolutionary War to make this Nation a land of freedom and individual liberty. We have already gone too far in sacrificing the rights of individual citizens. To go further would be disastrous. Danger to the ruin of this Republic lies within even more than from without.

Let the people speak and give them a chance to speak without all of this foolish, silly, misleading propaganda that is intended to inflame and to raise hatred.

I hope this time you will stand by America to protect our sons even if you would not protect them under the lease-lend bill.

Senator GEORGE, I am 63 years of age. I want to see America preserved for my children and my children's children. The preservation of America lies in our Senators and our Members of Congress. They should not give up their authority, guardianship and power to the Executive Department, nor should we be more British than American.

Very truly yours,
F. W. SINCLAIR.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 26, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HON. MR. TOBEY: I earnestly urge you to use your influence to have public hearings on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution.

We must keep this country from war and convoys mean war.

Sincerely,
CLARA G. NELSON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 26, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am sending to Senator GEORGE the following letter:

"I am writing to urge most earnestly the holding of immediate public hearings on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution (S. J. Res. 62).

"I am for no convoys and no war, as I believe are the majority of true Americans."

Sincerely yours,
MRS. MARCIA J. LYTTLE.

LAKE FOREST, ILL., *April 25, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I am very strongly anticonvoy and I hope you will do all that you possibly can to keep this country out of war.

The convoying of ships would certainly lead this country straight into the war, and that must not happen.

Yours sincerely,
DEBORAH S. FERRY.

LAKE FOREST, ILL., *April 25, 1941.*

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This country must not become involved in the European war, and if we convoy ships that is what will certainly happen. I trust that you will keep us out of war.

Sincerely yours,
DEBORAH S. FERRY.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 26, 1941.*

Senator TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: This is just to express our most heartfelt approval of your fight against convoys. When the subject of convoys was first brought to the attention of the public we wrote at once to all our Senators and Representatives, expressing emphatic disapproval concerning such a move, and we have recently sent letters in the same vein to President Roosevelt and Senator GEORGE. As citizens who love this country and give it our undivided allegiance, we sincerely believe that, under present circumstances, involvement in actual warfare would be a far more terrible and costly tragedy for the United States than the defeat of the British Empire. Therefore, even if withholding convoys should mean such an outcome in Europe, we are against convoys. We feel that it is more than high time that the welfare of this country should be considered first. We deplore many of the steps already taken toward involvement in the European conflict, and we are, regardless of what happens overseas, unalterably opposed to any steps which could lead to actual entrance into war. We do not want convoys, and we do not want war.

Sincerely,
MARIE WILLISON.
ROBERT D. WILLISON.

CENTERBROOK, CONN., *April 26, 1941.*

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: When Senator TOBEY'S anticonvoy resolution comes up for

business on April 30, will you please allow hearings on it.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MARTIN W. WRIGHT.

CENTERBROOK, CONN., *April 26, 1941.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Will you please favor hearings on Senator TOBEY'S anticonvoy resolution when it comes up for business on April 30.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MARTIN W. WRIGHT.

STONEHAM, MASS., *April 25, 1941.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The enclosed is a letter I have sent to the President, Hon. Cordell Hull, Mr. Stimson, Mr. Knox, and Senator GEORGE. I thought you might be interested in it not because it contains my views only, but, I am assured, the views of most Stoneham people, particularly the so-called inarticulate group. One such person when asked about writing to our Representatives at Washington replied: "You are called a 'red' if you do;" another, asked to sign a peace or war petition, tremblingly said, "I hope the President doesn't deport me for it." This from an American citizen. What a mess and what a deluge of fear has descended upon our people. Even the articulate seldom dare. Your loyalty is our bulwark in this dark hour.

Gratefully yours,

(Mrs. H. S.) GRACE TAYLOR.

STONEHAM, MASS., *April 25, 1941.*

DEAR ———: I would like to remind you that this is my country as well as yours and that it is the country of the American people who are overwhelmingly opposed to war and to the use of American convoys to get us into war. That is definitely my opposition, too. You can have your pro's and your anti's, and American citizens are entitled to theirs, whatever they be, but no private citizen and no public official has the right to ask American boys to fight and die in a war that is not theirs—as this European conflict certainly is not. The pages of history will tell us what's what in the future, as they have in the past, and it's up to us to pass by propaganda until we can verify it with fact. History has opened our eyes to the lies of the World War, and it has yet to disclose one single instance when the British Government was ever a friend to us (or to anyone else) and not an interfering greedy grab-it-all. Now that the American people must impoverish themselves to pay for the lend-lease bill, it's up to Britain (and Britain only) to get the goods and to forbear reaching out with her clutching hand for the lives of American boys. There are too many British-born "paytriots" (and some that are not) over here for her benefit, not ours. How about the Dies committee getting after this union now and federal union business, a project of Britain and an attempt to put America back into those very clutches from which the Revolutionary War rescued her? The Spirit of 1776 lives on and the blood that reddened the snow at Valley Forge has sunk into the soil to nourish forever the American people in their determination to make good, for all time, separation from Britain. It is blessed to mind one's own business and God-given to set a good example. And that example should be peace and prosperity. There is only one word for convoys—that ugly word, murder—murder of fine young men, the salt of the earth, the hope of America, young men who have wronged no nation (nor been wronged by any) and who possess, inalienably, the right to have their youth and to live. The responsibility for their safety lies at Washington. I urge—and urge most emphatically—that public hearings on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution be held immediately.

(Mrs. H. S.) GRACE TAYLOR.

KENT, OHIO, *April 25, 1941.*

Hon. WALTER GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In these trying times, with war so near, people in positions such as yours, find it very difficult to discover exactly what the American people want you to do.

That is why I am writing you this letter. I want to express to you my beliefs on the Tobey Anti-Convoy Resolution. This resolution is one that will help protect democracy and keep America out of war. This resolution should come up for public hearings in your committee immediately.

The people of America do not want war. Our President has given his solemn pledge to keep us out of war. The Anticonvoy Resolution will help him to keep that pledge. Will you exert your influence to bring the Tobey resolution before your committee for immediate public hearings? In doing so you will be giving the American people that opportunity to tell you how they feel about war.

I am just 21 years old. I have my entire life before me. I certainly have no desire to be buried in a short while on a distant foreign battlefield. The Tobey Anticonvoy Resolution must be passed.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH BLAIR, Jr.

Copy to Hon. CHARLES TOBEY.

THE SPRINGVILLE-DIMOCK CHARGE,
THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Springville, Pa., April 28, 1941.

The Honorable WALTER GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the name of humanity and the best interests of our Nation and of the cause of Christ, I urge you to do all in your power to secure immediate public hearings on the Tobey Anticonvoy Resolution.

American democracy must survive and grow, but it cannot do so if it adopts the methods of the totalitarian states. The means are never justified by the ends, except as the two are in harmony. If we take the sword, we, or our country as we now know and love it, shall surely perish by the sword. The convoying of shipments to Britain or elsewhere cannot but mean the taking of the sword.

But above all, let the American people speak. To fail to hold a hearing on this resolution is to move further along the way to fascism.

Very sincerely yours,

PHILIP N. PITCHER, *Minister.*

Copies to:

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, White House, Washington, D. C.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SPOKANE, WASH., *April 27, 1941.*

Senator CHAS. W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We heartily endorse your fight against convoys and hope you succeed in getting hearings on your resolution.

Enclosed find copies of letters sent the President and Senator GEORGE.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. L. C. BRADFORD.

SPOKANE, WASH., *April 27, 1941.*

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are definitely opposed to the convoying of British war materials. We favor the holding of hearings on Senator TOBEY'S resolution. Will you kindly do all in your power to insure these hearings be held?

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. L. C. BRADFORD.

SPOKANE, WASH., *April 27, 1941.*

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You gave your solemn pledge to keep us out of war unless invaded, and we are trusting you to keep that promise. Convoys mean a shooting war, as you yourself said; therefore we expect you not to use convoys. We are anxiously awaiting the hearings on Senator TOBEY'S resolution.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. L. C. BRADFORD.

HURD-MOST SASH & DOOR CO.,
Dubuque, Iowa, April 26, 1941.

Hon. F. D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: From the standpoint of sentiment, most Americans hope for a British victory. According to the various polls, about the same percentage of the people insist on America remaining at peace.

As democracy is government directly by the people, our chances of remaining at peace should be approximately 9 to 1.

The polls also indicate that the people oppose convoys, and our political leaders should at once patriotically refrain from suggesting convoys or any other measures tending to bring us closer to war. To do otherwise would destroy the principle of democracy treasured by all of our people.

In your Boston speech of October 30 last you stated as follows:

"Fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Naturally, the fathers and mothers of America confidently expect this solemn pledge to be fulfilled.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE H. MOST.

Same letter addressed to Hull, Knox, Stimson, and my Senators and Representatives.

ALBANY, N. Y., *April 28, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It seems to me to be of extreme importance that public hearings on your anticonvoy resolution be held immediately, with representative American citizens invited to testify.

Sincerely,

Miss PHEBE C. BROWN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 27, 1941.*

To Hon. WALTER GEORGE,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am expressing the views of many of my friends who are not taking the time to write you when I ask that you do all you can to see that public hearings on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution are held immediately.

I am also expressing the general sentiments of most of those with whom I have had occasion to discuss the matter when I say that at all costs the Tobey anticonvoy resolution must be passed. We should stop encouraging the carnage in Europe. Let them solve their own problems; they have a lot to do to keep them busy for several years at least. In the meantime we can work on perfecting our own social order and solving our own problems of unemployment, credit, etc., so that we may have something more constructive to offer

Europe than instruments of destruction, which only prolong their torture.

Yours sincerely,

LILLIAN L. HAYMAN,
Registered Voter,
Third Congressional District.

Copies to Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 26, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have written today to Senator WALTER F. GEORGE urging support for the Tobey no-convoy resolution, and I sincerely hope that it receives favorable action in Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Very truly yours,

GLADYS M. PAGE,
Registered Voter, Precinct 14, Ward 2.

THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Farmington, Maine, April 26, 1941.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I am writing to express the hope that hearings may be held immediately on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution.

Yours sincerely,

HARDING W. GAYLORD.

Copies to Senator TOBEY and President Roosevelt.

THE STRATFORD BAPTIST CHURCH,
Stratford, Conn., April 25, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am expressing a cross section of public opinion as I find it and my own deep conviction when I say that we most heartily endorse your proposal to prohibit the use of convoys for aid to Britain. I, and countless others whom I know, earnestly hope that your measure will be given favorable consideration by the committee and will become a law of our land, because we fear that the use of the United States Navy, ships or men, for purposes of convoying will mean war. We the people as revealed in the most recent polls stand opposed to war by the overwhelming percentage of 80 to 85 percent. We therefore support your stand against convoying because we believe that would lead to a war to which we the people of America are overwhelmingly opposed.

Keep up the good work for keeping us out of war, and for keeping intact what is left of democracy here in America.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. KENNETH L. MAXWELL.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Pontiac, Mich., April 25, 1941.

Hon. CHAS. W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: It seems important to me that your resolution concerning anticonvoy measures should be placed before the people immediately in public hearings that will give us an opportunity of measuring its worth and stressing its importance. Do you know of ways in which we could influence others in favor of your resolution?

I would appreciate receiving any material available on this matter.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. MEAD.

DEMAREST, N. J., *April 26, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Have just sent a letter to the Honorable WALTER GEORGE, and one to the President of these United States urging immediate hearings to be held publicly in regard to your most excellent measure, or resolution against convoys to foreign countries.

We want no war, therefore no convoys.

Respectfully yours,

(Mrs.) ILU SUTTON CAMWAY.

TROY, PA., *April 25, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your very wise and timely resolution against the use of convoys deserves the support of every honest citizen. I urge that public hearings should at once be held on this very necessary measure.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORA L. PAINE.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF., *April 22, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am very much interested in the passing of the Anticonvoy Act for I feel so convinced that if we once start convoying ships to Great Britain we will find ourselves in war, and we cannot afford to get into war or any more entanglements than we are now insofar as the European countries are concerned.

I appreciate very much your efforts directed toward keeping us out of war.

I might state I have conversed with many people concerning the Anticonvoy Act and find at least 90 percent of all those I talked with in favor of the act and against any entanglement whatsoever with the foreign countries that might ultimately lead us into war.

Sincerely yours,

L. R. LAMBERT.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *April 26, 1941.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We are writing to you as representing many members of the Tucson chapter of the America First Committee to urge you above all to see that Senator TOBEY's request for public hearings on the convoy question be granted in accordance with democratic principles.

We sincerely believe that no convoys means no war.

Sincerely,

CAPT. JAMES A. MCGUIRE, M. C.,
Acting Chairman of America First Committee, of Tucson.

NOTE.—A copy of this letter was sent to President Roosevelt and Senator GEORGE.

LAIDLAW BROTHERS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., April 26, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: May I record my most earnest approval of your anticonvoy resolution (S. J. Res. 62)? I am writing Senator GEORGE urging that it be given immediate public hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee and I am asking my friends to do the same thing.

I have enjoyed hearing your strong radio presentations of this resolution. I also invite your support of the war-referendum resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) as a means of bringing to bear on Congress the vast antiwar sentiment.

Yours cordially,

H. F. HANCOX, *Editor.*

CONCORDIA, KANS., *April 26, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: I am glad for your anticonvoy resolution and do hope there will be immediate public hearings on it. I sincerely hope that the Tobey resolution will be passed, for it seems to me that the use of convoys is more likely to lead us into war. Therefore, I am opposed to convoys and would not want to see them used.

As an American history teacher, I can see no possible good that could come from our entrance into war. Certainly World War I showed that fighting could not make the world safe for democracy. I firmly believe that evil cannot be overcome with evil.

Sincerely yours,

EVALYN L. FIELDS.

FALLS CHURCH, VA., *April 26, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Just to thank you for the heroic effort you are making to keep us out of war and to advise that we have each written separately to Senator GEORGE to ask that public hearings be held at once on your anticonvoy resolution.

Respectfully,

MRS. ROGER H. BLAKE.
OLIVE BLAKE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 25, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBY: I am extremely pleased with the magnificent effort you are making to prevent convoys and other warlike acts on the part of the administration. With the speeches of Hull and Stimson and Knox during the past week it has become apparent that the pressure for a shooting war is being turned on. I am doing my best to counteract these men in my own limited way—writing and talking. I believe that the fight for peace can still be won if enough people will work for peace. In any case, I know from my own contacts with men in the Harvard Law School that your battles for peace in Washington are not going for naught. Men are becoming interested in the grave issues which you have called to the attention of the American people, and I am proud that this contribution toward the preservation of American democracy is being made by a Senator from New Hampshire.

Sincerely,

ALVAH W. SULLIVAN.

HAMBURG, N. Y., *April 22, 1941.*

HONORABLE SENATOR,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: In view of world events it is only right that every citizen be actively interested and willing to aid his own country to the best of his ability. Despite dangers away from our own homes, each person seems anxious to retain peace in his own land. What did we gain through the bloodshed during the World War, our institutions filled with broken minds and bodies?

Our boys question going into kill others against whom they bear no malice or revenge.

So as a mother of a young son and a sister of those who went during the World War, I beg of you to continue your fight and use every bit of power at your command to save our boys from being sent overseas to fight, or our boys convoying ships across the Atlantic.

I believe in aiding the British with food and munitions; they have enough manpower to man the ships.

I sincerely hope you can talk on the radio again against convoying ships, you can reach so many more homes. May God aid you.

Yours sincerely,

MARY R. ASBURY.

COOKE VALLEY FARMS,
Eldred, Ill., April 25, 1941.
Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We farmers of the Middle West are strong for preparedness, but we want no part of this European war.

Give us a fair break in this great crisis.

Sincerely yours,

L. L. COOKE.

COOKE VALLEY FARMS,
Eldred, Ill., April 25, 1941.
President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We farmers of the Middle West are strong for your program of preparedness, but we do not want to get mixed up in this European struggle in any way.

We are depending on you to keep us out of it.

Sincerely yours,

L. L. COOKE.

COOKE VALLEY FARMS,
Eldred, Ill., April 25, 1941.
Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We farmers of the Middle West are strong for preparedness, but we want no part of this European war.

Give us a fair break in this great crisis.

Sincerely yours,

L. L. COOKE.

COOKE VALLEY FARMS,
Eldred, Ill., April 25, 1941.
Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We farmers of the Middle West are strong for preparedness, but we want no part of this European war.

Give us a fair break in this great crisis.

Sincerely yours,

L. L. COOKE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 30, 1941.*
Senator TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Irene Smith Forum today adopted motion, without dissenting voice, endorsing your resolution against use of convoys under any circumstances. Three hundred attended meeting.

F. A. HIGH,
FRANK WINK COMMITTEE.

EIGHTY-FIVE PERCENT OF AKRONITES VOTING IN FORUM ARE AGAINST THE CONVOYING OF WAR MATERIALS

With the heaviest response from readers in weeks, Akronites voted 85 percent against the convoying of war materials to England. The question was asked in last Sunday's American forum on this page. Ernest W. Gibson, chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, presented the affirmative side of the question, while Gen. Robert E. Wood, acting chairman of the America First Committee, presented the negative argument.

In the preceding Sunday's American forum 92 percent of those Akronites who cast ballots voted in favor of Senator CAPPER'S argument that the United States should require a referendum to declare war. Senator HILL of Alabama presented the affirmative argument.

Honorable Senator TOBEY.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Akron is with you in your fight to keep the United States out of Europe's war. We don't want war. We resent bitterly the President's insult to that great American, Colonel Lindbergh. The majority in the great Middle West are for "America First Keep on Fighting Senator" TOBEY.

Sincerely,

H. A. WILLIAMS.
M. A. FRANZ.

Four of our direct ancestors fought in the American Revolution.

LAMBUTH COLLEGE,
Jackson, Tenn., April 27, 1941.
Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am wishing very much that there may be Senate committee hearings on your resolution against use of convoys. I have written to Senator GEORGE.

Yours sincerely,

J. R. WALKER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 28, 1941.*
Hon. WALTER GEORGE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to urge you to hold public hearings immediately on the Tobey anticonvoy resolution. I am very much opposed to the use of convoys and think the whole question should be adequately publicized.

The people of the United States do not want to get into the war. The use of convoys is another long step which may make war inevitable.

Respectfully yours,

(Miss) MARION FRENYEAR.

Copies sent to Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY and President Roosevelt.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 23, 1941.*

At a meeting held under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the National Council for the Prevention of War, in the First Congregational Church in Berkeley, Calif., on the evening of April 22, attended by approximately 1,000 citizens, the enclosed resolutions were adopted:

"RESOLUTION ON CONVOYS

"Inasmuch as we agree with the President when he said that convoys mean shooting and shooting is war, we wish to express our confidence that the President intends to keep his sacred pledge given to the voters of this country in Washington when he said:

" 'We will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'

"We also wish to express our firm opposition to the adoption of any policy of convoying under any circumstances."

"RESOLUTION ON ADVISORY REFERENDUM

"Since we believe that the American people have a fundamental right to express their opinion on the vital subject of participation in war, and to indicate to Congress their collective will: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we, citizens of Berkeley, assembled at the First Congregational Church on April 22, 1941, endorse the advisory referendum resolution No. 7, introduced in the United States Senate by Senators GERALD P. NYE, CAPPER, SHIPSTEAD, WHEELER, LA FOLLETTE, and CLARK of Idaho."

SKANEATELES, N. Y., *April 24, 1941.*
Senator TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished writing letters to President Roosevelt, Senators GEORGE, MEAD, WAGNER, and Congressman HANCOCK opposing convoys. As I roughly stated in letters to them I was opposed to convoys because convoys mean war—I believe everyone agrees with that statement. We are not yet prepared for war and probably won't be ready or prepared until 1944. We are at present seeing Germany winning this war because she was well prepared after a 10-year effort and we are also seeing England losing this war because she is scarcely prepared for war at all. Thus we are not prepared to take further risks as we are less ready than England.

We have embarked on a policy of aid short of war which is backed by the people but convoys are a war program which is not backed by the people—83 percent of the people are opposed to our entry into war at this time. Such a war program, when the great majority of the people are against war, would cause great disunity when unity is imperative.

Very truly yours,

LIVINGSTON LANSING.

SOUTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Buffalo, N. Y., April 28, 1941.
The Honorable Mr. TOBEY,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Please take deep reassurance in your work against authorization of convoys from your knowledge that you are expressing the will and mind of the great mass of American people, and particularly the mind of the more intelligent. There is widespread and increasingly bitter resentment against the policy of the President in bludgeoning this Nation toward the brink of open war. Do all you can to reverse the trend. And be assured of the undying gratitude of the people.

Very sincerely yours,

LEO ALVIN GATES.

IDANA, KANS., *April 28, 1941.*
Senator TOBEY,
United States Senator from
New Hampshire,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Over my radio I hear that the anticonvoy resolution will be debated in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Wednesday of this week. I hasten to write you this note, giving the sentiment of people in my area of the State of Kansas.

I am a Presbyterian minister, serving a congregation of 140 members. Of course, the constituency of the Church far exceeds its membership. I know from contact with the people that the great majority of them are not only opposed to convoying vessels to Great Britain, but are alarmed, and in many cases indignant, over the policy of the administration to take the country into the war by continually paring down the narrow margin which now separates the country from war. I have never known criticism of the administration to be expressed in such drastic terms as are now being used by thinking people in the community. Confidence in the Government, and in the promises of the Government, seems to be steadily dwindling. The boys were told, when they were conscripted and sent to camp, that they would receive a year's training, then set free for civilian life. Now there is talk of holding them in the Army for an indefinite period of time. The people are saying, "Some group somewhere is using us to further its own ends. We have no voice in important decisions."

Certainly it is true that the administration is following a policy which is not in keeping with the sentiments and wishes of the people in this part of the country. The critics of the administration are not pro-Nazis (for such simply do not exist here) but are good Americans whose sympathies are with Britain, but who feel this is not our war. I have been surprised to hear one person after another whose sympathy is openly with Britain say "Lindbergh may yet prove to be one of the sanest and safest leaders in the country. He may emerge from this crisis as the man

who gave America its best advice. He knew what he was talking about when he counselled the statesmen of Britain and France, and he may know what he is talking about now."

This note is written to give you an indication of public sentiment in my community in north central Kansas. Wishing you success in the patriotic effort to keep our country out of war.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. JOHN V. WRIGHT.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I should like to add to the record which the Senator has made today respecting the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday.

Following the disposition of the so-called Tobey resolution, there was insistence upon action on Senate Resolution 71, which I submitted some time ago. I asked that consideration of that resolution, going to the convoy issue, be delayed until the next meeting of the committee, at which time an invitation should be extended to a representative of the State Department, a representative of the Navy Department, and a representative of the Office of Production Management to be heard upon the question of the losses being suffered in the undertaking to make delivery of production under the lend-lease bill. The committee voted against being afforded that information, and then, pressing the issue, voted, by a vote of 13 to 10, against reporting Senate Resolution No. 71.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. It is an amazing situation when a duly constituted committee of this body—perhaps its most outstanding and important committee, in these times especially—refuses to a member of that committee the right to have the gentlemen referred to, who in the last analysis are servants of the Congress, come before the committee and explain these matters with a view to the debate which is to follow.

Mr. NYE. The thought which occurred to me was that since the matter of probable losses is basic to any convoy proposal, at least the Congress is entitled to know what losses are being inflicted; and we are being denied that information.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes on the matter on which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has just spoken. I wish to commend his determination to offer as an amendment to the ship bill a resolution relating to the subject of convoys. It seems to me perfectly apparent that the administration is trying to edge gradually into a convoy policy, which will mean war for the United States, and that it means to do so without submitting to Congress the question of whether or not it has the power. In my opinion, there is no question whatever that this is the body which should determine that question.

The lease-lend bill delegated many powers over foreign policy, but the one thing it did not delegate was the power to convoy. We put in the bill an express provision that American merchant ships still could not go through the war zone to Britain. Surely no one contends that the American Navy can convoy British ships through the war zone to Great Britain. Whatever else the lease-lend policy provided, it did not provide for convoys.

I have heard the argument, "What is the use of making munitions and other materials and giving them to England if we do not deliver them?" But the lease-lend policy was not to provide for delivery, and it was so stated on the floor of the Senate. If the argument were valid, it should include the sending of American boys to Europe; for what is the use of delivering the material in England if the British do not have the men who are necessary to make it effective? The same argument means sending American boys to Europe, and that argument means war.

I hope that when the Tobey amendment comes up on the floor we shall have a full discussion of it, and that the administration forces will freely and frankly discuss where the policy of the administration is leading us.

This is a matter which involves the question of war, and only Congress can declare war. That question should be settled. It should have been submitted to this body by the Foreign Relations Committee following its meeting yesterday; but, whether or not the committee acts, it can be submitted and it can be argued here on an amendment to the foreign-ship bill. I propose to discuss, and I think every other Senator interested in that policy should discuss, on this floor on that amendment the question whether the United States is now prepared to go to war outside its boundaries, in the absence of attack, in order to carry out the policy of the administration, which has not been approved by Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. ALONZO D. FOLGER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of the foregoing resolutions, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. KERR, and Mr. CLARK members of a committee, to join with such Members of the Senate as may be appointed, to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Bilbo	Hatch	Schwartz
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Herring	Smathers
Brooks	Hill	Smith
Brown	Holman	Spencer
Bulow	Hughes	Stewart
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Langer	Tobey
Capper	Lee	Truman
Caraway	Lodge	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wallgren
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Murdock	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Norris	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The clerk will proceed to state the bills on the calendar.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration was announced as first in order.

Mr. MCNARY. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 935) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to commodity loans and marketing quotas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MCNARY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1250) to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce cotton of the 1940 and previous crops which is owned by the Government or which is pledged as security for Government loans was announced as next in order.

Mr. MCNARY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ACCOUNT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND STATE OF VERMONT

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) directing the Comptroller General to re-

adjust the account between the United States and the State of Vermont was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to audit the claim of the State of Vermont with respect to advances and expenditures made by such State for military purposes during the War of 1812–15, with Great Britain, and after applying the rules of evidence and settlement to this class of claims, provided for in resolution of May 14, 1836 (5 Stat. L. 132), and in section 12 of the act approved March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. L. 229), to submit to the Senate a report containing the results of an audit of such claim, in conformity with said rules, and to certify to Congress for an appropriation the balance found due the State of Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this place in the RECORD a memorandum relating to the joint resolution which has just been passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum is as follows:

Memorandum regarding expenditures of the State of Vermont and the service of troops thereof on behalf of the Federal Government during the War of 1812–15

Attached are the following, which are submitted in support of the claim of the State of Vermont on the question of its right to be reimbursed for expenditures found by the Comptroller General of the United States to have been made by the State on behalf of the Federal Government during the War of 1812–15:

(1) Audit of the Comptroller General of the United States: You will recall that this was printed in full in previous reports of the Senate committee, but it was omitted in the last Congress because of its length.

Note therein statement of the Comptroller General as to the issuance by Vermont of "treasury notes in the amount of $10,130 for the use and benefit of the United States for the expenses of the War of 1812–15." Also his statement on page 2, "Under date of March 30, 1820, it appears the United States reimbursed the State of Vermont on account of the expenditures made in the amount of $4,421.18."

Thus, the reimbursement made to Vermont by the United States of this small item is certainly official recognition by the United States that the expenditures incurred by Vermont during the War of 1812–15 were for the benefit of the United States.

Finally, in this report is contained a list of the various principal expenditures, totaling $39,478.96, which were made by Vermont. Mainly these are payments to individuals who served as volunteers and in the militia of Vermont and who were called into the service of the United States during the War of 1812–15. Some of these payments also are to selectmen, to reimburse them for payments made by them to such volunteers and militia.

(2) Copy of act of the United States Congress of March 3, 1817 (5 Stat. L. 378), which was the original act passed by the Congress making appropriations to various States and to United States Government departments. This act is entitled "An act making additional appropriations to defray the expenses of the Army and militia during the late war with Great Britain." Note therein provision "for the payment of balances due to certain States on account of disbursements for militia employed in the service of the United States during the late war, $717,000."

As indicated, it was pursuant to this provision that Vermont was partially reimbursed, on March 30, 1820, the sum of $4,421.18 for certain of her expenditures in enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting volunteers and militia called into the service of the United States in pursuance of the requisition of the President of the United States during the War of 1812–15.

(3) Copy of act of the General Assembly of Vermont of November 9, 1812, appropriating $1,188.80 to selectmen of various towns in Vermont to reimburse them for payments made by them for the services and subsistence of volunteers and militia stationed at Troy and other towns on the northern frontier in the summer of 1812.

This total amount of $1,188.80, you will note, is found on page 9 of the Comptroller General's audit.

(4) Short bibliography on Vermont and the War of 1812. The first three works will be interesting, and also the one by Crocket entitled "Vermont, the Green Mountain State," might be helpful.

These can be secured from the Congressional Library.

[S. Doc. No. 23, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

CLAIM OF THE STATE OF VERMONT FOR EXPENDITURES MADE DURING THE WAR OF 1812–15

[Letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, in response to S. Res. No. 224, 73d Cong., certain information relative to the claim of the State of Vermont with respect to advances and expenditures made for military purposes during the War of 1812–15, with Great Britain]

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, February 19, 1935.

The PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Secretary of the United States Senate has transmitted to this office for action Senate Resolution 224, Seventy-third Congress, second session of April 26, 1934, providing:

"That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to audit the claim by the State of Vermont with respect to advances and expenditures made by such State for military purposes during the War of 1812–15, with Great Britain, and after applying the rules of evidence and settlement to this class of claims, provided for in resolution of May 14, 1936 (5 Stat. L. 132), and in section 12 of the act approved March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. L. 229), to submit to the Senate a report containing the results of an audit of such claim, in conformity with said rules."

Complying therewith I have the honor to report as follows:

It appears that during the years 1817 and 1818 the treasurer of the State of Vermont, pursuant to the acts of the State legislature dated November 4, 1816, and October 24, 1817, issued treasury notes in the amount of $10,130 for the use and benefit of the United States for the expenses of the War of 1812–15. The exact dates on which the notes were issued do not appear to be available, as the treasurer's records showing such dates are reported as among those destroyed in the burning of the statehouse at Montpelier, Vt., on January 6, 1857. In view of the circumstances, it has been assumed for the purposes of this report that the treasury notes issued pursuant to the act of November 4, 1816, in the amount of $4,130 were issued on January 1, 1817, and the notes issued pursuant to the act of October 24, 1817, in the amount of $6,000 were issued on January 1, 1818.

Under date of March 30, 1820, it appears the United States reimbursed the State of Vermont on account of the expenditures made in the amount of $4,421.18. Applying the rules approved in the settlement of a similar account between the United States and the State of Maryland authorized by section 12 of the act of March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 229), the computation would appear as follows:

Loan dated Jan. 1, 1817	$4,130.00
Interest thereon at 6 percent per annum to Mar. 30, 1820, 3 years, 2 months, 29 days	804.66
Loan dated Jan. 1, 1818	6,000.00
Interest thereon at 6 percent per annum to Mar. 30, 1820, 2 years, 2 months, 29 days	809.00
Total interest and principal	11,743.66
Payment by United States to the State of Vermont "for payments made to selectmen of sundry towns in said State for subsistence, camp equipage, ammunition, and transportation of baggage, etc., furnished by them for detachment of militia called into the service of the United States in the summer of 1812"	4,421.18
New principal	7,322.48
Interest on new principal at 6 percent per annum from Mar. 30, 1820, to Feb. 28, 1935, 114 years, 11 months	50,488.64
Total	57,811.12

There is included also in the report of the adjutant general of the State of Vermont, the officer having custody of the records showing the military expenditures incurred by the State, a list of various expenditures in the total amount of $39,478.96, as follows:

Curtis & Coolidge	$266.88
Richard Hayes	89.50
Caleb Hill	61.44
Stephen Pettes	46.08
Edmund Graves	8.13
William Baxter	19.71
Edmund Graves*	19.03
Gaius Kibbe	8.46
William Baxter	63.24
Do	8.68
Joseph Howes	19.16
Ezra Child	40.96
Abner Co	20.48
Samuel Wright	53.12
Galon Bliss	20.59
John Goodell	9.58
John Knights	16.26
Elihu Atherton	16.26
Luke Wallis	16.26
J. B. Emerson	20.59
Joseph Sleeper	16.92
Joseph Homes	9.58
Alpheus Hall	57.88
Andrew Dodge	20.59
Samuel Wright*	98.37
William Montgomery*	15.26
Thomas Wells*	17.26
Nathaniel Chamberlain*	44.63
Thomas Howe	20.37
Do	20.37
Do	11.58
Do.*	27.77
C. Jewett*	36.04
John Barrett	35.91
Gaius Kibbe*	12.91
Asa Tenny*	53.50
Calvin Putnam	20.59
Amos Rice*	19.21
Mills D. Forest*	12.86
Nathaniel Sawyer	18.92
David Harrington	16.26
Reuben Perkins	16.26
Reuben Hawks, Jr	16.26
George Reich	28.39
Nathaniel Chamberlain*	25.87
Amos Robinson	9.36
E. Ransom*	32.24
Lyman Kidder	9.00
Josiah Wright	16.26
Elisha Ferguson	16.70
Nath'l Kidder	17.58
Samuel Smith	20.37
Nathan Claflin	16.26
Nath'l Niles	7.01

Azarias Williams	$160.74
Andrew Dodge	80.71
Alpheus Hall	15.47
Asa Lyon	125.14
Daniel Clark	26.71
Samuel Cook	24.37
Benjamin Bin	16.26
Gideon Wheelock	39.75
Saml. Elliot *	7.83
Amos Robinson *	19.21
Amos Tuttle	59.55
Alfred Bridges	20.37
Chapin Keith	40.74
James Henderson*	21.62
Joseph Curine	20.37
Joseph Starlin	18.72
Lemuel Bostwick	232.80
Do	16.70
Peter Kendall	58.12
Benj. Swan	135.95
Luke Wallis	130.08
Joseph Sterlin	13.47
Zephaniah English	56.34
James Washburn	80.16
Jonathan Gleason	207.42
U. Holt	20.04
James Nepf	40.08
Silvanus Bates	48.86
Noah Chittenden	229.25
Robert Baker	9.00
Watson Jones	9.00
George Rich	19.16
Collins Pratt	9.00
Gustavius Meraim	6.13
Cyril Call	86.88
Benj. Swan	221.72
Lemuel Bostwick	120.55
Do	36.08
Downing Amsden	9.00
David Hodgman	9.00
Lemuel Bostwick	1,042.32
James Milliman *	43.26
Do	44.99
Waldo Tucker	19.82
W. Marcy	18.00
Elijah Knight	8.13
Syloanus Claflin	9.00
Jared Rickard	9.00
Andrew Gilman	50.10
Benj. Swan	23.04
Laban Webster	8.13
Calvin Whitney	8.13
David Mason	116.79
S. Simpson	9.00
P. Barrett	16.92
H. Whiting	9.00
Zonas Webster	9.00
N. Brooks	86.79
Josiah Kerdull	69.98
Joseph Wood, Jr	9.00
Benj. Swan	121.55
John Whitney	8.13
D. Brownell	8.13
T. Campbell	8.13
H. Bessey	9.00
Aaron Simmons	9.00
Benj. Swan	182.36
Samuel Weeding	9.00
J. Briggs	9.00
Erastus Cady	9.00
Samuel Healy	9.00
Robert Baker	9.00
Barnabas Delano	49.42
William Morrison	9.00
Marvin Blood	9.00
John Heath	119.87
Do.*	20.26
Aaron Small	8.13
Sam'l Briggs	8.13
David White	8.13
Amos Mathews	33.40
S. Woodward	16.26
Nathaniel Lewis	38.04
Alex'r Hutchinson	33.00
Levi Hall	8.13
Alex'r Hutchinson	8.68
Samuel Blood	9.00
John S. Willard	9.00
Samuel Healy, Jr	8.13
Levi Bean	106.52
David Moody	7.68
Lemuel Bostwick	$161.68
Do	237.07
Do	124.30
Do	269.29
Elijah Backus	9.00
Lemuel Bostwick	15.93
Do	147.79
Do	121.71
Do	171.68
Do	267.33
Do	164.10
Dudley Bryant	20.04
Nathan Robinson, Jr.*	15.35
Do	46.54
Lysander Raymond	9.00
Thad's White	181.03
John Bridge*	51.55
James Tarbon	207.36
Harry Bingham	7.68
Isaac White	9.00
Wm. Farnsworth	310.30
Benj. Swan	128.52
James Kelly	8.13
John Weed	173.06
Amos Galusha	132.70
Noah Chittenden	175.87
Leonard D. Fargo	5.00
Benj. Swan	107.55
Paul Mason	16.26
B. Eastman	8.13
Eban'r Holmes	9.00
Noah Benson	9.00
Jonathan White	8.13
Marcus Peake	8.13
Warren Blanchard	8.13
Ebenezer Gove	12.00
Nat Richmond	5.00
Amasa Piper	165.24
Do.*	7.80
Oliver Bugbee	8.13
Ira Elmer	10.90
Thos. Vail	5.00
David Mason	16.70
Robert Baker	7.68
Isaac Lull	8.13
Pamerson T. Platt	7.34
Asahel Raymond	62.34
Nathaniel Clark	9.00
John Berry	9.00
Cromwell Leonard	8.13
Ephraim Griggs	5.00
Osmand Brooks	15.36
Gurden Linkon	47.04
Benj. Downing	11.24
Bebee Booth	20.04
Addna Eaton	8.13
Cyrus H. Clement	20.04
Elisha Dyer	38.04
Joseph Hoyt*	21.80
Calvin Chapin	9.00
Ira Bishop	14.00
Wm. Ashley	9.00
Alexr. Hutchinson*	17.85
Lemuel Bostwick	16.26
Benjm. Swan	90.39
Roswell Jepherson	9.36
Ebenezer Sparhawk	9.00
John Bull	20.70
Meshack Wiggin	20.04
Frederick Griswold	143.86
Do	20.04
Do	9.00
Do	9.00
Ezekiel French	8.13
William Jennings	24.39
Calvin Fairbanks	9.00
John Cummings	9.00
Earle Newton	9.00
Ira Brown	8.13
Luther Hutchinson	8.13
Harry Page	8.13
Harry Boyce*	45.40
Ezekiel Parsons	9.00
John Weed	93.65
Abishai Hoisington*	75.37
Joshua Bayley	172.27
Ira Butler	243.25
Silas Miller	4.11
Joshua Lumbard	9.00
Dan Grout	14.90
Elijah Meacham	$9.00
Luther Hutchinson	45.63
Myron Powell	14.12
Rufus Furbush, Jr	8.13
Jeremiah Crosby	8.13
Daniel Morgan	10.90
Frederick Barrows	20.04
Joseph Reed	9.00
Jona Atherton	8.13
Moses Richardson	8.13
Nathaniel Perkins	16.26
Robert Heath	9.00
Rodolphus Sprague	8.13
Asahel White	7.68
John Griswold, Jr	64.16
Daniel Dana	12.24
Woodbury Massey, Jun	9.00
John Lock	5.12
Charles Rice	9.00
Henry Farwell	9.00
Ruel Cobb	20.04
Chester Carpenter	50.32
Etheny Miller	7.68
Smith Whitman	8.13
Frederick Converse	20.04
J. Congden	8.24
Allen Palmer	8.24
Lewell Read	15.47
John E. Stearns	7.34
Thad's White	59.48
Do	19.71
Wm. S. Ashley*	55.55
Lewis Rogers	124.59
Martin Row	9.00
Levi Rodgers	300.98
Polly Wetherbee	9.00
Asa B. Briggs	9.00
Sam'l Bryant	9.00
Morey Shippy	8.13
Wm. Spear	19.71
William Jones	17.13
Moses Davis, Jr	5.12
Benj. Swan	144.95
John Nutt	5.12
Rob't R. Wandall	2.00
Ralph Ellenwood	32.08
Oliver Tucker	7.68
Robert Baker	9.00
Do	7.68
Green Plumo	15.25
Solomon Pinney	8.13
Amial Pinney	8.13
Luther Taylor	8.13
Noah Chittenden	65.04
Seth Town	48.32
Wm. Tilestom	300.00
John Heath	128.44
Erastus Call	9.00
Seth Tomson	35.29
Luther Fay	9.00
Ebenezer Goss	9.00
Benj. Swan	163.62
Eli Austin*	48.54
John Weed*	55.08
Levi Grandy	8.13
Oliver Perry	8.90
Silas Thomas	9.00
Eber Robinson	11.69
John Weed	222.48
Salah Smith*	13.70
John G. Knight	48.78
Nathaniel Fisk	20.04
Moses Warner	9.00
Cyrus Snow	8.13
Asa Raymond	16.26
Do.*	20.13
John C. Baldwin	7.45
Harry Hale	21.27
Joshua Sawyer	8.13
Willard Holuen	8.13
Joseph Davison	8.13
Samuel G. Stevens	8.13
Thomas Turner	9.00
Job Lyman	8.13
James G. Parsons	24.83
James Cox	16.04
Thos. Richard	9.00
James Pollard	8.13
Stephens Wright	7.34
Robert Grandy	16.70

Samuel W. Morris	$15.93
Thos. Hazeltine	75.79
Benj. Pease*	15.96
Reuben Chandler*	42.92
Simon Cummins	20.59
Samuel Alford	15.93
Joseph Scott	252.72
Samuel Gregory	61.15
George W. Denison	78.80
Luther H. Sabin	20.04
Thos. Gilman	29.04
Jona. Whitaker	9.00
Calvin Burnap	8.13
Alex'r White	8.24
Rufus Guild	19.82
Israel P. Richardson	45.22
Wm. Kilbourn	20.04
John Fillmore	74.58
Do.*	49.74
Amos Richardson	8.13
Oel Billings	9.00
Richard Smith, Jr	76.65
Asa Fisher	20.37
Richard Smith, Jr	10.21
Do.*	8.75
Lemuel Bostwick	29.29
Kendall Boutwell	9.36
Israel P. Dana	130.55
Jonathan Ware	8.13
Israel P. Dana	426.59
Elijah Chandler	8.13
Uriah Thayer	24.39
Abel Camp	4.79
Susanna Sweetser	9.00
Allen Richmond	8.13
Dudley Thomas	8.13
Elisha Allis, Jr	16.70
Elisha Allis, Jr.*	19.00
Willard Caryl &c	17.13
Lem'l Richmond	16.26
Stephen Williams	20.48
Lowell Read	74.19
Luther Cox	16.04
Wm. Priv	29.04
Cyrus Perkins	19.71
Joseph Davis	7.34
Elisha A. Fowler	23.04
Norman Webber*	24.24
Parley Davis	20.37
Paul Sawyer	24.39
Andrew Ardgry	19.71
Theodore Foster	15.36
Benj. Swan	20.38
Eldridge Brigham	28.74
Josiah Kendall	38.04
Azarias Williams	74.03
Frederic Ladd	7.68
Ebenezer Dyer*	37.52
J. Wetherbee	8.13
Ralph Parker*	11.65
Ralph Parker	207.54
Daniel Ramsay	56.89
Sol. W. Bush	5.12
Alexander Hutchinson	26.39
L. Bostwick	61.34
Jonathan Smith	29.73
Abel Jewett	15.93
John Weed*	80.00
Daniel Stearns*	46.85
Amos Lane	8.13
Levi Wright	9.58
John Weed	261.57
Barzillai Burgess	58.72
Ira Butler	65.70
Elihu Lyman	4.22
Joseph Chapman	60.12
William Danforth	15.93
Samuel Havland	20.37
Lyman Kidder*	16.00
Noah White	20.37
R. Stewart	19.93
Thomas Gould	77.35
Levi Barnard	19.49
Samuel Snow, Jr	9.00
Giles Taylor	48.12
Willard Ainsworth	28.74
Asa Brewster, Jr	31.18
William Whitney	8.13
Neh'h Noble	7.68
Do.*	29.60
Abial Hibbard	$15.93
Robert Morse	23.29
Calvin Robinson	8.13
Jeremiah Pratt	9.00
Benjamin Clapp	7.68
Isaac N. Partridge	.55
Elijah Read	108.40
Do	36.81
Zerah Pulsipher	8.24
Robert Kimball	20.04
John Fuller	8.13
William Spencer	28.39
Richard Stevens	4.56
Nathan Stone*	30.38
Daniel Brown	97.06
William Spencer*	45.67
Thomas Turner	9.00
Jesse Crocker	5.00
Willard Ainsworth	32.08
Edward Preston	9.00
Warham Brown	140.96
Do.*	22.72
Stephen Holden	24.81
John W. Fellows	20.48
Phineas F. Wales	44.04
Levi Bigelow	14.68
Abner Waldo	18.00
Archelaus Jones	24.72
Luther Baker	16.04
John Thomas	128.73
Daniel Morse	156.94
Joseph Patterson	29.80
Stephen Brown	102.40
John Weed	163.23
Stephen Brown*	29.87
James Taylor	16.04
Asa Hedge	15.93
James Trowbridge	8.13
Samuel Howe	7.68
Elias Thomas	32.85
Rufus Root, Jr	9.00
Noah Crocker, Jr	9.00
Norman Williams	16.15
Eldad French	1.67
Joseph Lillie	7.63
Samuel R. Dudley	16.26
Ephraim Keyes*	21.18
Josiah Kendall	16.04
Walter Parmeter	58.08
John Sleeper	48.43
Martin Parmiter	20.04
Thomas Clark	1.78
Nathan Niles	170.26
Do.*	8.43
Edward Simons	133.75
Do.*	33.30
Do.*	25.72
John Robbins	16.48
Do	293.15
Isaac Martin	49.86
Do.*	47.25
Bradford Kinne	28.39
Do.*	18.80
Ed. C. Taber*	14.16
Do	17.14
Abner Bayley	14.02
Charles Johnson	8.24
Levi Barker	8.24
George Green	16.04
Simeon Chase	9.00
Timothy Bull	48.67
Archelaus Putnam	9.00
Nath'l Kendall	8.24
John Wood	24.24
Amasa Piper	26.94
Fullam Perry	9.00
J. P. Buckingham	45.00
Ephraim C. Ellis	20.04
Ara B. Rice	9.00
Solomon Lumbard	8.13
Gardner Spooner	9.00
John P. Williams*	53.05
Uriel C. Hatch	7.45
Elijah Knight	30.15
Samuel Waldo	32.50
Thomas Martin	15.93
A. Denison	12.57
Asa Tilden	1.00
Stephen Davis	8.13
Joseph Ross	8.13
Dyer Waterman	$28.50
Elisha Buscom*	21.66
Jacob Smith*	41.46
Pierce Kurton	8.13
Ebenezer Miller	10.34
John Holten*	56.04
Rhodolphus Clark	48.78
Daniel Cloud*	24.53
Wm. Whitford*	37.98
Do	148.87
Mosely Hall	22.06
Urban Lathrop	6.35
Nomlas Cobb	8.13
Goodwin Lincoln	186.66
Do.*	71.73
Nathaniel F. Stone	23.72
Moses Pollard*	54.63
Zadock Wheeler*	20.33
Do	232.15
Harry Bingham	46.41
Benjamin Swan	12.48
Champion Smith	16.70
Lowell Read	68.98
Daniel Drake	8.13
W. Roberts*	80.47
John Blanden, Jr	66.85
Elias Keyes	47.04
Hiram Harwood	16.48
Jeffrey Watson	16.04
John Spear	293.86
Do	185.66
Elias Keyes	47.04
Lem'l Bostwick	52.54
Elias Thomas	44.21
Samuel Mattocks	82.84
Joseph Lumbarce	18.91
J. & T. N. Morse	21.05
John Brown	17.36
Do.*	22.96
Samuel Crawford	44.04
Elisha Tilden	16.26
J. Williams	83.20
Stephen Pettes	106.75
Alexander Hutchinson	51.74
Thomas Little*	86.41
Thomas Little	7.34
Zebulon Delano	8.13
Gideon G. Russel	6.24
John Hallock	218.09
Linus Cramton	12.85
Ephriam Mott*	30.27
John Spear	247.68
Breakenridge & Pengree	16.48
Amos Huntington, Jr	16.48
John Space	367.36
Amos Huntington, Jr.*	78.90
Benjamin Swan	119.21
Simon Guilford	16.59
Abel Gilson, Jr	8.13
Benjamin Moulton, Jr	9.00
Phinehas Strong	25.37
Abel Bishop	32.96
Do.*	10.49
Richard Stratton	51.10
Richard Smith	8.24
John K. Chase	14.68
Arch Jones*	35.76
Do	24.50
Ebenezer Saunderson	16.04
Stuart Brown*	23.13
Orange Heaton	72.41
Do.*	54.02
John Maynard	16.04
Joshua Parsons	8.13
Erastus Herman	198.23
Amos Partridge, Jr.*	11.75
Erastus Sherman	314.01
Amos Partridge, Jr.*	19.51
Do.*	24.31
Do	16.04
Robert Whitelaw	19.94
Amos Partridge, Jr.*	15.09
Do	238.23
Almad Shur	213.59
Do	205.34
John Roberts, Jr	8.13
Hezekiah Moor	8.13
Daniel Calkins	8.02
Isaac B. Davis	32.08
Sheldon Bartholomew	8.13

Clark Cutting	$6.35
Selectmen of Guilford *	61.72
Ralph Turner	16.26
Abijah Towsley	28.96
Jason Sprague	22.81
Levi Stevens*	18.48
Elias Randall	9.00
Abel Houghton	14.68
Joel Lyon	9.00
Simeon Reed	7.34
Saml. Kendrick	8.24
Isaac Pratt	16.26
Daniel Marsh*	44.04
Daniel Ingraham	67.59
Abijah Eaton	16.26
Joseph Chaffe	8.24
Alvan Foot	5.91
Charles Stevens*	18.73
Charles Wallbridge	17.13
Ezra Child*	22.68
David Streeter	13.14
Shubel Converse*	35.78
Joseph Marsh	7.34
Syrel King	9.00
Daniel Dance*	12.10
John Moore, Jr	9.00
Alexander Milliken	8.13
Elisha Hutchinson	1.89
Edward Kibbe	8.13
Gurdon Randall	20.04
Jona. Barron	16.26
Do.*	30.13
Do.*	89.54
Do.*	48.84
Jacob Sargeant	8.13
John McCollum	8.13
Wm. D. Smith	47.55
John Ancy	20.04
Ebenr. Fisk	7.45
Isaiah Huntly	16.26
Samuel Damon*	27.99
Martin Guilford	23.60
Nathan Whitner	4.56
Phinehas Page	7.79
John Hoffman	8.68
Moses Holden	16.04
Daniel Moor	7.45
Arthur Bennett*	47.27
Freeman Chamberlin	6.24
Abram Gage	7.34
Seth Carver	7.68
John Hall	16.26
John Slafter, Jr.*	42.85
John V. Allen	39.39
J. Williams	44.50
John Robbins	30.51
Paul Bickford	8.68
Noah Holt	9.12
Daniel Bayley	1.67
Nathaniel Whitcomb	9.00
Sam'l Martin	15.58
Calvin Sollace	24.72
Do.*	29.00
Benj. Baldwin	8.13
Ira Phelps	14.68
Asahel Smith *	46.72
Cyrus Washburn*	40.62
Nath'l Kilborn	8.13
Iram Wilcox	7.34
Erastus Mott*	9.60
Elias Buel*	8.92
Jonas Clark	8.24
Sam'l Huntington	9.58
Edmund Groves	24.39
Salmon Green	16.04
Shadrack Hatheway*	22.08
Frederic Hopkins*	20.69
Joab Smith*	14.40
David Kellogg*	15.57
Sam'l Wright	24.72
Thos. Middlebrook*	13.91
Noble Munson	12.81
Wm. B. Marsh*	16.26
Samuel Fay*	96.03
Do	9.00
Do.*	68.04
Seba French*	12.72
Timothy Bliss*	16.61
Noble Munson*	21.22
Do	29.95
Thomas Foster	$11.02
James Roberts*	29.77
Nathan Canfield	8.13
Caleb Sheldon	16.04
A. Drury*	26.27
Aaron Mosher*	45.50
Nathan Canfield*	69.84
Joseph W. Ingalls*	19.65
Caleb Royce	5.04
Jed H. Harris*	59.45
Samuel Fay*	34.05
I. P. Dana	8.68
Benj. Udnay	123.75
Thos. Smith*	12.84
Peter Dudley*	10.84
Azarias Williams	11.02
Asa Sprout	9.36
Galus Perkins	9.00
Jonathan Smith	7.34
Marshall Whitaker	8.13
Charles Johnson	92.11
Daniel Benson*	39.97
Wm. D. Smith	2.57
Simon Guilford*	4.00
Lem'l Richmond*	41.44
Phinehas Strong*	44.00
Do	9.35
John Hatch	4.67
David Oakes	7.45
Uriel C. Hatch*	41.00
Wm. Williams	7.45
John P. Williams	7.45
Alden Toby	15.47
R. Temple	8.24
Do.*	12.99
Do.*	23.00
Benj. Swan	16.70
Do.*	19.48
Archelaus Jones	8.13
John Wood	4.90
John H. Burnam*	22.24
James Brink, Jr	8.13
Simon Baldwin	8.13
David Whitney	5.12
Nat. P. Sawyer*	9.25
Abel Smith*	10.39
James Q. McFarland	8.24
Allen Goodrich	8.24
Do.*	23.84
Ch's K. Williams	9.00
Abiel Richardson*	33.99
Do	16.37
Joshua Johnson*	8.50
Ezra Livermore*	22.02
Ezra Livermore	11.29
Caleb Sheldon	16.04
Darius Mathews*	10.67
Eleazor Packer	8.68
Harry Hale*	3.00
David Brown*	2.25
Rich'd Graves*	18.31
Daniel Kimball*	33.30
Peleg Stiles*	16.66
Sam'l Jewett*	8.34
Joseph Olds	14.68
Benj. Holmes	16.04
Joseph Olds*	70.00
David Barber	8.24
Asa Wheelock*	21.02
Jona. Brigham*	5.50
Wm. Howe	20.15
Abel Knapp*	16.98
Dyer Leffingwill	8.24
Caleb Sheldon*	16.34
James Smalley*	17.30
Zadock Wheeler	66.50
S. Haighte, Jr	16.59
Joshua Morgan	53.00
Stephen Pettes	27.27
Wm. Howe*	10.15
Sylvester Hall*	21.23
Royal Corbin	5.30
Ellis Cobb*	13.14
Wm. Baxter*	8.22
Dan Carpenter*	25.70
Dan'l G. Savage*	11.00
Frederic Hopkins	16.04
Jos'h Warner	8.24
Alex'r Gilchrist*	41.65
Robert Rand	8.13
Levi Rogers	$1.10
Jonas Newell	11.02
Simon Lawrence	8.24
Adam Taylor	8.13
James Barker	8.13
Dan'l Brown	7.45
Comfort Thrasher	22.02
Stephen Spaulding	8.24
Silas Davison	11.80
Wm. Williams	7.45
Enoch Emerson*	4.20
Amos Cory	1.45
Barnabas Myrick	12.59
James Witherell	15.25
Jona. Brush	16.04
Charles Johnson	30.93
Wm. Weaton *	8.47
Samuel Clark	8.13
Linus Cramton	2.44
Isaac J. Vail	8.13
Jona. Draper	8.13
Charles W. Soule	7.45
Phinehas Strong	8.24
I. Williams	22.24
James Haskins	11.24
Martin Tribon	8.13
John B. Catlin *	47.14
John Stanley *	28.82
Wm. Cahoon *	23.00
David Lewis	3.67
David Johnson	20.04
Benj. Norris	20.37
Amos W. Barnum	2,653.17
Smith	41.34
Rich. Stevens	11.01
James Q. McFarland	26.04
Andrew Farnsworth	225.73
Alex'r Hutchinson	19.77
Do	8.58
Do	3.32
Andrew Farnsworth	208.91
Timothy Foster	21.18
Andrew Farnsworth	29.96
Peter Martin	94.98
Benj. Henry	7.23
Benj. Swan	21.18
Do	52.41
Do	7.06
Do	17.65
Richard Smith, Jr	3.53
Samuel Heale	3.53
M. D. Follet	17.65
James Mason	3.53
Benj. Swan	258.29
Do	3.53
Do	2.73
Heman Allen	6.95
D. Richardson	24.64
Do	12.59
Alex'r Hutchinson	10.31
James B. Gilmore	12.12
Thos. Waterman	7.06
Elijah Bush	3.53
Andrew Farnsworth	43.28
Samuel B. Young	799.13
Jonathan Orms	39.60
Jonas Galusha	31.50
William Cahoon	15.00
John Mattocks	49.00
John M. Foster	317.00
Hugh Laughlin	10.40
Lyman Lamphear	10.00
Levi Ellis	10.00
William Howe (et al.)	36.38
Simon Briggs (et al.)	205.96
Thomas Ward (et al.)	731.10
John Mattocks	57.61
Selectmen of Moretown, etc	174.82
Joseph Scott (et al.)	64.78
Stedman Martin (et al.)	590.20
Samuel Britton (et al.)	143.09
Joshua Buzzell	38.00
Baruck Bolster	40.00
Thomas Foster	45.14
Hampton Lovegroove	75.00
William Richardson	34.09
John Willson	37.40
Amarziah Woodward	5.00
Samuel Scovel (et al.)	160.08

Selectmen of Barnet (et al.)	$1,188.80
John Benson	15.93
Adam Hurlbut	16.04
Total	89,478.96

It is certified by the adjutant general, State of Vermont, that this list is taken from the record book of the State and is supported by a copy of a certificate executed by the secretary of state November 7, 1856, at the time the list of vouchers was copied in the record book to the effect that the list was a true copy, in dates and amounts, of the original vouchers for payments made for services in the War of 1812.

Included in the above list, and indicated by the asterisk, are the items included in the claim allowed on March 30, 1820, in the amount of $4,421.18. The other expenditures are not supported by vouchers, it being stated that the original vouchers on which the payments were made were destroyed in the burning of the statehouse on January 6, 1857, and there is cited as authority for accepting the showing presented as evidence of the payments made the joint resolution of Congress in May 14, 1836 (5 Stat. 132), for the character of evidence to be accepted in settling claims of States against the United States arising out of the War of 1812–15.

The evidence now available as to the items not supported by vouchers, etc., is not sufficient to support a proper audit. However, should it be accepted as establishing the validity of this additional claim which the State of Vermont presents, for incorporation in this report, it is believed the amount of $4,421.18 paid the State under date of March 30, 1820, should be deducted from the expenditures totaling $39,478.96 and the account should appear as follows:

Balance due the State of Vermont for loans and interest	$57,811.12
Amount of expenditures ($39,478.96 less $4,421.18)	35,057.78
Total	92,868.90

Correspondence between Gov. Jonas Galusha and Congressman Charles Rich prior to the settlement of March 30, 1820, indicates that careful consideration was given the claim then presented by the State of Vermont and all amounts at that time supported by adequate proof appear to have been allowed.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. McCARL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

An act making additional appropriations to defray the expenses of the Army and militia during the late war with Great Britain

Be it enacted, etc., That for defraying the expenses of the Military Establishment, and those incurred by calling out the militia during the late War with Great Britain, in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated by law for these objects, the following sums be, the sums are hereby appropriated, viz:

For pay of the Army and militia, including the sum of $300,000, exclusive of interest, advanced by the State of Pennsylvania for defraying the expenses of the militia of said State, during the late war, $730,000.

For subsistence, $200,000.

For the Quartermaster's Department, $450,000.

For the Ordnance Department, $144,000.

For the payments of balances due to certain States, on account of disbursements for militia employed in the service of the United States during the late war, $717,000.[1]

For paying the expenses incurred in ascertaining and surveying the boundary lines established by the treaty lately made with the Creek Indians, $15,000.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the several sums, hereby appropriated, be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Approved March 3, 1817 (5 Stat. L. 378).

An act making compensation to the volunteers of Troy and other places on the northern frontier

It is hereby enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont that the treasurer be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to the several towns and persons hereinafter named the following sums, out of any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, as compensation for the services and subsistence of the volunteers and militia stationed at Troy and in other towns on the northern frontier the summer past, to wit:

To the selectmen of the town of Craftsbury, the sum of	$85.17
To the selectmen of Hardwick, the sum of	88.60
To the selectmen of Greensboro, the sum of	56.00
To the selectmen of Walden, the sum of	40.67
To the selectmen of Cabot, the sum of	57.17
To the selectmen of Peacham, the sum of	23.50
To the selectmen of Troy, the sum of	76.50
To the selectmen of Danville, the sum of	120.70
To the selectmen of Irasburgh, the sum of	35.00
To the selectmen of Sheffield, the sum of	33.20
To the selectmen of Barnet, the sum of	80.20
To the selectmen of St. Johnsbury, the sum of	30.00
To the selectmen of Wheelock, the sum of	59.40
To the selectmen of Ryegate, the sum of	22.44
To the selectmen of Lyndon, the sum of	4.10
To the selectmen of Canaan, the sum of	31.50
To the selectmen of Morristown, the sum of	44.84
To the selectmen of Kelly-Vale, the sum of	9.34
To the selectmen of Glover, the sum of	19.34
To Col. Joseph Scott, for supplies for troops, the sum of	235.67
To the selectmen of Barton, the sum of	27.46
To William Baxter, for supplies to troops	8.00
Amounting to	1,188.80

Passed by the General Assembly of Vermont, November 9, 1812.

A true copy.

Attest:

THOMAS LEVERETT, *Secretary.*

NOTE.—The above-quoted act shows that the volunteers and militia of Vermont, which were called into the service of the United States during the war with Great Britain, 1812–15, were stationed at Troy and in other towns on the northern frontier, some of which are listed above.

[The Library of Congress]

SELECTED REFERENCES PERTAINING TO VERMONT IN THE WAR OF 1812

Clark, Byron N., editor, A List of Pensioners of the War of 1812. (Burlington, Boston, 1904.) (E359.4.C62.)

Vermont, Adjutant and Inspector General's Office, Roster of Soldiers in the War of 1812–14. (St. Albans, 1933.) (E359.5.V3V32.)

Vermont, Records of the Governor and Council of the State of Vermont, volume 6, part E. (Montpelier, 1873–80.) (F49.V52.)

Carter, Robert M., Studies in Vermont History. (St. Johnsbury, Vt., 1937.) (F49.C34.)

Collins, Edward Day, A History of Vermont. (Boston, New York, 1916.) (F49.C715.)

Crockett, Walter Hill, Vermont, the Green Mountain State.[2] (New York, 1921.) (F49.C9.)

Lamb, Wallace E., The Lake Champlain and Lake George Valleys. (New York, 1940.) (F127.C6L3.)

Slocum, Harold W., The Story of Vermont. (New York, Chicago, 1926.) (F49.S63.)

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF STOLEN CATTLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1261) to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen cattle having a value of $50 or more in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in section 3, page 2, line 6, after the word "cattle", to strike out "having a value of $50 or more", and in section 4, page 2, line 11, after the word "cattle", to strike out "having a value of $50 or more", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the National Cattle Theft Act.

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(a) The term "cattle" shall mean one or more bulls, steers, oxen, cows, heifers, or calves, or the carcass or carcasses of one or more bulls, steers, oxen, cows, heifers, or calves.

(b) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" shall include transportation from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. Whoever shall transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce any cattle, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 4. Whoever shall receive, conceal, store, barter, buy, sell, or dispose of any cattle moving in or constituting a part of interstate or foreign commerce, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 5. Any person violating section 3 of this act may be prosecuted in any district from, into, or through which such cattle has or have been transported or removed.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein shall be construed to repeal, modify, or amend any part of the National Stolen Property Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] give a brief word of explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill, in substance, has been passed on two or three different occasions by the Senate

[1] Pursuant to the above provision, Vermont was partially reimbursed on March 30, 1820, in the sum of $4,421.18 on account of expenditures she had made for the use and benefit of the United States in enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting volunteers and militia called into the service of the United States in pursuance of the requisition of the President of the United States, during the War with Great Britain, 1812–15.

[2] Standard.

and by the House, but was vetoed by the President because of a certain provision which he thought entailed prosecution for misdemeanors. We have eliminated the limitation. We have deleted all provisions which would bring the offense into the category of petty larceny, and have made it to apply directly to stealing, taking, carrying away, or leading or driving away cattle from one State to another. Let me say to the Senator that this measure falls into the same category as the Dyer Act, by which stealing and driving away or removing an automobile is made punishable under the Federal law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall, when the bill was up before, that there was some discussion of the broad question whether it was wise policy for Congress to single out any article of theft and make it a penalty to take it across a State line, instead of dealing with all articles of theft and making all such transportation across a State line a Federal offense. I recall, however, that we did deal with automobile stealing, because at that time it presented a special situation because of racketeering and violations of the prohibition laws and of other things which induced Congress to feel that it was entitled to special treatment.

I desire to reiterate what I think I stated at the time the bill was previously considered, that if Congress is to penalize the transportation of articles of theft across State lines I am not so certain that it ought not to enact a general law on the subject, instead of picking out one or two things and providing a penalty for transporting those things across State lines if they have been stolen.

I shall not object to this bill, but I think the broad subject is entitled to consideration.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful for the Senator's statement that he will not object to the bill. I desire to invite his attention to this situation:

In recent years, grazing on the open public domain in the grazing-land States has been licensed by permits issued by the Grazing Division of the Interior Department, so that cattle ranging at large on the open public domain are today the subject of theft by persons using high-powered vehicles on high-speed roads; and the greatest loss to the stock raiser today on the range, aside from loss due to predatory animals, is from the man who comes out on the range or out into the open and takes cattle onto his truck and transports them across a State line. It is for that reason that the bill is sought to be enacted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen cattle in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS AT MILITARY ACADEMY FROM DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 702) to increase the number of cadets allowed at the United States Military Academy from the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1935 (ch. 201, 49 Stat. 332), as amended (ch. 523, 50 Stat. 534), is hereby further amended by striking out the words "five for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "nine for the District of Columbia."

ENLARGEMENT OF POWERS OF PROPERTY CLERK OF DISTRICT POLICE DEPARTMENT

The bill (H. R. 4083) to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to dispose of property coming into his possession was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FURNISHING OF STEAM TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM CENTRAL HEATING PLANT

The bill (H. R. 3869) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECREATIONAL BUILDINGS AT ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 145) authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to permit the American Red Cross to construct needed recreational buildings on the St. Elizabeths Hospital reservation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

CHARLOTTE E. HUNTER

The bill (H. R. 4221) for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS FOR FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

The bill (H. R. 4057) to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for the Freedmen's Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUGUST R. LUNDSTROM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 255) for the relief of August R. Lundstrom, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws August R. Lundstrom, late of Company L, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said organization on the 6th day of April 1903: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowances shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will look, he will see that there is a very elaborate report on the matter. Frankness compels me to say that I have not recently looked into the facts of the case, but a similar bill was favorably reported in the last Congress, and the measure has received very careful consideration from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The soldier was stationed at Whipple Barracks, in Arizona. Like some other soldiers, he overindulged, and was absent for 2 days. Otherwise, his military record is excellent. The committee took all the facts into consideration and recommended that the soldier's record be straightened out.

That is about the situation.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator tell me if, as a result of the passage of the bill, the dependents of the soldier would be entitled to receive a pension?

Mr. HAYDEN. If his record is cleared he will be in the same status as any other soldier.

Mr. DANAHER. I notice that there is a provision in lines 8, 9, and 10 to the effect—

That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowances shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the customary provision, and I think it is perfectly sound. After the Civil War a great scandal arose because of cases in which men would delay for a long time applications for pensions, and then, when granted, the pensions would date back for many years and would involve the payment of a very large lump sum. So Congress determined, first, that all pensions should begin from the date of the application; and, second, if granted as a result of congressional action, that no money would accrue until after the bill became law. That is the usual provision.

Mr. DANAHER. So that under this bill pension allowances will be prospective only?

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF STATUTE SUSPENDING ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN CIVIL LIABILITIES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) to amend Public Law No. 861, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 17, 1940, an act to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement

of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval Establishments, including the Coast Guard, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the joint resolution go over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust that the joint resolution will not have to go over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I objected because it is not perfectly understandable from the caption what the joint resolution proposes to accomplish. If the measure can be explained satisfactorily, I shall have no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think a word of explanation will satisfy the Senator. In the act of October 17, 1940, as passed, there was a typographical error. The word "insured" was printed in the act; it should have read "insurer." The pending joint resolution merely substitutes the word "insurer," and makes the original act read as it was intended to read. The mistake was made after the bill was passed, as I understand. That is all the explanation there is to it. The pending joint resolution merely proposes to correct the existing act.

Mr. McNARY. I did not quite catch the concluding remarks of the able Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I said I think that is all the explanation there is; it is a mere correction.

Mr. McNARY. The pending measure, then, is designed to correct the wording of an existing statute?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is all; it merely corrects a word which was obviously a mistake.

Mr. McNARY. I withdraw the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved etc., That section 413 of the act entitled "An act to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval Establishments, including the Coast Guard," Public Law No. 861, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 17, 1940, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the word "insured" where it first occurs in the second line and substituting in lieu thereof the word "insurer," so that section 413 shall read as follows:

"This article shall not apply to any policy which is void or which may at the option of the insurer be voidable, if the insured is in military service, either in this country or abroad, nor to any policy which as a result of being in military service, either in this country or abroad, provides for the payment of any sum less than the face thereof or for the payment of an additional amount as premium."

JOHN H. BALMAT, JR.

The bill (S. 972) for the relief of John H. Balmat, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to consider and authorized to grant the application of John H. Balmat, Jr., former captain, One Hundred and Forty-seventh Regiment United States Field Artillery, for such of the benefits under the act entitled "An act making eligible for retirement, under certain conditions, officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War," approved May 24, 1928, as the said John H. Balmat, Jr., may be entitled to in accordance with his disability rating: *Provided*, That the application of the said John H. Balmat, Jr., shall be filed with the Veterans' Administration within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act.

DEATH GRATUITY BENEFITS

The bill (S. 1060) to extend the 6-month death-gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army and Navy of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of section 1 of the act of August 30, 1935, as amended by section 5 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557), and by the act of July 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 1079), be, and same is hereby, further amended by changing the final period to a comma and adding the following: "including for their dependents the benefits of the act of December 17, 1919 (41 Stat. 367), as amended."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the 6-month death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States."

RAILROAD TRACKAGE AND FACILITIES AT JEFFERSON BARRACKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 916) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a revocable license to Guy A. Thompson, trustee, Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., and successors in interest, to maintain railroad trackage and station facilities on Jefferson Barracks Military Reservation, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the word "Reservation", to insert "Missouri"; and on the same page, line 5, after the word "purpose", to insert "and to maintain, operate, repair, and renew that portion of existing main line right-of-way of said railroad on said reservation in excess of the 60-foot right-of-way authorized by the act of Congress approved February 14, 1853 (10 Stat. 754), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 14, 1856 (11 Stat. 452)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War (hereinafter referred to as "Secretary") be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant to Guy A. Thompson, trustee, Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., debtor, and successors in interest (herein referred to as "grantees") a license to maintain, operate, repair, renew, and construct, at grantees' expense, upon Jefferson Barracks Military Reservation, Mo., such passenger station, depot grounds, and sidings as, in the opinion of the Secretary, are reasonably necessary to serve said reservation and will not conflict with the use of said reservation for any governmental purpose, and to maintain, operate, repair, and renew that portion of the existing main line right-of-way of said railroad on said reservation in excess of the 60-foot right-of-way authorized by the act of Congress approved February 14, 1853 (10 Stat. 754), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 14, 1856 (11 Stat. 452): *Provided, however*, That nothing herein, or in such license, shall be construed as relieving said railroad from compliance with any of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act as amended or as it may hereafter be amended. Any license so granted shall (1) be revocable at the will of the Secretary; (2) provide that the Secretary may, in lieu of revoking such license, require the grantees to relocate any such trackage or facilities for the purpose of preventing interference with the use of such reservation for governmental purposes; and (3) provide that the privileges granted thereby shall be exercised subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary, or the commanding officer of such reservation with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe in the interests of maintenance of good order, sanitation, discipline, public safety, and the interests of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1290) to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment." was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INSTRUCTION AND TRAINING IN AVIATION

The bill (S. 1246) to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), is hereby amended to read as follows:

SEC. 2. When the facilities of the Army for instruction and training in aviation are deemed by the Secretary of War to be insufficient he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and without reference to any limitation contained in section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), detail personnel of the Army of the United States as students of any technical, professional, or other educational institution, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants or other places as shall be best suited to enable such personnel to acquire a knowledge of or experience in the

specialties incident to aviation in which the training of such personnel is essential: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in addition to the authorized emoluments of the personnel so detailed except for the cost of tuition at such educational institutions, and the cost of maintenance of necessary personnel who may be detailed as supervisors or inspectors and of the equipment assigned to them for their official use: *Provided further*, That the tuition for the personnel during the period of their detail may be paid from any funds which may hereafter be made available for the procurement branches.

RAILROAD UNDERPASS ON NEW YORK AVENUE NE.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 774) to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., operating lessee of all of the railroads and appurtenant properties of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., in the District of Columbia, be, and it is hereby, authorized to establish switch and siding connections with its tracks in parcel 130/9, to cross New York Avenue by means of a suitable underpass, and thence into and through parcel 129/33 and lot 801 in square 3585, as well as into and through the bed of Brentwood Road between New York Avenue and Florida Avenue, if and when said road is officially vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, all of said parcels of land being thus known and identified on the plat books of the surveyor's office of the District of Columbia, with all switches, crossings, turn-outs, extensions, spurs, and sidings, as may be or become necessary for the development of the said squares and parcels of land above indicated for such use as may be permitted in the use district or districts in which said squares and parcels of land are now or may hereafter be included as defined in the zoning regulations of the District of Columbia and shown in the official atlases of the Zoning Commission.

SEC. 2. Before any of the work above authorized shall be begun on the ground a plan or plans thereof shall be prepared and submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for their approval and only to the extent that such plans shall be so approved shall said work or any portion thereof be permitted or undertaken.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as limiting or abridging the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under the act of Congress approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. L. 1353), entitled "An act to provide for the elimination of grade crossings of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

SEC. 4. That Congress reserves the right to amend, alter, or repeal this act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as modifying the requirements of section 1 (18) of the Interstate Commerce Act insofar as they would apply to the construction referred to in section 1 of this act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not understand the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a bill which affects the District of Columbia. The Pennsylvania Railroad sought to extend its tracks across New York Avenue so that it might provide certain facilities for the loading and unloading of cars in the District of Columbia. The Interstate Commerce Commission sent a letter to the committee, which I ask to have read. I think the letter will explain the purport and meaning of the amendment. The amendment was not considered by the Committee on the District of Columbia because at the time it considered the bill the amendment had not been brought forward to the attention of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the able Senator whether the committee having jurisdiction of railroad matters, the Interstate Commerce Committee, was consulted?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it was not, and if the Senator will listen to the suggestion in the letter he will note that the amendment merely preserves the right to the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and issue a certificate permitting the trackage, if necessary. I ask that the letter be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, April 18, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Since my letter to you dated April 17, reporting on S. 774, certain facts have come to my attention which lead me to feel that some clarification and amplification of that letter would be desirable. Although Mr. Murray's letter was dated April 7, it did not reach the Commission until April 14, and, as it was understood that you wanted our comments as soon as possible, we had no opportunity to make any investigation of the circumstances relating to this bill other than those appearing from the bill itself.

It has since been stated to us that the project involved in S. 774 will probably entail the expenditure of a considerable amount of money for an extensive terminal, with the necessary railroad extensions, which will probably be opposed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., the Pennsylvania's principal railroad competitor in the District of Columbia. If this be true, it may be that the project is one for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity would ordinarily be required under section 1 (18) of the Interstate Commerce Act, quoted in my letter of the 17th.

Insofar as S. 774 is limited solely to the municipal regulation of the use or occupancy of streets in the District of Columbia we have no objection to it. However, we are fearful that if enacted into law as it now reads it might be interpreted as giving the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. full authority to carry out the project without any further governmental action except that specifically mentioned in the bill. It was for that reason that we suggested deleting the word "extensions" from line 8 of page 2. Upon further consideration our legislative committee feels that it would be well to go a step further and insert a new section between the present sections 3 and 4, as follows:

"SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as modifying the requirements of section 1 (18) of the Interstate Commerce Act insofar as they would apply to the construction referred to in section 1 of this act."

If the bill were so amended, the present section 4 should, of course, be renumbered 5.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may explain a little further that the bill is entirely a municipal bill so far as the Committee on the District of Columbia is concerned. The question before the District of Columbia Committee was whether we should permit the Pennsylvania Railroad to put an underpass across New York Avenue. That is all our committee had to do with. Mr. Eastman evidently wants to see to it that the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission is preserved, and it was for that reason that I offered the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENTS OVER CERTAIN GOVERNMENT LANDS

The bill (S. 634) to authorize the Attorney General to grant easements to States over lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the following bill on the calendar, Order No. 209, House bill 3394, is identical with the Senate bill the title of which has just been stated. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3394) to authorize the Attorney General to grant easements to States over lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that Senate bill 634 be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

MARTIN F. GETTINGS

The bill (H. R. 4065) for the relief of Martin F. Gettings was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. BRINSKELLE AND CHARLIE MELCHER

The bill (S. 1352) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher for damages for loss of

a fishing cabin located on Warrior River, Jefferson County, Ala., on or about March 6, 1937, because of fire allegedly caused by negligence of Government employees in connection with clearing operations along the banks of the Warrior River and its tributaries.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after enactment of this act and proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

J. M. SWINNEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1348) for the relief of J. M. Swinney, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, after "Mississippi" to strike out "the sum of $200 a month from May 23, 1938, during his lifetime, and, upon his death, to pay to his widow, if then living, the sum of $100 per month during her lifetime, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation on account of the total and permanent disability of the said J. M. Swinney, resulting from injuries received by him on May 23, 1938, from the explosion of several dynamite caps in his welding and blacksmith shop, which was being used without charge by the Works Progress Administration as a tool and storage room in connection with work on Works Progress Administration project No. 5466 in Pearl River County, Miss. The first payment under this act shall be made within 60 days from the date of its enactment and shall include all sums due and payable from May 23, 1938, to the date of such payment. All such payments shall be made through the United States Employment Compensation Commission"; and insert: "the sum of $2,719, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of injuries to the said J. M. Swinney resulting from the explosion of several dynamite caps handed to him loosely by Works Progress Administration employees in his welding and blacksmith shop on May 23, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. M. Swinney, of Poplarville, Miss., the sum of $2,719, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of injuries to the said J. M. Swinney resulting from the explosion of several dynamite caps handed to him loosely by Works Progress Administration employees in his welding and blacksmith shop on May 23, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percentum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK AND PAULINA RUBLEIN AND MRS. ETHEL BOWERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 853) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Frank Rublein and Paulina Rublein, husband and wife, for the losses sustained by them by reason of the death of their son, Ernest J. Rublein, resulting from the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000, and to Mrs. Ethel Bowers, mother of Richard Bowers, deceased, the sum of $5,000", and on page 2, line 5, after the name "Ernest Rublein", to strike out "was" and insert "and Richard Bowers were", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Rublein and Paulina Rublein, father and mother of Ernest J. Rublein, deceased, the sum of $5,000, and to Mrs. Ethel Bowers, mother of Richard Bowers, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damages for fatal injuries suffered by their sons on the 15th of August 1934, on route No. 28, about 3½ miles east of Newberry, Mich., when the automobile in which Ernest Rublein and Richard Bowers were riding was struck by a motor truck owned by the United States and driven by Richard Hobson, an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps Camp No. 1688, located at Newberry, Mich.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein, and Mrs. Ethel Bowers."

SPECIAL-TAX SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN BROWARD COUNTY, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 59) for the relief of special-tax school districts Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, Broward County, Fla., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY FORTUNE

The bill (H. R. 3269) for the relief of Mary Fortune was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HERBERT M. GREGORY

The bill (H. R. 4063) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Herbert M. Gregory was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUGHEY PARSLEY

The bill (H. R. 438) for the relief of Hughey Parsley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLENTOWN AIRPORT CORPORATION

The bill (H. R. 701) for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FAIRCHILD AERIAL SURVEYS, INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 694) for the relief of the Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,239.22" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MAJ. HAROLD SORENSON

The bill (S. 583) for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $313.02 to Maj. Harold Sorenson, of Bismarck, N. Dak., formerly the United States property and disbursing officer for North Dakota, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of amounts paid by him in the settlement of certain charges made against his accounts by reason of disallowances in his accounts for the month of August 1932, such disallowances representing overpayments of mileage allowances to certain members of the North Dakota National Guard for travel from their home stations to Devils Lake, N. Dak., and return, for the purpose of participating in field training of the National Guard during the period June 11, 1932, to June 25, 1932: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLAUDE W. LASALLE AND DAUTERIVE HOSPITAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1040) for the relief of Claude W.

LaSalle, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,830.50"; in line 6, after the name "Louisiana", to insert "and the sum of $169.50 to the Dauterive Hospital, New Iberia, La."; and in line 9, after the words "sustained by", to strike out "him" and insert "Claude W. LaSalle, and for medical and hospital expenses incurred", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,830.50 to Claude W. LaSalle, of Jeanerette, La., and the sum of $169.50 to the Dauterive Hospital, New Iberia, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Claude W. LaSalle, and for medical and hospital expenses incurred as a result of a collision when he was struck while on foot by United States Coast Guard truck No. 1616, said collision occurring on May 22, 1939, about 3 miles east of New Iberia, La., on United States Highway No. 90: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle and the Dauterive Hospital."

WILLIAM G. SULLIVAN

The bill (H. R. 198) for the relief of William G. Sullivan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONE AND MARY LIPKA

The bill (H. R. 224) for the relief of Antone and Mary Lipka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BEN TORIAN AND JOE J. McDONALD

The bill (H. R. 2006) for the relief of Ben Torian and Joe J. McDonald was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOPHRANIA HOLMES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3828) for the relief of Sophrania Holmes, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$179" and insert "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. CLYDE THATCHER AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3827) for the relief of Mrs. Clyde Thatcher and her two minor children, Marjorie Thatcher and Bobby Thatcher, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the name "Texas", to strike out "and"; in line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500", and on page 2, line 3, after the name "Thatcher", to insert "and for medical expenses incurred by Mr. Clyde Thatcher."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Thatcher and their two minor children, Marjorie Thatcher and Bobby Thatcher."

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT MOTOR VEHICLE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4036) to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act, approved May 3, 1935, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Act of May 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 166), as amended, is amended by adding after the second subparagraph therein the following new subparagraph:

"Reckless driving, as provided in section (9) (b) of such Traffic Acts, if personal injury occurs as a result thereof."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am somewhat in doubt regarding the objectives of this bill, and I should like to have it explained. Otherwise, I shall want it to go over.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, House bill 4036, if enacted, would accomplish this result: In the District of Columbia at the present time it is provided that if a person is convicted of driving while intoxicated, or of leaving the scene of an automobile accident without making his identity known, before he can secure a license to drive again he must show his financial responsibility. That provision, however, does not apply in the case of a conviction for reckless driving. This bill provides that if a person is convicted of reckless driving as the result of which personal injury is brought about, the financial-responsibility law will apply to him, so that before he can obtain a license to continue driving he also must make a showing that he has sufficient financial responsibility to meet the requirements of the act. The act calls for an insurance policy covering an injury in the amount of $5,000, for each person, or a total of $10,000 for one or more persons in any one accident, or $1,000 damage to property. That can be met either by an insurance policy or by a bond, or by a cash deposit.

So the net effect of this bill will be that hereafter, if a person is convicted either of driving while under the influence of liquor or of leaving the scene of an automobile accident in which a personal injury occurred without identifying himself or, under the proposed new act, is convicted of reckless driving, he must show his financial responsibility and provide insurance before he can secure a license to continue driving.

The bill has already been passed by the House and has been approved by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF UNION RAILROAD STATION ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3066) to amend an act to provide for a Union Railroad Station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? I may say that I am somewhat humiliated. I am a member of the Senate District Committee, but if we have had any meetings, except one, I have not been notified of them; and the bills now coming up in relation to the District are bills I have never heard of. I should like to have them explained.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this bill contains two amendments to the act which provided for the establishment of the Union Station in the District of Columbia. When that bill was enacted it contained section 10, which provided that in the case of any streets or highways within the District of Columbia which crossed any line of steam railroad the District of Columbia would have to eliminate the grade crossings and provide for a separation of the grades at the cost of the District of Columbia. At that time every line that went into the depot was a steam railroad. Now there are some electrified lines. The first amendment is to eliminate the word "steam," and make that requirement apply to any line of railroad other than a street railway, so that if one of these electrified lines crosses a street it shall be requisite that the District of Columbia shall separate the grades as much as if it were a steam line. That really is merely a technical amendment to cover developments in transportation.

The second amendment is the important one. There are also a number of spur tracks and switch tracks which are used perhaps once a day; and to apply this provision to such spur tracks and switch tracks would, of course, involve an expenditure far out of proportion to the amount of benefit to the public which would result from the separation of the grades. It seems that at the present time there are a number of such tracks in operation as grade crossings, and there have been no particular extensions in recent years; but now, with the development of the District, it is becoming neces-

sary to make use of some spur tracks across minor streets where they have not been in use before. Therefore it is proposed to add this clause:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall require the location, construction, or maintenance of any such street or highway under or above any spur, industrial, switching, or side track, or branch line of any railroad unless the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall find the same is necessary in the public safety.

For example, one of the spur tracks immediately under consideration is used perhaps once a day. To separate the grades would cost something like one or two hundred thousand dollars. There are several other grade crossings on the present spur tracks. This amendment eliminates the necessity for separating the grades unless the District Commissioners find it to be necessary in the interest of public safety.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINERAL RESOURCES OF PUBLIC LANDS

The resolution (S. Res. 53) submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on January 23, 1941, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the development of the mineral resources (including oil and gas) of the public lands of the United States, and of the existing laws which relate to such development, with a view toward (1) providing for more effective development and utilization of such resources for the purposes of national defense, (2) fostering free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in the development of the mineral industry and the production of essential and useful minerals, and (3) conserving such mineral resources to the fullest extent which is consistent with their proper development and utilization. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

WILLIAM T. J. RYAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 175) for the relief of William T. J. Ryan, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "wife", to insert "if living, or to William T. J. Ryan", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 649), relating to the support of families of enlisted men in the Military Establishment who served during the expedition into Mexico, the claim of William T. J. Ryan, then sergeant, Headquarters Battery, Seventy-sixth Regiment United States Field Artillery, Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo., for Federal support of his wife, Beulah E. Ryan, be held and considered to have been received in the office of the depot quartermaster, Washington, D. C., on or before June 30, 1917, in view of the fact that delay in receipt occurred through no fault of the soldier but through loss or miscarriage of his application in the mails, and that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Beulah E. Ryan, his wife, if living, or to William T. J. Ryan, the sum of $184, in full satisfaction of said claim: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or receved by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOUTH DAKOTA WHEAT GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) for the relief of South Dakota Wheat Growers Association, Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$85,390.71" and insert "$40,473.71", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to South Dakota Wheat Growers Association, Inc., of Aberdeen, S. Dak., the sum of $40,473.71, in full satisfaction of all its claims against the United States for losses sustained by it, during the stabilizing operations of the Federal Farm Board in 1929 and 1930, through withholding grain from the market, paying the storage and carrying charges thereon, and making advances to its members in order to stabilize prices: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this joint resolution in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this joint resolution shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was rejected.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a casual glance at this bill indicates that it is a plan to remove any State authority from the provisions of section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

I do not know that I should oppose it on that ground, but I have a telegram which has just reached my desk from W. A Schoenfeld, director of the experiment station and school of agriculture at the Oregon State College, asking for an opportunity further to consider the proposed legislation. It is important. I understand a great many States have not cooperated with the Government.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection to the bill going over. But I am sure the Senator understands that action must be taken at this session, otherwise the whole soil-conservation program will be terminated.

Mr. McNARY. I would not go that far; but we will not discuss that now. I shall be satisfied if the bill goes over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF CROP INSURANCE TO COTTON

The bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it seems to me this bill is of such importance that it should have more consideration than can be given to it on a call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection. As I gather, it extends the crop-insurance program to all agricultural commodities.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to make a statement about it. Of course, if there is objection, I cannot do anything but consent that the bill go over. But the Senator is in error.

We passed a bill identical with this one, word for word, 2 years ago, and the House passed the same bill and it went to the White House, but was vetoed. This applies only to cotton, and that was explained when the bill was before us previously. When the wheat-insurance program was included in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, we had an agreement that we would make a trial with one commodity to see how the law operated, and it was agreed that if it proved satisfactory as to wheat, cotton would come next in order. We went along in the hope that we could finally take in a great many other agricultural commodities.

After wheat had been tried for 2 years, Congress passed the bill including cotton. The President sent the bill back with a veto message, because he was not satisfied, from the experience, that the action

was justified. At this time, however, the committee has a letter releasing this cotton program. It is approved by the Director of the Budget and by the administration, and, as I stated, this measure is identical with the bill that was previously passed. So under those circumstances I do not see any real reason for the bill going over.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I see that there are substituted for the words "wheat crop" the words "agricultural commodities." On the face of it, it includes many things other than wheat.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That applies merely to the administration program. This bill includes cotton only.

Mr. ADAMS. It seems to me of such significance and importance that it should be more carefully considered than it can be at this time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the Senator will give it his consideration.

Mr. ADAMS. It is a matter of great importance.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to have it acted on at the next call of the calendar.

Mr. ADAMS. I suggest to the Senator that we do not wait for a call of the calendar, but set it down and have the matter gone into with greater care than is possible on a call of the calendar.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The bill contains an amendment authorizing the administration to take notes, in connection with wheat, instead of insisting on actual delivery of the wheat, in which event they have to take it and store it and keep it. The Department is anxious to have the proposed legislation enacted. It says the bill will enable approximately a million dollars to be saved. Policies are now being taken and time is important. So I ask the Senator to give this bill his consideration before the next call of the calendar.

In view of the long consideration previously given the bill—and it was unanimously reported by the committee—and in view of the fact that we are merely going over ground which has been heretofore covered, I had hoped there might not be objection to consideration of the bill. But if the Senator objects, I can only say that I am sorry.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the bill extend the law to all agricultural commodities?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; it includes only cotton. The Department is making a study of different agricultural commodities, in the hope that it can go from one to the other as fast as the statistical information is obtained to justify such action. The Senator doubtless knows the Department has already acted in the case of wheat.

Mr. TAFT. The first section contemplates substituting "agricultural commodities" for "wheat."

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is general administrative language, so that when some other commodity is included the law will apply. The bill does not add anything but cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. ADAMS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES IN FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

The bill (S. 1390) to amend section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this is another little bill on the same subject, covered by the preceding bill, introduced at the request of the Department, who ask that they be empowered to permit notes to be taken, rather than to be required, as the present law requires, that the commodity itself be delivered. In the case of wheat they have to take it to a warehouse or elevator, store it, and hold it. They want to handle the transaction in another way, by taking notes payable in wheat if the farmer is not in a position to pay cash. The Department says it will save about a million dollars if it is permitted to take notes.

Mr. HATCH. Does the question of storage space also enter into the matter?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not sure; but the officials are anxious to have this bill enacted, because they say it would involve a large saving, and the matter of convenience. It may involve the question of space, too.

This matter is presented in two ways. I presented it as an amendment to the cotton-crop insurance measure so that it would apply to both crops if the cotton measure were passed. If it should not be passed, then it would stand as an independent bill, so that we could get it through any time, and use it under the wheat insurance plan. It does not enlarge the program; it merely authorizes the taking of notes rather than the actual delivery of the wheat.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the bill now under discussion is in the form of an amendment to the bill which precedes it on the calendar, and that was brought about by the objection made by the Department and the objection of the Budget Bureau. The whole thing is a complete story with the preceding bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. However, this does relate to a little different subject matter from that covered in the bill which precedes it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; the Senator is in error. If the bill covering cotton is not passed, then this bill relates to wheat only.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I said; this amendment is separate and apart from the substance of the bill that was discussed a minute ago.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. While it is linked with the other bill at the request of the Department of Agriculture and of the Bureau of the Budget it still applies to a different subject matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting the following sentences immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Nothing in this section shall prevent the Corporation from accepting, for the payment of premiums, notes payable in the commodity insured, or the cash equivalent, upon such security as may be determined pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and from purchasing the quantity of the commodity represented by any of such notes not paid at maturity."

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, MISSISSIPPI AND ARKANSAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 961) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after "Congress", to insert "approved May 17, 1939, heretofore extended by an act of Congress", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., authorized to be built by the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission and its successors and assigns by an act of Congress, approved May 17, 1939, heretofore extended by an act of Congress, approved May 27, 1940, are hereby further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, WISCONSIN

The bill (S. 1147) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa," approved August 7, 1939, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the act approved August 7, 1939, authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

PATAPSCO RIVER BRIDGE, MARYLAND

The bill (S. 1223) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across or tunnel

under the Patapsco River at Baltimore, Md.; and a bridge across Chesapeake Bay from a point at or near Miller's Island, Baltimore County, Md., to a point at or near Tolchester, Kent County, Md., or a bridge across or tunnel under Chesapeake Bay, or a combined bridge and tunnel, from a point at or near Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, Md., to a point on Kent Island, Md., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across or tunnel under the Patapsco River at Baltimore, Md., and the construction of a bridge across Chesapeake Bay from a point at or near Miller's Island, Baltimore County, Md., to a point at or near Tolchester, Kent County, Md., or a bridge across or tunnel under Chesapeake Bay, or a combined bridge and tunnel, from a point at or near Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, Md., to a point on Kent Island, Md., authorized to be built by the State of Maryland by an act of Congress approved April 7, 1938, are hereby extended 3 and 5 years, respectively, from the date of the approval of this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE, OREGON

The bill (S. 1226) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., authorized to be built by the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees by an act of Congress approved June 13, 1934, as amended, as heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved August 30, 1935, January 27, 1936, August 5, 1937, May 26, 1938, August 5, 1939, and December 16, 1940, are further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 13, 1941.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BRIDGE, PENNSYLVANIA

The bill (H. R. 2829) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (H. R. 2830) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE, OHIO

The bill (H. R. 3682) granting the consent of Congress to the Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River in the village of Lowellville, Mahoning County, Ohio, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. LOUIS RIVER BRIDGE, MINNESOTA AND WISCONSIN

The bill (H. R. 2766) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CUMBERLAND RIVER, TENNESSEE

The bill (H. R. 2684) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Cumberland River at a point approximately 1¾ miles below Clees Ferry, connecting a belt-line highway in Davidson County, State of Tennessee, known as the Old Hickory Boulevard, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OHIO RIVER TOLL BRIDGE NEAR CANNELTON, IND.

The bill (H. R. 1824) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 106) admitting JOSEPH ROSIER as a Senator from the State of West Virginia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

EXEMPTION FROM INTERNAL REVENUE TAXES

The bill (H. R. 3835) to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTINUATION OF TEMPORARY INCREASES IN POSTAL RATES

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH. I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that I reported the joint resolution favorably from the Finance Committee. It merely extends the 3-cent postage rate for 2 years beyond June 30 of the present year. The figures show that it means approximately $101,000,000 to the Post Office Department and the Treasury of the United States. Unless the Senator from South Carolina has some serious objection to the joint resolution I should like to have it passed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I know that taxes and other charges must go to the point where everything will be burdened thereby, but I believe we will get as much or more revenue by going back to the 2-cent postage rate. I never did know exactly why the rate was raised to 3 cents, except to get more revenue. I have no personal objection; only the 2-cent postage rate was, in my opinion, an ideal rate, and it brought in sufficient revenue. It would be well if we took action with respect to certain matter which now goes as second class and burdens the mail, but we do not have the courage to do it. We help certain interests to carry their advertising through the mails, which results in making millions of dollars for them. They use the Post Office Department as a carrier; they are favored, while those who write letters must bear the burden. That is my main objection to the measure.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that the very subject to which I think he is referring is now under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. SMITH. It has been under consideration ever since I have been here.

Mr. BROWN. And it is also before the Senate Finance Committee. Whether it will pass, I cannot say. But an estimate of some $78,000,000 by way of revenue from the source to which the Senator referred has been made by the experts of the joint committee. I cannot assure him that such a measure will pass.

Mr. SMITH. I can assure the Senator that it will not. Of course, it will not.

Mr. BROWN. I trust the Senator will let this measure be passed, because it means, according to the estimates of the Post Office Department, $101,000,000 of revenue.

Mr. SMITH. When does the present law expire?

Mr. BROWN. June 30 of the present year.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator will have sufficient time to provide for bringing in the $76,000,000 to which he has referred.

Mr. BROWN. I do not want the Senator to say that I intend to bring it in. I merely say that the matter is under consideration.

Mr. SMITH. Very well; we will consider that, together with this joint resolution, when the matter comes before us. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The joint resolution will be passed over.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS BY THE TREASURY

The bill (H. R. 4239) to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICIAL SEAL FOR THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The bill (H. R. 3974) to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security

Agency to adopt an official seal, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE FUND AND THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE FUND

The bill (S. 1045) to increase the earnings of the United States Government life-insurance fund and the national service life-insurance fund by expediting the investment of the moneys thereof, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the bill be passed over. I wish to look into it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1045?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I object to the present consideration of the last bill on the calendar. I do not know that I shall persist in my objection, but from the caption of the bill it seems to be a rather formidable piece of legislation. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Georgia make an explanation if he desires.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I shall be satisfied to have the bill go over if the Senator from Oregon wishes that it go over, but I shall be very glad to explain briefly what it is.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator may have the opportunity now. I may be convinced by his statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the premiums paid or payments made on the two types of Government life insurance, the old war-risk insurance and the present insurance which has been provided to take care of the trainees, the men called temporarily into service, must be invested in funds of the United States Government. Under the detailed method of handling those collections at this time there is a loss of some time between the time of receipt of the money, while it passes through the Treasury, and is taken out, with certain formalities, and sent to the Comptroller General for his approval, and so forth, and the time of its investment. There is a necessary lag in time. This bill seeks to do only one thing, and it does but the one thing, namely, to cut the red tape, so that immediately upon the receipt of the money by the Treasury such funds may be invested in interest-bearing bonds, without the loss of some necessary days and sometimes weeks. The earnings on the bonds go to the benefit of the insured. The general funds of the veterans and of the trainees who have been called to the service are increased by interest paid upon these bonds. The only purpose of the measure is to eliminate that lag in time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is a reasonable and satisfactory explanation. I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary", and on page 2, line 11, after the word "accounts", to insert "by the General Accounting Office", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That all cash balances in the United States Government life-insurance fund and the national service life-insurance fund on the enactment of this act, together with all moneys thereafter accruing to such funds, including premiums, appropriated moneys, the proceeds of any sales of investments which may be necessary to meet current expenditures, and interest on investments, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in the disbursing accounts of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, and shall thereupon be available for disbursement for meeting all expenditures and making investments authorized to be made from such funds without covering into the Treasury of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions. All necessary bookkeeping adjustments of such funds in the accounts on the books of the Treasury shall be made upon the basis of the settlement of disbursing accounts by the General Accounting Office.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair), laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating John C. Fitzgerald, of Maine, to be Work Projects Administrator for Maine, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Frank J. Kuhl, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John M. Morin, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of 6 years from March 15, 1941 (reappointment).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general.

By Mr. AUSTIN (for Mr. REYNOLDS), from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Joseph O. Donovan, to be State Director of Selective Service for the State of California, under the provisions of law; and

Brig. Gen. Sion Boone Hawkins, Georgia National Guard, to be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States, under the provisions of law; the same officer to be assigned and detailed as State Director of Selective Service for the State of Georgia, under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceed to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the calendar.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FOLGER, OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Senate resumed legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 192) from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

House Resolution 192

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 1, 1941.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALONZO D. FOLGER, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the lamentable news conveyed to us by the message from the House of Representatives, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the

death of Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, let me say that I deeply regret that I am unable to serve as one of the committee from the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative FOLGER. We are engaged in hearings on the ship-requisitioning bill, and we are under the necessity of pressing those hearings with a view to the final determination of the attitude of the committee in order that we may report back to the Senate at the earliest possible opportunity. So I ask that someone other than myself be designated as one of the two Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will announce the appointment of the committee at a later time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 1, 1941:

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

John C. Fitzgerald, of Maine, to be work project administrator for Maine.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1941:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON

Eugene C. Stamm

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS

David J. Prather
Louis L. Williams, Jr.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE CHIEF GUNNER

Ralph A. Taylor

TO BE CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

John T. Oden

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER (WITH RELATIVE RANK OF LIEUTENANT, JUNIOR GRADE, IN THE NAVY)

Arthur Loren Wardwell

TO BE AIDES (WITH RELATIVE RANK OF ENSIGN IN THE NAVY)

John Thomas Guthrie
Howard Stapleton Cole
Robert White McCarty

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, the God of nature and of the human heart, we thank Thee for our kinship with Thy marvelous works. On this radiant May day we pray for a life so simple and natural that we shall be able to enter into sympathetic relations with the promise and glory of Thy handiwork. Teach us the gladness and peace of that life which is responsive to Thy messages through Nature; herein are the virtues which ennoble and enrich our relationships. Here enduring patience appears and distorted tempers are subdued, blessing us with the companionship of great thoughts. In the light and beauty of this good world-house, strengthen our aspirations and make real to our souls the higher vision. "Our Father who are in heaven, hallowed be Thy name." So long as we revere Thy holy name, our homes will be pure and the genius of our Republic be sacred.

Blessed Lord, we wait at the altar of prayer by a common impulse. Our hearts are touched by the sudden death of an honored Member, whose character and fidelity to high purpose endeared him to his colleagues. Comfort Thou the devoted companion of the years and care for the two dear boys that they may be kept in the embrace of Thy Fatherly love. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 22, 1941:

H. R. 3786. An act to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

On April 23, 1941:

H. R. 2990. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931," approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212);

H. R. 3097. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940;

H. R. 3160. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939; and

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939," to provide for an extension in the life of the Commission, to authorize the transfer of property to other departments and branches of the Government without consideration, and for other purposes.

On April 24, 1941:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

On April 29, 1941:

H. R. 3486. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, relating to defense housing, by authorizing an additional appropriation of $150,000,000 and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VREELAND asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article in reference to the University of San Francisco which appeared in the San Francisco News of April 26.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by me to the California Real Estate Association, and to also extend my remarks in the RECORD in reference to the labor situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two statements on the St. Lawrence seaway proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters from Carl G. Snavely, of Cornell University, as well as an editorial entitled "Strategic Evacuation" from the Cornell Daily Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a reprint of an article appearing in the River Forester, of River Forest, Ill., in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an oration and also my statement before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by David Lawrence in the Evening Star of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under a previous order of the House I have been allotted 10 minutes to address the House today. I ask unanimous consent to have that deferred until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article concerning myself, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by myself at the dedication of the Windsor post office at Windsor, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the Honorable JOSEPH E. CASEY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain particulars with reference to the Rockland Voluntary Aid Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore made, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some information I have received from the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Msgr. Robert P. Barry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the special order I have to address the House this afternoon be continued until a week from today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES — INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY (H. DOC. NO. 197)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American republics in Central America in the survey and construction of the proposed Inter-American Highway within the borders of those republics.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 1941.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein resolutions passed by the Knights of Columbus at Westpoint, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GEHRMANN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE LATE ALONZO D. FOLGER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the tragic and untimely death at Mount Airy, N. C., his home, of ALONZO D. FOLGER, a Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. He was fatally injured in an accident in his home town early yesterday morning and passed away yesterday evening.

His untimely death has shocked and saddened his legion of friends in all walks of life, especially in his home State, and has brought to a tragic end a most useful and faithful career.

The people of North Carolina, his home State, and of his district, loved and trusted Mr. FOLGER as they did few men. All who had the opportunity to know his many high qualities admired and respected him, not only as a faithful public servant, but as a gentleman and a true friend.

I know that I speak the sentiment that is universally shared by all—that in his death the State of North Carolina, the Nation, and the House has lost not only a friend but one who gave unstintingly of his ability and energies to further improve the lot of his fellowman. LON FOLGER was beloved by all and we shall greatly miss him.

I know I voice the sentiment of my colleagues when I extend to his widow and family the profound sympathy of the House of Representatives, for we all feel a deep sorrow in the tragic passing of one we highly respected, greatly admired, and dearly loved.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 192

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALONZO D. FOLGER, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members of the House: Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. KERR, and Mr. CLARK.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 2, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will continue hearings on the following days:

1. Friday, May 2: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Ohio River and tributaries.

2. Monday, May 5: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Tuesday, May 6: Proponents and representatives of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Wednesday, May 7: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the Arkansas, White, Red, and St. Francis River Basins.

5. Thursday, May 8: Lower Mississippi River. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers on the lower Mississippi River and proposed modifications of the adopted project.

6. Friday, May 9: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries other than the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

7. Monday, May 12: Proponents and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

8. Tuesday, May 13: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

9. Wednesday, May 14: Senators and Members of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4017, a bill permitting exemption from certain restrictions on political activity in municipal affairs, on Wednesday, May 7, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before Subcommittee No. 1.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, May 7, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4215 (Mr. ALLEN), to exclude certain aliens.

Consideration of House Resolution 94 (LELAND M. FORD) and private bills, Thursday, May 8, 1941.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, May 7, 1941. Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 4314.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Wednesday, May 14, 1941, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 3361, to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish-restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

485. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to $143,680 (H. Doc. No. 191); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

486. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Department of State, for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, amounting to $611,000 (H. Doc. No. 192); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

487. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a change in limitation affecting an estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency as an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 193); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

488. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 194); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

489. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1941 in the amount of $15,000,000 for defense housing (H. Doc. No. 195); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

490. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries and administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1941, in the amount of $250,000 (H. Doc. No. 196); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 4545. A bill to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program; with amendment (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 44 and 45, also House Resolution No. 149, relative to floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 20, with reference to the Old Oregon Trail; to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

937. By Mr. BOLLES: Resolution of the Milwaukee Woman's Club, endorsing the principles of House bill 3793 and Senate bill 1131, which seek to stop the wasteful outmoded logging practices which have resulted in the slaughter of entire forests in this country, and which will place approximately 2,000,000 acres in northern Wisconsin and in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan under selective cutting management by State and Federal agencies and so put timber production on a permanent basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

938. Also, resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Racine, Wis., requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation enabling the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

939. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution of the Assembly of the California Legislature, relating to conversion of fruit surpluses into alcohol; to the Committee on Agriculture.

940. Also, communication from the American Trust Co., Oakland, Calif., relative to taxes and sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

941. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the common council of the city of Yonkers, N. Y., opposing any change in the existing law covering the cane-sugar refining industry that would add additional burden on the American

consumer, cause further unemployment in the State of New York, or disrupt in any way our good-neighbor policy with South and Central America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

942. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, asking consideration for Resolution No. 149, appearing on page 2099 of the Assembly Journal of the State of California, relating to profiteering in foods and other necessities of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

943. Also, memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 44, relating to the Sacramento River north from Chico Landing; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

944. Also, memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 45, relating to flood and seepage conditions along the Sacramento River and its tributaries in northern California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

945. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Kerrville National Farm Loan Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to agriculture and farm loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

946. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, St. Paul, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

947. Also, petition of the Sons of the Revolution, New York City, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the stoppages of work; to the Committee on Labor.

948. Also, petition of Local Union No. 101, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.